

Canal Winchester

*City Hall
Council Chambers
45 East Waterloo Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

March 6, 2023

6:00 PM

Council Work Session

*Bob Clark - Chair
Laurie Amick
Jill Amos
Steve Buskirk
Chuck Milliken
Patrick Shea
Mike Walker*

- A. Call To Order** *Clark called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.*
- B. Roll Call** *Present 7 – Amick, Amos, Buskirk, Clark, Milliken, Shea, Walker*
- C. Also In Attendance**
Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire, Amanda Jackson

D. Request for Council Action

RES-23-009

Mayor

A RESOLUTION STRONGLY URGING THE OHIO GOVERNOR AND MEMBERS OF THE OHIO GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO RESTORE THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUND TO PRE-RECESSION LEVELS

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Amos, seconded by Buskirk to move RES-23-009 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Amos, Buskirk, Milliken, Shea, Walker, Amick

No 1 – Clark

Discussion started at 2:47 on YouTube Channel!

Ebert – I put an explanation in my report too. I'll kind of go over this just briefly. In 1934, the State of Ohio adopted its first sales tax of 3%, with 3.68% of the revenue to be shared with municipalities and divided up based on population and other factors. In 2008, Governor Kasich took away more than one-half of what all municipalities across the state were receiving, which was calculated at 3.68% of the state sales tax revenue. At that time, the state had an \$8 billion budget gap to fill during a recession that we were all in. Since then, we have been receiving less than one-half of that percentage, which remains at 1.66% of the sales tax revenue. It was considered a short-term reduction to the municipality's full share of the sales tax revenue until the state fund was rebuilt, which happened more than ten years ago. All of the local governments, cities, and villages through the entire state are going to send a letter to the Ohio Municipal League and ask those legislators and the governor to help refund or at least get started re-establishing the local government funds to their original share that is derived from the state sales tax revenue. We'd like to get back to the 3.68% we were getting at one time.

Amick – If there were enough cities and enough influence behind this, is this something that would take several years to get reinstated?

Ebert – No. I wouldn't think so.

RES-23-010

Finance

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A DEPOSITORY AGREEMENT WITH HUNTINGTON NATIONAL BANK FOR THE DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC FUNDS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Walker, seconded by Amick to move RES-23-010 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 – Walker, Amick, Amos, Buskirk, Clark, Milliken, Shea

Discussion started at 6:23 on YouTube Channel!

Jackson – The resolution in front of you this evening is for a five-year agreement with Huntington National Bank. We're required to have these agreements with them for the city's deposits. This was brought to my attention after our last meeting, although our last agreement with them expired on December 31, 2022. You will see an emergency declaration there to get this passed this evening. You will likely also see agreements similar in nature coming from our other banks as well. I do believe Chase is on a very similar schedule to Huntington National Bank, so we will probably see that one, I believe, in June. Again, this is something we do every five years to allow us to deposit money with this bank.

Shea – Before we came to the meeting, you were kind enough to do some quick emailing with me about banking and interest rates. The whole reason is that about a month ago I was talking to one of my personal banks, and I asked what they were paying me on that account. They were paying us 0.01%, and I said okay. I said I'm going to take it over at another bank because they're going to give me 3.6%, and they said here's 4.14%. The reason I bring this up now is that interest rates have changed dramatically, and with the amount of cash that we have on hand, we should absolutely be shopping around to see what kind of interest rates we can get for the city. I understand that the operating account does not pay interest, but I think that should be part of the discussion from a business standpoint for the city.

Jackson – They're not going to give us that kind of rate in this agreement. It wouldn't be a good financial business decision for Huntington Bank to put a rate in this agreement for five years. The other thing is that it's all dependent on the type of account we have with them and how quickly we get access to the money. They may give us a higher interest rate, but they also may charge me every time I need to touch that money. There are pros and cons to every type of account out there, and that's why I have a representative from Huntington and Chase. We talk on a very regular basis about these accounts and what's best for the city. Where we're at right now with it is what Huntington's representative has deemed appropriate for us given what Huntington can offer us.

Shea – How much is that?

