

Wilmington City Council met in special session on Thursday, February 12, 2015, at 7:30 p.m. with President Cindy Peterson presiding.

Call to Order

Roll Call: Jaehnig, present; Spicer, present; Stuckert, present; Mead, present; Miller, present; Milburn, present; McKay, present.

Chief Weyand was also present.

Pledge of Allegiance

Council gave the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Moment of silence observed

Finance Committee - Chairperson Miller introduced legislation making supplemental appropriations: \$50,000 for Income Tax Refunds; \$50,000 into Capital Equipment for a dump truck; \$127,000 for a grant in the Waste Fund, \$63,500 for the match for this grant, and \$53,000 for Capital Construction for a retainage invoice; \$26,304 to repair and expand the computer server that is crashing and \$20,600 to expand IT services.

Councilman Jaehnig questioned why the income tax refund line was already short in February. Councilwoman Miller stated that it was presented as standard refund. Councilman McKay said that Marque Jones indicated that he foresees more refunds in the future, but did not indicate if it was a particular group.

[Discussion of income tax refund line]

Councilman Stuckert – Are the computer items things that we didn't realize we needed when we budgeted last year.

Councilwoman Miller – The server has been crashing. There were a few issues back in November, but now it has affected payroll, water, income tax. They are also rolling in a couple of other upgrades, such as Wi-Fi in the community room.

Chief Weyand stated that it was not only the Wi-Fi, but the cabling in the building needs to be upgraded. At the end of the day, we will be functioning better.

Councilwoman Miller – A lot of the networks have been operating as an island. This pushes it together under the police server.

Councilwoman Milburn – Does this have an effect on the other fiber project we've talked about?

Chief Weyand – It has nothing to do with the building itself. We are trying to move the server from Mary Kay's office to ours. It will be separate. We are trying to fix the cabling issues that will allow the tax department to reach the server. The fiber is outside and has nothing to do with the cabling inside the building.

Councilwoman Milburn asked if the capital construction invoice was something that affected this year's budget or last year's budget. Councilwoman Miller said it was an expensive oversight on the landfill budget, but we can't do anything about it now.

A motion was made by Miller and seconded by McKay to give the first reading only on the ordinance Making Supplemental Appropriations.

President called for vote.

Motion passed. All yeas.

Director of Law read ordinance by title only.

A motion was made by Miller and seconded by McKay to suspend the rules and give the second and third reading on the ordinance by title only.

Roll call: Jaehnig, yes; Spicer, yes; Stuckert, yes; Mead, yes; Miller, yes; Milburn, yes; McKay, yes.

Director of Law read the ordinance by title only.

A motion was made by Miller and seconded by McKay to pass the ordinance as read.

Roll call: Spicer, yes; Stuckert, yes; Mead, yes; Miller, yes; Milburn, yes; McKay, yes; Jaehnig, yes.

Motion passed.

President of Council declared Ord. No. 5207 passed as read.

Streets Committee –

President Peterson explained that there would be a discussion of street paving issues in the council meeting to allow all members of Council to participate.

Councilman McKay – There is a shortfall that we need to cover, streets need to be paved, and money needs to be acquired from some source.

Mayor Riley – We had the Streets meeting two weeks ago where we discussed this. I asked Denny Gherman to give me a list of the top streets and prioritize them in terms of need and provide a cost for each one. That list is at your places. The list is actually alphabetical. I would suggest that council go out and drive them and see what they think. Side streets and cul-de-sacs can go longer without repair because they have less traffic. Major thoroughfares need more attention. Davids Drive is on here and it constitutes \$530,000, over half of the budget. I would move this down on the priority list because while it is a major thoroughfare, we owe it to our citizens to take care of more residential streets. We really won't know what the cost will be until we bid it out to the contractors. We can get those bids at no cost to the city, and then the Board of Control will review them to determine what the lowest and best bids are. Then it would go through Streets Committee, Finance Committee and City Council. We are just getting to the point where it is time to start this process in order to start construction when the weather breaks.

Denny Gherman – I was asked to put together a list of 10-12 streets. I drove the streets and came up with 47. I feel that nine of them can be repaired or patched by my crew. That left 36. I gave you a list of 18. There are three to four streets in each of the four wards. I thought that was a good deal for the citizens of Wilmington. I thought it was a little premature to prioritize them until we find out how we are going to pay for it and how much we have to do it. At that time, we can prioritize it. It would like some input from the council people.

