

Thursday, September 19, 2019

ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Flaute called the Riverside, Ohio City Council Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Riverside Administrative Offices located at 5200 Springfield Street, Suite 100, Riverside, Ohio, 45431.

ITEM 2: ROLL CALL: Council attendance was as follows: Ms. Campbell, present; Mr. Curp, present; Deputy Mayor Denning, present; Ms. Fry, present; Ms. Lommatzsch, present; Mr. Teaford, present; and Mayor Flaute, present.

Staff present was as follows: Mark Carpenter, City Manager; Chris Lohr, Assistant City Manager; Tom Garrett, Finance Department; Chief Frank Robinson, Police Department; Chief Dan Stitzel, Fire Department, Kathy Bartlett, Service Department; Tamara Ennist, Zoning Administrator; and Katie Lewallen, Clerk of Council.

ITEM 3: EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS: There were no absent members.

ITEM 4: ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO AGENDA: No changes were made to the revised agenda.

ITEM 5: APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Ms. Lommatzsch motioned to approve the revised agenda. Deputy Mayor Denning seconded the motion. All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

ITEM 6: WORK SESSION ITEMS:

A) Update on 10-Year Paving Program – Ms. Bartlett stated she had been working hard between PMG and the financial consultant back and forth; it is an iterative process getting information from one program and working out the finances. This is what she will show them tonight. The presentation will show a new budget scenario #4 that will get them to a PCI 70 rather than 75, using the 2020 draft budget with the street levy; and present the financial plan to front load projects in the first five years. She hopes to get a motion to go forward with the 5-year paving plan using front loading for the first five years. There is \$3.0 million proposed for both thoroughfares and residential streets which comes from the gas/motor vehicle tax, \$700,000; permissive tax, \$375,000; and street levy funds, \$1.925 million. There is the variable of needing added staff if there is front loading.

Ms. Bartlett stated the problem with budget scenario #3 is that both columns the \$500,000 and the expected annual budget for a total of \$2.0 million to maintain in years five through ten. They can borrow the \$1.625 million a year for the first five years, but it puts them at their limit and it may not be where they want to be and have flexibility should other things come up. Ms. Fry asked for a reminder on what the expected annual budget is based upon, with or without the levy. Ms. Bartlett responded that is with the levy. Ms. Fry stated the expected annual budget with the levy gives us one column and the additional needed annually is above and beyond the levy. Ms. Bartlett stated the \$1.625 million is above and beyond the levy. The middle column averages \$1.5 million, when you take the loan amount out, which is almost \$1.0 million; you don't even have that. She stated this is where she didn't do the best math on the slide showing the cost to maintain with additional loan amounts as she is not a financial person. The \$500,000 was too low, the loans for the Springfield Streets were too low; and then she didn't include with the committed and planned projects the funds they were going to put towards residential. What they need as a budget by those numbers is something in the neighborhood of \$4.2 million and they only have \$3.0 million. Ms. Fry asked if the \$4.2 million is annual or is it in the front-loaded years. Ms. Bartlett replied that it would be in years five through ten after the loans were all taken out. She stated that in her talks with the financial consultant; they would not take out an annual loan each year. Years one and two would be combined taking out \$3.25 million, as would years three and four. In year five, it would just be \$1.625 million. They would be fine for those five years, but then they would be getting close to the maximum of what they could borrow. Then they would only have roughly \$350,000 to put towards roadways in 2025 –

Thursday, September 19, 2019

2029 and the PCI would allow them to get to 75 but they could not maintain it. They start out in 2020 with a 66 and they would end up with a 66 in 2029 with maxing out their loan ability.

With scenario #4, instead of going to a PCI of 75, they could go to 70. That means instead of \$1.625 million a year for the first five years, they only will need an additional amount of \$1.0 million. For the first five years, for residential streets, they would have an annual budget of \$2.5 million per year until they get to 2025. Ironically, the budget needed to maintain a 70 is identical to what it is to maintain a 75. She asked PMG, and was told that in budget scenarios #3 and #4, the costs to maintain are the same for years 2025 through 2029. The number of 75 or 70 isn't the variable, either way, the same number of projects at about the same costs needs to be done each year to maintain. Mr. Curp asked if it was the same number of streets or the same dollar investment. Ms. Bartlett replied it was the same dollar investment. Mr. Curp added that if they move to an overall 70 PCI target at the end of five years, they will have to put in a similar investment to get streets up to a certain level so that the calculations work out to 70 as opposed to 75. That would seem to indicate to do that they would be paving more residential streets. Mr. Carpenter stated that when they got James's response, he interpreted it as whatever PCI they get to, it will cost them \$2.0 million/year to maintain that. Anything less, then they start coming down. Deputy Mayor Denning stated that he said to maintain where they are now it will cost them \$2.0 million so all they are trying to do is raise the bar and then stay at that level. So, whatever it costs us to get to whatever level they choose, it will be the same whatever that is. Ms. Bartlett added that was right as their roadways are in a declining mode; they are trying to hit the curve and bring it up. Deputy Mayor Denning followed with just to maintain where they are is going to cost them \$2.0 million wherever 'there' is.

Ms. Bartlett continued on the costs with additional loan amounts in this scenario with good numbers and after talking to the financial consultant. All of the loans for the Springfield Streets, US 35, and the \$1.0 million borrowed at different increments over five years they would have loan payments of \$700,000. The cost to maintain in years 6 – 26 would be \$2.0 million for a total of \$2.7 million plus the committed planned projects. They will still need an annual budget of \$4.2 million in years 5 – 10. She provided the financial plan and where she took the figures. She added they are still in the conceptual stage as to which direction they want to go.

Ms. Bartlett stated that in budget scenario #4, in years 5 – 29 they would have \$1.0 million to keep investing in their streets. This would give them a graph where they start with a 65, they get to 70 and stay there for a year and then they drop back down to 65. Deputy Mayor Denning commented unless they invest more. Ms. Bartlett confirmed that was true; it all hinges on a \$3.0 million budget that she is saying they have to work with, which is based on the draft 2020 budget and the street levy.

Mr. Curp stated he understood the wear and tear, but if the useful life of a newly paved street is out in the 10, 15, 20 years, why, after only five years would the PCI rating start going down if they are continuing to improve the streets. Ms. Bartlett stated it was because 70 percent of the streets are in the fair to very poor condition so they keep losing streets as they are not making as many increases as they are getting decreases to that number. Mr. Curp replied that they can't fix them fast enough. Ms. Bartlett confirmed that. Mr. Curp asked if they can't fix them fast enough then are they sure that even with a front load they can get to the 70 PCI in five years. Ms. Bartlett stated with the additional amount they can get there, but they can't stay there. They will have PMG come back in a year or two and reassess the roadways and they will get a better idea of how quickly they are deteriorating. The model bases it on three to five points a year. Mr. Curp stated he is concerned with stating they are spending a certain amount doing a front-end load to get them up to a higher PCI rating and then they are saying they need the same amount of money to maintain them, while fixing the other roads except the useful life is to be close to 20 years. Where is the maintenance money going if the useful life is 20 years? Ms. Bartlett replied they aren't going out 15 – 20 years,

Thursday, September 19, 2019

which is the useful life. The model from James's response back, the projection, there are so many variables to look at it 20 – 25 years down the road in theory they might see the money to maintain drop, but they could have hard winters or the thoroughfares could take a beating because of traffic.

Ms. Fry stated that they have a chart showing them maintaining a 70 that is labeled budget scenario #4, and then they have a different type of chart that drops to 65 PCI that is labeled budget scenario #4 with loans. Ms. Bartlett replied that budget scenario #4 is if they had \$4.2 million to continue on in years 5 – 10, but because they don't, based on the \$3.0 million budget, the scenario with the loans is what they actually have. Ms. Fry asked her to explain the 'with the loans' part. Ms. Bartlett stated the \$1.0 million for five years and the Springfield Street and US 35 loans that total \$700,000 has to come out of that \$3.0 million budget; this eats into the budget they can use to improve the streets. Ms. Fry stated she is struggling with talking about loans rather than how much money is being spent toward the streets because ultimately that is what drives the chart. If the amount of money spent to maintain is \$2.0 million, is that a correct statement? Ms. Bartlett replied that is what it needs to be in years 5 – 10. Ms. Fry asked if they do not do anything else, if they come up with \$2.0 million just to do the sealing or whatever to keep the condition of those roads at a 70, everything from that \$2.0 million to the \$4.2 million is additional ongoing projects and things of that nature, was that correct? Ms. Bartlett confirmed that was so and it was the committed projects and the residential, everything that would have to come out of that \$3.0 million and the loans have a significant cost. It would be approximately \$700,000 in loan payments starting from year one and going for 20 years. She is trying to work with a \$3.0 million budget because that is the number she has to work with. Ms. Fry stated she can wrap her mind around the loans once she understands the costs. The cost for the roads isn't \$4.2 million because that \$700,000 is financing. Ms. Bartlett replied it is \$2.0 million to maintain the residential years 6 – 29. Mr. Curp asked if they are differentiating between maintaining the residential versus newly paving the residential or are they lumped together. Ms. Bartlett stated the cost to maintain is for residential and thoroughfares to maintain an average of 70 for all roadways. Deputy Mayor Denning stated what that really means is that they will be paving some and sealing some, whatever it takes to maintain the average of 70. The more they can pave the better the average can be. Ms. Bartlett stated every time they pave they bring it up to 100. Deputy Mayor Denning discussed how the average would change every time they paved a road and maintaining the average. Mr. Curp asked if it was just paving or paving and maintenance because he hears they do a front-end load to get a lot of work done in the first five years to get to a certain PCI level and then it will cost them \$2.0 million thereafter to maintain; maintain the streets or maintain the PCI? If it is maintaining the PCI then they are talking about continuation of paving the streets that needed to be paved that didn't get paved in the first five years. Ms. Bartlett stated that was correct. Mr. Curp stated that is one definition, but if they are saying if they front-end load and do a lot of paving in the first five years and now it costs them \$2.0 to maintain those streets they paved. Ms. Bartlett stated it is to maintain the PCI, which is resurfacing the worst, anything at a 55 or below gets mill and filled; and then those numbers that are higher to keep them up, they would crack seal or slurry seal. With 70 percent of the streets at or below a 55, they will want to mill and fill as much as possible, which is the most expensive work. If they projected this out 30 years from now, the number could come down, but then you have streets in good condition now, the 30 percent above 55; you have to address them and then there is inflation. Mr. Curp stated that in years 5 and beyond the predominance of the street maintenance itself still trying to keep the PCI up to 70 or whatever, most of that maintenance is going to take place on the thoroughfares because they don't have the same traffic volume or kinds of traffic like larger vehicles as they do on the thoroughfares. Most of the semi-truck traffic, RTA bus traffic, and school bus traffic, most of the heavy stuff takes place on the thoroughfares, which causes the need for crack seal and other stuff because they are beating the heck out of the thoroughfares. It seems that the predominance of the maintenance of a 70 or whatever PCI goes to maintaining the thoroughfares. Ms. Bartlett replied that after the last meeting she asked James to calculate the PCI was for the residential and for the thoroughfares, right

