

## **CITY COUNCIL MEETING – MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2011**

The Council of the City of Zanesville met in regular session at 7:00 p.m., Monday, February 28, 2011 in the City Council Chambers, 401 Market Street, Zanesville, Ohio.

Mr. Vincent led those present in the Lord's Prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The following members of Council answered Roll Call: Mr. Hutcheson, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Tilton, Mr. Zakany, Mr. Baker, Mr. Tarbert, Mrs. Gentry, Mrs. Norman, Mr. Kilpatrick, and Mr. Vincent.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Zakany moved to accept the minutes as printed, seconded by Mr. Tilton. Motion Carried

### **COMMUNICATIONS, REPORTS, AND RESOLUTIONS**

None.

### **PROPOSED ORDINANCES**

Ordinance No. 11-17 – Introduced by Council – Authorizing the proper City official to advertise for bids and enter into contract for purchase of various insurances, and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Zakany moved to waive the three readings, seconded by Mr. Tarbert.

R. C. to waive  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

Mr. Tilton moved for passage, seconded by Mrs. Norman.

Mr. Kilpatrick: Mr. Raines, will these insurance packages be put out to bid?

Mr. Raines: Yes.

Mr. Kilpatrick: About how much will the total premium for all of this coverage?

Mr. Raines: In the contracts signed in 2010 were about \$245,000 per year.

Mr. Roberts: Just for clarification, with the one, two, or three year period are we looking to get the best rate?

Mr. Raines: Yes, and anyone would have the option to bid.

Mr. Roberts: Just gives them a little more adjustment room for the best needs.

Mr. Zakany: Our self insurance money that we had set aside, what kind of money does that save us?

Mr. Raines: Self insurance is on the health insurance, this is for something different.

Mr. Zakany: This is liability?

Mr. Raines: Yes

R. C. for passage  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 11-18 - Introduced by Council – Establishing pay ranges, terms, and conditions of employment, and personnel policies for the Police Secretaries and Records Clerks' bargaining unit represented by the Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Roberts moved for first reading, seconded by Mr. Tarbert

Mr. Raines: I just wanted to point out that the deadline is 30 days after this is presented to Council. If you are going to reject this it has to be rejected within 30 days.

Mr. Tilton: The one we voted down last meeting is where?

Mr. Raines: The union is contending and I am waiting for a letter from them. I think they are correct that the objection occurred on the 35<sup>th</sup> day after it was recommended to you, therefore it is in effect. I asked for a letter from them to give to the law director.

Mr. Roberts moved to waive the three readings, seconded by Mr. Tarbert.

Mr. Hutcheson: Why wasn't this ordinance presented back in January?

Mr. Raines: Because we did not reach an agreement until a couple of weeks ago.

R. C. to waive  
8 Ayes – 1 Nay Mr. Hutcheson  
Motion carried.

Mr. Tarbert moved for passage, seconded by Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts: You put on the bottom that this was negotiated prior to us turning down the last one. Then we received an email from Mr. Downes right after we voted down the Police Captains stating that we should make every attempt to keep these contracts as short term as possible with the pending litigation in the Ohio Senate right now, so my thoughts would be to try and get a year or something temporary in place.

Mr. Vincent: I think a July date was recommended. I think that answers some of Council's concerns about where we will be a year from now and one year contracts can make that more comfortable.

Petition from Randy Case, 916 Vine Street

Mr. Case: Mr. Roberts basically touched on some one of the main things which I brought up when the last union contract came up. Is the need for doing these contracts as a one year contract and my concern isn't about what is going on in Columbus with the state bill or whatever it is called. My concern is more of the budget issues we have had the last two years and tying up the next administration and the next Council's hands with three year contracts with no forecasted budget ahead of time. My other concern is as looking at this is after the budget committee meetings and budget hearings talking of furloughs all through the end of last year, I was shocked to see that there are three percent raises on here. I don't understand how the City can talk about furloughs and at the same time they are negotiating contracts with raises in them. It is mindboggling.

Mr. Kilpatrick: Just to follow up on what Mr. Case said including the three percent raise and including the step increases, five of these seven employees covered by this proposed contract would be getting pay increases of over six percent total. I have to agree with Mr. Case, I think now that the financial difficulties that have, we need to decide the time for pay increases still in front of us or are the behind us. I think they are behind us for a while, given the revenue situation for the City.