Jackson – How much is what?

Shea – The interest rate that they're offering the city.

Jackson – We have an operating account with them. We don't get interest on the operating account with them.

Shea – Understood. We have all these other accounts that you sent me. One of them was with Huntington, and I think it had \$6 million in it.

Jackson – Correct. That is our bond anticipation note money. We've been taking money out of our operating account and putting it into that account. They set that up as a secondary operating account.

Shea – I'm not sure I understand. Can you help me understand?

Jackson – It's not a savings account. It's not an interest-bearing account because that's not the way it was set up. It is a short-term account.

Shea – Are we getting sweeps on it?

Jackson – No. We don't have sweeps with any of them.

Shea – Is that something that we're allowed to do statutorily?

Jackson – Yes, but the interest rate wasn't worth it.

Shea – Is it now? When is the last time you looked at it?

Jackson – The last time I talked to my Chase representative, about a month ago.

Shea – So, there's no benefit for us looking at increasing our revenues on interest rates from the cash that we have on hand?

Jackson – I'm not saying that's not a possibility. I'm moving money from that to our long-term investments, but we also need to have cash on hand, which is the fine balance that we're playing right now because we're talking about potentially paying off \$6 million worth of debt.

Shea – Absolutely.

Clark – So, we're getting higher interest rates on the long-term money?

Jackson – Yes.

E. Old/New Business

OTH-22-021

Pedestrian Safety

Discussion started at 11:46 on YouTube Channel

Peoples – On the Washington and Waterloo intersection, we have engaged a firm to go in and do the striping. They said they would schedule it in March.

OTH-23-001

Mayor and Council Salaries

Discussion started at 12:12 on YouTube Channel

Milliken – I'd like to start by just saying that, after chewing on this a little bit more and realizing I'm the one that came up with the idea of pairing the salary with the administrative position, I think it would behoove us to move somewhat quickly on this in the case that, if for some reason it does not pass, we're up against a wall as far as timing is concerned. We have to approve salaries by July, I believe. Is that correct? That'll sneak up on us rather quickly. If we're not doing the first meeting in July, I think we need to get something down.

Amos – Mr. Boggs, one of my questions is, if we decide to look at a charter change, what's the latest that we have to put this on the ballot?

Boggs – For any charter change, it would need to go to the Franklin County Board of Elections no later than 90 days before the November general election. It would be August 3rd or something thereabouts. It can't be more than 120 days before the general election. There's a window you have to hit. Just to be clear, in terms of a charter change, what are you referencing?

Amos – If we were to go a city administrator strong position and having that change. The August 8th special election date that they have coming up, would we potentially be able to get in for that one?

Boggs – No. It has to be on a general election date.

Milliken – I can't say that I'm for putting a charter change for this position on the ballot in this election cycle. We talked before about whoever may or may not choose to run for a mayor's position not knowing what they're running for. If the charter gets changed at the same time as a mayoral election, somebody may not be getting what they bargained for. If that makes sense.

Amos – It does. I think for me it's the wrong year for us to look at it because of the mayoral election. Looking at two dominant salaries and two positions that have a lot of control in our city, I mean, you're relying on these two positions to heavily keep our city running. I just think it's a bad year for us to look at this because I do want whoever runs for mayor to know exactly what they're walking into. You're not going to have time for a charter change for it. I just think it's bad timing right now, to be honest.

Clark – I think there's plenty of time. You're just adjusting the salary by creating the city administrator position. Then you're kind of realizing that you're reducing the mayor's responsibilities on a day-to-day basis, so he probably is not necessarily needed full-time. You just reduce that compensation down to that factor.

Shea – One thing is that the charter allows for it now if we want to do that, but we can't take away the mayor's responsibilities because those are given to them by the charter. We can't lessen those.

Clark – True. You can't lessen the responsibilities, but I think that if a city administrator position is there to oversee all the duties of all the directors and you've got one person overseeing that, of which the mayor's doing a large part now, that would reduce his or her workload.

