



# THE CITY OF *Zanesville*

401 Market Street • Zanesville, Ohio 43701

Phone (740) 617-4875

E-mail: [council@coz.org](mailto:council@coz.org)

Council – Mayor  
Government

## Zanesville City Council Ways and Means Committee Agenda Council Chambers, 401 Market Street, Zanesville, Ohio January 26, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

This meeting is open to the public to attend in person or remotely by using the information below. This meeting is for discussion pertaining to the upcoming ordinances and discussion items of the Ways and Means Committee for review as follows:

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes of December 15, 2025

### Ordinances

3. **Ordinance No. 2026-08** – Introduced by Council – An Ordinance authorizing the proper city official to provide funds for Transitions.

### Discussion Items

4. None

#### **Next scheduled meetings of the Ways and Means Committee 2026:**

Tuesday, February 17, 2026	Monday, June 15, 2026	Monday, October 19, 2026
Monday, March 16, 2026	Monday, July 20, 2026	Monday, November 16, 2026
Monday, April 20, 2026	Monday, August 17, 2026	Monday, December 21, 2026
Monday, May 18, 2026	Monday, September 21, 2026	

This meeting is open to the public who may attend in person or attend by phone or Internet using the information below.

Phone **1-844-621-3956** US Toll Free or **1-415-655-0001** US Toll  
Use Access Code: **1267508098** #

Online with WebEx – Enter **[zanesvillecity.webex.com](https://zanesvillecity.webex.com)** in web browser. Enter Meeting Information **1267508098**

## **WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE MEETING**

December 15, 2025 at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Hennessey: I'm going to call the Zanesville City Council Ways and Means meeting to order. We'll have roll call.

### **Committee Members Present:**

Councilperson Ralph Hennessey, Chairman  
Councilperson Mark Ballmer  
Councilperson John Taylor-Lehman  
Councilperson Mike King

### **Committee Members Absent:**

None

### **Others present:**

Scott Brown, Director of Public Service  
Billie Corns, Clerk of Council  
Lisa Hittle, IT Administrator

Amanda Perkowski, Budget & Finance Director  
Jaclyn Porter, IT Technician  
Dan Vincent, President of Council

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17, 2025**

Mr. Hennessey: We are at approval of the minutes from November 17, 2025.

Mr. Ballmer made a motion to approve the minutes of November 17, 2025. It was seconded by Mr. Taylor-Lehman.

Mr. Hennessey: All in favor signify by aye. Opposed?

A voice vote was taken with all being in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Hennessey: Motion carries.

### **ORDINANCES**

3. **Ordinance No. 2025-XX** – Introduced by Council – An Ordinance adopting a cybersecurity policy.

Mr. Hennessey: Who would like to lead us off with this?

Amanda Perkowski: I am going to ask Lisa.

Lisa Hittle: Thank you. So, House Bill 96 was sent out earlier this year. What that is doing for us is it kind of made us make our cybersecurity go a little faster than what we wanted. We were in the works of getting it finished. But what this bill is saying is it wants us to be able to, if and when, we ever had a cybersecurity incident, who do we report to? So, now we have two agencies that we have to get to. So, we have to let Cyber Incident to the Ohio Cyber Integration Center, so we have to let them know in 7 days. And then we have to let the Auditor of State know within 30 days. So, currently we don't have to tell anybody right now. But if we do have an incident going forward with this House Bill 96, those are the two places that we have to tell right off the bat. Knock on wood, we haven't had any of those.

But it also, like I said, put it into perspective for us to hurry up and get our policy done quickly. We've had it in the works trying to get it done. But with this House Bill, we were able to put what you have in front of you in place. That policy will be an ongoing document that we will update periodically as things change. So, right now, if we have an incident where somebody has hacked in, we would have to give those two places a heads up, this is what's happened. We have to notify them, and then we have to follow our incident plan that we have in that book of what will happen and in what order for us to make sure that we get those incidents under control, if that makes sense.

Mr. Hennessey: Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. Ballmer: Mr. Hennessey.

Mr. Hennessey: Mr. Ballmer.

Mr. Ballmer: Is this just incidents that they actually get in or is this all incidents that have to be reported even if the firewalls and so forth we have in place shut it down?

Lisa Hittle: I would say this would be all. This would be all, and so we want to make sure that we're covered. So, what we would do is we would go ahead and give them a heads up. We would do our incident plan, this is what happened, nothing resulted in that, but this is what happened. And we would just let them know in advance.

