COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 1, 2016

Committee Members Present:	Rick Rodgers Joe Kernan Dennis Pierson Paul Tousley Scott Pelot Charlotte Whipkey
Also Present:	Mayor Mike Zita Valerie Wax Carr Ron Messner Justin Markey Karla Richards

The Committee Work Session convened on Monday, February 1, 2016 at 7:00 PM, in the Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Charlotte Whipkey, President of Council. Following a salute to the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance, there was a moment of silent prayer.

General Topics of Discussion:

Workshop agenda items for discussion

Ms. Whipkey stated that in lieu of the proposed Council Rule changes and the fact we still do not have the full balance of seven (7) members; Ms. Whipkey stated this may be a moot point. Ms. Whipkey stated she would like to hear any suggestions from the rest of Council or the Administration to topics of discussion. Mr. Pelot suggested we have discussion on the potential impact to the local businesses for the Cleveland-Massillon Road Widening project and to mitigate that as much as possible.

Resolution for potential Assessment relief

Mr. Pierson stated that two weeks ago he had asked if there were any changes in the Resolutions before they were read. Mr. Pierson stated that Mr. Markey indicated at this time there were no changes in the Resolution. Mr. Pierson raised concerns because there are indeed several changes, such as changes to the pump stations as a pump station on 261, Gulf Course Drive, etc. Mr. Markey stated again that the exhibits did not change and wanted clarification from Mr. Pierson. Mr. Pierson stated that when we received the information he had stated he was going to look back through it in copies we did not get, it is showing an additional 2000 feet of six inch forced main.

Mr. Pierson stated that back in June and July we moved the pump station to Shellhart Drive and the fact that Gulf Course Drive is still in the listing which it had been removed. Mr. Markey stated all of the exhibits and plans and maps are the same as the last time you voted on this earlier. Pumping stations are at Shellhart as proposed and removed which are in the plans filed with Mrs. Richards. Mr. Markey stated the only change is there were a few numbers in properties removed although the map may indicate Gulf Course Drive they are not on the assessment list, and are not being assessed. Mr. Pierson questioned where the 2,000 feet of six inch forced main is coming into play. Mr. Markey responded the project is the same as was approved by Council back in October or November. Mr. Pierson responded so Gulf Course Drive is not in it, we are not running a pumping station up into 261, and we are doing just the Nash Heights project with the reduced number of 278 or 284. Mr. Markey concurred with some discussion over the actual number of connections. Mr. Tousley asked to make sure the map in the exhibit is correct as it does show the southern side of Greenwich being included, running all the way to Golf Course Drive, and includes all of Little Blvd. Mr. Rodgers asked if Little Blvd is in or out and Mrs. Carr stated that at this point this is out. Mr. Pierson discussed the fringe areas and those that wanted out or in. Mrs. Carr stated that some like on Higgins are in, regardless of whether they want it or not; however those that are in the fringe area and the line comes down far enough will be able to get it if they want it. Mr. Pierson stated if someone is within this project and within the 200 ft they will be required to connect regardless. Mr. Pierson stated they could be forced to connect if they have a failing system under the County Health or by State Code through a domino effect. Mr. Pierson stated the point is that the home closest within the 200 feet could be required to tie in as stated by Mr. Ryan Pruett; it depends on how this is being pushed and the legislation needs to clearly state this. Mrs. Carr stated we have no authority or control on how the enforcement agencies handle this process. Mr. Pierson stated if someone in the fringe area wants to tie in, that's fine but he does not want to see someone forced in due to it obviously being a financial benefit to Barberton for more people to be tied in. Mrs. Carr stated it is a state rule as to who ties in and it does not matter who is the sewer provider. Mr. Pierson concurred and added it depended on how it was pushed; you could do it like the County does it and ignore it until the property changes ownership or is commercial, which is not the case in Nash Heights. The language needs to be defined further. Mrs. Carr reiterated that is a Health Department determination and not Barberton's. Mr. Pierson responded come on, people talk to people; it is a financial benefit for Barberton and it is political just like someone in the audience stated. Mrs. Carr stated although she is not speaking for Barberton; however she believes that they would want to focus on commercial connections. Mr. Pierson stated he believed it comes down to a cash flow issue and he wanted to see it in writing before agreeing to anything. Ms. Whipkey stated these issues could be addressed when we are actually in the discussion with Barberton. When it all comes down to it, it's not our say, it's going to be up to state law and the EPA and we can only advocate with the Health District as they have stated we can. Mr. Pierson stated that basically what Ms. Whipkey is saying is we should be negotiating at a disadvantage with Barberton and take what is offered. Ms. Whipkey disputed Mr. Pierson's statement and Mr. Pierson responded that is what it seems she is saying. Ms. Whipkey responded that she is saying what the rules state and who has the authority to enforce them.

