

THE CITY OF STREETSBORO, OHIO
FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Monday, October 25, 2021

[Prior to this meeting Life Saving Awards were presented to Officer Matt Plesz, Officer Josh Bartholomew, FF/Medic Jeffrey Miller, FF/Medic Brad Ryczek, FF/Medic Mark Chappel, FF/Medic Eric Moss for their actions on October 4, 2021 that saved the life of a 43 year old female.]

This Finance Committee Meeting was called to order on Monday, October 25, 2021 at 7:03 p.m. by Justin Ring, Chairman. Mrs. Field welcomed the high school students in the audience, explained the Council procedures, and invited them to step to the podium if they had any questions tonight. Mrs. Field gave an invocation and Mayor Broska led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

ABSENT: None.

ALSO PRESENT: Glenn Broska, Mayor
Frank Beni, Law Director
Richard Polivka, Police Lieutenant
Rob Reinholz, Fire Chief
Bill Miller, Service Director
Justin Czekaj, Engineering Director
Patrick O'Malia, Economic Development Director
Shawna Lockhart-Reese, HR Manager
Greg Mytinger, Parks and Recreation Director
Caroline Kremer, Clerk of Council
[by Zoom video conferencing:]
Jenny Esarey, Finance Director
John Cieszkowski, Planning Director
Melissa Procop, Mayor's Administrative Assistant

Disposition of Minutes

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE REGULAR FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2021 AS WRITTEN.

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

Monthly Financial Report

Ms. Esarey said the September financial reports were distributed on October 1, 2021. Things were looking good for the first $\frac{3}{4}$ of the year. The salaries and wages were doing well, especially with the budget amendment. The General Fund expenses including encumbrances were right on target at 75%.

The Total expenses were a little above target at 77%. The General Fund revenues were about on target at 74% and Total revenues were above budget at 79%. The income tax for October was even with the budget amendment that was made in September and was at 85% with the October target of 83%. Everything was looking good. There were no questions about the financial report from Council.

Old Business

Discuss AECOM Water Rate Study

Ms. Esarey said earlier in the year [May 24, 2021] and last month there had been discussions about the AECOM Water Study and the need for Capital expenditures (meter replacements, specific capital improvements to the water system, and other needed new water projects). Even though the City was getting money from the American Rescue Funds, the City still needed to do a water rate increase. Ms. Esarey wanted to bring this issue up again, especially with the 2022 budget being presented this evening. She mentioned a 3.5% water rate increase had been discussed, but after doing all the calculations with regard to the proposed 2022 budget and where the City stood in 2021, she recommended a 3.75% water rate increase. Right now the City calculated an annual water rate increase with the County pass-through and 2% (per Ord. No. 2005-83). She was suggesting, instead of the 2% increase on top of the County pass-through, a 3.75% increase (an additional 1.75% beyond the usual annual 2%) but it would only be for the years 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027, and then it could go back to the 2% annual increase. She felt with the amount of capital projects that were planned the larger increase would be best, because without it the Water Fund wouldn't have the money to do all the projects.

Mr. Ring understood the need for a water rate increase to be able to manage all the water projects that were needed. The City had not really increased the water rate in a long time, however he wanted it to be the most minimal increase possible to pay for the projects and still have some buffer room. He asked if the spreadsheets Ms. Esarey had given to Council last week included the newer projects that had been discussed. Ms. Esarey answered that they did. The projects included were with regard to the Frost Road watermain, the HB 168 (City match), the Pleasant Valley/Twin Hills waterline, and the \$450,000 per year if the City moved forward as planned with the OWDA. There would also be the money, in a separate fund, for the American Rescue Funds.

Mr. Ring supported a water rate increase of 3.5%, instead of the 3.75% increase, because the City would be able to run these programs without a deficit until 2038, unless the City raised rates again somewhere along the way. He said the fund balance would be the lowest in 2024 at about \$650,000 and then would continue to build until about 2038. He wanted to keep money in the account for additional projects (new meters again, or some other capital projects). Mr. Ring asked Mr. Miller what amount he might be comfortable with having as a reserve. Mr. Miller said the City would need at least \$500,000 for any emergencies/repairs that might arise. Mr. Ring was concerned that raising the water rate increase from 3.5% to 3.75% wouldn't make that much of a difference in the account (\$677,000 at the lowest in 2024 instead of \$650,000) and the 3.5% rate increase would cover the planned projects and have some reserve for emergencies.