Thursday, September 19, 2019

now. The thoroughfares have an average of 70 already. The residential average a 55. Mr. Curp commented that is why the tax levy is on the ballot.

Ms. Fry asked if the planned projects for years 5 – 10 are being factored in to the PCI. Ms. Bartlett replied that was correct. She gave James the amount of money left out of the \$3.0 million to use to run the PAVER program. James put them in the year that they are getting done in. Mr. Carpenter commented that OPWC grants are not included or other grants partnering with the water department; those numbers are not in there. Ms. Bartlett stated the project in years 5 – 10 is primarily Woodman in different phases. She did include the MVRPC STP grant as that is \$3.0 million. Historically, Riverside has had a project with MVRPC every year to get that \$3.0 million to repair a thoroughfare. That means nearly \$1.0 million of the city's money has to be used so that money was subtracted out of what she gave James to work with. She also subtracted the annual expenses for paint striping, guard rail, signals, and signs; all that work in the CIP was taken out of the \$3.0 million because that has to be done on an annual basis and must come out of the same pot of money. Ms. Fry asked if the planned projects, \$1.5 million/year, are already factored into the PCI, then the number to maintain a 70 PCI should include that \$1.5 million so it isn't \$2.0 million to maintain, but \$3.5 million to maintain. Ms. Bartlett stated she could look at it that way. She added it to the bottom as the "plus committed planned projects". Ms. Fry stated she is trying to get to a realistic, anticipated cost for the foreseeable future, whether or not they have loans, a levy, regardless of source of the income, they should know from the outset what it costs to maintain our roads. She stated the number she believes she is hearing is closer to \$3.5 million than it is to the smaller numbers. Mr. Carpenter stated that the \$2.0 million is to maintain the PCI. If we are at a 59 now, we need to spend \$2.0 million to remain a 59. Ms. Fry stated they have to choose which way to interpret the numbers. If they are factoring in \$1.5 million worth of work to maintain that 70 PCI over 10 years then it is not \$2.0 million to maintain because they are maintaining the 70 after spending an additional \$1.5 million. Mr. Carpenter stated the reason being is that the streets continue to deteriorate as 70 percent are at fair or worse. A high number of them are not going to get too many of them done each year. That is going to keep them going downward; \$2.0 million is to keep them level, but they need the \$1.5 million to bring them up. Ms. Fry stated that if what he is saying is accurate then they could get rid of the planned projects and maintain a 70. Mr. Carpenter replied that they have to get there. Ms. Fry commented that in years 1 – 5 they get to 70, then in years 5 - 10 they nix the planned projects and they should maintain a 70, if the \$2.0 million is accurate, which she doesn't believe it is. Mr. Carpenter stated she made a good point; the \$1.5 million in projects are factored in. Deputy Mayor Denning commented that those are mostly thoroughfares and that is only 30 percent of the total streets they have so it only averages in 30 percent of it. Ms. Bartlett replied it was about 20 percent. The \$1.5 million putting to thoroughfares to realign Woodman Drive only the asphalt portion of that number helps the PCI. Deputy Mayor Denning stated that even if they spend only \$1.5 million, they may only be spending \$600,000 on asphalt. Mr. Carpenter stated that the \$2.0 million was dedicated to residential streets; the \$1.5 million was primarily committed projects.

Ms. Fry asked if the numbers included the required manpower. Ms. Bartlett stated it depends. It does not include front loading for the first five years; the numbers she handed out on that Saturday meeting was based on no front loading, 25 streets a year using the money as it comes in. Once they front load they go from 25 streets per year to 40 streets per year with this \$1.0 million additional scenario. Ms. Lommatzsch asked if she were talking in terms of streets or miles as they have short and long streets. Ms. Bartlett stated it is an average. Six streets, or 1.5 miles were done this year. She took those numbers and divided it into the budget of what they would have and that is how she came up with 40 streets or 10 miles. Ms. Fry stated that she mentioned only the asphalt improves the PCI, but there is some sort of ration of manpower to asphalt that is reasonable, right? She is trying to get clarity on what it costs at a minimum to maintain the roads if they don't care about improving them at all, what is the bare minimum cost of maintaining them. Ms. Bartlett stated it was hard to think in those terms as she is working on projects where they need to do something with Woodman as that wall will crumble, and this project will take several years. Ms. Fry stated planned

Thursday, September 19, 2019

projects are what they call maintaining. Ms. Bartlett stated, today, if they don't borrow the \$1.0 million each year, they are at a 59 with their streets. If they invest \$2.0 million that is the maintenance cost to maintain the 59. The \$1.5 million would be for planned, committed projects. They could then say it costs \$3.5 million to maintain the roads at a 59. Deputy Mayor Denning stated if they front load it and then get roads to a 70, it will be \$3.5 million per year to maintain it rather than \$2.0 million as they are still going to have their \$1.5 million for committed projects. He asked if staffing was factored into the cost. Ms. Bartlett stated that manpower for city staff is included for 25 streets per year but not 40. He asked how much she would need if they front load to cover staff. She replied roughly \$150,000. Ms. Fry stated the \$3.5 million is a number they need to be prepared to finance; then, if they want to improve anything, they need to be willing to do a front load that is wherever they can beg, borrow, and steal to get above that. Ms. Bartlett stated if they take the \$3.5 million and add the \$700,000 for loans that gets them the \$4.2 million, annually. Deputy Mayor Denning asked if that included the extra \$150,000. Ms. Bartlett shook her head no. They would need \$4.2 million plus \$150,000 for staffing. She stated she had been in talks with the city manager regarding possibly subbing out mowing the parks to save some money.

Ms. Bartlett was looking for a direction from council. PMG can put together a five-year paving plan if they decided if they want to front load or not. She feels it would be good data to share with the public whether they are going to do 25 streets a year or 40 streets a year in the first five years. She provided a graph of budget scenario #1 where they would use the money as it comes in rather than front loading. They would start out at a 64 ending in year 2029 at a 61. She presented the budgets and grant funding in years 2020 – 2024. She asked for a motion to move forward with a five-year paving plan and front loading.

Mr. Curp stated they had always talked about a front load and that was needed to do the streets. When they looked at the assessments from the engineering consulting firms that had come to them, 8.0 mills was a little under what is needed to do the job to keep them above \$2.0 million annually on maintenance to do more. Council decided that 8.0 mills would be about the max the community would support at this point in time, especially until they delivered. Front end has to be done to deliver promises and perceptions to the community. Deputy Mayor Denning agreed they need to front load as they need to prove to the residents they were going to do what they said they would do. Mr. Curp stated that deteriorating streets deteriorate at an increasing rate the longer they put off fixing them; this is why they need to front load to get big issues out of the way. Mayor Flaute stated that is why they are not doing a five-year levy, but a permanent levy. They need to front load and have a long-range plan.

