

THE CITY OF STREETSBORO, OHIO
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Monday, June 14, 2021

This Service Committee Meeting was called to order on Monday, June 14, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. by Mike Lampa, Chairman. Mrs. Field gave an invocation and Mayor Broska led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mike Lampa, Justin Ring, Jon Hannan, Jennifer Wagner, Anthony Lombardo, Chuck Kocisko, Julie Field

ABSENT: None.

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

Disposition of Minutes

None.

Old Business

Update on Forest Valley Development

Mr. Cieszkowski said Mrs. Fagnilli had mentioned during the staff meeting this morning that there were still a few things that needed taken care of with the eastern detention pond. She confirmed the performance bond for the subdivision would not be refunded to the developer until everything was taken care of to the City's satisfaction.

The Chair asked to have Mr. Lombardo's name added to this agenda item for future meetings since it was in his Ward.

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS TO THE JULY SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING FOR ANOTHER UPDATE.

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

T-7024^{amended} Zoning Text Amendment Regarding Keeping Chickens in Selected Residential Districts

Mr. Cieszkowski provided a cover letter and a GIS map as requested by Council to outline which parcels in the City the proposed zoning text changes would apply to [see attached.] The map was for the R-1, R-2 and R-T districts only and showed that a total of 243 parcels would be affected by the backyard chicken regulations as drafted. The 243 parcels did not include the 149 parcels in the O-C district and the 688 parcels in the R-R district that would be affected by the regulations as drafted, but the total number of parcels affected would be about 1,080. Mr. Cieszkowski had made a couple additional recommended revisions based on the information in the map.

Mr. Lampa said he had talked to Mr. Cieszkowski prior to the meeting and got all his questions answered. Mr. Ring said he felt Council still had not had a real conversation about chickens and if City Council wanted to do it to affect net new more than 6% of the City. Council had been given a recommendation from the Planning Commission and he was not certain what discussions they had because he had not listened to the audio of their meeting yet, but he felt Council had not had a discussion on whether this specific legislation was the right thing to do. He wanted to do it right and not have to amend the regulations multiple times.

He wanted to have the conversations at City Council so he presented his thoughts on some information/data Mr. Cieszkowski had provided. Mr. Ring said the net new was small because the O-C and R-R zoning districts already allowed chickens; this was just changing the setbacks. The new use of the property to allow chicken keeping was just in R-1, R-2 and R-T; only 243 parcels would be affected which he thought was only about 4.5% of the parcels in the City. He questioned if that was really doing anything for anybody; should it be accepted as presented, be expanded or be retracted; he hoped for discussion on this.

Mr. Hannan said he'd talked to Mr. Cieszkowski about the issue because this had started as allowing a few people that wanted to have chickens without opening the floodgates. Now it seemed Council was stuck between limiting it or opening it up to everyone. He said there were people all over town that wanted to keep chickens and people all over town that did not want them next door. Mr. Hannan thought the minimum 0.7 acre limitation allowed chickens in some of the bigger, more rural parcels and not all of R-1.

Mrs. Field agreed with Mr. Hannan that Streetsboro needed something about this issue in its Code. She felt it made sense in the rural areas of town, so limiting it to parcels of 0.7 acres or more was a good place to start to see if people would stick to the guidelines or if there would be a lot of complaints. She said Council could always open it to more places later if it went well, but hesitated to open it to everywhere to start. She understood there were a lot of people lately interested in raising chicken and it was becoming more common in other communities because people liked locally grown things.

Mr. Hannan agreed that there needed to be something on the books with regulations about setbacks from the dwellings, screening requirements, cleanliness/smell for those that wanted to keep chickens. Now people were keeping chickens in all kinds of methods and there should be regulations in place. Mr. Ring noted that keeping chickens in R-1 or R-2 zones was currently illegal which meant that

setbacks, screening, cleanliness didn't need regulated because it wasn't allowed at all and those people should be made get rid of their chickens.