Mr. Lampa asked if Ms. Esarey's spreadsheets included just the City costs for the Pleasant Valley/Twin Hills project because he thought Shelly Company was giving money to cover the majority of the costs. Ms. Esarey answered that the spreadsheets included, in 2021, \$100,000 in

Transfers In in the Revenue. She said Council would have to approve an ordinance to move the \$100,000 that was sitting in the Deposit Escrow Fund into the 503- Water Reserve Fund; there was also \$100,000 in 2022, 2023, 2024 in the miscellaneous receipts. So she had accommodated for that settlement amount in the budget.

Mr. Lampa agreed with Mr. Ring to not raise the water rates more than minimally necessary to cover expected costs and still have a little buffer, so he supported the 3.5% water rate increase. Mr. Ring said Council had originally agreed to a 3.5% increase, but that was prior to a couple of additional projects that had come up, and also prior to understanding that the American Rescue money could really only be used for water projects, so it kind of offset those additional projects, and he still supported the 3.5% water rate increase.

Mr. Lampa asked if these spreadsheets expected to pay cash for all these projects and not go out for loans. Ms. Esarey said the projects that were included for cash were Frost Road, HB 168, and Pleasant Valley/Twin Hills. In the spreadsheets starting in 2023 there was an OWDA at \$450,000. She thought it would be additional discussions if the City still wanted to move forward with taking out the loan, or build up balances and move through things, especially after the City received the American Rescue monies and used those for projects. The American Rescue monies needed to be used by December 31, 2024. Mr. Ring noted the \$450,000 was the amount discussed originally with the greater waterline project that Council originally started this with and it was a very low interest rate.

Mrs. Field commented that years ago the City had not done the Portage County pass-through of their increases for about 7 years and the City lost out on a lot of money that could have been available today for these necessary projects. She agreed Council shouldn't ask for more than it needed, but there were some major water projects that needed to happen as soon as possible. She wondered what the difference would be for a customer's minimum quarterly water bill between the 3.5% and 3.75% rate increase. Ms. Esarey said she had included that in the packet she had provided. The minimum quarterly water bill was \$58.32, a 3.5% increase would make it an additional \$4.67 per 4 quarters (for the 2% annual increase per Ord. No. 2005-83) plus an additional \$3.50 per 4 quarters (for the 1.5% increase) [see spreadsheets page 4]. A 3.75% increase would be the additional \$4.67 per 4 quarters (for the 2% annual increase) plus an additional \$4.08 per 4 quarters (for the 1.75% increase) [see spreadsheets page 4]. Households that used more water would have a larger annual increase. Mrs. Field summarized that the difference between a 3.5% water rate increase and a 3.75% water rate increase was just a few dollars per year [minimum usage = \$3.50 vs. \$4.08 per year] for each household, but it would add up to make the Water Fund much more comfortable for the expected projects and for any unexpected projects that might arise, so she supported the 3.75% water rate increase as recommended by Ms. Esarey since the water system needed the rate increase and it was only a few dollars difference. If Mr. Miller recommended having a minimum of a \$500,000 balance for any emergency, a little more would be good in case a second emergency fell on the City again quickly. Mrs. Field didn't want to have to worry about a deficit at 2038 or sooner if some calamity happened. She was glad to have gotten the Water Rate Study done because she knew things that needed to be done for the water system would start happening after that study.

Mr. Kocisko thought the annual 2% increase had been applied back in 2005 to help the Water Fund

catch up for the years when the County pass through had not been applied. He wondered when the fund would be caught up. Ms. Esarey wasn't sure about the history of the 2% annual increase because it happened in 2005 before she joined the City staff. She only knew about one County rate increase that didn't get passed through to the residents and the City was paying more for water than it was charging the customers. She understood the annual 2% rate increase was to cover the increased operating costs the Water Fund would have each year (contract costs, wages, health insurance, postage, supplies, water tower bond, etc.) She said the reason this water rate increase was being discussed now was because the AECOM Water Study confirmed what Mr. Miller, the administration and Council kind of already knew was there was more projects that needed to be done than the City could afford. The proposal now was that if there was an increase for just 2022-2027 the City would be able to do the water meter replacements and the necessary water projects as outlined in the AECOM Water Study. Mr. Ring summarized that the 2% annual increase was for operating costs whereas the 1.5% or 1.75% increase would be for capital improvements.

