

Mr. Cosby: Is there a situation where the paramedic goes out on a run where there's a degree of seriousness that they cannot transport without the second paramedic being there? That was something that was discussed last time.

Chief Driggers: The only time I can think would be a severe trauma or a cardiac arrest. If that is the case, we will put as many paramedics as necessary in the back of that ambulance to care for the patient. Other than a cardiac arrest, where they have to do CPR with cardiac monitoring, drug administration, airway management, things that take more than two hands to do, that would be the only case of that. It does happen, not all the time, but there would be situations like that. Then we would need two paramedics. Not to satisfy the law necessarily, but to satisfy the care of the patient. Many times we work with Anderson Township, particularly now with the road construction issue here. We have automatic mutual aid with Anderson Township and they'll provide us with whatever assistance we need, as we provide them with assistance, as they need it. All of their people are paramedic-trained.

Mr. Kobasuk: Can you tell me the percentage of runs that would require two paramedics based on your statistics?

Chief Driggers: Last year we did a survey. We do a run analysis every year. About 30% of our runs require at least one medic, which we would refer to as an ALS (Advanced Life Support) run. Other than that, it's a BLS (Basic Life Support) run. At least 30-35% of our details require at least one paramedic to be involved in the transportation to the hospital with the patients. Of that 30-35%, probably less than 5% would require two paramedics because of the severity of the illness or injury. In 2005, that same run analysis turned out to be about 50% of our runs were ALS vs BLS. For one, we have more medics now involved in the care of the patients which sometimes takes someone not quite as major of an illness or injury and it steps it up to a more severe level of care and it may just be a weird spike in the numbers. We pretty much blend in with the national statistics until last year and it's been between 30-35% where at least one medic was needed and a small percentage where you'd need more than one.

Mr. Kobasuk: There's always one there now?

Chief Driggers: 24/7

Mayor Hammon: What's the policy for the ambulance to go out? You talked about medics, but we haven't heard much about EMT's.

Chief Driggers: Everybody else is an EMT. If we have one medic on duty, there will be two EMT's. If two medics on duty, there will be one EMT.

Mayor Hammon: So everybody over there is EMT's?

Chief Driggers: Yes sir. We do not have any employees within the fire department that are not at least a minimum an EMT. We will occasionally bring on a recruit, which we call a POC (paid on call), which are the volunteers that come in the evening and some of them may not be current because they're in training for that level of certification. That is rare because we try to recruit only those people who have their certifications and it also keeps our training cost down. Just to get an EMT certification and go through the training, it's about \$300.00 plus books. The POC's are additional staffing; they supplement the three that are on duty. We can sleep up to six people over there, and many times we do. We always have three and next year when the new budget kicks in, we're going to reinitiate that seventh position and have seven on duty, seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day.

Mr. Kobasuk: Looking at this Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services agreement, it talks about the district agrees that as part of the services to be provided that we maintain a minimum at the station house with three personnel. My thought was when you specify three, one of which will be a paramedic.

Chief Driggers: I think it was in the old contract, not in the new one.

Solicitor Miller: It is now. There's been a new draft.

Chief Driggers: Currently it says, "the district will make every effort to maintain at least one paramedic on duty." What's the legal term? Best effort, rather than mandate.

Solicitor Miller: I think it says, "you will endeavor to have one paramedic."

Chief Driggers: Obviously there could be a catastrophic issue due to illness or something could happen that would affect that temporarily. We have made every effort to abide by that particular clause in the contract and will continue to do so.

Mr. Kobasuk: How many are certified as paramedics versus the total population of your employees?

Chief Driggers: I'm going to guess, we probably have out of the sixty-five employees, and probably thirty are paramedics. Almost half, of that fifty-percent, we would love for it to be eighty percent. All of our full-time people, with the exception of one, as far as the shift guys are paramedic certified. We have one captain who is not and he is at the other station.

Mr. Evans: My parents had a small get-together on Saturday night and a lady fainted and you guys were right there. My brother is a doctor and he was there doing stuff until they got there and your guys did a great job. I want to thank you.

Chief Driggers: Thank you. I'll pass it on to them. We're very proud of the service we provide and we have state of the art equipment. We have good-trained personnel. We believe we're a great asset to the quality of life in Newtown, as well as the other two communities we serve and we'll continue to do that. Understand that we don't short-change the citizens. We take very seriously the commitment we have with Newtown.

