WESTFIELD TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES SPECIAL MEETING/WORKSHOP FIRE DEPARTMENT FUNDING January 25, 2010 6:00 pm

Trustee Ronald Oiler opened the meeting at 6:02 pm by asking for roll call. **Trustees Oiler, Likley, and Harris** was present as well as: <u>Westfield Township Legal Council:</u> William L. Thorne Fiscal Officer: Martha Evans <u>Village of Westfield Center:</u> Mayor, Thomas Horwedel Council: Rick Robbs Terry Bittner Pat Edington Daryl Chidsey Fiscal Officer: Sue Ewers Law Director: Bill Hutson <u>Village of Gloria Glens:</u> Mayor, John Dean

Others in attendance are so stated on the sign in sheet that is attached to these minutes.

<u>Trustee Oiler</u> after careful review of the expenses and budget for the fire department it was concluded by this board that we must move forward with a viable solution to the funding and support of this very important service to our residents and our fire department personnel. We can no longer afford to do things as we have in the past, even though fault may be found with how things were handled over the last 10 years those things are in the past and there is nothing we can do about them expect move forward with the very best option for the good of the township, its villages and most importantly its residents. Therefore, it is the recommendation of Westfield Township Trustees that we form a joint fire district at this time and we must begin to look at the big picture for the future of our township. We are here tonight to get input from both of you as to how you foresee working toward a viable solution for all those concerned. Thank you. And with that we will begin with the first item on the agenda – FIRE DISTRICT

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: I guess my first question Ron would be how we do reconcile a joint fire district with our need to use our income tax money to fund our part.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> I don't know that I have a solution myself for that at this time. I am open for suggestions.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: A suggestion would be that we have an unincorporated fire district and we would contract with that way we can use our income tax and our voters aren't faced with voting for property taxes then.

Trustee Oiler: In our discussion so far we believe this would be forming an

unincorporated district would be putting our residents at risk for the future and it is not in the best interest of the residents of Westfield Township.

Mayor Horwedel: What would the risk be?

<u>Trustee Oiler</u>: The risk would be if the bottom happens to fall out all of the – everything falls upon the township.

Mayor Horwedel: Define bottom falling out.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> If per chance that the village should decide to do something different or the villages decide to do something different then all the expenses and entire budget would fall upon the township residents.

<u>Mayor Howedel:</u> Wouldn't you want a long term contract from us to over come that? <u>Trustee Oiler:</u> That might be some kind of a solution.

<u>Mayor Howedel:</u> I talked with Jim before on this and I said before you put on an unincorporated district you would have a contract with us. The village is more than willing to do some kind of long term contract to make this happen. The fact is, nothing changed since the letter I wrote last August regarding the options and our thoughts the village is never going to pass or even want to vote on an issue to add millage. We can't say to our voters that we need the money.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We have gone to our voters twice before for fire levies to increase that millage and two times it has been turned down. I think conversations that we've had should put the department as one department that serves the whole community – that serves all the communities. Putting it on to a fire district, I think it puts everybody at the same level. Taxation with representation, the voters have a voice in the level of service that they are willing to pay for. Comment has been made the village is limited as to the level of service that can be provided by the level of millage that the residents of the unincorporated area are wiling to pay. Thus we have some the funding and budget issues that we have today. We are under a joint district, everybody has the opportunity to vote and pursue the level of service that they are willing to pay for. I understand your 1% - I do not know how to answer that.

Pat Edington: I think you have had different issues in your township that affected your fire levy. There were so many controversial things going on at that time. I think if you would have put out a twenty-five cent levy that the township residents would have voted it down. I think that the level of confidence and a good working relationship within the trustees with the village and the fire department and then a thorough complete campaign might make a difference. Where there was so many issues during

the two levies that no one- there were a lot of negatives coming out regarding the fire department and everything that was going on so maybe things have to settle down and you go in a third time and really run a campaign for the levy and explain to the people exactly what is going on because I don't think the people really understood it. I think when they understand it and have confidence in the township trustees that they will in fact vote for better millage for the fire levy. You have to admit a lot of things were going on and not a lot of people were going out knocking on doors explaining to the people what this was all about. Would you agree with that?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I think that the message got out to the residents – information was given to them as to the need – in fact the levy hasn't been put on the ballot since '97. We are working on '97 money. That's a fact – I think this year's numbers are calculated in the packets everybody has. \$85,362 is what the township will generate in tax revenue for the fire levy. I just got my tax bill earlier this week and I think approximately \$75 went to the fire levy for ½ year.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I think whatever you put on in tax Jim, that the village would match their share from their tax money. If you put 3 mills on and pass it, the village would pay their share of 3 mills. If you want to set up a break down on that based on say property values would be good or base it on runs we don't care and we will pay our full share. If you put something on the ballot for our village has to vote I think you can forget it before you get it on. Because I can't imagine with 6 councilmen and a mayor answering the questions about do we need this money and we are saying no that it will ever pass. I just think you guys have to look in a different direction to get our support and we want to support you but we have to do it with our income tax.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> Ron, explain a little bit more about your concern about us not fulfilling the agreement as far as walking away. Why would we do that? We just spent \$400,000 collectively on a truck – for us to walk away – we're vested in this.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Yes, I know you are. I didn't mean it in a sense of the village just suddenly decide not to- 15-20 years from now and the residents would be left kind of holding the whole situation.

Pat Edington: Then you would be serving fewer people to.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Yes we would because we would be less people but we still have to keep up the service- that we might struggle with. There is nothing worse than for us to struggle with the most important service for all our residents.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> Are you referring to when you talk about the expenses and Jim mentioned \$85,000. Are you guys holding yourselves only to using fire fund-the taxation through the fire fund to support the fire department and not any other revenues or any other taxes? <u>Trustee Oiler:</u> For this year I believe roughly we had to pull approximately \$26,000 from our general fund to meet the expenses for the fire department and I believe the last 5 years Jim & Martha looked at it and was running between \$21,000-\$22,000 per year that we pulled from general fund just to meet the expenses of the fire department.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> So it is consistent from that stand point.

Trustee Oiler: Yes

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> So you guys can budget for that but out of your current expenditures and receipts.

Pat Edington: Why is that a problem? We do it in the village we supplement the sewer through the general fund also. I guess the question is – is it a problem?

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Yes, it is a problem. We are depleting the general fund at an ever increasing rate each year as we go.

Daryl Chidsey: Was part of that to pay the chief's salary – did you take that from the general fund or

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Yes I believe we did.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Yes, for the first 5 years until 2008 the salaries, stipend payment, taxes, OP&F all expenses labor expenses came out of the general fund. 2008 we had all funding in one spot into the one fund.

<u>Pat Edington</u>: My question is this an issue – other needs are not being met because monies are coming out of the general fund for the fire department or is this a philosophical question that you (Likley & Edington are talking all at one time)

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Each year the fund is being depleted by these expenses. The goal has been to get all expenses in one fund that is self sufficient through tax revenue. <u>Pat Edington:</u> So this is a philosophical attitude.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We are not philosophically loosing money or decreasing the general fund. It's a reality every year.

