

CITY OF READING, OHIO15
COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – LEGISLATIVE SESSION
JANUARY 20, 2026 – 7:30 PM

For the full detail of this evening's Council Meeting, please visit www.watchreadingohio.com.

CALL TO ORDER

President of Council, Mr. Mattscheck called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President of Council, Mr. Mattscheck led those in attendance in a prayer and then the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Council Members Present: Mr. Powell, Mr. Bronner, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Thamann, Mrs. Kroeger, & Mrs. Eadicicco.

OTHER CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Bo Bemmes, Law Director Dave Stevenson, Auditor Sabrina Smith & Clerk of Council Carla Bronner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion to approve January 6, 2025 (Regular) Council Minutes Meeting made by Mr. Boehner, seconded by Mrs. Kroeger. Motion carried by voice vote.

GUEST SPEAKERS: NONE

President of Council, Kevin Mattcheck read the following before Audience Participation:

Before I open up to the Audience Asking Participation part of the meeting, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge issues with this part of the council meeting. I take full responsibility for allowing it to get out of control as I thought it would be better to allow for open discussion between administration, council members and residents. I will be handling this part of the meeting differently in the future.

I also want to clarify that Audience Asking Participation is not intended for back and forth discussion but rather, for residents to voice concerns on current city issues. Residents can get a more timely response by reaching out directly to their ward representative or a council member at large to discuss their concerns.

For full transparency, there is a paragraph in council rules for me to read before I open it up to the residents, which I will be following moving forward. This is not something that has been recently added to the council rules.

I appreciate everyone's understanding and cooperation.

AUDIENCE ASKING PARTICIPATION:

(1) Lisa Durbin – Asked for the clarification of what “Declaring An Emergency” means on the ordinances and resolutions.

Mr. Powell's response: “When you see ‘declaring an emergency,’ that has nothing to do with suspending the rules requiring a second and third reading. The emergency clause allows the ordinance to go into effect immediately. If that is not there, then there's a waiting period of 30 days for the ordinance to actually go into effect.” Mr. Powell went on to further explain that pricing, or contractual stipulations, may be what necessitates the immediate need of the ordinance to go into effect sooner than 30 days of its passage. “The portion where you hear us making a motion to waive the rule requiring the second and third reading, that would require 6 (a “super majority”) of us for that to occur, and then that's how that occurs.”

Mrs. Eadicicco's response: Commented that Council does their best to explain when it's an emergency and stated that it typically does come down to a financial situation.

(2) Bob Ashbrock (221 Walnut Street) – Requested that Council *“go much slower”* regarding the Bond issue. Mr. Ashbrock's observed that *“the current proposed ordinance includes what, I believe, would be the proposed ballot language”* and he asked the *“bond counsel”* (referring to Brenda Wehmer who was present in the audience) *if that was the case* (she nodded her head in agreement). Mr. Ashbrock went on to say, *“While it's accurate in what it says, it leaves much out. It makes absolutely no mention of a new firehouse, police department improvement, city hall, or a stadium. It leaves voter very much in the dark as to what municipal facilities are intended to be improved.”* Urge that this not proceed, and that alternate bond issue, or voter language for the ballot be more informative and communicated to the citizens, giving them opportunity to weigh in.

(3) Sue Renderly – Regarding the Levy, hopes that Council will have all 3 readings and suggested a town hall meeting for community input. Mrs. Renderly stated that her biggest concern is the city fixing up the stadium and asked why an even landswap (*“the city gives them the stadium, the school, and then we get central”*) can't occur? *“Why should we as citizens pay for that for 28 years, especially when turf only lasts 10 years, possibly? Why are we paying for turf for 28 years”* Mrs. Renderly stated she thinks this issue *“is being rushed and there needs to be better communication with the residents, because not everybody's on social media.”* She suggested flyers in the water bills, or flyers manually handed out to the residents for better communication.

(4) Peggy Sutton (1762 Keith Drive) –

(1) How many levies and bonds are we paying on now?

(2) When will these levies be done, or is there no ending?

Boehner response – The only bond we're paying on now is the 2015 bond for the new school, and that is for 38 years, so there's another 28 years to pay on that.