Ms. Bartlett suggested doing a front load and five-year paving plan and then in five years do another five-year plan. James can do a 10-year plan, but she is unaware of the funds she could get him at this point. She requested direction if she could have James create a five-year paving plan and indicate, which streets would be best to do in years 1 – 5. Discussion was had regarding whether or not a five-year paving plan should be put forward and the perception that is put to the community. Ms. Bartlett stated that it isn't just putting asphalt on the streets that they need to consider; there are manholes and other things. Ms. Fry asked if she needed a firm budget in order to proceed. Ms. Bartlett said yes. Ms. Fry stated that she did not think she could have that at this point. Mr. Carpenter stated they are trying to establish through the CIP how many dollars they would dedicate to capital projects. There are roadway and non-roadway projects. He asked what else council needs to see. Mr. Curp stated that council is being asked to commit to an expense budget for capital items. He said they can commit once they know how much revenue there will be. If they don't know the revenues, then they can't commit to a budget. Ms. Fry stated she wanted to know the minimum costs, what they have to have in order to function. Then, over and above that they do the projects. They are making big changes this year in the staffing so they have not had the conversation to flesh out how they are affording new positions in the operating budget and all of the capital projects while last year's budget was slim. They need to have the conversation. Mr. Carpenter stated that he will bring that to council at the next meeting to have the conversation. Ms. Bartlett said a decision needs to be made prior to the election so they can

Thursday, September 19, 2019

get a jump start on what they need to do. They need to decide if driveway aprons are going to be at the cost of the resident to do; there is a cost of inspection, the resident needs notified, and they have to get it done in a certain amount of time. They are really pressed for time. Mayor Flaute stated council can't do that until they know if the levy passes. They can't give a committed number. Ms. Bartlett stated they will then end up bidding pavement work in the middle of summer and not get their money's worth; they will get a very high price because all the contractors will be busy. Ms. Fry asked what would happen if they say to go forward and the levy fails. Ms. Bartlett replied they have the projects in the 2020 budget that will go forward with the capital money that they have determined. The paving projects for 2019 were bid in February of 2019. She stated she needs her staff to start to work on inspections for storm sewers and driveway aprons. They do not have a plan as to what streets will go first so she wants to give James a number, and what number is that. She has proposed \$2.5 million for the first five years; if the budget turns out to be something different she can ask him to revisit it and make changes. It would be an iteration on his part and cost a bit more money, but not a lot of money. The cost for the plan is \$8,000 and he is already under contract so the money is already appropriated. Mr. Curp asked if the first five years of the five-year plan and the ten-year plan not look the same. Ms. Bartlett said it probably would. Mr. Curp asked if there was more money wouldn't the consultant know what could be done in year six. Ms. Bartlett replied yes; they will have another assessment of the pavements in the first five years. Those numbers then can be used in the 5 – 10 year plan; they would keep chunking out five year plans, indefinitely. She said it sounds like they are in favor of front loading, but that \$2.5 million was based on \$700,000 in gas tax funds, which they haven't approved the budget for. Mr. Curp stated that a sage consultant would have a plan that is modularized enough that they wouldn't have to do it twice. They would have a multi-year plan that would cover a scenario for \$2.5 million for the first year or first five years. Ms. Bartlett stated the unknown is how much the budget will be in year six. By front loading they can be sure of what can be done in the first five years, but in years 6 – 10 they aren't going to have \$2.5 million that is the unknown. Ms. Fry asked if they could give her something indicating the minimum they intend to spend and that is something they can perceive. Ms. Bartlett stated she can tell James \$2.5 million for the first five years and work with that and then if more money is found...Mr. Curp asked if this is the levy passing or not passing. Ms. Bartlett stated if it passes. Mr. Carpenter stated that they were working from the numbers they showed them as the minimum budget they were planning for to contribute.

Mr. Curp stated that she made a comment of wanting direction from council before the election. Ms. Bartlett stated she needs the plan to be available as early in November as possible. She needs to let James know in the next week or two to make that happen. Mr. Curp asked what that has to do with going to the voters. Ms. Bartlett stated it doesn't. It is something they would do internally. It would just be nice to share the statistics with the voters if they are going to front load using \$2.5 million as they would be doing 40 streets a year or 10 miles. She feels it is a number they can understand. Mayor Flaute stated she has gotten the best answer that she will get from council: front load and \$2.5 million. Mr. Curp stated that James needs to put together a modular plan as there will need to be alternatives.

B) 2020 Budget – It was determined that there would be a special meeting to discuss the 2020 budget. Mr. Curp stated he would like to see where the cost for additional staffing would come from. Mayor Flaute stated there is legislation for additional staffing on the agenda tonight and asked if he planned to put them all in the 2020 budget or just one. Council did say before to put everything on the sheet, but he stated that doesn't mean he is going to hire all of them in 2020. Mr. Carpenter stated there are still some variables; not all the positions that are proposed would be filled; he will send council what he has. Mayor Flaute stated they could put them in the structure, but it wouldn't be prudent for them to tell him to go hire all those people and spend all the 2020 budget. Deputy Mayor Denning stated just because it is on the list doesn't mean they will all be filled; it is a planning tool. If the budget isn't there then he decides who is hired. He stated that the community development director is in the budget and feels council will be comfortable with that. All of the positions listed on the Table of Organization ordinance have been appropriated. They will decide that as they

Thursday, September 19, 2019

get closer. Mr. Curp asked to see a spreadsheet showing new revenues, new dollar amounts and what those new dollars are being spent for. What new revenues are being projected for next year and do they already have those targeted to be spent and what are they targeted on so they know what is left over to pay for additional head count or street paving or additional something. He wants to see more than abstract and does not want to be spending money twice. Council determined to meet on Thursday, September 26, at 7:30 p.m. after the community meeting.

ITEM 7: RECESS: Council recessed at 7:12 pm.

ITEM 8: RECONVENE: The meeting reconvened at 7:20 pm.

ITEM 9: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/MOMENT OF SILENCE: Mayor Flaute had Zoning Administrator Tamara Ennist lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM 10: MINUTES: Consider approval of the minutes of the August 24, 2019 special Council meeting and September 5, 2019 regular Council meeting. Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Fry seconded the motion. All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

ITEM 11: ACCEPTANCE OF PRIOR MONTHS FINANCIAL REPORT: Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to approve the financial report from July. Mr. Teaford seconded the motion. All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

ITEM 12: LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATION: Mr. Carpenter stated there were no issues from the police regarding the new application from Oddbody's. No hearing was requested.

ITEM 13: ACCEPTANCE OF WRITTEN CITIZEN PETITIONS: Mayor Flaute advised citizens to fill out a form if they wished to speak about agenda or non-agenda items.

ITEM 14: DEPARTMENT UPDATES:

A) Monthly Update Police Department – Chief Frank Robinson: Just have some personnel issues going on with the police department right now; you got my monthly information from the city manager. It is very concerning at this point because we continue to be about four to five officers down. It is causing some manpower issues. Sgt. Jackson has been cleared to come back to work by her doctor, but she still has to pass a fitness for duty from us before she can come back. We are hoping to get her back next week, Wednesday, somewhere around there. Officer Stephen Ritchie got injured off the job and he has been out for having surgery for his hand. He has been off maybe two weeks and probably off a couple more weeks. Detective Cooper is still out; I can't make any comment about that one other than he is still out from working here. Officer Stamper has some upcoming issues and he is going to be out for four to five weeks as well. The other day, Officer Josh Schmidt was working and was assaulted on duty. The person punched him in his head and broke his orbital bone to his face so he will be out four to five weeks as well with the broken bone in his face. He is currently working on light duty now. In fact, Office Schmidt is also our resident IT guy in the department; he worked for CMI prior to us so he does a lot of our in-house stuff. We sent him to some training in reference to his ability with the computer and he is currently at a forensic computer academy for a one-week course. He went to two other courses with digital evidence collection for investigators and all this is free. We are only paying for him to be there. He can do this on light duty so it works out in our favor there, I guess, not for him. If you look at him you really can't tell; there is a little bit of swelling, but apparently it is cracked somewhere up in here. They are still looking for that person; we have not located the person who did that. We have good photos and have sent all those out. We have a good line on him, we think; we may be able to track him down, hopefully, this week.

Thursday, September 19, 2019

B) Monthly Update Fire Department – Chief Dan Stitzel: Our big news, we did get the SAFER grant from FEMA. Starting the process, there is a lot of paperwork that goes into that, a lot of administrative things that have to happen to make sure we get that off right. We currently have the two postings; the lateral entry and the entry level posting out there because we do have a current full-time vacancy. We look to fill it within the next four weeks and then whatever else we have on that eligibility list will be considered for the SAFER positions. We are hoping to have everything done, all the interviews, all the backgrounds, by January 1 so they can get started that first week of January that is my goal. Just to recap, it does bring in \$214,000 each year for two years and then the third year is right about \$100,000 is the grant amount. That is for wage and benefits for three firefighters. Our share is \$71,000 the first year, \$101,000 the second year, and \$223,000 the third year and then after the third year it is 100 percent on us. It is a great way to get things kicked off, really happy this is certainly a step in the right direction that we are hoping to go to with the fire department over the next several years. One of the drawbacks is that I have lost a couple more part-time people. One of my part-time people just took a full-time job with the city of Xenia. A couple of my people on my list to be full-time are currently part-time. If I transition them to full-time, it kind of hurts on that other side also so we are still struggling with the part-time program. The crews are really busy with the last groups we hired trying to get them to be trained up to be primary on the medic unit, teaching them how to drive and operate the pumps on the fire engines. That is taking up a lot of their time. We are working on a lot of the year end preventative maintenance stuff right now, trying to get it done a little bit sooner than November/December so we can wrap up the budget by mid-November is the goal this year. In years past, it just seems to drag out so we are trying to get that done a little bit sooner. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

Mr. Curp: These people, our part-timers, transitioning to full-time, what takes so long to train them? Chief Stitzel: No, one of them has been part-time with us for six years. If he was to get a full-time position, he would just start showing up twice as much. Mr. Curp: So, the training you were taking about were the new part-timers? Chief Stitzel: These are the new part-timers we have; now the full-time people, if we hire somebody that is an entry level and doesn't have a lot of experience then yes, it takes just as much training, but we get it done in half the time because they are here every third day where are part-time people are typically here every sixth day. I look for those people that have experience, especially if they work part-time here it is a big benefit to us as far as the training aspect. It is like the flip of a switch, he goes from part-time, a driver-operator cleared on our medics, he knows what he is doing; we just make him full time. There is really no training period for him, but for others there may be depending on what their experience level is. Some of them, one of the applicants, is a brand-new part-time person, who is also qualified to be full-time so between now and then he would be another one of those that would not need as much training. Anybody else from the outside, they will still need trained on our pumps, our apparatus; things like that, it just depends on where they are at and their experience level.