<u>Pat Edington:</u> We pay out money every year and decrease the general fund also but that's what the money comes in for is to meet the needs of the people.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The carryover each year is less, and less, and less each year.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> The other problem is if we do what the mayor says that they have a district of the unincorporated territory, they can't use general fund. All they get is the tax revenue. They can go back as what it was intended at least arguably back that this is an unincorporated district, all they got is \$85,000 that is it. They can't pull from general fund.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: If that is the case if we pass something in a district then it has to come right from that millage also, doesn't it?

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Yes, then everybody would vote on one levy and that it is the service they would get. Right now if it's an unincorporated district and this is the levy they have \$85,000 is it – that is what they they've got to spend.

<u>Unidentified speaker</u>: They would have to pass something to raise the level of service. I guess the question is – is the township open to other options other than a combined fire district – are you open to a fire district of the unincorporated area.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> I believe that would take further discussion for the board.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Like Mr. Thorne stated the limited ability to supplement that – if the millage isn't passed – then we all have to realize that the department then suffers. Now we can say alright our funding for 2010 is \$85,000, the budget for the department needs to come in tune to that or the village can pick up the remainder of those expenses in the form of a contract.

<u>Unidentified speaker:</u> What is the \$85,000 based on - what millage?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> 1.5 mills – that is what we are running on now and it was passed in '97 and it's generating about .95-.96.

<u>Unidentified speaker:</u> What would you look at if you put one on a levy now? <u>Trustee Likley:</u> Again you would have to look at some of the information that has been presented as to the level of service that both entities are willing to look at. Full time chief, part time staffing. In that packet that Martha has presented- maybe it's <u>Pat Edington:</u> Jim do I read this correctly? 1.5 mills would yield you \$109,177. Oh this is if it passes. So you are now collecting how much? 1.5 mills on '97 valuation. So maybe we have to go to the legislature? But that doesn't make sense.

<u>Rick Robbs</u>: Whether we do a combined fire district or a fire district of the unincorporated area the monies that are generated can only be used for fire – correct?

Trustee Oiler: Correct.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> If you do an unincorporated ok those monies generated can still only be used for fire. The village has said if you go and put 2.5-3 whatever it's gonna take to run this fire department we will match our share of it. We just don't want to go back to our residents with an additional tax.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> I think that puts us at risk – I really do because we would be asking our residents for more millage.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> If we ask for 3 mills across the board – ok your residents are going to pay 3 mills right? <u>Oiler, Yes they would.</u> Ok the village residents will be paying 3 mills ok – that's if we do a combined. If we do an unincorporated and its 3 mills the residents of the township are gonna pay 3 mills, the village of Westfield Center will pay the 3 mills of whatever that dollar amount is out of their general fund and pay for our portion of the fire department. You still pay the same amount and we still pay the same amount. All the difference is our money comes out of a different bucket.

Trustee Oiler: I understand

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> It appears you can't pass an issue on an unincorporated district. <u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Not at 3 mills I don't believe we can.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> What we're telling you is we don't think – I can't tell what the voters are going to do in Westfield Center but I can tell you this it's going to be hard for me to know that I am paying an income tax of 1% personally already for fire that I already receive. So why would I and nobody from the village had come to me and told me they need this money and I understand where the money comes from, so why would I vote for that – to become an incorporate fire district.

<u>Trustee Oiler</u>: Mainly because you need to pay for the service that you want. <u>Terry Bittner</u>: We're prepared to do that.

Pat Edington: We have been.

Trustee Oiler: I know-I understand.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I think you vote would be worse – we said go ahead and put it on and let it rip I got to believe you would loose by more because I can't imagine the village would support it. Maybe they'll fool me.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> The responses that we got from your mayor's letter pretty much told it all on how they feel about an additional tax.

<u>Daryl Chidsey:</u> When you say you feel you are more at risk is that you fear that we would not stay in this with you?

<u>Trustee Oiler</u>: No not necessarily that – not in the immediate future but down the road – down the road things could change for us and if we're all not working together as one unit with a fire department that is under its own legislation and its own people running it – I just think that is the right way to go – I really do because you have representatives from the village, you have a representative from Gloria Glens and representatives on that board from Westfield Township running the fire department under the budget that they had been given.

Mayor Dean: We are in a unique different position than you are especially when you are already paying a tax that you want to pay. Apparently Gloria Glens should have always been paying on some kind of Westfield levy. We haven't. From talking to the village, they're happy that they haven't been and happy they are collecting their own fire levy and have the choice to go to a different place if they want to. Because historically Lafayette Fire Department was the fire department we used just because of the proximity, response time and things like that and they just came to us one year - the first year I was on council – 10 years now? They came with a new contract price that was above and beyond that we could afford and couldn't break it down and explain why it was going to be so much different. The guys I learned from got on council first those guys were all about saving the money for the village because the village is so small and I got a little mad and came down here for a contract. It's not that we haven't been happy with the service that we've had. I guess concerns would be what's going on through the last years -the little divisiveness going on and things like this. Our contract is coming up in a year to year and half that made us want to have the option to see if we could go somewhere else. I think and I mentioned this in private talks, I would put this up to the village for some kind of vote or survey or something but I think everybody is leaning towards that if they have to vote on a Westfield fire levy that they are talking detachment from the township. It's only because and we are unique in that way we are this little spot tucked in here with lakefront and cottage community

and they do feel like an entity unto their selves. I am a new guy and I have been there 20 years and that's how they are and I am trying to help them keep everything the way they've had it. Before I would say that we would detach and I definitely would go my people in the village and see if they would want to participate-incorporated or unincorporated. I would never just – because we so small we can get out to the people. I hate to always you know we are elected to represent their interests, I prefer to go out and find what they really want, instead of 6 councilmen and a mayor deciding especially on something like this.

<u>Unidentified speaker</u>: Would you restate how your funding and your expenditures here. <u>Mayor Dean</u>: We have our own fire levy; in fact I didn't know that this whole thing was about this so I came kind of unprepared I am not sure what the levy is. It generates more than enough to pay for the contract plus we keep accumulating funds. <u>Question?</u> 1% or 1.5%?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Their millage is based off of our millage.

Mayor Dean: It's about a \$9,000 contract. It always has.....

Mayor Horwedel: Why would you want to be in this?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> A joint district would be offered to them if they are interested in participation. One of things that Gloria Glens consider is: note that Lafayette is at 3.5 mills <u>Mayor Dean</u>: and we will be looking at all this <u>Trustee Likley</u>: and you look to go to Lafayette you would be changing and that is what it will be based on. Some of the numbers that we're looking at are well below 3.5 mills.

