President of Council Mr. Vanover called Council to order on June 17, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

The governmental body and those in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. McNear provided the Invocation.

Mrs. McNear took roll call. Council members Diehl, Emerson, Harlow, Hawkins, Knox, Squires, and Vanover were present.

The minutes of June 3, 2015 were considered. Mr. Squires made a motion to adopt; Mrs. Emerson seconded. Minutes were approved as published with seven affirmative votes.

Committee and Official Reports

Civil Service Commission
Mr. Thamann: The Civil Service Commission had no June meeting; the next scheduled meeting is July 2nd, 2015.

Rules and Laws
Mr. Hawkins - no report

Finance Committee
Mr. Diehl - no report

Planning Commission
Mrs. Harlow: Planning Commission met in these chambers on June 9th; all members in attendance. We had a Minor Modification to the PUD for Full Throttle Karting, which is located at 11725 Commons Drive. This was a parking lot expansion at the south end of the lot. This was approved with full approval of the board.

Our next order of business, which kept us quite late, was a Major Modification to the PUD of Tri-County Commerce Park, which is 12100 Princeton Pike, which we know as GEEAA Park. We had a lot of discussion that evening – we had 25 pages of staff comments and the developer went through those very quickly. We had a lot of questions about landscaping. They offered the city $30,000 for the landscaping program but they could not tell us the caliper number of trees that they would be taking down, where those trees would be. They did not have a Landscape Plan. Our City Planner offered to walk through the site and identify trees that they would want keep, trees that might need to go. We offered to meet prior to our next regular meeting, if that would help them move their project along. Unfortunately, it was not a very productive meeting. We ended up tabling the item. We didn’t get new sets of plans. There’s issues on setbacks on Crescentville Road. There’s a building there that they want to have less than a 75’ setback and they finally said well they could deal with a 75’ setback when they saw that we weren’t going to budge. They have this building that is on the east side of the property that would be 48’ tall, 430,000 s.f. I just think that even with the landscaping and the mounding that they say they will do, that’s just a real problem for our residents over in that Heritage Hill area. As we move forward, I know that Administration will keep sending letters on the meetings that impact the Heritage Hill community and I hope that those residents will come out and be more vocal in the development of this property. That was tabled.

We had a Development Plan for 175 Progress Place for a parking lot addition. They were before Planning Commission a month ago requesting over 1,000 parking spaces. There were issues with landscaping and the main aisle and safety, so they were back on June 9th and they scaled down to 772 parking spots and worked out all of the landscaping details with our Building Department and our City Planner. That was approved with full majority. That would conclude my report unless there are questions.

Mr. Squires: Mrs. Harlow, It sounds like that might not be approved – is that correct?

Mrs. Harlow: The GEEAA Park?

Mr. Squires: Yes.
Mrs. Harlow: I don’t think it’s going to get approval the way it stands now. The gentlemen that were here really wanted the commission to vote on it and Mr. Okum said that he would put a motion out on the floor if that was their desire but he said he felt like, from all of the comments that had been made, the motion would fail. It got a little bit of a heated exchange, about what our role was and what they wanted us to do and basically it came down to our role is to either approve or deny whatever program and plan that you put in front of us as it goes to the city’s zoning and what the city can live with, with Comprehensive Plan, that type of thing. Mr. Diehl might have more to add but it was a rather tense meeting as far as it went. I think Mr. Vanover was there as well and Mayor Webster was there.

Mayor Webster: Yes, I was there. In answer to Mr. Squire’s questions, it’s still a work in progress, if you will. Mrs. Harlow is exactly right – there’s still a lot of unresolved issues but I don’t think anybody is ready to make a final decision on it. The developer has got to come to the table with some answers and the Planning Commission has laid out some things that have to be done. I think the ball is in the developer’s court at this point. I think it’s too early to say; if you’re going to ask me if it’s going to go or not, at this point, I don’t know. They’ve been working on this since I don’t know - we had our first meeting with them maybe in October, September? A long time ago, it was in the fall; we’re going on nine months here. Their original plan had them breaking ground by now. If I may, Mr. President, we’ve got a lot of people in the audience here tonight, primarily from the Crossings, and we also send letters out to you guys when we’re having any kind of meeting regarding that development. I say it to you folks and anybody out there in TV land, if you’ve got some strong feelings one way or the other, you really need to let the Planning Commission know because that’s where the issue is right now. It’s not with City Council, and it may never get to City Council if it doesn’t make it out of Planning Commission. So if you’ve got some strong feelings for the project or against the project, you need to get a letter together with signatures on it, appoint a spokesman, or all of you stand up and speak here, whatever. You know, I can’t advise you on how to do it, but you need your voices to be heard before it’s too late.

Mrs. Harlow: And again, in an effort to work with the developer and to work with GEEAA Park, we offered special meetings. We just said we have to be able to give notice of those meetings. We want to show that we want to work with them and help them get their project done, but at the same time, they’ve got to answer the questions and come up with the solutions that Planning Commission has asked them to do.

Board of Zoning Appeals

Mr. Hawkins: Board of Zoning Appeals met on June 16th of this year; all seven members were present. We had one matter of Old Business – the owner of 175 Progress Place requested a variance to reduce greenspace to 17.5%. Said variance was from Section 153.269, which indicates there “must be a minimum green space shall be at least 30% of the lot area”. That variance was granted with a 7 - 0 vote. It’s important to note that the property prior to the variance being granted, was already legally nonconforming and was at 25.4% minimum green space.

We had a few matters of New Business. The first was the owner of 175 Progress Place requesting a variance to allow the minimum parking stall size to be reduced to 9’ x 18’. Said variance is from Section 153.502(A), which indicates “minimum parking stall size shall be 9’ x 19’.” That variance was granted with a 7 - 0 vote. It’s important to note that the Rezoning Committee is going to adopt the 9’ x 18’ parameters anyway going forward. The owner of 175 Progress Place also was requesting a variance from Section 153.608 for the planting requirements for a buffer yard along a public right-of-way or private street adjacent to the I-275 right-of-way. The minimum buffer yard requirements for the 2,071 l. f. of frontage are 60 trees and 690 shrubs. A total of 49 trees and no shrubs are located in the 10’ perimeter area. A variance was needed to eliminate the requirement of the additional 11 trees and 690 shrubs. That variance was also granted with a 7 - 0 vote. It’s important to note that all of the required caliper inches had been replaced and the shrubs are basically for visibility screening and the reality is, from I-275, if they put the shrubs in, they’d be at an elevation where you wouldn’t see them anyway so there would be no impact.
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Mr. Hawkins (continued): We had the owner of 578 Grandin Avenue requesting a variance to allow a garage conversion to remain. Said variance was from Section 153.105(B) which indicates “A single two-car garage and related parking area is required…”. That variance was granted with a 7-0 vote with the caveat that they must maintain an overhead garage door and keep an unfinished storage area of 10’ x 11’. We also had a discussion regarding the property at 246 Balsam Court which was a previously granted garage conversion. I’ve shown everybody on Council and Mr. Knox had already seen from the meeting, what that property owner had done with regard to the conversion and their garage door. That matter is going to be looked at. I think, further by Administration and Legal Counsel to see if that is in fact appropriate. That concludes my report unless there are any questions or Mr. Knox has anything to add.