Mr. Kocisko asked how many complaints had been filed about chickens. Mr. Cieszkowski said the Planning and Zoning Department had received a handful of calls, but he'd heard more about calls Council Members had received regarding chickens. Mr. Kocisko felt Council was looking to change the City Code for just a couple or maybe just one request that recently came in, which he didn't feel was necessary. He said he'd been involved in conversations about chicken at least twice in the last 20 years and things weren't changed then. He thought major changes would be needed to allow chickens and that might not be fair to the others that were not in favor of allowing backyard chicken keeping. He felt there were existing regulations and it wasn't necessary to make these proposed changes; leave things the way they are.

Mr. Lampa kind of agreed with Mr. Kocisko, but also thought Streetsboro needed to change with the times; there was urban farming in small town cities and Streetsboro needed to accommodate change with the way the world was going. By having something on the books the Zoning Inspectors could work with that and spend time on other zoning issues and not have to fine people or give violation citations regarding chickens.

Mr. Ring said he wasn't against people having chickens, he just wanted to get it right. He felt the Zoning Inspector would still have to cite people regarding chickens because with the minimal effect of this proposed ordinance there would still be plenty of people with illegal chickens. He wanted to figure out how to fairly address the people that did want to have chickens that were excluded by this proposed ordinance, which was most of the City. He wondered if there was another solution other than acreage restrictions; he would need to consider it further to see if there was something better to propose. He noted that for every one person that wanted chickens, there were probably 10 that did not want them in their neighborhood. He didn't like the currently proposed ordinance because it was such a tiny minimal impact.

Mr. Ring mentioned the email received from Mr. and Mrs. Grimm today regarding environmental safety/water quality concerns. Mr. Ring said the article cited in the email referred to large commercial chicken farms and the environmental impact those farms may have on ground water. Mr. Ring didn't find anything in his own research today regarding urban backyard chickens having any environmental/safety impact.

Ms. Wagner commented that when families move to a community, they do their research and determine it's where they want to be, and they would be frustrated if there was suddenly a major change with chickens in the neighborhood that were not there before. She said chickens were not a small change, it was significant, and if that's something a homeowner wanted, they should have considered that when they moved to a new property. She felt the people that would be the most upset were those that did not want chickens near them.

Mayor Broska commented that enforcement was near impossible. When the Zoning Inspector noticed chickens on a property, he wrote a zoning code violation notice (it was not a criminal

offense), and the property owner would have a certain amount of time to get rid of the chickens. If the chickens were not gone in that amount of time, the owner may ask for more time, but it was difficult to enforce. Mayor Broska wanted a better way to enforce this because it often took months through the civil courts. The subdivisions with HOAs didn't allow chickens, so this proposed ordinance may impact even fewer parcels than it seemed, so this proposed law would affect very few people. He said he would not want chickens living next door to his home. He wondered if this proposed change would be helping the few at the expense of the masses. He added that if someone wanted to raise chickens there were other nearby towns where it was allowed. He noted that the proposed legislation required chickens to be in coops, but sometimes they got out, and if they got into the roadway, it could be detrimental to motorcycle riders. He said he didn't think there was any way for this to be popular in either direction, but Council needed to consider how many people this was appealing at the expense of how many people that did not want it.

Mayor Broska didn't want to make it a criminal offense, but he hoped there was a way to make enforcement of illegal chicken keeping faster. Mr. Ring said there was already a method of enforcement for any zoning regulations; he didn't think there was anything that would give the current regulations more "teeth." Mayor Broska responded that the existing regulations were not readily enforceable; it could take several months after the violation was initially noticed for the issue to go through the civil court system, and this proposal did nothing to remedy that concern. Mayor Broska also said if this proposal was passed and people in a subdivision with more than 0.7 acres of land kept chickens under the law, it would become an HOA issue to enforce, which was difficult too.

