

President of Council
MICHAEL KLINE

Vice President of Council
TANYA TAYLOR DRAPER

Council Clerk
NICHOLAS AIELLO

Council
JULIE A. BELICH
JOE JARMUSZKIEWICZ
DANIEL KNECHT
VICKI MILLER
KATHLEEN SIVO

City of Willoughby Hills

Working Committee of Council and Rules & Legislation

Minutes of March 24, 2025

The Working Committee of Council and Rules & Legislation was called to order on March 24, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers. **Council President Kline** presided.

Call to Order 6:00 p.m. (0:03)

ROLL CALL (Audio: 0:11)

Members Present: Councilwoman Vicki Miller, Councilwoman Kathleen Sivo, Council Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper, Councilwoman Belich, Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz, Council President Michael Kline, and Councilman Dan Knecht,

Also Present: Finance Director Bruce Scott, Police Chief Matthew Naegele, and Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss

Absent: Mayor Hallum, Law Director Michael C. Lucas, and City Engineer DiFranco

- **Council President Kline:** Mayor Hallum is not present tonight; he is on a well-deserved vacation.

BEGINNING DISPOSITION: (Audio 2:20)

ORDINANCE 2025-009-THIRD READING

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PART 3-TRAFFIC CODE OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS, CHAPTER 339 CAPTIONED "COMMERCIAL AND HEAVY VEHICLES," SPECIFICALLY, SECTION 339.02 TITLED "USE OF LOCAL STREETS; LOCAL PERMIT AND CONDITIONS," AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

- **Council President Kline:** We asked the Police Chief and the Road Superintendent to be with us this meeting. I would like to ask them to give us their comments on this ordinance.
- **Police Chief Naegele:** Good evening, everybody. I appreciate the fact that you have us here to talk

about this. I just want to present a little bit of the background to you and then I can answer any questions that you may have. This has been a matter that Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss and I have discussed for quite some time. The discussion returned once the bridge had been replaced, thus improving the infrastructure over on Bishop Road. The replacement of the bridge with a higher weight capacity is a key factor in this. The original ordinance may have been put in place due to the limitations of the old bridge. With a new bridge, the infrastructure is now capable of handling the weight of larger vehicles without causing harm or stress to it. It is an improvement that should be reflected in the current regulations that we have on the books.

- I will defer to the road superintendent for data about the bridges and specifications. He could speak better on that than I could. In terms of enforcement challenges, without the necessary resources, such as commercial enforcement officers, a weigh station or portable scales, it's impractical to enforce the ordinance effectively given that in our assessment, most trucks that violate the weight limit, do so inadvertently. Enforcing the ban creates a situation where the law is largely ignored which undermines public trust in the law and local governance of it.
- At minimum, it's difficult, but certainly to a large extent, impractical to enforce this ordinance. The absence of enforcement personnel means there's no practical way to catch violators, and therefore the ordinance is essentially unenforceable, which renders it ineffective. There is confusion among truck drivers. The weight limits confuse them, many of whom are already navigating the area without realizing that they're violating a restriction. This can cause unnecessary delays for the drivers passing through the area. Since the roads infrastructure can handle the additional load, trucks often ignore the restriction due to confusion. Removing the ordinance would reduce that confusion and improve traffic flow.
- In the situations that we've encountered at the Police Department with trucks passing through the small stretch road, we've often been told that they either did not know of the restrictions, did not see the sign, or were just outright confused. With discussions I had with Mark, he stated the same regarding his interactions because he has had face-to-face interactions with truck drivers at various times over the years on this. In terms of traffic-flow and economic efficiency, lifting the weight limit would some extent improve the flow of traffic and efficiency for area businesses. Trucks, especially delivery vehicles, or those transporting essential goods, would be able to travel more freely without detours or delays. And I believe that removing restrictions aligns with the City's broader goal of supporting local economic activity. In terms of community impact, I understand that some residents oppose this change. I understand their concerns, but I have emphasized that infrastructure improvements have been made with safety with the City's overall benefits in mind. Maintaining an ordinance that's difficult to enforce strains of City resources, including time spent dealing with complaints or calls for enforcement.
- Again, I'd like to stress the fact that trucks historically have, currently, and will continue to travel that small stretch of Bishop Road regardless of restrictions due to the reasons I have presented to you. If lifting the weight limit does lead to an increase in truck traffic, the road structure has been improved to handle this on the new bridge as the bridge currently is. It is designed to handle heavier loads. Lifting the ban would not compromise road safety or the longevity of the infrastructure. The focus should be more ensuring road safety through regular maintenance and monitoring rather than unnecessary restrictions. I understand the concerns that are from the residents who are worried about increased truck traffic. Their concerns are valid. It is my job to ensure that we can address all complaints responsibly from the police department's perspective.
- In order to address any concern, you have to first confirm that there is in fact a large problem. In this