Mayor Riley – I don't know if I could give my priorities without driving them. The eighteen on the list are for mill and new asphalt.

Councilman Stuckert – What are the nine streets?

Denny Gherman – Dana and Regal, Kathryn Drive, Mayfair Drive, Newham Street and Oak Street can be salvaged in-house.

Councilman Mead – Those don't count repairing potholes, correct?

Denny Gherman – Yes. That is separate. We run the pothole patcher continuously.

Paul Hunter – Are the state highways on that list?

Denny Gherman – No.

Mayor Riley – In streets the other day we were talking about Truesdell from Mulberry to Nelson Road. ODOT has said they will help us. They were initially talking about 80/20 split, but we would have to do the engineering.

Service Director Reinsmith – That would be \$30,000. We would also be responsible for any and all in-depth repair. Their preliminary estimate was around \$500,000 for all of

that. They want to tell you right up front. They say 80/20, but when you get into the repairs, it becomes more like 50/50. That project is scheduled in 2016.

Paul Hunter – State Route 68 and 134 are in 2018? Correct?

Service Director Reinsmith – Yes.

Mayor Riley – Whenever we have an opportunity to tap into the state budget, we will. There will probably always be some split. If our share is only 20%, compared to 100% of costs, I think we need to jump on those when ODOT is willing to move on them. I look for input by council on the ranking. We also need to look at the future of maintaining 110 lane miles of city roads. We need to come up with a replacement and repair program for all of those. Some streets can last as little as eight years before they need to be repaired. A cul-de-sac can last 20 years before it needs to be repaired. My goal is that we have some money appropriated every year for a portion of the street repair. We would need to go through a regimented system of deciding when these streets need to be replaced and have the money available. We could have done that if the \$800,000/year was still coming in from R&L. In fact, we did that in the days before we lost those funds. I've talked to Jeff Linkous about this. Even if we got the licensing back in Ohio, it would benefit the city absolutely nothing. We need to find a way of bringing in another \$700,000 or \$800,000 a year just for a street maintenance and repair program – basically, Denny's budget. In the State of the City last week, I proposed a 0.25% earnings tax increase, which would bring in approximately \$1,000,000. The greater portion of that would be dedicated to street repair. The rest of it would be dedicated to replacing capital equipment. We need a capital fund to replace equipment that we know we need, such as cruisers. I think if we have \$750,000-\$800,000 for Streets, \$150,000 for replacement of capital equipment, then we need to supplement the parks. In the past three years, the parks have gone it on their own and they have done an amazing job of getting grants and donations. But for our city park to continue to grow and be something that everyone of us can be proud of, the city needs to supplement the City Park Board to some extent. They have done an amazing job operating almost as an Enterprise Fund with their tax levies. I think everyone of you would like to do something and this would give us the opportunity to do something.

Councilman McKay – In essence, I think we understand the task before us. We need to break this down a little bit. I am willing to, with Madam President's approval, have some discussion with other council members. That is why we wanted to have this meeting. Do we agree with this layout of streets that need to be repaired? Also, how are we going to pay for it? The mayor alluded to a long-term plan. I know Councilman Mead has talked about this year to jumpstart things taking a significant amount of money from the General Fund to start that process. I think council needs to speak to that. At some point, we need to wrestle with the long-term situation, because I can't see a way to come up with an extra million dollars every year until we get a lot more employment within the city.

President Peterson – Let's start with your first question – the plan to drive the streets and prioritize the repairs.

Councilman McKay – That next Streets meeting would be Wednesday, February 25.

Councilwoman Miller – I would question why that would be done. When the \$600,000 was appropriated last year, the way it was worded was, "Denny and Larry know best, so it's not really our role to prioritize the streets." I drive the streets. I know they're terrible. It's embarrassing that some of the streets are almost impassable. I was happy with our street repair last year and I thought you guys chose great bang for your buck. I question our role in delaying by having to re-present my inexperienced decision. I am happy to give it, but I question why.

President Peterson – What emerged last year from the Streets Committee Meeting was an agreement that was brought to Finance to move forward with streets paving, but the Streets Committee made a determination at that time that they would defer to Denny to

make that list because they felt he was closer to the situation. So, the matter before us is, do you want to defer back to that plan?

Mayor Riley – There was a little bit of a difference last year in that council had allowed us \$600,000 to be used for streets, so let's get the best bang for our buck. So, we started with the worst and we used \$600,000 to work our way down. This is a little bit different because we are looking at more money. We can do the same process.