Ms. Lommatzsch: With this grant, our commitment is after the three years, we are obligated to keep those positions, is that correct? Chief Stitzel: We are not obligated, but yes. Ms. Lommatzsch: I understand, some of the grants we had in the past, we've had to agree to absolutely fund that position in the future, but by then I am hoping there is another grant we can apply for. Chief Stitzel: I'm hoping there's grants so we can apply before then. In order to keep them...Ms. Lommatzsch: But, we aren't signing on for life with this position. Chief Stitzel: No, they removed that requirement on the grant. We do have that option, we can absorb them through other positions that come open, but we have to refill them to keep the grant. They have to stay full so we have to hire somebody if they move up out of the grant status. Obviously, we want to keep them, if at all possible, but we are not legally committed by the grant to maintain them afterwards.

Deputy Mayor Denning: When we talked about these grants to start with, we talked, it was three, six, or even up to nine positions that we could have added. We also talked about doing three this year, three next year, and three the next. Is that your plan or do you want to see

Thursday, September 19, 2019

how this goes first? I know we need more. Having more here would be better, but I also know you need to play with the budget. Chief Stitzel: If you look at the life of this grant, our commitment gets larger and then that fourth year it is 100 percent on us. I don't have that money in my current budget to support that. I am going to need new money by the third year of this to maintain it without sacrificing my part-time program to pay for it. Any additional grants or hires would require new money, also. Deputy Mayor Denning: that is why I asked you a while back for a total cost for if we wanted to staff up to 34 firefighters instead of 17 or whatever the answer was. We got those numbers. My thought process behind that is then we have the number to go to the residents to say, if this is what you want, the level of service you want, this is what it will cost you, and this is what we will ask for and why. Chief Stitzel: I would love to get to that point and have more discussions on that plan. I will take full advantage of all the grants I can to kind of ease that burden as much as possible. You are looking at a little bit more than \$500,000 over three years, this given to us by the government to do this so that is a big relief. If I can continue doing that, I certainly will as long as I have council's support to continue to apply for these grants. I will apply for another one in February, if you want, but again, just understand that means we have to find additional revenue to support that support because there is nothing else I can cut that will support employees. It is just too big of the piece of the pie to support with the little slivers; we just can't do it.

Mr. Curp: When is the start date of the grant? Chief Stitzel: I have 30 days to accept it and then I have six months to get them started. I can start them earlier with a notification. My plan is to get them hired the first week of January that is when the grant will start. The actual performance period would be whenever they start. Mr. Curp: The percentage they pay the first year? Chief Stitzel: The first year is 75 percent, 75 percent, and then 35 percent. Mr. Curp: So, when the city manager and staff puts together that spread sheet that I asked for earlier then 25 percent of whatever new money comes in is going to be committed to the fire departments portion of the SAFER grant. Chief Stitzel: Yes, and understand that the percentages are based off of 2019s entry level salary. I pay more each year because of increases, contractual and cost of living increases, but the grant doesn't get bigger. They base their three years off of this year, the grant year's wages. It doesn't get bigger, unfortunately, because my share, next year will be \$71,000, the year after that is 101,000, and the year after that is \$232,000. That is our minimum share out of each year so it goes up, but the grant money is the same for two years and then it is \$99,000 the third year. Mr. Curp: If you bring in three laterals with five years' experience each, then you may choose to put them on Step 5 of the salary schedule instead of the entry level. Chief Stitzel: I would really work hard to negotiate down to about Step 2 or Step 3. If we look at that and I have asked the city manager; we are still talking and nothing has been finalized, but what I have asked for is to budget or calculate one lateral and two entry levels out of these three so we can have an idea of what the money looks like, and give me an idea of how much I can negotiate with. The last new person we hired was a lateral; he came in at Step 1 as opposed to entry level so it is one step up and we base that off where they come from, how much of an increase that is for them personally. I would love to be able to do year for year, but a lot of times that isn't budgetary. Mr. Curp: I'm going through my mind that 25 percent or the number that the manager and staff is going to put on that spreadsheet isn't necessarily 25 percent of an entry level. It might be a little bit higher than that. Chief Stitzel: Yes, and I am asking for a little bit more for one of the positions, entry level for the other two.

C) Monthly Update Public Services Department – Ms. Kathy Bartlett: You have a report in the PAR; the only thing I want to add is we did receive our preliminary score from the OPWC for East Springfield. That score is 31 and there is still 10 points, well, what I think we will get is 10 additional points so it is coming in as we expected so a 41 may be able to get us the grant we ask for, the nearly \$375,000 in grant money we asked for and \$1.1 million in zero percent loan. Mr. Carpenter: We need to add one thing about the Airway Road project, the estimate, our share of that project. Ms. Bartlett: Our share of the road project came in much under budget. We had \$370,000 budgeted, and I believe ODOTs estimating section, and this is top secret estimating that they do, and our share was based on

Thursday, September 19, 2019

our engineer's estimate. Their estimating section came in lower and that is what brought our share down to just under \$170,000 so we are \$200,000 in the black for Airway West. That will be bid on October 31.

Ms. Lommatzsch: What is going on on Marblehead? Is this a punch list for repairing the manholes? Ms. Bartlett: Yeah, Jay went through the projects and there were some miscellaneous things that the contractor still needed to do. There was some curb that got damaged during construction that was being repaired, and adjustments to grade.

Mr. Teaford: What is going on at Rohrer Park with those big machines? Mr. Carpenter: Actually, I was going to mention that. The city of Dayton is installing one of those test wells as part of the source water protection program. Ms. Lommatzsch: Since that subject came up, in the future, when we know that is going to happen, can we be ahead of the game rather than waiting until the phone blows up with what is going on in Rohrer Park, please? Mr. Carpenter: I am not sure they did notify us in this case. Ms. Lommatzsch: Well, if they didn't then we need to address that. Deputy Mayor Denning: I have a suggestion, if they are going to do that anywhere that they put a flyer out to the neighbors. Ms. Lommatzsch: Isn't that what I just said. Deputy Mayor Denning: No, you said we get ahead of it and put it up on the website or whatever. I think that they should be the ones putting the flyers out saying they are coming to your neighborhood and this is why. Ms. Lommatzsch: Good luck. Deputy Mayor Denning: We just put it on their back because we end up taking the brunt of it. Mayor Flaute: I definitely believe we need to put it on social media. Ms. Fry: I appreciate the statement that did go out on social media; I think it addressed it very well. It was after the fact, but it addressed it very well. Ms. Lommatzsch: Kathy didn't know that was going to happen? Mayor Flaute: She is saying no. Ms. Lommatzsch: I would like you to have them let us know ahead of time; can you address that. Mr. Teaford: Last year, they came and dug one on Troy Pike right beside the Green Lantern Bar and when I went and talked to them because it was right behind my house; they said they thought they were in Dayton. Dayton has given them permission to dig the wells. If they come in our community, we should know it. Mr. Carpenter: This was, actually, approved in August of 2018 by us. Ms. Lommatzsch: I remember that; I remember we approved them coming in and doing the wells, but I don't believe the locations were in that approval. They just asked for permission to put those wells in. Deputy Mayor Denning: Right after that is when they put the one on Valley; the thought was they were done.

Ms. Campbell: I just had a question about Lorella Pond. When I drove by there, is there some kind of filter they can put in it; they have some others, I know, but I didn't know if they could put one in there to help it out. Mosquito heaven back there. Deputy Mayor Denning: Lorella Pond is covered with about that much algae, and it just looks really bad. I don't know if there is anything we can do for that. Ms. Bartlett: I will check with Jay and Kevin and see if there is anything we have done in the past. Deputy Mayor Denning: The ducks are walking across the top instead of swimming. Ms. Campbell: A long time ago they talked about putting some kind of filter in there, but they never have.

Deputy Mayor Denning: I did have a question about the wells, when I remember I'll come back to it. Mr. Carpenter: They have reached out to us to place some over at the Center of Flight, but we haven't agreed. Deputy Mayor Denning: That was my question, when we passed these resolutions to let them go into our right-of-way, is it an open loop, unlimited number of holes they can dig or do they give us a specific map at the time so we know what is going on? Mr. Carpenter: We do come to an agreement on where they are going to locate it. Deputy Mayor Denning: Before we pass it? Mr. Carpenter: Yeah. Deputy Mayor Denning: Either we didn't remember that information or it took too long for them to dig the holes. Ms. Lommatzsch: Well, I just zoomed in on the picture that was sent to me and saw that it didn't say Riverside on the truck so I knew it was somebody else. Deputy Mayor Denning: I was concerned it was for the Mullins Rubber. Ms. Lommatzsch: No, that's what the residents assumed.

Thursday, September 19, 2019

D) Monthly Update Planning and Program Management Department -

Ms. Tamara Ennist: It has been very busy last month. We have had a lot of code enforcement issues coming up. A lot of calls; a lot of complaints. Rob Gibbs, our code enforcement officer, has been out on medical leave, but he came back on Monday; he came back early that will be very helpful. We are a little behind on the grass because we had some trouble with our contract mower and his way of billing isn't appropriate for us to send the invoices out so we had to put a stop to that and we are now sending out a contract for next year's mower and I am working with individual mowers to pick up what we can pick up. For zoning, we are putting out zoning permits and getting requests for those. For planning and development, we met with the Montgomery County Landbank and they are getting ready to turn over some of the parcels that they had foreclosed on and had demolished some of the structures so we are doing an inventory of those NIP properties to see the best way to dispose of those properties. Some of the properties may be able to be sold or marketed; others may have to be determined if a neighboring property would buy them. There was a BZA meeting last month; the board of zoning appeals approved a front yard setback variance for a citizen to put a covered patio over his front yard and entry deck. The planning commission is discussing many items. We are still talking about accessory structures in the front yard that will go as a public hearing next month. We are still talking about the mobile food vehicles; although that will probably be coming to you soon. We are talking about leaf litter and how to improve the current ordinance to include some restriction on putting grass mowing or leaves into the street. We discussed the rezoning of Linden Avenue and next month we will have that scheduled as a public hearing also. We've had several more phone calls and discussions with the Taco Bell for the development of the Taco Bell north of Valley Street. Circle K is still looking to develop the site at Airway and Woodman. Also, I would like to publicly apologize to Jan Pitzer. Evidently, the last time I was in here giving my report, I got to speaking too fast and I attributed a complaint, a second complaint to Jan that was not Jan's complaint. It was one that Rob picked up on his own. While I was talking, and it was not on purpose. I sometimes stick my foot in my mouth and when I was talking I just went with it so I do apologize. I realize it has caused you some grief and it definitely was not intentional. We get a lot of complaints and it is very hard to get names, addresses, and people separated. I'll have to be a little better about keeping my foot out of my mouth.