Mr. Hillis: Simply as a courtesy and response to Mr. Cases' concern and Mr. Kilpatrick's concern, I understand the position of Council and the position of members of the public about the fact there was a three percent raise in this contract, I would point out that we are talking about a bargaining unit of eight people. I feel comfortable if the eight members wanted to take this to arbitration I think the City would have a hard time explaining how 300 other City employees in 2011 got a four percent raise and these eight employees were not entitled to a three percent raise.

Mr. Roberts: I understand what you are saying, but this falls into the same gap that we always talk about where do we begin?

Mr. Hillis: I agree it is time to begin, but everyone has to begin in the same year.

Mr. Roberts: If we keep letting people fall into this gap then we are never going to ascertain that time when we stop giving raises to people. We are just going to keep on going and going. We have the contracts for the “Big Three” coming up this year. I understand what you are saying this is only eight people and that is what we said about the captains and that was only three people, but that is going to give the “Big Three” a little more leverage to use against us when they are negotiating with us.

Mr. Hillis: I certainly would agree if this was a three year contract that provided raises for three years, but this was specifically drafted so that the only raise was for 2011 and that is one percent less than every other City employee received. I think certainly if a contract was put in front of you that was three percent in 2011, seven percent in 2012, seven percent in 2013, yes make me negotiating with the other unions, would have a hard time looking them in the face and say no you do not get raises in the future, but these eight people do. That is not the case. What we have is the opposite and my opinion was based on what has happen to this particular group of eight in the past in regards to their step increases going into their past history they have gone a couple of years and lost out compared to other secretaries throughout the City. Now to again not give them a raise as the other secretaries in the City received. I think you would have a hard time explaining to an arbitrator – yes it is fair that three hundred other people get a raise, but these eight do not. My fear is that everyone else in the City got four percent and these eight will get three percent. I thought that was a good deal. That is my position.

Mr. Roberts: If we left it like that and got them down to a one year contract.

Mr. Hillis: We talked about a one year contract, but if you notice and take a look at the contract, it is a three year contract, but all financial provisions are “me too” clauses. Anything financial that we negotiate with the police union is going to carry over to this group of eight. So if we are successful with the other unions in making cuts in 2012, 2013, and 2014 whatever we accomplish with the other unions will be imposed on this union.

Mr. Kilpatrick: Do we have any more of these small employee groups coming up for renewal before the “Big Three”?

Mr. Hillis: No, this is the last one we have before the “Big Three”. There was some discussion with the administration, I see how this has developed over the years and personally I agree it makes more sense to have them all on the same page, I know it means more work in the negotiation year, I am not in favor of going to the point of having all the negotiations on an annual basis. Not only do I not want that, but the administration does not want that and the unions do not want that. I certainly think it makes sense to have them all in the same time period so that we are all looking at the same raises, every time we negotiate, so they cannot play each other off. That is why this one only had a raise in one year and “me too” causes in the next two, so we do not have to be playing this game of “this union got this, so we want it”. I have no objection if our union contracts were for the same time periods.

Mr. Tarbert: I understand that the raise is percent this year and “me too”, but are some additional terms in these contracts that carry across the full three years that also cost us money, correct?

Mr. Hillis: Yes

Mr. Tarbert: And one of those things that we would be locked into low insurance payments. We are not locked into those?

Mr. Hillis: My understanding is the insurance provisions are in the benefits and we tied them into the “me too”.

Mr. Raines: The language says that concurrence, if the police officers negotiate a concession on insurance that would apply to this one as well. If they received better insurance that would apply also.

Mr. Hutcheson: Dale, did you state earlier that if we vote this down tonight it will still go into effect prior to the 30 days of us receiving this ordinance?

Mr. Raines: No, City Council has thirty days from it is first introduced to Council. If Council is going to reject, it has thirty days to reject or it goes into effect. That would send you to the third reading because it is twenty-eight days from the first to third reading unless there is an extra week. There was an extra Monday in January, 2011 and that put the captain's contract over the limit.

Mr. Tarbert: What happens if this gets rejected?

Mr. Raines: We have to go back to the table with the bargaining unit. If you reject this we certainly need discussion as to why we are rejecting this contract. If you want to reject this because you want a one year contract. Some of you seem to have a problem with three percent. There is no point for us to go back and negotiate a one year contract with the three percent if you are going to reject that also.

Mr. Tarbert: If it gets to arbitration who presents our case to the arbitrator? Is it Mr. Hillis? Then does he take the Council's wishes or the administration's wishes when you are the one that negotiated this in the first place. Mr. Hillis, have you gone to these arbitrations before?