Mr. Kobasuk: I guess Chief my thought is when I read this last month and I looked at it and I saw three personnel, I thought we just ought to specify at a minimum, one would be a paramedic.

Chief Driggers: And we do and we will continue. I think that was one of the issues, were there not three issues that we wanted to address?

Solicitor Miller: Just so you understand Mark, it doesn't say, "one will be," it says, "they will endeavor to make sure that one of them is a paramedic." They're not willing to give a guarantee that 100% of the time there will be a paramedic there because things do come up.

Mr. Kobasuk: Is that a common thing to encounter in other contracts like this, best efforts?

Solicitor Miller: Quite honestly, having this whole contract is a little unusual. Usually, with a joint fire district, there is no contract. It's kind of like, you live in Newtown, you live in a joint fire district. They provide the services as that board or that council sees fit. It hadn't been in the past because of all of the funding.

Chief Driggers: We had the contract initially, because the funding was part of the contract. Now that it will no longer be the case, we felt if it is the will of the three communities to maintain a contractual obligation to one another, but remove the financial ends of it and also clean up some other things that we want to clean up. That is where these other issues arise, the hydrant issue, the EMS billing issue, things of that nature.

Chief Driggers: (Continued)

- **Fire Hydrant Issue:** Obviously, we do have a little bit of time to work on this new contract.

Solicitor Miller: We do and we don't Chief, because we need to let the auditor know not to collect our levy within so much time.

Chief Driggers: That is strictly a decision of Newtown Council.

Solicitor Miller: Right, so we kind of wanted to have the contract enforced so we knew that wasn't a problem.

Chief Driggers: The FireBoard discussed those three issues at their July meeting. They did not have any immediate reservations, other than agreeing with it. We want to look at how statutorily Fairfax and Newtown can give up ownership of their fire hydrants because they are part of the water distribution system. We're looking at that issue, I've never heard of it being done before.

Solicitor Miller: I don't know the trading of ownership; you're just saying you're going to maintain them. We're not giving up ownership of the fire station, but you maintain it.

Chief Driggers: I have one other question. Keri, have you been in receipt of a letter from Dusty Rhodes about additional funding coming in for the levies that are currently being collected on?

We got one....

Mayor Hammon: I left it on your desk.

Ms. Everett: I was on vacation last week, so I've not gone through everything yet.

Mayor Hammon: I got the letter. I put it on her desk. She probably has not seen it yet.

Chief Driggers: In there, it will advise you that every taxing authority is going to be receiving; I hate to call it "windfall," because it's not a lot of money. But, more monies are being divvied out to the different communities on the levies that are being collected on. For an example, one a 2.5 mill levy, we got an additional \$5,000.00. That levy, the reason I'm asking a question is, can the fire district expect that additional funding that Newtown is going to inherit from the additional collections?

Ms. Everett: I'll have to get back with you when I look into it.

Chief Driggers: Okay.

Solicitor Miller: What was that for Chief?

Mayor Hammon: It's the administrative costs that were reduced so they're returning some of the funds.

Solicitor Miller: I don't know that that's exactly what that is, because what happened was, in their reappraisal of all of the properties they did, they didn't spend all the money that was in the budget, so Auditor Rhodes returned each community's share of what wasn't spent. I don't know how they came up with those numbers, in terms of who gets what, but I don't know that it is going to come back and say we get \$2,000.00 to your fire fund. I know in another community, it just went to the general fund.

Chief Driggers: I guess the reason I asked the question is because if the levy is a fire levy and if it is earmarked for that purpose.

Solicitor Miller: I didn't understand that refund meaning because of a levy, it was because their reappraisal cost weren't as high.

Chief Driggers: The reason I ask, the Fire District currently has a 2.5 mill levy that we collect on, until next year. It has to be based on whatever levies are out there.

Solicitor Miller: I don't know that it is.

Mayor Hammon: The letter is not that detailed.

Solicitor Miller: You can get it because you're a political subdivision in the county. Every political subdivision got a refund of money because their reappraisal costs weren't as high as they thought they were going to be.

Chief Driggers: If you happen to look into that to see just what the legalities are.