Amos – For me, is your \$120,000-\$140,000 salary range city administrator reporting to your \$30,000-\$40,000 mayor? When you look at all these other cities, that's not how they have theirs laid out for a reason. They don't have their leader reporting to their \$30,000-\$40,000 mayor. They just don't. I agree we could reduce the mayor's salary and move forward, but we're still saying our mayor, who can define their own schedule, is reporting to council, and your person who's doing the majority of your large picture is reporting to somebody who may or may not be in the office on a regular basis. That's hard for me to grasp.

Boggs – If I could weigh in on just one point of clarification here. If you're referring to a city manager form of government where the person hired is reporting to council, that would require a charter change. The city administrator that is permitted by charter now would report to the mayor regardless of how many hours the mayor would or would not actually spend in the office. That level of accountability would be to the mayor. That is the way it is in places like Grove City and Whitehall, where, according to the MORPC survey that was provided, there are a handful of places where you have a strong mayor and an administrator who reports to that mayor. I think that in terms of salary considerations, whether the salary of the mayor is greater than, less than, or comparable to the city administrator, that doesn't account for the fact that a mayor is the elected mayor if when you have a strong mayor system who is elected by all the voters of the city. Alternatively, if you have a city manager, that person is reporting to council members who are elected by the city but who may be receiving very modest stipends for their service. I

would encourage you to think about sort of the political accountability aspect versus necessarily salary because that varies so widely for the elected officials.

Amos – I hear you, but I will argue the fact that in the cities that you pointed out, they are three if not five to six times our size. Whitehall, I'm looking at 20,000. Grove City has almost 42,000 people. We have 9,000 people, and we do have to consider the financial aspects of having two top-heavy positions. Just in general conversations, I think most of us agree that having two top-heavy positions is not the way we should be going for 9,000 people in our city.

Clark – We have the right to not have two top-heavy positions. We have the right to reduce the salary. I agree. I would not support the mayor making the current salary and creating a city administrator at that amount. I could come to the conclusion that I think it's time to move this city forward with a professional position full-time and somebody that has more experience running a city than somebody who got elected that didn't have that experience. I hear you, but I'm taking that out by saying it would come with a reduction in the mayor's salary so you don't have a top-heavy situation.

Amos – How would you sell that to somebody in the community? How would you argue that to your community? Your city administrator is reporting to somebody at a \$30,000-\$40,000 salary who may or may not have the experience. How do you justify that to the community?

Clark – It would be like what Thad just pointed out. It's the same thing. How would you sell the city manager who is reporting back to council and who is making \$6,000 a year? It's the same scenario. I think you have to take the salaries out and realize the mayor is at the top of the chart.

Milliken – I appreciate all this discussion. It's very healthy and helpful. We've gone over quite a bit of this. I want us to work on a path forward for this. I'm just playing around with ideas in my head. My suggestion would be that if it's feasible, Mr. Boggs, I think we can solve this by putting forth two separate pieces of legislation. One being no change and keeping the mayor's current salary, and two being the reduced salary of the mayor with the administrator position. We can see which one passes.

Shea – That's fair, but the point was salaries, not roles and jobs. I think we should talk about some numbers too.

Amick – There's structure. There's authority. There's salary. There's kind of three different things that need to be dissected. Are you suggesting that the structure be one element of an ordinance and a salary be a second ordinance?

Milliken – No.

Amick – Are you proposing a structural change?

Milliken – On one. My suggestion is that we bring forth two separate pieces of legislation. One being what we normally do, which is just a mayor's salary with no change. It's what we typically do. The other one is a reduced mayor's salary with a city administrator position tied to it. Does that make sense?

