

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

Patricia G. Geissman called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. with Stephen D. Hambley and Sharon A. Ray present.

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance and a prayer.

Mrs. Geissman requested that the minutes of December 1 and December 11 be reviewed at the Monday, December 22, 2008 meeting.

Scott Miller, Finance Director, presented and reviewed the following resolutions: (1) amending the 2008 Appropriations Resolution by transferring appropriations; (2) amending the annual appropriation resolution; (3) transferring County General Funds to the County Diversion Program; (4) authorizing the County Auditor to transfer funds from the General Fund and the Child Support Enforcement Agency Fund for Title IV-D Domestic Relations Court Magistrate and Prosecutor's services; (5) authorizing the County Auditor to transfer funds from various County department accounts to the Gasoline Rotary Fund; (6) cash transfer for the Community Center Parking Fund; (7) revenue adjustments for the sale of surplus County property; (8) entering into an agreement with Mirifex, LLC for Medina County network backbone support services; (9) authorizing the County Auditor to transfer funds from the County General Fund (0010) to the Child Services Fund (0055) for the respite of foster parents; and (10) authorizing a new cellular telephone service agreement. Mr. Miller requested payment of the weekly bills in the amount of \$1,486,067.01. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the ten finance resolutions and payment of the weekly bills; the motion was seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll call vote showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Gary Berkowitz, Human Resources Director, presented and reviewed the following resolutions: (1) approving personnel changes for the employees under the jurisdiction of the Medina County Commissioners; (2) approving personnel changes for employees of the Sanitary Engineer's Department; (3) approving personnel changes for employees of the Sanitary Engineer's Department; (4) approving rate increases in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement between the Ohio Association of Public School Employees (OAPSE), AFL/CIO Local 340, and the Medina County Transit Department; (5) approving wage increases for employees of the Medina County Child Support Enforcement Agency; (6) approving rate changes in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement between members of Teamsters Local 293 and Medina County Job and Family Services; and (7) approving rate changes for the employees of the Medina County Maintenance Department through their collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the seven resolutions; the motion was seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll call vote showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Charles Huber, Building Official, reported that there were 17 new housing starts in November 2008, continuing a three-year downward trend dating back to 2005. Comparing November 2008 to November 2007, revenues collected by the Building Department are down 28.88%. Comparing 2008 and 2007 data year-to-date through the end of November, revenues collected are down 18.24%. Brunswick Hills Township and Montville Township both had 20 residential permits during November. Montville Township leads with 435 permits year-to-date, followed by Brunswick Hills Township with 383. Brunswick Hills Township also leads with 5 commercial permits issued in November. The City of Wadsworth leads with 32 commercial permits year-to-date, followed by Brunswick Hills Township with 19 permits. Commercial permits included a new First National Bank of Seville for \$500,000 and 5 apartment building totaling 32 new dwelling units at \$1.6 million estimated construction costs.

Mr. Huber continued that last Friday, the State of Ohio Board of Building Standards made their decision regarding amending the Residential Code of Ohio (regulating one-, two- and three-family residential construction). The 2005 edition of the National Electric Code will be replaced with the 2008 edition. One portion contains a greater requirement for a safety device known as an arc fault circuit interrupter. They also amended approving the replacement of the 2003 edition of the International Energy Conservation

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

Code with the 2006 edition and provided the public with a different compliance methodology, an Ohio-authored compliance alternative. The new law takes effect January 1, 2009. All building permit applications on and after that date will need to comply with the new requirements. Mrs. Geissman questioned the short notification. Mr. Huber answered that even though there was less than a month notification of the effective date, the issues were studied since February 2008 by the Board of Building Standards and the State of Ohio's Residential Construction Advisory Committee. Various stakeholders, including the Ohio Homebuilders Association, knew that the changes would likely be taking place on January 1, 2009. Mrs. Geissman said that the new laws make homes safer and will save lives.

The meeting was opened for public comment. No one wished to speak.

