

The Council of the City of Milford met in Council Chambers at 745 Center Street at 7:00 p.m. on May 5, 2015. Mayor Howland called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance and a Moment of Silence.

Roll Call: Present: Mayor Howland, Mr. Brady, Ms. Brewer, Ms. Evans, Ms. Hinnners, Mr. Pittman. Ms. Hinnners made a Motion to excuse Vice Mayor Lykins' absence while he was away on business; seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes.

Proceedings: Mr. Pittman made a motion to adopt the Proceedings of the April 21, 2015 regular City Council Meeting; seconded by Mr. Brady. All voted yes.

Correspondence: There was no correspondence.

Financial Statement: Mr. Pittman made a Motion to receive the March, 2015 Financial Report; seconded by Ms. Evans. All voted yes.

Public Comments:

Bob Huxell came to the podium to voice his dismay with the April 21st City Council meeting. He then gave the numbers of the persons who attend St. Andrew's Church and Milford Methodist Church (numbering approximately 2,200 together) indicating that he knows that all these 'investors' are supportive of the City developing the property at Milford Main. Mr. Huxell then stated that the property at Milford Main does not now nor has it ever had any economic value to the City.

Standing Committee Reports:

Administrative Services: There was no report at this time.

Community Development: There was no report at this time.

Parks and Recreation: There was no report at this time.

Public Services: Ms. Brewer presented the following report:

Called to Order: 8:00 a.m. by Amy Brewer

Present: Ed Brady and Charlene Hinnners

Staff: City Manager Jeff Wright, Water Dept. Supervisor Matt Newman, Finance Director Dan Burke and City Engineer Bud White

Ms. Brewer indicated that before she delivers her report she would like to address Council's summer schedule. She made a motion to hold only one meeting a month during the summer months of June, July and August; seconded by Ms. Evans. Mr. Minniear indicated that this could be accomplished by a voice vote. All voted 'aye' at this time. Mr. Pittman asked if having the meetings on the first Tuesday of the summer months would cause a conflict with National Night Out in August. After discussion regarding this, the decision was made to hold the meeting in August on the third Tuesday (August 18th).

Ms. Brewer then asked for a motion to adjourn into Executive Session to discuss real estate matters at the end of the City Council meeting. The motion to adjourn into Executive Session was made by Ms. Hinnners and seconded by Mr. Brady. All voted yes.

Engineering contract for Price Road storm water project

Mr. White distributed a proposal for geotechnical engineering services from Civil Solutions Associates for the design and inspection for a culvert extension, new wing walls and headwall on Price Road. He explained that the existing condition of the culvert, headwall and stream bank has deteriorated to the point that Price Road and the entrance to Miami Woods could be compromised. The funds for this design contract and the construction contract that would be awarded later this summer will come from the City's Storm Water Utility fund and money has been budgeted for 2015.

The Committee agreed to make a motion to draft an Ordinance authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Civil Solutions Associates for the design of the Price Road Storm Water Project in the amount of \$11,250; seconded by Mr. Brady. All voted yes.

Engineering contract for Water Treatment Plant Clarifier rehab

Mr. Newman explained that the clarifier at the Water Treatment Plant has not been rehabbed since it was installed in 1999. We need to have the specifications for repairs prepared by an engineering firm so that the improvements can then be bid on by contractors. Mr. Newman solicited design proposals from two engineering firms and is recommending that the contract be awarded to HDR Engineering, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$14,454.

The Committee agreed to make a motion to draft an Ordinance authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement with HDR Engineering for the design of the Water Treatment Plant Clarifier Rehab Project in an amount not to exceed \$14,454; seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes.

RFO for City Engineering consulting services

Mr. Wright stated that Mr. White is retiring at the end of August and as previously discussed during the past two years, it is more cost effective for us to provide the vast variety of engineering services by

contracting with a firm that has municipal engineering experience versus hiring a full-time employee to perform only engineering work. There are some weeks when we may only need 10 hours of assistance and there could be weeks when we need 35. We already contract with several firms throughout the year for engineering help as Bud does not have the equipment or time for all of the engineering design work in addition to his Building Official duties. Attached is a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) that has been prepared to use to attract and evaluate appropriate firms. Mr. Wright's plan is to send the RFQ to several engineering firms that we have used in the past few years and had good experiences with. The thought is that it is most logical to select a medium-sized firm that has nearly every specialty of engineering (traffic, civil, utilities, surveying, etc.) in-house so that we have one firm that can assist almost all of our engineering needs. A concern is that picking a firm of only a few employees could result in them needing to find sub-specialists for many questions or projects and a concern is of picking a very large firm with hundreds of offices all over the country resulting in Milford becoming a low priority client for them.