Mr. Lombardo asked Ms. Esarey if she felt the 1.5% or the 1.75% increase was needed to make this all work. Ms. Esarey answered that she thought with the 1.5% the last few years would end with compounded deficits for spending every year. So she recommended 1.75% because it helped the fund financially for those years. She understood it could always be readjusted at any time. She thought the 1.75% increase was a more conservative approach, since there was going to be an increase anyway, and it would only be for a few years and it could always be adjusted moving forward.

Mr. Ring confirmed with Ms. Esarey that the City could complete these projects at the 1.5% increase for the first few years, but she still supported the 1.75% increase to avoid looking at other increases again at the end, especially since the dollar difference was not that much. The rates could be looked at every couple of year. Mr. Ring understood the dollar difference was not that much, but to some fixed income households it might be, and the City could still do what was needed at the 1.5% increase.

Mr. Hannan asked when this needed to be decided. Mr. Ring answered that it needed to be settled by year end soon so it could be effective for January 1, 2022.

MOTION: TO INCREASE THE WATER RATES BY 3.5% FOR THE NEXT SIX YEARS.

Moved by Mr. Ring, seconded by Mr. Kocisko. Upon voice vote, **motion carried**. Legislation would be needed for the November 8, 2021 Regular Council Meeting for a Council vote to codify this change prior to January 1, 2022. The Council Members thanked Ms. Esarey for her spreadsheets and all her work on this issue.

New Business
Executive Session

MOTION: TO ADD PENDING LITIGATION AND LAND ACQUISITION TO TONIGHT'S EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

MOTION: TO RECESS INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION TO CONSIDER PERSONNEL – COMPENSATION, HIRING, PENDING LITIGATION, AND LAND ACQUISITION.

Moved by Mr. Hannan, seconded by Mr. Lampa. Upon roll call vote, **motion carried unanimously and the meeting recessed at 7:32 p.m.**

MOTION: TO RECONVENE FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Moved by Mr. Hannan, seconded by Mr. Lampa. Upon voice vote, **motion carried and the meeting reconvened at 8:29 p.m.**

Present 2022 Annual Appropriations/Budget

Ms. Esarey had provided a lot of information to Council last week regarding the 2022 permanent appropriations budget: line item appropriations, the General Fund carryover balance, the estimated resources, the budget template, and details on the proposed Capital Improvement Fund purchases. She hoped that City Council could pass the annual permanent appropriations at the end of November or beginning of December prior to the transition to the new Council after the November 2, 2021 election, so there would not be any issue about having a permanent budget in place by the end of the year. She offered to answer any questions the Council Members may have. Mr. Ring said he had quickly reviewed the information and didn't have questions at the moment, but wanted to spend more time on the budget and then bring it back to Council at a Special Finance Committee Meeting in two weeks.

MOTION: TO SCHEDULE A SPECIAL FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2021 TO REVIEW THE PROPOSED 2022 ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS/BUDGET FURTHER.

Moved by Mrs. Field, seconded by Mr. Lampa. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.** Ms. Esarey said she was willing to explain the budget to any Council Members that had questions, they just needed to call her.

Mr. Ring moved a couple items up on the agenda for Mr. Czekaj so he could leave the meeting early to go home for his anniversary.

T-7119 Contract w/Environmental Design for City Center Master Plan

Mr. Czekaj said this was the first step in the process to develop the City Center. This was a proposal for a City Center Master Plan. The proposal provided a great synopsis, a little bit of history, and how it intertwined with the Core Concept Plan. The Master Plan would give a vision, an idea of what the City wanted to have happen on the site. He summarized that once the City had the vision and understood how the elements of that vision interacted, supported one another and came to life is what made a development a success and was the next step in the planning process. Mr. Czekaj said part of this proposal was the City Center Master Plan itself, the other part was the programming for City Hall (to determine special requirements, etc.) to figure out how it would fit on the site. Mr. Czekaj said once this project started and was approximately half way through, the administration could start having discussions about City Hall itself to initiate RFQs, etc.

Mr. Czekaj said he was very excited about this project; it was one of the things that drew him to work

for Streetsboro. He looked forward to getting it moving and asked that Council pass this as emergency legislation tonight. Mr. Ring said he was also excited about this project and felt it was a good vision and it was time to move forward with it.