Mr. Ring said the legislation was written to keep chickens out of the more densely packed subdivisions if less than 50% of the parcels in the subdivision were over 0.7 acres so the HOA issue might not be a problem. He thought opening it up to the whole City with a 0.51 acre minimum requirement was too much. He didn't like how the proposal was written and didn't feel it was actually doing anything in reality; it was just legislation to appease a small percentage of the population, and didn't help the administration in enforcement at all. He was not opposed to the R-R portion of the proposal to reduce the setbacks somewhat. He thought there should be some type of change enacted for the rural areas. Mr. Ring thought if this proposal was enacted as written it would be fine for the few people it impacted, but then more people with 0.7 acres of land that wanted chickens would find it unfair and maybe file lawsuits; the legislation may hurt more than it would help, but he didn't know what the solution might be.

Mr. Lombardo wondered how many people had actually asked to have chickens. Mr. Cieszkowski said he'd heard from a few Council Members that they had been approached by a handful of individuals. Mrs. Field said, as the Ward 4 representative, a more rural part of town, she had been approached by a handful of people. She felt the City needed to do something regarding this issue. She understood there may be a few people that wanted chickens that didn't qualify under this proposal, as Mr. Ring mentioned, but you couldn't please everyone. As Ms. Wagner had said, if people wanted to keep chickens, they should have done their research before buying a home, but most people just assumed if there is open/rural space near them, maybe with horses nearby, that they could keep livestock. Mrs. Field said she personally did not want to keep chickens or to have them anywhere near her home, but that was her personal opinion, and there were others that wanted to

have them. Mayor Broska said the majority of people felt as Mrs. Field did, but Mrs. Field wasn't sure if that was true or not. Mrs. Field said this issue had been considered from many viewpoints and maybe the changes should be just kept to the R-R setback changes.

Mr. Lampa said he represented Ward 1 where most of the lots were 0.5 acres and he'd had a handful of people tell him they wanted chickens. He'd seen the zoning violations of the handful of people that already had chickens illegally. He personally did not want to keep chickens, but had no problem with others that wanted to raise chickens, as long as the chickens stayed on their own property.

Mr. Kocisko suggested leaving the legislation as it was because it would disappoint someone by just changing part of it. He didn't want it to be like "garage sales" where it was discussed for months and then just dropped with no changes. He felt there were too few people (out of all the 16,600 residents) requesting a change, so don't make any changes.

Mr. Hannan suggested at least changing the 200' setback in O-C and R-R to 100' because as Mr. Cieszkowski had said it made more sense, but if the majority of Council wanted to make no changes because only a handful of people were requesting a change, then he'd agree with them. He had wanted to discuss this issue because a handful of people had reached out to him.

Mrs. Field felt it was ridiculous to not make any changes at all because it would disappoint someone. There had been a lot of time and energy put into this and she felt the City could make some changes to the R-R and then move on from this topic.

Mr. Hannan said the original email Council had received was from a family raising chickens in R-1 just south of Emerald Avenue so the Planning Commission had looked into changes to the current regulations. Mr. Lampa asked Council what they wanted to do with this proposal. Mr. Ring suggested sending it forward to the Regular Council Meeting but amending it first to strip out R-1, R-2 and R-T and just leave the provisions for R-R. Mr. Cieszkowski and the Clerk clarified that the recommendation from Planning Commission had included changes to O-C, R-R and R-1 with the 0.7 acre limitation; City Council had suggested adding in R-2 and R-T, but that had never been voted on, just drafted for discussion purposes.

MOTION: TO REMOVE R-1, R-2 AND R-T PROVISIONS FROM THE DRAFTED PROPOSAL AND LEAVE O-C AND R-R PROVISIONS AS WRITTEN.

Moved by Mr. Ring, seconded by Mrs. Field. Upon roll call vote, **motion carried 6-1 with Mr. Kocisko opposing the motion.**

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS TO TONIGHT'S REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING FOR FIRST READING AS AMENDED.