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> Let me ask a question, I don't think I have heard anyone talk about it. Do you take '97 revenue (too much intermingled talking)

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> If you renewed it at today's valuation that would be what each entity would

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> Could you run your fire department on this? <u>Likley:</u> \$197,000? No. <u>Mayor Dean:</u> What millage did you run the last two times? <u>Likley:</u> 2.5 mills that was a 1 mill increase.

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> I agree with what you said, I don't think you sold your levies the last time. You really got to get out there and let people know. I know we are really small and it's hard for us to. A police levy or a fire levy never goes down in my village, never because my people know that we have the services they look for. We do go out, we do send flyers out and we do go door to door and we actually explain that this is a renewal, this isn't a new tax. I have seen it on signs that this is a renewal but sometimes you got to get out there and talk to them. I am surprised when people don't pass fire levies but you know if got information from two or three different places and they can't find a spot to settle on they just say no to that.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Just a clarification – you do not have to detach to get out of the fire district. Once it is created statue gives you the right to withdraw once they create it, if you don't like it. A district of the whole area they can withdraw. <u>Mayor Dean:</u> So we can withdraw from that and still be part of Westfield Township. <u>Bill Thorne:</u> You can contract for it.

Mayor Dean: and we would still be part of the township?

Mayor Horwedel: can they withdraw and come back and contract with them? <u>Bill Thorne:</u> Yes.

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> We don't want to do that Gloria Glens wants to be able to vote for trustees and things like that. The only service that you provide to Gloria Glens is we contract the fire department; we plow our own roads and take care of our own roads. <u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> We just want to use our income tax. Is there any way we can do this that doesn't hurt them?

<u>Bill Hutson:</u> If they pass a tax only on the unincorporated area of the township it's really a matter of modifying the contract that we have today.

Mayor Horwedel: But they don't want to do that.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> They don't think that they can but if it doesn't pass then there're stuck with the on going levy of \$85,000. If the service is above and beyond that can't happen. <u>Rick Robbs:</u> But if it doesn't pass, then how can it be

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Either way it can be formed and implementation contingent on passing a levy, but either way it has to pass to do what we talking about under either scenario. <u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> So they can do an unincorporated district contingent on passing a levy?

<u>Bill Thorne, Mayor Horwedel (listen to the audio) too much intermingling of conversation)</u> <u>Bill Thorne:</u> The problem is right now what the Board of Elections has is as a district and it shouldn't be supplemented it never went forward and again everyone should be voting on. Status quo isn't gonna stay the way it is we got to do something. <u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> It seems to me you have talked around one of the problems and that

is being stuck and if they put it on contingent, the only other problem I hear... Bill Thorne: It can be continued either way.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> If we go with an unincorporated district what is one of the legal ramifications of that unincorporated district with the past levy issues from the Board of Elections.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> I can't answer that at this time. The unincorporated district they have been doing it all along and only part of the unincorporated area has been voting and they didn't pass it. If you really went ahead and formally organized it, set up a separate district, separate name, and separate bookkeeping and passed it, it would just formalizing what you keep going. But if you have a district then at this point you would be stuck with just the \$85,000, that's the levy. But if they say it's an unincorporated district your levy is what the Board of Elections put out is for the \$85,000 without any supplements from the General Fund.

Terry Bittner: The Board of Elections has it as a district - an unincorporated district and

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> that's the only people that voted on it and if that's the case it shouldn't be supplemented. The problem is it isn't being treated as a district but the Board of Elections is running.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> The error occurs at the Board of Elections not... I humor the fact that the error occurred at the Board of Elections and they have taken the hit over this the last couple of years. Is there any way to run the fire department as part of the township – no fire district?

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Yes, if they had funds. Where are you going to get the money? <u>John Dean?:</u> The way it's set up today all residents in the villages and township should have voted on the levy. But because of the problem at the Board of Elections it was treated as an unincorporated fire district so only the township residents voted on it and paid. So the problem is to go forward, basis is which path do you go down, but got to go down a different path than you are today. Technically the way it is set up, it's not an unincorporated district it should either be voted on by everybody or you need to pass a resolution creating the unincorporated district or create some other form essentially what you proposed.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: Can they back out of this in a way to have an unincorporated issue on the ballot that's contingent on passing?

<u>Bill Hutson:</u> Yes, they could pass a resolution creating an unincorporated district and then <u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> and if it fails they do not have an unincorporated district. <u>Bill Thorne:</u> You could do the same with a joint district they are talking about. That could be contingent on passing of the levy by the residents in the entire township, if they wanted to pass it or if they don't they don't pass it, it becomes a separate legal entity unto itself. It's not yours, it's not the townships, it is a separate legal entity. <u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> We understand that.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> One of the advantages in the joint district I see is the fact that it is a separate board. We have – we just received a bill last week for pieces parts for the fire truck. It comes to fire committee, we vote on a portion of it, this board votes on a portion of it, you folks vote on a portion of it. You could approve the entire bill we couldn't so how much do they buy? The paying of the bills, the percentages – none of that stuff goes away without either a joint district or we don't do anything and it goes out to the entire township. The ballot goes out to the entire township. The present operation, funding, budgeting, payment of bills, employment is very cumbersome, it's very awkward, it's very hard to - we look at 2009 and we paid 69.5% of the operating expenses of the department. I have talked with the mayor; I have talked with Rick, Greg Oakes about looking at day time staffing. The percentage that we pay day time staffing it's contractually a clothing allowance but we don't have language in the contract for part-time staffing but yet not nothing has come back to the table regarding part-time staffing. We pay 75% of the part-time staffing that's in that station every day protecting all the residents in this township. We pay 75% of that.

Mayor Horwedel: But there is a reason for that, Jim.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The reason is we have a contract that says we pay 75% of the clothing allowance.

Mayor Horwedel: Most of the calls are from the township.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> But that cost

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: We would gladly change that to the valuation of the property or something, but don't just sit up there and say you are getting treated unfairly because you are paying ³/₄ of it that is how it has always been set up.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Those people in that station sitting there are answering calls to every one of the residents in this township.

Mayor Horwedel: That's correct.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> They are presently under a contract – I've talked to them about parttime staffing – I've talked to them about soft billing. We soft bill our residents to assist in paying for the operation of the department.

Mayor Horwedel: I understand that.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The village doesn't feel that is fair to soft bill their residents.