Mayor Flaute: Would you like to talk a little about what the planning commission has to deal with on the KC Lounge? I know we don't know much, but I think council needs to know what you know. Ms. Ennist: Right now, what we have before planning commission at the last meeting was a replat of the KC Lounge parcel. There is a narrow parcel just to the east of the KC Lounge that is in the same ownership, and then there are two parcels behind on Meyer Avenue that would also be included in this replat; there would be four parcels. The one parcel was vacated right away, Fickle Drive, it was vacated in 1952 so probably with the township, but they will take the four parcels, owned by Theenz Properties Incorporated. Michael Heitz will be purchasing the properties. The planning commission had to table that application because they had questions about what the proposed use would be and there was no applicant there to give answers so they tabled it for next month. Mayor Flaute: The applicant asked for the replat, but didn't tell us why; the planning commission has some questions about that, and I wanted council to know that. Ms. Lommatzsch: That area needs some clean-up. Ms. Ennist: Yes, I think anyone that is going in there to develop is going to have to do something. Ms. Lommatzsch: Grass, all along that section. Mayor Flaute: As soon as we learn something, I will ask Tam to please let council know. I know you are going to have to let the planning commission know. Ms. Ennist: We did have one call from a frantic citizen as she was concerned as one of the properties was going to be sold to an individual who was going to develop it as a biker bar and she had concerns because she knew this certain group and she did not feel that was a good group to come into the community. They were able to talk to the owner and he had a change of heart and it is now not going to be developed that way. That was on Springfield Street just down the road here.

Mr. Curp: KC Lounge, is that still an operating business or is that closed, do we know? Ms. Ennist: I was told that it was closed; it appears closed. I haven't come out at night to make sure. Mr. Curp: Do we know how long it has been closed? Ms. Ennist: Not yet, but we are

Thursday, September 19, 2019

looking into that. That is one of the questions the planning commission had. Mr. Curp: When you were here the previous time there were a couple of items you discussed the front yard and required front yard earlier, porches and decks was the other. Any progress on the porches and decks? Ms. Ennist: The planning commission wants us to do a little bit of research to find out what other communities are doing with the front yard decks and also maybe do some language about percentages. They would like to see what a new regulation would look like so they are thinking if it is a very large lot and the house is setback further, maybe they should have a bigger percentage of front yard entry deck. We are still are research that a little more. Mr. Curp: Mr. Manager on leaves, out on one of the neighborhood blogs this past week there was a discussion about leaf pick-up at the curb as opposed to bagging and who does and who doesn't. We don't, but it is included in our trash hauling by Republic. I don't know what Huber does or any of the other Republic communities that they haul for, but could we look into whether it might be beneficial for Republic to provide that service because in the end, if they, perhaps reached an agreement with one of these communities that collects leaves and mulches them and there might be two communities to the south of us that do that, but it might be cost effective for them to offer that service and work out an arrangement with one of those other communities to put the leaves in their mulch pile and they don't get charged for the tonnage at the tipping station. Right now, all those leaves go into the tonnage that calculates to the charges to our residents, and, if that works out that the cost and the savings would offset that could be a win-win for a lot of people. It is probably too late into this year, but maybe for future years.

E) City Manager Report – Mr. Mark Carpenter: It came earlier about the community meeting next Thursday, September 26 at 6:00 pm. I know I sent out a note to council that we did close on that Ketchum property that is no longer in our possession. Ms. Lommatzsch: What are we doing to get the word out about this community meeting. Mr. Carpenter: We've had it posted on our social media. There is going to be a press release that should go out tomorrow. Mayor Flaute: We are going to be able to do that with Facebook Live? I think it is very important that we do that. Ms. Fry: Not Facebook Live, YouTube.

Deputy Mayor Denning: The sign at the other building looks like 9126. So, I would much rather see 9-26 because it kind of threw me when I first saw it. I got the community meeting, but there were a lot of numbers there. It said 9126 and then it said 6 to 7. Mr. Teaford: It is supposed to be a slash but it is sticking straight up. Deputy Mayor Denning: Ten minutes later it finally clicked, maybe it is just me, but I think we need to do something, even if it is a space would be better than what that says, very confusing.

ITEM 15: PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS: No one wished to comment on agenda items.

ITEM 16: NEW BUSINESS

A. ORDINANCES

I) Ordinance No. 19-O-692 approving employee position titles, number of positions and pay ranges and to repeal ordinance 18-O-674, adopted October 18, 2018. (1st reading)

Mr. Carpenter: This is the ordinance referred to earlier about authorizing positions. We are not appropriating any funds for these positions. It does include moving a majority of pay scales up seven percent. There are a few exceptions and that is in the memo that came with it.

Mr. Curp: Can we postpone this until after the budget discussion? Ms. Lommatzsch: I was going to move to table this ordinance. Deputy Mayor Denning: Well, this would just be the first reading that way we are no any further behind. Mr. Curp: I don't see any need...Ms.

Thursday, September 19, 2019

Lommatzsch: What's the hurry? Ms. Fry: It might give us some context for evaluating the budget. Mr. Carpenter: My one, and I guess it is not necessarily mandatory that this be in place, but I know council has talked about a community development director and to get started on that process. Mayor Flaute: That is what I am thinking; we need to get that process started, and this is planning tool to do that. Mr. Curp: It can be a planning tool without any formal action. It is a piece of paper they can use. Mayor Flaute: But they can't hire somebody and say we can't do it. Mr. Curp: The only positions on here that are of any immediacy are the fire department positions for the SAFER grants and the community development director. As far as planning, this is only September. Mayor Flaute: In the past we always have said we wanted to start planning in September. It is up to council. Ms. Fry: I think there is value in having the discussion tonight without voting on it. Mr. Curp: Exactly, we can discuss it, we don't have to vote on it. Ms. Lommatzsch: I was going to make a motion we table this. Ms. Campbell: I seconded. Deputy Mayor Denning: Then we can't discuss it. Mr. Curp: Yeah. Ms. Fry: Yes, which way? Mayor Flaute: Madam Clerk, if it is tabled we can't discuss it? Deputy Mayor Denning: No, once it is tabled you can't discuss it. Mr. Curp: You can talk about anything you want to talk about, you just wouldn't take any formal action on approving the specifics that are being asked to be approved. Ms. Lommatzsch: I take back my motion. Mayor Flaute: At this point then, without a motion, we are going to have a discussion on it. Ms. Lommatzsch: She has to take back her second. Ms. Campbell: I did.

Ms. Fry: Go ahead and go first. Mr. Curp: I'm just in the parliamentary thing, go ahead and talk whatever you want to talk about. Mayor Flaute: We are okay doing that; we are allowed to discuss anything, ok? Mr. Curp: Yeah. Mayor Flaute: Ms. Fry, what would you like to say. Ms. Fry: One of the things that jumped out at me is the increase of the part-time wages for the firefighters. Have we compared the cost effectiveness with the higher rate with a full-time firefighter? Mr. Carpenter: Chief Stitzel and I have had some conversations and he could probably give you more details, but we did some comparisons for other departments and we are well under what other departments are providing and even in the private sector, private ambulances are paying well over \$20/hour. So, even if you are a paramedic with your fire card, you may be more inclined to do private ambulance then work for the Riverside Fire Department. Chief if you want to add some of the things you have encountered? Chief Stitzel: I've talked to several; I hear people getting out of class or retiring and invite them over. The one told me he is going to work for a private ambulance company because he is getting \$25 an hour. Our paramedics are making \$15/hour. We are below the average out there and I think we talked last time, just the environment of the department is a challenge because of how busy we are and the call volume and the number of people we have on duty. Other departments that have larger staff are more attractive to them because they know they aren't going to be assigned to the medic unit every single shift; they are going to get chances to ride the engine, which again that is a lot of their passion to be the firefighter, not necessarily ride the medic, and they ride the medic because it is part of the job. Their true love is riding the engine. I think one of the things you are looking at is which is more cost effective hiring part-time versus full-time. It costs less for the part-time simply because we are paying less, but what comes with that is the challenge of keeping them, long-term retainment, training over and over again. My full-time staff that have been here for years, a lot of their time is spent training the basics over and over again. They don't have time to get into the advanced stuff, the technical rescues because they are too busy training our part-timers on how to run pumps. We train them up; they get their certifications, they find another full-time job, and then they are gone. They go to other departments that are hiring more. Ms. Fry: Right, so my point is, there is a point where it is more advantageous for us to look for full-timers. Chief Stitzel: In my opinion, it is more advantageous. I come from both systems. I spent 24 years in an all career fire department and I see the benefits of longevity, the training, the abilities of being able to do more with the full-time. They are here a lot more often so we have a better quality of operations and training and cohesiveness because we are just together a lot more. Some of these part-time work three or four different fire departments and come here once a week so they are not really fitting in as well. It is a bit of challenge for them. Sometimes they have to show up late or leave early because of other jobs that they have so we are trying to accommodate that. As far as a cost, I struggle with that because I