(5) Robin Knight – Speaking to the bond issue, agrees that a Town Hall meeting is a good idea for community input and for the residents to receive accurate information. She's concerned the property tax increase that will be imposed upon her for 28 years is unaffordable. She stated that Reading is a *“middle class community and it just feels like we're reaching for the stars.”*

Eadicicco response – Clarified that Council is only voting on one levy. There are 2 separate bond amounts to discuss, but only one levy will be voted on. Communicated that there are going to be a dozen information sessions at City Hall, as well as facility tours (City Hall, Fire Station, Police Station and the stadium) – 2 during the weekdays, and then Saturdays from February through April. This information will all be able to be found on the City's Website.

Bronner response – Clarified that the 27 Mil bond issue would be \$206 for every \$100,000 in market value.

(5) Kevin Kinizner – Commented that 5 million dollars for construction & turf at the stadium – turf doesn't last 10 years. School is guaranteed the property after 10 years. Doesn't think the City should be giving away commodities.

(6) Dave Flynn (1300 Bonnell) – Regarding the Bond issue, will it increase over the years as property values increase, or will it stay the same?

COMMUNICATIONS:

(1) December 2025 Mayor's Court Monthly Disbursement Report

187 Bench warrants Issued, 223 Cases Heard & \$11,094.00 Collected

(2) Email from Nicolle LouAllen

Members of City Council and Mayor Bemmes,

I am a resident of Walnut Street, a neighborhood that feeds directly into US 42, and I am writing to formally oppose the proposed road diet.

Reducing US 42 from four lanes to two will not reduce traffic volume. It will displace it. The most likely result is that residential side streets will become cut-through routes for commuters trying to avoid congestion. This puts children, cyclists, and families at risk, particularly near the old Central school soccer field and areas like Jefferson Avenue, where kids regularly cross to play at Keonig park.

I am also deeply concerned about emergency response access. During peak traffic hours, when trains block crossings between Reading and Lockland, or when I-75 diverts traffic due to accidents, congestion is already significant. A two-lane US 42 increases the risk of gridlock and could prevent emergency vehicles and residents from moving in or out of our neighborhood.

Additionally, the planned Givaudan facility off Reisenberg is expected to bring approximately 300 new jobs to the area. This will further increase peak traffic volumes. When rail crossings are blocked, those vehicles will have no access to the highway on-ramps and will be forced into Reading, adding even more congestion to Reading Road and surrounding neighborhoods. I am concerned this future traffic impact has not been adequately considered in the current plan.

US 42 is a critical regional corridor, not just a local street. Any change to its capacity must account for rail blockages, highway diversions, future development, emergency access, and neighborhood safety, not just free resurfacing and traffic calming goals.

I respectfully ask City Council to reject this proposal or, at minimum, conduct a comprehensive impact study that includes neighborhood diversion, emergency access modeling, rail-related congestion, and future development traffic before moving forward.

Thank you for your time and for considering the safety and accessibility of our community.

Sincerely,

Nicolle LouAllen

(3) Email from Jennifer Dick

My name is Jennifer Dick and I am writing to share a few issues that I am seeing more often with the current council.

I'm sure many will remember the criticisms of previous council members. Behavior and lack of transparency are two notable critiques. So tonight, I would like to express my concerns with the current council.

First, there are several council members that rarely have a report. There are also a couple of members that seem to only speak for a vote. It would be nice for members to share reports and or updates so that residents know what each member is working on.

Secondly, the behavior of this council is reprehensible at times. Many residents have expressed their fear and hesitation to speak at meetings due to the defensive posturing and attacks that have occurred to those that have chosen to speak. Members have also taken their feelings about residents to social media. Most recently, I received messages from six different residents that included a screenshot of a council member sharing how she was "over uneducated people" with comments that confirmed exactly what the post referred to. Referring to any resident as undereducated or anything negative only cements why there are those that hesitate to attend or speak at the meetings.

Finally, I have seen it said multiple times about how transparent this council is. Most, if not all of council has seen the issues related to the outdated website and ordinances. There have been complaints of a person in administration that does not show up to council and when referred to for an answer, doesn't return calls. Things are passed on unnecessary emergencies which cuts out the option for residents to have a say. It truly feels like council sometimes waits to the last minute to notify residents as an effort to keep them from being involved. For instance, the stadium/firehouse bond was said to have been worked on for 18 months prior to residents being informed. The administration spent \$26k for a report that was discredited both by administration and council. It is my understanding that council was given the report at least thirty days prior to the public finding out and yet, no one thought there was a need to raise the issue. Now, we have the Reading Road project. We have been told the city could decline, then told even if they decline, that is not the final say so. The public has been told how important resident input is, just to be told it is ultimately ODOTs decision. There have been several contradictions with not only Reading Road, but other concerns and that doesn't scream transparency to me.