As far as working with Barberton, she has always stated we would be on the short end of the stick, but needed to go for whatever we could get. Ms. Whipkey stated we are off topic because the Resolution you are supposed to be referring to now is Resolution 9-2016. Mr. Pierson stated he would look at that in a minute. Mr. Pierson stated that last week when Mr. Tousley spoke about the offsetting of costs to the residents, he had asked for other Council members comments on this. Mr. Pierson reminded everyone that Fund #128 is for water and sewer expansion and is the people's money. Mr. Pierson stated that he got the impression some on Council from what they had commented recently they were not so much in favor of this, and he would like to know why. Ms. Whipkey stated that what is presented is stating there would be a subsidy and that we just don't have a dollar amount. Mr. Pierson stated that we need to have that dollar amount in there; otherwise he cannot support these Resolutions. Mr. Pierson stated we had previously gone with amounts of $5,000 and $8,000, only to remove them. Mr. Rodgers agreed with Mr. Pierson and noted that we do need a dollar amount attached to this. He has given this a lot of thought and that we talked about helping Greenwich and Oak Streets and to have a dollar amount in addition to assisting the Nash Heights project. Mr. Rodgers stated he believed Ms. Whipkey had stated before she wanted to help the two past project residents to which Ms. Whipkey concurred. Mr. Rodgers stated he would like to use the 128 Fund to aid those residents and be passed with or prior to the Resolutions of Necessity for the Nash Heights project. Mr. Rodgers asked Mr. Messner if we can borrow against that rollback money to fund this, and Mr. Pierson interjected that the fund goes all the way out to the year 2034. It would be the choice of Council to extend that fund; it's not like we are draining this and it's not being replenished. Mr. Rodgers stated since financing is so cheap right now, he would rather see that we borrow against this. Mr. Pierson stated we could borrow this from Fund #127 which is specifically earmarked for pumping stations and maintenance. Mr. Markey stated that you still have to have a funding source that can pay this back long term and there is only about $1.2 million dollars there. Mr. Markey reminded everyone that you still have the Adair lawsuit to deal with; in addition to a lot of logistical concerns he has with borrowing against this fund. Mr. Pierson asked how much is in the Fund #127 account and Mr. Markey and Mr. Messner both concurred it is $1.7 million. Ms. Whipkey asked for clarification the Fund 127 account is basically the surcharge account and Mr. Markey concurred it is the City's sewer fund. Mr. Tousley stated if he lived in Nash Heights and for Council to say they will look at doing something, that's not good enough. At a starting point of $5,000.00 or 10-13% of what is going to be collected, is a good place to begin. Mr. Tousley stated that it's really not a lot in comparison to $10.8 million still coming in. Mr. Tousley asked past Council members how we arrived at the assessment amount of $8,250.00 back in 2013 and where this number came from. Ms. Whipkey stated that number was pulled out of the air and was tied to us purchasing the sewer lines from Summit County. Without that purchase it was never a true number to begin with. Ms. Whipkey stated she raised this issue then that there was no real number and no one wanted to hear what she had to say. Ms. Whipkey stated there was never any real figure as we currently have the real figures of $15,000.00-$16,000.00 and $19,000.00 to $20,000.00 for the costs of running in front of the homes; she recalled no such numbers given outside of the $8,250.00 tied to the County line purchase. Mr. Pierson stated that on June 21, 2012 the assessment figures were at $13,880.00 for gravity and now without any changes it's up to $19,465.00.

Mr. Pierson stated he wants the 128 account-roll back fund not only be used for the Nash Heights, but a fund set up for going forward a standardized subsidy going to the people affected in these projects throughout the City. It's their money and they should have the right to it and the ability to gain from it. Mr. Kernan stated he had asked the Clerk of Council to pull the past minutes and he spent the weekend looking over all of that. The understanding at the time was to use this rollback fund was intended to be used for the expansion of trunk lines in business areas, for over sizing lines and not to assess residents; and intersections where we cannot assess residents. Mr. Pierson stated that he believed using an 8 inch line or larger was not the resident's responsibility under County law. Mr. Kernan stated that may well be, but his understanding is that is what the Fund 128 fund is for. We have taken the idea of subsidizing the project to the voters twice and that failed twice. Mr. Pierson stated that was not a very good argument as the first vote was lost by a very slim vote and questioned the campaign contributions made from residents in certain areas of empty land along 261 and 21. Mr. Pierson stated he could provide the documentation of certain people's campaigns if you like, but it looks a little on the gray side. Mr. Kernan stated that slim votes win elections. Mr. Pierson responded when he can benefit by someone giving him $1,000 or $2,000, it makes him question why although he is not saying it is illegal. Mr. Kernan stated we need to be careful in setting a precedent here and noted that he had one resident call him to complain about the use or misuse of this fund. Mr. Kernan stated he is a little nervous in setting a $5,000.00 precedent and he does not think that is what the people had intended when they voted for this back in 2009. Mr. Kernan stated he had a call from a resident over the weekend who was upset that we are talking about using this money for Nash Heights, he indicated it's not what this fund was set up to do. Mr. Kernan stated is nervous in setting any precedent here because that is not what the fund was intended for. Mr. Rodgers stated his whole thought with this subsidy is to set a precedent here and that everyone is treated equally going forward and we have voiced that often in the past two years. That money is paid for by the working people in Norton since 2009 and using that money for the residents in this fashion is a good idea. Mr. Rodgers stated as far as the trunk lines in the businesses and commercial areas goes; yes, we need those, but the developers should be responsible for bringing in the utilities. Mr. Tousley discussed the comments about this use was not the intentions of the residents; in 2009; the people did not vote at all on that. The Council at that time went beyond the citizens and put that roll back on. In actuality the residents put out a petition with double the amount of signatures needed and because of a technicality those petitions were thrown out. Mr. Tousley stated at that time he stood at the podium and told Mayor Koontz that he knew this was wrong and you should let this go to the people to decide. Mr. Tousley stated that this is why he is here on Council because previous Councils had gone behind the residents backs on issues. Mr. Kernan agreed that was correct, however the people did vote to put Council in their seats. Mr. Pelot agreed with a subsidy and that to micromanage the amount and where it's to come from should be at the Finance and Administration levels. We need to set a reasonable figure to work with as this will not be our last sewer project we will be dealing with. It may be better to consider and set up a percentage as opposed to a dollar amount representing the City's portion to cover. Mr. Pelot stated it's important to make sure Council defines the boundaries and he is in favor of subsidies and wants to make sure we can maintain that going forward for all residents.