Thursday, September 19, 2019

truly believe if you take into account the amount of time we train these part-time people, the amount of time I go through recruiting and interviewing, background checks, getting them trained up is the big part. If you take all that away and I am only doing once or twice a year when somebody retires or leaves for one reason or another, then that is a lot of time saved and a lot more energy that can be spent on more productive things we can be doing rather than just trying to sustain a part-time program. It is cheaper, but I don't think it is nearly as effective or efficient as full-time staff. Ms. Fry: I guess my point is those extra efforts expended have a cost. Chief Stitzel: Yes, they do. Ms. Fry: If we are bumping it up by 25 percent from what the salary was that is a huge increase. Once we factor in those other investments does that bump it past, well, maybe part-timers exceed their value with that investment, but maybe we really should be looking at loading some of those over to full-timers. Chief Stitzel: And, I certainly agree with that. I used to work on another department that was a combination like this part-time and full-time and they pretty much did away with all their part-time; Kettering, Washington Township, Beavercreek Township, they are all doing away with their part-time program because they are all with the same struggles that we just talked about. They realized the benefit of doing that. Absolutely, I agree wholeheartedly with you that it is more advantageous, it is better for the community and for the department that we have an all career fire department. It is costly, but on the back end, the payoff certainly offsets that because we are able to do a lot more other than just the basics over and over again. Right now, our medic units roll out with a paramedic and an EMT basic; other departments that are all career, there are two paramedics on every medic unit so just the level of certification increases when you are able to do that, also. The capabilities increase, the level of care, the level of treatment, the quality improves also with that. I agree. Now what I asked the manager to do with the org chart was just give me some room because I would like to increase. Not necessarily up to the max right away. Right now, our max is 15. I definitely want to go 16, which matches the current org chart, but I kind of would like to expand on that, hopefully, next year. It is kind of setting a hope in place by putting that on the org chart to make that adjustment later and maybe go above the 16. If my overtime falls off and I can move some of that overtime to part-time, I can bring on more part-time. I don't have high hopes for that plan; I really don't. The part-time program is everybody just struggling and it is getting more and more difficult to maintain a combination department. Ms. Fry: So, we are talking about adding, I guess we aren't adding, we are just changing the salaries? Mr. Carpenter: Right, as chief was saying so we have the room, if that is what it is going to take to attract firefighters that is where we are having a hard time is attracting part-time firefighters. Mr. Curp: Moving from what amount to the \$20, what was it before? Mr. Carpenter: \$16. Mr. Curp: Okay, so you are taking \$4 times 33 hours so there is an additional financial cost. Mr. Carpenter: Right, and as chief said the idea is not to start at \$20. Ms. Fry: What I heard is it gives us room that we may not even have an opportunity to utilize. Chief Stitzel: I would hope. Honestly, yes. I would love to see us a little bit more, and again, the SAFER grant is a great first step. There are many other steps we need to be looking at in the future to continue this transition. As your chief, I am telling you it is my opinion that we need to set a plan in place that will transition us to an all full-time department sometime in five years, maybe.

Deputy Mayor Denning: If I look at these numbers right, you are authorized 42,000 hours of part-time people. In my brain that is equal to 21 full-time 2,000 hours a year, basically. I understand that part-time don't have benefits, so we could drop that down to 15, okay. Now you could have a fire department of 30 full-time firefighters and no part-time firefighters for basically around the same money. Mr. Carpenter: It doesn't quite work exactly like that. Deputy Mayor Denning: Tell me what it would be because maybe that is where we need to go. Mr. Carpenter: An entry level firefighter is about \$96,000 that is what the 2020 draft budget is showing. Deputy Mayor Denning: I was going by the hours. Mr. Carpenter: Right, and that is assuming everybody is at the top rate, not everyone is at the top right. Deputy Mayor Denning: I guess what I would like to see is a plan of what it would look like to transition and what a cost would be or if we could work it out to be about the same budget what that would look like as all full-time instead of 20 some or 30 some part-timers and 15 full-timers. If your budget is \$2.0 million for staff and you have 35 part-timers and 15 full-

Thursday, September 19, 2019

timers and you have that same \$2.0 million how many full-timers could we have? Mr. Curp: Is the \$96,000 fully loaded or is that just salary? Mr. Carpenter: That is fully loaded. That is entry level. Mr. Curp: So, on here you have 33,000 hours, \$20, that is \$660,000. At \$100,000 fully loaded that will get you six. Deputy Mayor Denning: That doesn't get me to 30, but that gets me to 21. Mr. Carpenter: But, there is not \$660,000 in the budget either.

Ms. Lommatzsch: Well, what has to happen is after we get the street levy, the community needs to decide what kind of fire department they want and that would be folks our plate is loaded. Ms. Fry: I don't see the value of chasing after part-timers that don't exist. I like to be plain and transparent and put the information out there and if the reality is we can't afford it, we can't afford it, but at least we know why. I think that there is a point at which chasing after part-timers is just counter-productive. I just want to know where that point is. Is it at \$20, is it at \$25; I just want to know where it is. Mr. Carpenter: I'm not sure the dollars will do it either, but what we are looking to do is to share the workload and fill some of those slots. We need bodies, and unfortunately, we can't afford all full-time bodies. That is the struggle. Ms. Fry: If we ultimately want to be full-time, I agree with Mr. Denning that a plan to get there, maybe not a plan in the near term, maybe it is longer term, but a plan to get there where we can say okay, our decisions we make this year or next year are supporting our long-term plan that gets us to where we want to be. Deputy Mayor Denning: If we have that plan, now we can work with the SAFER grants to at least slow, get a portion of that covered as we do that transition to full-time. Isn't that part of the idea of the SAFER grants, too? Chief Stitzel: Absolutely, and understand the goal of the SAFER grant is for the fire department to meet NFPA Standard 1710, which is our response staffing standard: how many people on a fire engine, how long does it take to get to calls, things like that. That is what the grant looks for to try and improve through hiring of full-time firefighters so if we have a plan set, we want to increase our staff by three each year, I can show you when we can start dropping off part-time and add full-time to kind of balance it out to where we can get to where we need to be per NFPA 1710 or if you want to use the ICMA numbers. There are several different standards out there that we can look at. I will include all those in the plan so you guys can make informed decisions on what is best to take to the public and ask them. That is the goal of the SAFER grant to help communities, especially like us, that need that extra help to get us started and get us moving because you are looking at \$300,000 for total, we are going to pay \$71,000 next year out of that so it is a big help to get us started. We have to have an end game that is going to carry beyond that. To your point on the hours, understand that I know the hours in the org chart does not necessarily match what we have in the budget. My part-time budget is \$290,000. That would be three entry-level full-timers, if I were to transition with the money I currently have that would get me three additional full-time people. My daily staffing would drop at that point. I'm staffing three to four part-timers a day, you change that to one full-time, then I lose three people a day. I can't do that right now. It is a phase in type thing. Last point, the sign has been changed.

Deputy Mayor Denning: We are at 15, what would be the good number if we were at everything full-time, what would be the number of full-timers you would need plus you probably have to add a lieutenant and/or another battalion chief, right? Chief Stitzel: Right now, as a total number? Deputy Mayor Denning: Yes, it says you are at 12, right now... Chief Stitzel: No, 16 full time counting myself. To get where I think we need to be to meet 1710 to the best of our ability; you are probably looking at 43 – 45 full-time people. If we can get to 35 – 38, we can certainly work with that. Again, only a third of those work a day. I have 15 people in operations right now, only five are here at a time. There is usually one or two on vacation or EDO, so I need 11 people on duty a day, 13 people a shift that is 33 plus if we had some staff; we could probably do it with 38.

Ms. Lommatzsch: Okay folks, we have roads to do right now. Mr. Curp: You still have to deal with the issue that people don't want to come here because they don't want to work that hard. Isn't that what you said? We are a very busy department and people don't want to be that busy. Chief Stitzel: There are some out there that are looking for a little easier, part-time are looking for that. They are full-time on another department and are looking to go to the

Thursday, September 19, 2019

smaller rural departments paying part-time the same or better than we are and take a lot less call volume. We have a high call volume with a small number of people. If we had more people that call volume would be spread across more people; it wouldn't be as strenuous on them. We are averaging 13 to 14 calls a day. Right now, I have five people on duty; two at each fire house and one battalion chief. They are handling all those calls themselves. They pretty much go on every single call that comes in.