Councilwoman Miller – I think it is important that we move the money and we allot it and we tell him how much to spend. I feel like that is more my role on council than it is to play the role of Larry or Denny and try to prioritize.

Councilman McKay – I think they were just trying to give us an opportunity. I agree with you, Marian. In the past, we have allowed the folks that know what they are doing to make those decisions. Normally, Denny and Larry.

[Discussion of division of responsibility]

Denny Gherman – My comment when I asked for your input, is I get a call from a lot of council people who say they have residents complaining about streets.

Councilman Spicer – I drive the streets all of the time, but I know Denny and Larry have the expertise. I can look at them, but I will defer to them.

Service Director Reinsmith – I told the mayor I think we could probably delay Davids Drive. That is half a million dollars. That roadway was built in two different phases. We built one phase that went on Fife and turned right and went to Southern State College. Then we came back and connected to Rombach. I think we could delay. My feeling is if we got half a million dollars, we could do a lot with that. It's not like that is all we are going to do this year. We have other public works projects. We are building a water line out on Fife Avenue. We are building a connector road out at Ahresty and that starts on July 1. The way I see it, there are only me and Denny that are going to oversee these two big projects. We have our plate pretty full. So, a half a million dollars in paving would fit in there real nicely. I hate to see you take a million dollars out of the General Fund. I know that Paul says we missed the ballot early on and it would be a fall ballot. I would like to do a half a million dollars in paving, take our time and figure out what we want to do, and if we want to put it on the ballot put it on in the fall.

Mayor Riley – It was late in the year last year when we decided to do paving last year.

President Peterson – I think we have a decision on the first item – prioritizing the list.

Councilman Stuckert – Did we actually spend the \$600,000 last year on that list?

Service Director Reinsmith – It was just a hair lower.

Councilman Stuckert – Also on Lowes/Davids Drive. Did we buy that debt? Is that the one where we bought the debt?

Service Director Reinsmith – We still owe it.

Mary Kay Vance – We still have approximately \$300,000 of bond anticipation note on Davids Drive. We have a little piece left on Lowes Drive, less than \$100,000, and then the rest we did last July was landfill. You are absolutely correct, there is a piece that is around \$300,000 left on Davids Drive.

Councilman Stuckert – Denny would it be possible for you to give us a report and a cost on each of the ones you did last year?

[Discussion of last year's paving projects]

Mayor Riley – I can have Denny give that to the Street chair and give it as a presentation in a week when we have our meeting.

Service Director Reinsmith – I don't want you to spend all of that General Fund money because we are acquiring a cemetery and it needs a lot of work. We don't know where we are going to be on money with that thing either, so we just really don't want to tap out knowing that we have that over our heads, Bob.

President Peterson – Do we have a consensus on the prioritizing?

Councilman Stuckert – I would like to see it start early.

President Peterson – The second item is short-term funding and the amount.

Councilman McKay – I understood Larry's idea about a half million and then tackle the rest of it, primarily Davids Drive, as we corral the rest of the funds.

Councilwoman Milburn – I agree that it would be a good start.

Councilwoman Miller – Did we move money at the second half of last year? It was pretty late in the season and we got a lot done. So, even if we just did the \$500,000 now and keep them busy, I don't want to have so many irons in the fire that you feel pulled away from the projects. I know you said Fife is going to be a big deal. If we have all of this going on at once, it might stretch you too thin. If we could present it as this \$500,000 and then once it's spent, catch your breath, prioritize again. I wouldn't be opposed to that.

Service Director Reinsmith- Another thing with Davids Drive, there are still several catch basins out there that need to be rebuilt. I'm sure you've seen barricades over some of them. It would be nice of you to have those rebuilt before we went and finished them out.

Councilwoman Miller – Is there a timeline for those?

Service Director Reinsmith – I think Harry can develop a plan that fits in with whatever we're doing.

President Peterson – Any other discussion on the amount?

