# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH CANTON SPECIAL Meeting



Held Wednesday, December 3, 6:45 p.m. 20 03

CALL TO ORDER:

1. The special council meeting was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by President of Council Jon Snyder.

Mr. Snyder: And it's relative to ... we talked on Monday night, Fire and EMS levy. Pursuant to that meeting we've had some discussion and I want to bring it up here before we vote on this resolution. We are prohibited by law to combine both fire and EMS levies, because when they were initiated and passed, they were passed for the purpose of ...

Mr. Pusateri: You need a roll call Jon.

Mr. Snyder: Oh excuse me. We need a roll - it's a regular meeting, yea. I beg your pardon. Will you call the roll Madam Clerk? I apologize I forgot it was a council ...inaudible...

ROLL CALL:

2. The following member of council responded to roll call: Foltz, Kiesling, Lane, Lindower, Peters, Sarbach and Snyder: Also present were: Mayor Rice, Director of Administration Held, Director of Law Pusateri and Director of Finance Herr.

Mr. Snyder: Thank you. So we will have to request one at one ...inaudible... we request here? Raising one to two mills.

Mr. Pusateri: That one's for ambulance service, emergency medical service...

Mr. Snyder: Yea, that would be the EMS levy. And then the fire levy would be raised to one mill, which would combine three mills. And then I did put in your packet and these incidently were ready for last night, but we're out of sync so nobody picked their's up.
Mrs. Kiesling: Inaudible...
Mr. Snyder: But after I left I contemplated what Member Lindower said and what Member Lane said and I didn't realize it the night on Monday night and some of you might of. But you know here's the problem, we know the three mills still comes up short, as Doug said. We also did not consider, I don't think, the consequence that the tax increase would place upon business. We're not sending a message across the street ...inaudible... we do, we want our employers here and then we turn around and raise their real estate tax. As we noticed last year, there were 18 - approximately 18 hundred runs so far. And this year so far 1175 have been transported. So what I'd like you to kind of consider is a fee for service. Approximately eleven and a half percent of our residents use EMS predicated on that 18 hundred runs. And if we charged only what we are charging outside residents for the run when we transport, it would be called paramedic transport, it would bring in roughly five hundred and some thousand dollars, plus the money that's already in place, which would still be short. However, it does two things. It gives us the ability to change it as our costs go up. It gives us the ability for time to study with Chief Bacon and the paramedics and Julie and the personnel committee and anyone else who wants to do it. Actually rather than giving it a knee jerk reaction and immediately placing a levy on the ballot and having to come back in two or three years because we were way short on what we need. So that was the other option that we had. And what we would probably bill is - leave the present levy in place for administrative and equipment, because we'll need that money as well as for operating and then go to the insurance - insurance only billing. It seems that the easiest way to make that transaction is to go to - to bill the insurance company. And then as long as it is not discriminatory, because I don't know the law and will defer to Julie or Paul on the medicare portion of it. Because we have to be ...inaudible... we have to be careful how we bill that. But that's just some thought. It would be my suggestion personally is that we go ahead and send a resolution down, get the information. We do not necessarily have to act on it. But it would keep us within the time frame and still give us time to study this and put a couple members that were out of the comfort zone in the comfort zone. But...

Mr. Lane: Yea, and I think you also have to look at provisions for people without insurance that might come back and it end up being a pro bono service to those people. And as you indicated it could be a billing nightmare that we might want to look into and make sure that we're not biting off more. And I know Member Lindower talked about some savings that could come from some different personnel moves. And I would feel more comfortable waiting. I think it's good to get the figures down from the resolution and know exactly the dollar amounts - what we're dealing with and then we can make that determination and possibly do a special election in August and get our ducks in a row and our committee together and know exactly what we're doing.

Mr. Snyder: Well it brings up another aspect that we did not discuss, the fee for service we can put into place at any time and we control that. The levy, depending when it would be passed, would be a minimum of year before you start realizing the proceeds, because you're normally paying your real estate taxes in arrearage. And a - there's no question that we do need the additional money. How we obtain it it's a - when you figure it out - I'm sure at this point people

are looking at every avenue before they do it. I know the Mayor has a strong program - wants to ...inaudible... a strong program on economic development and you know we don't want to do anything to say where we're putting the tax base at risk, we're raising it, not that it's a significant amount of money, but that's at the residential sector. But the business sector, you know their investment in their property tends to be a little bit greater than a resident. So that 56 or 58 dollars could be much much higher on along the main street or in the business community. Anybody else have any - Member Lindower...

