

**XENIA CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL SESSION MEETING MINUTES
MAY 8, 2018
6:00 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER: Vice President Edgar Wallace called the May 8, 2018, Special Session to order at 6:05 p.m. in the Second Floor Conference Room, City Administration Building.

2. ROLL CALL: Vice President Edgar Wallace, Councilman Thomas Scrivens, Councilman Dale Louderback, Councilman Levi Dean, Mayor Sarah Mays, and President Michael Engle (arrived at 6:35 p.m.) were present. Councilman Wesley Smith was absent.

Motion by Councilman Scrivens, seconded by Mayor Mays, to excuse Councilman Smith from the meeting. No discussion followed. The Roll on this was the following:

Ayes: Scrivens, Louderback, Dean, Mays, and Wallace
Nays: None motion carried.

3. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: Streets Solutions Panel (aka Blue Ribbon Panel) Report and Recommendation. Mr. Merriman said per Council’s instruction, the Streets Solutions Panel met on three occasions in April 2018. The panel participants represented a variety of interests, and a few were not Xenia residents but were significant stakeholders including the Xenia Area Chamber of Commerce’s President. All participants were interactive and invested, they had good back and forth conversation, and they eventually arrived at a unanimous consensus. He provided an overview of the Panel Process:

- Reviewed similar presentation provided for City Council with less focus on utilities
- Detailed review of financial limitations and scope and scale of streets needs
- Provided discussion starters on long-term funding options
- Good group discussion on options resulting in consensus on three final recommendations

Mr. Merriman introduced Matthew Bennett and Jeff Vaught, two members of the Streets Panel who were present to discuss their observations and recommendations for their next steps.

Mr. Bennett agreed the panel had lively discussions because this was a very hard decision. This was not a “want to” decision—this was a “have to” decision. This City was falling apart, and the citizens’ perspective is that City government was not taking care of the City. He acknowledged there were a lot of positive things happening in the City right now, but some people see what they see—and terrible streets are everywhere. The Panel looked at all City budget lines to see where money could be saved. Unfortunately, they cannot get where they need to be with budget-cutting measures only and still provide the quality of services that residents expect. They looked at the City’s books, and City Staff was good stewards of the taxpayers’ money. He realized 70% or more was for employment costs and noted the negotiated union contracts were favorable. They need to do something sooner rather than later with regard to the City’s streets. The Panel felt that Xenia government needed some “skin in the game” before they go to the voters to seek a levy. The Panel also noted that a higher tax base would result in more tax revenue.

Vice President Wallace asked Mr. Bennett if he was willing to share the cost of employment at his business. Mr. Bennett said about 25% of his small business expenses were for four

employees, which did not include himself (that would put it at about 50%). He noted that sometimes his salary is zero. He did not provide any benefits other than a small retirement plan, which was based on each employee's income. Vice President Wallace said they cannot compare Mr. Bennett's cost for four employees to the City's cost for 220+ employees. Mr. Bennett agreed. However, he noted his employees are covered by their spouses' insurance plans, and Xenia's cost for coverage averaged at about half of what they pay.

Mr. Bennett said the Panel looked at the dollars going into the budget and the value of the dollars expended from the budget. There are some areas where they cannot do anything. Regarding the "assistant" positions, most of them were paid from numerous lines with very little paid from the general fund, which was the funding source for street improvements. They recognized police and fire services were the City's biggest expense, but their hands are tied due to union contracts and manning requirements. They need to find a way to keep the same staffing levels and find an extra \$200,000 per year to do one extra street project. He noted they needed to start doing larger projects now and not wait too long; otherwise, a resurfacing project will turn into a much more expensive complete mill and fill project. Spending only \$500,000 for a half mile of paving per year was just not making a dent at all. The Panel suggested the City make a few cuts and a few changes to show the citizens they are trying to bridge the gap.

Councilman Louderback said they are spending more than \$500,000 per year on street improvements. Mr. Merriman agreed that more than \$500,000 was being spent from the General Capital Improvement Fund as well as other dollars from other funds.