Shea – It does, but in that scenario, you've left the variable of the mayor's salary still to be determined. I don't think any of us have an idea what we'd do with the mayor's salary if we went ahead with the city

administrator's role and approved it. I've heard a whole range of numbers. When you are an executive and you're running an organization and you are pulled in every different direction as you are oftentimes, it makes it nice when you have a key lieutenant that you can trust to run that so you can do the executive things that you want to do to work on bettering the community. Whether it be being at events instead of being in a meeting for operations and things like that, I can see that it gives the chief executive of the city the flexibility to truly be an executive and work on the city. That is just a mindset that I have coming from business. I think that there's absolutely a role for it. My second point is that the continuity of operations in our city is incredibly important. We are getting bigger and bigger. We are one of the only municipalities in the Greater Columbus Metro Area that maintains its own sanitary storm and water systems. Not a lot of cities do that. They rely on the city of Columbus. We're in a really fortunate position here, but we have to protect the integrity of those operating utilities because they're absolutely critical. At the end of the day, that is one of the primary things we do, and I think an administrator who is familiar with those operations as mayors come and go over the years gives continuity to our city, our residents, and our city services. When it comes to asking the voters what they think, I've gotten comments from residents, and I've listened to them; they've been good. I would also say that there was an election several years ago where the charter provisioned a change to add the administrator, and it was approved by the voters of this city. At this point, are we okay with it? That's going to be a yes or no piece of legislation, and what are we going to pay them? We have to get to that number to figure out what we're going to pay them. I have a friend who used to be on the council in Grandview, and he said that they pay their mayor \$50,000. He said, "Honestly, it's really not worth it to be the mayor of Grandview because of the amount of work you have to do for the money." We do need to make sure that the position pays enough to ensure that we get a good, qualified person in there. The voters pick who the mayor is. If we think that we're going to influence that, we're not. It's their pick, and I think we need to remember that. I'm going to throw \$80,000 out there because I think that's about a 20% decrease in what we're paying now and still gives the mayor a good living so he can engage the job full-time. I would hope that the mayor, whether it's he or she, will do that, and if they're not, then they'll answer to the voters four years later. I think we're making it too complicated. I might be too high on the \$80,000, but I'm just telling you where I'm coming from. When it comes to council salaries, if we put in a 3% raise compounded over the last six years, it takes it to \$8,100 and some change. There are other people out here that I'm on this body with that get credit from public bodies from other public pensions, and one factor they may want to consider is: what is the minimum amount that you have to earn for PERS to get a full year of service credit? I think its \$9,200; is that a statutory thing or is that a PERS thing, Thad?

Boggs – That is outside of my direct area of expertise.

Jackson – I will look it up.

Amos – I'm going to say that's high on the salary.

Milliken – If you had to throw a number, what would it be?

Amos – I would say \$30,000-\$40,000.

Clark – That's about where I am.

Amick – I'm at \$50,000.

Milliken – I'm more with Mrs. Amick. Mr. Buskirk or Mr. Walker, do you have a number in mind?

Buskirk – I was leaning towards \$50,000.

Walker – I would also be leaning towards \$50,000.

Shea – I can move.

Clark – I can move to that.

Amos – \$50,000 is hard for me because it's not something somebody would most likely quit their job over. It's going to be somebody who's either retired or doing this as a part-time gig.

Amick – The bottom line is that, unless the structure has changed, the mayor is still accountable for the execution of these responsibilities laid out in the charter. Whether that person chooses to delegate is up to them. We're not proposing a responsibility change, so if you're still holding the mayor accountable for executing on these responsibilities, that, to me, is not a \$30,000 a year job.

Milliken – Mrs. Amos, I'd ask you to clarify your line of thinking on that. If \$50,000 is not something that somebody's going to quit their job over, how would \$30,000–\$40,000 make someone quit their job?

Amos – Maybe we would get more people interested knowing they have a strong city administrator. You would get more people interested in this position if it were available to a retired person. This would be interesting to them. I think more retired people might consider the hours and the work. I also look at other cities and see what they're doing. It's hard to say we're only 9,000, but let's go 25,000 more than most of these cities.

Shea – If we used something like a per capita number, we'd have a lot more police officers too. You don't use that in every formula. Mrs. Amick made a really good point—the requirements and responsibilities—are you really going to get a qualified person for that? At \$50,000, are you going to get a qualified person? There's a give and take here. It is a public service job. It's a thankless public service job. You get yelled at a lot.

Amick – Without a charter change, the voters of the City of Canal Winchester will hold the mayor accountable, whether that person is making \$10,000 a year or \$100,000 a year. The residents who voted for that person will hold that person accountable.