case a new bridge has mitigated the risks that are associated with trucks. One of my goals is to ensure that the City's resources are used efficiently, and that ordinances are practical and enforceable. The City's infrastructure has been upgraded to accommodate heavier vehicles on this bridge and proposing to remove this restriction is aligned with the progress. By doing so, I believe the City is addressing both the logistical concerns of truck traffic and the safety and quality of life on that end of town.

- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** I will just touch on the bridge too. The old bridge was only rated at 4,000 tons because the deck was rotted out along with everything else on it. That is why it had such a low rating. Now, it can handle 80,000 pounds going over that bridge. The deck of that bridge is about 17 inches thick. The road over there is not in terrible shape, but it does need some work. I just did a little math on those trucks. For UPS and the smaller little brown trucks, they are around 11-5. The bigger ones and extra-long ones are around 30,000 pounds. So, when those trucks are loaded, they are all running up and down Bishop Road anyways. It is the tractor trailers that are not, but there are a lot of tractor trailers that go up and down Bishop Road (concrete mixers and everything) because of all the development in Highland Heights, and even in our own City.
- I've kicked these people off this road multiple times and they come up Rockefeller Road traveling White Road, and coming up Rockefeller with a carry-all and a big machine, which also has a weight limit on it. If that 6-ton limit gets lifted on that road then that is a state route to that point (state Route 84) they can't go any further because they're not allowed to go through there. They still do anyways. I recently had a no truck sign up. I had the sign saying all trucks must turn right or left. Those are your only two options. We took it down because I thought this bridge now would be able to accept truck traffic. In my opinion, I understand the safety of the people that live there. I've talked to a few residents. Trucks are traveling this route anyways, and like Matt said you do not have the resources to have somebody sit there. I don't want to sit there. The only reason I stop them is if I'm working there, and I am not even law-enforcement. It's not allowed. Like I said, it would eliminate the whole problem across the board.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Currently, what route do trucks take?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** They are supposed to go up Bishop, turn right on 6, and go down Richmond Road, to Curtis Wright, back to Miner Road.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Is there a problem with that right now?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** You are just going out of your way.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Doesn't that alleviate some of the traffic coming down that road?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** No, you still have the same amount of traffic, just tractor trailers.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** I understand some of the concerns of the people. The road wasn't made heavier or hasn't been widened. That will result in having more wear-and-tear on the road won't it?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** That road is as thick as any other road in the City.

- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** What about the signage you had for directing trucks?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** It did not matter. They still went down that road.
- **Police Chief Naegele:** The problem that we see is a lot of confusion, at least stated by truck drivers that we have been contacted by, because you have a straight route through, and common sense would dictate to a truck driver passing through the area that you would just go a straight route without any weight restrictions. Then you get to this small stretch that you have to do this large detour to go around to reconnect to the same road and it is almost like you spill into the area that the weight restriction is in and before you know it you are already in it, and it is too late. They are inadvertently entering those areas and traveling through.
- We are limited as you know as a police department because number one we have resources that are stretched throughout the whole City with other duties. In addition to that we don't have commercial enforcement officers. Even if we did have commercial vehicle enforcement officers certified, which is a very lengthy process to go through something like that, you then have to have the capacity to weigh these trucks. You need weigh stations. You need portable weigh scales at minimum for that. It's a lot of resources that go into something like that. I'm not an anti-enforcement individual. We are a proactive police department, and we do not shy away from citing vehicles and stopping vehicles for all sorts of things. But I just think that this particular ordinance on this particular small stretch of roadway is ineffective.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Right now, I revolve around the complaints and problems we had at that intersection at White Road and Bishop. It is still a four-way stop. If we add more trucks to that, wouldn't that cause more congestion?
- **Police Chief Naegele:** There are already trucks that come to that intersection.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Now there is, but if it becomes well known that this is a straightaway now, it will allow more trucks to come down that way. How do we assure the residents that that road will not become a major congestion of trucks coming up and down. If I lived there, I would be concerned myself.
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** I get your concern, but it's not like we are going to have 50 semi-trucks all lined up at the same time.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** I hope not, but all the other trucks taking the other route are now going to take this route, right?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** I am sure that will, but they do now. I see gas tankers coming through there because they just want to go to Highland Heights to the gas station.
- **Police Chief Naegele:** In terms of the four-way stop I know that we've had concerns about that over the years from residents in that area. First, we've had officers at that intersection and the problem is when you sit an officer at a four-way stop they are all going to stop so we're not catching any violators. Even when we are not there, it is not a high accident area. The number of accidents that we have in that area is far and few between. We sit officers on Bishop Road and officers particularly during the night

hour spend a lot of time down on the west end targeting speeders and other violators. From time to time, we get some speeding violations on that stretch of Bishop. I wouldn't call it a problem of epidemic proportions with reckless drivers that are traveling down Bishop Road. We actually get more speeders on the section of Bishop that you would think is less because it's more congested, but it is the area along Bishop Road with the small business district. We have officers that sit over there in the church parking lot and do moving radar up and down that section of Bishop Road and maybe it's because of the presence of an officer, but we don't encounter a ton of speeding violators on that stretch of Bishop Road right there.

- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Why is there not a stop light at White and Bishop?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** CT did a traffic study, and it doesn't warrant having one. I have been here for 10 years, and I have seen it backed up at that intersection a handful of times. Once was due to an accident on the freeway and the other was due to a water main break or something going on on Richmond Road which forced everyone to come down through there. That is when you get massive amounts of traffic. It is few and far between it is not every day.
- **Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper:** When was that study done?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** I would have to ask Pete. I want to say it was during Mayor Weger's term.
- **Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper:** That was a long time ago, we now have more residents. I understand and appreciate what you are saying. I respect you both, and I know you have a good firm grip on what is going on in our community. But with all due respect, you do not live there. I do not live there and none of us live there. I'm hearing from others who are there 24/7 and they are telling me a different story. I used to live over there, but I have not in a while, but I can actually verify some of the things that they are saying that is true. There's recklessness and it's not just on 271. It's on our city streets. I know that's the case on more than just Bishop such as River Road and Eddie Road and that people are just driving like crazy. My concern is those houses on Bishop Road. A lot of them are very close to the street. A lot of people on White Road have houses where you walk out to the front door, and it's about 20 feet from the road. That is my concern. They're worried about this excess speed and near-misses. I understand we don't have great statistics that say we are getting into a lot of accidents, but a near-miss would scare me too especially if I had a child. If I was outside gardening or washing my car or doing any other activities, that would scare me too. I totally understand the aspect of what they are saying.
- The reason that bridge got a makeover wasn't because they are trying to get more semis. It was because it was in disrepair, and we repaired some of the things that were failing on that road, not because we wanted more semis there. I'm just trying to figure out what you're saying, and I know that we cannot change behavior. We can't change what people do. It's hard to manage. I wonder how many trucks are doing the right thing. Do we have a statistic on that?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** There are quite a few that do.
- **Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper:** We can't get every single one and we can't make everybody do everything because some of it is confusion. Some of them have never been in this area before and I totally get that but I'm agreeing with Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz. If we just say "okay" then that is