Mr. Knox: Yes, I would like to make a comment about what was submitted to us from the people from 175 Progress Place – they did not give us a diagram of the parking spots. We had no idea whether they’re going to be perpendicular to I-275 or parallel. If they’re going to be parallel, and the submission said that there are 49 trees. I drive by there every day and there aren’t any trees there. There are going to be, so I think we’re going to need a little more specificity in those things.

About the garage door, we had the discussion. I’ve beginning to wonder why it ever came before us because it should have been obvious that it was going to go either to the Legal Counsel or let it go as it was because the variance said that he would have an operational garage door and he felt that he met it. I personally thought that he had; other people didn’t. Question was the type of garage door; it wasn’t what was envisioned. So again, we need more specificity and I think the members of the Board of Zoning Appeals now realize that. Thank you.

Mr. Hawkins: Just one comment as to Mr. Knox’s comment with regards to the 175 Progress Place, which is the Avon site. Mr. Knox is completely correct – the Applicants didn’t give us any diagram of the parking, with the trees, that I know Planning had previously, so Mr. Taylor did help us by going and getting a big diagram I guess Planning had previously. It would have been helpful if we would have had that to begin with but we did get to review some of that information.

Mrs. Harlow: Can we go back to Planning Commission for just one second, please? I’m sorry. I should have mentioned this as a caveat to the Planning Commission. Planning Review met and we have completed the entire Zoning Code and it’s being looked at now for final draft, for word-smithing. It’s being looked at by Mr. Taylor, by Mrs. McBride and that group, and by the moderator, who worked with us. Her name is Liz. She’s going over it all with a fine tooth comb. It’s going to be ready to present and the best way we thought to present it would be through a workshop where the Council, the Board of Zoning Appeals and Planning would all be together and we would all hear the same information at the same time. They were looking at a tentative date that we’re going to run through Administration, for July 23rd. That again, is looking at when we could get it approved or make any adjustments that Council says we need to make, and then get it back before Council for approval so that we can get this done in late September/early October. Thank you.

Mr. Diehl: Mrs. Harlow, I have a question – will we receive a copy of the report prior to the meeting?

Mrs. Harlow: You will.

Mr. Diehl: Thank you.

Mrs. Harlow: We will all have copies of it and Administration will work and make sure that’s everybody’s schedule can be accommodated for that meeting.

Mr. Parham: Just to follow-up on Mrs. Harlow’s comments. Mr. Taylor did send to me a tentative schedule for the proposed meeting, I guess the committee put this together for Council’s consideration. Hopefully before we leave, we can come up with some timeframe for the meeting to give them some direction on what may work for your schedules. The schedule they’re looking at right now is the distribution of the draft document on Monday, July 6th; then they would advertise for a Public Hearing for the August 11th Planning Commission meeting.
Mr. Parham (continued): As Mrs. Harlow pointed out, they were looking at a joint meeting on the 23rd of July. I have suggested to Mr. Taylor that perhaps the 22nd would be a better date because that’s a Wednesday and you all typically are meeting on Wednesdays. Although the July Council meetings are normally scheduled the first and the 15th. So the 22nd would be open, as well as the 29th would be an open date. The Planning Commission would review and hopefully, have a recommendation for Council as a result of their meeting on the 11th of August. At that point, the first reading could take place before this body on September 2nd, with the second reading and Public Hearing taking place on September 16th for the final adoption of the new zoning code.

Mrs. Harlow: Mr. Parham, the reason that we looked at the 23rd instead of 22nd is our moderator, Liz, is at a conference and would not be available on the 22nd. That’s the first date we went for also but it wasn’t going to work for her.

Mr. Parham: I was wondering if that was the case. I contacted Mr. Taylor and asked if there was something unique about that date? Is there somebody who couldn’t be there? He wasn’t certain at the time, I asked him and so he was going to review the minutes to see.

Mrs. Harlow: It’s Liz.

Mr. Parham: Mr. Parham, do you need any further direction from us?

Mr. Vanover: Council, any problem with July 23rd meeting?

Mr. Hawkins: What time?

Mrs. Harlow: We have it planned for 7:00 in the evening.

Mr. Hawkins: I’m fine.

Mr. Vanover: (Council confirmed the meeting date and time) Alright, you have us July 23rd.

Mr. Parham: Thank you.

Board of Health
Mr. Squires: Thank you, Mr. President. The Springdale Board of Health is still on summer break and they will not return until September 10th; hence there is no report.

Public Utilities Mrs. Emerson - no report
Public Relations Mr. Hawkins - no report
Capital Improvements Mrs. Emerson - no report
Public Welfare, Safety, & Education Mr. Diehl - no report
Housing Board Mr. Squires - no report
Public Works Mr. Squires - no report

O-K-I

Mrs. Harlow: Mr. Knox is going to give the report today, thank you.
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Mr. Knox: Because of yet another delay on I-75, I didn’t arrive until 21 minutes after the meeting started. This is twice in a row. I’ll have to find another route if I go down there again. When I got there, Mr. Policinski was detailing the sad state of the Highway Trust Fund. As it stands now, the needs of the greater Cincinnati area, we can expect little help from the federal government in that quarter. On a closing note, he stated that all members of the OKI Regional Council are expected to receive a survey from OKI, so if you haven't received it yet, you will be receiving something in the mail. The council adopted the budget for the Fiscal Year 2016; it did not contain any outstanding changes from this year’s budget. Next came the amendments to OKI's 2014 Regional Transportation Plan. Neither item had a direct bearing on Springdale residents; however, it’s interesting to note that the conversion of the rail line to a bike path known as Wasson Way Trail, contained the stipulation that nothing could be done that would prevent it from being converted back to a rail line. I believe the Enquirer missed that pertinent point. The next two items contained rank orderings of the SNK Highway Projects that had been submitted. Most of the highly rated projects were those where communities requesting the funds offered more than the minimum 20%, which is something our Administration knows about and usually does a good job on. The council next approved an extension for the Fiscal 2016 contract with 4BIS.com for their computer administration and then the council approved two amendments for the OKI Water Quality Management Plan. The second one, which has been in the news, was to dissolve the Waynesville Wastewater Facility planning area. Both Warren County and the Village of Waynesville had approved that and they requested it. The vote by OKI was for dissolution as the final step to make it official. The next meeting of OKI will be on August 13th; there will not be a July meeting. Thank you.

Mr. Vanover: Just a quick question on that bike trail that said they could do nothing that would prevent them from turning it back – does that mean including the asphalt path that’s typically what a bike path is?

Mr. Knox: Yes. That would be fine but the asphalt can be taken up and tracks can be re-laid if necessary.

Mr. Vanover: I guess what the organization that’s in charge of the bike path are just leasing it?