Mr. Ballmer: Thank you.

Lisa Hittle: Now, we will be doing a lot more training. So, right now, the only training that we do right now with our employees is we have a phishing email, which you guys also get that. So, that goes out once a month. We have a third-party vendor that sends those out. Then we will react as individuals see those, they'll either send it to us and ask if this is part of our phishing. If so, we'll let them know. But we also are telling them, if they have any weird emails that come through, please let us know so we can block them in our spam folder so that doesn't happen again. So, we do, do that. But we are going to get more stringent with our employees, that we're going to do a lot more training. We're going to try to do lunch & learns so that they're more aware of what could happen with cybersecurity and try to teach them a little bit better than what we are, what we have currently done in the past.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Hennessey: Yes, Mr. Taylor-Lehman.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: What constitutes a cybersecurity breach? I mean, we had the weird video...

Lisa Hittle: Correct! So, if this was in place then, then yes, we would have wanted to send that out as a potential risk, even though it didn't get to the network. And the reason why I say it didn't get to the network is because that was Webex. So, Webex is a separate platform that we have. So, we looked into that to try to figure out what happened. And we were able to block a couple other things with that. So, that would have been that incident. But what else consists of one? Our phishing emails come through. If somebody clicks on a link and takes them somewhere, we've had this happen before, where it will pop up with a Microsoft, it's a very loud person that will talk to you, like, your system has been taken over. Please call this 1-800 number. So, even though it's not through the network at that point, it's just on that person's computer, we can stop it. We can take that person's computer off the network to be proactive, and then we can do different scans on that machine to make sure that it doesn't go any further.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: I have another question about the emails that get forwarded to us, and it always says, this comes from an outside source. Should we just completely ignore those? I mean, not open them, not do anything with them?

Lisa Hittle: Not all of those. Because let's say you get something from Genesis Hospital, and it's legit. It's still going to have that caption on there that's it is coming from an external email. So, you wouldn't want it to ignore.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: So, how am I going to know that though?

Lisa Hittle: Well, that's how we would train you. The very first thing of what we do is we tell a person to look at the email domain. So, some of the fishing emails that we get could be @hotmail.com, but if you look at the beginning of it, it could be, and I'm just making this up, it could be hackyourpc@gmail.com. So, we would know right away that that is something that we would want to block.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: Okay. That's what I do with my own emails. I look at the address of the sender.

Lisa Hittle: Correct. So, those are things that we have to teach our employees because we have a lot of employees that don't look at it that way. So, again, we've got to get a little more stringent in trying to get more training into them so they know what to look for.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: Thank you, Lisa.

Mr. King: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Hennessey: Yes.

Mr. King: Lisa, do all Zanesville city employees have emails?

Lisa Hittle: The answer to that question is yes, and that just happened in July of this year because of how we have our timeclock system. Every employee has to have an email to be able to log onto the timeclock, to be able to move time in that.

Mr. King: Okay, are we able to block external emails to certain employees?

Lisa Hittle: Yes, Dan and I talked about this because I think Genesis has this same thing, that if they, let's say a Parks & Rec person, they need their email to get through Time & Attendance, which is the timeclock. But they don't ever email. So, what we were going to do at the beginning of the year, we're going to look at blocking those individuals, not to have external email come through. So, that is one thing on our list that we are going to do.

Mr. King: A good precaution too.

Lisa Hittle: So, yes, that makes perfect sense.

Mr. Ballmer: To John, to your point, I've gotten several emails from Mayor Mason that he needs me right now. If you click up on the top and look, it's not his email.

Lisa Hittle: And that's awesome! We do have some people that do send us those, and we can block that, normally if it's not a Gmail or a Hotmail account, we can block just the email domain. But if it has Hotmail or Gmail, obviously we can't block that because there could be people that are emailing that is legit from those email domains, so we'll have to block the whole entire thing at that point.

Mr. King: And is that just a bot that keeps spitting those emails out?

Lisa Hittle: It's because his email has gotten phished, but it doesn't mean that that is a cybersecurity issue. It's just that his email got phished. So, we just have to watch it.

Mr. Hennessey: Who created the policy? Who did this work for us?

Lisa Hittle: I did.

Mr. Hennessey: You did all of this on your own?

Lisa Hittle: Yes.

Mr. Hennessey: Oh my! So, no third parties. This was all created internally?

Lisa Hittle: Correct, that is correct, yes.

Mr. Ballmer: Well done!

Mr. Hennessey: Believe it or not, we read this.

Lisa Hittle: Awesome, I appreciate that!

Mr. Hennessey: So, we know this meets the state standards then?

Lisa Hittle: Correct, yes.

Mr. Hennessey: Was it submitted to them yet?

Lisa Hittle: It was not submitted, and we don't have to submit it to the state, just as long as that if they would happen to come and ask us, then we have it.

Mr. Hennessey: We have a policy that says it.

Lisa Hittle: Correct. So, a lot of our audits that we've had, so we've had the FBI audit, the state audit, and the LEADS audit, every audit they always ask, do you have a cybersecurity policy and what does that look like? We have said in the past, it's in the works. Well now we can say, here it is. And then there's one page on there that will show you how many times we have amended it or made changes. So, once this gets passed, then I'll put that date out there so they can see how often that we are updating it.

Mr. Hennessey: I see this needs to be in place by yearend and training by June 2026. So, we need to rush this along?

Lisa Hittle: If you could waive the readings, that would be amazing.

Mr. Hennessey: Okay, that was my understanding as well.

President Vincent: Mr. Chairman, a question please.

Mr. Hennessey: Yes, Mr. Vincent.

President Vincent: With that, if we waive the readings the next meeting and it passes, it still has a 30-day waiting period without the emergency language in there. Is that still okay?

Lisa Hittle: That's fine, yes that's okay. We'll be fine with that.

President Vincent: And then two questions here, two things if you could touch on. I think probably the biggest concern is someone getting in and knocking out our network, and we do have backup and we would only lose minimal information. If you touch on that and then also touch on the big scare is ransomware coming in and taking over our system and wanting millions of dollars to release that information. So, I'm not sure how that affects the city, but I know like the hospitals, they quite often end up paying millions to get their systems back and the chaos of trying to operate is awful.

Mr. Hennessey: It does say, Mr. Vincent, that Council would have to approve that, if there was a ransomware, we would have to approve any expenditures. It's in there.

Scott Brown: We also have two insurance policies. I don't remember how much they are for, but we have two separate policies that cover us for that. One is with our PEP and then we went ahead and purchased another one on top of that. So, we have pretty good insurance right now in case we got hacked.

Lisa Hittle: Which, that is true.

President Vincent: We do have backup to a certain point?

Lisa Hittle: We do have backup, yes. Yes, depending on when that incident would happen, we do have backups that happen nightly, weekly, and monthly. So, whenever that would happen, then we would have to pull the backup that's the most recent to pull that information.

President Vincent: In a separate, isolated system that they could not get to.

Lisa Hittle: Correct, yes. So, we have a backup that happens, it's called Synology. So, we have a portion that's here, but then once it's backed up here, then it goes to a third party, which is in Newark. And then they also have backups from there at different locations, as well. So, we do have multiple backups that are happening.

President Vincent: So, if we did get taken over by ransomware, we could just say we've lost that day, delete everything, and start again.

Lisa Hittle: Start over. So, we would have an incident to where we would spin up a new server. We would put that last backup on there, and then we would be up and running. Now, what is that timeframe? It depends on what server that we had to look at. If it's multiple servers, obviously it's going to take a little longer than a couple hours. But we do have that plan in place of how long it would take us.

President Vincent: Thank you.

Lisa Hittle: Now, knock on wood, I, again, it's my worst nightmare of a phone call saying, we have ransomware. But again, we're trying to do everything we can to make sure that we don't get there. And I feel that the first thing is we have to educate our employees. We do have a lot of employees that are like, I just clicked that link. Please don't, please don't.

Mr. King: But I assume that's probably part of the insurance policy as well too, is what training and education we are providing. The more bases we can cover, the better.

Lisa Hittle: Absolutely! So, again, with you guys approving our fourth person, Glen's going to be dedicated, once we get that person up and running to do cybersecurity, it's a lot of work as you can tell. And you know from where you work currently, it's a big deal.

Mr. Hennessey: Yes, it is. Are there further questions from the committee? Would someone like to make a recommendation this evening?

Mr. Ballmer: I would make a recommendation for passage and waive the readings so that we can get this done as quickly as possible.

Mr. King: I'll second.

Mr. Hennessey: All in favor signify by aye. Opposed?

A voice vote was taken with all being in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Hennessey: Motion carries. Thank you, appreciate it. It's something I don't want to deal with on that side. I couldn't imagine walking into that.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Engineering and Parks Budget**

Scott Brown: I appreciate you adding me to the agenda. What I've provided you guys with is a packet. Basically, I wrote up a one-page memo to explain the packet. Within here was a printout of the 2025 Engineering budget. I've provided a copy of the legislation from 2022-132, which is the Central Service Allocation plan that is passed by the legislation. And then lastly, we conducted a Parks & Cemeteries staffing analysis, and that analysis is also in this packet. I don't want to read this word-for-word, but I am going to go through it and then answer. I'm sure there will be questions.

So, in 2022, Council passed legislation to continue the 2017 Central Cost Allocation ordinance, which transfers money from the Enterprise Funds into the General Fund. Within that allocation, there's a formula for the Auditor to use when transferring the money from the Enterprise Funds to the General Fund to pay for efforts spent on Enterprise Fund activities by General Fund expenses. So, I won't expect you to follow and try to bounce back and forth, but what I do what you to see simply is that there's somewhere around 15, roughly, funds within the General Fund that receive Enterprise Funds in some form or another. Part of that legislation then was to explain multiple formulas, which I'm not going to pretend to understand all of them right now. But there's a multitude of formulas that the Auditor should use based off of which fund to transfer money back into the General Fund.

So, the reason I bring this to your attention is that the legislation is going expire in 2027, which means this committee or whomever is on this committee in 2026 is going to want to take a look at the Central Cost Allocation, which of course, the committee can simply renew it or completely change it. However, what I'm asking today is for us to consider removing the Engineer's Office out of the Central Cost Allocation altogether, and instead split the Engineering Office based off of all four Enterprise Funds. So, it would no longer receive any General Fund funding. The four Enterprise Funds are water, sewer, storm, and sanitation. What's strange is that the employees in Engineering are paid uniquely. I think that it was



done in the past primarily because Council was tasked with having to figure out what funds were the healthiest and could afford to pay the Engineer. So, for a very long time now, the City Engineer, his salary is 100 percent paid for out of sewer; the Assistant City Engineer is paid 100 percent out of sewer; the Engineering Technician is paid 100 percent out of General Fund; and the Storm Water Manager is paid 100 percent out of stormwater. The Engineering budget was \$443,380. So, roughly, \$450,000 in 2025. We paid 100 percent of that out of the General Fund for the year of 2025.

And then, this week, I think actually is when the Auditor will make a journal entry and transfer the money from the Enterprise Funds back into the General Fund. It's done at the end of the year as a one-time transfer. They will use this page here as how the formula based off of what it tells them to do.

Mr. Hennessey: Is that the attachment?

Scott Brown: Yes.

Mr. Hennessey: Application and Rules?

Scott Brown: Yes. When you boil it all down, of the \$443,380, the General Fund gets reimbursed about 70 percent. So, the General Fund ends up paying about 30 percent of the Engineering budget. 70 percent comes by way of the Enterprise Funds. What I'm asking to do is not have the General Fund pay any of the Engineering at all and eliminate the 101 as simply General Fund. The Engineering group is 7791. Amanda will explain those better than I if you need clarification. But we use numbers to identify General Fund, and then we have groups, and then we have other numbers that then identify other things. Simply put though, within the General Fund, 7791 represents Engineering. What I have prepared legislation is to eliminate 101.7791 and instead go into 603, 604, 608, and 650, which is Sanitation, and create 7791 in all four of those. And then take that money that we appropriated in the General Fund and divide it by 25 percent and put that in each one of those Enterprise Funds. That would then eliminate the amount of money that the General Fund is paying for Engineering and push it all out into the Enterprise Funds. Why is that? Engineering spends all their time working with the Enterprise Funds for the most part. It is a true statement there are some things that would be, say, Streets, which aren't really part of the separate Enterprise Funds, and Street is a function of General Fund, which is probably why they set things up the way they did.

This is a proposal, is that we go ahead and just push everything out to the four Enterprise Funds and not have the General Fund pay any of the Engineering. Why? That leads me to where we did a staffing analysis in Parks & Cemeteries, which is the last attachment to this. What we found is that we have, well, you can read it. And if I try to estimate, I'll use the wrong numbers, but there's roughly 250 acres of parks and, and I forget how many acres, are of cemetery. When I asked this company, who by the way, was the same company we did to do our rate analysis for water and sewer, so this is what they do. They were able to take a look at the total number of staff that we have fulltime and seasonal, and divide it up amongst all the acres of our parks. What they came up with is that we really need three more seasonal employees. And right now, I have a Superintendent, and that's the only management staff to take care of all of Parks & Cemeteries. So, they recommended that we put in an entry level supervisor position, which we call a Crewleader. We have three tiers of management in the city: Crewleaders are entry level

supervisor, Supervisor would be in the middle, and then Superintendent is at the top. And so, the next question is what does that cost? Well, they were able to put together those costs for us at the end here. The long and the short is that by taking Engineering out of the General Fund and pushing it into the four Enterprise Funds, we would remove \$135,000 in expense from the General Fund for Engineering. And I need \$125,000 to have three seasonals and a Crewleader in Parks and Cemeteries. So, I would be asking to swap the General Fund cost that is currently going to Engineering and allow me to instead use it towards Parks and Cemeteries so that I can have three seasonals and an entry-level Supervisor position.

Mr. Hennessey: Thank you. You explained that very well. Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. Ballmer: Mr. Hennessey?

Mr. Hennessey: Yes.

Mr. Ballmer: So, the cost is basically the same. We're just rearranging. Does this have to be done at the beginning of the year?

Scott Brown: I couldn't get the legislation, but I got it done today, sent it to Tarbert. I was surprised. He got it reviewed, and I got it to Billie. I didn't expect to have it here for this committee meeting. But I have it ready for next Monday's Council meeting. It is not emergency, and I don't know the comfort level. So, it's something that if we passed in January, I believe that Amanda would still have time to prepare the final budget to account for that change.

Mr. Hennessey: Further questions?

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: Yes.

Mr. Hennessey: Mr. Taylor-Lehman.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: So, if we're going to divide it up 25 percent to the four different Enterprise Funds, do they equally use the Engineering services?

Scott Brown: That was the question and why they came up with this document. This one here that I'm referring to is the City of Zanesville Central Service Cost Allocation Plan Application and Rules. So, I don't know when this was first put into place. I don't know if this started when Dan was President, when Ralph, or if you guys all inherited it. I don't know how long this document has had. I only went back to 2017, found the legislation, and then saw in '22 they just continued forward. At some point, people sat down and said, at the time, this is what makes sense. I don't know how much review has been done since this first one came out. And your question is, does the Engineer spend an equal amount of time? The answer would be no, it would not be. It would be, say, maybe like 30, 30, 20, and 20 or something like that. I don't oppose to coming up with any formula. I'm simply asking to remove the 30 percent that we're spending in General Fund and push that into the Enterprise Funds. If there's a feeling that the number shouldn't be 25 percent split evenly across all four, I have no objection to that. It's easier to write purchase orders, it's easier to keep track of a budget, and it's easier to do all those things if everything

is the same. If you feel that there should be some scrutiny, that maybe they spend more time on water and sewer than they do on stormwater and sanitation, so they should pay more, I have no objection to that. I just, for purpose of ease, went 25 percent across all four of them.

Amanda Perkowski: May I add?

Mr. Hennessey: Yes.

Amanda Perkowski: And this is considering just their general operating expenses, if the Engineering Department has expenses that are dedicated to a particular Enterprise Fund, they're going to charge it to that Enterprise Fund.

Scott Brown: Correct.

Mr. Hennessey: The expenses will follow?

Scott Brown: Yes, right. Or to this point, we do a waterline project, and we hire an engineer to do a design, the cost of that is already going to come out of water. It's not coming out of the Engineer's budget. So, the Engineer's budget is taking care of the things that the Engineer does to represent the city. Within the Enterprise Funds, we hire consulting engineers because we can't possibly staff enough engineers to do all of our projects. Each time we hire a consulting engineer, it gets paid out of that Enterprise Fund directly. It doesn't funnel through the Engineering Department.

Mr. Hennessey: So, you're only just spreading out the salary, per se...

Scott Brown: I'm spreading out the salary and then for instance, yes, I'm spreading out the salary demand and then any of these other fees that are in there. Yes basically.

Mr. Hennessey: The reason for the additional employees...

Scott Brown: Yes.

Mr. Hennessey: Is it due to overtime with the seasonals or is it just the need to keep up?

Scott Brown: It's the need to keep up.

Mr. Hennessey: So, we're not having overtime in seasonal?

Scott Brown: No, as a policy we don't typically have seasonals get overtime. Sometimes it happens, but we try not to. To your point, there's only so many hours in a day. And so, working a 40-hour week, we're not getting to things. And so, unfortunately what happens right now is that when we have major holidays that are important to veterans in our cemeteries, then we're staffing 100 percent there and then unfortunately we lose a lot of ground in the parks. So, that's what's really happening.

Mr. Hennessey: So, it's a manning issue?

Scott Brown: Yes, the manned issue. There are more acres to take care of than we have staff hours to take care of it. And it's challenging to have a Superintendent who has a lot of management obligations, not just from day-to-day planning, but then also from being able to plan projects, fund those projects. But then also with the cemetery you have to understand there's an awful lot of contact with the people. There's a lot of contact with the funeral homes. So, the right person for that is going to be the Superintendent. And so, now there's not enough hours out in the field to be able to direct. And that's really where having an entry-level Supervisor would really help, is that there could be somebody out in the field checking on all the different crews to make sure that we're not going in a direction we don't want to go for some reason.

Mr. Hennessey: Personally, I think there's been an improvement over the years. I honestly do. And obviously there's always room for more improvement. So, if it's affordable, I can see how this is a good way to go, personally. Are there any questions?

Mr. Ballmer: Is it possible after a period of time, say two years, if this is passed, two years from now, to review this to see if the 25, 25, 25, 25 would look better 30, 30, 20, 20?

Scott Brown: Oh yes! In fact, I think that perhaps, so when I said '27, honestly, it's in this legislation. So let me just give you the exact. This passed in it said November 2017. Then this one was done in November '22. So, you're looking at November of '27. So that's going to give us all of '26's data to then probably half of '27's data before you really have to pass a legislation. So, that would be a good time to be able to then revisit this ordinance, minus the Engineering, and say we think that at that time, we should do XY & Z with how the Enterprise Funds are funding Engineering.

Mr. Ballmer: And then in November '27, then it's up for another five years?

Scott Brown: Correct. What I'm asking is that if the ordinance passes, Engineering would no longer appear in this cost allocation because it would no longer be a function of General Fund. However, there is no reason at the same time that the committee is reformulating the cost allocation, that they couldn't at the same time, look at reformulating the Engineering cost formula.

Mr. Ballmer: Amanda, would you be able, if this is done, the numbers at the end of the year, everything would come out okay. So, we would still have the same picture we have now? If you're taking it from, and I don't remember the numbers now, you're taking it out of one and you're putting it in another. So, that kind of changes the ledger a little bit. Does that make...

Scott Brown: So, let me try in my lay terms. Are you asking for? These are not going to represent real time numbers. These are going to represent the 2025 budgeted numbers. So, this was put in place in March as a budget, and that's what I'm working off of. What the real numbers spent, to your point, would come about sometime in January or unfortunately maybe February, to say how much was really spent. What I did was just took what we've budgeted to show you the numbers. Usually, we don't spend everything that we budget, right? Because then that means you don't have any money. So, I don't think

that we would have spent \$435,000. What I'm saying is that, based off of what we budgeted, that's what we're looking at.

Mr. Hennessey: Projected numbers?

Scott Brown: Right.

Amanda Perkowski: And we would do this sort of in pieces, right? You would pass this ordinance to establish the accounting structure. And then I would take that and build that into the budget, and then you would pass a separate ordinance for the budget. Does that make sense?

Scott Brown: Right.

Mr. Hennessey: So, would this take effect for the seasonals in 2026?

Scott Brown: That's the goal. That's what I'm shooting for is to be able to go into 2026 with those numbers. So, by doing this in the next four to six weeks, let's say, then that would allow us to do a final budget in 2026, which would then allow us to have the increased number of seasonals and the Crewleader.

Mr. Hennessey: The bottom line, we're increasing our budget somewhere, no matter what?

Scott Brown: Well, we're going to increase on paper Parks and Cemeteries and decrease, but it's going to be a swap. As opposed to if I didn't come to you and ask to swap, I would be coming to you and asking you to actually increase the net for these positions.

Mr. Hennessey: It's a net zero the way you're doing it, but still more expenditures in the long run.

Scott Brown: Correct.

Mr. Hennessey: Okay, just the way we're putting it on the books.

Scott Brown: Right.

President Vincent: Mr. Chair, if I could? I don't know if anybody would know the answer to this. I'm just thinking you're talking about as far as dividing the Engineer up into 25 percent in each of the areas and not necessary to spending 25 percent in each of those areas as far as providing service. I just wondered about audits, if that might become an issue during an audit.

Scott Brown: So, we have home rule, which allows us to basically establish ordinances that allows us to dictate how we want to do things best for our city. There certainly are things that you can't do just because you have home rule, but how you wish to allocate things. For instance, we were paying both the Engineer and the Assistant Engineer 100 percent out of sewer when they weren't doing 100 percent work. So, you see, they give some of that leeway to the local authority to decide how they wish best to

spend their money. You just have to do things legally. I can't even give you an example, other than you can't buy nefarious things with public dollars just because you passed an ordinance that said it's okay.

President Vincent: Okay, and I guess from 100 percent in one category to 25 percent and not being equal, that's a lot closer. Thank you.

Mr. Hennessey: Yes, Mr. Taylor-Lehman.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: One point of clarification and the 25 percent was just a curiosity about what the Engineering does. Quarterly, you adjust things for allotment of money in our accounts, right?

Scott Brown: Well, I don't mean to answer for you, but we do have budget amendments when we catch that things are...

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: Yes, a greater expenditure here, and so that, whether it's 25 or 30, it doesn't really matter because if there's a greater expense, you're going to balance it out.

Scott Brown: I think that going into the permanent budget, we can set it up as 25 percent across the board. If what you're saying is we get into October and we realize that we spent 40 percent of our time in sewer, does that mean that we could do a budget amendment to then have more of the money come out of sewer, I think that's a possibility. But your first go-around with your permanent budget, you would show it as 25 percent, 25, 25, 25. You would allocate that.

Mr. Taylor-Lehman: Right, which makes a lot of sense. It's just that when emergencies come up and different projects come up. Amanda's been able to handle and reallocate some of the budget amendments for us.

Amanda Perkowski: And, to Scott's point, these Enterprise Funds are very healthy. We're not concerned about fund balances. I'm not foreseeing any issue doing this.

President Vincent: Mr. Chair, I've got one more thing to add.

Mr. Hennessey: Sure.

President Vincent: Would we have to change the legislation if we're going to adjust the 25 percent, say to 40 percent for one, and drop another, we'd have to change the legislation for that, wouldn't we? It's one thing to amend the budget, but if we're guided by the 25 percent rule, I don't think we can change that.

Scott Brown: So, here's what I'll say to that is that I don't have the answer, and the Law Director is not here. So, I can't say one way or the other. I know there's flexibility in changing a budget. To your point, if we have legislation that says it has to be 25 percent, 25 percent, 25 percent, and 25 percent, I don't know then if it's a budget amendment or whether it's a one-time piece of legislation that says on this

date and this time, we're going to modify "x" in this account for this reason, and Council says yes, and then you go on. But I think there are ways to do it.

President Vincent: And it might be a modification of the percentages for the future then, too.

Scott Brown: Absolutely!

Mr. Hennessey: Mr. Brown, what are we going to see? Are we going to see something this Monday?

Scott Brown: Yes.

Mr. Hennessey: And what are we going to see?

Scott Brown: What you're going to see is two pieces of legislation. One would be the maximum strength that would show three additional seasonal and one Crewleader. And then you would see a piece of legislation that will remove 101.7791 from the General Fund and create 603, 604, 608, and 650, .7791.

Mr. Hennessey: And we can run those as normal legislation?

Scott Brown: Correct.

Mr. Hennessey: No waivers?

Scott Brown: Whatever you want to do. I don't need you to waive it on Monday night. You can look at it over the holidays, come back in January, maybe the second meeting, if we waived it, that means it would be active then in February, which would give Amanda the time that she would need to prepare the final budget and put all of it in there.

Mr. Hennessey: Okay, so we will have two ordinances?

Scott Brown: Yes, two ordinances for Monday night, first reading.

Mr. Hennessey: Are there further comments from the committee? Questions? Are you good, Mr. Vincent?

President Vincent: I'm good, thank you, sir.

Mr. Hennessey: If there is nothing further, I'll ask for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Ballmer: So moved.

Mr. King: Second.

Mr. Hennessey: All in favor, signify by aye. Opposed?

A voice vote was taken with all being in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Hennessey: Motion carries.

The meeting ended about 5:37 p.m.

**Regular scheduled meetings with the next dates as follows:**

Tuesday, January 20, 2026  
Tuesday, February 17, 2026  
Monday, March 16, 2026  
Monday, April 20, 2026

Monday, May 18, 2026  
Monday, June 15, 2026  
Monday, July 20, 2026  
Monday, August 17, 2026

Monday, September 21, 2026  
Monday, October 19, 2026  
Monday, November 16, 2026  
Monday, December 21, 2026

---

Billie Corns, Clerk of Council

---

Ralph Hennessey, Chairman of Ways and Means



**ORDINANCE NO. 2026 – 08**  
**INTRODUCED BY COUNCIL**

**AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE PROPER CITY OFFICIAL TO  
PROVIDE FUNDS FOR TRANSITIONS**

**WHEREAS**, Transitions was incorporated under Ohio Revised Code Chapter 1702 in the State of Ohio in January of 1979; and

**WHEREAS**, the attached Memorandum of Understanding (Exhibit A) defines the services and public purposes of Transitions to the City, including the public purpose provided by this agreement, and the City's responsibility to Transitions.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED** by the Council of the City of Zanesville, Ohio, that:

**SECTION ONE:** The proper city official is hereby authorized to execute the attached Memorandum of Understanding (Exhibit A) with Transitions.

**SECTION TWO:** The proper city official is hereby authorized to pay \$30,000.00 to Transitions for 2026 from line item: 201-1111-53299.

**SECTION THREE:** This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

PASSED: \_\_\_\_\_, 2026

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Billie Corns  
Clerk of Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel M. Vincent  
President of Council

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_, 2026

This legislation approved as to form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald L. Mason  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Law Director's Office

Attachment for Ordinance 2026-08  
Exhibit A

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

This Memorandum of Understanding (hereinafter "MOU") is entered into as of the date last signed by the parties hereto by and between the City of Zanesville (hereinafter "the City"), a body corporate and politic of the State of Ohio, and Transitions, Inc. (hereinafter "Transitions"), an Ohio not-for-profit corporation.

**WITNESSETH:**

**WHEREAS**, Transitions was incorporated under Ohio Revised Code Chapter 1702 in the State of Ohio in January of 1979. Its mission is to provide domestic violence survivors and their children temporary shelter in a caring, non-judgmental, supportive environment and provide referral services to various agencies and groups that may give additional support and encouragement of individual growth and independence; and

**WHEREAS**, Transitions agrees to provide services to the City and work in collaboration with the Salvation Army, Eastside Community Ministries, Christ's Table, Muskingum Behavioral Health, Mental Health and Recovery Board, the United Way, Muskingum County Job and Family Services, Zanesville-Muskingum County Health Department, and the Zanesville Metropolitan Housing Authority, and other entities in order to assist the City of Zanesville, and the Division of Police in providing services to families impacted by domestic violence; and

**WHEREAS**, Transitions will continue to provide Municipal Court advocacy and assistance to the Law Director's Office to victims of abuse, and to further provide assistance to victims with protection orders, restraining order referrals, emotional support, and safety planning; and

**WHEREAS**, the City recognizes the importance of providing advocacy and a safe haven for victims of domestic violence; and

**WHEREAS**, the City supports the endeavors of Transitions to make our community safer for all residents; and

**WHEREAS**, Transitions has requested a grant from the City to continue its vital work in representing our citizens who have suffered from domestic violence.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, in consideration of the foregoing, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged herein, the City and Transitions do hereby agree to the following:

1. The City shall pay Transitions the sum of \$30,000 for its services in 2026 from line item: 201-1111-S3299.
2. In exchange for the payment from the City, Transitions agrees to continue the work set forth herein.
3. A representative from Transitions shall meet with City Council in June of 2026, and at any other requested time, to update the City about its activities and the benefits to the City provided by Transitions.

Attachment for Ordinance 2026-08

Exhibit A

4. The term of this MOU shall be for one year commencing on January 1, 2026, and ending on December 31, 2026.

***IN WITNESS WHEREOF***, the parties hereto have signed this Memorandum of Understanding on the dates provided below.

**CITY OF ZANESVILLE**

By \_\_\_\_\_

Its \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**TRANSITIONS, INC.**

By \_\_\_\_\_

Its \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID J. TARBERT

CITY OF ZANESVILLE LAW DIRECTOR

By: \_\_\_\_\_

David J. Tarbert, City Law Director