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

Moved by Mr. Lampa, seconded by Mrs. Field. Upon voice vote, **motion carried**. Mr. Hannan asked if any Members of City Council would be part of the leadership team for this project. Mayor Broska said he had recommended that three Members of Council be on the team and Council could decide who that would be and report the names to Mr. Czekaj. The first kick-off meeting was scheduled for day time Friday, October 29, 2021.

T-7120 Contract w/GPD to Design Twin Hills Waterline Project

Mr. Czekaj said this was to move forward with the design to bring water to Twin Hills Drive and Pleasant Valley Drive. Mr. Kocisko wondered how many people would be affected by this, how would each pay for their share, and were most of the people interested in getting City water. Mr. Kocisko said the Mayor had said most people were interested in tapping-in because they were concerned about their wells. Mr. Hannan said there had been a meeting with the residents and there was a lot of positive feedback, and a lot of Mr. Kocisko's questions about waiving tap-in fees or financial assistance through the County were answered.

Mr. Kocisko said it was mentioned to give 12 or 18 months to decide to tap-in, but he said the City had set up a program originally when waterlines were put in years ago to give the residents free tap-in for six months. If they couldn't decide within six months to tap-in or not, they would have to pay the tap-in fee. He felt six months was long enough and this project should not be different. Mayor Broska explained that the City had most of the residents at the meeting, and normally in any other water projects the City had done the City had assessed 35% to the homeowners. Because Shelly Company was paying about 60% - 65% of the cost of the waterline, the City was not going to assess the homeowners for their frontage, and the only thing the residents would be responsible for would be the purchase of a water meter, and to hire a plumber to run the line from the tap into the home. He said the City would give the homeowners two construction seasons from the time the project was complete to decide to tap-in or not and the \$1,500 tap-in fee would be waived for those two construction seasons. Mayor Broska said the City had also given Sunny Slopes two construction seasons. He said even after the two years if something happened to their well it would be better for them to pay the tap-in fee and get City water than try to drill a new well at over \$10,000; he added that once City water became available to the home, they wouldn't be allowed to drill a new well, they would have to tap in according to the City ordinances. He thought the City had made this as attractive as possible for the residents.

Mr. Kocisko was still concerned because the cost of running the line to the home and the water meter was about \$3,000 to \$8,000. He also wondered if this project would have any affect on the condition of the well water some people may choose to still use and if they would have to end up getting City water anyway. Mayor Broska said he had heard that most people wanted to tap in as soon as they could and there would not be many keeping their well water system. Mayor Broska noted that this

would give those homeowners better fire protection too with hydrants down the street instead of having to bring a water tanker if there was a fire.

The project would butt the end of the line on Pleasant Valley Road so that in the future if Portage County (not the City) wanted to run the line to SR 43 the line could be tapped and run to the south end of Meadow View, which would result in a huge closed circuit and improved water quality. Mayor Broska thought the proposal that had been given to the residents was more than fair because in the past the minimum the City had charged for the assessment was 35%, but these homeowners were not getting assessed at all.

MOTION: TO AMEND T-7120 TO CORRECT THE ACCOUNT NUMBER IN SECTION 2 TO #501-52-5312.

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

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

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

T-7121 Apply to OPWC for Road Resurfacing (Greentree, Portage Pointe, Maplewood)

Mr. Czekaj said the City was applying to OPWC to resurface the streets of Greentree, Portage Pointe and Maplewood. The cost of construction was almost \$800,000 and there would be a 50% match on that. He asked that Council formalize this application with emergency legislation tonight.

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

Moved by Mrs. Field, seconded by Mr. Lombardo. Upon voice vote, **motion carried.** [Mr. Czekaj left the meeting.]

T-7115 Purchase Spring Loaded Banner Bracket Sets

Mr. Mytinger said in 2022 he planned to put up banners along SR 14 and SR 43 and a few other intersections with beautification monies. The banners would be 30" wide x 5' tall. The Hometown Hero banners were a little smaller at 2' x 4'. These spring loaded banner brackets were needed along the State Routes and he planned to purchase 60 sets. The Service Department would help install the brackets. The banners would be for the bicentennial and for seasonal displays. If there were enough poles near the school, maybe high school senior athletic/sports banners could be put up. The Hometown Hero banners were on poles on Market Square owned by the City. The new poles along SR 14 and SR 43 installed with the new City-wide traffic signal upgrades and the steel poles on either side of the roads with traffic lane signs were also owned by the City. The brackets would not be on the wooden power poles. The Bicentennial Committee was looking to get businesses to buy advertising/sponsorship for the banners.

