

# Montgomery Funding Cut?

*How should the City of Montgomery respond to the potential elimination of Ohio's Estate Tax and Local Government Fund? How do you see this affecting you as a resident?*

Public comments as of October 27, 2011, 1:59 AM

All Participants around Montgomery



*As with any public comment process, participation in Open City Hall is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.*

# Montgomery Funding Cut?

*How should the City of Montgomery respond to the potential elimination of Ohio's Estate Tax and Local Government Fund? How do you see this affecting you as a resident?*

## Introduction

If Ohio's estate tax is repealed (HB3), Montgomery may need to make some tough choices regarding the provision of services in the City. Over the past year, the City has budgeted conservatively in regards to the income received from the estate tax and local government fund. Last year, the estate tax and local government fund comprised \$1.14 million of the City's revenue. For 2010, the estate tax revenues were \$1,070,186 and the Local Government Fund revenues were \$284,531. Current State of Ohio legislation would eliminate or severely curtail these revenue streams? How should the city respond?

# Montgomery Funding Cut?

*How should the City of Montgomery respond to the potential elimination of Ohio's Estate Tax and Local Government Fund? How do you see this affecting you as a resident?*

---

As of October 27, 2011, 1:59 AM, this forum had:

|                                 |    |
|---------------------------------|----|
| Attendees:                      | 49 |
| Participants around Montgomery: | 4  |
| Minutes of Public Comment:      | 12 |

## Montgomery Funding Cut?

How should the City of Montgomery respond to the potential elimination of Ohio's Estate Tax and Local Government Fund? How do you see this affecting you as a resident?

### All Participants around Montgomery

Don Wahle inside Montgomery

March 30, 2011, 3:58 PM

We suggest the recycling "rewards" be eliminated for citizens, instead the income should go to the city to use as needed. Don and Ginny

---

thom monahan inside Montgomery

March 29, 2011, 2:01 PM

We cannot all know every detail within our government operations. That's why we elect officials to represent our best interests. Because we cannot know all, we get our lessons in small doses which usually come disguised as reductions in services. It is only when decisions impact us directly that we concentrate on issues that normally have no value. As we prepare for the potential reduction in funding, we must anticipate that certain services will be cut. Cuts provide opportunity to weigh the value of all services and make choices as to the value of each.

There was a time when health insurance did not exist and everyone provided their own solution. The insurance industry capitalized on the lack of health insurance and provided programs that covered catastrophic incidents. Eventually programs advanced to the point where even the slightest of medical costs were covered. Now we are in a time when the only way to control our medical insurance costs is to pay out of pocket for the everyday medical charges and only ask insurance to cover the major bills.

Perhaps our city benefits have reached the same challenge where we must decide what services we residents can incur on our own and which services can only be provided by the masses.

---

Name not shown inside Montgomery

March 29, 2011, 1:53 PM

I think a key focus for the City should be in attracting new (tax-generating) business to the city. The old auto dealerships sit right in the southern gateway to the city represent a golden location with easy access to the interstates. Perhaps the city could take a leadership role much in the same way they did with the historic district triangle property and become a catalyst for creating an attractive mixed use development that would add to the appeal and tax base of the city.

---

Mike Cappel inside Montgomery

March 27, 2011, 2:00 PM

Significant changes in life and business are great opportunities! They force upon us the the obligation to review our priorities, create new objectives and focus on what is important. A significant change to funding for local governments is one of these opportunities. How we prepare or react is what defines us and separates great government from good government. Last year's strategic planning sessions were a step in doing this.

The traditional role of government is to provide the public goods that a person can not reasonably provide for themselves: roads, safety services, an orderly market place, etc.

Since the funding changes will potentially affect all levels of service provided by the city of Montgomery all operations should be on the table regardless of how they are funded.

## Montgomery Funding Cut?

How should the City of Montgomery respond to the potential elimination of Ohio's Estate Tax and Local Government Fund? How do you see this affecting you as a resident?

### All Participants around Montgomery

First the city should understand its layoff policy and how any union contracts control this. The budget should not be balanced on the backs of those who provide services to us every day, but payroll is an expense.

Staff, residents, businesses and suppliers should be made aware of the potential risk of the funding cuts and what steps are being taken to address them. This should be tempered with the idea that most residents don't understand that some funding streams are dedicated for specific projects and can not be diverted for others.

Internal changes can control costs.

At the end of each shift, all employees should be required to post one item that went well or badly that day: abstentions prohibited. Certain barriers to good government will rise to the top and should be addressed.

Every two weeks each department should be required to formally propose one cost saving measure. These should be implemented, evaluated and tracked. If effective in that department they should be rolled to other departments where applicable. I know of one business that did this, implementing \$31,000 of changes with documented savings of \$250,000 in the first year.

Every department, program, event, etc should have to justify its expense and ability to meet the needs of Montgomery stakeholders. When the numbers are not right the service should be reconsidered.

Finally, the city should never forget that its residents are its customers. If Montgomery does not fulfill our needs, then we can simply move to an area that does.

---