Chief Driggers: (Continued)

- **EMS Billing:** The three communities have agreed for the Fire District to participate in an EMS billing program. We call it a "soft billing" program where no resident is charged, but only the insurance carrier that provides medical care is charged. When there is a mistake by the billing service where they have billed residents erroneously, that money is returned immediately once the error is discovered. Since all checks come through me it is pretty easy for me to find them because they're all on personal checks, not on insurance-cut checks. It happens on rare occasions, but it does happen. It is a policy that we carry out throughout the three communities. I'm not aware of any fire department in Hamilton County that doesn't do EMS billing. It's pretty much a standardized form of recovery of costs. Just to give you an idea, last year we collected around \$95,000.00 based on our EMS activity, which was almost 800 EMS details. It does off-set some of our costs, particularly on EMS supplies and replacements that the hospitals no longer do and haven't for the last ten or twelve years. That is the policy of the district and was agreed upon by all three communities.

Solicitor Miller: We've changed the contract to reflect that also that they'd only be billing as they are now.

Mr. Pulskamp: Are they billing the insurance companies only or are they billing the residents?

Chief Driggers: The insurance companies are the only ones supposed to be billed. Occasionally, a bill may get to someone's home in error. Once error is discovered, a letter of explanation goes back to the resident with the check they may have sent in. The resident should not receive anything. I know this gentleman received a phone call from the billing service to gather some insurance information. Usually, that procedure is handled through the hospital and our crew with what they call a "face sheet." Part of the registration process provides us with insurance information. We turn that over, along with the run sheet to the billing service and the insurance companies are then billed. That is how it is supposed to work. Once I'm made aware of any errors, like Becky called and talked to my staff assistant last week, in regards to this gentleman receiving the call from the billing service. We took care of it and that's our

policy, we're going to collect from the insurance company and that's our policy. If I don't know about it, I can't get it fixed.

Resident Dale Myers: Ragland Road. This happened to me last week. I come down here to town hall and talked to Becky and she got me in touch with the fire department. At first, they said I didn't have to pay it. Later that afternoon, I got another call from the fire department and they said they were going to send a bill to my insurance company. My only thing is, this 7.9 mill levy we passed was the highest this village has ever had and yet people's insurance company has to pay for a squad run. I was appalled by this. I've been in this town for fifty-six years and never have I had to pay for a squad run, nor my insurance company.

Mayor Hammon: My only comment back, I don't share from the fire department that you got the right answer to begin with from Lieutenant Snider. She gave him a lot of wrong information and the wrong information shouldn't be coming out to a citizen. It may have been a misunderstanding between her and Mr. Myers.

Chief Driggers: First off, if it was a phone call he got, it wasn't from us.

Mr. Myers: I came down to Town Hall and Becky helped me and called Cathy at the fire department for me. Cathy told me I wouldn't have to pay it or the insurance company wouldn't be billed.

Chief Driggers: You may have misunderstood.

Mr. Myers: No I didn't, she told Becky the same thing.

Chief Driggers: For the record, Cathy is the one who submits the information to the billing service so that bills are generated to the insurance company.

Mr. Myers: At 2:10 p.m., that afternoon, Lt. Cathy did call me and say I was going to be billed for it. To me, I was appalled by it really.

Mr. Cosby: What got changed? Remember, several years ago, we never billed the resident or the insurance company.

Mr. Pulskamp: Curt, I know before we went with LMFR, when we had our own fire department we were billing also. We've been doing that for years.

Mr. Cosby: I don't recall. I know when I was here before, we did not.

Chief Driggers: The Attorney General ruled you can soft bill, but you can't isolate resident vs. non-resident.

Solicitor Miller: I think that is when the change came in is when they changed their opinion that allowed for the soft billing. The theory being you don't have to bill your residents because they're paying for the service through their taxes but you have to bill where you can differentiate. I don't know that it was the Attorney General, it could have been. That was three or four years ago.

Chief Driggers: I thought it was an AG rule because there was a lot of conversation about resident vs. non-resident and then the soft billing issue.

Solicitor Miller: What the average person doesn't realize is the tremendous increase in cost that EMS and fire departments have experienced since 9/11. Greater requirements have been put on them and in this area a couple of communities went out and paid outrageous salaries and hired a bunch of people and it kicked the salary level up for everybody. I'm sure that's why you keep losing people. I don't deny anybody any amount of money they are able to make, but it's getting tough for some of these communities to hire fire and EMS personnel.