After we receive the submittals of qualifications back from the engineering firms, we can evaluate them and the Public Services Committee can make a recommendation for Council to authorize a contract. The Committee members agreed with the RFQ process.

Dedication of utility lines

Mr. White distributed an easement plat and legal description for water and sanitary sewer dedication by the City. He stated that the owner of the commercial property at 731 US Route 50 has installed water and sanitary sewer lines that are connected to property owned by others in order to make a loop at the request of the City. Since the lines were constructed to City specifications, inspected and serve multiple customers, it is customary for the City to accept the maintenance of the lines.

The Committee agreed to make a motion to draft an Ordinance to accept the dedication of sanitary sewer and water mains and easements located on the property at 731 US Route 50; seconded by Mr. Brady. All voted yes.

Water Utility Rates

Mr. Wright distributed a memo and several supporting documents that staff prepared to explain why it is necessary to increase water rates. Water rates were increased in 2014 for the first time since 2006. Sanitary sewer and storm water utility rates are not proposed to be increased.

We completed two large improvement projects in 2014 and successfully competed for grants and low interest loans to help with the expenses. We received a 20% grant and 80% low-interest loan for the Oakcrest and Valleyview waterline replacement. We have also secured a 49% grant for the Main Street Phase 1 waterline replacement project and we received a low-interest loan for the remaining 51% of that project. For 2015 we have also been approved by the OPWC for a grant for 49% of the cost of the Main Street Waterline Phase II project and a zero percent loan for the balance.

We estimate that in 2017 the City will need to replace the existing Wallace Avenue Water Tower and the hundreds of feet of waterline adjacent to it. That project could total as much as \$1.5 million and will require debt payments on a partial loan.

In order to keep operating costs as low as possible we have implemented severe measures to reduce our personnel costs. In 2013 we did not backfill an opening when an employee left. In October 2014 another employee retired and we are not going to backfill that second position. We are operating the department with only four employees instead of six. In times of unscheduled waterline break emergencies, we are contracting with a private contractor so that emergencies are quickly remedied.

A 2014 recommendation by the EPA for the loan and grant program was for the City to raise rates by 20% in 2014 and by 15% in 2015. They recommended annual rate increases of 3.75% each year after that to stay current with inflation.

Staff has provided an analysis showing increased revenues to the Operating and Capital Funds based on options of 3%, 3.5% or a 4% rate increase. We also have created tables showing what a 3, 3.5 or 4% rate increase would do to the typical household water bill. Staff is recommending that we only increase the water rate by 3% so that the impact is very slight to residents and we have just sufficient balances to be able to make necessary improvements to the water system. The typical Milford household uses approximately 9,000 per two month bill. If the water rate were increased by 3% then the typical bill would increase by only 65 cents per month and \$1.30 per bill.

Every year Oakwood, Ohio conducts a survey of all the water and waste water utilities in Southwest Ohio. Of 63 communities in the Cincinnati and Dayton regions, we currently rank the 29th cheapest for water rates and the 20th cheapest for sewer rates. If current rates for Milford are raised by 3% we would still rank in the cheaper half for water in the region.

Mr. Burke stated that money received from water utility payments is divided into a Capital Fund and an Operating Fund. He recommends that the formula for allocating the funds be modified and he will prepare a reallocation proposal for future review. The Committee discussed several rate scenarios and agreed to recommend the smallest increase.

The Committee agreed to make a motion to draft an Ordinance increasing water rates to \$4.55 per 1,000 gallons for customers within the Corporation limits; increase water service fees to \$4.55; and to \$6.80 per 1,000 gallons for customers outside of the Corporation limits. The foregoing rates shall be effective on the August, 2015 utility bills; seconded by Mr. Brady. All voted yes.