Mr. Knox: The city is paying for it; I’m not sure if it’s going to be leased or it’s going to be under the city’s control.

Mayor’s Report

Clerk of Council/Finance Director

Mrs. McNear: I have the General Fund update through May 31st, 2015. Our receipts for the General Fund, we have a budget of $16.153M; so far this year, we have received $8.675M and that’s 54% of our anticipated budget. Our top five receipt sources are Earnings Tax, Real Estate Tax, Paramedic Services, Local Government Funds, and Mayor’s Court. Of that $8.675M, we’ve collected $8.187M, which is attributed to those five top reasons. For the Expenditures, we have a net budget of $16.830M. We have expended $6.636M, which is 38% of the anticipated expenses. Our ending balance, at the end of May, was $5,189M. Secondly, we do have a resolution this evening adopting the tax budget of the City of Springdale for 2016. That is required by the county and that will be coming up later in the agenda. That concludes my report, thank you.

Administrator’s Report

Mr. Parham: Council, I have a few items for you. At the April 15th meeting, I mentioned relative to the West Kemper Road project that there are a number of sanitary sewer lateral issues that we were having. If you recall that discussion, I identified that we had to relocate a number of laterals that were in conflict with the project. At that time, our cost for this work was at $44,000, so we knew we would be back before you for approval of a change order. To date, and now that all of the work has been completed we are ready to seek your approval. There were nine laterals that required being relocated for a total of $61,854. Of the $61,854, we believe that a portion of that should be covered by the Metropolitan Sewer District because of their inability to appropriately identify the location of those laterals. We had discussions with them early on concerning this issue. We have now re-engaged discussions since that part of the project is complete. I would ask for legislation at the next meeting, the July 15th meeting, for the authorization and approval of the change orders, with an emergency clause.
Mr. Parham (continued): Item #2: We have also previously discussed the State Route 4 Southbound Lane Addition project. In fact, we had a rather lengthy discussion about that topic. The staff has continued to research the project. Based upon the bids that were received in 2010, we have sort of taken the median of those bids to come up with an estimate for the cost of this project and the number is around, again this is a rough estimate, $486,000. This is an opportunity for us to apply for the STP funds (the funds Mrs. Harlow identified about a meeting or so ago) that are available on a very short timeframe, between July 1st and June 30th of 2016. If we have an interest if applying for these funds, we need to have our application in by July 1st of 2015. Tonight is the last meeting that I could get your approval to submit and application for this project. We would apply for 80% of STP funds and the City would cover 20%. Based upon our project estimate that would come to about $97,000 for the City’s share, and then the STP funds would be approximately $388,000. There is no guarantee that we are going to receive these funds. I am sure that it will be competitive. Well, one would expect that it would be a pretty competitive market but then, as you stop and think about it, a community really had to have a project that was pretty ready to go or shovel-ready. That has become the popular statement. We have had some conversations with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) relative to whether certain documents have to be resubmitted from what was submitted In 2010. In 2010, we submitted an Interchange Modification Study. ODOT has indicated that we do not have to submit a new study. They are willing to accept the 2010 study. Another document that is key to this application would be an environmental document. We submitted one of those back in 2009. What they have said to us relative to this environmental document is that we will more than likely not need to perform a full study. However, we will have to perform some level of an environmental assessment report. Again, if there is interest in moving forward with this project and we want to attempt to secure these funds, we need to act tonight. Again, the rough estimate is $486,000 with the City’s share being about $97,200.

Mrs. Harlow: I would like to see us give Administration the authority to at least investigate it and move forward and see if we can’t be successful. The way they were talking down at OKI, they’ve got the $10M and it has to be for shovel-ready projects that can start right away and this is one of the projects that we have that seemed to fit the bill. I think with the expansion of the Avon property in that complex there and the expansion of whatever development happens at the GEEAA Park, I think it’s worth the investment to do so.

Mayor Webster: Here’s the thing I don’t want to see happen – what I don’t want to see is go to the state, OKI, whoever, and get approval of these funds and then we don’t pursue it for a second time. That doesn’t bode well, to create a record with these funding agencies – to get approval and then back away from it. We did it last time; I think we did it for some good reasons. As far as authority, I would like to have us have more than authority just to explore it. I think we need to have the authority to acquire the funding and an agreement that we are going to go ahead, if we get the funding, we’re going to go ahead and build this thing. While I’m talking about it, I think it’s important, you know this thing resurfaced, I guess at an OKI meeting - Mr. Okum, who called me and wanted to have a meeting about this, and Mrs. Harlow – well, she was part of the meeting we had here, but I guess she was part of the OKI discussion also, but it was primarily precipitated by a council member from Fairfield. As far as we’re concerned, this application has nothing to do with Fairfield, in relieving their traffic situation. That’s an issue that Fairfield has to deal with and Fairfield does not have a shovel-ready project that they’re going to be able to apply for these funds. If you vote yes for this thing, do so because we, and we think it’s going to benefit Springdale businesses and employees coming and going to work, on Crescentville Road and the Avon site, and so forth and so on. I think it’s a good project; I think it’s one we should do but I want to make sure that we’re firmly committed to doing it before we put the time and effort into filing the application and then, if we’re successful, I would like to make sure that we’ve got the approval from this council that they’re going to build the thing because it has to be completed or started by June 1st, isn’t it, next June?

Mr. Parham: It has to be under contract by June 1st of 2016.

Mayor Webster: If you have some reservations about it, we need to air those and we need to make a call on it. As Derrick indicated, this is the last Council meeting we’re going to have before we have to make this application.
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Mr. Hawkins: Say it again for me please, the total cost and the cost that it’s estimated the City’s going to come out responsible for.

Mr. Parham: The estimated cost is $486,000 for the total project. The City’s share would be $97,200 if we are successful with 20/80 percent split, and then $388,800 would be the STP funds. Is my math off?

Mr. Hawkins: Without looking at the five-year budget or the budget from last year going forward, what are we anticipating that we have coming up in terms of projects for 2016 that we’re looking at money being expended for, as we sit here right now? Do you have any idea how much?

Mr. Parham: In 2016, as we talked about at the last meeting because we have one project on tonight’s agenda – the Boggs Lane project. We talked about the Sweeney Place improvement; that will be somewhere around $850 - $900,000. We have sort of adjusted our participation number to 41% City share and 59% for SCIP funding. Those numbers are about $440,000 that would be our commitment. The only other capital improvement project that I can think of right now - well, let’s look at the budget – would be any type of Summer Street Program.

Mayor Webster: I think that’s terribly important that we make sure that we all keep that in mind - we need to put some money in that summer street program for the residential streets. I would love to see us get back up to that $700,000 number that we used to put in there year after year. If some of the economic development, after it’s come to fruition, we should be able to start inching back up towards that.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you. For the sake of the record, as far as I’m concerned, if we’re able to get the 20/80 funding and we’re talking about $97,000, if we get the funding, I think it’s worth pursuing, particularly with, God-willing, some developments happen back there, with the hotel and everything else, I think it would probably benefit that whole area. I would be in support of it if we get the funding.