going to increase the number of trucks coming and the number of near-misses or chances that somebody can get hurt. Personally, I don't care if it's one or two I don't want to take a chance on that. I don't want to take a chance on somebody's kid getting run over. I already know that school buses have a hard time going down Bishop Road because people are not stopping. People are just reckless. I personally do not want to take a chance on that. What is it benefiting the City? I know it would relieve some stress or obligation.

- What is the benefit of the residents who live there or in our City? How is it making it better? How is it making it stronger, allowing semis to go up and down Bishop Road? I wonder what it is doing. I do want more commerce, but I am not willing to sell out our residents. We still have to regulate and make sure that it's safe for everybody. Those are my concerns and as I have mentioned before I've been hearing this forever. There was a gentleman who called me and said that people are just speeding up and down White Road so much that he cannot go across the street to get his mail. I have a serious problem with this, and I feel like I would be letting those people down in the second district if I did not stand up for them. Like I said, none of us live there. They live there every day. They're seeing things that we do not see. We have to heed and understand what they are talking about, but we can't change everything. We have to understand that compounding the problems by putting semi's is not going to help our City and it's not going to help those folks whose front doors are so close to the streets. Those are my concerns.
- **Councilwoman Miller:** Council Vice President Taylor Draper said a lot of things I had on my mind too. Perhaps White Road and Bishop Road is not a high accident area because most of the residents there know what to look for. A lot of times, I am looking, and it is supposed to be my turn to go, yet somebody else decided to go after making a quick stop. UPS has been a fairly good neighbor over there. Allowing semis to go out to 90 or come from 90 could be dangerous because they cannot stop quickly if something were to occur. They could rear into a car and veer off into somebody's yard or house. I am not comfortable with allowing trucks here. I understand and appreciate the weight limits and the perspective from the trucking community that say we can't continue to limit it based on the weight on that bridge. Is there something else that we can do to deter the traffic and not have it continually build up in that Bishop Road area? There are currently issues with people going around school buses, FedEx trucks, and UPS trucks. I have almost been hit on several occasions. When I go home, I have to turn left onto Hayes Drive and most people think, even with my left turn signal on, that I am slowing down to turn right into Squire's Castle. I came very close to getting hit the other night. I am concerned for the residents and am not comfortable to vote on the legislation as is.
- **Council President Kline:** The restriction now is 6 ton. It would seem with a 6,000-ton weight, that would rule out keeping almost everything off the road except for maybe cars and smaller vehicles. A full-sized SUV's gross vehicle weighting is 7,500 lbs. That is not much more than half of 6-tons. Minivan weighting is 6,500 lbs. Most of the vehicles passing through there are ignoring the signs and should not be passing through there. Nobody is paying attention to what the sign says. With current restrictions with the 6-ton limit, larger vehicles would be subject to citations for going over that. If we are citing some of them, can't this open the City up to lawsuits? Why are we targeting some vehicles but not all the ones that are passing through?
- **Police Chief Naegele:** I do not think there is any liability associated with who we enforce and who we do not enforce. That is the nature of enforcement. You could use the same analogy with speeders. That is similar to arguing "if we don't cite every speeder how we can stop one speeder?"