Moved by Mr. Ring, seconded by Mrs. Field. Upon voice vote, **motion carried with Mr. Kocisko opposing the motion.**

Mr. Cieszkowski mentioned that in his cover memo for tonight's meeting he had recommended making an amendment to clarify setbacks in the R-R and O-C zoning districts where more than six hens and a rooster are present. He wanted to know if Council wanted to make that amendment to insert that clarification as a revision in 1151.33(c) because it was in the two zoning districts that Council would like to retain in this legislation. Mr. Ring thought the setbacks were already spelled out and didn't need further clarification. Mr. Cieszkowski said it sort of took what was implied and made it explicit. He just wanted to be sure Council was comfortable that this would still apply; that people were permitted to have more than six hens and a rooster in the R-R and O-C districts. The currently existing Code did not specify roosters or no roosters. Mr. Ring felt it was already allowed, within the proper setbacks, and the proposed legislation wasn't changing the applicable use just changing the setback, so it was fine.

Mrs. Field felt this version of the legislation wasn't too far off from what the Planning Commission had recommended to City Council. It was confirmed that it would take 2/3 of Council [5 of 7] to pass legislation that was different than what the Planning Commission recommended. Mrs. Field thanked Mr. Cieszkowski for all his time and effort on this issue. Mr. Ring also thanked Mr. Cieszkowski for the maps, which had been very helpful. Mrs. Field suggested the Council Members keep the maps and other information on this topic in case the issue came up again or other amendments got proposed in the future.

New Business

T-7049 Construction Agreement for Hannum Crossing Phase 10

Mr. Cieszkowski said this was a construction agreement for the last phase of Hannum Crossing; there would be 8 sublots in the northwest portion of the subdivision. It was approved by the Planning Commission on November 10, 2020. This phase would finish North Jennifer Lane to a cul-de-sac to accommodate the proposed 8 sublots. All the exhibits to the construction agreement had been included, especially the performance guarantee.

MOTION: TO FORWARD TO TONIGHT'S REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.

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

T-7050 Award Residential Curbside Waste Collection Franchise

T-7051 Award Curbside Recycling Franchise

Mr. Beni said the City administration had recommended to the Planning Commission that the franchise for both trash and recycling be awarded to Kimble. The same materials City Council had received had been provided to the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Lampa commented that the current cost per quarter for unlimited trash service from Kimble was \$40.08 (\$160.32 per year). The current cost per quarter for recycling service from Portage County was \$10.50 (\$42 per year). This new contract with Kimble with trash and recycling would increase the recycling to \$59.52 per year, an increase of \$17.52 per year for recycling (\$1.46/month).

Mr. Lampa currently used autopay for the trash collection from Kimble. He wondered if the

recycling would also be included in the quarterly autopay. Mr. Beni thought all billing from Kimble would be quarterly. Mr. Lampa wondered how Kimble would handle non-payment of a recycling bill because Portage County had added the cost to the sewer bills and non-payment was assessed to the property taxes. Mr. Ring said Kimble could refuse service and it would go through the usual collection service process because a non-governmental entity could not add an amount to a tax bill.

Mr. Ring said he did not support forcing people to buy a product/service from a private company. He would not vote for a franchise agreement that required that. Mr. Beni said the City ordinances required mandatory participation; it was not part of the franchise agreement language. Mrs. Field agreed with Mr. Ring. She had been on City Council when Council changed that legislation [in 2017]. Mr. Ring understood the financial argument for mandatory participation because it was easier for the recycling company to give a price if they knew how many customers they would have and the more customers, the lower the price for each. He thought it was inappropriate for Council to force a citizen to use a private service.

Mr. Hannan understood Mr. Ring's comments, but if Council were to change that now, it would change the bids, then there would be a lapse in recycling service while the City rebid; the change should have been considered months ago before the RFPs even went out. Mr. Ring said that Portage County Recycling had said they would continue to pick up Streetsboro's recycling until Streetsboro got another service provider. This had been put together rather quickly when the City got surprised by Portage County saying they didn't want to do recycling anymore. Mr. Beni clarified that the bid responses were prepared to adhere to the existing City Ordinances.

Mr. Kocisko said when this was discussed at multiple meetings years ago, most rubbish/recycling companies required that they get all the business. The issue had come up years ago (1990s) because of the amount of heavy trash trucks on the roads and the timing of the pickups when there were multiple haulers, so it was changed to a sole provider for picking up trash to preserve the roads and to avoid conflict of pickup times; there was no recycling back then. He offered this background information on why the citizens were "forced" to do this.

Mayor Broska said these bids were put together based on the existing ordinances. He said the City could select a bid for waste collection and deny the curbside recycling bid. He added that if Council made the recycling non-mandatory, he doubted the City would get any bids for recycling at all because the majority of people would not recycle (if they could save a few dollars a month) and the City would have no way to indicate to a bidder how many people would sign up for the service. Mr. Ring thought it should be the people's choice if they wanted to recycle. Mayor Broska didn't disagree, but emphasized that the City would not get any bids for recycling and according to the Ohio plan the municipality was required to recycle, so if it was not going to be curbside recycling, the City would need to come up with another plan (maybe a big bin area).

Mr. Lampa said the contracts were written for five years. If Council changed the Code months later to make recycling non-mandatory, Mr. Lampa wondered how would that affect the pricing going forward? Mr. Beni said all the bids came in that they wanted to have both franchises or they didn't want either one of them. Mr. Ring said he would not let the trash companies bully him. Mr. Beni

and Mayor Broska said then the City wouldn't have trash pickup. Mr. Beni said he'd have to read the exact language to answer Mr. Lampa's question, but the City would probably be breaching the current franchise agreement.

Mrs. Field wasn't concerned about a couple week lapse in recycling service; she wanted the City to consider what it would look like if recycling was non-mandatory, if it was a choice. The Mayor had mentioned that it was required by the State of Ohio that we recycle, so what might it look like? Mayor Broska said in the towns that had large bin collection spots instead of curbside, those spots turned in to trash dumps. It was difficult to police and maintain. Mayor Broska added that the large collection bins were a cost to the City that would come out of the annual budget, not paid by the individual citizens, and he had no idea what that cost might be.

Mr. Ring noted Kimble had requested about 5 changes to the language in the curbside recycling franchise agreement. Mr. Beni said those requested changes were pretty minor. Mr. Ring said it seemed Council was "painted into a corner" and had to take all or none, and he took extreme exception to that.

Mrs. Field said there was a little history to this from the previous bidding process a few years ago and she understood, to some extent, why Kimble was coming in this direction. She thought there were probably a lot of companies that would want Streetsboro's business. She asked why there was not a Kimble representative here tonight for this discussion. Mayor Broska said the administration had not asked them to attend because the administration didn't expect there to be an issue; the trash companies had done their bids in accordance with the City's ordinances, but now at the last minute Council was raising objections that should have been brought up earlier. The City was running out of time because the current trash contract was set to expire July 1, 2021. Mayor Broska said this bidding process was started with plenty of time to get things done, and there were only four bids received (Waste Management, Kimble, Rumpke, and Republic didn't bid recycling at all) because there were not a lot of trash companies out there. He said it was difficult at this late date, and even if a Kimble representative was present tonight, it would be hard from him to respond to whether Kimble would accept the trash franchise without the recycling franchise since he wouldn't be able to consult with his board. The bidders had done everything in good faith, and it seemed the City was going back on that and now objecting to having it forced on the people. Mr. Ring said he had brought it up clearly to the Mayor and his administration in the private work sessions the administration had when Portage County Recycling had said they were withdrawing from providing the recycling service because he was completely against the forced participation in the program. Mr. Ring suggested taking a vote.

Mr. Lampa commented that he had spoken to Don Johnson, the Kimble representative, about the community clean up day, which was to be done by Kimble at a phenomenal price (\$2,000 less than last year plus they would take tires). Mr. Ring said he had no issues with Kimble regarding trash service, they were a good corporate partner; he was just completely against a government entity forcing anybody to buy a product/service from a private company and he wouldn't support that. Mr. Lampa said he agreed, but this Council had not made that decision, it was done by a previous Council.

Mr. Hannan said he was on City Council when that change was made and he supported it because it gave the residents a better rate. Mr. Ring said it was also another government agency doing the work at that time, which was a little bit different, but now it was a private company. He gave an example of how he saw this and wondered if Council would ever require the citizens to “go to Giant Eagle and buy broccoli once a week.” He didn’t think the City should ever force a private company to be used by citizens and asked to address that legislation at the next Service Committee Meeting.

Mr. Hannan clarified that even if recycling was made non-mandatory, it would still be provided for those that wanted it by a single hauler, to address the concerns Mr. Kocisko had mentioned earlier.

Mrs. Field said these pieces of legislation regarding the franchises were only up for first reading tonight, so there was time. She also liked the service Kimble provided, and she would have had Kimble provide the recycling at the last bidding process.

Mayor Broska was also not a fan of mandatory participation, but he emphasized that the City would not get any bids for recycling. He added that Portage County wanted to get out of the recycling business because during the last bidding process Mr. Steiner from Portage County was allowed to negotiate from the podium to get his price under that of the private industry providers, so Portage County was losing money. Mayor Broska would reach out to Kimble, but he predicted the City would not get any bids for any type of recycling because the bidders would not know how many residents would be participating and wouldn’t be able to work out a price. Mr. Ring said that was the bidders’ choice, and if that was true, then the City would have to figure out what to do with recycling. He said he would not be pushed around and put in a corner. Mr. Beni said not having recycling would factor in to the bidders’ trash service price rate because the residents would put more into the trash bins if they were not recycling.

Mr. Kocisko had explained some history on this topic. He said in the past recycling wasn’t part of the consideration for arranging trash service. He said it was almost too late and the City should go with the bids offered now, and then in the future (in five years when this contract would expire) Council could reconsider the mandatory participation requirement. Mr. Ring was frustrated that the City could not change its own law for five years because the City could be sued for breach of contract.

MOTION: TO MOVE BOTH T-7050 AND T-7051 TO TONIGHT’S REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING FOR FIRST READING.

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

T-7052 Purchase 12-Ton Capacity Trailer for Service Department

Mr. Miller said Council had passed Ord. No. 2021-55 earlier this year to purchase a trailer, but prior to being able to order the trailer, the prices went up. The Service Department was able to find a better, bigger trailer for a price comparable to the increased price of the previously approved trailer. This new trailer would cost \$16,692 from Southeastern Equipment. It was state bid pricing. He

asked for approval of the new trailer at the higher price tonight, so he could get the order placed right away. The money was in the budget for 2021.

Mr. Ring asked what this trailer would haul. Mr. Miller said it was for the Bobcat excavator that he wanted to purchase and the 12-ton capacity trailer would be sufficient according to the Department's mechanics. The Department's dump trucks would be used to pull this new trailer.

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

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

T-7053 Purchase Bobcat Excavator

Mr. Miller said the Service Department staff had reviewed 6-7 machines and they selected the Bobcat machine. There were four buckets with it, a hydra-tilt, and a flail mower. This was a local dealer, so it would be easier to get parts if needed. This was at state bid pricing. Mr. Miller asked that this also be approved by Council tonight.

Mr. Ring asked if this excavator was large enough for the Department's needs. Mr. Miller said the staff selected the biggest machine they could and still stay within one lane of traffic to work, and it could reach into the dump trucks fine.

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

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

T-7054 Contract for Epoxy Flooring for New Truck Storage Garage

Mr. Miller this would be the last piece for the new Service garage. The company had done some repairs to the concrete as requested, which was finished, and the City had a deal with them that the City would pay the \$10,100 for the epoxy flooring to seal the floor; they were paying about \$17,000 toward the project. There would be an appropriation adjustment at the Special Finance Committee Meeting tonight to cover this, but it would still be within the \$92,413 that was originally approved.

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

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

Discuss Purchase of GIS Update for Water Department

Mr. Miller said they had received 4 quotes for this. Both Water Operators had reviewed the quotes and interviewed the companies and selected the Precision Laser quote for \$41,477. The companies were all similar and the first two companies did this work all the time, so that's a reason why the first bid was selected, and it was the lowest quote. This system would allow the crews to have GIS iPads

in the field and see where the waterlines and water valves were. These iPads would link into the CMI system so the crews could create work orders in the field rather than write paper work orders. Eventually other departments would be able to hook into this GIS system so it would help all the departments. Later the Service Department would add storm water and street lights to the water GIS system. Mr. Miller thought it was a great tool to move the City into the future. He said this was not an emergency and could be moved to the June 28, 2021 Regular Council Meeting.

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS TO THE JUNE 28, 2021 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING.

Moved by Mrs. Field, seconded by Mr. Lombardo. Ms. Esarey mention there was a budget amendment needed for this item that would be done at the June 28, 2021 Finance Committee Meeting. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.**

T-7055 Resolution for AMATS Grant

Mayor Broska said this was the authorizing legislation to apply for AMATS funds for some different projects that were planned for the next few years.

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

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

Citizens' Comments

Vincent Crawford, Waste Management (WM), said he attended tonight's meeting because he wasn't sure where the City was going with the trash/recycling bids, and if there would be any discussion with the Kimble representative tonight. He said Waste Management had provided an alternate bid and mentioned the start timeline that was an issue. To start a community the size of Streetsboro could not be done in such a short time frame. So they provided an alternate of 90 days and he said they were the low bidder on the trash portion. He understood the City was kind of painted into a corner with two different franchises. He said Waste Management would be more than happy to be the provider for the trash piece if the City was considering staying with the County for recycling.

Mr. Crawford said Waste Management provided some additional things beside the program they had put together for the City at the lower price for the trash portion, not the recycling portion. The first differentiator was safety; their trucks had cameras with AI to direct the drivers to be safe drivers, their trucks had GPS tracking to make sure the routes were completed appropriately, and the onboard computers could transfer the pickup points to another truck if one truck goes down. He said the communication was next level and they could alert their customers with text or email regarding any service delay or change. They also had a mobile app for the customers to manage their accounts from their phones.

He had attended tonight to see where Streetsboro was regarding this issue knowing that the Kimble and Waste Management bids were very close for trash, but not recycling. He mentioned that with the short timeline some companies (Republic) didn't even bid; there were only three bidders and one

wasn't even close to the others. He said in today's world they needed 6-8 months to really get legitimate bids and deal with the logistics for a community the size of Streetsboro. He said Waste Management would love to partner with Streetsboro for trash service if Streetsboro chose to stick with the County for the recycling service, with the 90 day alternate to start the service.

Mrs. Field thanked Mr. Crawford for coming. She asked if Waste Management did a recycling collection service. Mr. Crawford said yes, and they actually processed all the recycling that was currently picked up by Portage County at their Akron recycling facility. Mrs. Field asked Mr. Crawford, "In most of the communities Waste Management collected recycling, did the residents get to decide if they wanted to recycle or did most of the contracts WM worked with have a requirement that the residents recycle?" Mr. Crawford said the requirement was that everybody was going to pay for the service but could decide whether to use it or not. He said it was a benefit to the whole community to have the trash and recycling service, but people didn't have to use it. The cost savings was exponential for required participation; if it was an opt-in service, the Mayor was correct, the City would probably not get any bids or the bids would be extremely high. Mrs. Field really appreciated Mr. Crawford attending tonight and speaking to Council although the City had not requested any of the bidders to attend.

Announcements

A Special Finance Committee Meeting will immediately follow this meeting.

There being no further business to be addressed by this committee, and upon motion by Mr. Hannan, seconded by Mrs. Field, this meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

ATTEST:

Caroline L. Kremer, Clerk of Council

Michael L. Lampa, Chairman