Mrs. Emerson: My question is what if we don’t get the 80/20 - is there enough movement in the budget that we could handle more than the $97,200?

Mr. Parham: Well, you’re going to submit your application and tell them what amount you’re going to apply for. Either, the way I understand it, they’re either going to approve your application. Well, let me take a step back. Generally, they’re either going to approve your application or not. Now, the exception that we’ve seen is that, let’s say that there are 15 projects out there and you’re number 16. They receive enough dollars back based upon the bids coming in lower than estimated or someone not performing their job, not being able to perform their project; you may find that instead of us receiving $388,000, maybe only $250,000 becomes available. Then we have a decision to make as to whether we’re going to come up with the difference.

Mrs. Emerson: Then again we’re turning them down.

Mr. Parham: At that point, well, that is a decision we have to make. Either we are going to turn it down or we are going to accept the $250,000, come up with the difference, and proceed with the project. Again, the numbers here are estimates. The bids are going to determine what the true cost will be.

Mrs. Emerson: Okay, thank you.

Mayor Webster: Mrs. Emerson, I think if we would turn down a partial funding of it, I don’t think that would go against our record, so to speak. I think we get the full funding for a second time and we said we’re not going to do it, then I think the next time we submitted an application, I think somebody down there’s going to remind us that what’s the use of doing this, you’re not going to do it anyway?

Mr. Knox: I need to have my mind refreshed as to where this project starts – does it start north of Ray Norrish?
Mr. Parham: No, sir. The project starts, if you can envision heading south-bound on State Route 4, pretty much across from the entrance into Showcase Cinemas, roughly, and then heading south and adding a separate dedicated lane taking you to I-275 south-bound. It would be on the west side of the median that blocks the traffic from the dedicated lane onto I-275 and the through traffic down State Route 4.

Mr. Knox: Thank you.

Mr. Squires: Council, it seems to me like time is of the essence here. Mr. Parham, would you agree with that?

Mr. Parham: Yes, sir. We need to know tonight.

Mr. Squires: If that be the case, I would propose that Council give Administration the authority to procure these funds and if we are lucky enough to be granted those funds, that we go ahead with the project. Is that what you need from us?

Mr. Parham: Yes.

Mr. Squires: Then that’s my proposal to Council.

Mr. Vanover: Is it a motion?

Mr. Squires: Yes, I'll make that a motion. (Mr. Knox seconded the motion.)

Mr. Vanover: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? (No response.) Motion passed with seven “aye” votes. Administration, you’ve got your direction.

Mr. Parham: Thank you, sir. Next item: I talked with the members of the Capital Improvement Committee. I think we’re ready to present to the committee the 2015 Annual Street Improvement program. If you recall, the budget has $410,000 in it in 2015. $150,000 of that is found in the Street Maintenance Fund (061) and another $260,000 is in the Capital Improvement Fund (090). So if we can proceed with our meeting on June 24th at 3:00 p.m., then we are looking at a schedule of making a presentation to Council at the next meeting, July 15th, and then hopefully awarding a contract at the August 19th meeting.

Next item: if you recall, a year ago, we were presented with an opportunity to have the state pay for our annual bridge inspections. Council approved it and we thought it was only to cover our 2014 bridge inspections. I raised the question at our recent Project Review meetings and we were contacted by ODOT to say that they are committed to pay for our 2015 and our 2016 bridge inspections. The only one bridge they did not inspect is a pedestrian bridge and we are going to have CT Consultants to perform that inspection as well as provide other analysis on the documentation we received back from the State. That concludes my report.

Mr. Diehl: Mr. Parham, going back to the neighborhood Street Program – what is the total dollars that’s going to be available at this time?

Mr. Parham: $410,000 is what’s in the budget. Right now I will tell you that the proposed program is slightly over that number.

Mr. Diehl: Thank you.

Mr. Hawkins: Mr. Parham, what’s the title again of the legislation regarding the change orders that we need emergency clause for the next meeting?

Mr. Parham: I think it’s going to be an ordinance to authorize the approval and authorization to make payment for change orders with the West Kemper Road Rehabilitation Project.
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Mr. Hawkins: Thank you.

Law Director’s Report

Mr. Forbes: No real report tonight, although I would like to let Council know that I’m going to be on vacation for the July 15th Council meeting. Since that’s the case, I wanted to take the opportunity to reintroduce Council to Mr. Greg Laux, my partner, who will be likely covering that meeting, in my absence. I thought it would be a good idea for him to come out, just to see what happens the meeting ahead of time and also, it was great luck that now he knows he has to come to a meeting on July 23rd for a joint workshop because I’ll still be on vacation for that. Between now and then if you have any questions, as always you can contact me but Mr. Laux will be attending that next meeting. Other than that, nothing to report.

Engineer’s Report

Mr. Shvegzda: On the West Kemper Road project, the closure of Kemper Road through the project area is underway. That commenced June 8th. At this point they are detouring traffic through Northland to State Route 4. The detour and associated work are anticipated to be wrapped up by August 8th. Local traffic for the residents to access their homes will be maintained during this period. The anticipated upcoming construction schedule is: installation of the storm sewer and the removal of the old asphalt surface is planned to be completed this week; the full depth removal of the old pavement and reconstruction of the aggregate base in the vicinity of Springdale Elementary will take place the week of June 22nd; concrete work involving the replacement of existing curbs, driveways, and sidewalks will take place the weeks of June 29th and July 13th; the roadway base and intermediate asphalt work will take place the week of July 13th; catch basin grate adjustments and topsoil and seeding will take place the weeks of July 20th and July 27th; and then the final asphalt and pavement markings will be completed the week of August 3rd. The overall project completion date is late September of this year.

On the Boggs Lane Rehabilitation Project, the bids were opened June 3rd; those results were reported to Council. Prus Construction is being recommended as the lowest and best bidder at $196,630.89. The legislation to award the contract to Prus Construction is before Council tonight. The anticipated project schedule is to start construction mid-July and to conclude late November. That concludes my report.

Mr. Squires: I would just like to compliment the engineering firm for the way that it is being handled. I got caught on it the first day; I admit that. I came down and attempted to turn west on Kemper and couldn’t but my observations are that things are just working out extremely well. There’s lots of cooperation out there; there’s no tempers being displayed. It was just an excellent idea to wait until school was closed. There are no school busses to deal with under that situation. Things are going well and I think they’ll continue to go well. Thank you.

Mrs. Harlow: Mr. Shvegzda, we spoke at Planning the other night about the traffic issues that are coming down Lawnview, Van Cleave, Harter, Nelson - were you able to address that with Administration?

Mr. Shvegzda: Yes, actually I mentioned that to Derrick and I believe he got with Chief Mathis to take some action on that.

Mrs. Harlow: It’s really bad. We’ve got a lot of speeders. People get stuck back there and they don’t know which way to go and they end up backing up into the right-of-way where other traffic is trying to go. It’s a learning process for everybody I guess but the speeding is what really in concern.