- **Council President Kline:** That is part of my thoughts, but I was also thinking more along the lines of the following scenario: One truck gets pulled over and sees another pass through without getting cited. What if this were to get back to UPS or Amazon corporates? Could this be the basis for a lawsuit?
- **Police Chief Naegele:** I do not think there is a basis for a lawsuit. If a complaint comes in for an overweight vehicle, it is not instantaneous that we get this information. A complaint may come through, but we might not know the reason the truck is coming through there. There may be a construction site on the other side. Then, it would have the ability to go through at that point. Perhaps they are delivering something. Regardless, the vehicle is long gone by the time we get there.
- **Council President Kline:** I am going to declare a special public portion. Questions can be directed to the Police Chief and the Road Superintendent but only pertaining to this ordinance.

PUBLIC PORTION: (Audio 31:35)

An opportunity for the public to address Council with any comments, issues, or concerns.

- Public Portion opened at 6:31 p.m.
 - **Britney Matlock 2886 Bishop Road:** Hello, my name is Brittany Matlock 2886 Bishop Rd. I come to you this evening on behalf of my family but also representing the following residents who live on Bishop Rd., Evergreen Drive, White Rd., Eddie Road and Legend Ln., Tony and Bobby Yerman, Alex Yerman and Mandy Wate, Jeff and Candice Daley, Jessica and John Ulrich, Jenny Hensley, Mark Shroyer, Jenna and Daniel Pritz, Elaine and Mary Crocker, Mike and Carol Jeffery, Robert Myers, Jim and Denise Kousik, Jessica Dilworth, Ivy Willis and Barb Landry.
 - We come to this Council in strong opposition to the amendment to Section 339.02 of the Codified Ordinances which would allow semi-trucks to utilize Bishop Road. The new bridge may be capable of withstanding the additional weight, but we appeal to this Council and to our City officials to consider the effects of this amendment on the residents and frequent commuters of our road between White Road and Chardon Road.
 - There are approximately 40 residential properties, 1 church, and 1 Residential Side Street, (Evergreen Drive) and a narrowing of four lanes into two lanes south of Chardon Road. According to the ODOT statistics provided by the City Engineer in November, the most current daily average traffic count of that stretch of Bishop is 9,578 motors per day. The residents reside in this part of the City on a daily basis. It is an already dangerous route. We cannot turn into or out of our driveway safely during many parts of the day. We see cars dangerously trying to outmaneuver each other where the road narrows. Also, as a sidenote, I am still interested in receiving a response from the Engineer and/or Council and Mayor from the email sent on November 18, 2024, from my husband and I concerning this lane issue respectfully.
 - We see a disregard for school buses, congestion, and a dangerous intersection at Bishop and White Road.

We see UPS trucks, FedEx trucks, and Amazon trucks speeding horribly with no pre-percussion around the end of each business day. We see pedestrians and cyclists utilizing the road. There are no sidewalks or bike pads past Evergreen to be safe while sharing the road with motorists we see. Semi-trucks and large trucks are already breaking the rules as stated by the Chief by choosing to drive down our street on a weekly basis. We see a congested entrance and exit to Route 90 during peak traffic times on the border of the City.

- Now imagine opening the floodgates to the businesses who are both inside and outside our city to receive semi-truck deliveries, mixing in with the already hazardous conditions of the ordinance currently in place. While it has been noted, and I do appreciate that the police officers have directed more monitoring in that area, we have quite a long way to go, and I do say that as graciously and gratefully as I can, knowing that our police officers have an entire city to look after. As far as the signage goes, what I will say is the signage currently is very small. I don't know of the signage on the other side coming from White Road, but I do notice that the one is small. It's my finding since planting roots in the City that this Council is one who favors being marked by a spirit of advocacy for the safety and overall well-being of the concerns brought to them by their residents. People bring concerns with the utmost urgency, declaring an emergency. Thank you.
- **Denise Kossack:** I agree with everything she said. I have a 14-year-old granddaughter. We live on Legend Lane. I do not let her walk or ride her bike on Bishop Road due to the congestion. Everything stated tonight was correct. Even going from two lanes to one is precarious. I don't think the truck drivers have to go that far out of their way to take Richmond Road and go around if they count that time into their day. I just don't see the fact that we need to have that on a road that is not very wide, and without sidewalks. I do not understand why you can't put signs along the speedway there perhaps with lights around them so that it sticks out more. I agree with everything the Council has said tonight and I appreciate it.
- Public Portion closed at 6:36 p.m.
- **Councilwoman Miller:** Brittany, I am sorry that you did not get a response to your email. I spoke with your husband a couple of weeks ago. I never received this email, but if you would like to send it again, I will definitely review its content.
- **Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper:** Do you believe that bigger signage would help and make a difference to the ones not following the rules?
- **Road Superintendent Mark Grubiss:** No, because we have the same problem on Pleasant Valley Hill. There are huge signs at the bridge, and they go across it anyways. I would say we could put up bigger signs and put the signs back up that were there, but there is no guarantee that there are no trucks going down that road. It just gives a false sense of security, but it can be done.