Mayor Flaute: Any other questions about the org chart that we can address at this time? Ms. Lommatzsch: Let's not talk about what the police department wants. Mayor Flaute: The only question I have is that we have a specialist that is full-time under community development and paid for out of the Wright Point Fund. Is that position funded, is that full now, is there someone there now? Mr. Carpenter: Yeah, that is Ms. Minnich. Mayor Flaute: She is completely paid out of the Wright Point? Okay. So, the communication specialist you are asking for is in the city manager's office. Is that the right place for that person to be? Shouldn't that person be under Community Development? Mr. Carpenter: I see this person as doing communications and information, a PR person, a social media person. This one replaces where we had the IT/Communications position that was authorized. Ms. Lommatzsch: So, this specialist is a new hire? Mr. Carpenter: It is a new position, yes? Ms. Lommatzsch: Somebody who is trained in that field and is a specialist in that field. Mr. Carpenter: Ideally, yes. Ms. Lommatzsch: Is that a salary that will attract the kind of person we need? This looks like to me that this is attracting somebody that might be right out of college or something. Mr. Carpenter: Are you saying on the low end or the high end, mid-range? Mayor Flaute: If they are completely IT, they would be. Mr. Carpenter: The primary function of this role is doing PR, social media, overseeing the IT functions, also, keeping tabs on continuous improvement, tracking our performance measures things along those lines. Mr. Curp: It might be good to see a salary survey for what you have in mind. Ms. Lommatzsch: The communications specialist, this is not going to be....Mr. Curp: This is social media, newsletter, isn't that what is in the position description? Mr. Carpenter: Yes, oversee all of that, presentations, connecting with the residents. Mr. Curp: Coordinating the IT, but not necessarily being an IT person. Mayor Flaute: That is where we have to be careful because an IT person will demand more money, I would think. I don't know, I guess. Mr. Carpenter: The IT position that was in here before was the range was \$37,500 - \$63,500. Mayor Flaute: I thought that sounds cheap for an IT person. Okay.

Ms. Lommatzsch: I'm just interested to know we are going to spend money to do something because communications is where we are failing bad. We don't need to pay somebody a minimum salary that is not going to give us more than we've got. Mayor Flaute: But do you agree we need a community development director before we need a communications specialist? Mr. Curp: Yes. Mayor Flaute: Okay, I got a yes, I believe that very strongly. I know maybe our communications does suck as you say. Ms. Lewallen: I have to type that. Mayor Flaute: The word has been used, I'm just using the same one. Ms. Lommatzsch: I didn't say that word, you did. Mayor Flaute: I thought you did; I thought I heard that word. That is my opinion anyway. Mr. Curp: The functioned is challenged. Mayor Flaute: Anyway, that is my opinion, I think this communication specialist when our budget can afford it. Ms. Fry: When we approve this, what are we actually approving because the appropriated strength looks like 2019 numbers? Mr. Carpenter: I am not asking to fill any of these this year. It is dependent upon the budget which one of these can be filled. These are the positions, if the funds are available that we fill. Mr. Curp pointed out about the firefighters that we need to do for sure. I think there is consensus about the community development director position. We talked about the junior foreman that essentially, we have a vacant service position this year and so this one because of all the roadwork we are proposing the levy will pass that position will certainly be needed. Mr. Curp: That is not the position she is talking about for the streets. Mayor Flaute: If the levy passes that is the position we are talking about, right? Ms. Bartlett: I need that one now. Like 20 percent of their time would be buildings because Jay is run ragged trying to do the supplemental engineering work that I am asking him to do. He has more or less removed himself from a lot of the operations stuff, Kevin is running the operations. It is just a trickle-down effect. Going after all these

Thursday, September 19, 2019

grants and I am doing a lot of the engineering that I think you guys used to pay ChoiceOne to do so it is snowballing down and we need somebody to take over buildings for sure and then Kevin is also swamped he needs somebody to delegate things to and then also succession planning with Jay and Kevin nearing retirement getting that person up to speed. Ms. Fry: To finish my question, when we pass this, this would be theoretically carrying over into next year in the appropriated strength may fluctuate, correct? Mr. Carpenter: What I had hoped to do to start the first reading here and then as we talk more about the budget, which ones are going to be able to be filled. This would be approved along with the budget so the appropriated would be in line with the budget. Ms. Fry: What is the value of putting the positions in the ordinance if we have to pass another ordinance to change the appropriated strength? Mr. Carpenter: I would say the second reading would coincide with the passing of the budget. Ms. Fry: Okay, but is there any value in listing a communications specialist if it is not going to make it in the budget? Mr. Carpenter: I think the value is that council would be in agreement that we need the position; we just, unfortunately, can't fund it. Ms. Fry: If we found the money to fund it, would we have to pass a new ordinance that changes the appropriated strength? Mr. Carpenter: It would need to be appropriated, yeah. Mayor Flaute: I mean we can say next year; we wouldn't have to do this next year because it is in there. Mr. Carpenter: We would have to appropriate the dollars. This would be updated. Mayor Flaute: Yeah, we would have to appropriate the dollars, but we wouldn't have to change the organizational chart. Mr. Curp: Then that begs the question of why would we not then go ahead and add the additional positions that the public works director wants and the additional 20 police officers the police chief wants and just leave it at the current authorized strength but we got the positions in there that say this is where we are headed. Mr. Carpenter: We could. Mr. Curp: I'm saying it is an academic discussion. Ms. Fry: What does this table do for us? Mr. Carpenter: What it does for you and what it does for me is that council is in agreement that we need these positions and as we talked before about starting the recruiting to fill a position. I think this confirms the direction we are headed. Ms. Fry: So, this table is the minimum positions that we think our city needs. Mr. Carpenter: No, I'm saying this would be, it is not even the most we can afford even. Ms. Fry: It's not the minimum we need and not the most we need. Mr. Carpenter: It is in between. When I gave the council the table of organization chart that is what all of us said what we would like to have on this sheet, but it is not realistic to put them in the 2020 budget. Some of these may not be realistic for the 2020 budget. Ms. Fry: I propose that there is very little value in taking the middle path. Either it is a minimum or the idealized version. Both of those things I see value in. The middle path seems very arbitrary and I struggle to find the value.

Mayor Flaute: If there is no other discussion we did approve the agenda, so now we have to... Ms. Lewallen: We need a motion to amend it since you are not going to hear it for the first time. It is on the agenda as a first reading so now I need a motion to amend the agenda since we are not doing a first reading. Mr. Curp: Or to table this. Ms. Lewallen: Or to table this.

Ms. Lommatzsch made a motion to table Ordinance No. 19-O-692. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion.

Mayor Flaute: That means it is going to come back. In this form? Ms. Lommatzsch: It can be changed; I want it to come back. Ms. Fry: I second. Mayor Flaute: I think Ms. Campbell already seconded and now is there any discussion on that? My concern is if we table it, it has to come back in its exact form. Is that not true? Ms. Lewallen: I would have to look that up; I can't answer that right now. There is no reason it can't come back in this form. Mr. Carpenter: We can make changes prior to the second reading.

Six were in favor; Mr. Teaford opposed. **Motion carried.**

B. RESOLUTIONS

Thursday, September 19, 2019

- I) **Resolution NO. 19-R-2517 appointing Kevin Allen to the parks and recreation commission for a term beginning August 2, 2019 and expiring August 3, 2022.**

Ms. Lommatzsch motioned to approve Resolution No. 19-R-2517. Deputy Mayor Denning seconded the motion.

All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

- II) **Resolution No. 19-R-2518 recognizing the Riverside Area Chamber of Commerce’s “Hometown Holiday in Riverside, Ohio” as a function that promotes the public health, general welfare, and contentment of the citizens of the City of Riverside.**

Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to approve Resolution No. 19-R-2518. Ms. Lommatzsch seconded the motion.

All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

Ms. Lommatzsch: They are also looking for volunteers; anyone who would like to help that day let us know please.

- III) **Resolution No. 19-R-2519 accepting the amounts and rates as determined by the budget commission and authorizing the necessary tax levies and certifying them to the county auditor.**

Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to approve Resolution No. 19-R-2519. Mr. Teaford seconded the motion.

All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

- IV) **Resolution No. 19-R-2520 authorizing the city manager to make application to the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) for the purpose of obtaining STP Resurfacing Funds.**

Ms. Lommatzsch motioned to approve Resolution No. 19-R-2520. Deputy Mayor Denning seconded the motion.

All were in favor; none opposed. **Motion carried.**

- V) **Resolution No. 19-R-2521 authorizing the city manager to make application to the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) for the purpose of obtaining STP/CMAQ/TA Funds.**

Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to approve Resolution No. 19-R-2521. Mr. Teaford seconded the motion.

Ms. Bartlett: I originally estimated that it would only cost \$3.0 million from Valley Street from Broadmead to Harshman. That estimate actually was like \$7.7 million for that stretch or roadway. It was broken into two parts with the first part being \$4.7 million and our share went up from \$900,000 to \$1.7 million. I seriously think we should rethink submitting on Valley Street. If we wanted to submit on an STP grant, I would go back to Woodman and do Woodman from 35 to Eastman would get us a \$3.0 million chunk, which is the maximum

Thursday, September 19, 2019

the grant can be. Ms. Lommatzsch: So, you want to vote down this? Ms. Bartlett: Right. Ms. Lommatzsch: Then you will bring another one forward. Ms. Bartlett: Yeah, at the next meeting. What I was thinking is that we needed a filler project, this is a \$3.0 million grant and I think it is good to have something in the works and Valley Street was a good project; it was just more expensive than I ever imagined. There is a water line main that runs under Valley that has to be lowered. The cost just escalated beyond what I envisioned and then that was only going to get us to Pleasant Valley and then we would still have another \$3.0 million project. I really want the attention to be on Woodman in future years so what was going to be a one-year project became a two-year project, which would push Woodman further down the pike. Ms. Lommatzsch: Let me ask you, does that chunk as you refer to it, is it affected by the redesign of the bridge and the whole intersection. Ms. Bartlett: No, they are just going to come down on the south side of Woodman; we would coordinate what is being done with the interchange. This money would not be available until 2025 so the interchange would already be constructed. They aren't doing very much approach work on Woodman Drive itself.

Mayor Flaute: Is there any further discussion on the motion? We can either have the motion pulled back or just go ahead and vote. Ms. Lommatzsch: Vote it down.