Mr. Pierson stated he thought all were correct in many of their statements and that all were elected by the people to represent their best interest. Mr. Pierson stated he would differ on one thing and that is it's the Administration/Finance jobs to present the facts so that we as Council can make educated sound decisions in the best interest of the people and not what the Administration wants based on what might happen down the road for governmental or someone's personal agenda. Mr. Pierson stated that he wants to see everyone's money protected, and that's one reason why he is on Council. Mr. Pierson discussed taxes versus services in other communities; if you check you will see Norton residents are paying a lot for what they get. Mr. Pierson stated we are here to represent the people, adding Mr. Pierson foremost. Mr. Rodgers asked when the assessment goes to Summit County and put on your tax bill, is the interest included? Mr. Markey replied yes Council passes the ordinance and the interest is then set over the 30 years, if that's the option, and the principal with interest is spread out over the time period; if the City gets a 30 year loan there is a 30 year assessment. Mr. Rodgers stated if the figure for assessment is $19,000.00 and then you have maybe another $3,000.00 in interest for a total of $22,000.00 to pay on. Mr. Markey stated it's the rate of borrowing that sets the assessment interest and we do not know that rate at this time; it is not included in the resolution. Mr. Pierson stated in the long run you're going to pay more in interest to make it easier for the individual property owner if you go an extra 10 years as was discussed last week; he does not see that as a great favor. It is going to cost them more money and isn't a great deal. Mr. Markey stated it would be a lower payment with additional interest costs. Mr. Pelot stated it may not be a great deal, but the intention was to lower the monthly payment just like buying a house or a car. Mr. Markey clarified what Mr. Pelot was stating earlier is that Council sets the assessment rate and it will be up to Admin/Finance to determine where and how to make the subsidy figures work and Mr. Pelot concurred. Mr. Pierson discussed the figure of $13,880.00 in June 0f 2012 for Nash Heights, and where the differences are from now of $5585.00 more at the current $19,465.28 and then; he did not think offsetting it by $5,000.00 would be that much or explain how we got the difference in the price although obviously more people reduces the price. Mrs. Carr asked if that $13,880.00 was in a piece of legislation or where those figures were coming from and Mr. Pierson stated he had some notes from handouts from he believed were from Mr. Nicolard in the past and would have to dig these up from a large pile. Ms. Whipkey stated that there were more in the project at the start and it includes both sides of Greenwich Road and possibly Golf Course Drive. Mr. Pierson disagreed with this because originally Golf Course Drive was never in it. Ms. Whipkey stated if that's the case then why did we talk about taking Gulf Course Drive out? Mr. Pierson first asked if we did legislation and then stated he didn't remember how it originally got added to it. Ms. Whipkey stated she believed they were going from the original plans from the Comprehensive Plan that took it all the way down to 21 on Greenwich. Ms. Whipkey discussed Mr. Tousley's comment that over $600,000.00 is coming into the tax credit roll back and that we talked about this amount changing in the future to be lower from the State. Mr. Messner concurred and stated that due to House Bill 5 the changes will be coming in at lower amounts starting in 2017 and once we get there we will see how much this will cut into our collections. Mr. Markey stated the roll back cannot be calculated foe the final of 2015 until later in the year from all the income tax and this will take time to determine the final amount to move into the fund.