Councilman Mead – You've all looked at the list. Hopefully there will be paving coming to a street near you soon. At the last Streets meeting and the last Finance meeting, I presented an idea that I think we should adopt. I have not presented it as a motion yet. I came here this evening fully prepared to present it as a motion to pass an ordinance to do this, but, because of protocol and various positions, we've decided to put it off by a week. My idea was that we have money in the carryover. I think the streets are getting terrible. As Denny has explained, if we don't do something soon, we are going to be deeper in the hole. It takes a certain amount of money every year to keep them up. He said he needed quite a bit of money to get a jumpstart and catch up. In the streets meeting, I recommended that we consider a significant portion of the carryover to be used for that purpose. The streets are for all the citizens. The streets are bad and they need to be repaired. Everybody agrees with that. That is what I wanted to do. They wanted to wait. I went to the Finance meeting this evening, and I was prepared to present again what I wanted to do, which was take \$1 million from the carryover and transfer it to street repaving. If we don't do it, we're going to have to wait a year or more to get enough money to start some of these things, and we are going to be in a bad way. We've got the money now, and I know I'm one of those guys that says not to spend it. But, here I am saying that this is something that we've got to do. It tickles me that these aren't all fancy streets. These are for all of our citizens. I can't think of a better place to spend one million dollars. At the next council meeting, I am going to propose that we do it.

President Peterson – So we have a couple of numbers that we are talking about: one is \$500,000 this year; another is a \$1,000,000 this year.

Councilman Jaehnig – Bob and I seemed to have flip-flopped seats. Bob is spending money and I'm concerned about spending money. I feel like I'm about to be struck by lightning. In regards to the funding of the streets, whether it's a million or a half million dollars. I have no argument that they need to be dealt with, and the sooner the better. I feel like we're getting the cart before the horse. I can feel comfortable going forward with this in one of two directions. One is that we have some consensus from council of how we are going to start to solve our long-term funding issue. That discussion has not happened yet, and I'm not sure that it is a short discussion by any means. Even if council made a decision to move one way or the other, if the one direction was to move forward with the tax, we don't get the call on whether that actually happens or not because that decision is made by the voting public. My other concern is, if we spend the carryover, we have run with the basic premise that we want a 25% carryover as we move into the new year. That is the budget we usually set. We just finished the finance portion in this meeting and we spent \$97,000. We just spent all of the extra revenue that we were ahead in January with the extra \$100,000 that we brought in, taking us back to even. I believe it is going to be a very good year, and that we are going to see some really good revenue come in. When we get to the end of the year, my concern is there is going to be a big ask for major budget cuts to get us back to the 25% because we've decided to go ahead and spend those funds now. If council can agree that 25% may not be the number...it may be only 20% while we're figuring out our long-term funding issue, I'm good to go forward. But if we are going to spend all of this money now on streets and then we are going to come back in November and December and hold a very hard line on the 25% carryover and start gutting services or causing layoffs or terminations of positions, then I have real concerns. I believe, like Bob, that we have the funds there, we can use them and be safe to move forward. If council makes the decision that the 25% carryover is a mandatory thing that we absolutely have to have, then I'm very concerned about what we may do to the services to the citizens. I want to make sure we are taking a balanced approach to how we move forward. We don't know where the long-term funding is going to come from. If we went ahead with a tax levy, we don't know that it would pass. I just don't want to be at the end of the year and find that we are cutting to meet the 25% carryover.

Councilman Stuckert – To Councilman Jaehnig's point, I think the critical part to what determines our position on possibly having a lower carryover or not is what is the priority. The number one concern that we had is we have four core responsibilities as a city government with regard to the General Fund – Police, Fire, Streets, and Parks. For far too long, we have not done streets. We have not funded parks for several years. That's 50% of our core responsibilities that we don't take care of because we always find another hundred thousand that we need here and another five hundred thousand that we need here and another seven hundred thousand that we need here. And we always find money for those items, but we are not putting our core responsibilities first. If we are funding them properly, there are not going to be any layoffs. From my perspective, if we are funding streets, I agree with the mayor that at some point in time we need to figure out how to do something with parks also. I personally believe that with the increases in the revenue that we are seeing, we've got to quit...we have \$100,000 worth of supplementals now. If I've got this down now, all of them are from things that were simply left off the budget in error. We have to get better at budgeting. We have to know what is in our budget at the end of the year. What are we going to have to pay so we can decide some of these other things? We are getting eaten alive by things that we left off the list. My point right now is, fund streets and that is going to make all of the difference in the world as far as what we are doing with carryover and things like that.