Mr. Vaught said he has been an employee of the Greene County Engineer's Office for the last 24 years, and he was disturbed by the condition of Xenia streets. Long before being asked to sit on the Panel, he had been communicating regularly with the City Manager and City Engineer. He knew how much was being invested into the streets each year, etc. He noted the EPA has made some major cuts and the emulsion used today did not last as long as it used to. The County was now paving roads every 10 years with residential streets lasting a bit longer. It costs about \$500,000 to improve two lane miles. Without an injunction of money to get caught up, the street conditions would continue to decline. The Panel felt a tax levy was needed. Without it, even more streets would continue to decline, and in the next five years, they would all be as bad as Galloway Street. He cautioned that they did not want to seek enough dollars to do all the streets in two years, which would result in another problem of trying to come up with the money in ten years to do all the streets again. They need to spread out the improvements over a ten-year period and get them into a maintenance cycle. Once 80% of the streets are done, the maintenance program could be accomplished with about \$750,000 to \$1 million every year. He noted the City of Fairborn was in the same situation with their streets.

Mr. Vaught said the Panel was comprised of individuals who fell into three different categories:

- One-third of the members were conservatives who wanted to see positive things happening in the City first, they wanted the "Rainy Day Fund" utilized, and then they wanted to seek a levy;
- One-third of the members were passive individuals who just listened; and
- One-third of the members (where he and Mr. Bennett fell) understood the City's predicament.

Mr. Vaught said streets are not a splash pad or a City park improvement project—this was a serious matter. The Panel came to a consensus—even the conservative members—and agreed a levy was necessary.

Mr. Bennett said the Rainy Day Fund could be used as capital to pay back a note to do larger projects, such as Colorado Drive. As Mr. Vaught said, the longer they wait to do Colorado, the more expensive it would be. They cannot do all the needed street improvements without additional funds, which can only be achieved with a levy or assessments—neither of which are popular choices.

Mr. Vaught said there would be no end to the problem without a tax levy. Even with a \$500,000 per year investment, which the City was doing now, the streets would only get progressively worse over the next five years. He said once a street loses its base and mud comes up through the cracks, the street is a complete failure and a total rebuild is required, which is very expensive versus a simple resurfacing project.

Mr. Bennett said the Panel focused on four to five action items and not just one approach. Everyone, including those on the Panel, want to be sure the City was good stewards of taxpayer dollars, but they also recognized a bigger tax base was needed so Xenia would be a “City of Choice” instead of a “City of Last Resort.” Before that happens, they need to change the perception of this community. Councilman Louderback agreed—they have to grow the tax base. However, he noted the City increased the income tax rate from 1.75% to 2.25% in 2010. He felt the taxpayers would not approve a street levy because they are tired of paying taxes.

Mr. Bennett said it was a very hard decision to recommend a ballot measure, but there was no other solution. The City cannot operate with a skeleton crew of Police Officers and Firefighters. He noted there were many smart people on the Streets Panel who all looked at the City’s budget—a levy is the only way to get the streets done.

Councilman Louderback recommended the City borrow \$3 million without using any money from the “Rainy Day Fund.” He would not support a tax levy, but he would vote to give the taxpayers the opportunity to make that decision.

Mr. Merriman said the Panel recommended the following recommendations:

- Pursue cost-cutting measures short of cutting core safety services and redirect funds to street rehabilitation projects (Goal: \$150,000/year)
- Aggressively market steps, both past and present, taken to reduce operating costs and maximize efficiency and make sure the public was informed about the nature of the problem, how street improvements would positively impact them, and provide hard costs of a street levy
- Pursue 3.5 mill ballot measure in fall 2018 for street rehabilitation

Mr. Merriman said in response to the Panel’s recommendations, he suggested cost-cutting measures that would provide for additional street funding in 2018 as follows:

- Staff identified approximately \$115,000 in cuts or delayed spending that could be freed up for FY 2018 street program to include funding for community events, Economic Development programs, minor facilities projects, utilizing a Workers Comp rebate, etc.
- It was also possible to utilize all or a portion of the \$200,000 budgeted for land acquisition for Fire Station 32 relocation, which was not being pursued at this time.

Mr. Merriman respectfully recommended they pursue a 3.5 mill ballot measure and let the taxpayers decide. If Council agreed, they would need to take the first legislative action as soon as May 10 but no later than May 24. If approved, they could add a full-depth reclamation project

for Dayton Avenue to the budget. The only other large expense in the Five-Year CIP was the purchase of a front end loader, which would be paid from multiple funds including Water and Sewer Capital and General Capital Funds, but this front-line piece of equipment was critical and could not be eliminated. There were no earmarks for other projects. In a best-case scenario, they would see a maximum of about \$700,000 per year for street improvements, but they needed to be in the range of about \$1.5 to \$2 million per year to gain ground and improve the City's overall CPI score.