*Thank you
Jennifer Dick*

Response from Shelly

Dear Residents,

I would like to take a moment to address a portion of a recent letter submitted by Ms. Dick that referenced me personally and a Facebook post of mine.

In her letter, Ms. Dick quoted—or misquoted—a statement from my personal Facebook page. For clarity, my original comment stated that I was frustrated with uneducated commentary, meaning commentary that lacked factual information about the subject being discussed. This was in response to a post by Karen Speaks regarding the Reading Road project, which incorrectly cited the project cost as \$28 million. As has been stated multiple times publicly, the actual cost of that project is \$3.9 million.

Social media has become a space where council members are frequently criticized, often with inaccurate information. While public officials should absolutely expect scrutiny, it is also important to acknowledge that we are human. We are not immune to frustration, and at times we may respond imperfectly. I stand by the substance of my comment because the information being shared was incorrect and misleading.

Over the course of my time on council, I have been ridiculed, called a liar, accused of nepotism despite being elected by the voters, and subjected to personal attacks that have extended to my family. I have been told that I am part of a “secret alliance” and that my service is invalid because of who I am related to. These accusations are not only false, they are hurtful and discouraging.

I understand that many will say, “it comes with the territory,” and to a certain extent, I agree. However, public service should not require accepting personal attacks, misinformation, or disrespect—especially when those attacks are directed at one’s family.

I strive to be a kind, respectful, and fair council member. I ask for respectful dialogue in return. Productive conversations—especially when there are disagreements—are essential to good governance. Respect is earned on all sides, and when it is absent, meaningful communication becomes difficult.

My commitment remains to serve this city honestly, transparently, and to the best of my ability. I welcome questions, discussion, and even criticism—but I ask that it be grounded in facts and mutual respect.

*Sincerely,
Shelly Kroeger*

Katie Eadicicco response: We never want to discourage anyone running for Council. The more people to get involved, the better. I definitely learned a lot after I was on Council, and how the city runs and operates and why things take as long as they do. I’ve tried explaining the bond issue, that we’re not rushing it through - there’s a deadline to get it into Hamilton County by a certain date to get it on the May ballot. In relation to transparency, Mrs. Eadicicco has a specific Council Facebook page and she’s repeated asked people, what can we do to better communicate? Besides the website, which Council has no control over, Mrs. Eadicicco has not received any answers to the better communication question. Print media was the main communication years ago, and now, not everyone is on Social Media, but that seems to be the best way to reach people, and then get neighbors communicating about what’s going on with the City. We do send out 1-2 newsletters a year. We try to do mailings with the water bill, however, there is a cost that comes with that. Also, not all types of communication is allowed to be sent out through the water bill due to certain regulations. But, we do try our best to get the word out. If anyone has any suggestions on better ways to communication, she’s listening.

Bob Boehner response: Reminded the public that everyone on Council has an email address to where they can be contacted regarding city issues. For the last 3 weeks, Mr. Boehner has received 2-3 phone calls, emails, or folks walking up to him in public to discuss things like the bond issue, and he does his best to explain it, how he knows it’s going on. Does think we need to do a better job of getting the playback of the Council meetings to the public.

2026-2027 Reading City Council Members

President of Council	Kevin Mattscheck	kmattscheck@readingohio.org
Ward 1 Councilman	Dave Powell	dpowell@readingohio.org
Ward 2 Councilman	Andy Bronner	abronner@readingohio.org
Ward 3 Councilman	Mark Bishop	mbishop@readingohio.org
Ward 4 Councilman	Bob Boehner	rboehner@readingohio.org
Council At Large	Scott Thamann	sthamann@readingohio.org
Council At Large	Shelly Kroeger	skroeger@readingohio.org
Council At Large	Katie Eadicicco	keadicicco@readingohio.org
Treasurer	Brenda Owens	bowens@readingohio.org
Auditor	Sabrina Smith	ssmith@readingohio.org
Safety Service Director	Patrick Ross	pross@readingohio.org
Mayor	Robert "Bo" Bemmes	rbemmes@readingohio.org
Clerk of Council	Carla Bronner	Carla.Albrinck@gmail.com

Mark Bishop response: Addressed why not everyone has a report during the meetings. Everyone serves as the chairman of their assigned committee, and each of the Council members also serves as a chairperson on 2 other committees. Every committee doesn't get a report on the stats, like the service committee, the safety committee or the finance committee. If we don't have an official committee report, then we don't give a report.

Also addressed the comment made regarding the report on the Police department. *"We, as Council, did not discredit that report, and I don't think Administration did either. It can't be used in exchange for human resources documents filed against somebody. It's an outside entity giving us a report to let us know how things are going. It's more of a doctrine of how to proceed in the future, what not to do, instead of something we can actually take to court if we have to defend ourselves for doing something we shouldn't have done."*

Dave Powell response: Clarified that on the front page of the City's website (<https://www.readingohio.org/>) there is a button that reads "WatchReadingOhio.com" and will link you to the live meetings, as well as archived meetings

US EPA Grant Floodplain Remediation Plan


[Home](#) [Business](#) [Departments](#) [Government](#) [Residents](#) [How Do I...?](#) [Contact Us](#)

Click the button below to watch live and archive council meetings for the City of Reading.

Bookmark this address [watchreadingohio.com](https://www.watchreadingohio.com) to view from your phone, tablet, computer, and smart tv.

[WatchReadingOhio.com](https://www.watchreadingohio.com)


EXECUTIVE SESSION: NONE

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Brenda Wehmer of Dinsmore & Shohl, legal counsel to the city on bond and economic development matters, provided a deeper insight and understanding for the 2 resolutions regarding the bond issue:

"The city is considering putting a bond issue on the ballot and has two ordinances in front of them tonight, and I would like to clear up the confusion. Council can only adopt one of them. They will be deciding whether to request a bond issue on the ballot at all, and if they do, they will decide the amount at either the 26 million or the 27 million. They will not be voting to put both of them on the ballot. Council will narrow it down, then it will appear on the ballot - one or the other - for the voters to decide upon ultimately.

To the comment about whether council is or is not rushing the process, the statutes do require that there is a specific process to be followed to get an issue on the ballot, and when it involves a tax levy of this nature, it is a multi-step process which does take time. Council has to adopt a "resolution of necessity," which they have previously done, that must then be sent to the county auditor who prepares various mileage and revenue calculations, and certifications, and returns that back to council upon which information then the resolutions determining to proceed with the matter, and actually put it on the ballot, are then adopted, or considered by Council.

Then, all of that has to be filed with the Board of Elections 90 days before the election. So, when we talk about putting a voted bond issue on with a corresponding tax levy, Council merely makes the determination that the project is necessary, the financing is necessary, and an additional new revenue stream is necessary to support the project. But the voters ultimately decide whether or not the project and the bond issue is going to go forward, and the corresponding tax levy. So, in these situations, the decisions are really up to the voters. Because there is a deadline for filing to get on each ballot cycle, and now given recent legislative changes at the state level over the last several years, instead of having four election cycles like we used to have, we now have essentially two election cycles per year - one in the spring, and one in the fall. Back when I started, we used to have a February election, a May election, an August election, and a November election. They have consolidated those and you can only have an August election now if you're in fiscal emergency. So, essentially the August election is pretty much void, except for statewide issues. Local government's really are not on the ballot anymore in August. You're left with the spring election, which changes between March and May, depending on whether it's a primary general election season or just local elections, and then the November election, which is always the same day in November, I mean the same timeframe in November it doesn't move.

Communities that want to put tax levees, or bond issues, or other matters on the ballot, really only have that opportunity twice a year now, rather than four times a year what they had historically. If the matter does not go on the ballot in May, it has to wait until November to go on the ballot, which means, in the case of a construction project, you lose an entire construction season and potentially costs can go up in between waiting a whole other construction cycle for that. That is one reason why Council is looking to be on the May ballot. Then there is a period of 90 days, or more, depending on whether they passed tonight, for the council and administration to educate the public, and make sure that the public has all of the information they need before actually going to the polls and voting and making their decision. So, there is a period of time with which additional information can be given to the public, and additional information can be obtained by Council, if the residents, or the voters have questions for which the information has not already been made available. There time for that. So, that is the process to get an issue on the ballot.

The ballot proposes the maximum amount that can be borrowed for the maximum term. In this case, they are deciding which maximum amount to put on the ballot, but they don't have to actually borrow the maximum amount if, when they start the process of getting bids for the project, they come in less than the amount that was on the ballot, they will issue a lesser amount. They will not issue the full amount just because that's what's authorized - it has to match the actual project. The estimated bids, right now, are what we are using to determine what amount should go on the ballot in order to do the project that Council has expressed they want in terms of the scope of the project. But, things change, and again, 90 days before the election, you have to wait another 30 days for the election results to get certified before you can move forward with anything. Things may change, if costs go up significantly, Council may decide we can't afford the project anymore, and even though voters have approved it, we may not go forward at all because costs have risen so much because something beyond our control has happened. Or we may

delay the project, and wait for some unusual event to reset, and things to normalize again. Or other things could happen that could be favorable to the project, and cost could go down on the project, and council say yes we're going forward with the project, but voters have authorized 26 million but because of "X,Y,Z," we only need 23 million now and we're not going to issue more than we actually need.

Similarly, Council can make determinations that if interest rates come down significantly they may say, well, given the interest rate environment, we don't need 28 years, we only need 27 years for the bond, so we're going to structure it so that the levy goes away a year earlier than originally anticipated. They cannot have it on for more than the maximum 28 years that's authorized. Nor can they issue more than the 26th or 27 million depending on what they decide on. But they can do less than the maximum's authorized.

With respect to the purpose clause, and the issue that it is vague in terms of it authorizes capital projects for city facilities. It is legal for the ballot issue to be much more narrow and specific, but we have found over the years in this business, that can create problems down the road when after the ballot issue was passed, something, again beyond control, may change and things may make it difficult to stay the course because of a specific language choice in a ballot measure. School districts, who are the most common type of local government to put voted bond issues on the ballot, 90% of the time their ballot issue says "for the construction, acquisition, repair, remodeling, renovation of School facilities." They have been down this path before where they put something too specific on the ballot and then they couldn't make adjustments later after the ballot issue was passed. If you look at ballot measures across the state, 90% of school district ballot issues have that more general "construction of school facilities, renovation of school facilities," and so the Reading ballot language was tailored in that manner, to provide authority to do the facilities that were requested because the city has said that they need a fire station, an administration building, stadium improvements, turf, track, and to try to get every single component into the ballot language, there's going to be an instance where something gets overlooked, or something needs to pivot in terms of the improvement, and so we kept it within the confines of what's legal under the statute without cutting off any future flexibility in terms of the project. Again, Council does not have the authority to sort of "run a mock," because there's a limited amount of money, a limited term, they have advertised for a specific scope of the project and that's what the money is going to have to be spent on. When they get ready to issue bonds for the actual project, the purpose clause for the actual bonds will be a little bit more specific in the legal documents that authorize the bonds, should the ballot issue pass. But again, they will not be so specific that Council has no ability to actually manage the project, and manage unforeseen circumstances, as they are going through the project.

Katie Eadicicco: *Asked about whether or not anything can be put in the water bill.*

Brenda Wehmer response: *There are rules about spending public money on, sort of what I will refer to as "campaigns," advocating one way or another for a particular issue, particularly a particular issue that is on the ballot to be voted on and in particular for things that may raise taxes. City Council is allowed to expand public money on getting factual information to the residence and electors. So, to the extent that you were adding something to the water bill that was factual only, and not persuasive in nature - not saying, "please vote for this because it's a good idea for..." but to say, "the issue on the ballot is going to be 26 million, it's going to be 28 years..." You want to pair at the county auditor certification information with respect to that particular issue saying "it's going to be \$206 per hundred thousand for the 27, \$198 for the 26," whichever you choose. If you want to put this factual information, "this is going to equate to this many mills, initially," you can put factual information and sort of disperse that information - you can post it on the website - you can put it in your newsletter, but you cannot put persuasive information. "Here's why this is a good idea for the city. Here's why we should pass this." We cannot put that kind of information in any kind of water bill, flyer, or post it on the website. These are things that a separate levy campaign is created for, and funded by private donations. They have to put out the persuasive information. So, to the extent of, "can you put something in the water bill?" Yes, but if it's factual, only.*

Mrs. Kroeger: *The question was raised as to whether or not the amount would fluctuate if property valued changed. I know with a school levy it does not,*