Mrs. Geissman noted that an Executive Session was requested at 9:50 a.m. for the purpose of discussing pending litigation followed by the Discussion Session. Executive Sessions were also requested at 11:30 and 1:30 for the purpose of personnel/appointment. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the Executive Sessions and Ms. Ray seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Roll call vote showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

The meeting recessed at 9:45 a.m.

Executive Session

At 9:50, the Commissioners reconvened the meeting to go into the Executive Session to discuss pending litigation that had been voted on earlier.

The meeting recessed at 10:30 a.m.

Discussion Session

At 11:00, the Commissioners reconvened the meeting to go into the Discussion Session.

One Drug Enforcement Agency

Mrs. Geissman distributed copies of the work they've done to try to get all three of the cities under one drug enforcement agency. She noted that in late spring/early summer, there were discussions regarding the "splintering" of the Drug Task Force with the second request from Medina to obtain a \$20,000 grant for drug enforcement. The discussion was that this wasn't the intention and that talks with the cities should be arranged to see what could be done to have one drug enforcement agency. Brian Nowak, Chris Jakab, she, and some of the Operating Board members met with MEDWAY and the cities a couple of times. There were three options offered: (1) MEDWAY completely; (2) Drug Task Force completely; or (3) through the Sheriff's Office completely. In meetings with the three cities, it was very clear that there was not a desire to use the Sheriff; the main reason was that the sheriff changes due to elections and there wasn't a comfortable feeling about this option. Regarding MEDWAY, there appeared to be a consensus that MEDWAY was probably not the answer since it's a levy that is generated in Medina County and that the tax dollars should stay in the County. There were no serious complaints from any of the three cities to put it under the Medina County Drug Task Force and they (Brian Nowak, Chris Jakab, Mike Barnhardt, and she) were asked to put together a proposal, using the information that had been provided during the meetings. She will be presenting the proposal, provided to the other commissioners a little over a week ago, this afternoon.

Mrs. Geissman noted that she had received correspondence from Steve Hambley that he wasn't in support of the proposal and that he had problems with the figures. Mr. Hambley stated that the figures are incomplete and not comprehensive. The Sheriff had operations by the hotels and at the truck stop; the Drug Task Force hasn't been involved with that. He felt that the consensus had been mischaracterized; he was told that there was not a consensus that MEDWAY wouldn't work. MEDWAY is working fine from Brunswick's perspective and also from Wadsworth's perspective. Mrs. Geissman said that they were told

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

that. Mr. Hambley noted that they are not supportive of changing the arrangement. There are a number of issues. He spoke with the chairman of the Operating Board (Brunswick Chief of Police Deforest) and he indicated that the Operating Board is also not supportive. Chief Osecki, the former chairman of the Operating Board, isn't supportive of it. Mrs. Geissman said that the information was not given to them. Mr. Hambley stated that while they haven't seen the proposal; they've been part of the discussions in several meetings. The three police chiefs of the cities are in favor of keeping everything the same because it provides flexibility. It was taken to the voters. The Drug Task Force and MEDWAY have certain ways of operating. Putting everything under one agency, although it gives the appearance of efficiency, does not measure the efficiency of drug enforcement. Drug enforcement has a potential corruptive nature; therefore, you shouldn't want just one agency. The best mechanism is to have the police chiefs when MEDWAY is appropriate for the situation and the Drug Task Force agents when that is appropriate. The Sheriff, instead of using the Drug Task Force, decided to use his own people. It should be left to law enforcement personnel and the Operating Board to determine the best way to address matters. The voters have been very clear when the matter went to the ballot. It was for drug enforcement purposes and other related services. The proposal would diminish law enforcement's ability in this county.