Amos – I understand we're picking a salary, and whatever the medium is, I completely understand, but we can go back to what Mr. Shea said too: the voters are picking it, and they may not be picking the right person. We've seen popular contests before in elections. Let's be honest. They may not be looking at the person and saying, I think for \$50,000 that person can do it. They're going to be looking at a lot of other things. Who dropped off the coolest pen?

Amick – Welcome to politics.

Amos – I know, and that's the thing. We're picking a salary, and we want somebody to apply who's qualified, but realistically, our voters are the ones who go and pick the person who's going to be the next

leader.

Ebert – I just want to point out one thing: an entry-level position at the City of Canal Winchester right out of high school is \$43,000 plus.

Amos – That's a really good entry-level. I like that. We've had lots of residents come up to us and talk about it. I hope that some of them will come in to share their thoughts too because it is their city.

Amick – The ones I've talked with are not for full-time salaries for both positions. I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth, but that seems like a thing that most of us seem to agree on. I think for those residents who feel that way, I think we are in agreement. The question I'm struggling with is still: are residents wanting a structure change? Which in turn would then lead to a charter change, which we now, I believe, realize we can't get done before the election. Are they wanting a structure change?

Amos – When you try to talk to residents, you try not to lead to the answer. I will phrase it as, "If you have your mayor at this salary and you have your city administrator like this under the current charter, how do you feel about that?" The majority of them advocate for a strong city administrator. That's why I've struggled so much with this.

Amick – From that viewpoint, nobody says that can or cannot be done. It's the timing that would not allow it to happen before the mayoral election.

Shea – We could try it and unwind it too. If it goes horribly, we can undo it. Once we create it, we also have the ability to uncreate it. Any piece of legislation we passed, we can undo. We always have the ability to undo something.

Clark – You have to remember that no matter what we do, the mayor who runs next time is subject to a charter review in 2025. That's going to happen in 2025. That can all be unraveled in that charter. I'm not sure of the legality; would it take effect with the next mayoral election, or would it take effect next year?

Boggs – It would depend on how you write it, but when you do that kind of amendment, you write it such that it passes in November of 2025 and then takes effect either at the end of the current term or...

Clark – Right. So, no matter what we do, if we leave it the same, there still could be a radical change at the next charter review, which is in 2025. If we do this now, there might be or might not be a change. You can't predict the future.

Ebert – I don't know if any of you even know this or not, but the mayor's position is the only management position in the whole city that does not get PERS pickup.

Amos – I don't think we're allowed to have PERS pickup as an elected position.

Ebert – You got it.

Amos – We do?

Ebert – Yes.

Shea – How about \$50,000 with PERS pickup?

Amos – Are you back to our salary or the mayor?

Shea – The mayor.

Clark – How much is the PERS pickup?

Shea – About 10%. It's whatever the employee's contribution is. Is it 10.25%?

Jackson – 10%

Amos – Were you able to find the buy-in amount?

Jackson – It is \$696.84 per month as of January 1st of 2023.

Amos – That's what you have to make for a year to be considered?

Jackson – Yes. That's earnable salary. \$696.84, and then currently our highest-paid city council member is the president, and they make \$604.25 a month. So, you're about \$90, give or take, for that individual.

Shea – So, annually, that would be like \$8,362.08 or round up to \$8,400. Does it have an automatic CPI inflation?

Jackson – No. Not that I know of.

Shea – I'd like to see legislation drawn up for \$50,000 plus PERS pickup for the mayor. For council, let's do \$8,400 and a 3% cost of living so that it keeps up with that PERS number.

Amos – It kind of seems substantial. I appreciate the money, don't get me wrong, but it seems substantial. That's \$2,000 plus a little bit more per year. I'm not saying we don't deserve it because most of us do lots of work to do this job.

Shea – How does everybody feel about \$8,400?

Clark – How much do we need to bump it up to in order to get the one full year credit?

Shea – \$8,400.

Clark – I thought you said \$90?

Jackson – A month. That would get only your president. That's not all of you.