Mr. Parham: Mrs. Harlow, as Mr. Shvegzda indicated, he did provide me with a copy of that email. I did share that with the Police Chief. In fact, they had already begun to run extra patrol in the area. The challenge with a project like this is there are really only two other options for drivers and they are not a part of the detour, unfortunately. One is coming around Lawnview and the other is unfortunately, going through the Olde Gate Subdivision. Of course, Olde Gate is not a public road, but Lawnview is a public road and so the traffic is going to go in that direction. We are trying to make sure that we stay visible and that we can at least eliminate or slow down any speeders that are going through there.
Mayor Webster: Mrs. Harlow, I heard that you had made this request to the Engineer and for the life of me, I’d like an explanation as to why you would go to the Engineer to address a speeding problem, because the traffic is being deferred off of Lawnview.

Mrs. Harlow: It was a conversation that happened at Planning, when we were both in a meeting and we were talking about the road closure and I said to him we were having a problem with speeding and extra traffic back there.

Mayor Webster: What’s he going to do about it?

Mrs. Harlow: He volunteered to take it to Administration.

Mayor Webster: Okay, I would suggest if anyone has a problem with speeders in their neighborhoods, let Mr. Parham know and he’ll make sure the Police Department gets on it, as they had already done in this particular case, by the time it got to the Police Department.

Mrs. Harlow: Side-bar conversation, sir.

Mrs. Emerson: Mr. Shvegzda, I’m changing the subject here a little bit. On the rehabilitation on Boggs Lane with Prus Construction, have we used them before, that company?

Mr. Shvegzda: It’s been quite a while since we’ve utilized them but they are a very reputable company. Their expertise is in concrete work, but they do a number of different projects that are very similar to Boggs Lane.

Mrs. Emerson: Thank you.

Communications

Mrs. McNear: Nothing this evening.

Communications from the Audience

Mr. Sheffield: My name is Sam Sheffield. I live at 22 Edinburgh Lane. I currently own a condo within GEEAA Park. I know with what the mayor had said, a lot of this should be addressed with the Planning Commission. I was at that meeting a couple weeks ago. I did not get up and speak. Somethings that concern me with that is some of the past history we have with GEEAA Park, especially with developer that basically ended up going bankrupt. The bank took control of it and then it was sold to a group that basically bought it for a fire sale. Back in 2007, I purchased my condo for $180. The condos around me, the same type of condos around me are going in the $120,000 range, some in the $110,000 range. So I’m personally about $60,000 under water. Five years from now if this warehouse project goes through, what’s the going rate for my house - $60,000, $70,000? It seems like to me the only one taking financial burden are the homeowners because the City of Springdale will be receiving taxes, the members of GEEAA will be receiving profit checks, and also when I purchased this, nothing was said about some of the financial problems that GEEAA was having. My understanding, from what I’ve heard and read, is that they’re losing membership. They went from, back in 2004, from like 150 ball teams down to about 30. Now we’re 11 years beyond that now so I don’t know what the situation is but nobody was honest or up front about this; nothing was told to me. Right now I know that there’s about five people that have got their houses on the market, trying to get out while they can. I certainly don’t want to live in warehouse district and I don’t think that anybody in this room would want to either. Some of this probably I should bring this to the attention of the planning committee. I guess that’s enough for now but it’s just that it’s a financial issue and for the home owners and the home owners are going to lose double what we’ve lost right now if we were to sell. Either that or our families.

Mrs. Harlow: We’re very much aware of the situation that you’re in. Everybody on Planning Commission understands exactly what the condo owners are talking about but the developer has told us that he has been in direct communication with the condo owners. Have you been part of that conversation?
Mr. Sheffield: I haven’t been part of it; I’m not on the board.

Mrs. Harlow: Well, I thought it was open to all of the condo owners.

Mr. Sheffield: No.

Mrs. Harlow: It’s not open to all of the condo owners?

Mr. Sheffield: Just the board members.

Mrs. Harlow: It’s just the board members?

Mr. Sheffield: Yes.

Mrs. Harlow: That’s not the impression that I received. Mr. Diehl, how about you?

Mr. Diehl: No, I thought it was open to everybody.

Mrs. Harlow: I thought it was open to everyone too, the way that it was worded.

Mr. Sheffield: We do have one board member here.

Mrs. Harlow: I was under the impression that it was open to all of the owners of the condos over there and that they were all in agreement and that they had been notified what the developer planned to do and how he planned to protect the condos.

Mr. Sheffield: I don’t see how he’s going to protect the value of the condos.

Mrs. Harlow: I understand.

Mr. Sheffield: It’s also the people that live around you.

Mrs. Harlow: What year did you purchase that, sir?

Mr. Sheffield: 2007.


Mr. Sheffield: Now somebody’s bought something in the last ten months. One of the owners that’s selling their house now bought it ten months ago and they said they’re getting out because there’s no disclosure, you know what’s going on.

Mrs. Harlow: I can’t address any of those issues but I was under the impression, and I can’t speak for Mr. Diehl, he’s here to speak for himself, but I was under the impression that there were meetings with the condos owners and that they were very much being kept in the loop as to what was happening with the development.

Mr. Sheffield: I hear you, ma’am. Thank you.

Mr. Vanover: Just do go to the next Planning Commission, all of you, and I’ve had conversations with some of the ladies here. There’s no louder voice that you have is there. I will state this and I’m very pleased and happy that the Planning Commission Chairman has opened that because typically at Planning Commission, you, we, meaning the public, and I include myself in that, at this point – make a statement on that. This is: A. he realizes the levity of this situation and do take that opportunity.
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Mr. Sheffield: Also, I worked in a warehouse for 30 years. It was a chemical company. I also worked for trucking companies and there’s no way anybody wants a 24 hour operation in their backyard – all the noise that goes on with that. You know, I don’t see anybody in this room that would be interested in living in a situation like that.

Mr. Hawkins: I’ll reiterate what’s been said and to everybody who is here and everybody who’s watching on television – it’s critical that you come to Planning Commission; those meetings have been very well attended. I think I’ve been to two out of the three where they’ve been discussing this matter. It’s critical that you give that input there, because that’s when the plan is going to be addressing those things before it gets too far down the road in terms of the process.

Mr. Sheffield: Oh, I’ll be at the next meeting.

Mr. Hawkins: The only other thing I would say is – this probably gives you very little solace, in the position that you’re in; If I were in your position I wouldn’t take much comfort in it, but the biggest thing that you will hear at those meetings – the Planning Commission is interested in and that everybody on Council is interested in, is with regard to the residents and the impact on the residents – that’s the number one thing, whether it’s folks that are living in the condos, whether it’s the folks that live in Heritage Hill, along that line – that’s the number one thing that’s a concern for how that’s going to impact the residents. I can’t sit here and tell you what the outcome of this whole project is going to be,

Mr. Sheffield: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Hawkins: or what Planning Commission is going to do, but rest assured, to some extent, that that’s the number one worry/concern and how, if this is going to go forward, how can it be done so in such a way that it has as little, if any, negative impact on the residents that are there.