Mayor Mays asked Mr. Bennett and Mr. Vaught if the Panel felt that "cuts" could be interpreted as "skin in the game." Mr. Bennett said the Panel wanted to show citizens that every cent that could be cut was cut. Borrowing money was also an option, but even if the City borrowed \$3 million, there was still a \$30 million problem. He said if citizens saw the City making cuts and borrowing money to do extra projects, he felt they would vote to keep the improvements coming. He noted the City cannot borrow \$3 million every single year—that would be a one-time thing until the money was paid back. They needed a consistent \$2 to \$2.5 million per year; however, borrowing \$3 million may show the taxpayers that the City was making streets a priority.

Mr. Duke noted the reserve requirement was a financial policy recommended by the Appointed Officials and approved by City Council. Mr. Merriman said reserve dollars (aka Rainy Day Fund) impact other things that affects the City's cash-to-debt ratio, cash on hand, the City's bond rating, etc.

Mayor Mays said if they take \$1 million from the Rainy Day Fund, which she was not necessarily endorsing but just asking the question, she asked if that would be looked at as "skin in the game." Mr. Vaught said the City of Beavercreek has a street levy that generates \$7.6 million a year; however, most of Beavercreek's streets are less than 40 years old. There was no way the City could get where they need to be without a street levy. Borrowing money would help in the short term, but the streets absolutely need to be paved every 10 to 12 years. Streets are a snowball problem, and they are only getting worse. If a ballot measure was pursued, good education materials needed to be developed and sent to voters to inform them of the situation. He noted the average income for Xenia citizens was only \$37,000 per year and Beavercreek's was \$83,000.

Mr. Bennett said none of the options are perfect, and the Panel felt it was difficult to provide Council with any advice. However, the problem was not going away. Regarding Councilman Louderback's previous comment about the income tax rate increase, he asked them to consider where the City would be if they had not increased the income tax rate—he felt they would be even further in the hole because the City's demographic has not changed. The only way to change the City's demographics is to change the way everyone thinks. They have to make difficult decisions to change perceptions, and those decisions would affect the City 10 to 20 years from now.

(President Engle arrived at 6:35 p.m.)

Mr. Vaught said people are very upset because they do not know the situation, they haven't taken the time to do the necessary research, and/or they just want to complain. He said they haven't bothered to realize that Xenia has a 26% poverty level. Councilman Louderback agreed, which is

why he said residents cannot afford to pay more taxes. Mr. Bennett said that was the scary part of all this—he wondered what they would do if the levy did not pass.

Mayor Mays again asked if \$1 million from the “Rainy Day Fund” would change the public’s perception. Mr. Vaught said the conservatives wanted the City to do that and then wait a few years to seek a levy, but in the end, a levy would still be needed.

Councilman Louderback said the bottom line was they need to grow the tax base. They need to start with getting more high paying jobs in the City of Xenia. Mr. Vaught agreed. He had a car full of subdivision plans and most of the plans included \$350,000 homes in Beavercreek that were being built by people in their 20’s. Beavercreek was very successful, but they are every surrounding city’s detriment. Regardless of Beavercreek’s success, it did not change Xenia’s predicament.

Councilman Louderback said he previously asked if \$1 million could be used from the reserve fund, but Mr. Duke recently said that \$150,000 was the maximum he could support. He thought the fund was about \$5 million. Mr. Duke said the “Rainy Day Fund” used to include the Police and Fire Capital Improvement fund; however, that fund was removed, so the reserve requirement was reduced by about \$1 million. Regardless, those funds are not available for street improvements. Currently, the fund has about \$3.7 million. He again noted the reserve requirement was a Council policy—not a state requirement. Mr. Merriman added that most municipalities have a reserve fund policy. Mr. Duke said he would only support using money from the reserve fund by way of an interfund loan so there was a guarantee that those funds would be repaid. He said \$3 million could be borrowed and paid back with 361 funds. However, they would need to replace those dollars with revenue on the backside; otherwise, the \$500,000 that they spend on streets annually would be needed to pay back that debt service. If they wanted a cash infusion upfront, he recommended borrowing money versus spending reserve dollars. He did not recommend using key operating dollars to pay for street improvements without a plan to repay it because he didn’t want them to end up with a problem with streets and a problem with key operating funds.