Mayor Riley – Last year we did keep the 25% carryover. At times, we had significantly more than that and were able to put \$600,000 into street paving programs. This administration has done really well with maintaining the basic services that you are talking about. Going into this discussion where Bob wants to put a million dollars of the carryover into the streets, I'm tickled to death about that. Let's get some of the streets fixed, but my goal at the end of the year is still to have 25% carryover. I don't know if we can do that. If we are spending part of that carryover now, where is it going to be later on? I am just absolutely delighted to hear that we have some wiggle room in that 25% and we can use it. Maybe at the end of the year we will only be budgeting a 20% or 22% carryover. My goal is still going to be a 25% carryover, because that is good fiscal

management and this administration has committed itself. Mary Kay and David have done an outstanding job of finding money where sometimes there appears to be none. We're going to continue that process through the year.

Councilwoman Miller – Just to piggyback off of that. That is one of the agenda items on the committee meeting for Finance. I can't speak for all of council, but I know Bob and I are just going to work on our consistent message as the Finance Committee support that Randy can have going into the budget season. Have a united message. If it is that we can accept a 20% carryover with the condition that there is a significant street portion...I can't speak to that yet because we have not had the discussion. It is on the schedule to have the conversation of what we will compromise on to take care of the streets. I believe that was one of the things that I had problems with the budget, that there wasn't streets funding. I would probably have been okay digging into the carryover even more if there was Street Funding. I think the streets are everybody's priority no matter what committee you're on. Finance we are going to get on the same page to make sure you have that reassurance.

Councilman Jaehnig – I don't have a problem spending the money, I just want to make sure we all realize that if we are spending into that 25%. I believe the new jobs that have been coming into the community and the new jobs that haven't been announced yet that are coming into the community, it will still improve. I don't know if it will solve our long-term funding or not, but I know it can eat up a good portion of what we decide to move forward on streets.

Mayor Riley – If council decides it wants to do a one million dollar supplemental to go into Denny's budget for streets, I can assure you, we will review this list. We will get the best bang for our buck in getting city streets milled, replaced, and patched.

Councilman Mead – We are all adults here. We have common sense. We all understand that if we spend the money then we won't have it. We know that. We know that if we don't have it, we won't have the carryover. Keep that in mind. We understand it and we will remember it. It doesn't mean we will commit to anything tonight.

President Peterson – Can we send it back to Finance for discussion of the carryover amounts for next year and the money budgeted for streets repair and have legislation come out of there relative to the funding?

Councilwoman Miller – Our discussion in finance included having this meeting about streets first and then having him be able to have the opportunity to bring his supplemental back up again. That is next Tuesday.

Councilman Spicer – I think most of us know that the departments are running bare bones. If we maintain our spending to last year's level, with the increases coming in, we can borrow this from our 25% ourselves. I believe with good management, like we've done to control the spending, we can come close to having the 25% back at the end of the year. Then maybe we can turn around and do this again next year. If we do decide on a million dollars, and they prioritize, how many more of the 18 streets could we do with the other half a million? I have enough confidence in the way things are going right now to dip into that. Our departments really need to watch their budgets this year. If they have something that needs to be expended and carried over, we need to make sure it is in there so we don't have these supplementals.

Councilman McKay – I do want clarification from Larry and Denny. If they really don't feel they have the manpower to handle more than a half million dollars of street repair, which is all of these with the exception of Davids Drive, it would be silly for us to go for that given all the other projects they have on their plate.

Councilwoman Miller – I don't disagree with that. I'm not even opposed to the million dollars either. But it also could be that as a council we understand that we are going to move this \$500,000 and we are not going to put our head in the sand and we're going to reopen the conversation. Like I said, catch your breath after some of the projects. If you

don't have the manpower or time, there is no sense to give you the money right now if you can't use it.

Councilwoman Milburn – I am comfortable with the \$500,000 and then revisiting later.

President Peterson said that the issue could go back to Finance for further discussion and possible legislation.

Councilwoman Miller announced that the next finance meeting is Tuesday.

Councilman McKay – It looks like we are going to come to some resolution on the short-term financing. Just remember, we have the long-term financing situation hanging out there and we need to decide that.

President Peterson suggested starting the discussion of a long-term plan.

Councilman McKay – I'll lead off. If we are willing to bring something forward to the taxpayers, I feel that an earning tax makes a lot more sense than a property tax because it affects lots more people than the property tax would and it also provides more income. If we go with the quarter percent, it provides about a million dollars, which makes sense. Also, the money comes from folks from out of town as well as folks in town, those folks that use our streets and use our other city services. I would be in favor of going forward with that type of proposal.

President Peterson asked for other comments.