Mrs. Geissman said that she didn't feel that this was the case. At the very beginning when the levy was passed, it was Mr. Hambley's recommendation to put it under one "umbrella". Mr. Hambley said it wasn't and that Mrs. Geissman wasn't involved in passing the issue. Mrs. Geissman agreed and said that she stays away from levy issues. Mr. Hambley said that it was the commissioners' levy; if it wasn't in place, there would be additional costs at the community and county levels for drug enforcement. It was passed years ago and he supports it; the people who helped to pass the levy and the voters are the stakeholders in it. Mrs. Geissman said just a few months ago that Mr. Hambley was supportive of trying to put it under one "umbrella"; Mr. Hambley stated that he was not. Mrs. Geissman said that something had to be done because they were getting away from the intention of the levy and the programs under it. Mr. Hambley said that Mrs. Geissman wasn't involved with the levy and wouldn't know. Mrs. Geissman said she knows because other people and groups were requesting funds, which bothered Mr. Hambley and started the entire thing. Mr. Hambley said that wasn't true and that the records did not show that. He had never made a commitment that there should be a change. Two years ago when MCDAC prepared a strategic plan, it was felt that the agencies were being used wisely and that they were communicating as best as possible – he had always asked for that. To look at the efficiency of law enforcement, more comprehensive numbers need to be used, not just one year. There are other local resources being used for law enforcement purposes. The Drug Task Force is not the same thing as MEDWAY.

Mrs. Geissman said that under one "umbrella", each city can be exactly what they want to be because the Operating Board is the one that has the authority to do whatever each city wants. This is because the chiefs are sitting on the Operating Board are the ones in charge. They can make it be whatever it needs to be. Mr. Hambley noted that the Drug Task Force is under the COG. There's an Operating Board that's part of the contract that provides for the operational oversight and direction of law enforcement. When it comes to the civilian control, those decisions are made by COG. He had told Mrs. Geissman at the time when the proposal came up that it needed to be taken to COG. Mrs. Geissman had requested an Executive Session with commissioners; he said it wasn't appropriate because it wasn't their Drug Task Force. The COG involves all of the communities. Brunswick has a commitment with the commissioners to receive dollars. If they don't receive the dollars, they have a tax (a continuing levy) that they would enact and they would no longer support the MCDAC levy because they would no longer be honoring the promise. Brunswick has no intention of leaving MEDWAY. Mrs. Geissman said Brunswick hasn't told them that and it was Brunswick who asked them to bring forth a proposal. Mr. Hambley said they want something in writing.

Mr. Hambley continued that the proposal is coming from Mrs. Geissman, not the commissioners. Mrs. Geissman said that she was working on behalf of the Board of Commissioners and she had a verbal commitment from the Board and there was discussion that she would work with the cities to see what

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

could be done about getting it under one “umbrella”. She felt that this needed to be done for efficiency - \$86,000 could be saved. It’s costing Brunswick and Wadsworth \$200 per man-hour to have MEDWAY services. The committee felt that they could do a better job at \$50 per man-hour. Mr. Hambley asked if she could show minutes and who participated in the evaluation. Mrs. Geissman said that she could tell him who participated – Brian Nowak, Chris Jakab, Chief Osecki, and MEDWAY. Mr. Hambley stated that the COG wasn’t involved nor was the Operating Board in its entirety. She said she recalled that the person involved had gone back to the Operating Board to tell them what they were trying to do. Mr. Hambley said they were aware she was working on it, but it’s not the same thing as consensus or granting permission. Mrs. Geissman said there wasn’t a proposal.

Mr. Hambley noted that the analysis is flawed. The Sheriff’s Department wasn’t looked at or other law enforcement entities. Mrs. Geissman said that those funds are entirely different. Mr. Hambley said that cost of man-hours is not a measure of efficiency; it’s just a measure of costs per man-hour. The effectiveness of the law enforcement agency must be determined; police chiefs understand that. Mrs. Geissman can meet with them as a commissioner, but she can’t use his name. He cannot “buy into” the proposal.