Chief Driggers: That's exactly why we lost one of our Captains. Thank you for your time.

Solicitor Miller: Chief, where are we with the fire hydrant issue?

Chief Driggers: The Fire Board did not take issue with the fact that the fire district would take over the maintenance and cost replacement of fire hydrants. They were specific in that it only involves the fire hydrant and whatever is above ground, nothing below the surface of the ground. It isn't an unreasonable amount of money to create a budget issue for the fire district. We're looking into getting an insurance policy, having a deductible that would basically cover that issue in the event of an accident. The question Mr. Avis had, I think you bring up a good point which I'll bring to him, which it's merely an agreement to maintain and replace, not own. The district took no offense to the verbage of best effort having at least one medic on duty, at the Newtown station. They took no offense to the hydrant issue or the soft-billing EMS issue. They were in total agreement with the language for all three issues. Thank you.

Darwin Brooks, Resident: (Attachment) 6620 Crull Street.

- **No Parking Issue – Crull Subdivision:** For those in support of the removal of signs and revert back to parking in the streets, would you please respond to the valued opinions we sought. Mark, I understand you would support the removal of signs, would you please respond to these opinions.

Mr. Kobasuk: I will say the committee did meet and three Councilmembers were on the committee. We had three residents: Shirley Torrence, Heather Patton and Dale Martin. We went through a process and looked at all these issues and we came to a tentative conclusion to let people go back to the way they were with no parking thirty feet from the intersections in all directions and do it at a step-by-step approach. That was the recommendation that came out of the committee. We did consider these things and I don't know if these correctly state the reasoned opinions that you indicate. I didn't hear them like you have stated them here. My problem is we had a committee, we put a committee in place and the committee did its work and came to a conclusion and it was not going to be never revisited. This is a good first step, let's see how it works. To me, we had that signed petition where a majority of people in that neighborhood wanted the regulation to go down and go back to the way it was. As I recall, I don't remember the Chief indicating that he was in favor of no parking on the streets. I thought he indicated he had trouble navigating a truck around one of the corners. Therefore, we as a committee decided there would be no parking thirty feet in all directions from the corners so emergency vehicles could pass through. My point is I was going to present the Ordinance at some point to implement the will of the committee and the recommendation of the committee. If the problem was not solved, we would come back and revisit it. That was one of the recommendations of the committee also. To me it is a slap in the face not to follow the committee's recommendation. These people, citizens, some sitting here worked on it. They canvassed their neighbors. How do we get people to come down here and participate like you do every Council meeting? Which I think is great, but how do we get people to participate if we have

them involved in a process then we say we don't like the conclusion; we're going to do something else. I viewed it as a first-step, not the ultimate solution. Have I answered your question, or not?

Mr. Brooks: By what authority could you overrule the traffic code?

Mr. Kobasuk: How was it overruling the traffic code Darwin, I don't understand.

Mr. Brooks: Did you read that?

Mr. Kobasuk: I read that. I don't think that is overruling anything. If somebody has their vehicle blocking the street, they can be cited. It doesn't mean you can't park there. I don't see it being a problem.

Mayor Hammon: When this came up, I talked to Chief Zornes about it and his comment to me was "I'll not enforce anything with no signs up." That's how this really began to escalate to putting the signs up, because were parking in the driving lanes. Since that time, I talked to Tom and that's when he came up with the Ordinance that Darwin has cited and handed to you about the ten feet. That's way after the fact when I talked to Tom. It originally started with Mr. Zornes.

Solicitor Miller: First of all, he is correct. You have to have signs.

Mayor Hammon: So see Mark, you are putting police in a tough situation.

Mr. Kobasuk: This Ordinance does not require a sign as I read it. Am I wrong Doug?

Solicitor Miller: I did not get a copy of that so I have no clue what you're reading.

Ms. Hueber: But this is our Ordinance. He is stating that the officers will not cite with a ticket.

Solicitor Miller: I think you still have to have signs up. Whether this says it or not. I agree with the Chief.

Mr. Evans: Mark, I agree with a lot of what you have said, but you're kind of taking the thing and bending it the way you want it to be. I went to the meetings too and I think the people down there want to move forward and make things nicer and still not give up all their parking. I do believe the roads are to have cars and trucks drive on not park on. I think to go back the way it was would be a mistake. There are a few hardships we'll have to take case-by-case. I'm not saying you're wrong. A lot of people were intimidated by one person and signed the petition. Overall, there are a lot of people trying to make it better back there. Some did put parking spots in the back. The roads are narrow and it is a safety issue.