Mrs. Field mentioned that she would like to see hanging flower basket along with the banners. Mr.

Mytinger agreed they were pretty if they were well maintained, but he did not have the staff or equipment to constantly water and maintain them. He would discuss faux flowers with her outside the meeting.

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

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

Discuss City Stage/Amphitheater Concept Plan

Mr. Mytinger said in September 2021 the Thrasher Group presented their final concept for the community stage during the Parks, Recreation Conservation Advisory Committee (PRCAC) meeting. The final location was determined to be just east of the police station in the bowl area. The Brandywine structure from Enwood Structures was to be the stage portion at 43' x 25' deep. There were all kinds of programming activities that could be incorporated with an amphitheater/community theater. He said the facility would be able to hold about 1,200 patrons in the seating area with overflow of a couple hundred, maybe a total of 1,800 to 1,900. There were 94 parking spots up top with an additional 6 ADA parking spots closer to the stage area. The conceptual design consisted of a vendor patio, facility restrooms, green rooms, storage, fencing, a gravel walkway from the main part of City Park to this new facility, tree plantings, etc. The estimated cost for the entire project (Cadillac style) was about \$1.75 million for the amphitheater, the seating area, parking, electrical and plumbing infrastructure.

Mr. Mytinger said the next discussion step as a City would be to determine what the town wanted to do with this information. Did the City want to fully fund this project? fund it in stages? use a couple different options for funding?

Mr. Ring thanked Mr. Mytinger for all the information. He thought the concept looked awesome; however he had not expected it to be a "Cadillac" version, which he knew the City couldn't afford. \$1.75 million seemed extremely aggressive; he had been thinking maybe half that amount. Mr. Ring suggested refining the proposal to eliminate unnecessary things to cut the cost. Mr. Mytinger agreed it was a high amount, but just the stage and concrete work was not a whole lot (maybe under \$300,000). The stage and storage room, which could be phase 1, was almost at \$1 million, and then the City could determine when to do phase 2 and phase 3 to eventually end up with the "Cadillac" version. He said once the City went into the next step of putting the construction documents together, that would probably be the time to whittle down pieces, because right now we didn't know what to leave out because we had not gotten to that planning process yet. This was still just a picture, a concept, a wish list.

Mr. Lampa asked if it would be more expensive if it was done in phases instead of all at once. Mr. Mytinger thought the phases would get a little more expensive because of re-mobilization costs for construction crews and costs in general tended to go up over time. Mr. Lampa wondered at what point the stage would be usable enough to be able to charge for events to bring money in to the City; would phase 1 be enough or would it be phase 1 and 2? Mr. Mytinger said the minimum would be phase 1 with the stage and proper electric. To really draw audiences the City would probably need to consider beer/wine/alcohol sales and food vendors although a paved patio with tables and umbrellas might not

be immediately necessary. He added that proper restrooms were very important because venues with Port-a-Johns were not as desirable. Mr. Lampa noted that most of the initial cost was the grading and that needed to be done before the stage could even be constructed.

Mayor Broska felt the core part should be done as a unit. Some of the asphalt walkways and the parking could be done later but start out as just limestone gravel for now. The parking could be included as part of the annual paving program at a later time. Some of the walkways would need to be paved right away to be ADA compliant. If Council approved, any profit that may be generated by any entertainment event (from renting space to food trucks, etc.), could go into a Special Capital Improvement Fund for improvements specific to the amphitheater site. Mayor Broska thought the main portion of the stage area needed to look good initially, and then could be added to later. He thought there could be 8-10 events each summer. Mayor Broska thought it would cost \$1.2 million to \$1.5 million to look good and be able to hold events/generate money relatively quickly.

Mr. Lampa said the City had received about \$500,000 from Bureau of Workers Comp last year and about \$14,000 this year. This money was unexpected and could be used to give back to the residents by putting it toward an amphitheater, although he understood there were other needs in the City.

Mr. Ring wanted to go over the funding options as outlined in the stage proposal. He did not want to ask the residents for a tax levy, nor did he want the City to take out a loan and have to pay interest. He said the City had the carryover to do it, but did the City want to commit that much? Mr. Ring liked the idea of figuring out the cost of the main section and save the parking and other items for later.