Mrs. Geissman said that she’s been working for several months thinking that she’s been representing the Board to try to gather information and put together a proposal. Mr. Hambley asked when she had communicated with him any of the aspects of the meetings or when meetings were being held. Mrs. Geissman said that she hadn’t until he was given a copy of the proposal. She stated that she met twice with the cities, twice with MEDWAY, and several times with the committee. They finally have something to put on paper and that was what she was bringing to the other two commissioners to review. They were asked to give a proposal. They heard from Brunswick and Wadsworth that they have the best of both worlds. However, both of the cities were shocked to find out the few hours that were really spent by MEDWAY in their communities.

Mr. Hambley said that the hours are for only one year. Law enforcement activity, and the way that the subscription service with MEDWAY works is multi-year and permanent. Some years, there is less activity; some years, there is more activity. Mrs. Geissman said that it was activity in both MEDWAY and the Drug Task Force. Mr. Hambley said that was only one year as opposed to multiple years of measurement to see the law enforcement activity and how it was utilized. The communities and police chiefs will need to weigh in on this before he can support it.

Mrs. Geissman said this was a very good analysis and she was pleased with the analysis. She thought that one year was enough to give a good analysis and so did everyone else. She asked Chris Jakab and Brian Nowak for their thoughts and what they felt about the analysis.

Chris Jakab said that the information they could get was what was used. He didn’t think that it would be variously skewed from year to year. Mrs. Geissman agreed. Mr. Jakab said that it’s difficult to get stats from the two groups. They were able to obtain 12 months of operating data and that was used.

Ms. Ray stated that Mrs. Geissman put a lot of time into the proposal and that she should put her name on it and follow through by presenting the proposal. Brunswick and Wadsworth will then give their thoughts. Mr. Hambley said the proposal shouldn’t come from the “Board of Commissioners”. Mrs. Geissman said that is who she is representing. Mr. Hambley said that it wasn’t with his vote and his vote is that it cannot say that the proposal is from the Board of Commissioners. He didn’t authorize her to develop the proposal and it wasn’t shared with him prior to last week. Mrs. Geissman said that she shared it with him as soon as the proposal was prepared. Mr. Hambley noted that the numbers weren’t shared; in fact, Mrs. Geissman had said that some other numbers were available and would be used. No original drafts were shared. The only way he knew that she was working on it was that he had seen her campaign literature. Mrs. Geissman said that he knew she was working on it because she would never have invited the cities to work on it if she didn’t have the consensus of the Board, especially him because he “likes to pick

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

things apart". She was doing it, feeling that she had the support of both of the other commissioners after discussions that people around the table were part of. It was definite since she was the liaison to MCDAC and she would see what could be done about getting the people under one umbrella because more people would be coming in asking to splinter off and they would never be able to afford to have a drug task force if everyone wanted their own money.

Mr. Hambley said that he never proposed that. Mrs. Geissman said that he bought into it because she would never have done this. She has told everyone that she represented the Board of Commissioners in trying to get the information together. That was her belief from conversation at this table. Mr. Hambley said that if she could show him conversation at the table when he gave that information, that's fine but he doesn't recall that being the case. Mrs. Geissman said that everyone had good memories of it; Mr. Hambley said he also had a good memory and it would be a matter of record. If the record showed him wrong he would apologize. It still doesn't change his viewpoint that it is a flawed analysis and he isn't supportive of this. It doesn't make sense based on what he knows about the law enforcement activities and from working with the various police chiefs. He will be interested in hearing, more formally, what the Operating Board has to say about this.