Mayor Horwedel: So we won't.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> That's double taxation.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The point of it is that day time staffing is there to serve everyone of the residents yet we are paying a higher percentage in that staffing and

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> Of course you are and for a reason, I mean.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Mayor – we pay 75% of the operating calls when someone calls at 7 o'clock in the evening we pay 75% of that call. My point has been since we put parttime staffing in the station, they're sitting there, they're willing to answer 100% of the calls no matter where they are at but yet we still pay 75% of that cost for them to sit there. No matter how many calls they take to the township or to the village. That's the problem with the present operation. It's a village it's a township resident they all are served by one department and those staffing costs should be split evenly, the same way the truck is sitting there, we pay 50% you pay 50% for the vehicle for that equipment. Why should we pay 75% because they go out to 75% of the calls? <u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> Ya, I always thought we were being the good guys paying 50-50 <u>Trustee Likley:</u> For the equipment that sits in the station to answer every call? <u>Terry Bittner:</u> You just volunteered to pay \$300,000 instead of \$200,000 on the new truck? <u>Trustee Likley:</u> no.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> That's just what I heard you say.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> That can all go away that can call go away all these percentages can go away 50-50 65-35-75-25 can all go away because if you look at it and say it going to take 2 mills it going to take 2.5 mills whatever the dollar amount it's gonna take to run this department and going back to your comment about we could approve all these bills. This department gonna have a budget have a capital budget, a salary budget, gonna have a normal expense budget. OK? It's gonna be based off tax dollars based off the property values of all the different entities.

So the percentages go away.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The percentages have to away.

<u>Rick Robbs;</u> They will go away.

Mayor Horwedel: There will be a percentage based on the property values.

<u>Pat Edington:</u> See the village is going to be paying less than Gloria Glens will be paying less, we are not all going to be paying equal.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> The township's gonna be paying more because the property values are higher in the township it's bigger.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: I believe Martha figured that out once that we wind up just about the same of what we're paying, correct me if I'm wrong if we went to property values instead of this 64-35 75-25- is not true?

<u>Martha:</u> Look at this – we have a full time chief and part-time staff and you can see the millage (if we would collect from non-residents) would be 2.65. underneath that the township would yield \$192,880, Westfield Center their property values at that rate would yield \$135,510, Gloria Glens would yield \$20,704. You put that together that is going to equal the \$348,755.

Terry Bittner: What are the percentages?

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: Martha do you know what the percentages are of the whole what each entity's percentage is of the whole?

Martha: no, I didn't calculate that I just calculated the millage.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> If I did my math right, the township is at 55.5%, the village is at 38.5%, and the Glens are at 6%.

Trustee Likley: per 2009?

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> That was based off 2008.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Ya, we were at 59? 2009 fiscal officer's calculations put us at 69.5% and I think – in actual expenses.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> I am not talking about actual expenses this is based on property values. If you look at the township as a whole, the village and the Glens and township all as one whole the property values in the township is 55.5% of that, the property values in the village is 38.5% and the property values in the Glens is 6%. The total property values of the whole township & villages are \$261,503,042 that is from the auditor's office. That is what you base it off of.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> That is where your revenue is coming in and practical to see it set up that way and every 2 years readjust. Because that is where your income is coming.

<u>Pat Edington:</u> I know we came into this meeting based on what was in the newspaper (coughing couldn't understand) I am just wondering now if we don't go back and reopen this whole thing and think about it.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Utilize people that you have here.

<u>Trustee Oiler</u>; Do we have a resident that wanted to speak?

Carol Rumburg: Are taking comments from the audience?

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> I will for you, yes.

<u>Carol Rumburg</u>: I have a question is your income tax in the village do all residents pay that? <u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: Some that are retired may not pay it.

Carol Rumburg: Is that also does the employees of the company?

Mayor Horwedel: Oh yes, that is where the money comes from.

<u>Carol Rumburg</u>: So if you had an employee at the company and is also a township resident they would be double paying, right?

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> They would pay the income tax, yes and if they live out here they would be paying it out here that is true.

<u>Carol Rumburg</u>: So I think that is something to consider when you have township residents and they are working at the company that they are double paying.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: If you have this income tax and we paid our full share for 1,000 years and they wanted to keep paying for it and now you go back to the residents and say vote some millage, we just don't believe it will happen.

<u>Carol Rumburg</u>: I am just looking that you have some residents that are not paying in toward the fire department.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: You could look at it that way and yet you have everybody over at the company, the only thing they are getting from it is protection during the day.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Does everyone agree that they want to rethink this a little bit more? <u>Rick Robbs:</u> I am pretty sure where I am at on it.

<u>Trustee Oiler</u>: I am in favor of a joint fire district and that's the bottom line for myself and if you folks want to contract that's fine.

Mayor Horwedel: It's the same thing isn't it?

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Not a joint district it's so hard to get out of at that point. You were talking about If they organize a district independently you could withdraw and then contract you would still be back of the people not voting.

<u>Trustee Harris:</u> Could you use that income tax for something else besides fire?

Mayor Horwedel: Sure we use that for everything.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> That's our primary source of taxes.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> That is why I brought the question is there a way for you guys to receive if the fire department did not necessarily have to come under a fire district if you could run it through a budget outside of a fire district.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We could supplement from general fund but general fund is limited to its ability and that's strictly property tax, local funding from the county, state. Now we have resources for our road service but that is restricted to road service, we can't pull from that fund. We do not have the privilege of an income tax.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I can't exactly speak for council but I would think council would have some openness in short run with changing those percentages for something as property

values 55,39,6. If that would help in the short run maybe we could work something out. (Too much speaking and coughing)

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> Martha do you have what the percentages should be? <u>Martha:</u> No not necessarily percentages but what I am hearing I can see that it would be very workable ideas using this type of thing with the millage and each entity if they chose to be in the fire department. Like the 39%. This is strict millage that would be calculated that would be on contract with the village saying OK you would pay \$135,510 into that district/or township and we would be paying the bills.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I am saying just for today if that would help. Right now we're the place that you feel it if this went on indefinitely and bought some more equipment, there you would be paying a higher percentage. Right now it would help you directly on a day to day stuff. Again I threw it out there because I think council and the village want to cooperate we don't any obstructions here, we just don't.

Trustee Likley: I am not trying to be an obstruction either I think it's important that – I guess we got to a point where the present millage - valuation of each entity was put into a pot, was put into one pot operation - operation of the department was based on those funds resources. You pay the bills out of that one fund the percentage of the runs, the fuel, the day time staffing, the chief's salary. I know Ms. Evans up until this 2008-2009 I think even your fiscal officer, they pulled their hair out figuring out this percentage and who gets what, who receives what. We still have an issue with soft billing. We soft bill 100% of our residents to assist in paying the fund. The non-resident is a 75-25 split. We draw the 75% because we are servicing those non-residents probably more often. But yet the split, we still have issues trying to get that revenue from soft billing split, if we billed across the board that keeps the millage level down and it puts more funding into the operating expense of the department. But the present situation of the contract that says we'll pay 69% of the chief's salary and 75% of ------l think if present operation if we generate \$85,000, \$6,130 from the contract with Gloria Glens, soft billing -maybe soft billing of our residents isn't fair either, maybe we shouldn't be soft billing our residents and then we work with the funds that are available for the department.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I guess I – I'm simply saying that we offered to change the split so that we don't have seventeen different things to get one split based on the property values and get something worked out on soft billing I guess we could do that too. I don't know what else to do.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I think in the present if we look at it in the present at the present valuation what they would generate.

<u>Mayor Howedel</u>: The present valuation we pay all the bills instead of splitting them the way they are 55-30-6.