Mr. Rodgers asked for clarification as to why the rollback would be reduced and Mr. Markey answered that all income tax collections would be reduced due to House Bill 5 making all income tax collections more streamlined and uniform throughout the State. Mrs. Carr explained in the training for HB 5 we have learned that some business industries have changed and the tax revenue would be less coming in due to the collections being done differently. Ms. Whipkey asked Mr. Pierson what his proposal was for Resolution #9. Mr. Pierson stated he did not believe Mr. Markey had put anything on paper for this evening and Mr. Markey pointed out it was in his packet. Mr. Pierson stated he had asked Council what they thought and if they were willing to use money as a percentile or a set amount. Ms. Whipkey stated she was under the impression that we won't know how much money we have to use until we iron things out with Barberton. This Council and any other Council in the future will have the ability at any time to amend this, add a figure, etc. This resolution is basically telling the public we are going to subsidize in some manner. We just don't have a set amount as we don't even know what the project is going to cost until the bids come back. Those figures are set by our engineers and are set higher than what the City expects and if we don't start higher and the bids come in lower, then we have to go out and rebid. Mrs. Carr concurred if the bids come back 10% over than the engineer's estimates we are required to rebid. Ms. Whipkey added that in the past all the bids have come back lower than the estimates. We have to look to the future for those maybe on Golf Course Drive or anywhere else, and if we help the Nash Heights residents, we have to be able to help others down the road as well. Ms. Whipkey stated there has never been a Council in this City at any time that has had such a massive project that affects the residents and the City at the same time. It's always been by a developer and those buying into those allotments had the costs included when it was purchased. Ms. Whipkey stated the 200-foot and 400 ft is not a rule it's a law and about fourteen years ago three of us came in front of Council and tried to tell the public that the so called domino effect was going to happen. At that time nobody cared because they weren't getting bit; now we're upset, but the time for actually being able to do something about the situation has passed. Mr. Pierson asked Mr. Markey if one dollar of the Fund 128 account been mentioned or talked about in the projection spread sheets, and Mr. Markey stated that Council passed legislation that told the State that Fund 128 is to be the repayment source for the State loans so right now that is the source along with any assessment passed. Mr. Pierson stated that wasn't in the original model and Mr. Markey stated if he meant the Barberton agreement that the 128 Fund was not used it was for the pump station. Mr. Pierson stated he thought the permitted use of Fund 127 is for maintenance and pump stations and Fund 128 passed by Council was for use for water and sewer improvements. Mr. Markey concurred that is what the legislation says. Mr. Pierson emphasized that is the difference and it has never been part of that model. Mr. Rodgers stated this idea that Norton will be sewered overnight or the domino effect; he does not like this kind of talk as people with failed systems are not getting the work done due to the fear mongering that goes on up here. If you keep your septic working and make repairs, they are not going to run a sewer down your road and force you to connect if you are not polluting. There are some who know they have a failed system and are doing nothing about it and shame on them. Mr. Rodgers stated that the sewer project before us is a large task but we were elected to address this and some of us have gone out to get expert advice for a savings although it has fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. Rodgers stated before he votes on any resolution of necessity he wants an agreement in the form of a resolution that if at any time we enter into a deal with Barberton then we go back to the $8,000.00 and $5,000.00 numbers that were funded and justified just like discussed in the models. Mr. Tousley stated he has minutes from the May 11, 2009 Council meeting during the discussion of the tax credit roll back: Mayor Koontz had stated *"this is vitally important to the city, something we must do to clean up our water, to protect our health"*. Mr. Tousley stated we do have a water and a health issue and it's is very clear to him so why not use it. Ms. Whipkey asked Mr. Pierson if he was intending on not moving Resolution #9-2016 forward to the agenda or is he wanting it amended with a dollar amount. Mr. Pierson stated he wants to see a dollar amount in place, and if we don't do this now, down the road it could all be forgotten. Mr. Pierson referred to statements in the newspaper from the Mayor in 2013 that everyone should pay $8,250.00. Ms. Whipkey again reminded everyone back in 2012-2013 those figures were under the assumption of purchasing our lines from Summit County, which came to a screeching halt in 2014. Ms. Whipkey stated her concern was on February 8, 2016 we are supposed to pass the Resolutions of Necessity and if we go back to the drawing board how this would affect our time line and what position would this put us in? Ms. Whipkey also asked if the EPA ever responded to us on our letter? Mr. Markey stated that the EPA has not responded, and the time line we submitted showed us submitting a PTI (Permit to Install), which is being done now, the date of when we go out for bid and the date of completion. That bid date is tied to getting a Resolution of Necessity passed. The Advertising would be June 23 and June 30, 2016 and the bid openings on July 26, 2016. In order to get there we need the Resolutions of Necessity passed, the appointment of the Assessment Equalization Board and approval and then you can go out for bid. If we push this back now, it can all get potentially pushed back. Mr. Pierson stated it does not push back the time line, all Council has to do is agree to a dollar amount in the Resolution now with emergency language and adopt next week and we can then address the other Resolutions of Necessity. It's pretty straight forward and simple either you want to do it and help the people or you don't. Mr. Rodgers stated he would be moving in this session that if we end up with an agreement with Barberton that we go back to the assessment amounts of $8,000.00 and $5,000.00; and its justified in that financial model even without using the rollback funds. Mr. Markey stated he is pointing out that original model showed using the 1400 additional connections and that most of the revenue of those 1400 connections going into the Nash Heights project to be able to support those subsidies. Mr. Rodgers stated here we go again muddying the waters as that was a great deal as Mr. Markey and the Administration recognized it when he went against it. Now all of a sudden you're going to tell the people of Norton that you are going to subsidize Nash Heights if we go with Barberton. Is that what you are saying? Mr. Markey responded he was stating what the model said. Mr. Rodgers asked Mr. Markey if everyone wasn't also going to subsidize the people with the package plants. Mr. Markey answered no, theoretically yes, but the model showed the package plants could pay for themselves through grant funds that are not absolutely guaranteed. Mr. Rodgers then interrupted and stated they won't now because Barberton bought the package plants and they won't be able to charge the amount in the model. Barberton will need the rest of the City to pay for the package plants.

Mr. Rodgers stated after reading the comments from the newly elected Councilmen how good a Barberton deal was there is no way that we won't be in a deal with Barberton soon and all of us, even some of us that won't see sewers for a long time, are going to be sharing the costs for the whole City. Ms. Whipkey referred to Mr. Markey that in order to instigate Mr. Rodgers suggestion to take the figures back to $8,000.00 and $5,000.00 and the proposed motion to do so; don't we want to have an agreement already in place with Barberton and Mr. Markey concurred. The original model is based on a 50% surcharge and using that money to subsidize the assessments. Mr. Rodgers stated his desire is that "In the event" we have an agreement with Barberton we take these figures back to the $8,000.00 and $5,000.00 figures. Mr. Pelot commented on the fact that we have lost a lot of our negotiation powers, so how can we make that statement; and the assumptions may not be the same. Mr. Rodgers argued that we are now in an even stronger situation with Barberton than we were before and those package plants are something Summit County wanted to get rid of as they were a losing operation. Barberton needs customer base and is losing hundreds of thousands of dollars with those package plants. Mr. Kernan stated it makes more sense to pass the two (2) Resolutions of Necessity, and go out for bid. We can continue negotiating with Barberton and get the numbers to see what we can subsidize. Mr. Kernan stated that this seems to him like we are putting the cart before the horse and not doing this in proper order. Mr. Rodgers stated he does not believe the people trust this Council to have their backs once legislation is passed; that is the message he got, not only in the affected area of Nash Heights but the entire City. Mr. Tousley stated let's say we put the $5,000.00 on the resolution now and in the event we get the deal with Barberton we don't have to change the figures back to $8,000.00 and $5,000.00; we could put it into the legislation that we don't have to use the roll back funds. We are not committing to the roll back we are committing to the residents. Mr. Pierson discussed the language and the caveat of the outcome of the negotiations with Barberton. Mr. Pierson stated he agreed with the lack of trust Mr. Rodgers was commenting about. Mr. Rodgers suggested the language reflect the desires and Mr. Markey stated he can craft whatever Council decides upon. Mr. Pierson suggested having language requiring that it would take a 2/3 vote of Council is required to change this. Mr. Markey he did not believe you could, there would be issues if one Council can bind future councils. Mr. Rodgers asked to rescind anything that we pass will take five (5) votes and Mr. Markey replied it takes a simple majority for either a Resolution or an Ordinance. Mr. Jack Gainer, 3920 Wadsworth Road, Norton, Ohio, stated the City website has a legal opinion from June or July this past year about the legal use of sewer fund #128 for Nash Heights. It indicated Fund 128 can only be used for infrastructure for the main lines, expansion of the present sewer system. Mr. Markey stated Fund 128 can be used for any purpose in Nash Heights, and Fund 127 cannot be used in the Nash Heights project other than pump stations. Mr. Gainer stated so the roll back fund can pay for the entirety of Nash Heights. Mr. Robert Copen, 2525 Sue Lane, Norton, Ohio stated he does not live in Nash Heights, and asked if Fund 127 can be used for the pump stations then we can move this totally out and would lower the cost to the citizens. Mr. Pierson and Mr. Markey concurred that is exactly what Council has done so far. Mr. Markey stated you cannot use those dollars in an un-sewered area to lay the lines. Mr. Tousley asked about the pump station cost being included in the assessments and Mr. Markey assured that the pump station was not included as it was separate.