Councilman Louderback said with all due respect, they just need to let the voters make the decision.

Mr. Bennett agreed the voters need to decide, but overall, they do not want the Xenia community to fail. Council needs to say street improvements are a priority because the people of Xenia are a priority. They need to show the voters what Council has done and enforce that the ballot measure would not include other projects such as sewers, etc. He said Xenia is a great community with great people, and those people deserve better. If they are happy, then good things will happen.

Mr. Vaught said after the school levy failed, he was interested in pursuing a solution to the streets problem. If the school levy had passed, he did not think any another ballot measure would be successful. That said, he noted the school levy was a 37-year tax. With a street levy, 100% of Xenia citizens use the roads, and the Panel recommended a 10-year levy versus a 37-year levy. The City has about 120 miles of roads, so every 10 years or so, about 12 miles of roadway should to be improved. At the pace they are going with only \$500,000 per year and only two miles of roadway being done per year, they will never get there. Eventually after catch basins, curbing, ADA ramps, etc., are improved, more money would be available for paving projects.

Councilman Louderback asked if \$37 million was the estimate to improve every single Xenia roadway. Mr. Berger said yes. Mr. Merriman said not every single street needed to be done—some have been recently improved; however, they need to make a short-term decision with the long term in mind. They are currently required to do “super maintenance” or complete reconstruction. Past leadership made the best decisions they could at that time, but the current leadership now must deal with the results of those decisions.

Mr. Berger said once they get the streets into a rotation cycle, by the time they get to the second round of improvements, the majority of catch basins and curbing would already be done. Councilman Louderback said it would help if catch basins could be done in house. Mr. Berger said staff has the ability to do them. He noted some of the catch basins on Galloway would be done in house.

Councilman Louderback said the public needed to be educated; they think the City is top-heavy, especially in the Police and Fire Divisions. He noted about 12 public safety employees are making over \$100,000 per year, which did not include their benefits. They need to understand that our police and fire employees are “at the bottom of the barrel” with regard to wages when compared to others in this area.

Mr. Vaught said it was an income problem—not a spending problem. Councilman Louderback said 70 to 80% of the City’s budget was for personnel expenses. Mr. Vaught said citizens may not understand how poor they are—this was a \$37,000 per year average household income problem.

Councilman Louderback talked about the Roundabout project and asked how much the City contributed to that project. Mr. Berger said the City contributed \$279,000, but \$279,000 would not solve the City’s \$37 million street problem. Mr. Vaught said CSU just received agricultural grants, which will increase the traffic traveling to the university. The Roundabout project would serve as a great corridor to that location. Councilman Louderback said the roundabout was being installed as part of a safety project. Mr. Vaught agreed; he noted OPWC did not score paving projects very high, which is why Colorado Drive was not approved, but safety projects are a different story. He asked Mr. Merriman about the matching funds needed for grant projects. Mr. Merriman said some see the roundabout as a waste of money, but Council has long-advised staff to pursue grant dollars whenever possible. If they can leverage up to \$5 for every \$1 in local funds, it would be hard not to take advantage of those funds, especially when those funds would address safety issues as well as aesthetic issues and would add value to this community. Council wants to respond to citizen demands with regard to addressing the streets, but they cannot abandon their obligation to provide for other projects and needs such as park improvements, public safety equipment, facility improvements, information technology, etc. They cannot siphon all resources for only one thing; in doing so, they would create the same dynamic they face with the streets for all those other areas.

President Engle recalled when he served as Chair of the Political Action Committee (PAC) when they put the income tax increase on the ballot, people would complain and he would simply ask them, “Do you want more police and fire employees or not?” Now, they need to ask, “Do you want improved streets or not?” Regarding grants, those grants are taxpayer dollars. If the City of Xenia did not apply for those grants, local taxpayer dollars would go to another community.

Mr. Bennett felt that nothing could have been done that would have changed the current situation with the streets. The City has spent every dollar wisely. Mr. Merriman said if the State of Ohio had not significantly cut local government funding and made other changes that affected revenue in recent years, they probably could have dealt with the street problems with the revenue generated from the income tax increase in 2010. Mr. Duke agreed it would have been a much different financial scenario if the City had received an additional \$1 million or more every year.

President Engle said the average citizens did not educate themselves, they read social media, and listen to local gossip. He appreciated Mr. Bennett's and Mr. Vaught's point of view that they recognized the City had already "tightened their belt." Unfortunately, the majority of citizens probably believe they could do even more.