Shea – I was making the floor \$8,400. President would be a little bit higher, correct?

Jackson – Yes. President and Vice President are both higher.

Milliken – It sounds like the majority of what I’m hearing is to give the council a raise. I haven’t heard much objection to that other than myself. I’m happy with the way things are.

Clark – It doesn’t matter to me.

Amick – I don’t personally need the money, but like you said, Jill, I’m never going to turn away money. When I think about the number of seats that we’re going to have available in the next election on the council, I think it’s important to tell people and to make sure they understand what they’re getting into and that they will be compensated for what they’re getting into. I didn’t come in with a number in mind. When I did my research, it ranged from \$13,000 to \$49,000. I don’t think anyone’s going to give us \$49,000, but \$13,000 was kind of in the ballpark, and that was through Payscale.com.

Clark – Since I’ve served, it’s been the same salary since the very beginning, and that’s fine. I don’t need it to live either, but at the same time, you start falling back. You do this for a number of years; it gets so low, and it does cost money to run a campaign.

Amick – One of the things I did read, and don’t quote me, I was thinking it might have been Grove City, but recently they turned down a council raise but approved a percentage cost of living increase. I can’t recall if it was 3% or 5%. That’s another alternative. If the vote is against a \$2,000 raise, does that mean there’s also no cost-of-living raise, or do those have to be separate?

Shea – I think we as council decide. For the city employees, is there a cost of living built in?

Jackson – No. We bring any potential increase in hourly wages to council when we bring you the budget every year. It’s not automatic.

Shea – Are you raising them every year?

Jackson – If we can afford it. We would obviously like to in order to retain our employees, but if, financially speaking, we couldn’t do it, then we wouldn’t do it.

Clark – So, there’s no set amount across the board, like 2% or 4%?

Jackson – It’s not guaranteed, no.

Amos – You have a range though, right?

Jackson – The highest that we’ve done is 3½%.

Amos – Based on the merit system?

Jackson – When we did merit raises, yes. We haven’t actually given merit raises in several years. We’ve just been doing the cost of living based on what we as a city can afford.

Ebert – There was a period during the recession when nobody received a raise, but you know what? They all kept their jobs, and they were thankful for that.

Amick – Don't laugh at me, but when I decided to run for council, I did not even know it was a paid position. I did not know we received some sort of stipend for serving on council.

Amos – I actually remember telling you, and you were like, "You get paid?" and I was like, "Yes, it's not a lot, but you get paid."

Shea – I'm also okay with keeping it the same. It's something I've committed to do for four years, and it's a service job. It's not here to make money and enrich us. It's to compensate us for our time.

Milliken – Agreed.

Buskirk – I think, being the newest member, I wasn't expecting to have to vote on a raise. I came in knowing that there was a stipend for being on city council, but I also think it's important for residents to recognize how many years that council went without a raise. I think if we do something, the cost of living should increase. It doesn't have to be a huge raise, but I think that's important to keep people interested in supporting our city by being city council members.

Boggs – If I may, in the interest of getting ordinances or resolutions prepped for our next meeting, I think we should separate the council adjustment from the mayoral adjustment because you're grappling with different issues here. Then my question is, with the mayoral adjustment, do you want to include within that the creation of the city administrator, which is already in the budget? Make that one piece, and then council an entirely separate piece.

Shea – I think they should be conjoined. Are we allowed to do that?

Milliken – I'd rather not.

Shea – I think we need to, because I think if you're going to change the mayor's salary but not have the city administrator position, you're doing a disservice. The whole idea of reducing the mayor's salary is because of the city administrator. If you're going to do the reduction in the mayor's salary and put it up for a vote, you need to put that whole option on the table at once so that it's a yes or no.

Clark – I think we're doing that as one piece of legislation, and then council salaries would be the other piece of legislation.

Shea – Are we allowed to do that?

Amick – Why would you? What are the pros of doing that versus having a mayor's salary ordinance, a city administrator position approval, and then an adjustment for council raises as another piece? In my mind, those are three distinctly separate issues.