Brenda Wehmer response: *Well, it can. So, once the bonds are issued, because of certain other rules in Ohio, bonds are issued*

for as what we referred to as fixed rate bonds. You know on the day you issue the bond what your payment is going to be each and every year. It's set. The payments don't change. They may not be exactly equal each year, but you're gonna know what they are each year, and they're going to be, for voted bond issue, they're as close to level as the financial underwriters and financial advisors can make them. They don't want the mileage to be going like this all over the place all the time. But, in some cases, they're not going to be exactly even each and every year. As valuations change for property, it is going to affect how much mileage is needed to generate that debt service amount that is known. So, if property values don't change, then the mileage is not going to fluctuate very much. If property values go up, the mileage usually goes down, slightly, each year. Overtime, you can see an effect from the first year, to the 28th year. From year to year the change is going to be probably very small in an established, built-out community. It will fluctuate more in "cornfield communities," where there's still a lot of construction happening because that can change the values from year to year more than just inflationary value changes or sale and resale of property, don't really affect the valuations as much as a new construction. So, in a built-out community, you don't see that much fluctuation in the millage, but it can, and if there were to be significant changes in your value, if it goes up your mileage that is needed to pay for the bond is going to go down slightly, conversely, dare I say it, if we all have the event that happened in 2008, and property values go down, now the millage has to go up. That has been a "once in a career," most of the time it goes the other direction. But, we can't guarantee that it will never do this again.

Mrs. Kroeger: For a resident though, their payment isn't going to increase drastically?

Brenda Wehmer response: Right, it's a small variation in the millage from year to year. And, in some years, the bond issue millage may go down. And, certain other existing levees may go down, but if some other taxing entity - the county, the school - puts a new Levy on, they may not notice those decreases because some other levy was added that caused the overall tax bill to go up, and so yes, there are fluctuations in each individual levy, whether it's for a bond issue, or a regular tax levy, every single year.

Mr Boehner: Right after the amount, it says, "for the purpose of site acquisition." We're not we're not acquiring any sites.

Brenda Wehmer's response: The reason that is in there is because you are acquiring. You don't currently have a site.

Mr. Boehner: From what I understand, the school is giving us the Central property.

Brenda Wehmer's response: Right. But to the extent - you're "trading" sites, potentially. And to the extent that you need to spend any money in terms of the improvements to the stadium site as part of the swap, it could be considered "acquisition." And, even though the stadium facilities are part of the bond issue because they are currently municipal facilities that can be improved under the current language of the bond issue, we want to have that in there in case the timing of the lands swap and so on and so forth. So, it's in there, you may or may not be spending what we think of as true "purchase price" but we do not want you, again as I said, we don't want the language to be too limiting, and then somebody raise an issue. So, side acquisition has been included because you currently do not own the site you intend to put this building on.

Mr. Bronner: My question is about calculating what your payment might possibly be as you go to the auditor site. There's two different amounts on the website - there's the assessed value of the home, which is 35% of the market value, and then there's the auditor's market value. Which of those two do you base your evaluation on for purposes of calculating your taxes?

Brenda Wehmer's response: For purposes of calculating your taxes, it's the assessed value, if you know the millage amount. If you were looking at the county auditor certification, where he says it's going to be this many dollars per hundred thousand of the county auditors market value, he's already done the millage times the assessed value and made that determination. If you're starting from scratch and you know the millage amount, you want to use assessed value. If you're using a county auditor certification on the basis of \$100,000 of value, then you're using market value.

Mr. Bronner: So then it would be Market Value on the Auditor's website?

Brenda Wehmer's response: *I have to confess, I have never, I just do my own math, I haven't even looked at the auditor's website for that purpose, so I don't really know what it looks like.*

Mrs. Kroeger: *Regardless, with the millage, it was 5.89, then would be multiplied by the assessed value?*

Brenda Wehmer's response: *Right, but you gotta move the decimal, because, remember, mills are a thousandth, right? So, it's really .00589, which is something that a lot of people forget when they see five mills, if you start multiplying five times your assessed value then you're going to go into shock because your property tax amount is going to be huge. There's three decimal points. You have to move the decimal point over before you start doing that kind of math or you're gonna get a number that is not real*

Mrs. Kroeger: *So you said it's going to be .00589?*

Brenda Wehmer's response: *If you're going to do the math yourself, right.*

Mr. Bronner: *So I was looking on the auditor's site today, and I just picked one of the most expensive houses on Siebenthaler, and the value was \$300,000 even. So that's easy math: \$300,000 times 206, you're at \$618 a year. Divide that by 12 and just over \$50 dollars a month."*

READING OF RESOLUTIONS:

(1) RESOLUTION DETERMINING TO PROCEED WITH BOND ISSUE AND TAX LEVY IN EXCESS OF THE TEN-MILL LIMITATION (\$26,000,000.00)

Motion made by Mrs. Eadicicco, seconded by Mr. Bronner, to withdrawal the \$26,000,000.00 Bond Resolution, per recommendation from the Safety Service Director.