Mr. Kobasuk: I am not trying to bend this; I don't care how they want to do it back there. If they are all in agreement that they want the signs up and no parking on the streets, that is fine with me. I got the consensus from walking the neighborhood that the majority of the people did not want the Ordinance. They were not consulted on it, they did not want it. If things have changed that is news to me.

Ms. Hueber: But it's not a matter of.....

Mr. Kobasuk: Let me finish Tracy, I have the floor please. We had three representatives from that subdivision: Heather Patton, Shirley Torrence and Dale Martin. My impression was they were talking to their neighbors and they were canvassing them as we caucused in that committee. If I am wrong and the majority of people want these signs up and want no parking, then fine. I'm trying to implement the role of the people. That is all I'm trying to do.

Mr. Evans: I agree with trying to follow the will of the people. What I heard was they wanted it cleaned up.

Mr. Cosby: I went door-to-door with Mark. I heard the same thing he heard. Overwhelmingly, they don't want it.

Ms. Hueber: Okay. Now it's my turn. The difference is that nobody wants it, nobody likes change. Council has to realize that we have taken all of these opinions from professionals and the difference in the safety issues. Nobody wants to pay taxes either, so if they go around and fill out a thing against paying taxes, are we going to say well looks like nobody wants to pay taxes.

Mr. Cosby: Well they do vote that way. If they vote a tax down like they did last fall, you don't collect it.

Ms. Hueber: I don't agree with taking it all the way back and I didn't at the meetings. I'm on that street and none of you guys are on that street and it affects me more than any of you and it affects Darwin.

Mr. Cosby: A committee was picked. It affects everyone that lives down there, not just you or Darwin.

Mr. Kobasuk: Maybe we should get our facts and take a poll again. If there's been a change of opinion like you're indicating Doug, I'd like to know it.

Mr. Pulskamp: It'd be like going up to Riverhills and take down the no parking signs. You wouldn't be able to get a fire truck or school bus through there. The speed limit use to be 50mph down SR32, we changed it down to 25mph.

Mr. Cosby: Actually we didn't, the state did.

Mr. Pulskamp: It based on safety reason.

Mr. Cosby: That's only one issue out of many. It's based off of numbers, density of population and there are all kinds of issues it takes. The deal is you put a committee in place and they came back with a recommendation and you're going against that as well, along with the will of the people.

Mayor Hammon: Mark, I look back and revisit this whole scenario and Doug and I two months ago went down there and talked it over. One of the things that comes back to me is this all started because people wanted the right to drive on the streets. People were parking irregular and parking where they wanted to and people had to take detours around. We've evolved that into a parking/no parking issue. Batavia paint the driving lanes, if you go down Miami Avenue in Madeira, they have the driving lanes painted with the white lines. The same thing I've proposed down here. Put the white lines down so this is a driving lane. If you don't park there, you can park anywhere you want. That's kind of a compromise I put on the table. If you look down West Plum Street there is one person that's going to be impacted by that. It's simply just painting thirteen or fourteen foot wide driving lanes so people can drive on them.

Mr. Evans: Mark is this something you'd be willing to consider.

Mr. Kobasuk: I want to get the neighborhood involved because it is such a divisive issue. I've never seen people fill up this Town Hall like that. I want to get them involved because we got them involved once and I just think we need to keep them involved. So if they will accept that. Look, if I lived there, I would agree with Darwin. I don't like the cars parked, but I don't live there so I have a problem imposing my will on those folks. If they're for that Doug, then I'm for it.

Mrs. Waits: It's your job.

Mr. Kobasuk: I could do without the comments from the audience. If you want my chair you can run for office.

Mrs. Waits: Maybe I will.

Mayor Hammon: It's a tough one Mark. You and I had some conversations in the past; is it the property owners, is it the residents? Who is it that sits there and makes this determination?

Mr. Pulskamp: People who live there.

Mayor Hammon: So the property owners have no say into it?

Mr. Cosby: The majority of the people who live there are the property owners.

Mayor Hammon: I can't say that.

Mr. Cosby: Well, can you say they're not?