Boggs – One thing you could do is, in that legislation, say the title is "Establishing a salary for the Mayor of 2024-2025." Section 1 says the salary will be \$50,000 per year, Section 2 says the effectiveness of Section 1 will be contingent upon approval of the city administrator position, and Section 3 says if no administrator position is approved, the salary will continue at the same level or receive some type of increase.

Shea – I like that.

Boggs – Then, you'd have a separate ordinance that approves the creation of the administrator position, and then a third ordinance adjusting the council salary.

Milliken – So, we would want to make sure that we vote for the administrator position first, then, correct?

Boggs – It wouldn't matter because of the language in the mayoral ordinance.

Milliken – Did we decide on the \$50,000 and are we allowed to add the PERS pickup?

Boggs – Yes.

Milliken – Is that okay with everybody?

Clark – I'm okay with it.

Jackson – Can I ask a few clarifying questions? The current mayor's salary ordinance also included a couple other benefits. One of which is a monthly travel allowance of \$500 per month, as well as the ability to enroll in or opt out of medical, dental, vision, and life insurance. Basically, the mayor has the same ability as any full-time city employee when it comes to health insurance. I'm just throwing that out there if you want us to keep that in or take it out.

Clark – Keep it in.

Walker – I'm okay with that.

Jackson – We've established the \$50,000, and I'm assuming that's if council were to establish the city administrator position. What happens if council chooses not to establish the city administrator position? What type of compensation are we looking at for the mayor? Are we keeping it where it currently is, or are we also giving that a 3% increase along with the council's increase?

Clark – I'm good with the 3%.

Shea – Jill has a really good point: if the city employees don't get a raise, then the council and the mayor don't get a raise.

Jackson – I'll look at Mr. Boggs to write the language.

Ebert – Hopefully that doesn't happen again.

Jackson – One more clarifying question: I'm assuming you want to maintain the president of council receiving a higher salary and then the vice president receiving something in between the president and the rest of council.

Amos – 3% across the board.

Jackson – So you want to keep that tier, is what I'm asking?

Amos – Yes.

Boggs – One last clarifying question for now: if the city administrator position doesn't get approved, would you still want the PERS pickup for the mayor?

Shea – Yes.

OTH-23-004

Housing Council Appointments

Discussion started at 1:04:12 on YouTube Channel

Haire – The Housing Council is a group in the city that reviews all the properties receiving a tax exemption every year. We generally meet at the end of March. The council has two appointments to that board, which consists of seven members. The most recent members appointed by council were Patrick Lynch and Mike Coleman; both of their terms have expired. You'll need council to appoint two additional individuals. We are looking at March 30th for the tour date this year. They meet one time a year, generally at the end of March, and it lasts all day. We tour every property that is receiving a tax exemption, some internally and externally, and some just externally.

Amos – I'm willing to throw my name in. It sounds fun.

Milliken – I was going to ask if Mr. Lynch or Mr. Coleman have expressed to you their desires to do that again.

Haire – It could be anybody. It would be up to council if they wanted those gentlemen to continue to serve in that capacity and reach out to them and see if they're interested.

Amos – I'm able to do it.

Clark – I'm already on.

Haire – Mr. Clark is appointed by the Housing Council.

Amick – I'd be happy to do it, but I've got some learning to do to understand why they get a tax exemption.

Shea – I can tell you all about that.

Haire – It is a three-year term.

Amos – You said the first meeting is this March?

Haire – Correct. We're targeting March 30th.

Amos – I'm in Chicago. Never mind. I can do the schedule; I just can't do it this year. It's too short notice.

Shea – I'm unable to participate at all.

Haire – It doesn't necessarily have to be someone who is on council. It can be anyone appointed by council.

Buskirk – I'll be available.

Milliken – Mrs. Amick, did you say you are able to do it?

Amick – Sure. I'll do it.

Haire – If that's the case, we can do a resolution and prepare that for the next meeting.

F. Adjournment @ 7:05 p.m.

*A motion was made by Shea, seconded by Amos to adjourn. The motion carried with the following vote:
Yes 7 – Shea, Amos, Buskirk, Clark, Milliken, Walker, Amick*