Councilman Scrivens asked if a moratorium on new hires would be advantageous. Mr. Bennett said less staffing did not make sense, especially for police, fire, and maintenance workers and other essential staff. Mr. Merriman noted that personnel cuts were done in 2009/2010, and many of those positions had not been restored. They just recently restored police and fire staffing back to their "normal" average; any changes would be moving in the wrong direction based on demand and this community's aging population. Councilman Louderback said many citizens probably do not remember that those cuts were made. Mr. Merriman agreed.

(Mr. Bennett excused himself at 7:08 p.m.)

Mr. Vaught said he reads the City's newsletter, which included all kinds of information, but he wondered if the majority of citizens also read it. Mr. Merriman said they continually try to come up with ways to provide outreach and noted Council will be holding a "coffee and conversation" event very soon. He felt the message about the streets almost required a one-on-one discussion, but staff simply did not have the time to engage people in that level of conversation to get them to an advanced level of awareness.

Mr. Merriman wished to conclude the conversation and presented a few decision points:

- As previously noted, about \$300,000 could be redirected from other projects. Did Council want staff to prepare an Emergency Appropriations Ordinance for the May 24th meeting for additional funding for 2018 street improvements?
- Did Council want staff to start the legislative process with regard to a November ballot measure?

Councilman Louderback noted they are already spending about \$850,000 this year for street improvements when they include Galloway Street. President Engle said part of that \$315,000 could be used to pay back the \$137,000 interfund loan used to add Galloway to this year's paving projects. Mr. Merriman said staff was comfortable with the reserve balance; therefore, he recommended that all \$315,000 could be used for the street program. President Engle asked how much could be done with \$137,000 (the cost to do Galloway Street). Mr. Berger said a mill and fill for one lane mile would cost about \$116,000. He planned to provide Council with more detailed information on May 24th. President Engle said he wanted the public to know exactly what they are doing, how the dollars are being spent, and what streets are being added. Mr. Vaught suggested the City publish something that was only about the streets and divulge all the ugly facts. He suggested putting it out there that Xenia has a 26% poverty level and the average income was only \$37,000 per year. Councilman Louderback noted all Xenia school

children are on the free lunch program. Mr. Vaught said about 20% of Xenia's population was paying for 80% of the services provided. Mayor Mays commented on Xenia's aging population and noted the Xenia Adult Recreation and Services Center has 22 vehicles and Beavercreek's senior center only has three vehicles.

Mr. Merriman again asked if Council would like to put a 3.5 mill street levy on the ballot and if so, how long did they want the term to be (5 years, 10 years, or longer). Legislation must be introduced very soon to get the ballot process started.

Mayor Mays said as far as the public was concerned, it may be advantageous to introduce the ballot legislation at the same time they put forth the effort to move money around to use on additional street improvements. Mr. Merriman said that was a valid point.

President Engle said taking action on May 24th would be sufficient.

Ms. Fisher said Council cannot pass ballot measure legislation as emergencies. She proposed the following timeline:

- May 24: Introduce Resolution of Necessity (requires Auditor to provide estimate of revenue with 10 days of receipt)
- June 14: Second Reading of Resolution of Necessity.
- June 25: Deadline for County Auditor to provide estimate of revenue.
- July 12: Introduce Resolution to place the levy on the November ballot.
- July 26: Second Reading of Resolution to place the levy on the November ballot.
- August 8: Provide certified legislation to the Greene County Board of Elections by this date (90 days before the election on November 6)

Ms. Fisher said she had already prepared the legislation, but she needed to fill in some blanks regarding the millage amount and term. She noted the number of years could be pre-determined or the levy could be a continuing levy. If Council wished to pursue a continuing levy, they would have the ability to reduce or terminate it at any time. In addition, she asked when they wanted the tax levy to begin. Property taxes are paid a year in arrears. If collected in 2019, they would get the money in 2020. If collected in 2018, they would get the money in 2019. Mr. Merriman said it was realistic to incorporate improvements into next year's budget if the levy was passed; therefore, it would need to go into effect this year. President Engle said if the levy was passed, he would be very comfortable loaning money to themselves via an interfund loan.

Mr. Vaught said it was important to advertise this levy as a street levy ONLY. Mr. Merriman agreed that the Panel recommended they promote the levy for street improvements only. Ms. Fisher said per ORC 5705.19(G), the ballot measure could be for the general construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and repair of streets, roads, and bridges in a municipal corporation. The State Statute dictates the money could not be spent on anything else. She would check with the Board of Elections to determine if the language could be limited to only streets.