Mayor Hammon: I can say certain people, I can name half of them but I won't. That's the issue you and I talked about before. Who do we go to for opinion Mark?

Mr. Kobasuk: You have to include most of them, whether they own property or pay rent, whatever the case may be. They have to have a place to park. Some came to me and said they want to have their relatives come and be able to have a party. Where do people park? They didn't have a solution.

Mr. Evans: We were going to help people do something for parking in the back and we aren't ticketing anyone until a solution is reached. It wasn't like we're trying to the thing and shove it down somebody's throat. We're trying to be reasonable and help them at the same time and figure out what they do want. Maybe John might have the right idea with some driving lanes.

Ms. Hueber: Then people could still park where people can get through.

Mr. Evans: I know it's a big issue Mark. I wouldn't take my time or your time down there. If we need to bring David Krings back one more time and get some more people from the neighborhood to go over the different issues. I want to do what's right.

Mr. Kobasuk: As do I. Where do we go from here John? We're not going to vote on it tonight.

Mayor Hammon: Well, it's audience participation. You take an action or whatever. You can table it until it's your turn.

Mr. Kobasuk: I didn't bring it up.

Mr. Miller: In the spirit of compromise. I keep getting the feeling you're going to end up with three to three anyway, which means it isn't going to pass. Why don't you try and find some other resolution that everybody's happy with and if that means going back out and marking the lanes. It doesn't sound like a bad solution to me. You keep putting this off. Quite honestly that one sounded pretty logical.

Mayor Hammon: I won't take credit for it. I just observed it in a lot of other communities. That seems to be the popular thing to do.

Mr. Kobasuk: What's that?

Mayor Hammon: Paint the stripes with driving lanes. Madeira has done it, right past Euclid. You'll see where they painted the lines with people parking along the curbs. They're painted out. A lot of other communities are doing the same thing.

Mr. Evans: Mark, three-fourths of your thing I'm agreeing with and you've done a great job. We just need to tweak it a little bit to meet everybody's needs.

Mr. Kobasuk: This isn't my project Doug. I didn't even want to be on the committee, as I recall. I'm just doing my duty on the committee trying to do what's right.

Mr. Evans: You have.

Mr. Kobasuk: Why don't we just move to the next issue because I'm not going to bring it up anymore?

Resident Joan Waits: Monongahela. As long as I've been in this Village, since when do the citizens tell the government here what they want?

Mr. Kobasuk: Since 1776.

Mrs. Waits: I'm speaking Mark.

Mr. Kobasuk: Now you know how it feels.

Mrs. Waits: That is why we put you people up as Council people and Mayor. A citizen has a right to come here and have an opinion of something. But we don't have the right to demand anything from this government. That's why we pay you people. You're the ones who can make the decisions and that's the way it's to be. I want to tell you Mark, if the people in Riverhills had their way, I could get a petition signed and they 100% would say to take the damn signs down. You cannot cater to one part of a Village and give them what they want. If you do that then you'd have to handle every subdivision the same way and we do not run this government. You people do!

Mr. Pulskamp: Thank you Joanie.

Mayor Hammon: One comment I'll make back is I think we do have a responsibility to listen to the citizens of the town. We don't always have to agree with them or take actions of their recommendation, but we should listen and solicit their input.

Mr. Kobasuk: I view this as a democracy. To sit here because people vote for you. You don't follow the will of the people, they should vote you out. I would vote against people if they weren't following the will of the people. That's how I view it.

Ms. Hueber: What happens if everybody down in a certain subdivision was all of the same type of person and wanted things a certain way. Like she said, we have to make it universal and make the same choice.

Mr. Kobasuk: It's not universal. Go to my neighborhood, we don't have any signs for parking.

Ms. Hueber: You don't have a lot of issues up there.

Mr. Kobasuk: It's not universal is what I'm saying and these people were basically getting along pretty well. They had some junk vehicles and those needed to be cleaned up.

Ms. Hueber: They were fighting constantly.

Mr. Kobasuk: They're going to be fighting more if they're parking on one side of the street. That's my concern. We talked it about it at the committee Tracy, you were there and they said if there's parking on one side of the street there's going to be a lot of fighting.