Refuse and Recycling Rates

Ms. Brewer asked Mr. Wright to present the analysis of the garbage and recycling rate subsidy prepared by Susan Ellerhorst. During the past two year's budget discussions it was discussed that the City's General Fund heavily subsidizes the true cost of garbage and recycling pickup and that a slight increase is warranted. Many local communities provide solid waste and recycling collection services to their residents/businesses through income taxes and service fees. The service fees vary from one community to another. In fact, some communities subsidize the service with the General Fund while other communities pass on the full cost and more to their residents.

The City of Loveland pays \$12.75 per unit to Rumpke for refuse service. Residents there are charged \$16.50 per month or \$198.00 per year for "Sanitation and Environment Fees".

In most townships residents are required to independently contract with a local garbage hauler for trash and recycling service. A service contract with Rumpke for a Miami Township resident will cost approximately \$28.01 per month or \$336.12 per year for garbage and recycling.

Typically a private Rumpke agreement with a local business is approximately \$44.13 per month or \$529.56 per year for garbage and recycling. The cost covers weekly pick up of a Rumpke owned 96 gallon trash cart and a Rumpke owned 96 gallon recycling cart.

In 2013, City Council approved a 3 year contract with Rumpke for trash and recycling collection services. Per the contract, the City pays Rumpke \$25,920 per month from the General Fund. The City is currently charged for 1984 units per month. Residents and businesses are currently only paying \$15 per year (\$1.25 per month) for solid waste and recycling collection which is around 9% of the actual cost. Residents are actually supplementing the solid waste and recycling services of some of the local businesses. Apartments with six or more units cannot be on the City's contract. Owners of apartment complexes privately contract for solid waste pick up.

The median household income for the City of Milford is approximately \$46,148. The residents are currently only paying \$15 per year (\$1.25 per month) for solid waste and recycling collection. The monthly contract cost with Rumpke is around \$13.80 per household. The subsidy of \$150.60 per household (\$12.55 multiplied by 12 months) is absorbed by the General Fund. The first \$15,060 of household income is used to subsidize the solid waste and recycling. Police, Parks and Road Maintenance are just a few of the City Services affected by the General Fund subsidy.

There are currently 1984 units on the City's contract. Most of the units are residential; however there are also around 100 business units on the contract. These businesses pay the same \$1.25 per month rate for trash and recycling collection that the residents pay. Because the residents are currently supplementing the businesses trash and recycling fees, the first recommendation would be to increase the business fees to \$13.80 per month. The increased amount collected per month would be \$1,255 which would be \$15,060 annually. If the refuse fee for residents was increased to \$6.25, an additional \$5.00 per unit per month, the contract subsidy would be reduced by \$9,420 monthly or \$113,040 over 12 months. If both increases were approved then the total amount combined would be \$128,100. That would be an annual savings to the City's General Fund.

Increasing Milford's residential rate to \$6.25 per month would result in our residents paying \$75 annually as compared to residents of Loveland paying \$198 and most residents of Miami Township paying \$336 annually. The Committee members agreed that the rate increase is fair, necessary and will still result in our residents having some of the lowest refuse fees in the region. Mr. Brady stated that he supports the small increase for those reasons, not in relationship to recent discussions of other funds; and that it is important for Council and staff to continuously identify costs savings for the budget.

The Committee agreed to make a motion to draft an Ordinance increasing refuse and recycling rates to \$6.25 per month for residential customers and to \$13.80 per month for commercial customers. The foregoing rates shall be effective June 1, 2015; seconded by Mr. Brady.

Before the voting continued Ms. Howland said she assumed that the increase in refuse and recycling rates will table the Park Levy issue.

Mr. Brady replied that this ordinance simply addresses a need and that he doesn't believe it relates to the Park Levy. He said his understanding is that the question of the Park Levy will take place in a future Administrative Services Committee meeting.

Ms. Howland said that when Council has talked about raising this rate in the past, it was never to this extent; it was to be a gradual increase – a couple dollars now – a couple dollars later. She indicated that she cannot see increasing the rate at this level and then also going to the residents with the Park Levy. Ms.

Howland stated that if the rate was being increased by \$1.00 which was discussed at previous meetings, she could see going ahead with discussions regarding the levy issue.

Ms. Brewer responded that while she is not a Parks Levy proponent, this rate increase has nothing to do with the levy, that it just addresses a need that needs to be remedied.