Mr. Mytinger said the next step would be to do the construction plans, which is where the City might decide to do something different that would affect the bottom line and get a more detailed engineer's estimate of costs that could be provided for the bidding process. The cost to do the construction plans would be just under \$18,000. Once those plans and engineer's estimate was done (maybe 30-60 days), the project could go out to bid. There would need to be a couple of meetings with Thrasher Group to give input for the construction plans. Mr. Mytinger recommended the whole project (parking and everything) be included in the construction plans, but it could be bid for only the first phase to be constructed, but at least the whole project would already be planned and the other phases could be bid/constructed later.

Ms. Wagner suggested doing it all at once and then paying the City back as the venue made money over the years. Mr. Ring wasn't sure he was willing to take the whole \$1.75 million out of the carryover at one time, (that was a lot of money; more than was anticipated for this project) but if others were, it could be discussed. He wasn't sure if the City should take a majority of the carryover to use on just this one project. Ms. Wagner agreed it was a lot of money, but also felt Streetsboro didn't have a lot to offer the residents compared to other cities, and this was something that would be seen and used by a lot of people.

Mayor Broska commented that the end of the year carryover could be more than projected in the budget estimates. He agreed with Mr. Mytinger that the project should be completely designed with cost estimates, even if it would not all be constructed at the same time. Mayor Broska noted the City

needed to build the Fire Department access road, and maybe pay for the design of a new City Hall and field house, from the carryover, and then see how much could be put toward the amphitheater while still keeping the required 25%.

Mr. Ring understood there were other needs for the carryover, so maybe the expectations for the amphitheater could be dialed back. He said the City had been deficit budgeting, which was ok, but couldn't last forever, so the City needed to plan now for the next 5-10 years not just the next budget. Mr. Ring asked that legislation be put together to authorize doing the construction plan that would stay within Streetsboro's means for the November 8, 2021 Special Finance Committee Meeting.

Mr. Lombardo asked how much other towns generated each year from their venues. Mr. Mytinger said Mentor didn't have a gate system so attendance was free, but all the money they made was from beer sales. They were in the black every year, with their entertainment budget starting at about \$60,000 for the first year (4 years ago) and about \$200,000 for entertainment in 2021 with about 17 concerts and shows. Without fencing and a gate system they were unable to regulate what people brought with them to watch the entertainment (canopy chairs, 10' x 10' tents, etc.) Jackson Township budgeted about \$150,000 for their entertainment venues, but they did charge admission and had beer tents. They were also in the black with about 14 events last year.

Mr. Lombardo agreed with Mr. Ring. Mr. Lombardo wanted to wait to see what the actual carryover would be at the end of 2021. Mr. Mytinger said even after the construction plans were done, there would be a bid process that could take 30+ days which Council would have to approve, and Council would know by then (some time into 2022) about the carryover and what exactly they wanted construction companies to bid on.

Mr. Ring emphasized that Streetsboro could not compare financially to Mentor or Jackson Township which were much larger communities than Streetsboro. Mr. Mytinger expected to draw a lot of attendees from Portage County.

Mr. Kocisko did not like the selected location near the police station, he preferred to keep the amphitheater closer to the other existing City Park features. He felt it would cost more to be constructed near the police station. He said it was difficult to get the money to pay for quality entertainment for Streetsboro Family Days along with all the event's other expenses. The entertainment programs didn't always make as much money as expected. Mr. Kocisko agreed with the others that felt the amphitheater proposal was way too much money. He had expected the cost to be about half of what was proposed.

Mr. Kocisko said he envisioned Streetsboro Family Days going away; there was no way it could exist in about two years with the stage layout being proposed. He said beer was a big issue; there was a lot of money involved in beer. There could be a beer tent near the stage, but there needed to be beer near the food locations too. He said it may work for the amphitheater, but it wouldn't work for Streetsboro Family Days because people wouldn't walk across the bridge to get beer, and beer companies were hard to get because they were booked all summer, so needing two beer tents (one near the food and one near the entertainment) would be near impossible. Mr. Kocisko was against this City Stage/Amphitheater Concept Plan, he was against the cost because it was too much. He said it was a

very nice project—for a community that could afford it, Streetsboro was not the area to put this. Streetsboro Family Days was scheduled for 2022, but it may not be able to exist in the future. Streetsboro Family Days would need a temporary stage for 2022, which he suggested be placed near the basketball courts, and at least 400' from the fireworks. Mr. Kocisko hoped the amphitheater went through, but was disappointed it would be located toward the police station because he thought the City would spend a lot more money than if it was located nearer to the existing park facilities. He would vote No on this proposal.