Mr. Hillis: No, we have not had an arbitration that I have been involved in.

Mr. Tarbert: If Mr. Raines goes to the arbitration and you go with the agreement you have already reached, my guess is you are going to present that to the arbitrator when I feel that is not the approach Council wants to take with the arbitrator. Who presents our view to the arbitrator?

Mr. Raines: That has been what I have done.

Mr. Tarbert: If this gets rejected you are looking from some guidance from Council?

Mr. Raines: As I said, if I go in to negotiate a one year contract with the union and leave the three percent in, there is no point in my doing that if you do not find acceptable, the three percent?

Mr. Tarbert: I assume Mr. Hillis does not want to have those discussions in an open session because it would tie your hand in the negotiations. Is that a work session or how do you want to handle that?

Mr. Vincent: Want to go to executive session now? Any questions before we do that?

Mr. Zakany: We got this on the floor, so call the question, let's get a vote on it.

Mr. Tarbert: Do we want to schedule a separate work session where we go into executive session or do it tonight? Does anyone need to prepare or have questions answered before we do that? Or do we go into executive session and give Mr. Raines some guidance?

Mr. Tarbert moved to go into an executive session for the purpose of discussing personnel and legal matters, seconded by Mr. Tilton.

R. C. for executive session  
8 Ayes – 1 Nay Mr. Zakany  
Motion carried.

Mr. Tarbert moved to end the executive session, seconded by Mr. Hutcheson.

R. C. to end executive session  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

Mr. Tilton moved to table for two weeks, seconded by Mr. Hutcheson. Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 11-19 - Introduced by Council – An ordinance authorizing the proper City official to advertise for bids and enter into a contract with the lowest and best bidder for repairs on the Canal Street Storm Sewer, and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Tilton moved to waive the three readings, seconded by Mr. Roberts.

R. C. to waive  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

Mrs. Norman moved for passage, seconded by Mr. Hutcheson.

Mr. Sims: This happened last spring and O.D.N.R. did not want to shut down the canal for the season. They are cooperating with us and they have made the attempt to close the upper gates which has lowered the level in the canal. That what was causing some of the collapse from the weight of the canal on the top of that pipe. It is designed, we do have the permits on hand and I would like to get this done because they want to refill the canal the second or third week of April. The project will not take very long, but we will have to wait for river conditions to be low enough to access the headwall. Right now it is under water. We will have to build a small coffer dam to dewater that. It is important to get it out to bid and have it done before O.D.N.R. reopens.

R. C. for passage  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

### **ORDINANCES FOR ACTION**

Ordinance No. 11-10 - Introduced by Council – Providing appropriations for use during the fiscal year 2011, and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Tarbert moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Roberts. Motion carried.  
1 Nay - Mr. Kilpatrick

Ordinance No. 11-12 - Introduced by Council – An ordinance to amend and revise the zoning map and make permanent zoning in the City of Zanesville, Ohio as herein provided.

Mr. Tilton moved to waive the three readings, seconded by Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Baker: Do we normally not do this for rezoning issues?

Mr. Vincent: The history, as long as I have been on Council, we have always gone the full three reading to get public input.

Mr. Baker: I would like for this to go the full three readings to give more time to the public to respond.

Mr. Tilton removed his motion to waive and Mr. Roberts removed his second.

Mr. Tilton moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Baker. Motion carried.

Petition from Randy Case, 916 Vine Street

Mr. Case: I have a question about Ordinance No. 11-18. You guys waived the readings and then tabled it. I did not know whether you need to rescind the waiving of the readings.

Mr. Hillis: No, because tabling takes precedence.

Mr. Case: My only thing about this was as of the last meeting there was discussion about the Planning Commission is the process of rezoning the rest of the area around it. I just think it is like doing the job twice. You are going to rezone one little section and three months from now they will bring another ordinance, two months or six months from now to rezone the rest around it and it was implied during the public meeting that there was not a big rush it wasn't like they had a buyer. I think it is silly for you to do the job twice. The Planning Commission should have done that themselves, to rezone whole "chunk," so let us look into that rather than charging

the people a fee and then turn around afterwards and rezone the whole area. I think you need to look at this and rezone the whole area, let's not rezone it until we can do the whole area.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Denbow, where does the City as far as progressing with the additional area to rezone.

