

## **Bellbrook-Sugarcreek Merger Commission Meeting Minutes February 11, 2009**

1. Joan Gallagher called the meeting to order at 6:59 P.M.
2. Tom Frantz, Mike Shank, Joan Gallagher, Donna Hellman, Bill Berry, Ron Folkerth, Charles Schwegman, Christine Tieman, and Linda Hummel were all present.
3. Howard Ackerman was absent.
4. Others who were present at the February 11<sup>th</sup> meeting were Bill and Alice Wiseman, Brittany Boedeker, Bill Schieman, Jim Tharpe, Dick King, Nadine Daughtery, Denny Bennett, and Harold Rogers.
5. This special meeting was called to review the changes made to the “Statement of Work” during the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and summarized by Linda Hummel. Two versions were rewritten by Donna Hellman and Linda Hummel and labeled 3A and 3B. The only difference being that in one the Income Tax issue was combined with other possible income sources. Donna felt that this was another solution to keep “income tax” listed but not as a bulleted item. Mr. Schwegman said that he did not necessarily want the words “income tax” listed but he wanted “other sources of income” listed which would automatically include income taxes. Mr. Shank stated that he did not want any surprises if the Merger goes on the ballot and that the words “income tax” should be put before the public without having its own bullet point.
6. Mr Swegman suggested using version 3A and insert item 2 from 3B which includes “income tax’ as a non-bulleted item. Donna Hellmann just wants to make sure that the issue of income tax be investigated along with other sources of income. Mr. Schwegman questioned what “local government funds” meant in 3A. Mrs. Gallagher thought they were fees from license plates, etc. Others agreed. Mr. Schwegman said that could include bond income.
7. Considerable discussion of the income tax issue ensued. Ultimately everyone agreed that it needed to be included in the RFP so that possible income is addressed and that the public could see that the Commission was not hiding the issue. There was a “straw vote” on the RFP section of version 3A as discussed above and it was unanimously approved.
8. Moving on to the Statement of Work, Mrs. Gallagher asked if everyone felt strongly about a survey going out to the citizens. Mr. Schwegman suggested that a survey be priced separately since it could be very expensive. Mr. Frantz agreed that the cost might be prohibitive and Mrs. Hummel suggested a random sample as an alternative. Mrs. Tieman questioned just what would be

asked in the survey. Mr. Gallagher said that the park survey was sent out with questions and the answer portion could be torn off and returned. Mrs. Hummel asked what response was received and Mrs. Gallagher said she did not know. Mrs. Hellmann responded that 10% might be typical and that perhaps a “Town Meeting” or something similar might be more appropriate. Mr. Frantz suggested that a survey could be conducted at the Sugar Maple Festival or the Lion’s Club Festival. Mrs. Hellmann said that the latter festival seemed more appropriate to allow more time to formulate proper questions. Mr. Shank wanted to know what type of questions would be on the survey and who would decide what to ask. Mr. Frantz felt that the survey should determine whether financial issues or lifestyle issues are more important to the residents. Mrs. Hellman said that the contractors should determine the proper questions and not the Commission. Mrs. Gallagher suggested that the survey could be a part of the City and Township Newsletters to be filled out and returned. Mr. Folkert suggested that the Survey be quoted as a separate item so the true cost involved could be determined. Mrs. Hellman felt that the contractor should come up with the questions and the methodology to obtain answers. Mr. Berry was of the opinion that the survey should be a part of the total cost and not a separate item. After a lengthy discussion of whether the survey should be a separate item, Mrs. Gallagher suggested that the SOW ask for a “a survey of a representative sample of residents of the potential merged government”. The Committee then moved on to the next item.

9. Mr. Schwegman then pointed out that the RFP did not actually ask for a firm, fixed price proposal and that this should be in the opening statement. He also thought that item 5 should be in the opening statement. Others agreed so Mr. Schwegman volunteered to write it out so everyone would be looking at the same thing. As this was taking place, Mrs. Gallagher asked if everyone was in agreement with the changes that were made in the SOW from the previous meeting. Mr. Shank stated that he had made his feelings clear previously and still did not agree with the changes. He does not feel the Commission is tasked with studying not merging and therefore does not agree with item 8. Mr. Frantz made several points supporting why it is necessary to show what would happen if there was no merger. Mrs. Hellman suggested that the words “should a proposed government not be formed” be stricken from item 8. Mrs. Gallagher proposed that besides striking those words, the words “and what are the possible consequences” should be added.
10. At this point Mr. Schwegman read his proposed changes to the RFP, which also referred to the Statement of Work. Mrs. Gallagher asked if someone would like to move that the Commission take what Mr. Schwegman just read and the changes that had been made to the SOW and have it finalized as an RFP and sent to the presenters from last week as well as other potential bidders. Mrs. Hellmann asked that the changes to the SOW be spelled out for the record. The only changes were the use of version 3A and item 7 from 3B to include the words “A survey of a representative sample of the residents” Mrs.

Tieman moved and Mrs. Hellmann seconded the motion to incorporate Mr. Schwegman's changes to the RFP and to include the changes to item 7 in the SOW. The motion passed as Mr. Shank voted no and all others voted yes. Mrs. Hummel will update the RFP and Mrs. Hellmann will send it out to prospective bidders.

11. Mrs. Gallagher said she had talked to Dr. Dustin from Wright State and he will not be able to participate in the bidding process due to a conflict of interest. She asked Bill Schieman if he had heard from the people at Miami University. He indicated that he had not but he thought the RFP should be sent to them anyway. He will provide the contact information to Mrs. Hellmann.
12. Future meetings are scheduled for March 4, April 1, May 6 and June 3. The minutes from the last meeting are in draft form on the web page per Mrs. Gallagher. Mr. Shank thanked Mrs. Hummel and Mrs. Hellmann for taking the time to put the SOW together. Mrs. Gallagher reported that Sam Staley, a Bellbrook resident and expert on consolidation of governments cannot come to the March meeting but can come to the April 1 meeting.
13. Mr. Schwegman asked when the RFP would go out. Mrs. Hellmann will send them out by email by Friday, then followed up with hard copies. Mrs. Gallagher stated that there was some thought that the lawyer for the City and Township should look at the contract. She said that the lawyer for the Township is Tom Miller from the prosecutor's office and asked Mrs. Hellmann to have Mr. Tiffany alert Mr. Miller. Mr. Schwegman requested that multiple copies of proposals be returned by bidders and Mr. Shank suggested 10 copies.
14. In public comment, Bill Schieman asked for automatic notification of meetings for residents who do not have email. He stated that the "Sunshine Law" requires that such notification be made. He stated that the remedy is for the recipient to supply a stack of self addressed stamped envelopes and also pay a fee up to five dollars to cover the cost of preparing the notices. Mr. Shank said that the Commission had already addressed the issue.
15. Mrs. Hellman moved to adjourn and Mr. Schwegman seconded the motion at 8:21 P.M.