Mr. Tousley stated he cannot be on board with the assessments lowered to $8,000.00 and $5,000.00 because there would be no funding for other projects. Mr. Markey clarified that the current motion was for a subsidy and not an assessment. Mr. Rodgers moved to add the figure of a $5,000.00 subsidy per benefit on Resolution #9-2016, seconded by Mr. Pierson.

Roll Call: Yes: Rodgers, Pierson, Tousley
No: Kernan, Pelot, Whipkey

Motion failed 3-3.

Mr. Rodgers moved to subsidize or refund the residents in Greenwich and Oak Street in this same amount of $5,000.00 per benefit. Mr. Markey stated he has stated previously that these projects have already been assessed, there are bonds that cannot be retired for at least ten (10) years, and there are some legal issues he has to do so. You need to know the exact amount and where this funding is to come from. Ms. Whipkey stated she had discussed this in the past that the City could just cut them a refund check and the property owner decides where or how they want to use it. Mr. Markey stated he is more comfortable with the term of a refund. Ms. Whipkey asked how can we make any set amounts when we don't even know what the figures will be for Nash Heights or have anything with Barberton? Ms. Whipkey stated that she understands what you are saying and that all of us here want to do what we can to ease costs to the residents in any way we can. With Resolution #9 we can always come back and put in the dollar amount. Mr. Rodgers made a motion to refund $5,000.00 to the Oak Street and Greenwich Road residents and Mr. Pierson seconded it. Mr. Markey clarified that if this passes, Council will have to act what the specific source is to be for those payments. Mr. Messner cannot just do it without authorization.

Roll Call Yes: Rodgers, Pierson, Tousley
No: Kernan, Pelot, Whipkey

Motion failed 3-3.

Mr. Pelot stated if we did this for Greenwich, Oak, what about those on Long Drive, we don't even know the numbers we are looking at yet, so how can we arbitrarily pick a number out of the air and say we will give this money back? .Mr. Rodgers asked when these other projects were done was that before or after 2009? Mr. Pelot stated he did not recall. Mr. Kernan asked what does it matter if your intent was to make all of the citizen's whole then why are you going to cut it off there? Mr. Rodgers replied because that's when we the City believed that Council and the Administration passed the tax to sewer the City. Mr. Kernan stated the residents along Gardner Blvd that paid for their waterline are not going to see any of that money. Mr. Messner stated that if the idea is to be fair to everyone, and we know Oak Street and Greenwich Road residents paid about $13,000.00, and knowing that we have the engineer's estimates at $15,000.00 and $19,000.00; wouldn't it be fair to assess everyone at $13,000.00?

Mr. Rodgers moved that if we enter into an agreement with Barberton like we had before we go back to the $8,000.00 and $5,000.00 as with the previous model, seconded by Mr. Pierson. Mr. Rodgers stated he understands Mr. Tousley's concerns, but that model had a figure of $5,000.00 and another figure for future projects could be used. This model has no rollback funds used except for the fund paying for the pump stations and Barber Road. Mr. Kernan stated this is too speculative at this point and if and when we do have an agreement in place with Barberton, then we can address this. Mr. Pierson stated he does not feel this Council would honor that and some would just as well assess the Nash Heights residents the $19,000.00. Mr. Rodgers stated that he knew one and maybe two people who ran and made campaign promises on this for Oak and Greenwich and it was just broken so how can we trust or the people trust. Ms. Whipkey stated there were only a couple of us that ran and she does not recall promising anything as a campaign promise as she did not campaign what so ever. Ms. Whipkey stated that in the future these prices are not going to go down so how do we tell those people in the future we do not have the money to help them as we gave it all away or make a promise now that we cannot deliver. Mr. Pierson stated he would agree with Mr. Messner's suggestion to a degree; however he wants to see something in writing to guarantee there will be some relief before agreeing to it. Mr. Pierson stated he wants to see that in writing and for it to be legal and binding. Mr. Messner stated that in the model shown before shows that in mind with the various cases of part of that being paid by assessments and part by the City, and it was an affordable amount of about $500.00 assessments and Mr. Markey concurred. Mr. Tousley stated if we use the $12,900.00 amount that's more than $7,000.00 less on the $19,000.00 estimated assessment. We have more than $1.5 million in the account and it's just sitting there and more than $10 million coming in later. He is not suggesting we drain it. Mr. Tousley stated that the comments have been made that we don't know if we have it, well we do have it and it's just sitting there as we speak. At some point we are going to have to commit some amount to the residents, and we cannot sit back here for five (5) years and do nothing. We are going have to blindly do something at some point. Mr. Kernan called for the question.