Mr. Denbow: The upcoming meeting this month we will start discussing which properties we want to pursue for the rezoning. I have an idea as to what I am going to present to them. I want to get the ideas from the Planning Commission and at that point we can go on with applications, public notices for those specific properties. We are looking at least three months before any of that will come to City Council. The Planning Commission did look at this and said the rest of this area should be rezoned also, but they also looked at those specific requests that was in front of them and agreed that property as presented should be rezoned anyway. No matter what happens with the rest of the properties, this property is appropriate for C-4.

Mr. Zakany: That land will be more valuable as a commercial area than residential or non commercial. We would not be doing spot zoning would we?

Mr. Denbow: The area is all zoned commercial now, it is not residential. It is zoned C-2 Commercial and what this would do is upgrade to a C-4 Commercial.

Mr. Roberts: There is no legal definition for spot zoning on the books anywhere.

Mr. Baker: How many people still live in that area? We are talking about several abandon houses.

Mr. Denbow: The property that was presented in this ordinance, I believe the only structure left on those properties is the Maria Adornetto's Restaurant. I think all the other properties have been demolished. In the rest of that area I believe there is only maybe two homes left.

Mr. Baker: Do they have people been living in them?

Mrs. Clapper: Yes, they are occupied.

Mr. Baker: That is where I was getting confused, so it is the rest of the area not specifically what we are looking at.

Mr. Denbow: Those properties are existing as non-conforming now and that is not going to change their status.

Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 11-16 - Introduced by Council – An ordinance authorizing the proper City official to advertise for bids and purchase materials for waterline improvements along Gattrell Avenue and Nutt Street.

Mr. Roberts moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Baker.

Mr. Sims: I would like to request to amend this ordinance for two reasons. When looking at the break down of the components of this project. We have stone backfill, pipe, the valves, the hydrants, topsoil, seed, straw, and any asphalt materials for patching. None of these individual components are over \$25,000 which would require us to go to an advertise bid. If we were to advertise all these components, whoever got it would be marking up the components that they do not manufacture. For instance, the pipe manufacture does not manufacture the valves and hydrants; therefore they would be adding their ten percent to the bid. I would like to request that we change the preamble in section one to eliminate the advertise for bids, but to purchase by lowest and best quote which would require us to get three quotes from three vendors. The stone is the only one, we have \$23,000 worth of backfill. We already have a contract for the backfill for the year. We purchase all of our stone from one supplier. A couple of the other items are \$7,000, \$3,000, and \$4,100 all could be purchased by lowest and best quote.

In the preamble I just want to remove “advertise for bids and”. It should read “An ordinance authorizing the proper City official to purchase materials for waterline improvements along Gattrell Avenue and Nutt Street by lowest and best quote”.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Sims wouldn't you also have to change Section One?

Mr. Sims: Section One would also need that same amendment. And my other request from Council would be that this in coordination with the Round 24 Paving that was done last year and is not completed yet. We need to have this project done by June 30, 2011, so I would like to ask Council to waive the readings and pass as normal legislation so we can get this going.

Mr. Tarbert: Mike sent me an email earlier on this today and I was in favor of it in principal. Mike, maybe you or Mr. Hillis can tell me do you mean you are subbing this out or you are going to do different parts. You are going to do it yourself with different pieces? If it is under that amount you do not need our authority at all.

Mr. Sims: I really need is the ability to expend \$38,000 and to purchase those materials by quote.

Mr. Tarbert: You are saying you want approval for spending the \$38,000 and that is over the \$25,000, so I am uncomfortable unless Mr. Hillis says we can do that.

Mr. Sims: We have done this in the past.

Mr. Tarbert: But if it is under that you do not need our approval at all can we just take the ordinance off the agenda.

Mr. Sims: Margo, to expend \$38,000 on a project...

Mrs. Moyer: If it is one project and he is spending over \$25,000 he needs Council's approval. If he was just going to do something with informal quotes and not advertise and it comes to \$28,000 to buy a truck he would still need Council's approval because it is over \$25,000.

Mr. Baker: So the plan is to break up the job into a lot of little jobs?

Mr. Sims: Not little jobs. Just purchases from vendors that supply, manufacture, and handle the components.

Mr. Tarbert: Are you doing the work yourself?

Mr. Sims: Yes, we are doing the work with our own City crews. We are not trying to piece meal this and contract it out; we just want to buy the components for the least cost possible for the City and still by the lowest and best quote.

Mr. Baker: Have you done this before?

Mr. Sims: Yes.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Hillis are fine with everything?

Mr. Hillis: Yes.

Mr. Vincent: We have two requests from Mr. Sims, the first is an amendment to the legislation, and the second is to waive. Would someone like to make the motion so amend the ordinance?

