

THE CITY OF STREETSBORO, OHIO

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Monday, August 10, 2020

This Service Committee Meeting was called to order on Monday, August 10, 2020 at 7:08 p.m. by Julie Field, Chairman.

PRESENT: Jon Hannan, John Ruediger, Justin Ring, Mike Lampa, Chuck Kocisko, Julie Field, Jennifer Wagner

ABSENT: None.

ALSO PRESENT: Glenn Broska, Mayor
Frank Beni, Law Director
Caroline Kremer, Clerk of Council
[by Zoom video conferencing:]
Troy Beaver, Interim Police Chief
Rob Reinholz, Fire Chief
Jenny Esarey, Finance Director
Bill Miller, Service Director
Joe Ciuni, City Engineer
John Cieszkowski, Planning Director
Patrick O'Malia, Economic Development Director
Greg Mytinger, Parks and Recreation Director
Sara Fagnilli, Assistant Law Director

Disposition of Minutes

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE REGULAR SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 11, 2020 AND JUNE 8, 2020 AND THE SPECIAL SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 2020 AS PRESENTED.

Moved by Mr. Lampa, seconded by Mr. Ring. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

Old Business

T-6866 Purchase a Utility Vehicle for Parks and Recreation Department

Mr. Ring thanked Mr. Mytinger for getting the information he had request at the last meeting. Mr. Mytinger got a quote for a utility vehicle model that was the next size up (Polaris Ranger 1000 at \$14,128.34) to see if that machine would be better for the department. Mr. Mytinger had provided a memo stating that the department felt the Polaris Ranger 500 model (at \$9,528.34) was sufficient to meet or exceed the department's workload needs. Mr. Mytinger lost connection to the Zoom meeting, so this topic was tabled until he could reconnect.

Update on Forest Valley Development

Mr. Ruediger noted there were some residents here from the development that wanted to talk about the issues at Forest Valley. He said Mrs. Fagnilli from the Law Department had talked to the neighbors and they were trying to work things out. Mr. Ruediger had visited the neighborhood.

Janet Russo, 9940 Forest Valley Lane, said she had moved in to her new home in September 2019 and had drainage problems since day 1. She had someone from K. Hovnanian, the home builder, come out three times who then sent an email that said the City had signed off on the property for her to move in and the builder had no liability. Ms. Russo contacted the City's Assistant Law Director last week who said she wasn't able to help her. Ms. Russo had put money into the property to alleviate the water problems and prevent it from ruining her carpeting. She said she was not the only one in the development with a grading problem. She felt it was an embarrassment that the City would allow K. Hovnanian to give them occupancy. She wanted to know how to resolve this. She said the homeowners had all put a lot of money into their properties and she wanted the City to waive their property taxes for the next three years to cover the money they spent to repair the damages. The developer was blaming K. Hovnanian and K. Hovnanian was taking no responsibility.

Michelle Smith, 10015 Forest Valley Lane, also had drainage issues and had put a lot of money into her property. She had a landscaper at her property that told her the storm drain at the back of the property was 18 inches too high and the water would not go uphill, so he suggested contacting the City. She had called the City and talked to Mr. Ciuni who said he was aware of the issue and would contact the developer to fix it but didn't know when that would get done. Ms. Smith said the side of her yard kept flooding and the greenspace had not been landscaped with swales or anything. Then they put in the sidewalks and put all the dirt excavated from the sidewalks and dumped that into the green space and the flooding on her property was worse and affecting her shed. She said this was really bad and something needed to be done. She also explained that when they installed the sidewalks they dug up the property pins; one of hers was found in the dirt that was dumped in the greenspace. She said these needed replaced and the neighbors needed help in getting this resolved. She said she had lived there two years and it was just awful there, very embarrassing.

Mr. Ring thought there would have been a storm water management plan submitted when the development was proposed. He wondered if the plan was followed.

Scott Forman, 9932 Forest Valley Lane, said he'd had a lot of discussions with various people at the City because this had been an ongoing problem. He knew the City had a bond, but the big problem was both the developer and the builder were saying it was the other's responsibility. Mr. Forman said most of the neighbors were retired/elderly and needed help with this; they needed the City to take action. Last year the road didn't get plowed because the road had not been dedicated because the developer had not completed his part. Mr. Forman said the developer threw in the sidewalks incorrectly on a weekend and Mr. Forman had to call the Mayor to get GPD to send an inspector out on a weekend. Mr. Forman said there was less than 1 inch of stone under the concrete sidewalks which was not to spec. He added that most of the residents didn't want sidewalks, but now there were sidewalks with wide gaps beside them and vertical displacement of up to 16 inches, which was a safety issue. He said the sidewalk installers had also taken down a stop sign that needed replaced.

He said the neighbors were trying to work with the City and trying to get help with who had what responsibilities. He said K. Hovnanian got a sign off and certificate of occupancy on each house and now wants nothing to do with the houses and says it's the homeowners' issue now. Mr. Forman said every home was missing GFCI outlets near water sources and there was an issue with the grading and something needed to be done. The residents bought the homes in good faith, thinking they were inspected and everything on the streets was done correctly, which is not the case. Mr. Forman said Ms. Russo's water drains onto his property and was cutting across his backyard, not the drainage ditch behind all the houses. He said he had to spend money to fix the issue before his yard got worse and a lot of the neighbors were also spending money to take care of issues, but they couldn't do it any longer. He said the sidewalks needed to be finished, graded and seeded. The sidewalk installation had damaged irrigation lines, there was still no fence around the detention pond which was a huge liability, landscaping was still not done, and streetlights were still not done. He felt it time to enact the bond to get this stuff done.

Mrs. Field thanked the citizens for coming tonight and appreciated that they had chosen to live in Streetsboro.

Mr. Ruediger described the drainage and sidewalk issues he had seen when he visited the neighborhood. He had talked with the Law Department and didn't know where the City's, homeowners', developer's or builder's responsibilities or jurisdictions were. Mrs. Field thought the final grade by the builder was important, but this was outrageous. Mr. Ruediger said Council had been told that the City had approved the grading by the developer but then the builder came in to put in the homes and changed things and he didn't understand how that worked. Mrs. Field was shocked by what was happening in this neighborhood because she knew the City's inspectors had been very detailed in the last few years.

Mr. Forman noted that part of the issue with the drainage was that they didn't put any topsoil down after they graded the embankment in the back of the development so there was no grass or any of the systems that were designed to help slow down the erosion and the water flow. There were about 20 mounds of dirt in the green space without topsoil. Mr. Forman also said the sidewalks weren't done and even if the edges were backfilled the sidewalk construction would have issues with the snow and ice to come. He said the only thing left was to go after the bond and remedy the things that were related to the development.