Councilman Louderback solicited Council members for a consensus. He and Councilman Dean said they did not support a street levy. Councilman Louderback noted, however, he would afford the citizens the right to vote and decide for themselves. President Engle, Vice President Wallace, Councilman Scrivens, and Mayor Mays indicated their support of the street levy.

Mr. Vaught said the levy would generate \$10 million over the ten-year period, which allowed them to make improvements over that time period and get the streets into a maintenance cycle. He noted the Panel discussed a perpetual levy, but they felt a levy with a designated end time would fare better than one without an end date.

Councilman Louderback asked if retirees would be affected by the street levy. Mr. Duke said yes because it was a property tax.

Mr. Merriman reviewed the information below for a ten-year levy:

Millage Generation & Impact				
Mills	Revenue	Cost per Year*	Cost per Month*	
1	\$380,190.00	\$35.00	\$2.92	
1.5	\$570,285.00	\$52.50	\$4.38	
2	\$760,380.00	\$70.00	\$5.83	
2.5	\$950,475.00	\$87.50	\$7.29	
3	\$1,140,570.00	\$105.00	\$8.75	
3.5	\$1,330,665.00	\$122.50	\$10.21	
4	\$1,520,760.00	\$140.00	\$11.67	
4.5	\$1,710,855.00	\$157.50	\$13.13	
5	\$1,900,950.00	\$175.00	\$14.58	
5.5	\$2,091,045.00	\$192.50	\$16.04	
6	\$2,281,140.00	\$210.00	\$17.50	

Debt Structure Options & Payments				
Debt Amount	10 Year Debt (2.75%)		20 Year Debt (3.75%)	
	Debt Payment	Mills Needed	Debt Payment	Mills Needed
\$2,500,000.00	\$289,349.30	1.0	\$164,179.33	0.5
\$5,000,000.00	\$578,698.60	1.5	\$328,358.65	1.0
\$7,500,000.00	\$868,047.90	2.5	\$492,537.98	1.5
\$10,000,000.00	\$1,157,397.20	3.0	\$656,717.31	2.0
\$15,000,000.00	\$1,736,095.81	4.5	\$985,075.96	3.0
\$20,000,000.00	\$2,314,794.41	6.0	\$1,313,434.61	3.5
\$25,000,000.00	\$2,893,493.01	7.5	\$1,641,793.27	4.5
\$30,000,000.00	\$3,472,191.61	9.5	\$1,970,151.92	5.5

*Based on a \$100,000.00 home

Councilman Louderback asked if the City’s overall CPI index rating would increase once \$10 million was invested in the streets. Mr. Berger said yes. Currently, the City’s overall PCI rating was 61.99; the investment of \$10 million would increase it to 70, noting that the overall state average PCI rating was 73 or 74.

Mr. Merriman concluded that a 3.5 mill street levy with a ten-year term would be placed on the November 6 general election ballot with the tax to start in 2018 and the first collection in 2019. Staff would provide a general strategy moving forward. Staff would also look at other long-term solutions if the levy was not approved because they still need to determine a logical way forward.

Councilman Louderback asked how many times they could put this on the ballot. Ms. Fisher said they could put it on a general election ballot as many times as necessary.

Mr. Merriman said the City also has a very old (1959) 3.5-mill operating levy that is due for renewal within the next three election cycles and could go on the ballot this year through November 2019. However, he did not recommend putting the operating renewal levy on the ballot at the same time as the street levy. He noted the operating levy generates about \$400,000

per year, which goes into the General Fund. Council held a brief discussion. The consensus was to hold off on the renewal measure.

Mr. Merriman said regarding the street levy, they needed to come up with a greater strategy to get the information out to the public. Staff cannot do it alone—they need the Streets Panel members, et al., to help get the word out. He offered his sincere thanks to the Panel members for their time, consideration, and input.

4. ADJOURNMENT: Motion by Councilman Louderback, seconded by Councilman Dean, to adjourn the Special Session at 7:37 p.m. No discussion followed. The Roll on this was the following:

Ayes: Wallace, Scrivens, Louderback, Dean, Mays, and Engle

Nays: None motion carried.

Michelle D. Johnson
City Clerk

Michael D. Engle
President, Xenia City Council