Mr. Tilton moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Kilpatrick.

Mr. Sims: I think if you just waive and pass normal we will be fine. Obviously an emergency clause would help, but Mr. Hillis said I have to have a justification clause for the emergency and that would be simply to have the project completed by June 30, 2011. I think we can anyway.

Mr. Hillis: I do not see the emergency if you are not going to bid it; advertising for bid would take a couple of months.

Motion carried

Mr. Vincent: We are now at Ordinance No. 11-16 as amended.

Mr. Tilton moved to waive the three reading, seconded by Mr. Baker.

R. C. to waive  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

Mr. Roberts moved for passage, seconded by Mr. Hutcheson.

R. C. for passage  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Motion carried.

#### **PRIVATE PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

Petition from Mr. Don Jones, Crime Stats 2010 Report:

My name is Don Jones and I am from Zanesville Crime Stoppers Watch. The Z.C.S.W. has the 2010 Crime Stat totals for Zanesville. All crime stats are purchased from Z.P.D. Records Office, as was the 2010 Police Department Report. Please hold your questions until the end. All questions will be presented to the Z.C.S.W. Board of Directors.

Z.C.S.W. had a total of 1773 tracked crimes in 2010, or 5 crimes daily.

These are not the total crimes, but only the crimes that Z.C.S.W. tracks.

The total crimes for 2010 were 4407 or 12 crimes per day. Z.C.S.W. tracked about 40% of the total crimes.

So, here are some stats:

- \*4407 crimes reported for 2010. 272 less crimes than 2009 or a 5.9% reduction
- \*32,010 calls for service for 2010. 1,977 less than 2009 or a 5.8% reduction
- \*Major crimes totals went down 74 crimes in 2010 from 2009 or a 1.6% reduction

Major Crimes: These facts are from the 2010 Police Department Report by Chief Lambes:

- \*Rapes: 25 down from 31 in 2009 or 84 citizens raped in the last 3 years
- \*Robberies: 42 down from 53 in 2009 or 160 citizens and/or businesses have been robbed in the last 3 years
- \*Burglaries/B&E: 279 down from 345 in 2009 or 918 citizen's homes and/or businesses broken into the last 3 years
- \*Thefts: 1399 up from 1361 in 2009 or 4095 citizens and/or businesses have been stolen from in the last 3 years
- \*Motor Vehicle Thefts: 48 up from 44 in 2009 or 154 citizens and/or businesses vehicles have been stolen in the last 3 years
- \*Drug Busts: 178 up from 150 in 2009 or 502 drug busts in the last 3 years, which is overwhelming our jail and court systems.

We do not have a drug unit in Zanesville. It is in the county. From 2003 to 2010 you had an average of 228 drug busts in the City of Zanesville. We just gave the county 228 drug busts per year and we gave them one person to help handle that. I do not know if that is going to work.

We need to have some kind of meeting with the administration to work on these steps and I am telling you it is all over the City. It is getting worse every year. Our police department is down to 41 instead of 45 patrols and investigators. We need to find the money to reinstate four more police officers. At a certain times we ran with four officers and one supervisor for the whole City.

There is no money in this budget to open the second floor of the jail. Right now we have all kinds of programs – come in at 6:00 pm and leave 6:00 am you have two days of jail time in and those sorts of programs. We need to open up the second floor. We have people being sentenced thirty days in jail, getting ten days in jail, reduced to ten days in jail. We are putting criminals right back on the street. Hopefully Council will come up with the money to help fund our patrolmen and open the second floor of the jail.

No matter how we slice it, the criminal activities are costing the tax-paying citizens big time.

All 2010 Crime Stats and maps are posted on the Zanesville Crime Stoppers Watch Website. [http://www.neighborhoodlink.com/Crime\\_Stoppers\\_Watch/pages/](http://www.neighborhoodlink.com/Crime_Stoppers_Watch/pages/)

You can also Google or Bing our name. For those of you who do not have MS Mappoint, and did not receive an email with the 2010 Crime Map attached, we uploaded those maps to our website in PDF format, so all citizens with computers can view the crimes happening in their neighbourhood and/or wards. Also, we will be working with WHIZ, The Times Recorder, and all local radio stations in the near future with a program called Crime Corner, to help those citizens without computers to be informed too. In the near future, Z.C.S.W., M.C.C.S.W. and all citizens throughout Muskingum County will be asked to start a Surveillance Watch, where all citizens with Webcams, and those who can afford to purchase them, and those with any type of video equipment can start watching their property 24/7, but especially at night. From what we have found on the Ohio Codified Ordinances, it is perfectly legal to video, but without audio. We ask Safety Director Brandford, Law Director Hillis, Sheriff Lutz, and Chief Lambes for their advice. Can you just imagine if several hundred or even several thousand citizens start watching their property? The positive affect it could have in reducing crimes and helping apprehend criminals?