ORDINANCE 2025-012-SECOND READING

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PART NINE – STREETS, UTILITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICES CODE, TITLE THREE – UTILITIES, CHAPTER 925 – SEWERAGE SYSTEM REGULATIONS, SECTION 925.06 – FEES, SUB-SECTION (C) OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS, OHIO AND REPEALING ANY AND ALL CONFLICTING LEGISLATION.

- No comments were made.

ORDINANCE 2025-018-FIRST READING

AN ORDINANCE TO DECLARE ONE (1) CITY VEHICLE AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND GRANTING AUTHORIZATION TO SELL SAID SURPLUS VEHICLE ON THE OPEN MARKET UPON SUCH TERMS AND AT SUCH PRICES AS ARE DEEMED MOST ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

- **Council President Kline:** This Ordinance pertains to the vehicle that was turned into the City. It is not a Police vehicle or City vehicle. The City did take possession of it but have no use for it.

ORDINANCE 2025-019-FIRST READING

AN ORDINANCE TO DECLARE FIREARMS AND WEAPONS AS SURPLUS PROPERTY PURSUANT TO ARTICLE VI – LEGISLATION, SECTION 6.01 – GENERAL ORDINANCES, SUBSECTION (E) OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

- No comments were made.

ORDINANCE 2025-020-FIRST READING

AN ORDINANCE TO DECLARE CITY SERVICE EQUIPMENT AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND GRANTING AUTHORIZATION TO SELL SAID SURPLUS ON THE OPEN MARKET UPON SUCH TERMS AND AT SUCH PRICES AS ARE DEEMED MOST ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** *Inaudible*
- **Council President Kline:** Regarding the ordinances that pertain to surplus vehicles and equipment, the sooner we vote on these, the sooner we vote on these and there is less of a chance that the values have dropped than if we were to keep them on additional readings.

ORDINANCE 2025-021-FIRST READING

AN ORDINANCE TO DECLARE (2) TWO CITY VEHICLES AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND GRANTING AUTHORIZATION TO SELL SAID SURPLUS VEHICLES ON THE OPEN MARKET UPON SUCH TERMS AND AT SUCH PRICES AS ARE DEEMED MOST ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

- No comments were made.

ORDINANCE 2025-022-FIRST READING

AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING THE COMPENSATION AS OF JANUARY 1, 2025 FOR CERTAIN PART-TIME NON-UNION CITY EMPLOYEES NOT COVERED BY ANY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY; PROVIDING FOR SPECIFIC INCREMENT PAY INCREASES THEREAFTER, AND EFFECTIVE FROM JANUARY 1, 2025, TO THESE EMPLOYEES; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