Mr. Lindower: Jon, I'd like to say that in view of the fact like you stated that it would take possibly a year or better to realize the proceeds of a levy and so forth, I would like to gather more information on that. At the same time I would like to say that to the public that we would require the emergency medical services and the Fire Department to take a look at their operations with the administration to see if there's any cost cutting savings that we can make in those departments prior to implementing a levy.
Mr. Snyder: I concur ...inaudible...
Mr. Lindower: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Snyder: Mr. Foltz, have you any comment?

Mr. Foltz: No, I'm just digesting this now about this service fee that you want to charge. I'd like to see who does it in the neighboring community. I'd like - I did bring up last meeting, as you mentioned Jon, that the levy was not going solve our EMS and fire funding issue. We were going to still be short and still have to pull out of the general fund. But and speaking of the levy, I think it's absolutely right, I think, I got some other information tonight with another levy I'm involved with in Canton, but I think we won't realize any money from a levy, if it is passed in March, till middle of next year, in 2005. Cause as you indicated Jon, it is billed in arrears so as to speak. So ... didn't make no difference if it was passed in November, it'd still be you know beginning of 2005. So that we'd realize any money from a levy - increase at this point. So that's all I have at this time. I'm not you know I'm not going to make a commitment on the fee service. Maybe we just need to study this more. It seems like we've kind of changed in the direction of what we want to do as a council. And that's fine if you ... information, it's a better decision making process for our constituents. So...

Mr. Snyder: One other thing. You and I had a conversation I believe on Tuesday, yesterday, basically our cost without equipment just - is about $612.00 per run. That's without amortization or depreciation of the equipment that we use. So it does call - when the ambulance does roll it's about $610.00 to answer a call. So it is expensive. Now if we go to a you know that's figuring everything, averaging it out whether it'd be a basic call and transport or what they call I think they call it advance life support, and where it takes more technical, more people, more technical things. That's probably much higher. But the average of the call is about six hundred and some dollars. Any other comment from any members that we have? Well I think if you're in concurrence we'll send it down, just follow the time line. Again, we don't immediately have to act on it. And then Julie is gathering some more information for us this week that we'll have that we can discuss this. Because I don't - you just don't want to do a knee jerk reaction and it end up in you know - And again, if we find ourself in a situation the last - when the levy was implemented in 1982 we let it alone for 20 plus years and we didn't look at it and then we wonder what ...inaudible... with our water rates and a few other things. Then all of a sudden we were several dollars in the arrears. And thinking of the fee for service you can look at it every two or three years and kind of control it. And again, as you pointed out, some people have insurance, some don't and there must be provisions made that it's not discriminatory against the people not insured. But are there any other questions on that? If not, may I have a motion to read by title only, the first reading of Resolution No. 139...

Unidentified: Inaudible... change the subject.

Mr. Pusateri: 139-03.
Unidentified: 03.
Mr. Snyder: 03.

Mr. Pusateri: I just want to mention though that once again how the original resolutions you had in the packet were combining the two levies. You can't do that cause it's separate purposes. So I have instead the resolutions are changed or been modified. Resolution 139-03 is to increase the existing - what one mill ...

Mr. Sarbach: One mill ...inaudible... the ambulance is 1.5.
Mrs. Herr: For the - is that for the ambulance.
Mr. Pusateri: Yea, what is it now?

Mr. Snyder: .75.

Mrs. Herr: Right now it's 1.0, but it's going to go to 2.0.

Unidentified: 1.0...

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH CANTON SPECIAL Meeting



Held Wednesday, December 3, 20 03

Mr. Pusateri: Inaudible... Yea, the 2.0 and then the second resolution is to increase the existing fire protection levy of half a mill to one mill. And this is just simply again to send it to the Auditor's Office to certify the amount of actual dollars that would be recovered if those mills were changed. These are two replacement resolutions. Any questions? If you have any questions I'll ... I'll answer them.

Mr. Lindower: I'd like to ask one thing if I could, Paul. In view of the fact that you're separating fire and EMS on the levies, one department realizes the benefit of the other in this particular case on these levies. Isn't that correct?
Mr. Pusateri: I'm sorry...
Mr. Lindower: That's financially one department realizes the benefit from the other department just as well since they're incorporated now?

Mr. Pusateri: Well I mean if these levies were to go through and were to pass, the amount that was recovered for the one for the ambulance would have to be used just for the ambulance alone, not fire. Inaudible...
Mr. Lindower: So that - those funds wouldn't be shared between the two...
Mr. Pusateri: That's right.
Mr. Lindower: Okay.
Mrs. Herr: Correct.
Mr. Pusateri: We'd have to watch that closely...
Mrs. Herr: I mean they're separate funds as they are. So it would just stay the same.
Mr. Lindower: Okay. Thank you.
Mrs. Kiesling: Inaudible...