Ms. Howland stated that she is hesitant to cast her vote on this Ordinance for this large of an increase if there is still a chance for the Park Levy.

Ms. Brewer stated that it has been brought up several times this month that there is not enough revenue sources coming in to the General Fund to do some things. This increase would put additional money into that fund.

Mr. Brady stated that the levy was never part of the discussion regarding the increase in rates. He then added that any discussion regarding the Parks Levy would need to take into consideration the fact that Clermont County is considering having its own county-wide Parks Levy.

Ms. Howland indicated that she was in a meeting with Mr. Wright where they said, "Hey, instead of a levy, why don't we increase the refuse and recycling rate." She indicated that some of the residents had come to her and said they would prefer an increase in rates rather than a levy. Ms. Howland said the question of this increase came up in February when Council discovered that there wasn't enough money in the Parks and Rec Fund and we needed a levy to supplement that fund. She said her issue with the levy is that Council had just come out of Budget Sessions and at no time during those discussions did it come out that the Parks and Rec Fund was under-budgeted. Ms. Howland stated that staff has worked hard to portray the City as a strong, financially sound, viable entity and that having a levy contradicts that image. She said a levy indicates that you have to tax your citizens to continue the services they've always gotten. Ms. Howland said if the rate increase is approved she sees no reason to continue discussion about a Parks Levy.

Mr. Brady indicated that Council agreed to send the matter of a Parks Levy to a committee who decided to discuss it at a later time and wondered if they could just 'yank it out of the committee' without further discussion.

Ms. Brewer asked Ms. Howland for clarification if she was holding off voting on this Ordinance until she was sure.

Ms. Howland stated that she is reluctant to vote on this rate increase if there is still going to be a Parks Levy to further tax the citizens. She stated that a levy indicates that the City is in financial trouble and she refuses to keep going to the citizens for more money.

Mr. Brady asked if Council should wait until the committee is convened to discuss the levy.

Ms. Howland stated that Council could decide right now to table the levy. She then asked Mr. Wright for clarification.

Mr. Wright stated that if Council is trying to decide one or the other, the advantage that the rate increase has over the levy is that Council would have more latitude in deciding its use because funds could be used for any General Fund purpose. If Council would agree to a Parks Levy and if the residents voted in favor of it, the funds could only be used for Parks and Rec services. The second advantage is that sometimes businesses and residents will compare tax rates including income tax rates and Milford would still be on the low end. They seldom compare refuse and recycling rates; and even if they did they would find that the City still heavily subsidizes them.

Mr. Pittman then asked to clarify a couple things. He stated that there really is no reason to try to sell our town as financially sound because it actually is financially sound and that is the truth. He indicated that the reason he is supportive of a levy is not because the parks are underfunded because they are not and anything discussed in the budget session would support that statement. He stated that clearly the reason for the levy, which heretofore has not been mentioned, would be to support a new park at Five Points. That's the reason it's there and that's the reason he mentioned the levy in the first place and that's the primary reason it's even necessary. He indicated that he didn't know until it came up in committee and Mr. Brady mentioned it, that Clermont County is considering a county-wide Parks Levy, and that is a big issue. He said he knows it is a lot of work to get a levy passed even without all the other considerations coming to the fore. He indicated that if the rate increase should come to fruition, Council will then need to engage in discussions regarding a levy. Mr. Pittman said he will not tie his hands with potential legislation that he is not sure is in the best interest of the City and he will not tell Council that he is tabling the levy simply for this purpose.

Ms. Howland said previous meeting minutes indicate that the maintenance of the parks is a constant drain on the General Fund.

Mr. Pittman disagreed at this time saying that wasn't what the minutes say. He stated that the minutes say there are certain things that are paid for out of the General Fund and because of those things the additional

cost, the extraordinary cost, of purchasing a new park is unreasonable. He stated that no one said the parks are a drain on the General Fund.

Both Ms. Evans and Ms. Howland disagreed with Mr. Pittman's remarks indicating that the budget for the Parks is \$123,000 a year and it is a constant drain.

Mr. Pittman stated that he has never said the City doesn't spend money on parks but that he wanted to be clear in that what Mr. Lykins was indicating and what he is indicating is that those expenditures from the General Fund make the purchase of the park land proposed unreasonable. He stated that no one is indicating that the City's funds are in ill-health.