Councilman Spicer – I'm adverse to solving our problem with taxes. If we were at a stalemate or declining, I would be 100% on the bandwagon. I think with a little patience and good management, barring any major downturns, we can get through it without taxing our people. I realize we have one of the lowest income taxes around, but what's wrong with that? I think that's pretty good that we've done so well. I have trouble asking the people to support something that I'm not willing to support myself. I'm taxed out. I don't want more taxes. Most of the people I've talked to, they absolutely don't want to see us raise taxes. Some of them do. I appreciate all of Paul's input. He's really good to feed me information. I consider everything that the people tell me, but I'm just not ready to support any kind of a tax increase.

Mayor Riley – Actually, our taxes have gone down over the past year or so. The Governor has made some significant cuts in state income tax. Property tax went down how much, Paul?

Paul Hunter – Two mils.

Mayor Riley – The state has done a really good job of balancing their budget and reducing the state tax. At the same time, they are reducing the money that comes down the pipeline for the cities, villages, townships and counties. I think that is a good way to do things. Let the government that is closest to the people take care of the people. Instead of paying that much more in state tax, I don't have any problem paying a fraction more in city tax to make up for what we have lost. The net is, we're still doing better. I agree with everything you just said, Joe.

Councilman Spicer – I agree with everything you say, Randy. The problem is, we put the tax on, that's forever. Then things get good, and we have all of this money, so what do we do? We spend it. We're doing well. We've got jobs coming. Businesses are relocating here. I really think we can do it.

Paul Hunter – You're not invoking the tax. You can't invoke it. The people should assume some responsibility. The citizens should at least have a choice. If we have a pothole that can't be fixed, they have said yes or no to fixing it. That is the ultimate poll. We don't know how they would vote until you put it there.

Councilman Spicer – That's fine Paul. They can have a referendum. I respect that. It's hard for me to ask the voters to support it.

Paul Hunter – You’re not asking them.

Councilman Spicer – Of course I am. Let’s ask for a tax levy, I should be supporting it. I find it hypocritical to ask them to vote for a levy that I don’t want.

President Peterson – I am confident that this will not be the last discussion. I would like to bring this to close.

[Mayor Riley left the meeting at 7:36 p.m.]

Councilman Stuckert – I don’t support a levy. I have a strong feeling that we really will have the money without additional taxes. I would be in a position saying, “I don’t need your money, but I’m going to give you the opportunity to give it to me if you want to anyway.” In the State of the City address, the mayor offered a very fine rationale for the labor agreement. Our employees had gone five years with no pay raises. During that time, the purchasing power had declined at least 12%. Even though his logic was beyond reproach, I still felt like something was missing. What was not addressed was what was happening to the taxpaying public during the same period. Over the past five years, the taxpayers of Wilmington have not received pay raises. They have not maintained their previous earnings. In fact, the latest data indicates that the Wilmington area median household income has declined from over \$40,000 a year to a current level of \$29,000. Therefore, we would be asking taxpayers who had lost over \$10,000 per year in income, not to mention the additional purchase power lost, to increase their earnings tax rate so we can repave our streets, in spite of the fact that we have the money for other things. I also make a note that despite of the small percentage of that increase, we would be taking in around a million dollars, which means we are taking a million dollars out of the Wilmington economy to repave our streets. I don’t think that’s a good idea. We should not take a million dollars out of the economy. I don’t think we ask people who have suffered financially to increase their tax rate.

Councilman Jaehnig – I am amazed that we have clear feelings over what we should or shouldn’t do. I have a lot of questions before I can make a decision either way. What is the timeline? When do we have to make a decision? Once we know that, we can figure out the questions that really need to be answered. Some of those questions, the answers may change over the next few months. I believe the filing deadline if we want to move forward is in August. Do I want another tax? No. I definitely don’t want to pay any more in taxes than anyone else. By the same token, I want to know...are we heading in the right direction? I want us to analyze everything. Let’s take a hard look at our options and then make an informed decision. I don’t think any of us have enough information right now to make a decision either way. Do I want new taxes? Absolutely not. But I think we need to take the time to do our homework and make a determination. If we don’t have to make a decision to file until August 24, that means we have six months to look into this and make a decision. If we continue to see \$100,000 per month then we would know that we don’t need to do this. If we see that our taxes fall off dramatically, we may have to look in the other direction.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, President Peterson asked for a motion to adjourn.

A motion was made by Milburn and seconded by Miller to adjourn.

President Peterson declared the meeting adjourned.

Council adjourned.

ATTEST:

President of Council

Clerk