Mr. Nowak asked Mr. Hambley if he believed that they couldn't have one county-wide drug task force and that two task forces are needed. Mr. Hambley stated that he believed that the current situation works very well for the County given that the law enforcement community uses different approaches. Brunswick and Wadsworth have benefited from having MEDWAY and we had hoped, over the period of time, that the Drug Task Force, likewise, would be a resource. He has said consistently that the County doesn't need less law enforcement; we need more law enforcement when it comes to drug interdiction. Education and treatment are important. It was the intent of the levy that drug enforcement is absolutely essential and this was the way to fund it. When the Sheriff does drug enforcement, he has legal authority to do that. If he doesn't involve the Drug Task Force, that's his option. He is using general fund dollars to do that. We have a drug task force that could do the same thing, but didn't. Do we challenge that and say to the sheriff that he can't do that? No. We have the capability in our county to allow the law enforcement officials to use the resources provided to them. If the proposal is brought up before the next ballot issue, that's fine. But he has explained it to the public and to the press, as did Dean Holman and the Drug Task Force people and Brunswick and Wadsworth people, and it would be reneging on what was told to the voters on how it was going to work. Mrs. Geissman said that she didn't think the voters would mind at all if they were going to be saved \$86,000 and it made something more efficient. Mr. Hambley said that it could all be trashed, but they will end up with a drug problem. Mrs. Geissman said that no one is suggesting getting rid of the Drug Task Force. Mr. Hambley said that there would be a reduction of tools that are available to Brunswick and Wadsworth; Mrs. Geissman said there would be no reduction of tools. Mr. Hambley said that there would be a reduction if there is no MEDWAY because there would be only the Drug Task Force. Mrs. Geissman said that the Drug Task Force can be whatever they want it to be. Mr. Hambley said it's a different means of operation; they don't have the same comfort level or interest.

Mr. Jakab said that the bigger issue is why Wadsworth and Brunswick are getting duplicate services. Mr. Hambley said that they are not duplicate services. It's like saying the Highway Patrol and the Sheriff are duplicate services. Mr. Jakab said that they receive duplicate services from both groups in some cases. The issue is why are we funding the Drug Task Force to go into areas that are the jurisdiction of MEDWAY? Maybe that's the answer – maybe you pull the Drug Task Force out of Brunswick and Wadsworth; however, they've chosen their provider.

Ms. Ray said that this is the first time that she's seen the agent activity report. They had one investigation, seven cases, and four prosecutions in Medina City. Mr. Hambley said that at one point in time, Medina City had a lot of drug cases. Over the years, the character of complaints has changed. Mrs. Geissman said that at one time, there was a lot of conflict with the former director and Medina City. The Task Force doesn't go into the City unless they're asked because the City has two full-time officers taking care of

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

drug activity. Mr. Hambley said that was his point – every community can control their own. Civilian control is still important in any kind of law enforcement activity. The local law enforcement has civilian control over it – it's not just a police chief. There is the mayor, the council, and the voters and it's up to them to determine the level of required enforcement activity. Having that flexibility is very important to Brunswick and Wadsworth – that's what was told to the voters in 2006. At times, they've operated differently. MEDWAY has different agents coming from different communities. The Drug Task Force is using the same agents they've been using the last several years so it's hard to do a drug buy when you're recognized. They have different strengths and different ways of enforcement – that's why you leave it up to the Operating Board and the police chiefs to determine what works best. If the proposal was coming from the Operating Board, then Mr. Hambley said he would consider it. But it's being driven by getting rid of one entity and being more efficient – you can't measure law enforcement efficiency just by man-hours.

Mrs. Geissman said that she knows that the prosecutor and sheriff are in favor of this – they will both be attending the meeting that day to support it. The prosecutor goes to the Operating Board meetings and there have been several people from the Operating Board that have not indicated in any way that they would be against this.

Ms. Ray said that she's amazed by the report of how many hours the Drug Task Force spends in Brunswick City. Overwhelmingly, the majority of their time is in Brunswick. She's surprised that Medina and Wadsworth don't have an objection. Mrs. Geissman said that Brunswick asked for a proposal because they were shocked to find out that eleven weeks were charged at \$100,000. Mr. Hambley said that that is one year; they've had more activity than that. That's the problem with the report. Mrs. Geissman said that it's one year of activity and it's fair because it's on both MEDWAY and the Drug Task Force. The line has to be drawn somewhere and one year was a good time period. It was very difficult to even get those numbers. Mr. Hambley said that some cases take more than a year to do the undercover work. Using only one year doesn't look at the bigger, longer term picture. Mr. Jakab said they could look back to try to get other annual records; it was difficult to get any information. Mrs. Geissman said that it appears that MEDWAY isn't even accountable to the cities that they operate in. Mr. Hambley said that the cities of Brunswick and Wadsworth don't feel that way or they would have been the first ones to want to do something differently. This is a council of governments that they belong to and, for Brunswick, predates the MCDAC levy and the Drug Task Force.