Trustee Likley: Out of one fund.

Mayor Horwedel: Ya, whatever.

<u>Pat Edington:</u> You want to put it all in one pot in one bank and say OK Martha this is where we draw the fire funds out of, we can't do that.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> The bills come due instead of you paying 75 and we paying 25 you pay 55-39-6. When it comes to buying new squad down the road 5 years from now, you'll pay 55-39-6 until we can work something else out.

Bill Thorne: Are you still talking about operating with a fire committee?

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> Ya, I imagine we probably would still have to because nothing would change in terms of the operation. It would be just the split change. If the concept has some idea let a couple of the fire committee people work something out, bring it back to both entities. Obviously we cannot solve the joint fire district thing tonight, I don't think.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Martha what is our projected revenue for 2010?

<u>Martha:</u> For the fire, I would say we are going to get about the same in taxes, Gloria Glens about the same, billing should increase with the amount of soft billing the township residents. So if I were going to be a conservative person, I would say we would have \$125,000 that would be for the fire department for 2010. And if we are going to say the village would pay the same amount that's \$250,000. Last year we spent \$217,000 without capital expenditures now.

Terry Bittner: Definition of "we"

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> "The department" spent \$217,000-\$219,000 without any purchase of equipment.

<u>Martha:</u> I don't think there's anything on the table for a large capital expenditure this year.

Terry Bittner: 55% of \$217,000?

Martha: About \$119,000 right?

<u>Unidenified speaker:</u> Yours is gonna go up, speaking to Gloria Glens.

Mayor Horwedel: You could go as high as 3.5 mills

Martha: No, we couldn't do that because we still have a contract with them unless we re did theirs.

Mayor Horwedel: Contracts should be modified

Pat Edington: "I agree" but we have to wait to see what council says.

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> I just – I think something could be worked out with my council – the concerns before of what was going on with the fire department and you have done a lot of good things the last few years. I don't understand why there isn't some kind of way to figure out how they can use their income tax, especially if they are wiling to get some kind of contract legally that we still accumulate funds for what you need but the way we all need to do, if that makes sense.

They want to use their income tax and you might want to pass a levy maybe get in on your levy too. We are not much more that the contract is anyway what you would pay, right? Is there a way that you could do what they want?

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Sure a joint district and everyone gets a chance to vote, if they vote it down then obviously you don't go that way, that's not gonna work. If we go for an independent district they are limited the whole district if you percentagewise it, you are limited to your 39% of what they can pay and it's not gonna be the amount that you want to fund this department.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> And future funding will then require us to go our residents for a higher and higher millage in order to keep that service available.

Mayor Horwedel: No higher than us paying our millage tho.

Terry Bittner: If it stays at 55-45

Martha: That 55% - I want the trustees to understand is the property valuation

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Property value does not have anything to do with the property tax

<u>Pat Edington:</u> Do I understand you correctly that you said we could pass a resolution for a joint fire district and then that would have to go to vote?

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> The would want to pass a levy to institute ... contingent on the passage of the levy and if the voters said NO it's off the table you have to do something else.

<u>Pat Edington:</u> So you don't vote for a fire district, you vote for a levy. Bill Thorne: Right, if the levy doesn't pass it's off and we aren't going to do it.

<u>Pat Edington:</u> You could go for the levy and we could pay out of income tax <u>Trustee Likley:</u> If it is a joint district your residents would have to the opportunity to vote

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> If it is turned down, the joint district would be off the table and you would have to come up with some other method to do it.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> And if Gloria Glens wanted to participate in the joint district they could be in the joint district as well, if you choose not to you wouldn't have to. But the point as I stated earlier was that the millage is going to be effected. What Gloria Glens pays whether it's a joint district or strictly a contract, the end result will eventually increase. But if you choose to go to Lafayette you are going to match their present millage I would assume I'm not negotiating for Lafayette, they are presently at 3.5 mills. And was one of the reasons why you came to Westfield, they had gone up to 3-3.5 mills and we were still at 1.5. That's your prerogative.

You are unique because you are at the outskirts of the townships.

Mayor Dean: Between them both, right.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Another thing if you had a joint district you would have one entity; you don't need a joint board, not going through both fiscal officers all that stuff goes away. It will have its own board, its own fiscal officer and one pot where everything is paid for. There has to be one member of each entity on the board.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> We are automatically loosing dollars off the because we gonna be paying somebody on another board instead of using the

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> You wouldn't because it would come out of the levy.

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> What I am saying is that is just an ineffective way to use dollars and we are trying to find the best way to use dollars here. If we try to go with the unincorporated

area and present it back by percentages of the real estate. I don't see a disparity between either taxation through a tax levy for funding which in essence Westfield Village is presenting as well as John may offer to. It seems to me you get equal dollars just that you tackling it in a different way.

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> There's nothing wrong with that. Get ourselves settled in one place and pass a levy or join together would be innovative to come up with something like that. <u>Darryl Chidsey:</u> I get the feeling that you guys think that if our residents would vote on a levy that it would pass a little easier. And I am not about to predict what they would do but based on the feed back we got, the results of the mayor's letter in August I would say we would over whelmingly not pass it. They gave us a lot of feed back that was against paying extra taxes. So bringing this on in an election for a levy I don't know that is necessarily a positive thing.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> That's a valid point and our residents equally. I mean like I said how it was presented there was an issue there, a lot of turmoil in the department. If in the present economy, it would be tough to even pass a levy across the entire township for the fact that there is still gonna be that our funding is limited at the present time and that budget from the department would have to come in line with available resources, revenue for fire funding. As a result that's going to affect our revenues source is going to affect ultimately affect that level of service overall. That was one of the reasons that if you go to the residents across the board they will prove the level of service that they are willing to pay for. That was the intent – that was the hope. If it is 1.5 mills, 2.5, 3 whatever it might be.

<u>Darryl Chidsey:</u> What I hearing you say then is you feel just go to the township you don't feel like you have a positive opportunity to pass the levy. Is that what I'm hearing you say?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I think in today's present economy it's gonna be tough no matter how much you knock on doors. As a result we then have to look at the revenue that is available which is \$85,362 everything adding up in the soft billing \$124,000-\$125,000. <u>Darryl Chidsey:</u> So what you are is that you guys have limited amount of resource Trustee Likley: Absolutely I have been saying that for 3 years.

Darryl Chidsey: You do understand where we are coming from

<u>Trustee Likely:</u> Absolutely. But as a result of the percentages that have been established in the contract we are still paying over and above in order to meet the needs of the department we have to pull from our general fund and we cannot continue to do that. So everything has to get pared back.

Darryl Chidsey: We have offered is that not sounding OK?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We have to then look at – the percentage part of it is if as long as they everything falls under the funding that is available. If we have \$125,000 and 49% more of that gives us a number that we can operate the department on or whatever the percentage is, that's fine. Here's the number that all operating expenses and future

purchases have to be under at this time. 2011 if we have another squad that's coming due we don't have the money. And we can't pull from the general fund.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> \$125,000 is based on what we're proposing the 55% of the overall. We would have figure out what the overall would be.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> What's that number? What's give us a total of.