Roll call went as follows: Mr. Denning, no; Mr. Teaford, no; Ms. Campbell, no; Mr. Curp, no; Ms. Fry, no; Ms. Lommatzsch, no; and Mayor Flaute, no. **Motion failed.**

ITEM 17: PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: Mayor Flaute stated that due to the nature of what he was seeing he said that comments need to be kept civil and direct them to council only and not to any staff and to be civil to staff. Mayor Flaute invited Mr. Frank Smith forward to discuss his issue.

Mr. Smith: I'm bringing up an old subject. Still haven't seen the sign back up. I'd like to get that sign up. Trucks are using the street, and I don't know what the code is, but we have been fighting this dust issue. Jerry is putting more of that black wrap down by the truckloads. I am tired of this subject about this dust. He hasn't watered and now he is putting some more of that stuff down. I've just put new siding on my house and I'm trying to fix my property up and I am tired of fighting this dust. I think everybody in the neighborhood is, but me and Steve and Dave are the only ones that will come forward because everybody else is afraid of Jerry. But, I'm tired of fighting this subject. I've been fighting it for 10 years. You passed the resolution that Jerry would spray, put this stuff down to solve the dust, but putting this wrap down and making it worse. Now, this isn't helping; something needs to be done. I'm tired of fighting it. Thank you.

Ms. Campbell: Any comments, anybody? I was just wondering if anyone was going to answer him. Mayor Flaute: If you want to you are welcome to otherwise the city manager will get with him. Ms. Fry: I would like to have a discussion with the city manager. Ms. Campbell: If you mowed your grass lately, anybody, it is dusty; I can imagine what you are going through. If there is something we can do; we need to do it. Ms. Fry: So, what is the city's position on whether or not he's doing what he is supposed to be doing? Mr. Carpenter: He has been calling in when he is putting the chemical down. I'm not sure the days from the last time to today on how many days it has been, but I know we usually get a phone call that he has put it down, the spray. I'm not sure, I think I heard about the material you are talking about; I'm not familiar with it. Mr. Smith: It is ground up asphalt is what it is. We fought this before, right Steve? It's horrible. Now he is putting it down again. Ms. Fry: Is he putting it down in lieu of spraying? Mr. Carpenter: I don't know. Mr. Teaford: Yes, he is. I go by there on a regular basis just drive by. For one, he is not allowed to use ground up asphalt as a base; it's illegal in the city of Riverside to use ground up asphalt as a base. I've been through that with the city of Riverside. I don't know how he is getting away with it. He agreed to spray some type of apple juice chemical, and for some reason Riverside has not forced him to do that. Ms. Fry: What would be the next step? Mr. Smith: Your out of your own council have said about people taking care of their properties. Now, I've spent a lot of

Thursday, September 19, 2019

money to take care of my property. I just put new siding on because the siding that was on there was beat up, ugly, horrible. Now, I have to face this fact again. Mayor Flaute: Mr. Manager will you answer...Mr. Carpenter: It sounds like there are two issues; there is this black asphalt being put down, if it's illegal then I guess we have to investigate that. Then, the repercussions for non-spraying, the way it is written is that we would have the spraying done then charge him for it. For the spraying, we've been contacted and is saying they are spraying, but I don't know today how many days how many days it has been since the last spray. Deputy Mayor Denning: Do we go check to see what he tells us he did? Mr. Carpenter: I do drive by. Deputy Mayor Denning: If I call you up to say I did it...well, that is my concern. Mr. Smith: I haven't seen him out there spraying; we've seen him spraying at least once outside that I can't say. That brings up another issue. The street sweeper come down by a couple weeks ago and he is putting up more dust than what was on the street. He was not using water; I mean there was dust everywhere. He come down Byesville, went up Planters, went down Derwent, turned around and come back and never did do Planters down by my house and Steve's. The dust rolling out of that thing is horrible. Mayor Flaute: So, you prefer they not use a street sweeper in your neighborhood? Mr. Carpenter: They do put water in it. Mr. Smith: They need to use the water with it. They didn't do no water; it was dusty. Ms. Campbell: You said in the past, not to change the subject, you said in the past they had some signs out where it wasn't their property; it was your property? I thought at one time you were talking about somebody putting signs up. Mr. Smith: There was a 'no-thru' truck sign half-way up Planters and they took it down because they said it was the wrong color, but it has not been put back up and it really needs to be put back up. Ms. Fry: Can we follow up and make sure he is putting down the substance that was agreed to and follow up with the ground up asphalt? Ms. Lommatzsch: I don't know how often he is supposed to do that. Mr. Carpenter: Every 30 days he is supposed to spray. Ms. Fry: Can we have an update on the action at the next council meeting? Mr. Carpenter: Yeah. Deputy Mayor Denning: As far as the ground asphalt that may be something that the EPA can get him for because I had looked into using it for pathways and stuff and was told you couldn't use it because when it rains it leaches into the ground especially in a well protection area. We may be able to get the EPA looking at him for using that.

Mayor Flaute invited Mr. Dave Coterel to come forward and discuss his issue. Mr. Coterel: I'd like to make two statements. The citizens of Riverside elect the council members to do their job and the council members are the ones that hire the administration people. Now, if the administration people aren't doing their job, the council people need to back off and do their job and make the administration do their job. Number two, there is no address on Byesville Boulevard in Floral Park plat zoned as business. It is all residential and it doesn't take a dummy to set and figure that out all they got to do is look that up all the way from Smithville to the dead end of Byesville, okay. Now, we have a zoning no commercial vehicles parked on residential streets. Now, on the curb of Byesville, residential, the curb street, 4505 Byesville, you have two wreckers setting there 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week, and nobody does anything about it. Nobody even follows up on the residential zoning on these properties. That takes in every residential or every property that is listed as Byesville Boulevard. You guys need to check that out. Your administration people aren't doing their job. I can name a few and you don't want to hear the few. The other thing is, I got 11 lots including the one that my house sets on at 1009 Fairfax. The one on Springfield Street and Kimbolt, here about a month ago, I did my fence roll, cleaned it all out down through there, did it on a Saturday; I went to my post office box on a Wednesday, and I got a notice from the city of Riverside, an anonymous complainer that I had weeds and grass grown up into my chain link fence. If I'd got that notice before I'd done it; I would have told Riverside to kiss off and go around and look at all the other places down there in worse shape than mine is and I keep mine in good shape. All you have to do is drive by it. Now, anonymous complainer, I think one of your members of the administration is one of them. Thank you.

Mayor Flaute invited Mr. Steve Massa to come forward and discuss his issue with council. Mr. Massa: Good evening, I'm pretty confident that at least six of the council people know why I am standing up here tonight. I had planned to read a message to council concerning

Thursday, September 19, 2019

Mr. Chris Lohr. To avoid diminishing Mr. Chris Lohr's chance at being hired by one of the many establishments to which he has applied for employment; I would instead like to use my three minutes to pass out a copy of the message to council and let them read it silently to themselves. I have six copies; one for Mr. Teaford, Mr. Denning, Ms. Fry, Ms. Lommatzsch, Mr. Curp, and Ms. Campbell. May I pass them out. Mayor Flaute: Yes, I guess so; you have three minutes. Ms. Campbell: Mayor? Mayor Flaute: He doesn't want to give me one. You have 1:16 left, sir. Mr. Massa: I think you all have pretty much read it so I don't expect a response tonight, I just want to make sure you got the message, Thank you very much for your time.

ITEM 18: COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS: Deputy Mayor Denning: There is a Shred-It event on October 5, if you have anything that needs shredded, the Jaycees, Chamber of Commerce, and Domescik Realty have funded the shred it event. It will be at 1213 Old Harshman in the cul-de-sac. Bring your old stuff that needs shredded down and it will be done for free. They are asking if you would like to donate non-perishable food items they will accept those at the same time to be used locally at one of the food banks.

Mayor Flaute: I did four weddings in the last two weeks. We had an InCrowd event at the Event Connection, Tuesday night, it was a great event. A lot of our businesses are getting together and everyone is always welcome. The next one will be at the Eintracht Club on Troy Street on October 21 so please come on our and enjoy a good evening with your fellow businesses and members of Riverside. An anniversary has passed, our clerk has been with us for one year.

ITEM 19: EXECUTIVE SESSION: Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to go into executive session. Mr. Teaford seconded the motion. Roll call was as follows: Mrs. Lommatzsch, yes; Deputy Mayor Denning, yes; Mr. Teaford, yes; Ms. Campbell, yes; Mr. Curp, yes; Ms. Fry, yes; Mrs. Lommatzsch, yes; and Mayor Flaute, yes. **Motion carried.** Council entered Executive Session at 8:58 pm for the following:

- A) Section 103.01 (d)(7) To receive and consider from an applicant for a permit, license, variance, zoning change or other similar privilege granted by the City, the following information confidentially received from an applicant: C. Production techniques and trade secrets.
- B) Section 103.01 (d)(1) Unless the City employee or official requests a public hearing; to consider the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion or compensation of a city employee or official or the investigation of charges or complaints against a City employee or official.

ITEM 20: RECONVENE: The council came out of Executive Session at 10:00 pm.

Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to approve the first reading in its entirety of Ordinance No. 19-O-704. Mr. Teaford seconded the motion. Ms. Lewallen read the ordinance in its entirety. Role was as follows: Deputy Mayor Denning, yes; Mr. Teaford, yes; Ms. Campbell, yes; Mr. Curp, yes; Ms. Fry, yes; Ms. Lommatzsch, yes; and Mayor Flaute, yes. **Motion carried.** Ordinance No. 19-O-704 will have its second reading and public hearing at the upcoming council meeting.

ITEM 21: ADJOURNMENT

Deputy Mayor Denning motioned to adjourn. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. All were in favor; none were opposed. The meeting adjourned at 10:02 pm.

William R. Flaute, Mayor

Clerk of Council