Roll Call	Yes:	Rodgers, Pierson,
	No:	Kernan, Pelot, Tousley, Whipkey

Motion failed 2-4.

Ms. Whipkey stated since we can't seem to move Res #9-2016 as written and Mr. Pierson has eluded that he won't support this and Mr. Pierson stated he would not move on it without the added language. Mr. Kernan stated the current committee line up of all 7 as members on every committee which means that that anyone can move to place Res #9-2016 as it stands on the agenda. If it passes then you have you have a vote on this on Monday. Mr. Pelot stated this has already been voted down so someone that was in favor of this would need to make the motion. Mr. Markey clarified that Resolution #9 had not been voted on as written. Mr. Rodgers, as Vice Chair, refused to move the resolution as written so Ms. Whipkey moved to add Res #9 as it's written without a dollar amount, to Councils next agenda, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Mr. Pierson asked for more discussion on this, to which Ms. Whipkey declined to do so, noting we have discussed this enough, we have beat it to death**.** You say we don't want to give any help and this says we will and asked the Clerk for roll call.

Roll Call: Yes: Whipkey, Pelot, Kernan
No: Tousley, Rodgers, Pierson

Motion failed 3-3.

Appoint Standing Committees
Ms. Whipkey discussed this earlier and that in lieu of Mr. McGlone's swearing in next week since the Board of Elections has failed to certify him, she would add this to the agenda for next week under the assumption we have the election certified.

Review of Council Rules
Mr. Tousley stated that he would defer the floor to Mr. Kernan since he has submitted a few changes. Mr. Kernan stated he looked these over and mostly made grammatical changes and in concurrence with the Charter. Mr. Markey also received these and some items were added. There was one comment from Mr. Markey relating to Rule 208-Mail: and his comment was incomplete. Mr. Kernan suggested we remove this entirely since all of Council gets their mail electronically. Mr. Markey stated his comment was that whatever is decided is to the security in the mail boxes for Council. Mr. Rodgers suggested allowing those who wanted hard copies to state they wanted them and put them in the court room; it was pointed out that the room was now the IT room. Mr. Pierson suggested that all Council mail be kept locked in the Clerk's office and can be received during normal business offices. Mr. Tousley stated he uses his hard copy and Ms. Whipkey stated she likes to have the hard copy also and the idea was to make sure that Council was taking an interest in what was given. There could be some sensitive items that are not yet a public document, but become so when emailed. Mr. Kernan stated the reference to Sunday has no impact as we do get them electronically. Mr. Kernan moved to strike Rule 208 all together. Mr. Tousley requested to go through the rule changes from the beginning and discussion commenced with Rule #103 on changing the rules. Mr. Rodgers asked if this is just done at the beginning of the year and approved by the majority and changes there after a need a 2/3 rd vote is all that is needed. Mr. Markey stated the Rule #103 that Mr. Kernan referenced referred to Rule #601; there was a conflict, and it's been revised. Mr. Markey stated Rule#103 would be the same the way it is with consideration of the initial changes. Council concluded it would rather have the majority vote be required at the beginning, with a 2/3 majority for later changes, and Rule 601 would be changed to reflect that. Ms. Whipkey noted since Mr. McGlone is present tonight that if he felt necessary he can chime in at any point tonight with his concerns and or comments. Rule 105 Meeting Times: Ms. Whipkey noted the word hour needs added after twenty-four (24). Rule 106 Meeting Days: Mr. Kernan suggested we take out the reference of 5th Monday; add language for Executive Session which is straight out of the Charter. Annual workshop is deleted completely, we already do committee of the whole two (2) times a month and we don't need an annual work shop. We can always add an extra meeting anytime we feel the need.

Ms. Whipkey stated she agreed as has attended many in the past and they are redundant. Mr. Kernan stated these seem to be the longest rules in Norton. Mr. Rodgers stated if we ever do move forward as a Council and Admin team; we have set some benchmarks to achieve in the past and in absence of the annual workshop we can still set some goals/benchmarks in the future. Rule#107 Vacation: Mr. Kernan stated there is some flexibility here and it's in compliance with the Charter to have one (1) meeting a month. It was decided the added language is not necessary and the rule remained as it was. Mr. Kernan noted that Rule #108 Meetings and #Rule #202 Addressing Council have conflicts with each other when the public can comment, and this has been modified. For Special Council meetings, notifications are by email and if email is down a notice would be with a phone call and last resort would be hand delivery by an officer. Rule #109 Committee Assignments: Mr. Tousley asked if during the middle of the year someone on Council changes does this cause issues with Administration? Mr. Markey stated the President has the powers to appoint the committees and that can fall in their duties; it's also a Charter provision in Section 3.04. Rule #110 Committee Meetings: Now they all just happen at Committee of the Whole and the changes just reflect that. Mr. Tousley clarified Council still has the option to call a separate committee meeting if so needed. Rule #201 General Order in Council: Mr. Kernan added language of Police Officer to be in front of the rail; although that is really more for the Safety Director and Chief of Police to decide. Mr. Tousley stated if we are simplifying the rules do we really need the full blown job description? Mr. Pierson stated we just need to clarify they are acting under the law and still subservient to the Council and bound to follow directive of the Council President. They cannot take things into their own hands. Mr. Markey stated we had an issue last year and the roles, but he felt this is best to just take it out. Ms. Whipkey discussed the history last year with an interpretation by some outside legal opinion that did not agree with our own Law Director's opinion. Mr. Pierson strongly disagreed and noted that a peace officer is not permitted to take the situation in their own hands outside the threat of bodily harm. Ms. Whipkey stated the last instance she had residents express their concerns that Ms. Whipkey or others may have been struck in that instance. After much discussion it was decided to take those suggestions out as the officer should know what his/her duties are. Rule #202 Addressing Council: no significant changes other than we all want to give the public the right to stand and be heard and not be interrupted. This helps preserve decorum and Mr. Markey stated it's also a First Amendment right that could be viewed as being denied if constantly interrupted. Mr. Rodgers discussed a past meeting with the Summit County Health Department at the high school and their format was not to respond to questions from the public and that only adds to the fire. Mr. Rodgers did note that the Health Department eventually responded to the questions on their web site. The language remained that Council could respond to questions/comments presented by the speaker without it using the public's five minute speaking time. Ms. Whipkey asked to have these revisions updated and ready for next meeting and she noted if any Council members have other changes please bring them forward as soon as possible. Mr. Tousley requested copies of the Rules be made available for the public and left at the rail.