Martha: 55% is \$119,350.

Terry Bittner: Martha didn't you take 55% of the \$219,000?

<u>Martha:</u> Yes

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> That was what was spent this year and it comes in under where they were at.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> Does the 217 maintain the services - does that maintain the full time <u>Trustee Likley:</u> That was 2009 operating expenses – that doesn't set aside money for future.

Martha: That is one half year of day time staffing

Terry Bittner: What is your current plan?

<u>Trustee Likely:</u> Have you hear of drop back and punt?

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> Obviously if you put 1.5 mill on it would be a renewal and you would actually get more dollars. Replacement Can you collect it immediately or wait until Jan. 2011.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> They could move it up and ask for expedited collection.

<u>Martha:</u> 1.5 mills would be \$109,177 at today's valuation and then you could the Gloria Glens and they add yourself.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> But that still wouldn't cover the cost of day time staffing for a full year <u>Martha:</u> The 217,000 was for just a half year.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> 6 months estimated plus 6 months \$89,831

<u>Martha</u>: That's Sue's paper, if you would look at this paper which the total came out the same actual expenses

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> That is what I was looking at was the actual expenses

Martha: That was Sue's and it matched mine

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> So it is safe to say that if we went through a 12 month period we're gonna end up approximately \$90,000 in salaries?

Martha: More or just together.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> What I'm saying is if we don't change anything, we keep the current department the way it is today and we run 12 months what's our salaries gonna be.

<u>Sue Ewers:</u> I estimated about \$96,500 but if you are going to up the day time staffing hours from 8 to 12 hours a day then you're up to about – close to \$115,000.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> What if you put together 6 months how much would that be without increasing the hours.

Pat Edington: \$96,500.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> So that has to be added to the 219 Martha?

Martha: No it wouldn't

<u>Bill Thorne</u>: So you have to added another \$46,000 basically. About \$265,000 total <u>Trustee Likley</u>: For the remainder of the year here in salaries for part-time staffing but the first part of the year was under a full time chief. Present operations for 2010 what would be the estimated cost of operation as is with part time staffing and a part time chief? We looked at 219 and change and 209 are we adding additional 46,000 in salaries to that number? So an additional 6,000 to the 219 of 2009 operations.

Martha: If we take this last column part-time chief, full time staffing

Trustee Likley: Which sheet are you on Martha so that we're all on the same page

<u>Martha:</u> If you take those numbers and take away the station, engine and squad and administration costs. You take the 127,612 and 55,000 is for a whole year for two part time staffing.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Is that in tune with what we have done thus far in 2009?

<u>Martha:</u> Yes

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> And that's at 2 staff 8 hours a day

Martha: Yep, that's right and Social Security and Medicare tax

Trustee Likley: \$55,000?

<u>Martha:</u> Yes. Then you take the runs that I calculated to have to come up with some type of estimation – I included the part time chief in that 35 and we want to use the 25,134 and then if we had a part time chief for a full year it's about 26,000. Using \$2,000 a month.

Trustee Likley: Does that include benefits?

Martha: Yes. So if you add all four of those together the 127,612+55,000+25,314+26,000 that came up to 233,746

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Does that make sense to you? What was number again Martha please <u>Martha:</u> 233,746

Mayor Horwedel: Take 55, 39, and 6 and see what we got

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The thing that people have to realize is that these numbers really for a long time were not evident to 99.9% of us for whatever reason. The operating expenses the funds available so we're thrashing at these numbers this isn't something that we have doing for a long time.

Mayor Dean: it was coming out of general fund

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> When the bills came in everybody paid them everybody was happy. I can't do that anymore.

<u>Unidentified speaker:</u> You don't want to be happy?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I do want to be happy. I'm a happy kind of guy

<u>Trustee Harris:</u> Bill, if we go through a renewal levy does Gloria Glens and Westfield Center vote on that?

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Not if you put it on as a district of the unincorporated. Right now if we put it on not as a district everybody votes on it. Well you would have to put it on that's another problem we have to deal with.

A lot of intermingled conversation – no sense talking about passing levy – Gloria Glens' levy

<u>Martha</u>: Right now if we would take that \$233,736 the township would have \$128,960 Village of Westfield would have \$91,150 and the Village of Gloria Glens \$14,024. Now these are round figures.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Depending on the level of soft billing that is generated we're again \$4,000 short this year. So I

Mayor Dean: That's better isn't it?

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> In reality though 2009 we paid \$26,000 over \$26,000 out of the general fund. Sooo does the math work? We created we generated – what was the number in 2009? Martha? 124? And is that what is anticipated for 2010?

Martha: I would say so

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Previous information that we received states that we had to supplement \$26,000 and change from general fund plus capital expenditures. Well one of the things that has to come into line is the 233,746 is the available resources, the township the village Gloria Glens. If we are willing to sit down open up the contract open up what we operate under communicate to the fire department and say guys 233,746 is the topped out number and that's with soft billing of all of our residents that we have done – that's your budget 233,746 and that's one of the things that we really haven't had that information up until 2008-2009. Budget came in and everybody says OK we can do that and paid the bills. We can't do that.

Bill Thorne: At 229 you still have to take from general fund

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Right. Essentially we gonna have to pull that down and if soft billing doesn't if soft billing doesn't does not generate the anticipated revenue half way to 1st quarter 2nd quarter 3rd quarter then some of that operating expenses will have to be pared out even more so as we go through the year

Mayor Horwedel: I do not know how much more we can offer from our end.

Trustee Likley: Well

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I mean we just gave up 20% of the percentage here to try to make this go and I think its right to do it but don't get me wrong but I would hope you could find to make this department viable. You might have to hit your general fund some and I'm not saying it's great but I've heard some of you say that public safety is your number one thing so

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> If they go to a district they can't

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I'm talking right now. I am talking with this budget here. We got to find what is solvent here. I think this full time day time thing works out really well but it ought to be expanded 6 to 6 to really make it viable

Mayor Dean: That's something we like too.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I think that is something everybody should realize that it's a valuable service to our residents to have people sitting there during those crucial day time hours to hit the ground running as soon as the alarm goes off that's a value to all of us. We just have to if my revenue stream source puts me at \$128,000 that's what I have to get. I can't get 129, 130, 140.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> Well, yes and no. We all know that you can hit your general fund if you have to.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We can't.

Mayor Horwedel: If you have to

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We can't. If I go to an unincorporated district though, I can't.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> I am talking today, I am talking this budget the budget we're working on this year, cause realistically nothing is going to change this year in the funding part of it what's coming in it's the only thing we got to work with this year.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Martha does this these numbers does this get us to the point and this is something for the department that is something we have talked about, council, fire committee, this board a commitment to the direction that we have our chief whether it's a I don't believe that a full time chief is feasible at this point because of the funding but does this get us to the point where we can designate a part time chief and take Mr. Carson out of the behind the eight ball as being the interim chief, whether it's Mike or somebody else does this give us the funding that we can pursue a part time position, hired part time chief.