Mr. Lampa said the stage location was overwhelmingly voted on by the residents to be located toward the police station compared to the other location. He said the amphitheater had nothing to do with Streetsboro Family Days; it was for the City residents to enjoy. Streetsboro Family Days was a great event but things changed into the future and Streetsboro Family Days would have to adjust with change. He said if Mr. Kocisko voted No, it would simply be because of Streetsboro Family Days. Mr. Kocisko said no, it was because of the cost also. Mr. Lampa was not in favor of cutting trees down in the park to build an amphitheater, and he was not in favor of people drinking right near a playground. The residents had spoken and said this is what they wanted.

Mr. Ring summarized that there was direction to prepare legislation for a future meeting although there was not a vote of Council tonight.

T-7116 Purchase Neptune Water Meters, Parts and Supplies

Mr. Miller said this was for the annual restocking of the water meters/parts, etc. This was usually done earlier in the year but had been delayed because he was considering a project to change out meters but that changeout had been postponed for another year, so this annual re-supply of new meters was needed.

MOTION: TO AMEND T-7116 TO CORRECT THE ACCOUNT NUMBER NAME IN SECTION 2 BY REMOVING (GENERAL).

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

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

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

T-7117 Purchase Power-Loading Cot

Chief Reinholz said this cot connected to the power-loading system inside the ambulance. A typical service life for the cot was 8-10 years and the current cot was 12 years old. It got maintenance twice a year, but it did have a lot of wear and tear. This item was budgeted to be replaced this year. There was only one vendor, Stryker Power Cot, that fit with the existing system within the ambulance, so Chief Reinholz could not get additional quotes. He asked that this be passed by emergency tonight, so he could get the replacement cot right away. This equipment helped prevent injuries to the firefighter/medics while loading the patients into the ambulance. The account number in the legislation needed changed.

MOTION: TO AMEND T-7117 TO CORRECT THE ACCOUNT NUMBER IN SECTION 3 TO #402-12-5745.

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

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

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

T-7118 Purchase 7 Sets of Turn-Out Gear

Chief Reinholz wanted to purchase 7 sets of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), the bunker pants and coat. He had applied for a grant for this equipment but didn't get it. The Fire Department annually bought 6-7 PPE sets each year so they wouldn't have to replace all 44 sets all at once since they were very expensive. The NFPA required the gear to be replaced when it was 10 years old. The vendor the Fire Chief had selected was the one they had used in the past, so the new gear would match the existing equipment, which was lightweight. The purchase had been budgeted for 2021.

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

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

T-7122 Amend Building Inspector's Contracts

Mayor Broska explained the current inspector's contracts were limited to Monday through Friday inspections, but a need has arisen for a Sunday inspection, which the inspector agreed to do. The Finance Director wasn't able to pay the inspector for the Sunday work because of the way the contract was written, so this was an adjustment to be able to do inspections after 7 p.m. on weekdays and also do inspections on weekends and holidays. The weekday inspections were \$75, the evening, weekend or holiday inspections were up to \$125.

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

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

T-7123 Join Equalis Group Consortium

Mr. Beni said Equalis Group was a public sector cooperative at State bidding prices. He and Mrs. Procop had met with individuals from the group regarding the copiers. The City would need to go out to bid in May for the copiers in the City offices, or the City could join this group to get State bid pricing. There was no cost to join this consortium.

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

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

T-7114 Amend 2021 Annual Appropriations [#12]

The sound from Zoom wasn't working, so Ms. Esarey couldn't explain it to the Council Members, but the Council Members had no questions about the appropriation adjustments presented.

MOTION: TO AMEND EXHIBIT "B" TO ADD A LINE AND \$1 APPROPRIATION FOR 16 CENTS OF BOND INTEREST IN ACCOUNT #304-81-5814.

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

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

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

Citizens' Comments

None.

Announcements

A Regular Council Meeting will immediately follow this meeting.

There being no further business to come before this Finance Committee, and upon motion by Mrs. Field, seconded by Mr. Lampa, this meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

ATTEST:

Caroline L. Kremer, Clerk of Council

Justin Ring, Chairman