Mr. Jakab reminded that at one time, the entire county belonged to MEDWAY before the MCDAC levy. Part of the problem is that the chiefs have been reluctant to say exactly or strongly how they feel in the meetings. Brunswick and Wadsworth hasn't clearly communicated to Brian Nowak and Pat Geissman to indicate that they would have any major concerns. They said they were willing to listen. Chief Deforest never said he was opposed to the idea of investigating it. Brian Nowak stated that neither of the chiefs even spoke to the issue that MEDWAY and the Task Force operates differently. Mr. Jakab said that, in some respects, this process has been where communication hasn't been strong enough about feelings. They've certainly been prodded to express their opinions. Dennis has been fairly clear about some issues that he's had, but he's the only one who's made his concerns known. Mrs. Geissman said that they have met in private, giving them the opportunity to speak without going public and there have been no negative comments regarding trying a two-year proposal.

Mr. Hambley noted that they can't leave MEDWAY and return in two years; that's not the contract. They have a property tax that's collected; they would just oppose the MCDAC levy the next time it's presented on the ballot. Mr. Hambley said that he started in 1996 because the MCDAC issue failed. In 1997, he met with the mayors of Brunswick, Medina and Wadsworth to try to find out why it failed. One of the biggest issues Wadsworth had was that they didn't get any money for MEDWAY; they weren't interested in the Drug Task Force. Mrs. Geissman noted that there also was a terrible personality conflict. Mr. Hambley continued that there were concerns about how it was operated at that time, there were too many people,

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

and we were paying too much. Those issues were resolved in the first year. Over the period of time, the issues were addressed and the levy has passed. So the question is – what is the crisis? The two entities still need to work better together, but getting rid of MEDWAY isn't the answer and Brunswick and Wadsworth won't be sold on it.

Mrs. Geissman said that she will go forward with this afternoon's meeting and that Sharon feels that a proposal should be given to see the reaction. Sharon has spoken with the mayor of Wadsworth and the sheriff. Sharon Ray said that when she spoke with the mayor and the service director in the City of Wadsworth, they privately expressed some hesitation to her. She told them that they needed to be very forthcoming. Mrs. Geissman said that they've met with them twice and they've not indicated that they wouldn't support going under one umbrella with one of the agencies. Mr. Hambley asked that Mrs. Geissman communicate that he's not in favor of the proposal. Mrs. Geissman said that it was his concerns that brought up the entire issue; Mr. Hambley said it was not. Mrs. Geissman said that Mr. Hambley was very concerned about Medina getting the \$20,000 and who else would want money. Mr. Hambley said that what he was concerned about was Medina coming in with a separate law enforcement; that didn't mean to get rid of MEDWAY. Mrs. Geissman said the goal was to give them three options. Mr. Hambley stated that the options were never discussed with him. He stated that Mrs. Geissman had come to him saying that Osecki had expressed concerns about it's operation and his expenditures and he told her that it needed to go to the Council of Governments and that it wasn't for the Board of Commissioners.

Parking Garage

Mr. Jakab reported that the bid opening for cost proposals was held on Friday at 10:30 a.m. The Evaluation Committee evaluated the design and some of the other technical components and the proposals were scored. He showed large versions of what the three firms (Donnelly, Thomarios, Ruhlin) thought that the parking garage would look like. Mr. Jakab said that the committee chose Ruhlin. Medina City will vote on the contract next Monday then, per the joint agreement, the commissioners will ratify the contract. Mrs. Geissman said that she feels that Medina should hold a public hearing should be held so the public can see the drawings. Mr. Jakab noted that once the contract is awarded, the project will move forward.