Mr. Lampa clarified that the greenspace that was mentioned was in the back of the cul-de-sac. He wondered who would have approved a drain 18 inches too high. Mayor Broska noted that the City had not accepted the street as a dedicated street, but the City had plowed the street as a courtesy because the residents were taxpayers. Although Mr. Forman had said some residents didn't want sidewalks, the sidewalks were part of the site plan. Mr. Forman said the sidewalks should have been done with the driveways, not afterwards. Mr. Lampa asked if the City could go after the bond.

Mrs. Fagnilli said many months ago the City did go back after the bond and tried multiple times to get the developer to do what he was supposed to do, so the City put the bonding company on notice. As a result there was now some activity happening. She had learned this afternoon that the

landscaper was going to backfill and clean up the sidewalks this week, they would clean up the detention pond cattails and then fence the area. The streetlights were not in; but that was not within the control of the developer at this point, it was up to Ohio Edison. The sites were prepared and the developer had tried to contact Ohio Edison for a schedule. She said the City had done what it could do relative to the City's contract with the developer and the bond.

Mr. Ciuni confirmed the SWPPP plan was submitted and was approved; whether it was implemented during construction he couldn't say, OHM did the inspections. He confirmed the City had not accepted the street yet and would not accept it until everything was correct; right now it was a private street.

Mr. Ring wanted to know if OHM, hired by the City, had approved the inspections. Mr. Ciuni said the City had given the developer several letters on what was wrong with the detention ponds and the City had gone after the bonding company because the developer wasn't fixing it. Mr. Ring said the storm water drainage through the development was an issue and he wanted to know who was responsible; he wanted to know who would have inspected it or approved it. Mr. Ciuni said if there was a drain 18 inches above ground it needed fixed, but he didn't know who should fix it because he didn't know who put it in. He assumed the Building Department issued the occupancy permits. Mr. Ring asked, if the sidewalks were not done to Code, shouldn't they be redone. Mr. Ciuni would check with the inspector, but he was not told that the sidewalks did not follow specs. The installer didn't inform the City when they started the sidewalks, but an inspector did get there after they had started and did correct some things they had wrong, but as far as Mr. Ciuni had been told they were put in according to specs. Mr. Ring asked him to follow up with the inspector, because if they weren't right, Mr. Ring wanted the sidewalks redone.

Mr. Ring wondered if the construction agreement between the developer and the City had any warranty period for the work done, or was it just for the road. Mrs. Fagnilli would have to look into it; she said there was a warranty period as to the City and the parts of the construction agreement that were applicable to the City; she didn't know if that extended to the home building as well. Mr. Cieszkowski didn't think it extended to the home building. Mr. Ring was most concerned about the overall site sidewalks and water drainage issues and if there was another legal tool beyond the bond that the City could use. Mr. Ring asked for a copy of the construction agreement for Council.

Mr. Ring felt not accepting the street was almost punishing the residents because it didn't get snow plowed, but he understood the City agreed to do it for safety issues. At this point, he thought not accepting the street was beneficial to the residents because if there were provisions within the construction agreement that didn't start the clock until the street was dedicated then it would give the City more time and ability to try to resolve this.

Mayor Broska said he'd known about some of these things for a while and the City had been working on them, like the sidewalks, retention pond, fence and streetlights, but he'd never heard about flooding yards and a too high drain. Mayor Broska explained that when a developer comes in and proposes a site plan with elevations, gradings, etc. the City Engineer approved it before it went on to the Planning Department. Mayor Broska said he would have the City Engineer review the property

and see if it was done according to the approved plan. If it was, there was nothing the City could do, but if it was not done according to plan, there were things the City could do, like go after the bond. He noticed that things started happening when the City threatened the bond because no developer wants the City to go after their bond because it would make it very difficult for them to get one the next time. He knew this had taken longer than anyone wanted, but usually it was much simpler to try to get folks to cooperate than to go to a civil trial (which could take a couple of years to be heard). The Mayor mentioned that the greenspace was not planted so the water tended to run off quickly and that needed dealt with. He said the resident's complaints had not fallen on deaf ears and the City was working on a couple items at a time and had made progress. Ohio Edison had delays on the street lights because they had to go deal with emergency hurricane repairs. He said the sidewalks would be backfilled and graded. He hadn't known about the storm water in the yards and would have the City Engineer check to see if things were not built to plan.

Mrs. Fagnilli said the whole drainage issue was something that had just come up recently, after the sidewalks started going in. Mrs. Fagnilli had told Ms. Russo that according to what Mr. Ciuni had told her, the developer's grade was approved, the sites were then turned over to the homebuilder. If the homebuilder did something that was contrary to the contract they had with the homeowner, that was not something that would involve the City, unless there was some inspection issue and she didn't know that there was. This was a recent issue and the bonding company had not been told about it. Once Mr. Ciuni figured out whether or not there was an issue, the City would have to go back and bring it to the bonding company's attention if it was something covered by the development agreement and bond; it may or may not be.

Mrs. Field said it seemed that things were not handled the way they should have been from the beginning. She didn't see these issues presented by the residents as complaints but requirements. She said when someone moved into a home, they would have expectations of these things having been done. Mrs. Field was very disappointed and frustrated because she felt it was clear that "the ball had been dropped." She said Forest Valley Lane was a beautiful street and she was upset by all the issues that had nothing to do with the homeowners, and thought if the City dropped the ball on inspections, then the City needed to take care of it; she wanted immediate action by the City because the residents had waited long enough.

Mrs. Fagnilli said this was an issue that had been brought to the City in the last two weeks and Mrs. Field needed to hold her judgement until the City could go out and figure out who did what when. If this was an issue between the homebuilder and the resident and the City had done everything it needed to do, it would be unfortunate but at some point there was a level of private contract involved that the City may or may not have anything to do with. Mrs. Field said she understood there were multiple facets and multiple parties involved and it may not have been the City that dropped the ball, but what Mrs. Field meant was that the residents had lived with these drainage issues for a year or two and that was long enough.

