

The Center for Local Government Board of Directors Meeting
May 1, 2019

1:30pm – 3pm

CLG Conference Room
(4015 Executive Park Dr. Suite 226)

In attendance: Jim Lukas, Kristin Bitonte, Jack Cameron, Vicky Earhart (Board); TJ White, Jeremy Worley (Staff)
Absent: Mike Rahall (Board)

- Call to order at 1:35pm
- Approve January 2, 2019 board meeting minutes
 - Motion to approve by J. Lukas. Seconded by V. Earhart. Motion passed 4-0
- W.D. Heisel Memorial Scholarship Discussion
 - The Board went around the room and shared their top candidates. J. Lukas stated that his top candidates were Anderson, Bahar and O'Bryon. V. Earhart's top candidates were Anderson and Palmer. J. Cameron's were Bahar, Lauber and Palmer. K. Bitonte's were Bahar and Palmer (in no particular order). T. White assigned points to each candidate based on whether they were a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd place rank. Under this system, Bahar had 8 points, Anderson had 6 and Palmer had 5. It was again noted that some candidates were not ranked in a preference order by Board members (e.g. Bahar and Palmer for K. Bitonte). The Board decided to get M. Rahall's choices to see how they affected the rankings.
 - T. White reminded the Board that in the event of a tie after M. Rahall's choices were in, the Board had the option of giving the top candidates to former CLG Executive Director Lee Meyer, who could cast the deciding vote.
- Electricity Aggregation Program with City of Cincinnati
 - T. White stated that he recently held a meeting between the City of Cincinnati, Silverton, Anderson Township, Wyoming, Woodlawn and Madeira. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss how they could join into Cincinnati's residential electricity aggregation program. This meeting was the indirect result of CLG's efforts to start a multi-government residential electricity aggregation program. Cincinnati read about it in CLG's newsletter, and approached CLG about facilitating a connection between Cincinnati and the surrounding jurisdictions.
 - K. Bitonte asked where CLG was in this process. T. White stated that one meeting had been held, with another one being scheduled for mid-May. T. White went on to state that CLG's role in this program is to be a facilitator and to get the ball rolling. J. Cameron stated that it would therefore make sense for CLG to step away once the process is complete, since this is Cincinnati's program. T. White agreed.
 - T. White went on to state that this program enables CLG to offer a residential aggregation program to CLG member governments without having to do the work of managing the program. It would also be up to the member governments to determine whether they want to be a part, and any intergovernmental agreements would be between Cincinnati and the participating communities. J. Lukas asked if Wyoming was currently a member of CLG. T. White stated that they are not, but that he would ask them to join if they went forward with participating in the program. Although CLG would not be managing the program, they are still doing work on behalf of the City of Wyoming.

- T. White stated that Cincinnati is currently not a member of CLG. J. Cameron stated that if CLG is essentially helping Cincinnati grow one of their programs that they are benefiting from CLG and should also be asked to join. T. White stated that was true, but they are also essentially providing a service for our members and helping CLG accomplish one of their programmatic goals. K. Bitonte suggested that Cincinnati be asked to join at a discounted “in kind” membership rate for 2019. T. White stated that he would pursue this.
- T. White went on to state that although Hamilton County joins every year, they pay \$15,000. If Cincinnati is a member, this may provide an opportunity to reduce Hamilton County’s dues burden in 2020.
- J. Cameron asked how CLG differentiates between what shared services programs to offer to members (from ones that are suggested from the outside). T. White stated that if it comes from a governmental entity or school district, he will forward the opportunity. Whereas if it comes from a private business he generally does not. J. Cameron stated that this is more than forwarding the opportunity, since CLG is facilitating discussions.
- CLG Credit Card Policy / CAMA Credit Card
 - T. White stated that since local governments are required to enact credit card policies, CLG will also put a policy together for passage at the July Board meeting. This adds an extra layer of administrative protection for CLG staff. CLG has been collecting policies (which are available in the code bank) in order to get good benchmarks.
 - T. White also stated that during his outreach visits, Scot Lahrmer from Amberley Village suggested an agreement with CAMA whereby CLG could pay for CAMA expenses with the CLG credit card, and then be reimbursed by CAMA. This would cover instances where the CAMA treasurer cannot appear at an event, and would also provide a layer of protection for CAMA, since CLG would be keeping track of all meeting expenses through invoices. K. Bitonte asked how this would be tracked. T. White stated that CLG would have a separate budget line item for CAMA expenses and reimbursements. K. Bitonte suggested opening a separate credit card specifically for CLG to use for CAMA expenses. There was a consensus from the Board to move forward with that approach.
- CLG Annual Meeting Review
 - T. White reviewed the Annual Meeting. He stated that attendance was down in 2019, and that the meeting conflicted with the State of the County Address in Warren County. T. White also stated that the Annual Meeting is marketed through e-mails and individual phone calls to members, and the main reason for people not attending this year was scheduling conflicts. He stated that there is probably not a good time to hold the meeting that will appeal to everyone.
 - V. Earhart suggested holding the Annual Meeting in the fall in 2020, and combining it with the Leadership Academy graduation. T. White stated that there is nothing in the bylaws preventing CLG from holding a fall meeting. J. Cameron suggested holding the meeting at the end of the day, with the potential for a social event to follow. The Board then debated the scope of the social event- would this event be part of the meeting or an unofficial event after the meeting? Would there be alcohol available? This issue will be revisited as CLG gets closer to planning the 2020 Annual Meeting.
 - T. White stated that if the meeting were to be held in the fall, CLG would likely publish its Annual Report in the spring, in order to not make governments wait all year.
- Information Sharing Redesign Update
 - J. Worley stated that the information sharing redesign is nearing completion. A new survey instrument has been developed, and the Knack system (used by the current datacenter) has been improved. The Annual Survey will now be conducted through Knack, who will show a government their answers from the previous year to assist in filling out the survey. The survey has also been

redesigned to enable document uploads instead of asking governments to describe their policies. This will lead to a more accurate datacenter and will again make the survey easier to fill out.

- Utility Coordination
 - J. Worley stated that he has been in contact with Duke and other utilities, as well as local governments, in an effort to find ways to smooth out the communication between utilities and governments. T. White stated that Jason Kershner with Charter Communications was eager to participate. J. Lukas asked if Duke Energy was still being responsive. J. Worley stated that they had asked governments to clarify the permit process.
- Membership Renewals
 - T. White stated that CLG is only waiting on 6 governments to pay dues, which was down from the 11 governments listed during the Board Packet distribution on April 24th. No government that has not paid dues has indicated that they do not intend to rejoin.
- Meeting adjourned at 2:50pm