Mrs. Geissman expressed concern that the buildings wouldn't fit in with the historic feel of the city and that she was envisioning seeing something like the parking decks in other counties that you couldn't tell what they are because they're enclosed. Mr. Jakab noted that the final drawing will likely look different since this is a rough architectural rendering. When they work with the city on the final design, we should see some evolution. The architects live in the County and are sensitive to the surrounding area.

Your Medina County

Mr. Hambley questioned if Mrs. Geissman's late taping would affect his taping. Mrs. Geissman said that she asked for hers to run a little longer, in conjunction with Mr. Hambley's anticipated taping. She had tried to tape before Thanksgiving, but was having problems with her voice.

At 10:48 a.m., Commissioners recessed to immediately go into the Executive Sessions that were voted on earlier for the purpose of discussing personnel/appointment.

There was a motion by Mr. Hambley and a second by Ms. Ray to adjourn the meeting at 2:17 p.m. There was no discussion. Roll call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED 12/15/08:

<u>Number</u>	<u>Resolution Title</u>
---------------	-------------------------

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

- 08-1117 RESOLUTION TO ALLOW CLAIMS AND AUTHORIZE ISSUANCE UPON THE TREASURER IN SETTLEMENT OF SUCH LIST OF CLAIMS
- 08-1118 RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2008 APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION BY TRANSFERRING APPROPRIATIONS
- 08-1119 RESOLUTION AMENDING THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION
- 08-1120 TRANSFER OF COUNTY GENERAL FUNDS TO THE COUNTY DIVERSION PROGRAM
- 08-1121 AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE GENERAL FUND AND THE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FUND FOR TITLE IV-D DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT MAGISTRATE AND PROSECUTOR'S SERVICES
- 08-1122 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS TO THE GASOLINE ROTARY FUND
- 08-1123 CASH TRANSFER FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER PARKING FUND
- 08-1124 REVENUE ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE SALE OF SURPLUS COUNTY PROPERTY
- 08-1125 RESOLUTION ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH MIRIFEX, LLC FOR MEDINA COUNTY NETWORK BACKBONE SUPPORT SERVICES
- 08-1126 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE COUNTY GENERAL FUND (0010) TO THE CHILDREN SERVICES FUND (0055) FOR THE RESPITE OF FOSTER PARENTS
- 08-1127 AUTHORIZING A NEW CELLULAR TELEPHONE SERVICE AGREEMENT
- 08-1128 RESOLUTION APPROVING PERSONNEL CHANGES FOR THE EMPLOYEES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE MEDINA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
- 08-1129 RESOLUTION APPROVING PERSONNEL CHANGES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE SANITARY ENGINEERS DEPARTMENT
- 08-1130 RESOLUTION APPROVING PERSONNEL CHANGES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE SANITARY ENGINEERS DEPARTMENT
- 08-1131 RESOLUTION APPROVING RATE INCREASES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE OAOPSE AFL.CIO, LOCAL 340 AND THE MEDINA COUNTY TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
- 08-1132 RESOLUTION APPROVING WAGE INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE MEDINA COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
- 08-1133 RESOLUTION APPROVING RATE CHANGES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN MEMBERS OF TEAMSTERS LOCAL 293 AND MEDINA COUNTY JOB AND FAMILY SERVICES
- 08-1134 RESOLUTION APPROVING RATE CHANGES FOR THE EMPLOYEES OF THE MEDINA COUNTY MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT THROUGH THEIR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

All deliberations concerning official business and formal actions by this Board of Commissioners were conducted in an open public meeting this fifteenth day of December 2008.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy Folk, Assistant Clerk

COMMISSIONERS

Patricia G. Geissman

OF

Stephen D. Hambley

MEDINA COUNTY

Sharon A. Ray