Martha: \$26,000 if you can get somebody to work for that. That is \$2,000 a month

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> And that covers all the expenses that go along with a part time chief.

<u>Martha</u>: Depending on how many hours a part time you are going – whether you are going to have hospitalization, life insurance.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> \$2,000 a month \$24,000 you are saying 26 - \$2,000 covers the responsibility to pay the Medicare and

Martha: Medicare and Social Security at 7.65%

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> That covers all our expenses. So we have in the 2010 option that these numbers are sound may give us the direction as a possibility of going for a part time chief

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> The budget for the department 2009 was 261,503. The department operated in 2009 217,000 because of some of the changes and stuff so your comment was this is what they got to work with this is what they you know and they have done it already proved themselves. I have the confidence that they can do it.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The point of the budget being what 261?

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> That was with Jack's salary that was salaries other etc. But barring no catastrophe with major expenses on equipment, major building modifications so on so forth we are basically saying that we got \$233,000 to run our fire department. If we have a catastrophe whether is be some building modification or some major expense to a piece of equipment we both are going to have to go to our general fund.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> In that so if that's the case 2010 operating budget should be 233,746. Right, Ms. Evans?

Martha: Yes that is what you came up with

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Ms. Ewers, Fiscal Officer from the village does that sound reasonable in the numbers to operate the department in 2010.

<u>Sue Ewers:</u> Yes

Trustee Likley: All right

Martha: Part time staffing, part time chief, nothing set aside for capital expenditures

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> I have a question from one of our captains (too much laughing and chattering.)

<u>Unidentified speaker:</u> Part time staffing and part time chief does that include the clothing stipend or not

<u>Martha:</u> Ron, the \$25,134 that is included in that and I took kind of what we had this past year and added the 7.65% because Sue has had to do that since the last half of year and even when the individual are getting paid to train those also are subject to that 7.65% it's not just a hand over anymore.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> One of things that I would like to suggest is we got a bottom line number, we need to go back through and put these dollars in allocated in salaries, expenses, building expenses, training its whatever utilities I mean just we can track how these expenses are going.

<u>Martha:</u> I agree but we didn't know what was going to come out of this meeting. That can be done. Sue and I can look at that.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> And the benefit from that as I stated an hour ago that quarterly we look at these expenditures- 1st quarter, how are we doing in the percentage of the expenses to our revenue that is available, we can then say OK the 1st quarter we hit it hard 2nd quarter we have to curtail some of these expenses so that we may maintain the same budget that at the end of the year that we started with at the beginning with the revenue that was available at the township level. We that's our goal no matter how you look at it, the goal has to be that fire department operating expenses are within the operating – the revenue that is available to the township.

<u>Martha:</u> Now as I heard Likley say that Sue and I have talked about this and Mike this is gonna be one of your so called duties. We need to have run by run whether it is a township resident, non-resident and what they were billed. Sue gets the money but she does not have a clue.

<u>Sue:</u> I got one today for because I knew it was a township resident and I put it in our account

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> When you receive that funding is there a run number, is there any indication as to what that is from, is there a name?

Sue: There is a name

Mike Carson: There is a name and a run date

Martha: What we need to do is go back

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We pursued the soft billing of our residents I don't recall the date

<u>Martha</u>: I was July and we've only received one at 100% township resident now from June until the end of December there's got to be more township residents that were billed which would be at 100%. Sue has no

<u>Trustee Likley</u>: 100% of collection

<u>Martha:</u> Right. But Sue doesn't know and it is all going to the village to that PO Box. We got to divide someway on this revenue. I think that's going to help the township quite a bit but Sue doesn't know, I don't know so we're since June of last year you may want to go ahead and pull all of that information and then we can redo that

<u>Pat Edington:</u> In billing out is there a return – Mike? When billings go out is there a return on

<u>Terry Bittner:</u> It's a 3rd party billing

Pat Edington: So the collection agency doesn't know they are just sending money.

<u>Mrs. Likley:</u> I just have a question. Why doesn't all the money be put into one pot and then paid instead of you guys paying one, or we're paying one and Gloria Glens one.

Pat Edington & Mayor Horwedel: We are separate political entities

<u>Mrs. Likley:</u> Ya, I understand that but it's all for one fire department. Why couldn't it go the fire department money be put into one fund and collect interest and then its get paid

Pat Edington: You can't give another governmental entity

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> A contract could be paid up front but then we would have to decide who would hold it and who is going to do all the bill paying because

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> That is why 2 people are handling it all too I mean right now we have these 2 people who are doing all this.

Mrs. Likley: and Mayor Horwedel: in a discussion

Mayor Horwedel: But then you would have to pay somebody to deal with all that money

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> No you wouldn't. Either of the clerks who would be willing to do it by contract how you would set it up.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> That is in essence what you would have to do. You would take 39% of that amount and put it into an account.

<u>Bill Thorne:</u> Gloria Glens would do the same thing and the township would put their money in there and all the bills would come out of that through one of the fiscal officers.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> And one chief administrator

<u>Pat Edington:</u> That is budget not expenditures. We're not paying the bills we are just putting the budgetary money. Then we would have to kick up money if they don't spend.

Mrs. Likley: Could that be held over for the next year then?

<u>Trustee Likley</u>: One of the other things that we're assuming that we are assuming I thing it's safe to safe to say the village is looking at a \$91,152 bill to operate the fire department and you're happy with that for 2010

Mayor Horwedel: Sure

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> On the other hand it's an increase to the residents of Gloria Glens. I can't assume that instead of \$6,500 that I collected last year that I'm going to collect or that the fire department will have \$14,000.

Rick Robbs: 95

<u>Trustee Likley</u>: 95 ya, but the township

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> 9500 not 6500

<u>Trustee Likley</u>: the township's number of \$128,560 includes the revenue from Gloria Glens and soft billing to get 128, because my tax revenue only provides 85,000.

Mayor Horwedel: Well John what do you thinks' going to happen?

Mayor Dean: What do I think is going to happen?

Trustee Likley: Drop back and punt

Mayor Horwedel: Its not that much money

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> Actually I am. Either and sometimes it could be a savings to us too even if it is a little more cost, myself I have no problem having the taxpayer paying for services like fire and police protection presence. My village - I wish some of my council people would have come tonight because I have to back and disseminate this information and I might not do it all correctly but you know what you are talking about our levy

Our contract is about 9,500 something like that going to 12 something like that. We are accumulating that we can't use for anything except for every now and then we come to you or you come to use for a piece of equipment. I mean at some point we're sitting on 40 some thousand dollars revenue.