Mr. Forman said he had phone calls and emails with Mrs. Fagnilli and GPD about a year ago asking for site plans because the drainage was not right. He was frustrated with Mrs. Fagnilli and Mr. Cieszkowski because no one was acting on it, but the residents let the City do what it has done, but

things were still not complete. He said the residents understood that the City was not in a position to go back on the homebuilder, but they still wanted the sidewalks backfilled and any property damage from the sidewalk install fixed. Mr. Forman said he had 30 years in the construction business and he knew the processes on how things were to be done, so he was frustrated that although he brought these issues up a year ago nothing had been done yet. He thought it had been so long that it would be a battle with the bonding company to get any kind of resolution or compensation for what had been done. He asked that GPD check the site. Mr. Forman said that because the sidewalks had not been backfilled GPD would be able to see that there was not enough stone base under the sidewalks. He said that's why he called the Mayor on the weekend when they were pouring the sidewalks in a hurry, to report that it wasn't being done properly, and when the inspector came out the inspector had told him the sidewalks were going to fail.

Mr. Kocisko asked if the City knew about the drainage a year ago. Mrs. Fagnilli said the whole issue first came to her regarding the snow plowing and they talked a bit about the other things that have been turned over to the bonding company, but her recollection was that the drainage was not part of it. She said if they found more information they would alert the bonding company. Mr. Forman said he would forward the emails he had to the Mayor. Mr. Beni confirmed for Mr. Ruediger that he and Mrs. Fagnilli had started with Streetsboro in spring 2019. Mr. Kocisko said in addition to the department heads and Mayor the citizens could go to their Ward Council Member or the three At-large Council Members for assistance to get resolution to problems. He asked that all of Council be kept informed regarding every step of this project as it happened. He had the same questions and concerns as Mr. Ring and was frustrated there were no clear answers. Mr. Ruediger said he would stay in contact with Ms. Russo to keep the neighbors up to date.

Mrs. Field thanked the residents for coming tonight and making all of Council aware of the issues. She repeated that she wanted to see action on this very quickly. She said it needed to be determined if things were inspected and if they passed inspection, if it was a City thing or a builder thing, and then the responsible party needed to take care of it. Mr. Ring added that the City Engineers would visit the site and they would measure and determine whether the plat matched the grading that's there. Mr. Ring wanted to know that what was proposed and approved is what occurred. He also expected that City Council would receive a copy of the construction agreement, and that the City Engineers also understood what the storm water plan was, what was approved, and inspect to see if it was followed, and who approved the final inspection if that had occurred.

Mayor Broska confirmed that the City Engineers would go out and check what was there, but the expectations of the bond only covered certain things; the things that the City could use it for, it would. It may be something different if there were issues on the individual properties where the homeowners themselves moved dirt, which he wasn't saying happened. If the development was done to site plan specifications there wasn't much the City could do. He said the City engineers could meet with a Council representative and a resident representative when they visited the site. Mr. Ciuni noted that for him to measure he would have to send a survey crew and he would have to notify all the residents that a survey crew would be on their property. He may be able to arrange the survey for early next week.

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS TO THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2020 SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING.

Moved by Mr. Ruediger, seconded by Mr. Ring. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

T-6866 Purchase a Utility Vehicle for Parks and Recreation Department (continued)

Mrs. Field suggested it might be better to purchase the more expensive 1000 model utility vehicle because it could do more and last longer. Mr. Mytinger said the Polaris Ranger 500 model was comparable to the John Deere gator the Parks and Recreation Department had now. The Ranger 1000 had more hauling and pulling capabilities and was a bigger machine and he didn't think the department would utilize it for all its capabilities, so he suggested purchasing the Ranger 500. Council supported that suggestion.

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS TO TONIGHT'S REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.

Moved by Mr. Ring, seconded by Mr. Ruediger. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

New Business

Discuss Livestock in the City

Mrs. Field said she had talked with Mr. Cieszkowski about this topic and expected the discussion tonight to be an introduction to the topic with further discussion at a later meeting based on where Council wanted to go with the issue. She said and Mr. Hannan had a few people talk to them about the topic. She said Streetsboro was a growing community and it needed to find a balance between all the new homes and new neighborhoods and also maintaining the beautiful rural aspect that people liked. She said the Comprehensive Master Plan identified the rural areas to be maintained. She commented that the wording of the current Ordinances should probably be updated to be clearer on what was allowed and what was prohibited regarding livestock in the specific areas of the City.

Mr. Hannan had also talked to Mr. Cieszkowski a couple months ago when a couple people had contacted him about it. He wondered if the City wanted to just allow chickens in the R-R zoning district as it was now and maybe change the distance requirements, or should a limited number of chickens be allowed in the R-1 zoning district with restrictions. He felt the R-1 district was spread out all over the City with some R-1 surrounded by R-R and some R-1 surrounded by more homes. He didn't really want to see chickens all over the City, but if they could be properly contained it may work. There were other nearby towns trying to do something similar.

Mrs. Field asked Mr. Cieszkowski what the surrounding communities were doing regarding this issue. Mr. Cieszkowski said he surveyed a few surrounding communities and Mr. Beni assisted in assembling the information. Mr. Cieszkowski didn't do in depth research but it seemed other communities were doing all kinds of things: limiting the number of chickens between 6-12, usually requiring at least 1 acre of property and most of Streetsboro's R-1 lots were ½ acre. Mr. Cieszkowski wanted to clarify exactly what livestock animals were being considered in these discussions (goats, pigs, chickens?). Mrs. Field said she was thinking chickens because that had become popular, but that should be made clear.

Mr. Ring said he wasn't totally against a backyard chicken coop, but wondered who would enforce the regulations when people were not compliant, or would just go investigate when the neighbors called in complaints. He thought the regulations would have to be specific to exclude roosters and exclude breeding for commercial sale.

Mr. Ruediger said the current Code required chickens to be kept 200' from the property line which would exclude most home lots under 1 acre. Mr. Cieszkowski calculated quickly that for a 10'x10' chicken coop to be 200' from the property line, the property would have to be just over 4 acres, so the current Code was intended to apply to parcels in the R-R and O-C zoning districts. If chicken were to be allowed in the R-1 zoning district, that distance would have to be recalibrated significantly. Mr. Ruediger was aware that people wanted backyard chickens, but he was thinking about the neighbors who had homes on ½ acre lots and had been there a while and then if City Council changed the Code and allowed their neighbors to have backyard chickens; he thought those neighbors might not be thrilled. Mr. Lampa said he wasn't against chickens, but with his home on a ½ acre R-1 lot it didn't leave much space for chickens. Mrs. Field said, even if the City allowed chickens in R-1, there should still be a lot of space required, so it would probably be unlikely in reality to have chickens in a neighborhood community.

Mr. Lampa wondered, if people did keep chickens, would they be allowed to butcher the chickens in the yard, possibly in view of the neighbor's children. Mr. Cieszkowski said in every example of home-based chicken coops that he had found it did not allow for slaughtering of the chickens. Mr. Cieszkowski noted that he had received a complaint today about a rooster in Streetsboro. He said in Cleveland Heights, where he lived, after some long deliberations with residents, Cleveland Heights had decided to allow backyard chickens as a conditionally permitted use and it has caused some administrative heart-aches regarding the amount of time and number of people needed to deal with regulating backyard chickens. He knew there were issues with a rooster in his neighborhood and he'd heard that hawks had killed some chickens in Cleveland Heights. Mr. Cieszkowski said he shared the same concerns as Mr. Ring regarding enforcement within Streetsboro. The Zoning Department was already heavily entrenched in the neighborly spats and chickens would just expand that. Mr. Cieszkowski said he needed to do more research on the topic, but he needed to know if Council was considering chickens only or other "livestock" too.

Mr. Lampa asked if Mr. Kocisko was aware of any previous discussion on this issue in the past. Mr. Kocisko said the topic had come up a few times in the last 20 years with the same types of questions and concerns. A few people want them and others do not want the noise or mess or smell from their neighbor's yard. Mr. Hannan asked if the chicken coop had to be 200' from the property line or was it the chickens themselves, or could the chickens roam the whole property (like a horse might) as long as the coop or barn was at the proper distance from the property line. Mr. Kocisko said there had been litigation in the past regarding horses and he didn't want to see it again over chickens.

Ms. Wagner said there were horses and chickens on Page Road that could be heard at Saunders Creek and the dogs sometimes chased the chickens that wandered into the neighborhood, so it could be big problems.

Mrs. Field said she had brought this up to get the Code reworded to be more clear, and if Council was to allow chickens (not roosters) in R-1 to only allow it on multi-acre lots that may be in R-1. She didn't feel it worked to have chickens on smaller lots in neighborhoods.

Mayor Broska said chickens didn't know property lines and the City would get constant calls if chickens were allowed on smaller lots. He said chickens were already allowed in O-C and R-R, within parameters, which was still a large part of the City. If Council wanted to allow chickens on smaller lots, the City would have to research and see if they could be contained by a fence (which was an extra cost to the citizens to get a fence permit) or confined to a coop so they couldn't be free range to other yards.

Mr. Ring summarized that Council should start with figuring out how to reword the current Code. Mrs. Field thought there may be residents that may want to speak on the topic at a future meeting or to present their thoughts in writing since it was difficult to have many people in attendance during the COVID-19 health crisis.

Mr. Hannan suggested, if the current Code was to be reworded, that a fence be required at a distance around the coop so the chickens couldn't get off their property to the neighbor's yard.

Mr. Ring suggested sending this topic to the September Service Committee Meeting, but Mr. Cieszkowski thought it might be better to refer the issue to the Planning Commission and let them review and consider any text amendments after Mr. Cieszkowski presented his research to them. Then the Planning Commission could make a recommendation back to City Council when they had a proposed text amendment ready. Council supported that suggestion. Mr. Cieszkowski would keep Council apprised of the progress on this issue in his bi-weekly report to City Council. Mr. Kocisko mentioned that this issue had been discussed by the Planning Commission in the past and they had determined not to submit any proposal to City Council, which could happen again.

Discuss City Park Basketball Courts

Mr. Mytinger said back in March 2020 all Capital Improvements were halted due to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and its potential effect to the incoming annual revenue, so now he wanted to go over the time frame for getting the basketball courts done under the grant and see how Council may want to move forward. The City was awarded a reimbursable ODNR NatureWorks grant and had until December 2021 to complete the project and still be able to receive the reimbursement amount of almost \$24,000 for this \$85,000 project.

Mr. Ring felt this project would benefit the City, but he was hesitant to discuss appropriations in the Service Committee Meeting and would rather wait to see the updated appropriations at the Finance Committee Meeting in two weeks. He said even though it felt like the economy was opening back up, it wasn't, and he felt a downturn was coming. He didn't want to appropriate money to a "luxury" item until he was sure the City would be in a position to have that money.

Mrs. Field was fine with moving this topic to the Finance Committee Meeting, but this project had

grant money and she felt it was important to appropriate the money and schedule a timeline for the project. The timeline options Mr. Mytinger had provided had some items (on-site survey, develop site plan, Planning Commission approval, and go to bid) happening in August. Although they could be pushed back to September she felt these things could be started with minimal cost; the big cost would be the actual construction that was still to be determined. She hoped to move forward and have basketball courts usable by the residents by next spring.

Mr. Hannan preferred to go with timeline option 2 or 3 and plan for this in the 2021 budget. He agreed this was something that would benefit the City and should be pursued, but it may be better to plan to do the construction in 2021.

Ms. Esarey said she and Mr. Mytinger had talked about this and the total cost of \$85,000 was already part of the 2020 budget in the Capital Fund and there was enough monies in that Fund because of the transfers already made to cover this; she was not concerned about this expenditure in 2020. Because it had been planned and there was a grant she felt this was more of a priority to be encumbered in 2020 than to push it off to 2021 which had a lot of unknowns too. Mrs. Field appreciated the information and would be glad to pursue this in 2020 and not delay it for the residents. Mr. Lampa commented that if this project was delayed into 2022 the construction could conflict with the City's bicentennial activities; he preferred to do it in 2020 also.

Mr. Ruediger commented that since Ms. Esarey had explained that she was comfortable doing this project as part of the 2020 budget, then he would like to move forward with it from here instead of moving the topic to the Finance Committee Meeting in two weeks.

Mr. Hannan noted that according to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan these new basketball courts were to go where the current stage was located, but the Stage Committee discussions had been halted because of the pandemic restrictions, so he suggested putting the basketball courts somewhere else so the City didn't have to rush the decisions about a new stage project. He suggested putting the new basketball courts between the library and the bathrooms by the skatepark.

Mr. Mytinger clarified that the new basketball courts were to be rebuilt in their current location in front of the existing stage and the area Mr. Hannan had mentioned was to have a pickleball court, a walking path, and the possibility of sand volleyball courts (he was preparing a proposal for sand volleyball courts). He said there were options that could be discussed, that's why he wanted to bring this up to Council tonight to maybe start with some of the initial preparation items that had minimal cost. If a discussion and a different location needed to be determined, it would delay the whole process. Mr. Hannan said there had not been much discussion, other than the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, on what other amenities might go in City Park to consider shared features, such as lighting or parking. He didn't really have a preference, he was just happy to get new basketball courts, but thought these things should be considered. Mr. Mytinger noted the Master Plan also showed additional parking for the library and maybe to close off the road next to Field 7 and the pavilion and to build a new main entrance by the Police Department, which as bigger project for future discussion.

Mr. Kocisko still suggested putting the new basketball courts near the library and the bathrooms to leave the old basketball courts available for games until the new ones were done. He understood Mr. Mytinger would have to let ODNR NatureWorks know about the change for the grant program.

Mr. Hannan commented that when Council discussed a new storage shed for City Park, he noted the Parks and Recreation Master Plan did not even call for a shed, but he was told “we can always change the Master Plan,” but now, when he proposed a relocation of the basketball courts, it seemed the Master Plan should not be changed, which was frustrating.

Mr. Ring thanked Ms. Esarey for her thoughts. Mr. Ring said his suggestion was because this was discretionary and although money was appropriated for these basketball courts this year (prior to the COVID-19 pandemic) the City may ultimately need the \$60,000 for something else. He was fine with building these new courts if Ms. Esarey was comfortable that the City was in a good financial position. He added that he agreed with Mr. Hannan that the current location of the courts was an odd location that was in the middle of nowhere, not near any City parking, and was not cohesive to any Park environment; he felt there was plenty of room for multiple types of courts by the library. He suggested looking again at where these new basketball courts should be placed. Mr. Kocisko noted the concrete for the current basketball courts had been for Safety Town at one time and that may be why the basketball courts were located there at the time.

Mrs. Field summarized that Council was comfortable moving forward with the construction of the new basketball courts, but still needed some discussion on the location. She preferred to follow the Master Plan, but if it truly did not make sense, it could be reconsidered.

Mr. Mytinger said the department could move forward with whatever location was chosen. He said he would have to get GPD to visit City Park to do the site work because GPD would put together the bid package to determine where the new courts would go. He was willing to do whatever Council wanted, he just wanted them placed in a location that made sense for the community.

Mr. Ruediger asked for clarification on what construction would actually be done. Mr. Mytinger clarified that the existing concrete would be removed and two side-by-side asphalt courts would be built with the appropriate painted lines and 4 new adjustable outdoor hoops so classes of various ages could be held and possibly leagues. He said the schools could use the space for recess too, which had worked well in the past with the current location. Mr. Hannan wasn't sure the school children would use the space during the day with the new configuration of the school buildings.

Mr. Ruediger suggested Council allow Mr. Mytinger to start the process on this. Mr. Mytinger clarified that there did not need to be any Council action on this until the bids were received and the City was ready to approve the construction. GPD was already approved by the Board of Control back in March 2020 for about \$8,000 as the engineer to put together the bid package. He said he could work with GPD and any Council Member that may want to walk the property to determine the location so it could be submitted to ODNR if there was a change of location. Mr. Mytinger would bring the issue back to Council when it was ready for Council action.

Discuss Grass Cutting Liens

Mr. Miller said this was a yearly ordinance for the lots that were mowed by the City because the property owner had not taken care of them; this was so the City would get paid for that service. These properties were billed and no payment was received. He asked that an ordinance be prepared for the August 24, 2020 Regular Council Meeting so it could be submitted to the County by their September deadline to put a lien on these properties. The total amount due as of today was \$6,900.

Mr. Ring asked how many people had paid for this service without applying a lien in past years. Mr. Miller said most of these places were empty. There were some that had gotten the violation notice, and the City had mowed the property, that would pay, but most of the properties on this list were just vacant properties. There was a \$300 bill sent each time the City mowed the property, so these properties had been billed multiple times. He emphasized that the City would not want to see these properties go to Sheriff's Auction without these liens applied because then the City would not get paid at all.

Mr. Miller explained for Mr. Hannan that if the grass/weeds got 8"-10" high a complaint was usually called in from a neighbor, then the property owner would be cited by the Service Director and given 5 days to remedy the problem or the City would do it for them at \$300 per mow. He said he did not have to cite them each time; he just put them on a rotation and the Service Department crew would cut those properties if needed after the crew finished their regular mowing every week or so.

Mr. Kocisko asked if any of these 8 properties on the list had made a payment. Mr. Miller said as of last week they had not, but he would double check and submit an updated list for the next meeting, if necessary.

MOTION: TO FORWARD THIS TO THE AUGUST 24, 2020 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.

Moved by Mr. Ruediger, seconded by Mr. Lampa. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

T-6872 Contract w/Portage County Health Department for Outfall Testing

Mr. Cieszkowski said this was a renewal of the contract between the City and Portage County Health Department to provide dry weather outfall screening, which was a requirement of the City's MPBES permit. The previous contract ran through the end of 2019. There was a delay this year due to COVID-19, but he had been working with the County Health Department to revise the original contract and this contract was very similar to the previous contract. It would be for a five-year term to be in line with the five-year term of the MPBES permit cycle.

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS TO TONIGHT'S REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING AS EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

Moved by Mr. Ruediger, seconded by Mr. Lampa. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

Discuss New Portage County Park on Ravenna Road [Trail Lake Park]

Mr. Ring said he had been contacted by a resident who was questioning if Streetsboro would or has had any involvement with the park on Ravenna Road, the former Gressard property. Mr. Ring wondered the same thing because in the past the City had assisted with Seneca Ponds Park (a Portage Park District park) by donating the sign kiosk. Mayor Broska said there was no partnership arranged; the park on Ravenna Road was a Portage Park District park and Streetsboro had enough to do in its own parks without volunteering to do something for another agency, but the City would entertain any specific request the Portage Park District might present.

Mr. Ring said the new Trail Lake Park was in Streetsboro and it would benefit the Streetsboro residents, so it would be nice if Streetsboro might offer something (not huge or expensive) that could show good faith between Streetsboro and the Portage Park District, even if it was just an offer to include their programs in our program guide or maybe expand Streetsboro's Tree Planting Program to this park; anything that might make the park better for the residents.

Mr. Ruediger said he'd also had a resident contact him about this park. It seems there wasn't anything specific the Portage Park District was looking for, it was just a request from a resident who wanted to see if Streetsboro could maybe lend some manpower or other resources to help build this new 200 acre park. Mr. Ruediger had explained to the resident that the Streetsboro Parks and Recreation Department was very limited in resources, especially during the pandemic. The resident had also suggested the City help encourage some kind of volunteer group to work to set up the new park, maybe some boy or girl scout groups, but Mr. Ruediger had told the resident that without knowing what the Portage Park District needed, this might be difficult to arrange. Mr. Ruediger thought this would become a gorgeous park and be an amazing property.

Mr. Lampa asked if Streetsboro Parks and Recreation or PRCAC had reached out to the Portage Park District to see if they needed or wanted anything from Streetsboro regarding this new park. Mr. Mytinger answered that a couple of years ago Streetsboro partnered with Portage County to help them take care of Seneca Ponds Park with some mowing and some light work while they were having some financial difficulty before they passed their levy. Mr. Mytinger said he'd had a meeting with Chris Craycroft, Portage Parks District Executive Director, a couple of months ago regarding partnering for a grant application for extending trails along Miller Parkway with Seneca Ponds Park, but there was no discussions regarding the new park on Ravenna Road or any projects there they may need assistance with. He noted that Eileen Fitzsimmons, a PRCAC Member, was heavily involved with the Portage Park District and often gave updates to PRCAC.

Mr. Ring supported Mr. Hannan's suggestions of each Park entity just being willing to share promotion of the other's programs. Mr. Ring had just wanted to start the discussion and maybe as the build out of the new park progressed something might arise or joint programs could be arranged.

Discuss Staffing for Planning/Building Departments

Mayor Broska said there had been a few issues with getting Zoning and Building permits processed in a timely manner. This year had been very difficult for the Building Department and the Planning and Zoning Department. In 2019 there were 9 requests for pool permits, so far this year there had

been over 90 pool permit requests. Dan D'Agostino had gone to the Mayor with ways to streamline the Building permit process. What they had found was that the current staffing was not adequate to move the departments forward; it was just enough "to keep our heads above the water." The inspection process was time consuming for the amount of homes being built in town in Meadow View and elsewhere (129 new homes last year) with numerous inspections for each home along with commercial developments that had to go through Planning and Zoning. Earlier in 2020 the City had increased the fee amounts for the Building Department which had met with resounding success. The Department had met the expected budget and even surpassed it. New staffing would not be a burden on the General Fund; it would be self-supporting by the Building Department fees. The new position would be cross-trained and split between the Planning and Zoning Department and the Building Department. The person would be available to fill in when a current staff member was out for whatever reason. Mayor Broska said Ms. Esarey had assured him the new income from the Building fees would more than cover the position, so Mayor Broska wanted to move forward with creating this new Building Clerk position as a full-time union position.

Mrs. Field asked Ms. Esarey for her thoughts on this and the salary amount she might recommend for this new position. Ms. Esarey answered that the budget for this for 2020 would be about \$15,000 in salary which would be a complete offset by the actual revenue brought in by the Building fees this year. The potential health insurance cost was about \$8,700 which would come from the money saved with the self-funded plan for Plan C. For 2021, with CBA salary step increases and worst case Plan A family insurance, it would be about another \$93,000 to the budget. Mr. D'Agostino had indicated the Building Department would more than cover that cost with the Building permits. She would work with Mr. D'Agostino to include a good estimate for the Building Department permits for the 2021 budget. He was expecting more commercial building permits.

Mrs. Field asked if this needed to be a union position because she was concerned once the position was created and filled it would be quite difficult to undo the position. Mayor Broska said this clerk position would not do inspecting, the City had contracted out for inspectors, this clerk would do research on zoning permit applications in preparation for the Planning Director to sign off on the zoning permits. This clerk would work jointly with the Planning and Zoning Department and the Building Department. Mrs. Field asked if there was a need for more inspectors because she understood they were only available a couple of days a week. Mayor Broska said that was not true; the need was for a clerk.

Mr. Ruediger wondered why there was an increase in building permits this year compared to last year. He thought it might be because people had a lot more free time and maybe extra money to use for home improvements since people were not doing summer travel, concerts or sports events during the pandemic and were not working or were working from home and saw the need for improvements. He wondered what would happen in a year or two or three when the volume of permits decreased. Once the union clerk position was created you couldn't take it away.

Dan D'Agostino, Residential Building Official, explained that earlier this year the Building Department permit fees were brought up to date, although there was still room to bring the fees more in line with other local communities. Mr. D'Agostino said the mission of any Building Department

was to protect the lives and safety of the residents and visitors of the jurisdiction, and to contribute to economic development. To perform this obligation in a satisfactory manner an organization must be developed and each component of that organization must be intimately related to the organization's functional responsibility and an adequate, competent staff must be provided if every facet of operation is to be properly covered. If austerity in the form of understaffing is imposed, then services will be diluted with a resultant adverse effect on the public because the department will not be able to get the permits out in a timely manner. Maintaining good public relations by emphasizing the importance of being a facilitator rather than a regulator is considered one of the most essential functions of building department employees. Harried inspectors or office personnel with excessive workloads are public servants and the face they present to the public is crucial to the public perception of all jurisdiction employees.

Mr. D'Agostino went over the length of time each type of inspection might take to be done correctly for each home, plus the travel time between homes. Although the workload was heavy this year, Mr. Ruediger still wondered what if the workload reverted back to the level it was last year. Mr. D'Agostino said so far this month alone the department had about 210-220 inspections. Mayor Broska said the workload would not decrease. In addition to new housing there would be fences, decks, pools, etc. for all the previously built homes in town. There were over 5,500 homes in the City and almost every home in Meadow View would have to have a deck put on and all that construction had to be coordinated through a clerk. The clerk was the one that took all the information in, scheduled the inspections, and issued the permits with Mr. D'Agostino's signature. Mayor Broska did not expect to ever have such a decrease in the amount of building in the City that the need for this additional person would not exist; every department in the City was already understaffed. He said according to research by the Economic Development Director Streetsboro only had about 52% of the employees it needed. This additional employee would give Mr. D'Agostino the opportunity to implement some of the plans he had to make the Building Department run smoother, i.e. using a cloud based system accessible as a data base instead of handwritten inspection records. Without the help needed in the individual departments, the City was never going to be able to move forward in this manner. Mayor Broska said he would not have asked for this position if it wasn't needed and if it wasn't affordable/self-funded. He knew there was a need for people in the Police Department, the Fire Department, the Service Department and the Finance Department, but there was currently a dire need for this Building Department position and it could be covered with the funding available from within the department. Mayor Broska felt the need for this person would not go away; the department would just keep getting busier and busier.

Mrs. Field agreed the City was understaffed in every department, but wondered if this was the specific position that needed to be filled. Mr. D'Agostino explained how many permits and other tasks had been done through the Building Department so far this year [see attached]. He said before any building permits were issued for certain types of construction, the plans had to be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Department for approval. Then it would go to the Building Department to review the plans. If all the documentation needed was submitted and everything was in compliance, then it would be a two week process at the most; but typically that didn't happen and someone was needed to help do the review letters, registrations, permit fees, handle the phones and cover the desk when the current Building Clerk was out of the office. There were only 8 work hours in the day to

do all the inspections, answer emails and respond to voice messages, which was daunting. This additional clerk would work in the Building Department to help do what the current Building Clerk does and also help the Planning and Zoning Department. Mr. Ruediger asked if there was already someone in mind for this position. Mr. D'Agostino said no, it could be a male or female person.