Examples: If we would have had video surveillance on Bluff Ave. and Bailey St. the day a male tried to abduct a 10 year old, and the 14 year old, we would have his photo, vehicle license plate number, and helped have him arrested. If we would have had it in our neighborhood on Ceramic Ave., when the robbery and shooting happened, we would have had all of them arrested sooner.

I could go on-and-on about the positive benefits of the Surveillance Watch Program, but I believe you to know how helpful it could become in reducing criminal activities. There are, and have been in the past, several reports in the Times Recorder, and on WHIZ which state that Z.P.D. or the M.C. Sheriff asking for information to help solve a crime. Most all of them have been to help solve business robberies and thefts. As our mission statement reflexes, we are the eyes and ears for law enforcement, and we will continue to expand and use better technologies year to year until the citizen's homes and business properties are safer.

Video Surveillance can be very helpful, not only providing information to law enforcement, but also help in preventing crimes. It would be like having Closed Circuit TV cameras, which our City uses, all over our City and county. We already have many homes and businesses which use video surveillance, and they can also be helpful. Z.P.D., as stated in Chief Lambes 2010 Police Department Report, used video surveillance from gas stations which were robbed to help catch the robbers. If businesses are permitted to video their customers and use those videos to help convict criminals, why shouldn't citizens video their property to help protect their property, and to help convict criminals too? It's a win-win for everyone, except for the criminals of course. Some cities are already using webcam videos and other video surveillance to help catch criminals. We are not advocating any other use, except to help in the prevention and the solving of criminal activities. Could the Law Director and/or the Safety Director please advise us on this matter? Thank you for your time! May God bless each of you and your families, and bless and watch-over Zanesville, and all of Muskingum County and its citizens.

Mr. Hillis, I talked to Mr. Brandford and you about this surveillance watch we have talked about starting throughout the whole county. Did you find anything that would be a problem?

Mr. Hillis: I do not see any problem...

Mr. Jones: We are just talking about people videoing their properties especially at night. I did not see anything in the Ohio Code about this.

Mr. Hillis: Cities do it.

Mr. Jones: Closed circuit TV's and we have some in Zanesville there are not promoted by the media. According to the COPS Program in the Department of Justice, you should promote that you have these cameras so the criminals know they are there. That is how you stop these "hot spots" from happening. We are not doing that.

Mr. Roberts: I thought the whole idea behind the combination of the drug units was so they could do more work with the same amount of funding. It was not my understanding we were transferring our drug unit to the county, instead it was a joint venture.

Mayor Zwelling: They are working together.

Mr. Jones: One man going from our City, we had three, one went to investigator and the other went to patrol, and one went over to Muskingum County Drug Unit.

Mr. Roberts: I think if you look back through the years the sheriff constantly has done drug bust within the City over the last five or six years.

Mr. Jones: They are two separate things. The sheriff drug busts are in the media. Z.P.D.'s are not. So you have not seen too many drug busts from Z.P.D. although they probably had 50 times as many as the county within a year. There were 228 per year from 2003 to 2010. That is Z.P.D. drug busts. I have a meeting with Sheriff Lutz this coming Friday and we are going to talk about the whole thing. It is overwhelming our court system, our jail system, and we need to do something about it.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Mayor Zwelling: Bob Brandford, Director of Public Safety was honored Saturday night at the Community Ambulance Recognition Night. He was given a special community service award and I am very proud of him. He made a very nice acceptance speech.

The Secret Auditorium Schedule for March:

March 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> is the Miss Muskingum Valley Pageant. They moved in today and they will be rehearsing every evening.

March 14<sup>th</sup> is the Z.H.S. Quarterback Club Stag on the lower level.

March 15<sup>th</sup> the Zanesville Concert Association featuring Tango Buenos Aries which I think is a very good program. Zanesville is fortunate to have it.

March 16<sup>th</sup> the Zaney Follies will move in to rehearse nightly.

March 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> the Zaney Follies will perform.

Mr. Tilton moved to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

---

VICKI L. FIGGINS  
CLERK OF COUNCIL

---

DANIEL M. VINCENT  
PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL