

## Economic Development Minutes

Honorable Council  
City of Newark, Ohio  
April 9, 2013

The Economic Development Committee met in Council Chambers on Monday April 8, 2013 following the Service Committee meeting. These members were present:

Rhonda Loomis, Chair  
Jeff Rath  
Bill Cost Jr

Doug Marmie  
Marc Guthrie

We wish to report:

1. Ordinance 13-07 enacting Chapter 1450 of the Codified Ordinances of Newark, Ohio providing for the licensing, registration, and inspection of all rental properties within the City of Newark, Ohio was considered and discussed.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked for her own benefit for the tenants in the audience to raise their hands, and then she asked the landlord in the audience to raise their hands. She then asked if there were any proponents for this legislation as presented from any member of Council, Committee, or Administration.

**Mr. Guthrie-** stated there were aspects of the legislation that he supported, but he was not a proponent of the entire legislation.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if there was anybody on the Committee who would like to speak in favor of the legislation.

**Mr. Guthrie-** said that during the discussion he will probably make some affirmative comments, he really wanted to hear more from the folks that were there to express their concerns on both sides of it and he wanted to interact based on that information.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if there was a member of Council who wished to speak in favor of the legislation in front of them as presented.

**Mrs. Floyd-** said she like Mr. Guthrie, agrees with some parts of it.

**Ms. Stare-** also said there were parts of it she agreed with.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if there was anyone in the Administration that would like to speak in favor of the legislation as presented.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if there was anyone on the Committee who wished to speak in opposition to the legislation as presented.

**Mr. Marmie-** stated that as the legislation is presented he didn't see an implementation Plan, he didn't see the feasibility economically, the finances in order to implement any such plan if there was one in place. Additionally he didn't see any kind of enforcement, who would actually enforcement it, and he said he had talked to the Administration and they don't know who would enforce it. It talks about various things it could be but putting legislation into place first of all the City has no finances of implementing it,

second there wasn't an implementation plan, third there wasn't an enforcement mechanism. He didn't see how it could be that a piece of legislation was put in place with those elements missing.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if any member of Council or Administration would like to speak in opposition of the legislation as presented.

**Mr. Frost-** stated that he had concerns that we were essentially taxing landlords who haven't done anything wrong by making them pay a fee every year. He stated we should be focusing on the ones that aren't doing their job. There are landlord that aren't doing their jobs, if we can correct Property Maintenance which he thinks the Administration is doing a great job of improving that to enforce the laws that we have before we look at new laws that would essentially tax landlords.

**Mr. Houdeshell-** stated his problem with it was that it doesn't provide for a way for the landlords to go after the tenant when they have a bad tenants that destroy the property. He said he had a friend who had a rental which smelled very bad because there hadn't been trash service in a year and a half when they moved out. All the garbage was in the basement and there wasn't a way to go after those people. He could have sued them but there wasn't any money to go after. He said if we are going to go after landlords then there has to be a way to go after the bad tenants who destroy the property.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if there was any other member of Council who wished to speak in opposition the legislation as presented, then if there was any member from the Administration who wished to speak in opposition of the legislation as presented.

**Mrs. Loomis-** then opened the discussion up to any member of the audience who wanted to speak in favor of the legislation.

**Anita Goodin-**114 N 11<sup>th</sup> St, she stated she is a tenant and feels fortunate because she has a great landlord who takes care of them. They take care of the property and he takes care of the property. She said she got involved with this because she is an avid walker and as she walked through the neighborhoods in the City especially in Ward 2 and Ward 1 how the properties were atrocious. Growing up in this town it is a pride thing for her. What happened to people taking pride in where they live and take pride in the properties that they own. You want business to come to this town, but who wants to come to this town if two blocks from City Hall you have properties so dilapidated.

**Richard Westbrook of Pierson Blvd-** he found a statement once made by Senator McCarthy which read "being in politics is like being a football coach you have to be smart enough to understand the game but dumb enough to think that it isn't important". He stated that we must have people in government who understands that we must have people who fend for the people who can't fend for themselves. Since everything we have now is being produced in some other Country that makes a rat race for the jobs. Million dollar companies like Wal-Mart only want to hire part time employees and pay no benefits. Since money is tight most spouses have to work to even afford a place like this. A display with pictures of properties was shown. He stated the picture were after we tore 81 houses down in this town and the reason there weren't more pictures is because he said there wasn't space for more. He believed there were

70 some there now. He said this is what people are getting with their money, something like this. Are they safe? I don't know but thank God I don't have to live in one to find out. He stated his other problem was using taxpayer money to tear down condemned houses and now he found out that someone is authorizing CHIP money to fix up rental property. He said landlords can't lose and that we needed to make a change and make it now. He said he knew if there were problems with the rental registration licensing, he was sure members of City Council wouldn't have any problem working them out. So far the City has torn down 81 houses over the last four years, now what are we going to do with these? Should we file for a CHIP program so that we can fix these up for landlords? He said he hoped a landlord whose name I can't identify on the disc, was in the audience to thank the City for the \$39,000.00 of repairs in his rental property and didn't cost him a dime, but we had to pay it back. As we have stated before we have to have a license or a permit for everything that we do, yard sale permit, dog license, fishing license, whatever but a landlord doing business doesn't have to answer to anybody. No permit, no license and this is the kind of stuff we are coming up with. It is time to end, let's clean up Newark and give the City back to the people like it should be.

**Mrs. Loomis-** asked if all the pictures were of rental properties.

**Mr. Westbrook-** answered that it didn't make any difference they are in Newark and that is what we are concerned about. People are living in these houses, are they safe are they sanitary or not. He said he could give you information but it doesn't change the picture any.

**Mrs. Loomis-** explained that she was asking because we are here to discuss rental registration so that is why she asked if they were all rentals and she meant no disrespect.

**Mr. Rath-** stated that it looked like there were multiple pictures of single houses and asked Mr. Westbrook if he knew approximately how many different addresses were represented on that board.

**Mr. Westbrook-** said he could provide addresses and there were 70 some pictures on there, only one picture was duplicated to show the defects of the roof.

**Leisha -** 519 Franklin Ave, said she was an unofficial representative of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, she is also President of the Society at St. Francis and a home visitor. She said their area for St. Francis covers all of the Newark Wards represented on this Committee from Bowers Ave to Churchill Downs to Executive Dr. Every week members of the St. Vincent de Paul visit families, the elderly and other vulnerable people that can't afford adequate houses due to high rents and an inadequate supply of quality housing for low income citizens of our community. They seek help for their rent or deposits which take most of their income and forces them to neglect their other basic necessities like food and medicine. We believe that housing is a basic human right and every person has a right to a decent home. From our perspective and those that we serve at St. Vincent de Paul having rental units registered and inspected regularly would meet our common responsibility for housing the most vulnerable of our society and would increase and improve housing opportunities for people who are need of a decent place to live. Registration and inspection would minimize hazardous and substandard

conditions of rental units where many of our citizens reside. She relayed information concerning different families that she is currently helping. She said that she hoped this legislation made it to full Council and she invited them to go out with the members of St. Vincent de Paul on home visits and see what they see. These are real people in need and she thought that it would be helpful to you who mostly get to see government reports and spreadsheets the needs of these people and the conditions they are living in. Many of our companion animals are living in better conditions than these individuals.

**David Greene**- 1791 Olympic Ct, he said he appreciated the opportunity to present the rental licensing legislation to the Economic Development Committee of City Council. He thanked Council for its willingness to accommodate participation from people of the community this evening. He also wanted to thank lots of people who came out to support this effort for the safety of residents and the improvement of housing conditions in Newark. Anita Goodin, Dick Westbrook and Leisha Freaz have illustrated the problem of housing as well as concerns for safety and well fare of our community. You all should have received this legislation and he hoped that they have had an opportunity to read it. The Ad Hoc Committee on rental registration established by City Council held 8 months of discussion. After many citizens spoke at City Council meetings about the need safety, minimum standards for rentals and a stronger Property Maintenance in Newark. For the next 5 months the Citizens Committee for housing rights developed and drafted this legislation with the able guidance of Mr. Sassen from the City's Law office. They have taken the time to meet with every City Council member to discuss this proposal and listen to questions and suggestions on housing and rental regulation as well as talking with members of the Newark community. We recognizes that the Property Maintenance Department is under the direction of the Safety Director just as police and firefighters are because the issue of safety is of a primary importance. The Ohio Landlord Tenant Law Chapter 53.21 of the Ohio Revised Code states that all of the housing must be safe and habitable. It also lays out the rights of both tenants and landlords. As a community group representing many people who have not voiced their concerns about housing and rentals in Newark we developed this legislation. We ask that you advocate for it, pass this legislation and send it to the Mayor for approval and implementation. In response to questions about how it will be initially funded and implemented. We expect that to be the job of City Council and the Administration. Several of our Committee members have suggested two or three months of initial funding required before rental fees begin could be funded by fines collected from violations, from CDBG Grant or other grants or the General Fund. If this issue is a priority for you as it is for so many people in this town you will accomplish this as well as you do other matters that you prioritize like the City financed the demolition of landlords properties or even with Federal funds or the \$34,000.00 repayment of the CHIP funds for renovation or the purchase of other property. As to the cost of these rental fees we have repeatedly pointed out that \$20.00 a year for a rental unit is \$1.67 a month. For landlords with more than 25 apartments or rental properties the additional cost is \$10.00 per rental unit or 84 cents a month. If this required an increase in rent then it

should not be a huge problem. If you believe that this proposal can be approved upon we invite your energy to do this. If you find this proposal lacking than it is your job to do better but in the process ensure the safety and housing and Newark's housing conditions are what they need to be. So partial what we are saying is that we are putting this in your lap. It is not acceptable for you to not pass this than do nothing. It is totally unacceptable the conditions of housing as you enter Newark from all four sides. When you enter downtown Newark are outrageous. There are conditions that discourage visitors that discourage business and that discourage residents who live in these communities. It is your responsibility and I put this on your shoulders and the Administration's shoulders to produce something that takes care of this problem, begins to deal with it more seriously than only the demolition of buildings. We also feel strongly that the Economic Development Committee has an obligation to send this on to full Council for discussion and vote. Councilmembers elected from some of the hardest hit sections of Newark are not represented on this Committee, granted they get to speak from the audience but they don't get to vote on this proposal and because of that we would urge in the interest of Democracy that is be passed on to full Council so that all of the Wards get to decide whether it is legislation for Newark. Whatever you decide, as Joann Westbrook states so eloquently "we are not going away."

**Mrs. Loomis-** addressed Mr. Greene when she stated that the Property Maintenance Department was established in the former administration and was ran poorly, can you give me that?

**Mr. Greene-** answered "sure"

**Mrs. Loomis-** this Administration has had one year and a few months of trying to build a Property Maintenance Department and taking it very seriously. Your letter to the Editor stated that after the tree hit that property on W Church St, Property Maintenance had to be called because the owner wouldn't clean up the tree that hit that property. When Property Maintenance showed up that tree got cleaned up. After that the roof still leaked, further complaints needed to be made to Property Maintenance and according to your letter the landlord said I give up. That is our Property Maintenance Department doing what they are supposed to be doing, she stated it was a win. She said she understood that there is going to be some rebuttal there, what we just saw in Service Committee tonight was another attempt to expedite trash, grass and rodents instead of allowing it to go on for 30 days and that process to go on for 45 days or better. They now have 48 hours that clarification came from Director Sassen to one of the landlords that had a question about it. She said she submits to him that this Administration is trying to work towards the same goal you have, be it not as quickly as you would like, but it has only been a year and a half. The CHIP Grant you are right it is appalling but it happened, that isn't supposed to happen again under the Hall Administration, it most certainly shouldn't. It probably took away some money that we could have used in Property Maintenance. With that being said she stated she didn't see where this Administration was sitting on their hands as far as Property Maintenance. You and some of your colleges have turned in multiple complaints to Property Maintenance multiple times in one day, causing a back log of sorts. They are working with what they have. She asked Mr. Greene if he could at least give this

Administration a little more time to continue to build on this department that in reality is becoming more and more robust by the day.

**Mr. Greene-** stated what he said is an expression he thinks of a lot of the communities sentiment and that Council listened very carefully to it because there is a great deal of impatience with this process. The whole process, the Property Maintenance process about how long it takes something to get fixed or not get fixed, about the complaint about people filing too many Property Maintenance complaints, which is crazy to him. The amount of complaints that could be written about deteriorating property in Newark we haven't touched the tip of an ice berg with this one. Although all of the Westbrook's pictures may not all be rentals a lot of them are rentals and there are a lot of other conditions in Newark that need to be paid a lot of attention to and a lot of people from the community expressed this concern about everywhere you come into downtown Newark from every side it is depressing to people, it is discouraging for residents who live there and they want something else done and that is all he is expressing. He said he would give credit to anybody who works hard to fix things but he said he along with other people will raise questions about how stuff needs done. He said they really need to see some results some times and some of the results are not happening. The purpose of the Rental Registration is to provide safety and wellbeing of housing, to improve the housing stock, to get more inspections of delinquent property or bad property. The idea that good people are hurt in this process, first this is a minimal amount of cost that we are talking about here. Other cities have much more stringent rental registration regulations. I will give credit to Council and the Administration for working on this but you should also be sensitive to the fact that there are at least 50 residents here that are saying whoa something is wrong here, something is wrong with this picture and you have to hear that. I just hope that you hear it real clear because all kinds of things are involved.

**Mr. Marmie-** told Mr. Greene that he appreciated all the effort his committee has put forth on this. Saying that it is our job and that you are going to put it in our lap, I can take the ball and run with it, I have no problem that. However when I did sit down with a committee member, not one of my suggestion I believe was implemented or listened to. You asked us to listen to you; I made suggestions of things to do. I think this current Administration is building upon the Property Maintenance and is doing it in an expedient manner. The legislation that you have, with the about \$150,000 a year you would generate, \$150,000 isn't going to correct the problem that you are trying to address, it isn't even going to touch the tip of that ice berg you just mentioned. You keep harping on the issue of the demolition; the demolitions weren't actually paid for by taxpayers' dollars they were by a litigation lawsuit. Those funds came back to us in the form of the State. It was not one taxpayer dollar, it was a law suit that was won by the State of Ohio and they utilized it in order to do what we did. The City of Newark took advantage of that program to the fullest extent, as a matter of fact I think that it was one of the largest in the State of Ohio that utilized it because we jumped right on it. It was not taxpayers' dollars and I would hate for all these folks out here to assume your statement was correct in that because it was not. We did not utilize taxpayers' dollars.

As far as building and improving I think that we do need to improve our Property Maintenance and I think that this Administration is making that a priority just like you

have asked. I think that everybody up here on Council feels strongly about Property Maintenance and wants to improve this City just like yourself and your committee. I even mentioned before, the three items that I mentioned that weren't in this, those were the three things that I talked about that had to be in place and had to be discussed before you bring legislation forward because you should never put a law in to place that can't be enforced or that can't be enacted. If you don't have a funding mechanism and you don't have plans on how to do that. You mentioned CDBG funds, CDBG funds can't be used for something like that it goes against the grant. Knowing where you can get your funding source is a primary example of what actually can be done. Our budget is very tight as it is with different priorities and we understand that but yet we have set aside dollars for our Property Maintenance and our Property Maintenance has improved 100%. Is it where we want it to be, no is it where the Administration wants it to be, no but they are improving on it daily. They are doing their best. You said you commend people for effort; I commend them because they are giving 110%, and they are doing the best with very limited resources.

**David Greene-** what I think is the responsibility of the community is to be involved and speak up about what you are concerned about, what we are concerned about. What I believe is the responsibility of elected officials and both in terms of Council and Administration is to make those things into a reality. So when I say that I am putting it in your lap, I think we are saying we are bring a serious concern to your table here. This has been talked about for a year straight and more than that. People have been getting together to do something about it but what will Council do about it.

**Mr. Cost-** told David that he commended his committee, for the work that you have put into this. I think that what you have done is bring this issue to the forefront, look around the room you have a lot of people concerned. He hoped that he understood that they were just as concerned as is every member of Council. We all want to see Newark property improved, we are all concerned about the safety of citizens, we want to see property values be maintained but it is something that we do a step at a time. He fears that we can't do it all at once but he doesn't want him to leave here and think that we would consider no action acceptable either. Doing nothing is not a choice it is not acceptable to any of us.

**David Greene-** said that the legislation is proposed a step it is not proposed as a solution and it is our saying the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof of the commitment to deal with the rental deterioration and problems in Newark is in what you do about it.

**Mrs. Loomis-** the problem with that statement is that what you presented to us is a law, this is not a step, a good faith effort from us to you, and this would become a law.

**Ms. Stare-** asked Mr. Greene if retirement and continuing care communities be involved in this like Candlewick Commons or Goosepond, Flint Ridge or the Avalon Building. Then also what about Metropolitan Housing, would this fall under this also?

**David Greene-** it says all rentals

**Ms. Stare-** said she talked to one community and they had 391 units. They would have to pay \$3,000.00 for a registration when they hire people to take care of the building, they have a staff and that is quite a bit of money when you are already paying someone.

**Mr. Greene-** I can appreciate that but if you have 390 apartments, I don't know what the rent coming in for that is and I realize there are expenses and maintenance but 390 apartments at \$500.00 each is a million or million and a half dollars. I think that we can find a lot of excuses not to move forward faster on this issue than what we are doing and they are around, on behalf of other people and myself I am just impatient with that whole process.

**Mrs. Floyd-** she addressed Mr. Greene, she said that she has spoken to David, Nancy and lots of you numerous times. Most of the pictures you have come from my Ward, most of the streets he mentioned are my Ward and I live just up the street in the area that you come into, to come downtown and almost everything around me is rental property so I understand what is going on with rental property. I sat in on most of the rental registration meetings that were held and listened to all the arguments for and against. I understand the reason behind it and I agree with much of that. In terms of reading the legislation as a person on Council who takes an oath of office which says I have to watch the money in Newark very carefully, what the problem with the legislation aspect is the fact that, and I remember I asked Lesa Best this when you went to Sandusky she said is there anything as a Council member would like to know. I said yes, I would like to know where they got the up-front money to start with because you have to have a way to fund it. It's fine to say that it will go through the Property Maintenance Department but we basically have 3 people in the Property Maintenance Department. We have one in the office and two inspectors that is not enough to deal with everything that would go along with rental registration. I don't know anyone on Council who doesn't want safe housing in Newark. Safe housing is important and I have seen many examples as many of us, one in my Ward that was a real mess. I definitely feel like we need to do something but like Bill said we are going to have to take it slowly. I think that there are numerous things that we could add to the Property Maintenance Department that would beef it up and as finances get a little bit better we have all pushed for an additional inspector in the Property Maintenance Department which I think would be very valuable. I think most of us are appreciative of the idea if there are 3 violations within a year than there is an internal and external inspection. I think that those are definitely things that we could go along with to start with. I don't see us dropping this, I don't see us says no done totally over with. I see us moving forward to hopefully improve housing because I agree with you, lots needs to be done. It would be nice if we had an extra 20 million dollars to put it all into effect right away. It does take a huge influx of money in order to do that, to have the inspectors and everything that we need. I do want safe housing I do want the houses around me to look a lot better than they do right now both interior and exterior.

**Mr. Rath-** said that he also talked with them. He stated he had issues with the legislation and he would discuss that but he also had a general question about the legislation. The issue that I have is this, when Mrs. Loomis asked the landlord to raise your hand in the room, there were significantly more landlords here than there are tenants. There are a lot of both but probably more landlords than tenants. I would go out on a limb and say that the landlords that are here are not the landlords we are having trouble with. I am just assuming that, the landlords that we are having trouble with are probably not going to show up at this meeting and shame on them for having properties the way they do. The



issue that I have with this is there are a lot of good landlords that are here today and in the City of Newark that aren't here and this does really nothing to protect them. Yet a lot of these fines against them because of the few that aren't here today that are bad landlords. The question that I have is I am not entirely sure what your objective is, obviously one of the objectives is to clean up Newark. I am all for that and I agree with you there are neighborhoods that look terrible and we need to do more to clean those up. I think that we have been like Mrs. Loomis said I think we have been doing better in the past year under the new Administration and I think that we will continue to do better as time goes on. I think that you will see some changes to the Property Maintenance Code in the very near future that will allow us to do an even better job. One of the other objectives that I think you have, and correct me if I am wrong, is to provide better low rent housing for people who can't afford full rent housing.

**Mrs. Loomis-** the objective is safe housing period.

**Mr. Rath-** right but I get the impression that they want to increase the amount of safe low rent housing, and I don't have a problem with that, but by fixing up a property and increasing its' value and increasing its' safety isn't going to increase the amount of low rent housing stock in the City of Newark. The only way that you are going to have low rent housing in the City of Newark and perhaps I am wrong on this, the only way to have good, low rent affordable housing in the City of Newark is to have those housing units subsidized by the Government. If there is housing units subsidized in the City of Newark than there are already a host of inspections that they go through in order to qualify for that subsidizing. Is that part of the objective you are trying to accomplish and if so how does this help that?

**Ms. Stare-** said that when she was reading over the registration she noticed that it asked for date of birth. She asked if that wasn't discriminatory. You can't even ask someone's age when you are hiring someone she just wondered why it was there.

**Mr. Greene-** explained that part of the reason was to make sure there was a reasonable, identifiable, reachable person in charge of buildings. There are cases where people are not reachable who are landlords and where tenants have to deal with whatever they have to deal with because they can't reach that person, or nobody can or if they have a P.O. Box somewhere in another town. So we have dealt with this question and it has been studied in other towns too. That is the reason; I am not sure about the date of birth but lots of details about how to get a hold of the person in charge.

**Ms. Nancy Welu-** she thanked the tenants and the people in the Citizens Committee for housing rights that are here this evening and anyone else who came out to support this effort. I also want to thank Law Director Sassen for meeting with us and also all the Council members, time is valuable. Mr. Marmie, I don't thank you for your time and I did listen to everything that you had to say I want you to know that and I appreciate it. It was nice just getting to know all of you on a personal level. Because not everybody is privy to this legislation in the audience, I don't think so, maybe some of the people have it but I would just like to quickly point out some of the highlights of it if it is ok Madam Chairwoman?

**Mrs. Loomis-** please do.

**Ms. Nancy Welu-** every owner/operator of a rental unit shall register on a registration form all rental units that are owned. Meaning if you own a rental unit you have to register it. No rental unit shall rent, lease or allow occupancy until it is registered. The fee should be \$20.00 for single family, duplex or multifamily complexes up to but not to exceeding 25 dwelling units. It is \$20.00 for the first 25 units then \$10.00 per unit after that. The money collected will be used exclusively for running rental registration, implementation, monitoring and enforcement purposes. So that means it doesn't go into the General Fund, it goes into Property Maintenance where I think that it should. A registration form is valid for one calendar year unless false information is furnished to the Department of Public Safety or transfer of a rental unit has been completed. Owner/operator of any premises containing one or more rental units shall perform or have performed a self-inspection of the interior and exterior of the premises annually. Results of the self-inspection shall be reported to the Department of Public Safety. Any owner/operator of any rental unit that has been found to be in violation on three separate occasions for any one rental unit within one year will be subject to a mandatory inspection of the interior and exterior to be performed by the Department of Public Safety and the owner/operator shall be responsible for the cost not to exceed \$100.00. Penalty for violating these provisions: 1<sup>st</sup> offense within a three year period \$100.00, 2<sup>nd</sup> offense up to \$250.00, 3<sup>rd</sup> offense or subsequent offense within a three year period fined up to \$1,000.00. That is kind of the nuts and bolts; there is a lot of legalese that Director Sassen said had to be in there when I questioned it. I don't understand all the WHEREAS's and I don't really like the birthdate either Ms. Stare, those are all legal things that had to be in there.

Across the United States and Ohio towns are enacting rental licensing and registration and they are also requiring inspections of every rental unit. Lots of towns are doing mandatory inspections but we didn't put that in here because we didn't think that was feasible. I would love to take credit for this idea, maybe I could make some money but it's not my idea. I have done hours upon hours of research, looking up towns and cities. We are not reinventing the wheel here is what I am trying to say. It's nothing new, it is just new to Newark and it is a new concept and change and change is hard, we realize that change is hard and it is hard to get a hold of.

In June of 2010 Youngstown, Ohio enacted a rental licensing and registration program. Youngstown has about 20,000 more people in their city than we do but what is kind of similar to us is their rental housing and owner occupancy rate. They are about 60/40 we are about 57/43, 43% rental 57% owner occupied. There are a little over 8,000 rental units in the City of Newark. Youngstown uses money from the Federal Government, Neighborhood Stabilization Funds to enact their program. Do we get those funds Neighborhood Stabilization Funds?

**Mrs. Loomis-** yes we do

**Ms. Nancy Welu-** I would like to read to you if you will bear with me what the Mayor of Youngstown, Jay Williams, is quoted saying in September of 2010 after this was enacted. "This program came about as a direct response to concerns our citizens expressed over many years. There is a collective and unwavering determination to have achieved success. We are getting calls daily from people who are wanted to confirm the status of their neighboring rental property. Their cooperation has been critical to us and we want to

encourage everyone to keep it up. It is tremendous to see our residents so engaged in our efforts to improve our neighborhoods. We welcome the cooperation and participation of the responsible landlords who are complying with the law and we will work with them appropriately. However for those landlords that choose to violate the law", Nancy clarified that it is their rental registration law, "well then consequences a wait. The bottom line is that at a minimum every resident in Youngstown deserves, decent, safe and sanitary housing. Any landlord that disagrees with that should not be doing business in our city." That is the Mayor of Youngstown, Ohio who has taken a very in my opinion courageous and very proactive stance to clean up their city.

Currently no other groups have brought forth any other ideas or legislation, other than the Citizens Committee for Housing Rights people who come to our meetings; nobody has come to our meetings with any other ideas. We welcome all people and ideas at our meetings, they are public meetings. I believe that this program, the rental licensing and registration will benefit the landlords for providing more appealing neighborhoods in which to do business and it will give out Property Maintenance Department another tool in their tool box to do their job for the City of Newark. That is truly how I look at this is just another too.

A topic that has not been addressed in this legislation, which is a subject near and dear to me is education and the need for a more robust tenant landlord rights and responsibility program. The Citizens Committee for Housing Rights has put two tenants' rights workshops within the last six months in conjunction with Legal Aid. We have also held one tenant association organizing meeting with another scheduled this month. All three of these meetings were very well attended by tenants and it was apparent that tenants in this community are hungry for the education and they are also hungry to be heard is what I feel. They just want someone to listen to them and I am sure City Council people get those calls all the time also so I don't want to diminish that. For me this process that we are going through right now is the beginning, I know this is legislation that we have put forward and we have worked hard and it's not 100%, nothing is 100%, I understand that. There is much work to be done in the area of housing, rental housing in particular. I am really pleased to hear about the 48 hours on the trash. I was the one that called about the trash across from the fire department on Hollander St. I emailed Director Spurgeon on a Wednesday and the trash had been sitting out there since the previous Thursday. It was cleaned up two days later. I found that just appalling that it was across from our Fire Department and it sat there for a week, I thought it was disgusting. I know the City is taking proactive steps and we are impatient, humans are impatient by nature. We all are, our kids are, we are, we want something, we have McDonald's drive thru, everything is fast, fast. Now is the time to take a proactive step to stop the decay of the rental houses in Newark. I believe that if the City of Newark makes housing a priority like fire and police it will greatly enhance the quality of life for its' citizens. I would also encourage all of you to vote in the affirmative to push this to full Council so all Wards like others have said can be represented and have a voice and at least talk about it.

Mr. Marmie you said that no taxpayer's dollars were spent this past year, you could be correct on that, but how about previous years? I know that in the last four years almost 80-81 houses have been torn down and taxpayers' funds have been used for some of

those demos. This past year I know they weren't for the 46 that have been demoed and I appreciate that but the other 30 some money had been taken out of citizens' taxes to pay for those. To Mr. Rath, this is about a business in Newark with minimum oversight and it's about structures. It's not about landlords, it's not about tenants, it's about structures and it's about making those structures have minimum property standards. Minimum property standards, that means running water, means heat in the winter, a furnace that is hooked up, I know of a house right now that they put a furnace in but they didn't hook it up, but by God it has a furnace. Roofs that don't leak, these are the minimum property standards that we are asking for and it has nothing to do with low income high income, it's got to do with property standards, it is about bringing the bar up. When we set the bar high for our children they meet that expectation. I guess that is what we are asking for, let's set the bar high for housing, rental housing in Newark. As you can tell there is passion on both sides, and to be clear there are no hard feelings on my part. This is just something that I am very passionate about a lot of us are. I am not driven by money, I'm not driven by fame, and I am driven by the right thing to do and empathy for my fellow human being.

**Mr. Guthrie**- thanked Madam Chairwoman, Nancy, David and everybody who was there that night. I know that a lot of effort has gone in to this and I hope that everybody shares the same concern about the deterioration of our old neighborhoods. It is downright depressing. When I was a 7<sup>th</sup> or 8th grader I walked back and forth downtown Newark to Blessed Sacrament and the neighborhoods were far different then. It would be interesting to see over the last 20-25 years what has happened to that percentage of rental properties versus owner occupied properties. I talked to a couple of owners who have lived in challenging neighborhoods now for almost their lifetimes, they are not here but they can really give a thought provoking case as to why we have got to do something because in many ways they are sort of trapped in their neighborhoods. Their property values have gone down because of deteriorating rental properties around them and I am not just saying it is rental properties but the ones they pointed out to me were rental properties and that was the bulk. We do have a responsibility as a community, as a Council to work together to do things like make our Property Maintenance program more and more aggressive, as everybody knows here we are behind the 8 ball. As far as the revenue we need, how great it would be if we could have a couple more Property Maintenance inspectors, how great it would be if we could have team 7 back at our Police Department, how great it would be to have a squad in every one of our firehouses 24 hours a day which we don't but the fact is we have to deal with those realities. But that doesn't mean in my opinion that there is absolutely nothing we can do here. I know Carol Floyd has mentioned a couple of times in the past about trash removal that I think we should look at especially in the area of Property Maintenance. The other point that I wanted to make Nancy if you will let me is that I want to thank St. Vincent de Paul for what they do in this community. I am telling you right now many of us up here don't realize what St. Vincent de Paul and many other organizations similar to them, but I think that they are unique in so many ways. The fact that they go into homes and the things that they do to lift people up so I want to recognize what they do for our community. He then asked Nancy a question about Section 1450.02b regarding random inspections. My past experience with the word random sort of doesn't fit this description. This is used

differently, this particular language of the random inspections, was it out of another community's legislation?

**Nancy Welu-** some do, that suggestion was made to us to make it fairer or to get a better coverage of the city. There are cities that divide the city up into four or five different quadrants then each year they pick a quadrant then focus on that. Property Maintenance aggressively focuses on that. There are all different ways to try to clean up or to bring minimum property standards to rental housing.

**Mr. Guthrie-** there are a lot of pieces of this puzzle, one of the pieces I view is a fair housing. Do you have any comments on what kind of a job we are doing in this community as far as fair housing process? I know we contract out with someone and have for years but are we getting anything out of it.