Mr. Kocisko said this additional person could be a big help to the Planning and Zoning Department. Mayor Broska agreed this person would be a benefit to the Planning and Zoning Department and the Building Department. Mr. Kocisko was not against additional staff, but he was concerned about the additional cost of approximately \$93,000 (salary and benefits) for another clerk especially with the cost of the current City Hall, the basketball courts, and other things that might come up.

Mr. Ring supported getting help for Mr. Cieszkowski in the Planning and Zoning Department because he felt he had been overworked and underpaid for a long time. The Mayor had said the building permit applications would not decrease in the future, but Mr. Ring disagreed. Mr. Ring said when Meadow View was built out in a few years, the City would not see that type of construction in the future and the building fees for an entire new home were substantially more than the building fees for a deck or pool, so the revenue would not be at the same level. He didn't think it was financially responsible to look at this as self-sustaining into the future.

Mr. Ring wanted to meet Ms. Esarey and discuss the finances of this issue. He was uncomfortable agreeing to spend this money in the current economic environment although he understood the need.

Ms. Wagner said she had also heard complaints from people about it taking a month to get a permit, so she wondered if a clerk position in the office or an inspector position in the field would help resolve the problem. Mr. D'Agostino explained that 80% of the applications submitted (by the owner or their contractor) were not complete or not clear and it took time to mail written notices regarding the needed information. It was a clerk that was needed to deal with this and help speed things up. Through 2012 there were two full-time clerks doing what one clerk was doing now, plus there was a full-time Building Official and a full-time inspector and now there was a part-time Building Office and a part-time inspector with two back up inspectors, and the Department was getting far more volume so there were delays.

Mrs. Field wondered if it would be more beneficial to add a part-time clerk and an additional part-time inspector because there had been so many complaints. Mr. D'Agostino said he already had two back up inspectors that were used exclusively for Ryan Homes because they had so much going on. Mr. D'Agostino said his first responsibility was to the residents of the City, not the contractors or developers. He said the Building Department was taking care of the other inspections during the day with the part-time inspector; the problem was getting the paperwork through Planning and Zoning and Building. He wanted one person to help both the current Planning Clerk and the current Building Department Clerk.

Mr. Lampa said he'd also received a tremendous amount of complaints and was tired of it because it was embarrassing. He noted that if one of the clerks was out for an extended amount of time there was no back up to do their job and keep the departments running. He thought hiring a dual-hat-

wearing person would help alleviate the problems the Planning and Zoning Department and the Building Department were having. He wanted the residents to have the level of service they deserved. He noted the \$93,000 mentioned earlier was the salary plus the employee benefits.

Mrs. Field had a concern that once you get a union position it was permanent. Mayor Broska said there had been unions in the City for quite some time. This was to be a union position because it was not a management/supervisory position or a confidential position; it was a clerk position, like all the other clerks in the Service Department. Only the seasonal workers in Service and the Director were not union members. Mayor Broska said, if in the future, the clerk position was no longer needed the City could lay someone off, which Mrs. Field thought would be difficult to do. Mayor Broska explained that the City could lay off from the bottom of the seniority list, and this person would be one of the last hired and therefore one of the first fired. All the union clerks (Service, Finance, Water, Fire Department, etc.) were equal.

Mr. Ruediger also agreed the departments needed help right now, but he still wanted to know what would happen if the number of permit applications went down significantly once Meadow View was built out. He also wanted to know the number of permit applications from previous years per month (i.e. seasonal demand) before he could decide on this issue. He wanted the information for residential and commercial presented at the next meeting. Mr. D'Agostino said he couldn't know if the current volume of work would continue for five or six years but there was a need now for an additional clerk.

Mrs. Field wanted to know from Ms. Esarey how the City might pay for this additional union position if the permit application fees were not enough to make this Building Clerk position self-sufficient. Mr. Ring agreed that information was needed because the City was already running a deficient budget in the General Fund. He agreed the help was needed, but the City needed to be able to afford it into the future if the fee revenue was greatly reduced. Mrs. Field summarized that Council agreed there was a need, they just wanted to make sure it was the right position to solve the problem and if it was affordable in the long run. She thanked Mr. D'Agostino for coming and for working so hard for Streetsboro.

MOTION: TO FORWARD THIS TO THE AUGUST 24, 2020 FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING.

Moved by Mr. Ruediger, seconded by Mr. Lampa. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

Discuss Carter Lumber Property

Mayor Broska said six or seven years ago he had presented the idea to redo the Carter Lumber property into the Water Department. At the time, the estimate to refurbish the property to be the Water Department was between \$330,000 and \$360,000. He asked Council to consider, for the 2021 budget, redoing the front building at the Carter Lumber property to turn it into the entire Water Department, including the Water Clerks, water bill payments, and the Water Department personnel. He said there would be office space and warehouse space with dry storage so all the file cabinets currently taking up space at City Hall could be moved to the Carter Lumber property. He was

against spending tens of thousands of dollars to build space in a new City Hall just to store file cabinets when there could be space available to store them.

He wanted to begin the process of seeing what it would cost to refurbish the Carter Lumber property. After discussing it with Mr. Miller and Ms. Esarey, the Water Reserve Fund and the Water Operating Fund had enough money to cover any type of construction without affecting the City's ability to redo or extend waterlines as soon as they would reinstate the OPWC grants. Then the next discussions could be about the Field House. If there were things that could be incorporated into the Carter Lumber/Water Department and into the Field House, then the footprint for a new City Hall could be reduced to something less than a 10,000 sq. ft.-12,000 sq. ft. facility. It would cost significantly less per square foot to redo space at the Carter Lumber property than to build space into a new City Hall. The refurbished Carter Lumber property would get a new façade, a new roof, paint the rest of the building, repair the parking lot, create 3-4 offices, and install security for the clerks. This would free up an enormous amount of space at the existing Service Department. Mayor Broska said Mr. Miller supported the proposal and the Mayor wanted to be able to plan for this to be done in 2021 for about \$400,000.

Mr. Ring thought it was a good idea because the Carter Lumber building was currently just wasted space, however it may not be a good idea to spend a ton of money in the middle of a pandemic. He realized the money would come from the Water Funds which were self-sustaining, but at the meeting where the Water Study and waterlines were discussed it was acknowledged that there was no way the City could do the needed waterline projects with the money it had. So he wanted to look into this further with the Finance Director.