Mr. Diehl: I have a question for you. I have a question for everybody. If you went to Planning Commission, which I am a member of, you know that I am not exactly a cheerleader for the project. What will happen if the project does not go through?

Mr. Sheffield: I don’t know exactly. That would probably depend on the financial stability of GEEAA.

Mr. Diehl: That’s about zero.

Mr. Sheffield: Yes. I don’t know. It would be nice if Springdale stepped forward or Hamilton County Parks stepped forward, it would be great but I don’t know.

Mr. Diehl: I’ll let the Administration speak to that because there’s been some discussion on that in the past. But do you think that this project, with all the sound barrier they’re going to try to put up in the landscaping, that you would not be able to see a portion of that? You would be sadly mistaken because we’re not going to be at 100%. I think they’re going to be at a very high number, but it’s not going to be 100%. Would there be those same barriers, would they have an effect on noise? Yes, they would have an effect on noise, but that’s not going to be a 100% solution. But I do encourage everybody that wants to hear their voice, come to Planning Commission, and also tonight, speak up! Somebody might have the same thing that something might be better than nothing.

Mr. Sheffield: The biggest thing is the financial impact of the residents, with this project or any other commercial type of project. Because we are, I mean you guys are, at some point, are going to decide whether to remove the park, I don’t know what you call it exactly, for GEEAA park. I mean that’s not commercial real estate right now – Am I right?

Mr. Diehl: Yes.
Mayor Webster: Yes, let me make a couple of statements. First off, let me just reemphasize what everybody up here is saying – you need to speak up. Your voice needs to be heard. Now, just to emphasize that once more, we’ve had meetings with those folks and we brought up some of the issues that we know the Planning Commission has an issue with, and rightfully so. We’ve gotten a response back from the developer ‘well, the residents don’t care; they’re not showing up’. So that just emphasizes that you folks and you people out there in TV land, and especially people in Heritage Hill subdivision and the Crossings of the Park, - you need to come out en masse and you need to stand up, every last one of you, and share your concerns with the Planning Commission. Now speaking a minute to the question that Bob raised, about what’s going to happen with property, we’ve gone through a lot of different scenarios with GE Park. They entertained the thought a couple of years ago of gifting that park to the city. That sounded just peachy; that was just absolutely wonderful. Well, we don’t know anything about running a golf course, so we contacted Hamilton County Park District. They were very gracious, very helpful; spent many hours trying to help us. They analyzed the situation. They came out and we went through the park; all of us went through the park. At the end of the day, their recommendation was that they would not take the park. I mean we did all kind of financial analysis on the operation of the park, expected revenues, with consulting with those folks that do it for a living every day. At the end of the day, it was going to cost the city a tremendous amount of money; I want to say close to a half a million dollars a year just to subsidize that park, assuming that we took it over. Hamilton County Parks said they didn’t want it; they wouldn’t take it.

So our initial thought was okay, they give it to us then we’ll sign a one year, dollar a year lease or something with Hamilton County Parks, let them run it and maintain it – no, they didn’t want any part of it. It’s just a niche type park – it’s not a par 3; it’s not a regulation golf course; it’s an executive-level golf course and there’s just not a market for those. So anyway, at the end of the day, before we could say no to them, they took the offer off the table. They decided no, we’re not going to give it to you and we’re going to sell it to a church - I think that was their alternative then, that they were going to sell it to a church. Well, that was 10 acres of the 106, I think. I don’t know what they were going to do with the rest of the park. Anyway, that didn’t go through, so the information they have given us is that GE Aviation is subsidizing them two or three hundred thousand dollars a year, just to keep the gates open and they’re saying they’re not going to continue to do that. So they’re borrowing money now from the GE credit union just to keep gates open until this deal closes, if it closes. The comment to me was that, if we don’t get the money, then the place is just going to grow up in grass. They’ll close the park, close the doors to the park and the whole park will just be a field, and needless to say, they’ve got a lot of financial obligations so it’s going to get turned back over to a bank. It will sit there like our hotel up here and it will not be a pretty site. Now I’m not trying to - like Bob, I’m not a cheerleader for the developer, but I think you need to stand back and look at the consequences of this thing. I think that just because, and I don’t want to minimize your financial loss here, I would not want to buy something for $200,000 and then find out a year later it’s worth $100,000; I’m just making up some numbers here. I can certainly sympathize with you but, at the same time, I don’t know that the city is going to be able to help you salvage whatever that loss is at this point.

Mr. Sheffield: Well, I understand but also, we’re stuck inside of a park that we have no control over.

Mayor Webster: That’s terrible. Somebody should have been forthright with you people and told you about, you know the park is skating on thin ice and so forth and so on.

Mr. Sheffield: That should have been done on the front end for everybody.

Mayor Webster: They didn’t do that, so that’s a bad situation but I think if there’s a glimmer or a silver lining, assuming this thing goes through and this developer can satisfy some of the issues Planning Commission has, and the Administration has, you will get a dedicated city street out of this.

Mr. Sheffield: Yes, I knew that.
June 17, 2015

Mayor Webster: It will be somewhat of a comprehensive street. I think that’s something that you folks have wanted since day one and were promised from day one and the developer’s never going to put that in, but as part of this development, some of the tax dollars that are generated in that project would go into what we call a TIFF fund, a Tax Increment Financing Fund, and out of that we’ll pay for the road system through there plus an upgrade of the traffic signal, and maintain the creek, Beaver Run – there has to be a substantial amount of work done on Beaver Run, to handle this water run-off but there will be money out of this TIFF to handle that. So yeah, you guys are going to be over here as part of an industrial subdivision, but it’s not all going to be industrial - some of that’s going to be office buildings, or at least that’s what we’re told and that’s what Planning Commission is being told, so yes, there’s going to be some warehouse space, but there’s also going to be some office buildings in there.

Mr. Sheffield: I think everybody would prefer to be 100% office buildings just because the type of operations you’d have when you have a warehouse.

Mayor Webster: So would we. We would love to see 106 acres developed as an office complex but that’s just not going to happen. We just can’t dictate and Planning Commission can’t dictate it. They can identify all of these issues that don’t fit the zoning and make them comply with that, and if they don’t, they can deny the zoning request except there’s certain issues that you can’t deny on and one of them is traffic unfortunately. We cannot deny the developer that zoning change because it’s going to generate traffic. Of course, being a city, you handle the traffic. That’s why we want to have some dollars in this TIFF fund to go out and make some street improvements, intersection improvements, traffic lights upgrades, and that kind of stuff, to try to help with that situation. Having said all that, I don’t know if that’s going to restore your total value, but I think that if we get a good road system in there and we get a good development, then maybe the other units sell, and your whole project starts to take off over there. I haven’t given up on that.

Mr. Sheffield: I think that’s hopeful thinking.

Mr. Vanover: Again, thank you for coming out and speaking up.