Ms. Howland insisted that when you say 'levy' the perception is that the City is financially unsound. We all know that that isn't the case; you can look at the March Financial Report and see that we are financially sound. We are solid. Ms. Howland said Dan Burke tells us that every month and we know that from our budget sessions. It's just the perception that a levy gives.

Mr. Pittman insisted that that is the perception if you look at the current Park Fund and say we need help meeting those current expenses, and that would be incorrect. However, if you feel that we don't have enough money in the General Fund for this extra, very big expense of this new park, then that would be correct. That's what we are debating; not whether or not we are deficient in the Parks Funds for the existing parks.

Ms. Howland indicated that they are talking about two separate issues.

At the end of the discussion regarding this Ordinance, the voting commenced. All voted yes.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Wright, City Manager

Safety Services: There was no report at this time.

City Manager's Report: City Manager Jeff Wright presented the following report:

CITY MANAGER

Good news! The OPWC grant and zero percent loan for the \$574,845 Main Street Water Main Replacement Phase II has been approved! The next step will be to send the project out for bidding.

The NIC contract began Friday for Building Department services. Bud White issued his last permit Friday, for the new Mint Bistro that should open on May 17th. This will be a time of transition for staff members and residents who are used to simply going directly to Bud with questions and permit applications.

Last Tuesday evening I participated in the Milford School District's Business Advisory Council meeting to recommend their swap of vacant property on Buckwheat Road for the Clermont County Library District's Milford-Miami Twp. Branch library.

The concrete work has been completed for the new Milford Parkway sidewalk. The contractor is now just finishing the grading and grass seeding.

Mike Minniear and I met Thursday with the Milford Schools Administration.

SERVICE DEPARTMENT

Ed Hackmeister reports that his staff picked up trash, mowed and weed whipped the gateway areas and parks. They also cleaned and restocked the restrooms at Riverside. Part of their spring duties also included spraying weed killer around guardrails, sign posts and fencing in parks.

WASTE WATER DEPARTMENT

Dave Walker, Waste Water Department Supervisor reports that his department completed two sewer inspections last week and filled a sink hole on Hudson Avenue. Later in the week they spread dirt and grass seeds where they had performed all the sewer lateral work this past month.

Dave reports that his staff operated the camera on two storm lines for the Water Department then Zach took the vac truck to Miami Twp. to assist them with cleaning a storm line. It is always a good thing when neighboring communities can work together to complete a project.

The department pressed 156,829 gals. of sludge and hauled out 177,810 gals. to Rumpke

Plant flows this week: Inf. 4.4MG Eff. 4.8MG

WATER DEPARTMENT

Matt Newman, Water Plant Supervisor, reports that his staff 'unwinterized' all of their outbuildings. Last week they completed 9 work orders and 8 utility locates for residents plus replaced a 2" meter at the Terrace Park Country Club. Later in the week they 'vacced' out all valve cans between Main St. and

Cemetery Rd. on Lila Ave. Staff also installed foam inserts in all the valve cans to keep the road grit from filling up the cans.

Matt indicated that they are working on getting water fountains up and running. They have two in operation and are waiting for a valve repair kit for the fountain at Memorial Park.

Plant production from April 21 thru May 4 is 8.41 MG or a daily production of 600,000 gallons.

OTHER

The City of Milford is searching for a part-time Code Enforcement Inspector to work approximately 16 hours per week. This position is responsible for inspection and enforcement of City's zoning and property maintenance codes. The Inspector will work closely with other departments. Prior inspection, code enforcement and/or law enforcement experience is desirable.

Interested candidates should obtain an application from the City of Milford's website. The completed application with letter of interest should be sent to the Assistant City Manager, 745 Center Street, Milford, OH 45150. The position is open until filled. The job description is available upon request.

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Administrative Services Committee: Not scheduled at this time

Community Development Committee: 5:00 p.m. Monday, May 11, 2015

Public Services Committee: Not scheduled at this time

Safety Services Committee: Not scheduled at this time

REMINDERS:

National Day of Prayer: Thursday, May 7th at 9:00 a.m. at the flag pole in front of the Administration Building at 745 Center Street. Everyone is invited to participate.

Parks and Recreation: Monday, May 11, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. in Council Chambers

Planning Commission: Wednesday, May 13, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers

City-Wide Yard Sale: Friday, May 15 – Sunday, May 17, 2015. Yard sale fees have been waived for this event.

There will not be a BZA meeting this month.

Police Department Report: Police Chief Jamey Mills presented the following report:

TRAINING

1. Sworn officers were qualified on the authorized handguns, shotguns and rifles.
2. Chaplains Wikoff and Poe attended a *Death Notification* course taught by Mothers Against Drunk Drivers.
3. Sergeant Mahan and Detective Rogers were re-certified through the National Institute for Truth Verification as *Computer Voice Stress Analyst*.
4. Officers Heller and Chastain attended *Crisis Intervention Training* through the Clermont County Mental Health and Recovery Board.

UPCOMING EVENTS

1. The Annual Clermont County Law Enforcement Awards Banquet will be held May 14th. Officers Mell and Bovenzi will receive awards for their handling of a suicide-by-cop incident last March and Police Volunteer Gene Bishop will receive a Civilian Lifetime Achievement Award.
2. We will host a 90 minute seminar for First Responders and their families regarding Post Traumatic Stress Disorder on May 27th.
3. Lee Oliver CPA volunteer has been certified by AARP to teach Fraud Watch to community groups. To schedule this free presentation, email your information to ohaarp@aarp.org or call 866-389-5653 and ask for the Speaker Bureau line.

Ms. Hinnners said the City is blessed with great police officers who routinely go above and beyond the call of duty to help those they have stewardship over. She stated that to an officer they are upstanding, honest and caring. She indicated that Miami Township and Goshen are equally blessed with fine police officers.

Chief Mills stated that he is grateful to be part of such an amazing community.

Ms. Hinnners went on to personally extend an invitation to the Police Department and Fire Department personnel to attend the National Day of Prayer activity.

Mr. Pittman asked Chief Mills if the Police Department Monthly Report is online.

Chief Mills indicated that he generally sends it out to Council only, but the Quarterly Report which is due to come out in a week, is available to the public.

Fire Department Report: Fire Chief John Cooper presented the following report:

Chief Cooper indicated that the annual car seat inspection and classes will be held May 11th and that anyone can stop in at the Fire Station on May 15th between the hours of 10:00 – noon to have their car seats inspected to make sure they are safely secured. This will give new parents some important information and makes certain that their car seats are installed properly.

He brought up the Frontier Days Parade and stated that they are striving to have more participants this year. He urged residents and clubs/schools/groups to contact the Chamber to submit a float or find another way to participate in the parade.

Public Comments:

Justin Bonnell came to the podium and said that he would like to comment that Mr. Lykins did introduce the levy as a way to supplement the \$127,000 Park Fund. Mr. Bonnell stated that he has personally approached Mr. Lykins several times since the last Council meeting and he had made it very clear one on one that that was the main reason for his introduction of a Park Levy. He indicated that the perception of the citizenry of the City of Milford is that the increase in the recycling and refuse rate is to take the place of a Parks Levy. Mr. Bonnell stated that he is the person who originally brought up the rate increase to the City; that it was wholly and completely his idea.

Council Comments:

Mr. Pittman stated that he has had many conversations with Mr. Lykins, as have others in Council, and that he would like to reiterate that there is only one reason Mr. Lykins brought up the subject of a Parks Levy and that was because of the question of a park at Five Points.

Justin Bonnell again came to the podium and interrupted Council's discussion at this time stating that he has spoken with Mr. Lykins several times regarding the Park Levy. He further stated that he has personal knowledge that Mr. Lykins intended the levy to support the general Parks and Recreation Fund; and that he has mentioned it in multiple meetings.

Ms. Evans indicated that she has heard Mr. Lykins say this as well.

Mr. Pittman said there is only one reason Council was considering a levy and that was the idea of a park at Five Points.

Ms. Hinnners stated that it is interesting that Mr. Bonnell says these things because there has always been a line item in the budget for Parks and Rec and it has always been for around \$127,000. She indicated that this past fall Council did allocate money for some things Council wanted to do to the parks. She stated that the City has had the need for a Park Levy for a long time.