Agricultural District Renewal-Eric & Kristin Beddow
Mr. Rodgers stated that this is boiler plate and is a renewal of an agricultural district application. Mr. Rodgers moved to add this to Councils next agenda for a first reading only, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Roll Call: Yes: Rodgers, Pelot, Kernan, Pierson, Tousley, Whipkey
No: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Mrs. Richards noted there would be a Public Hearing on Monday, February 22, 2016 at or about 7:15 and prior to the second reading the same night.

Unfinished Business:
Mr. Tousley noted the concerns of two (2) Resolutions of Necessity and the failure of the resolutions proposed earlier and he felt it would it be necessary for a Special Council meeting later this week to discuss this further. Ms. Whipkey noted this is set for a third reading next week. Mr. Rodgers asked Mr. Markey how many votes will that take next week to pass? Mr. Markey stated that it takes 3/4ths which would be six (6) of the seven (7) Council members to pass. Ms. Whipkey asked was that just for the emergency clause? Mr. Markey stated that under the Ohio Revised Code the Resolution of Necessity which is the first stage of the process requires the 3/4ths vote of Council and any future legislation such as ordinance to proceed or assessing ordinance only requires a majority. The 3/4ths vote round ups and go to six (6) members for passage. Mr. Tousley stated as of now it seems this may not pass. Ms. Whipkey asked which legislation are you referring to? Mr. Tousley clarified that he was referring to the subsidy issues. Mr. Pelot stated he would like to see the figures for the $12,900 or $13,000. Mr. Rodgers asked to have drafted legislation prepared on the three (3) failed votes from tonight. Mr. Markey stated he would like to have the proper time to address that after the meeting and it's discussed and then he would draft legislation from those discussions. Mr. Markey stated that he would prepare whatever Council decided. After many attempts to coincide all of Council member's schedules and conflicts, it was decided to have the Special Committee Work Session on Monday, February 8, 2016 at 6:00 PM.

New Business:
Mr. Rodgers stated he had a call from a resident in Ward 3 about their trash pick up. This resident indicated they do not like paying their bill three (3) months ahead for services and asked the City address that in the next contract. Mr. Rodgers stated he would like to see the recycle containers included. Mrs. Carr stated we are currently in the process of renewing the contract and the need for them is spelled out in the contract. Mr. Rodgers discussed the excessive use of the trucks and the deterioration it's been having on the roads. Mrs. Carr stated we are looking at this and there may be an up charge and may also have to bid this separately. Mr. Pierson asked to have a copy of the bid specs in our mailboxes and Mrs. Carr stated she has looked at other communities on what they like and don't like and we are looking at language that benefits the City.

Mr. Tousley discussed his concern with residents that hardly generate any trash and there is no opt out portion. Mrs. Carr stated just last week she had to chase a resident from dumping his personal trash in the recycle containers at the city lot. Mrs. Carr noted we will be doing some re-education on what is accepted and not accepted in the recycle bins. Mrs. Carr stated that some people are dumping a full plastic bag of recyclable materials in the dumpster; they need to be dumped out completely because the plastic bags can cause the machines to jam. Ms. Whipkey noted we need to have a seniors discount and the unlimited and limited rates are backwards as far as the rates go. Mrs. Carr asked for Councils specific desires to be sent via email to her ASAP because she is working on the bid packages now. Mr. Pierson specified whatever company we use must have their own point of disposal. Ms. Whipkey reminded Mr. Pierson and others to submit those requests to Mrs. Carr. Mayor Zita handed out his list of candidates for the Charter Review Commission (see attached) Mayor Zita stated he intends to have the members attend next weeks Council meeting to introduce themselves; to move through the process accordingly and get this up and running. Mr. Mr. Tousley moved to add this discussion to the agenda for next week, seconded by Ms. Whipkey.

Roll Call: Yes: Tousley, Whipkey, Rogers, Kernan, Pierson, Pelot
No: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Topics for the next Work Session:
Mr. Rodgers asked if the City is spending money for an interior designer for City offices and Mrs. Carr replied no. Mrs. Carr stated that Mr. Messner is getting quotes for new office cubicles in the Finance Department. Mr. Kernan moved to allow for comment from Ms. Lee who was not signed in to speak, seconded by Mr. Rodgers.

Roll Call: Yes: Kernan, Rodgers, Pierson, Tousley, Pelot, Whipkey
No: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Judith Lynn Lee, 3227 Creekside Drive Norton, Ohio spoke on the follow up on the water treatment issues. She has started up a collection for the residents in Flint Michigan. She met with Chief Schultz has agreed to allow the Fire Station to be a collection site for cases of bottled of water. She has also done the same with Copley and Fairlawn with the same response. If any residents are interested in contributing the deadline is Feb 15, 2016. Akron has also started shipping donated water to Michigan. Your donations can be dropped off any of these stations (see attached flyer).