Mrs. Carter: My name is Phyllis Carter. I live at 422 Lisbon Lane, which is a part of The Crossings in the Park. I’m just going to take a second here. It’s inevitable that’s something’s going to happen, whether we like it or not. But I just think this project is just too darn big. Those buildings are big. I’m hoping that part of them can be taken away so there’s not so many or scaled down and help us out a little bit that way. I think there was a little bit of confusion at the Planning Commission meeting last week, I believe it was, about the residents of Crossings at the Park. We do meet and talk between ourselves but then the Board of Directors meets with VanderCar. They just accepted what VanderCar was proposing in the green space area only in our property because that was only to be if the project goes through. I think there was some confusion on how that was understood. I’m not a member of the board but we’re just hanging out for our green space and hoping for the best. I believe if they can cut the project down so there weren’t so many big buildings, that it would be better. Thank you.

Mrs. Grist: My name is Patty Grist. And like Phyllis, I know something’s going to happen, like Mr. Lyons (?) said, he had no idea that this was going to happen. I was one of the first people into the facility and I was told by the salesperson what a wonderful unit this was. I looked right out over the 8th hole. I’m a golfer and I’m a senior and I’m looking for something like that. So I bought, I was told that it was such a nice facility. I know none of you can do anything about that. I’m going to have to swallow that, and I will but like Phyllis says, it’s just too big. Why do we need to take the beauty of that area and put in the building, the whole space? The corner of Crescentville and 747 would be an ideal place for a small business, say a restaurant or an office building. Something that if they could just sell that, and then, if you could give them a dollar for the rest of it, there’s so many things we could do. We could have a Frisbee park there, we could turn it into a children’s playground, a picnic shelters, Bochy ball, or a senior citizen area right beside it. I know I’m guilty that, I’ve been here at every meeting, but I did not realize that we could speak, so I haven’t. That’s my feeling on the project.
Mr. Vanover: Can we get your address?

Mrs. Grist: Oh, yeah. I'm on Lisbon Lane, 217 Lisbon Lane.

Mr. Vanover: Great, thank you.

Mrs. Grist: A dog park would be nice too.

Mrs. Carter: Phyllis Carter from 422 Lisbon. I forgot one thing. We were all told that there was going to be an Assisted Living Facility there and there's still ground for it; we'd love to have it. I think that would be a good thing, a selling point. One of the homes that's for sale right now is because that's not going to happen. That's what I had forgot. Thank you.

Mayor Webster: I think the senior assisted living is still part of the master plan. As a matter of fact, the owner of that property was here at, I think it was at the last Planning Commission and he was at the one prior to that and he was concerned about I think one of the buildings that was going to be built adjacent to his property so, I mean he's giving all indications that that's still a long-term viable project. So don't give up hope on that one either.

Mr. Vanover: I will say I hope to see you all next month. We have a standing date going here. Seriously, do come out and speak. It's probably the best opportunity; that's what's going to have the most impact. Planning Commission has got it in their hands at this point.

Mr. Parham: I just want to notify everyone here that the meeting is scheduled on July 14th, Tuesday, at 7:00 p.m. – that is the next Planning Commission meeting. Once again, as we have sent letters out to each and every one of you, you will get a letter again. In that letter it tells you very clearly you have an opportunity to speak. If you want to be heard by the Planning Commission, I suggest that you show up at that meeting.

Mr. Vanover: Thank you for that, Mr. Parham. We did have a few more Heritage Hill residents. Actually it was ironic because they were doing line of sight and we had two of the individuals that were pegged on that side. We've got ongoing, but thank you for coming out and sticking with it.

Ordinances and Resolutions

Ordinance No. 8-2015
AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CLERK OF COUNCIL/FINANCE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO, HEROIN COALITION TASK FORCE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Mr. Squires made a motion to adopt; Mrs. Emerson seconded.

Mr. Hawkins: Just a couple of questions and I know we have the Chief here so he might be able to answer if Administration can't. How many officers from Springdale are actually going to be assigned to the task force, if we know, right now?

Mr. Parham: We are not necessarily assigning an officer to the task force. There's an option that a community can assign an officer to the task force, very similar as with the DART Program. What we are going to do and what this enables us to do is to also partner with all the other jurisdictions so that we may have a couple of officers internally who will work on heroin-related crimes, issues, be able to share information and data with other jurisdictions - with Hamilton County and the City of Cincinnati. So our position at this point is not to assign a dedicated officer to the task force but to have officers that will sort of serve as the leads for us, if you will, internally that will work on heroin-related cases.

Mr. Hawkins: From a practical law enforcement day-to-day policing, is there anticipated, and I'll prefence this with I think it sounds like a good idea - anything dealing with heroin is important. What's really going to be done differently, because I know law enforcement agencies are going to share information now; is this more just putting a dedicated line of communication in place, sort of, to say we're going to talk about heroin?
Mr. Hawkins (continued): I’m sure Springdale Police Department is going to talk with Forest Park if they think that there is some issue between the two of them or Fairfield or what have you, but is that the main thing – is just that this is creating a dedicated task force to have more communication about it.

Mr. Parham: I could give you an answer but I’m going to take advantage of the opportunity - the chief is sitting here and ask him to come forth and then I may elaborate.

Chief Mathis: I try to deputize Mr. Parham on a regular basis and he’s getting close. We’re working on that. There are probably really three main components of this that will be a little different than how we normally do business, but not substantially, but I think in a significant way. One is there will be a more streamlined information-sharing process that agencies, that all of the agencies that sign on to this task force, which will hopefully be all the law enforcement agencies in this county, will use the Fusion Center, here in Hamilton County as the data center for information collection and dissemination and it will provide a more streamlined, centralized way of collecting information and utilizing it and getting it out in both a strategic and tactical way to deal with heroin issues. The second is there will be a dedicated task force of officers from a variety of agencies, local agencies as well as the state Attorney General’s Office and the Ohio State Highway Patrol from state-level that will specifically work as a Task Force. As Mr. Parham said, we won’t necessarily assign someone to that full-time, although that is certainly always an option at some point in the future if staffing and resources dictate that but this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) allows us to, as things occur in the City of Springdale, to have our detectives work in conjunction with that task force, essentially, kind of like temporarily assign someone to it for a specific investigation that would be very relevant to Springdale, allowing them to come in to our community, as well as us going outside of our community because it crosses jurisdictional borders.

Well those are really the main two things that does and the final thing is this task force concept – there’s hopefully going to be a standardized protocol for agencies to utilize when dealing with these heroin-related incidents which will help all of us be on the same page. Every Police Department is different, just like every city is different, every city council is different. While we all basically kind of do the same things, there are little differences and so hopefully through these MOUs and the task force and the meetings and the information sharing and just the relationships that will be built, some of those little friction points will hopefully get smoothed away and we will have some more standardized protocols on how we deal with everything, whether they’re overdoses or drug-trafficking investigations, or whatever – there’s some standardization there that allows us to, that if we start an investigation and it has to get transferred to the task force, there will be a smooth transfer because we’re all kind of operating off of the same sheet of music, so to speak.