Mr. Bonnell demanded to know why Ms. Hinnners said that.

Mr. Pittman said Ms. Hinnners spoke of a levy because she has wanted to add park enhancements that are not currently covered in the budget and Ms. Hinnners agreed.

Mr. Bonnell then demanded to know why Ms. Hinnners wanted a Park Levy.

Ms. Hinnners stated the reason was because the City didn't have the money to make further enhancements to the parks and keep them up and running with the way the parks are funded at this time. She said, in her opinion, it was not until this fall that the City was able to make some solid changes to the parks through the General Fund.

Ms. Howland asked for an explanation of the funding for Parks and Rec. She stated that every year 5% of the income tax went to the parks until 2009 when it was lowered to 1%. She stated that at the time the income tax support was lowered, Parks was a very flush account. The decision was made at that time to drain the account and not move any money over from General Fund.

Ms. Hinnners disagreed saying that the Parks Fund was drained every year because monies were removed for the Service Department and Greenlawn Cemetery and there was never a surplus

Ms. Howland disagreed stating that every year there was a debate about whether the account would receive 1%, 3% or 5% from the income tax. She then went on to say that Dan Burke, Finance Director had indicated to Council that once an amount was moved into a fund it could only be used for that fund. His suggestion at that time was to allocate 1% - 5% to parks and then move money into that account from the General Fund as it was needed for various park enhancements. She stated that at no time was it ever said that the General Fund could not withstand the \$127,000 allocated to parks without a levy.

Mr. Pittman stated that that was the point he was making is that no one had any problems with the current allocation of money to the parks account and neither did Mr. Lykins.

Mr. Bonnell insisted that he had personal knowledge that the reason Mr. Lykins brought up the levy was to cover the \$127,000 allocated to parks.

Mr. Pittman stated that had it not been for the possible addition of a park at Five Points, the talk concerning a levy would not have moved forward.

Mr. Bonnell insisted that Mr. Lykins had made it very clear to him personally that he only brought up the levy to support the current \$127,000 allocated for parks.

Mr. Brady stated that although several good points were made, it is hard to argue and discuss what Mr. Lykins actually said when he isn't present.

New Business:

- 15-1157** An Ordinance authorizing an agreement with Civil Solutions Associates for the design of the Price Road Storm Water Project: Ms. Brewer made a motion to suspend the rules and read by title only; seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes. Mr. Pittman made a motion to adopt the Ordinance, seconded by Ms. Evans. All voted yes.
- 15-1158** An Ordinance authorizing an agreement with HDR Engineering for the design of the Water Treatment Plant Clarifier Rehab Project: Ms. Brewer made a motion to suspend the rules and read by title only seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes. Mr. Pittman made a motion to adopt the Ordinance, seconded by Ms. Evans. All voted yes.
- 15-1159** An Ordinance accepting the dedication of Sanitary Sewer and Water Mains and Easements located at 731 US Route 50: Ms. Brewer made a motion to suspend the rules and read by title only, seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes. Mr. Pittman made a motion to adopt the Ordinance, seconded by Ms. Evans. All voted yes.
- 15-1160** An Ordinance increasing water rates for the City of Milford: Ms. Brewer made a motion to suspend the rules and read by title only, seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes. Mr. Pittman made a motion to adopt the Ordinance, seconded by Mr. Brady. All voted yes.
- 15-1161** An Ordinance increasing garbage and recycling rates for the City of Milford: Ms. Brewer made a motion to suspend the rules and read by title only, seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes. Ms. Brewer made a motion to adopt the Ordinance, seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes.

Old Business: There was no old business to be discussed.

Adjourn:

There being no further business to come before the City Council; the meeting was adjourned into Executive Session to discuss real estate at 8:10 p.m. with a Motion from Ms. Evans; seconded by Mr. Pittman. All voted yes. Ms. Howland stated that at the conclusion of the Executive Session, Council would return to regular session.

Executive session adjourned into regular City Council at 8:56 p.m. with a motion from Mr. Pittman, seconded by Ms. Evans. All voted yes.

There being no further business to come before the City Council; the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m. with a Motion from Ms. Hinnners; seconded by Ms. Brewer. All voted yes.

Sharon Waldmann, C.P.T.

Laurie Howland, Mayor