- **Finance Director Scott:** Before the meeting, I put together a summary of what kind of impact this may have on the budget. You can see on the list, some of the items were already budgeted so there is zero budget effect. You can see the overall increase in the number of hours that has been worked in prior years. The part-time fire is a little unique because they are struggling to retain their part-time staff. One of the things we talked about was adding an additional amount for paramedics. That is what they really need more than EMTs. I am not sure why 75 cents was not budgeted; it was an oversight on my part. I had budgeted the three percent COLA increase. I failed to put in the 75 cents. That would add around \$24,000 to the budget and the \$1.50 per paramedic would add another \$32,000. So, the total impact on this Ordinance is \$81,850. A little more than the \$25,000 was budgeted and \$56,000 was not budgeted. I spent some time going through and the main impact is the Fire Levy Fund 240. There are some things we can move around. The only concern is the ending fund balance would be pretty tight. We are going to have that same issue next year regardless.
- **Councilwoman Belich:** Pertaining to the last two line items both being the 75 cents, since this was not in the budget, where does the 75 cents and the \$1.50 come from?
- **Finance Director Scott:** In the Union agreements that were negotiated for 2024, everything had a three percent and a 75 cent per hour adjustment. To be equitable among all employees, everyone was getting the three percent plus the 75 cents. When I did the calculation for the part-time firefighters, because there are so many of them, and there are so many different rates, I took the average and in my attempt at efficiency, I left out the 75 cents. This was my error. The \$1.50 is what the Chief feels would be a good enticement to get more people with that paramedic designation to stay on and get more hours.
- **Councilwoman Miller:** Are these numbers an estimate based on what they foresee they will probably use or is this based on some actual people already?
- **Finance Director Scott:** This is based on the total number of budgeted hours that they need based on their staffing levels. The \$1.50 is an estimate on how many paramedic hours we had last year.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Are all of this strictly part-time fire?
- **Finance Director Scott:** Correct.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** This does not pertain to full-time?
- **Finance Director Scott:** Full-time has their own agreement and their own full-time paramedic bonus.

PUBLIC PORTION: (Audio 48:00)

An opportunity for the public to address Council with any comments, issues, or concerns.

- Public Portion opened at 6:48 p.m.
 - No one spoke.
- Public Portion closed at 6:48 p.m.

LEGISLATION: (Audio 48:15)

- **Vice President Taylor Draper:** Is it necessary to get this to you right away?
- **Finance Director Scott:** This does not concern me at all if you wanted to let this go three readings. The only thing is attracting and maintaining paramedics. The calculation for the backpay, since it is retroactive of January 1st, makes it a little harder to wait.
- **Vice President Taylor Draper:** So, the longer we wait on this, we could possibly lose people?
- **Finance Director Scott:** That is more of a question for Chief Gandee.
- **Councilwoman Belich:** Just to clarify, the \$1.50 an hour bonus is already retroactive for anybody that is on pay roll? So, this will go back to those individuals, as well as any individuals we hired to be part-time paramedics?
- **Finance Director Scott:** That is correct.
- **Council President Kline:** We don't have Facebook tonight, cable TV is working and going, although you cannot replay it. If people are listening or watching, this week will be the last Republic Service pick-up. It switches over to our new provider next week. From what I have seen today, both Republic and Major Waste are progressing at very good rates. Republic has been picking up their containers and the new ones are also going down. Residents should not worry about not having new bins. I have also seen emails regarding Republic's next quarter billing. Those have been followed up with some comments that advise you to ignore it. The new contract starts next Monday, so Republic should not be collecting any more money going forward.

ADJOURNMENT: (Audio 52:10)

- **Motion** made by **Councilwoman Belich**, seconded by **Councilwoman Miller** to adjourn the March 24, 2025 Working Committee of Council and Rules & Legislation.

Roll Call: **AYES:** Miller, Sivo, Taylor Draper, Belich, Jarmuszkiewicz, Kline, Knecht
NAYS: None
Vote: 7/0

The meeting was adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVED: APRIL 10, 2025
Date


Michael Kline
President of Council

ATTEST: Nicholas Aiello
Nicholas Aiello
Clerk of Council