**Mrs. Loomis-** informed him they are for discrimination

**Ms. Nancy Welu-** said she has done public records requests regarding Fair Housing to get an understanding and to try to educate herself. She said that the two meetings their committee had regarding Fair Housing drew more people than the Fair housing Officer had all year. She informed him that it was about a \$20,000 contract that we have to have because we get CDBG funds. Could our Fair Housing be more robust, sure how do we do that, well we get out in the community and talk to people, talk to them about meeting and give them flyers. We give them information such as tenant landlord rights. She explained that the Fair housing officer is not in City Hall that there is a 1.800 number and they work on discrimination but they take calls regarding tenant landlord situations. They tell them about escrowing their rent money. There were only about 4 reported cases of that occurring because people don't know they can do that and the process for doing that.

**Mr. Marmie-** asked if Youngstown had a Property Maintenance Department.

**Ms. Nancy Welu-** yes they do

**Mr. Marmie-** asked how long they have had it and was their set up with this

**Ms. Nancy Welu-** said she couldn't answer how long they have had it but she didn't believe that it was set up with this. She advised him that she could find out that she has made email contact and that they have interesting ways of doing things. She said they didn't use General Funds to set this up.

**Bob Bennett** – 13455 Blue Jay Rd, my comment is this: the best hunter killed his bird dog by aiming too low.

**Irene Kennedy** -867 Shelbourne. This was formulated into legislation I believe because there was nothing coming from the City so this group got together with Mr. Sassen. If I understand it this is not a do or die piece of legislation. It can be amended or changed and you can massage it. I have heard people say they like parts of it but they don't like other parts of it. What I think this group wants to see happen is that you pass it on to Council so it can be debated. Nothing should be so set in stone that you can't change. There were some things I would have liked to see in there too. I have been looking at this for many years. I am very aware of Akron and Sandusky; I used to be in email contact with those folks too. There are a lot of ways to do this, if you have ideas than this is the time for Council to work on this document and change it. You can either change it now or you can

change it once it gets to Council but my concern is that you don't let it die. If it gets tabled or it doesn't go on to Council I am afraid nothing will.

**Mr. Guthrie-** asked Ms. Kennedy if because she has been involved with these other communities if she could draw a comparison between Sandusky and our city. Owned stock versus rental housing stock

**Ms. Kennedy-** answered no that the only discussions that she had with Sandusky was where do they get their information, where did they get their Property Maintenance Code. They got it from the City of Akron. My conversation with them was about their code. The thing that I noticed in the Sandusky one was that it did spell out the rights and the obligations of both tenants and landlords. She said the lady in Sandusky told her that when the landlords saw that they realized that they weren't alone in it that the City was going to be protecting both.

**Paul Hurst-** 965 Grafton Rd, spoke in favor of the rental licensing and registration based on his experiences living in Northeastern Ohio as a property owner, tenant and property manager. He spoke of it being a matter of safety.

**Robert Ryan-** 87 Wilwood Ave, said he used to be a landlord and is a homeowner. He expressed his favoritism for the legislation because of his property value decreasing by about \$40,000 because of the "slum lords" around him. He didn't know why it was a big discuss, charge the people who are making the money. He called Property Maintenance on a few of his neighbors a few of times and they did a fine job, they did what they were supposed to do. He like the 48 hours.

**Steve Sunkle-** 400 Washington Ct, he now lives in subsidized housing. He relayed his experience of living in a boarding house where the elderly owner built a make shift wall in the downstairs living room for a bedroom. He stated fire hazard concerns regarding what was built. He said if we had this legislation that there would be inspections once a year which would stop this like that from happening.

**Mr. Marmie-** I hopefully can address a lot of issues that folks that are in opposition might have and thus saving some time. First of all, I want to say that this issue is not going to die. Whether this legislation that was present in a final form for us to vote for or not may not pass, however the issue of Property Maintenance and improving the housing stock in the City of Newark is not dying. The bar has been set high it's just that we can't jump that high yet. My recommendations on how it is not going to die and I have talked to Ms. Welu in depth about this on some different things that was presented in this legislation should incorporate into our Property Maintenance Code and I think that needs to be done immediately. There are some good ideas that definitely could be implemented in there. Some things that I also indicated that were problems with it; Mr. Guthrie eluded to the word random inspections. You have to be careful with random inspections because you can't unfairly discriminate therefore you have to inspect all the various properties and that means you are inspecting properties that there are no issues with and thus you are spending money sending someone out to inspect when there is no issue. We are not Akron, we are not Sandusky, we are not Youngstown, we are Newark Ohio, and we need to remember that. We don't have the tax revenue that Lakewood or Cleveland Heights has therefore we can't do as much because we don't have the funds to do that. Mr. Guthrie alluded to that earlier, if we had a lot more money we would do a lot of things.

City Government is here and is in place for the safety of citizens and that is always a priority. We talk about Fire and Police a lot but this is also an issue that is supposed to protect our citizens and the safety of our citizens. However it is not the responsibility of City Government to monitor business practices it is to make sure of the safety of the citizens and I think that we can do that with our Property Maintenance Code and not charge a tax onto a particular business. If we go along with the past we do have currently supposed to collect funds from that we do have licensing requirement and we only collect about 50% on those businesses. It is very difficult to enforce the collect on those businesses. To utilize what we currently do and to expect different results as far as if we impose what I consider a tax on landlords and expect to get 100% return is unrealistic. We will get good return with the folks we don't have problems with. It is those that we have problems with that we probably won't have very good successful returns. Mandatory inspections cost a lot of money and it will also take away from addressing the issues that are really the problem. I think that we our building on our Property Maintenance Code every day. This evening you got to witness just one thing by chance that we will change the first night that we are talking about it. We are constantly making changes and improvements; it's not just in legislation it is in efficiencies too. We do more inspections and address more issues this year or this month than we did last year during the same month because of the efficiencies of the technology and knowing how to manage time and manage the process of our Property Maintenance Code. I think that they have done an excellent job of doing that. Yes it doesn't appear that our bar is very high but it actually is. I think this Administration and those on Council have definitely proven that the bar is high and that we want to do better. One of the goals of Council is to add another inspector that is what we are looking to try to do. We would like to make sure that violators of our Property Maintenance Code are dealt with. I think that is one of the areas in this current legislation that can be implemented immediately. If you have a violation you are subject to another inspection later on and I think that is something that is not unfairly discriminatory. We have to make a decision on final legislation and we don't usually try to debate and change things in the Committee. If it is minor things, yes. The legislation that you have presented is final form legislation and to put it into law when there really is no way to enforce it, pay for it or implement it would not be prudent of anybody on Council. Councilmembers have always had attention on Property Maintenance. Since I have been here we have made great strides with Property Maintenance than where we were 10 years ago. I think that we will get even further in the years to come. I think this Administration is really good at getting things done quickly.