Mr. Lane: But if we decided to go to one levy then...
Mr. Pusateri: Excuse me.
Mrs. Kiesling: We can't go to one.
Mr. Lane: If we decided at one point in time to let these expire and bring in a new one then we could intermingle ...

Mr. Pusateri: Well these won't expire, it's a continuous. You'd have to discontinue them and pass a new levy. That's another option.
Unidentified: Right.
Mr. Pusateri: To just discontinue these two and pass one levy at three mill.
Mrs. Herr: A new levy.
Mr. Pusateri: A new levy, yea. Which is not what we're doing here today.

Mrs. Kiesling: At this point they'd have to vote twice.
Mr. Pusateri: Yea.
Mrs. Herr: Yes.
Mrs. Kiesling: That's a little sticky.

Mr. Lane: Right. But that is an option?
Unidentified: Right.

Mr. Pusateri: That's exactly - this would be actually two levies.
Mrs. Kiesling: Right.
Mr. Pusateri: Because you can't combine these two.

Mrs. Herr: Jon, does there need to be a motion for as amended?
Mr. Pusateri: Yea.

Mr. Snyder: Yes. Yea, we need a motion to have the first reading of Resolution 139-03, as amended. That is the EMS levy to go from the present one percent to 2 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. Pusateri: That's two mill.
Mr. Snyder: Two mill rather.

3. Mr. Lindower moved and Mr. Lane seconded to **read by title only, first reading, as amended,** Resolution No. 139-03. All members present voting:
Yes: Kiesling, Lane, Lindower, Peters, Sarbach, Snyder and Foltz.
No: 0

Mr. Pusateri: Inaudible... want to read?
Mr. Snyder: You want to read - yea, you want to read the first part
Mr. Pusateri: Inaudible...
Mr. Snyder: Just the first paragraph.

Held Wednesday, December 3, 20 03

**Resolution No. 139-03 - First Reading**

A Resolution on submission of request to the Stark County Auditor pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.03 (B) to certify to the City of North Canton, Stark County, Ohio, as taxing authority for the City of North Canton, Stark County, Ohio, the total current tax valuation of City of North Canton, Stark County, Ohio, as a subdivision and the dollar amount of revenue that would be generated for a replacement tax of two (2.0) mills pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Sections 5705.19, 5705.191 and 5705.25 for the purpose of providing ambulance service, emergency medical service or both along with the necessary appurtenances, to the City of North Canton commencing in 2004, first due in calendar year 2005.

Mr. Snyder: Any questions?

Mr. Sarbach moved and Mrs. Kiesling seconded to **adopt the first reading, as amended,** of Resolution No. 139-03. All members present voting:
Yes: Lane, Lindower, Peters, Sarbach, Snyder, Foltz and Kiesling.
No: 0

4. Mrs. Kiesling moved and Mr. Lane seconded to **read by title only, first reading, as amended,** Resolution No. 140-03. All members present voting:
Yes: Lindower, Peters, Sarbach, Snyder, Foltz, Kiesling and Lane.
No: 0

**Resolution No. 140-03 - First Reading**

A Resolution on submission of request to the Stark County Auditor pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.03 (B) to certify to the City of North Canton, Stark County, Ohio, as taxing authority for the City of North Canton, Stark County, Ohio, the total current tax valuation of City of North Canton, Stark County, Ohio, as a subdivision and the dollar amount of revenue that would be generated for a replacement tax of one (1.0) mill pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Sections 5705.19, 5705.191 and 5705.25 for the purpose of providing fire protection along with the necessary appurtenances, to the City of North Canton commencing in 2004, first due in calendar year 2005.

Mr. Snyder: There being no question...

Mr. Lindower moved and Mrs. Kiesling seconded to **adopt the first reading, as amended,** of Resolution No. 140-03. All members present voting:
Yes: Peters, Sarbach, Snyder, Foltz, Kiesling, Lane and Lindower.
No: 0

Mr. Snyder: Then again, what we are simply doing is requesting and we'll have back - the auditor has ten days in to which to send back to us the actual amount of dollars that the millage would collect. And we have then till the 18th of December to have it - another resolution to certify that we do in fact want to do the levy, if we choose to do it, to appear on the ballot on March something - 5th, 7th, I'm not sure what, 9th, whatever the date is. And we will continue - I will try to get us some more information with Julie and Mr. Lindower out of his committee relative to that so that we can put it in your packet. Then we can keep working towards hopefully the proper solution - which way to approach this. There being no other business to come before this council, may I have a motion to adjourn?

ADJOURN:

Mrs. Kiesling moved and Mr. Sarbach seconded to adjourn the special meeting. All members present voting:
Yes: Sarbach, Snyder, Foltz, Kiesling, Lane, Lindower and Peters.
No: 0

PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL

ATTEST:

CLERK OF COUNCIL