Pat Edington: So you are good for a while

TOO MUCH INTERMINGLED CHATTER

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> I like your idea what you said. I like the direction you are moving in I could be on board with going forth from here

Trustee Likley & Mayor Horwedel: For this year

Mayor Horwedel: Give us some breathing room to try to figure this thing out

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Like I stated earlier I don't want to be argumentative or decisive about that but this is where we're at as a result of where we've been at meetings like this. How do we keep moving forward year to year contract with you contract with you? You pay this portion we pay this portion. First option that we present takes all that away that puts an end to and we can discuss that later but we need to have the operating idea for 2010. If these numbers are sound give us the basis to move forward then I say we move forward for 2010 with the procedure or the plan to go with the part time chief an established part time chief but I still question my expenses for 2009. I had to supplement 26,000 without a part time chief with an interim chief that wasn't makin the money that a part time chief is going to need. I still had to supplement 26,000. The numbers don't jive here somewhere.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: If you can't go off then let's just stay with interim chief = I mean let's keep it as it is

<u>Trustee Likely:</u> But the problem with that is. It's not fair to Mike and it's not fair to the department to know the direction of the department

Mayor Horwedel: I'm just trying to get of it

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> This is a short meeting for us really

Pat Edington: You have to go back (Mayor Dean answered, yes) we have to talk, you have to talk

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> A little more on the budget for a part time chief is that realistically where we are at then?

Martha: You don't have to pay him 2,000 just because I put that in there.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I don't know that you can or not.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> Are we all in agreement that it's 233 or has that number changed

<u>Trustee Likely:</u> I have to defer to both entities fiscal officers to give us that direction that number for 2010 based on the operation of 2009 that \$233,746 is the operating budget for 2010 and does that

<u>Martha:</u> Sue and I will get back and I feel pretty comfortable with that don't you Sue? <u>Sue:</u> My only question is what about raises for the employees

Mike: No raises this year

<u>Bill Thorne</u>: You got a budget that means you work in that budget that means no raises no new equipment that's it

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> That's the hard line is that this budget is geared to maintain the service and the operation of the department for 2010. That doesn't set aside money for the squad in 2011 or the next vehicle replacement or a new SUV this is the funds that are available and if additional funding is needed required we'll have to look at what's available from the general fund and we always offer the opportunity to village to kick in additional funding. I'm never going to say no

Mayor Horwedel: We always do our share, we always do

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> That's not the question, Tom that's not really the question, the problem is this share, this share for a department that services everybody. Your share, our share, Gloria Glens share it services all of us. But ladies I'm not gonna say that the budget for 2010 for the fire department is 233 until I know that 233 is the number that fits the mark and that the townships revenue source is a sound at 128 because the 128 number has to be just as sound as the budget for this to go forward

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> You can't because you are basing that off of runs.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> I'm basing it off of soft billing

Rick Robbs: You're projecting

<u>Bill Thorne</u>: Like you said, we'll have to quarterly review what's coming in and if it's not there you will have – that's it. It's a budget

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> A budget is a projection

Pat Edington: Absolutely

Trustee Likley: If by the 2nd quarter we're leaning toward 15,000 deficit out of the

township, the 2nd half is gonna have to be trimmed.

Mayor Horwedel: Or you have to hit your general fund.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> Or you have to hit your general fund, but gentlemen and ladies please

understand. While you cutting steak I'm cutting bologna and that bologna used to be

all beef but it's not anymore

Mayor Horwedel: We have bent over every way that we can tonight to make this

happen and we're going to continue to and we want it to happen but we do have our

limits too and anything beyond a split based on the property values we certainly

cannot go further than that.

I think we have come a long ways just with the discussion and nobody came here tonight with that in mind.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The split in 2009 exceeded exceeded that that split.

<u>Mayor Horwedel:</u> Don't go there because that was always agreed on and you will just send right through the ceiling if you start talking about as if we are putting it to you because we're not that's the way it's been and for good reason. You can make an argument for that 75-25 just as easy as you can for the property values and that's why it was the way it was.

<u>Mayor Horwedel</u>: There's no sense arguing about it we're willing to go away from it and we can sit here and fight about the past but let's don't let's just.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> If we can come to an agreement on the budget can we then send Bill and Bill back to the contract? Because that's got to get righted.

Trustee Likley: Absolutely

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> We have come to an agreement that we are going away from the 75-25, 64-35, 50-50, and we are basing it on property values, we're get a number and then we gonna have Bill and Bill look at the contract and get this thing resolved and then he's gonna visit with his residents or his council (John Dean said Wed. evening the first Wed of the month) so basically and hopefully maybe we can all get back together and get this thing hammered out within 30 days.

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> I'll take comments from the audience now.

<u>Unidentified speaker</u>: This is just an observation, It seems to me that the township has a real need to sell the fire department and we need to start selling rescue responses, not the big fire truck that you see in the parade. Let's start selling what these guys can do, I think you're missing the boat. You need to get on this because sooner or later all this budget manipulation if gonna run out of steam. The end of the day you still have to sell the fire department. You have to learn how to do it.

Pat Edington: All entities have to gather for a good campaign.

A question about the levy, if it would be in May

<u>Trustee Oiler</u>: We've got to figure out, we got a few things to figure out first the way it's looking probably end up in November. I don't know if we can get everything decided that needs to be done between now and Feb. 18th.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> The important part in that determination is to the level of service, is it a full time chief, I mean those, if the village is adamant for a full time chief then we have to go our residents with an increased levy to pay for a full time chief.

Mayor Horwedel: We're pretty strong on that

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> So if that bumps that number up that we have to go to our residents our residents to approve that budget for.

<u>Rick Robbs:</u> You got to go to the residents for more money anyway you don't have enough money right now.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> We have to bump it up even more

<u>Mayor Dean:</u> We have to motivate these voters let's face it the last time you put this on the ballot there was horrible turn out.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> That was a special that was the only thing that was on there. That was terrible

Mayor Dean: I extremely disappointed. I don't know the answer either

<u>Unidentified speaker from the floor:</u> Why we can't I like this generalized fund idea. I mean whether we like it or not everybody here is in Westfield Township, Gloria Glens is in Westfield Township, the center is in Westfield Township we all use the same fire department and we should have one centralized fund OK? Gloria Glens should pay their 6 come up with your budget figure whatever it is, Gloria Glens pays their 6%, center pays their 39% township pays their 55. Whoever can't make their percentage it's

up to their entity to figure out a way to make it up. If Westfield Center can't make their 39% well they got to figure out a way to make their 30, township can't make their 55 then we got to get something on the levy. That's all there is. There should be one central administrator for this thing instead of people piecing everything is nuts. You should have one overseer or one administrator to oversee this and levy this stuff, pay bills watch the budget.

<u>Trustee Likley:</u> That's what a joint district can do.

Does the fire committee do that?

Bill Thorne: They just make recommendations they do have control

<u>Trustee Oiler:</u> No further business - meeting adjourned.

Approved March 1, 2010