

**Bellbrook-Sugarcreek Merger Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**March 4, 2009**

1. Mike Shank called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.
2. Tom Frantz, Mike Shank, Joan Gallagher, Christine Tieman, Donna Hellman, Ron Folkerth, Howard Ackerman, Charles Schwegman, Bill Berry, and Linda Hummel were all present.
3. Others who were present were Harold Rogers, Brittany Boedecker, Bill Wiseman, Jim Tharpe, Jim Martin, Bill Schieman, Barry Tiffany, Ben Rader, Don Buczek & Mark Schlagheck.
4. Mr. Shank requested a motion for approval of minutes of previous meetings. Mrs. Gallagher's motion for approval of the January 7<sup>th</sup> minutes was seconded by Mr. Frantz. They were unanimously approved. A motion was made by Mr. Berry and seconded by Mrs. Hellman for approval of the February 4<sup>th</sup> minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously except for Mr. Ackerman who abstained since he had missed the meeting. A motion was made by Mrs. Hummel and seconded by Mr. Schwegman to approve the February 11<sup>th</sup> minutes. Again the minutes were unanimously approved except for Mr. Ackerman who abstained for the same reason.
5. Mrs. Hellman received the proposals that were sent out to the Commission from the consultants: G.E.M. and Mercer Group.
6. The Commission thought that the G.E.M. group's proposal was non-compliant with the scope of work for the study. Mr. Ackerman thought that the GEM group's proposal included credentials that did not apply to the merger study, had the wrong philosophy on annexation, the whole proposal was just too general. The GEM group did not include interviews with the police and fire chiefs in the proposal. Mrs. Hummel stated that she believed the proposal left out everything that the Commission thought was important. Mr. Schwegman stated that the proposal did not even include 5 of the 8 areas for the scope of work. Statements 3,4,5,6 and 8 were not addressed. Mrs. Gallagher thought that the proposal was too general.
7. Mr. Ackerman commented that the Mercer Group's proposal had a better grasp on the request but they too missed the annexation. The proposal also missed steps 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Ackerman was also concerned that the communication could be very difficult since they are based in Santa Fe, NM. The Commission does not believe that it would be hard to communicate because technology is so advanced. One of the best

- possibilities is teleconferencing. This is a great way to communicate. Mr. Frantz believes that the Commission does not need consultants here every day nor have to talk to them everyday.
8. The Commission agrees that they should reject the proposals and give each company a second chance. By doing this it gives GEM a chance to be compliant and something to negotiate with the Mercer Group.
  9. Mrs. Tieman stated that the Commission should open bids up to other companies. Mrs. Hellman responded that they had sent the request to other companies and received no response back or were told that the companies were not interested.
  10. Mr. Schwegman asked if the Mercer Groups 5 year model is deliverable. Mr. Folkerth suggested asking for the software so the Commission can select what items they want.
  11. Mrs. Hummel suggested that a subcommittee be formed to decide the procedure to be followed after selecting a consultant. The Commission decided to form a committee consisting of Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Schwegman, Mrs. Hummel, and Mr. Frantz. The Commission also decided that once they receive the new proposals Mr. Schlagheck and Mr. Tiffany can negotiate with the two companies. Both Mr. Schlagheck and Mr. Tiffany have plenty of experience negotiating and will be good for the job. Once they have negotiated with the companies they will come back to the Commission with the results and let the Commission decide. Mr. Tiffany recommended that both of the consultants need to be informed that the Commission formed a subcommittee.
  12. Everyone can send their comments to Mr. Ackerman on the proposals for both companies.
  13. Mrs. Gallagher stated that on the upcoming agenda Sam Stanley would be coming to the April meeting to answer question or give his opinion on what the Commission should do.
  14. In public comments, Jim Martin commented on GEMS proposal. Ben Rader also made a comment on the study.
  15. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mrs. Hummel and seconded by Mrs. Gallagher. Meeting was adjourned at 8:57 P.M.