**Tim Bailey-** Dragoo Rd, stated he manages 100 and some places where the rent ranges anywhere from \$340.00 for a full single family house up to almost \$1100.00 a month depending on the house that you want and what you can afford. Taxing all of us landlords and whether you like it or not it is tax; it ain't the dollar amount it is the idea an all the extra paperwork. It would be like if you are going to tax all of us, the ones that are here tonight, probably 99% of us are good landlord, treat our people good. He said that it would be like going into a bar and saying you are going to arrest everyone in there because some of you are going to drink and drive home tonight. The idea is going to cause the rents to go up because of all the paperwork and it's not going to be \$2.00 either. He

said the cost of the paperwork will have to be added in there somewhere. The State Apartment Association has contacted him and their law firm has contacted him. They have fought this on many other cities. It is not very wide spread but they would like you to believe it is. He said he has the papers where they fought and won. He said he didn't want a long drawn out thing that he thought we could fix it. He said he thought Property Maintenance was great, he had gotten written up twice last year, one time it took a little longer than they gave me because they had to shut down Mt. Vernon Rd for him to cut a tree down. They gave me the time to do it, the tree is gone. For some reason he gets the idea that they want to decide what housing is appropriate for everybody. They were handing out flyers in a neighborhood that is dear to his heart. If you go down to Race street Amanda Babcock, sweet little old lady, I think she talked to Rhonda Loomis. I have been Ms. Amanda Babcock's landlord for approximately 20 years; I took over the house she lives in. He said the first time he went to meet her she asked him to please not fix her house up too fancy because you will have to raise my rent and I can't afford it. He said that he has done what he needs to do to make it safe and if Amanda calls him he is there within 24 hours if he is available. He said she called on a Saturday and the shower broke, he went on Sunday and installed a hand held shower so she could sit down and take her shower. He said the company is losing money renting it for \$340.00 a month. He said that it would not pass if the Property Maintenance guy went in and looked at some of the stuff. He said he was ashamed it would not pass. He said that it is not perfect, do I feel bad about it yes I do. He then relayed an experience regarding another tenant who she, her 2 year old son and boyfriend were living in a one bedroom apartment; it is too small, it is \$380.00 a month with all the utilities, but that is all they could afford. When they moved out they had trash in the apartment and had stuffed food down the register vents. He said they left him with a bad roach problem for the whole building.

**Charles Moore**- 120 N 24<sup>th</sup> St, stated that he has been a landlord for 20 years of three apartments that are attached to his house. He stated that it was about relationships. He said the issue was the tax; it is a source of revenue. He said the revenue exceeds the expense that it will take. He suggested that instead we make sure that in every leased signed there is protection for the tenant and the landlord. He suggested that whatever is in the Code is included in the lease agreement. He said that the tax is going to go directly to the tenants that the landlords aren't going to pay it. He said it will be passed along. He said it would be the same thing if the water or trash went up he would increase the rent.

**Christine** - 1600 Nautingham Rd Newark. She said she is a landlady and that she is just as compassionate as those that came up tonight saying they were for this proposal. She said she didn't think it had to be either or. She stated she has worked with single parent moms for the past 20 years who live in poverty and the horrible conditions they have lived in. She said there are already avenues in existence for helping people. She said if we could educate the tenants on how to be a good tenant and what to expect from a landlord. She said her concern is putting the fee on all of the landlords; go after the ones who are slum lords. She said that she feels it is an education issue to a large extent. She said she felt it was totally wrong and needed to be corrected to across the board demand that every landlord get involved in the registration process.

**Mr. Guthrie** – asked her how many rental properties she had in the City.



**Christine**- answered only one right now.

**Mickey Charles**- 2883 Mt. Herman Rd, stated he owns three rental properties, he said he just bought one down on Wilson St. He said that the fee adds up and should have been done 50 years ago when the housing started going down but nobody did anything. Now all the “do-gooders” are saying let’s do something about it. He said he was for fixing Newark up but Columbus was worse than Newark and Cleveland is worse than Newark, we are just a small town. He said when you kick someone out it takes 90 days and they tear your house up by kicking holes in the walls and doors, they take the copper and wiring out then it takes money out of your pocket to fix it back up.

**Steve Layman**- 9 N 3<sup>rd</sup> St, he stated that he didn’t think that there was anybody there who disagreed that there is a problem with property maintenance in Newark, Ohio. He said there is a lot of disagreement that this is the vehicle to fix it. He suggested that it is not. Part of the reason is simple math. We don’t have direct ownership but we are involved in about 300 units. He said that they may have had one complaint but that they solved it. You can’t fix everything if you don’t know there is a problem. People we work with are responsible landlords and they spend a lot of money on maintenance. He said they don’t want to be taxed, but ok, if it solved the problem that would be one thing but he doesn’t think that it solves the problem. He said that he didn’t get to read the legislation but that he thought they had said every landlord is responsible for inspecting each unit. We would have to have someone inspect 300 units which is not a normal thing therefore they would have to hire someone to do it and it’s not really in the budget. It takes a lot of time to inspect 300 units; it is not something that you are going to be able to do in a week. He said someone will have to inspect their 300 units that we don’t have a problem with. He said we are going to hire a couple of people at City Hall and we are not going to get any bang for the buck, we are going to use all the money that we are collecting from him just doing paperwork. He said there was a better way to do it; he commended them for their work. It’s a problem and nobody had focused on the problem very well. He said this Administration is vastly different than anything that we have seen in Newark. Beef up the Property Maintenance Code and take out that ordinance that works. There is not enough money; you will not raise enough money by the fees you are proposing for landlords to do anything but process paperwork and now you have frustrated half of your audience because now they are paying and they’re not seeing a difference. Then you will have to raise the fees up. He said it is the wrong vehicle to solve the problem.

**Mr. Guthrie**- addressed Mr. Layman; he said Mr. Layman talked about inspection then asked him if it didn’t make good business sense as a manager or owner to inspect properties you rent once a year. He asked if it was general practice.