Mayor Broska said the Water Study had included scenarios/recommendation for getting money to get the waterline projects done over time. He added that the projects the City could go after now were the replacement projects the City could get assistance for with matching funds. To extend new lines the cost would come out of the City coffers. The waterlines were like the roads; it had taken 9 years to get the roads up to the condition they were in now, the City would also not be able to upgrade all the waterlines overnight, it would take time. He said at some point the City would have to raise the water rates to generate more funding for the water projects. He mentioned that the Water Department had just completed the hydrant flushing and the water quality had improved dramatically, but there were lines that still needed to be looped, and the water quality would never equal bottled water that a lot of people were used to drinking. He said the City needed a multi-year plan to do all the water projects, they would not get done over night.

Mayor Broska said that if the City was not going to do something with the Carter Lumber property soon, then it might as well bulldoze the building because it was already starting to cost money to maintain it. It already needed a roof and needed painted and needed the parking lot repaired. If it was done now, then no one would have to do anything with it for the next 15-20 years. He understood there was concern about spending money, but this was an investment in the property that would save money down the road by not having to build additional space at the Service Department or at a future City Hall.

Mr. Ring noted there were about 57 waterlines that were approaching the end of their useful life and the replacement of those lines was estimated at about \$10,213,859. It could take 20 years to generate enough money to redo all these waterlines and by then the lines could be 70 years old. So he didn't think it was financially responsible to spend the \$400,000 on the building when the City hadn't even started these waterline projects. He understood what the City was doing now with the staff was not ideal, but it worked for now.

Mrs. Field was also concerned about using the Water Funds for this when there were so many water projects that immediately/directly served the residents.

Mr. Hannan commented that it seemed the City always paid more for projects than initially projected so the \$400,000 could grow to \$600,000+. He wondered if the City could sell the Carter Lumber property which was zoned I-1 Industrial since the City wasn't doing anything with the building. Mayor Broska said the water tower was on the property. Mr. Hannan also commented that if the two Water Clerks, who monitored the City Hall phones and front entrance were moved to the Carter Lumber building, the City would need to find someone else to work the front desk. He said the proposed new Building Department Clerk was to cover the front desk and phones only while the current Clerks were away from the front desk, not all the time. Mr. Hannan also wondered, if the City were to go with on-line bill pay, would that eliminate a Water Clerk position. Mayor Broska noted that the City Hall incoming calls could be answered by 5 different people. Mrs. Field did not want the proposed Building Department Clerk to become the City Hall receptionist.

Mr. Ring commented that the 2020 budget had revenues of \$3,734,750 going into the Water Operating Fund with expenses of \$3,609,718 for a difference of \$125,000 of surplus in the Water Operating Fund. There was a fund balance, but the City would need that for projects. In the Water Reserve Fund there was \$119,000 of revenue budgeted and \$74,000 of expenses for a difference of \$45,000 of surplus. With the two water funds there was about \$175,000 of surplus and there was a couple million dollars in the Fund balance, but the City had \$10 million of waterline to do you. If the building renovation cost \$500,000, he felt it would take five years of the entire surplus just to pay off the upgrade. He just didn't see it financially at this time.

Mr. Miller said the City paid for a 20 year rate study. That rate study was in preparation for all the waterline repairs. He understood things got stalled because of the pandemic and it probably wasn't right to move forward with raising water rates at this time, but at some point in time soon that would have to happen and the City would have to follow the rate study that was recently completed. The rate study explained in the various scenarios how to do it, from not doing anything to raising the rates for a 20 year program to get all the water system needs taken care of. It was all in the rate study.

Mr. Miller said the roof needed replaced right now on the Carter Lumber building or the City would totally lose that building and he was working on getting prices for a new roof. He wasn't against having the whole Water Department together in that building; it would make it more efficient to get repairs and billing done. He reminded Council that the rate study would take care of the 20 year waterline replacement program; that's why the City did the study, and the City needed to move forward with the study recommendations.

Mr. Ring said if the City did the most aggressive scenario maybe it would be able to get all the water projects done, but even then it would not leave a lot left over, so until the City decided which scenario to go with he didn't think this conversation was appropriate. Mr. Miller said the roof had to be fixed (it was leaking everywhere) or the City would lose the whole building; they did use a secured portion of the building for a workshop although the rest of the building was vacant. Mr. Ring asked for an estimate for the roof repair.

Mr. Kocisko thought the building had cost the City about \$450,000 and now the Mayor was considering putting about that much in it again. He reminded everyone that if money from the Water Fund was used to refurbish the building it could only be used for water related things, maybe it could not be used for the storage of other department's materials as the Mayor had mentioned he wanted to do. Mr. Kocisko said he wasn't against the project and the roof definitely needed replaced, but the City needed to determine where to get the money. He said the City was raising the customer water rates 2% annually to get the rates up to where they should have been.

Mr. Hannan wanted to replace the roof this year to at least save the structure until it could be decided what the City would do with the building and asked if that could be done with Water Fund money. He thought the most realistic use for that building was to renovate it as the Mayor had recommended and move the Water Department there so it wasn't vacant. Mr. Ruediger said he and Mr. Hannan had toured the building with Mr. Miller and agreed a new roof was imperative to save the building for the future. Mr. Ruediger agreed with Mr. Ring that \$400,000+ to refurbish the whole building was a lot in the current uncertain pandemic economic conditions. He also suggested getting a price on a new roof to save the structure and give time to decide what to do with the building in the future.

MOTION: TO FORWARD THIS TO THE SEPTEMBER FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING FOR PRICES FOR A NEW ROOF.

Moved by Mr. Ruediger, seconded by Mr. Hannan. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

Citizens' Comments

Carmen Laudato, Ravenna resident and former Council Member, thanked everyone, especially Mrs. Field, for following through on the Hometown Hero Banner project. She loved the way it looked in the City and hoped talks would continue with the School regarding high school Senior banners. Mrs. Field said she had talked with Mr. Mytinger regarding the poles on which the banners may be displayed and for various reasons there were not a lot of streets where it would work. One option Mr. Mytinger had suggested may be at the high school parking lot, which the School could handle. Mrs. Field had suggested installing new evenly spaced decorative lamppost along the upcoming road widening projects where banners could be displayed. Ms. Laudato felt it was fine to have the Hometown Hero Banners and high school student banners in different locations. She noted that the parents paid for the student banners so it wasn't a costly program for the City. She encouraged a conversation with the School to work toward this program.

Announcements

The Regular Council Meeting will immediately follow this meeting.

There being no further business to be addressed by this committee, and upon motion by Mr. Ruediger, seconded by Mr. Ring, this meeting adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

ATTEST:

Caroline L. Kremer, Clerk of Council

Julie Field, Chairman