Mr. Pulskamp: I'd like to see John that you send this committee back to the table. I think they need to take into consideration the widths of the street and look at the Village-wide issue, not just the Crull Street subdivision issue. We need to declare Ivy Hills no parking. I think number one thing in this Village, there should be no parking on any side of the street John and that clears up the entire issue. It's already enforced in Riverhills and other areas.

Mr. Kobasuk: My problem with that is if it's not broke, you don't need to fix it. You can't go around like a Gestapo and just change everybody's lives. Things are fine in Ivy Hills. Innocent people don't like being dictated to. All of a sudden, they come home and there are signs on both sides of the street and there's a multitude of signs. It's on the side of pollution. I wouldn't want to be treated like that.

Mr. Pulskamp: I agree. There are too many signs.

Mayor Hammon: Mark, a couple of comments back. What we heard from the Chief is it is a safety factor when you allow people to park in the hydrants, even though you keep the thirty-foot open. Because they can't look down the street and find the hydrants.

Mr. Kobasuk: You're talking a Village-wide issue though. You can't park in front of fire hydrants, it's a law.

Mr. Cosby: You can put a marker right in the middle of the street.

Ms. Hueber: Other villages abide by the no parking on that side of the street.

Mr. Puskamp: Anderson Township passed a total Township no parking on any side of the street that has a fire hydrant. It's something to think about to go back and look at. I don't believe in letting them to park on both sides of the street is the correct move down there.

Resident Heather Patton: 3524 Leonard Street. One thing with the fire hydrants and them not being able to see them, not all fire hydrants are not within thirty-feet of intersections. No one would be parking near them anyway. This whole thing just keeps going round and round and the people down there just want to be able to park. I don't park on the road, I park next to the road and almost everyone down there does. I just don't see where the huge issue is with this. I kind of think this was already decided before the committee ever formed. I think it was just to entertain the idea that we have a choice and a voice, to shut up a certain someone. I think this was really just a waste of time.

Mr. Kobasuk: Heather, have you seen a change in people's attitudes on this parking issue? When I walked the streets, people were against the signs; they wanted it to go back.

Mrs. Patton: They were against it, they're still against it, and they'll be against it later on. You know what, the signs are up and people are still parking on the street because it's not enforced yet. I drive up and down every single day and I get by just fine. Everybody gets by just fine. We're parking like we always have and there isn't an issue.

Mayor Hammon: I went down six weeks ago before a Council meeting. There were three people parked in driving lanes. I had to go on the edge of the grass to get around them. No attempt to get off the road. One guy drove through the front yard of another individual because he didn't want to wait because I passed him. There are at times issues down there.

Mrs. Patton: Ticket those people.

Mayor Hammon: It was Crawford, one of the narrowest streets down there. They parked in the street.

Mrs. Patton: You had said before that you would go down after this whole thing was decided and make an announcement to the people of what was decided. You go down there and say guess what, thirty-feet from the intersections, you don't park! Keep your tires off the road and everything will be fine. If you can't follow the rules, you will get a ticket.

Mr. Puskamp: You've heard John's idea of painting the white lines for a driving lane, parking outside the white lines. Would you have a problem with that issue down there? Do you think your other neighbors would have a problem with that? They could park anywhere they want as long as they're outside the white lines.

Mrs. Patton: I don't think that would be a problem but I would have to ask. I agree with wanting to clean up the area. Cleaning up is a good idea, but I don't think parking a car in front of your house is making it look terrible. I think there are a lot of other things making it look bad down there.

Councilmember Doug Evans:

Mr. Evans made a motion to suspend the rules. Mr. Puskamp seconded the motion. All Aye. Motion Carried.

Mr. Evans made a motion to adopt ORDINANCE 18-2006 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006 PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, DISPENSING WITH THE SECOND AND THIRD READINGS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Mr. Puskamp seconded the motion. Ms. Hueber-Yes, Mr. Puskamp-Yes, Mr. Evans-Yes, Mr. Kobasuk-Yes, Mr. Cosby-Yes. (Mrs. McCarthy-absent) Motion Carried.

Councilmember Tracy:

Ms. Hueber made a motion to suspend the rules. Mr. Puskamp seconded the motion. All Aye. Motion Carried.