**Mr. Layman**- he stated he could only talk about what he knew, but no that was not necessarily general practice. If tenants move out once a year then yes they get inspected pretty thoroughly. If you have had a tenant that has been there for 5 years, I am not going to bother them. Its working, they are happy, I am happy, I don’t need to bother them. He also stated that Irene, who he respects a lot, thinks that this should go to full Council, but he thinks that it would be wasting a bunch of people’s time. This is not the vehicle, fix it then bring it back. Change it so that it works and does the job you want it to do then turn it into legislation.

**Mr. De Palmo-** asked Mr. Layman if he would say that when regular maintenance is performed in a unit wouldn't that constitute as an inspection, doesn't a report come back that would indicate if there was a potential problem. He thanked Mr. Greene when he approached the podium for turning in three complaints about his property. He said they were all valid and they had a problem that he was not aware of. The day they received the letters they had people out there taking care of the problem. He addressed the audience of landlords and told them that there was a place where they could better educate themselves; it is called the Licking County Apartment Association. He said they were formed in 1969; their goal was to improve themselves so they could do a better job of dealing with their tenants. He said if they would like more information to call himself or Mr. Bailey or others and invited them to come to their meetings. He gave the Committee members a handout; he advised them that it was a fact that over the last 7 years landlords have not been able to raise rent because the community couldn't afford the increase. In fact, he said some landlords had to decrease their rent and barely got by. He said that not every landlord is rich and can afford these things because it just isn't so. He said that we would hurt the community if we enacted something like this because it was going to do a couple of things. One is that it will make somebody who would want to come here and build a large complex go elsewhere. What will happen to that void? It will invite more government subsidized housing to be built. If people are worried about their property values, who would want more government subsidized housing.

**Tom Hughes-** 100 Paul Ave, he said that he was part of the audience last year during the Ad Hoc. He said the details involved in this issue are so immense, it would take a long time to come up with a solution that would be affordable, effective and satisfy everybody in this community. He said he believes that education is one of the things most important and that we need to educate both landlords and tenants.

**Mrs. Loomis-** stated she appreciated all the work Nancy, David, Lesa, Irene, St. Vincent De Paul put time and energy into helping the poor and indigent for the most part living in substandard housing. She thought what we had here were landlords who do care, what we don't have are the landlords that don't care. She said she also thinks there are voices there for tenants who are afraid to come forward because if they speak out there could be consequences. Just raising of the rent could frighten them and it is just a \$20.00 a year fee. In front of us is the legislation that this group has given us. This is what they felt would improve the housing stock and safe housing for tenants.

**Mr. Rath-** restated what Mr. Marmie had pointed out about there not be any money, no plan to implement and no personnel to implement. He said that he came there open minded and was looking for a reason to vote for this. Three points came to mind, one we are talking about self-inspections, if we implement this into law, the landlords in this room will do the self-inspections, we will get the forms and everything will be fine. The people whom we are trying to influence or correct are not going to do the self-inspections. They aren't doing anything now, why would they do anything just because it is a law. He thought that we would get the forms but the self-inspection wouldn't be done because they don't care. If we have 8000 units in the City, we spend 5 days a week, 8 hours a day not taking time off, 52 weeks of the year it would take 15 minutes to inspect each one of the units. He said we have to do something more to make sure landlords and tenants are

held accountable. He said we do need to do something, we do need to improve property maintenance but he will not be able to support the legislation.

**Mr. Cost-** thanked everyone who showed up that night and was pleased how everyone conducted themselves. He thought this was the truest sense of democracy, everyone has gotten a chance to talk, ideas were exchanged and it was being done with consideration. He said that tonight was a start not a finish, he said it was hard for him to view what they had right now as a finished piece, he thought it was just a start of the conversation. He said what he has heard over and over that night was rights and responsibility for tenants, landlords and Council. He also said he had heard education. He thought that was what that night was about. Education has to go for landlords, tenants and for them so they can understand what has taken place. He said he believes we do need to beef up our Property Maintenance but he thinks we are doing a better job than what was done in the past. He said as he recalls we went two years without anybody in Property Maintenance and we have been back to a year and he thought they were far better than what they were. It's not perfect; it isn't what any of them wants it is better. He said he would like to get another inspector and that doing nothing was not what they were going to do. He thought that it was everybody's responsibility to take a look at them to see what they can do to improve this situation. He said that if everybody cleaned up in front of their own house this would be a far better place to live.

**Mr. Guthrie-** said that he hoped we didn't just vote this down, he hoped that we would keep this in place as a vehicle for some of the ideas folks have where we can make improvement in our current processes. He didn't want to see them simply vote it down and not use it as a vehicle for change.

**Mr. Marmie-** he said he agrees with Mr. Guthrie regarding making sure this doesn't just die but you have couple of different issues here. We have people asking us to not do anything but really that might be the best thing to do with this piece of legislation, not sending that negative connotation of voting it down. If nobody makes a motion it is just dead for now and it can come back up and can be massaged. Where if we bring it to the table and make a motion and it gets voted down, and I can tell you that I can't support it in the form in which it is in then it does send a negative connotation and I don't want that. I think that there are some good ideas. The Councilmembers that did speak up said there were some things about it they liked but not one said they were ready to support it. He said that he didn't want to see the hard work of the committee go by the way side. The Directors and Administration are already looking at how they can incorporate some of the ideas in the Property Maintenance Code.

**Mr. Houdeshell-** said he agrees with Mr. Marmie and his biggest problem with it is that there is nothing in there to go after tenants who tear places up. He said that if that doesn't happen he will not support it.

**Mr. Guthrie-** asked the Law Director whether there could just be no motion and the legislation remain in Committee as it is right now, pending.

**Law Director-** if there is no motion it dies with a small d. Basically it goes back to someone's desk and sits until someone on the Committee says let's try it again. If there is a motion and it fails then it dies with a capital D. If it fails at Council it could still go back to someone's desk to have things added or subtracted. An idea really never dies. Whether

Ordinance 13-07 will die for lack of motion it will die if there is not a majority vote but the concept stays alive as long as someone on Council wants to keep it alive.

**Carol Floyd**- said she appreciated everybody who had been there; they had been there a long time. I said all long I wanted to see something happen; I want to see something accomplished. I would be willing to work with anybody who is willing to take the good parts of this and whether we call it rental registration or what parts of it work to make inspections of houses that are not up to where they should be. Whether we put that through Property Maintenance, like everybody else we all want at least one more inspector two would be nice. If we can only get into properties and get them inspected and brought up to code we would be better off for the community as a whole. I don't want to see this die and I am willing to work with somebody to come up with substitution legislation.

No motion for Ordinance 13-07

Rhonda Loomis, Chair