Mr. Hawkins: Chief, while you’re up here, what are the odds that you’re going to get selected as the director of the task force?

Chief Mathis: I would say that’s virtually non-existent.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay.

Chief Mathis: Unless somebody up here knows something that I don’t. (laughter)

Mr. Hawkins: Last question, real quick - in terms of money possibly being taken from busts or what have you, being spread out among the folks in the task force - would that be spread out evenly among all the cities?

Chief Mathis: That’s my understanding through the MOU - that the task force, if they have a task force case, then if there’s eight different jurisdictional entities that are members of that task force, then it gets split eight ways.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you.

Mr. Vanover: Mr. Parham: Do you want to continue?
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Mr. Parham: No, I think he actually did a pretty good job, so I don’t have to say anything. (laughter)

Mrs. Emerson: Mr. Hawkins asked the question I was talking about - the compensation and the benefits and who was paying those.

Mr. Parham: Each community will still pay their own officers and each community is also responsible for protecting, liability-wise, their own officers, so that doesn’t change.

Mrs. Emerson: Okay, so that money doesn’t come from the collection of all the participation, the people participating?

Mr. Parham: There are no funds right now and if there is a situation in which something is confiscated and there are dollars, as the chief indicated and as the document indicates, that’s evenly split but that, more than likely, will not cover the wages for the individuals that participate.

Mrs. Emerson: Okay, thank you.

Ordinance No. 8-2015 passed with seven affirmative votes.

Ordinance No. 9-2015
AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CLERK OF COUNCIL/FINANCE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO, FIRE EMS MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Mr. Squires made a motion to adopt; Mr. Knox seconded.

Mr. Parham: Council, I think about maybe a year or a year and a half ago, we had before you the Mutual Aid Agreement for law enforcement. This document, with the Fire and EMS, was last updated in 1991. The Hamilton County Fire Chiefs’ Association took a look at the document and decided that it really needs to be brought more in line with today. The document was changed dramatically; however, the content, the spirit of the document, remains the same. Communities cover one another during times when either there are none of their own forces available, or if there is assistance that is needed. There’s really no change in how we operate but the document simply needed to be updated. It has been reviewed by our Law Director; I have gone through it; the Fire Chief has gone through it. We have talked to other jurisdictions and so, this is the document we present to you this evening.

Ordinance No. 9-2015 passed with seven affirmative votes.

Ordinance No. 10-2015
AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CLERK OF COUNCIL/FINANCE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH PRUS CONSTRUCTION FOR THE BOGGS LANE REHABILITATION PROJECT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Mr. Squires made a motion to adopt; Mr. Knox seconded. Ordinance No. 10-2015 passed with seven affirmative votes.

Ordinance No. 11-2015
AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF SPRINGDALE’S PARTICIPATION IN THE OHIO MUNICIPAL LEAGUE 2016 WORKERS’ COMPENSATION GROUP RETROSPECTIVE RATING PROGRAM AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Mr. Knox made a motion to adopt; Mrs. Harlow seconded. Ordinance No. 11-2015 passed with seven affirmative votes.

Public Hearing
Resolution No. R6-2015
ADOPTING THE TAX BUDGET OF THE CITY OF SPRINGDALE FOR THE YEAR JANUARY 1, 2016 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2016
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Mr. Vanover: At this point, we'll open the Public Hearing. If there's anybody in the audience that would like to speak either for or against the issue, you can come forward. (None.) We'll close the Public Hearing. This is a resolution so we can act upon it this evening.

Mr. Diehl made a motion to adopt; Mr. Squires seconded. Resolution No. 6-2015 passed with seven affirmative votes.

Old Business

Mr. Diehl: I would just like to report that on several occasions I was at the playground at the Community Center and our tetherball has been put in use. I've seen participation all three times I was there.

Mayor Webster: Very good.

Mr. Vanover: Did you win any of them? (laughter)

Mr. Diehl: I'm a looker. (more laughter)

Mrs. Emerson: Chicken!

New Business - none

Meetings and Announcements

Mrs. Emerson: The Capital Improvement Committee will meet June 24th at 3:00 p.m.

Mrs. Harlow: The Planning Commission will meet July 14th at 7:00 p.m. in these chambers. There is a Planning Review Workshop proposed for July 23rd at 7:00 p.m. in these chambers.

Mr. Hawkins: The Board of Zoning Appeals will meet on July 21st at 7:00 p.m. in these chambers.

Mr. Thamann: A couple of items from the Recreation Department. First of all, they are accepting registrations for youth fall soccer. Instructional soccer is offered to children four to five years old and then they also have SAY soccer for six and over. Those interested can register at the Community Center. Also the Sailfish swim team is accepting registrations. The program emphasizes fun, skill development and great exercise for kids. Again, you can register at the Community Center so if you’re interested, please do so. Also we are offering swim lessons – the American Red Cross learn-to-swim classes will be providing instruction to help children ages three to twelve develop their swim and water safety skills. The Family Fun day at the pool is going to be this Sunday, June 21st, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Mr. Karle reports that it’s a great day to spend time on Father’s Day with your family. They’re going to have plenty of pool games and activities throughout the day. The event is free to pool members and it’s $3.00 for guests.

Mr. Vanover: Council, I will remind you and everybody in TV land and the audience that, starting July and August, we will move into our summer schedule so we will meet July 15th and then in August, it will be August 19th. We only have one meeting per month those months unless something else would pull us back in for a special session.

Communications from the Audience - none

Mrs. Carter: I did not receive notification of the last Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Vanover: See that gentleman, Mr. Parham. (Checking address of Mrs. Carter)
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Update on Legislation Still in Development

Mr. Hawkins: As you review your Internal Memorandum, Item I was addressed with Ordinance No. 11-2015, which passed with a 7-0 vote. Item II was addressed with Ordinance No. 10-2015, which passed with a 7-0 vote. Item III was addressed with Resolution R6-2015, which passed with a 7-0 vote. Item IV was addressed with Ordinance No. 9-2015, which passed with a 7-0 vote. Item V was addressed with Ordinance No. 8-2015, which passed with a 7-0 vote. Items VI, VII, and VIII are all forthcoming. We also took a vote in support to pursue funding for the Route 4/I-275 project funding request.

Recap of Legislative Items Requested for next Council meeting

Mr. Hawkins: There’s a request for an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to Enter into an Agreement with Advanced Data Processing, Inc. dba Intermedix, for Ambulance Billing and Related Professional Services and Declaring an Emergency. We also have a request for an Ordinance Authorizing the City to Fund the Employees’ Health Savings Accounts in 2015 and Declaring that an Emergency as well as an Ordinance Assessing Property Owners for Improvements Made Related to Their Drive Aprons for the Ashmore Court and Woodvale Court Rehabilitation Project and Declaring that an Emergency and legislation for the West Kemper Rehabilitation Project regarding change orders with an emergency clause.

Council adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy McNear
Clerk of Council/Finance Director

Minutes Approved:
Tom Vanover, President of Council

______________________, 2014