Ms. Hueber made a motion to adopt ORDINANCE 19-2006 AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND FISCAL OFFICER TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH EMERGENCY VEHICLE SERVICES, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF VEHICLE LIGHT BARS, DISPENSING WITH THE SECOND AND THIRD READINGS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Mr. Puskamp seconded the motion. Ms. Hueber-Yes, Mr. Puskamp-Yes, Mr. Evans-Yes, Mr. Kobasuk-Yes, Mr. Cosby-Yes. (Mrs. McCarthy-absent) Motion Carried.

Engineer Bruce Brandstetter: (Attachments)

- 1. Church Street, Phase II 901093**
 - Pay Request No. 3, amount due is \$174,284.80 (all CWW related work)
 - Asphalt pavement repairs completed by August 9, 2006 for August 12, 2006 5K race
 - Progress Meeting August 10, 2006, update schedule
 - BCI On-Site Observation
- 2. Route 32 and Round Bottom Road / Riverhills Drive (98082)**
 - Final Pay Request and OPWC Closeout
 - Final Budget and Change Order
 - BCI On-site Observation Services Request
- 3. Pavement Management Study**
 - Submitted final document

Mayor Hammon:

- **Officer-in-Charge:** Chief Zornes is on extended sick-leave so Lieutenant Synan has been named the officer-in-charge.

Councilmember Curt Cosby:

- **Moundview Park:** We had a Parks Committee meeting and the door to the tenant's apartment needs to be replaced. We suggest it be done with a door of character rather than that metal door that they have up there, something that will enhance the building. Just inside the door there is some cracking in the floor so there is some work to be done there. The front porch to the left of the door is borderline dangerous. The floor is rotted out. The door may be a special order door. It may be an expensive door compared to what they have there now. The shutters are in need of being sanded and painted. We do have a lease that we need to address; we'll deal with that at the next meeting.

Fiscal Officer Everett: I have a motion. As you know, every year when the fire department does the testing of the fire hydrants, they send me a list of fire hydrants that need to be fixed. We've already been paying for some of them. The fire hydrant located at SR 32 and Round Bottom was fixed, they gave us a bill of \$500.00 or \$600.00. Before I pay them, I send it back to the fire department and tell them to go check them because I'm not paying it until you tell me they've been fixed. That one is not fixed. I talked to Quality Hydrants again and he said the only way it is going to be fixed is if they did everything they could and it is still doing what it's not supposed to do, is to dig it up and replace it. He gave me a not to exceed amount of \$4,000.00. He said it did not look like a new fire hydrant.

Mr. Kobasuk: John, are we going to pass any more ordinances because Curt needs to leave and I need to leave too?

Mayor Hammon: No.

Solicitor Miller: As far as passing the ordinance on the no parking thing, it's my belief you need to have four people to pass that ordinance.

Mr. Cosby: that's fine.

Ms. Hueber: So it's not going to ever pass, so we just need to move forward.

Solicitor Miller: It's also my belief that the Mayor can't break that vote because it has to be a majority of Council.

Mr. Kobasuk: Right. That's my understanding too.

Ms. Hueber: So it's pretty much dead.

Mr. Cosby: I apologize but I have to go.

Mr. Evans made a motion to approve Checklist dated 8/8/2006. Church Street South was added, amount of \$174,284.80, contingent upon Mayor Hammon's approval. Ms. Hueber seconded the motion. All Aye. Motion Carried.

Ms. Hueber made a motion to accept bid of \$500.00 for Plymouth Voyager van, for Tony Baxter to purchase. Mr. Evans seconded the motion. All Aye. Motion Carried.

Note: This was the only bid we received and an employee of the Village is purchasing the van.

Solicitor Miller: Just so you know Ivy Hills has made a request to change the zoning up there at the golf course. It is zoned residential and they're actually a non-conforming use because we do not include golf courses in our definition of clubs. I think they have proposed this to the Planning Commission asking us to change our definition of what's a club, and include country clubs. Apparently, their lender is causing them some problems because they don't have the zoning that they're supposed to have and they're non-conforming. Their attorney, Tim Burke called me and sent me a copy of a letter that he sent to the Planning Commission. They're asking us to amend, for a zone change to amend their zoning code to include private country clubs in the definition of club. Which would make them a conditional use and they would then apply. I told them I couldn't imagine that anybody would be against this.

Fiscal Officer Everett: The fire department had five firefighters pass their paramedics card.

Ms. Hueber made a motion to adjourn Council meeting at 9:15 p.m. Mr. Kobasuk seconded the motion. All Aye. Motion Carried.