Motion carried by a 6-1 roll call vote (Mr. Powell, Mr. Bronner, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Thamann, Mrs. Kroeger & Mrs. Eadicicco voting "yes," and Mr. Boehner voting "no").

(2) RESOLUTION DETERMINING TO PROCEED WITH BOND ISSUE AND TAX LEVY IN EXCESS OF THE TEN-MILL LIMITATION. (\$27,000,000.00)

Dave Powell Response: He recognized that this bond issue is a big ask of the taxpayers of Reading, but there is a need. The purpose of these is to put it on the ballot and let people's voices be heard. Let it get to the ballot and let the voters decide.

Katie Eadicicco Response: Agrees with Dave. It is important to let the people be heard, and let the voters decide.

Resolution was declared a first reading only.

READING OF ORDINANCES:

(1) AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE SAFETY SERVICE DIRECTOR TO OBTAIN BID SPECIFICATIONS TO REPLACE THE CURBS & PAVING ON OBSERVATORY AVENUE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY (Second Reading)

Ordinance was declared a second reading only.

(2) AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 2025 - 06 WHICH AUTHORIZES THE SAFETY SERVICE DIRECTOR TO EMPLOY CERTAIN TEMPORARY; SEASONAL AND PART-TIME HELP AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion made by Mr. Bronner, seconded by Mr. Boehner to suspend the rule that requires a second and third reading.
Motion carried by a 7-0 roll call vote. Motion made by Mrs. Kroeger, seconded by Mrs. Eadicicco to adopt the ordinance.
Motion carried by a 7-0 roll call vote.

ORDINANCE ADOPTED

ORDINANCE NUMBER 2026-06

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

Katie Eadicicco – Reminder, next laws and contracts committee meeting is being held Jan 27 at 6:30 pm in Council Chambers or the Caucus Room.

Bo Bemmes –

(1) Mayor Bo Bemmes called 1 (potentially 2) Special Council Meetings for the following date & times:
January 27, 7:30 pm, in Council Chambers and January 29, 7:30 pm, Council Chambers

(2) On Wednesday, January 28th, at 7:00 pm in our Council Chambers; we, the citizens of Reading, will get an opportunity to listen to ODOT’s proposal to improve safety and transportation for our residents, businesses, pedestrians, and motorists on Reading Road.

ODOT’s representatives initiated this conversation offering to cover 100% of the costs for their plans.

ODOT’s representatives have been polite, respectful, and very educational in their explanations as to why they feel this plan will improve transportation and safety through our city.

ODOT has listened to input from our top safety officials, and they are reading the many comments and concerns of our residents, businesses, and elected officials. Never has there been any ill intent from anyone concerning any aspect of these proposals.

ODOT representatives will guide us through this proposal. They are very well intentioned, professional, knowledgeable, kind, polite and respectful individuals who have worked very hard throughout this process.

I think I can also speak for each of us who serve our city, we have a sincere desire to do what is best for Reading. We read, study, and debate issues. We do our best to seek input from everyone. This is why I requested ODOT to present detailed plans two weeks in advance of their public meeting and accept comments from all.

Please attend this public meeting and respectfully listen to the proposal, consider the concepts, and then provide your comments and concerns. *This presentation will be televised and recorded so everyone who is interested can watch or listen at any time.

Please continue to supply your input to ODOT. Feel free to contact me at 513-509-8619 or at rbemmes@readingohio.org or contact our Safety Services Director Pat Ross or any of our elected officials. They can be contacted by using the 1st letter of their first name along with their last name @readingohio.org.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn came from Mr. Boehner, and was seconded by Mrs. Kroeger. Motion carried by voice vote.
There being no further business, the meeting was declared adjourned at 9:08 pm.

X _____
Carla Bronner
Clerk of Council

X _____
Kevin Mattscheck
President of Council