Public Comment-Agenda and Non Agenda Items:
There was no one signed in to speak.

Public Updates:
There were none.

Adjourn
There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM.

_____
Charlotte Whipkey, President of Council

NOTE: THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATIM

****ORIGINAL SIGNED AND APPROVED MINUTES ARE ON FILE WITH THE CLERK OF COUNCIL.****

All Committee Meetings will be held at the Norton Safety Administration Building, unless otherwise noted.

Flint, Michigan Is Suffering A Major Water Crisis

The city's water supply is contaminated with toxic levels of lead, and residents are unable to drink the water that comes through their taps. Gov. Rick Snyder has declared a state of emergency in Flint and brought in the National Guard to help deliver water.

Join the Water Pool…Answer the Call for Help with Judith Lynn Lee and the Norton, Copley and Fairlawn, Ohio Fire Departments.

DONATE A CASE OF BOTTLED WATER AND DELIVER TO

Norton Fire Division
3380 Greenwich Rd.
Norton, OH 44203
Chief Mike Schultz
(330) 825-3086

Copley Fire Department
1540 S. Cleveland –Massillon Rd.
Copley, OH 44321
Asst. Chief Keith Moore
(330) 666-6464

Fairlawn Fire Division
3525 South Smith Road
Fairlawn, OH 44333
Chief Russell Hose
(330) 668-9540

Judith Lynn Lee
(330-858-1479

Deadline is February 15, 2016

2016 CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

FIRST	LAST	WARD
Ron	Clawson	1-B
Mary Ann	Driscoll	3-A
Jack	Gainer	1-A
Thomas	Marino	3-C
Andrew	Mullins	2-A
Connie	Nutter	3-A
Richard	Orendas	4-A

Zimbra **annc@cityofnorton.org**

Re: Charter Review Commission

From : Ann C. - Admin <annc@cityofnorton.org> Tue, Jan 19, 2016 02:07 PM
Subject : Re: Charter Review Commission 1 attachment
To : Ron Clawson <clawsonron@hotmail.com>

Thank you Ron, I'll pass the info of you applying to the Mayor. :)

City of NORTON
Cheers,
Ann M. Campbell
Administrative Assistant to Mayor/Administrative Officer
Webmaster
Public Information Officer
City of Norton
4060 Columbia Woods Dr.
Norton OH 44203
330-825-7815 **x314**
annc@cityofnorton.org

From: "Ron Clawson" <clawsonron@hotmail.com>
To: "Ann C. - Admin" <annc@cityofnorton.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 2:05:12 PM
Subject: Charter Review Commission

Dear Mayor Zita and City of Norton Administration Staff,

I am writing to express my interest in volunteering to be a member of the Norton Charter Review Commission. I was a member of the previous commission providing me with a working knowledge of the city charter and its intent. I feel I am qualified as in my private life I work for a large company that provides services to the insurance industry. In my capacity I frequently and successfully negotiate many legally binding contracts such as NDA's (Non-Disclosure Agreements), SLA's (Service Level Agreements) and other performance oriented contracts. I do have legal council available and work well in contracts where there are a host of interested parties, many with distinct agendas. In addition, I work well with others, am an attentive listener and have excellent written and verbal communication skills.

Please feel free to utilize my contact information below if questions or need for additional information arise.
Warm regards,

Ron Clawson
2837 Carillon Drive
Norton, OH 44203
330-338-8143
e-mail: clawsonron@hotmail.com

City of NORTON **Cityof-Norton.png**
56 KB

Mary Ann Driscoll, PE

4006 Deerspring Court, Norton, Ohio 44203 | 330-607-5597 | Lammdriscoll@gmail.com

January 20, 2016

Mayor Mike Zita
City of Norton
4060 Columbia Woods Drive
Norton, Ohio 44203

Dear Mayor Zita:

I read about the Charter Review Commission you are forming in the West Side Leader on January 14, 2016. I am interested in serving my City on this Commission. I served on the last Charter Review Commission in 2011. I also served as a member of the last Comprehensive Planning Commission. Currently, I'm not holding any office or position with the City.

I have lived in Norton for more than 10 years and feel this is a way to use my background to serve my community. I'm a registered professional engineer and have been practicing civil engineering for more than 18 years. Over the years I have been indirectly involved in municipal governments in Northeast Ohio through attendance at Planning Commission meetings, work with elected officials, and review of the codified ordinances for various projects. I think this experience can be helpful.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to call or email me.

Regards,

Mary Ann Driscoll

Zimbra **annc@cityofnorton.org**

Fwd: Charter review commission position

From : Mayor Mike Zita <mayorzita@cityofnorton.org> Sun, Jan 17, 2016 01:47 PM
Subject : Fwd: Charter review commission position
To : Ann <annc@cityofnorton.org>

Ann, please add this to list of interested residents Thanks MZ

From: "Jack Gainer" <florida10_97@yahoo.com>
To: mayorzita@cityofnorton.org
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 8:40:49 PM
Subject: Charter review commission position

Mr Mayor;

I would very much like to be considered for one of the positions on the new Charter Review Commission. If you need a formal letter other than this e-mail please notify me and and I will respond via snail mail. I have been actively engaged in the council meetings for several years now and think that I would be a person who could contribute to the review in a positive manner.

Thank you for your consideration and should you appoint me, I would look forward to serving the city on the review commission.

Respectfully;
3920 Wadsworth Rd. 44203
330-687-7047

James(Jack)Gainer

January 25, 2016

City of Norton
c/o Office of the Mayor
4060 Columbia Woods Drive
Norton, Ohio 44203
mayorzita@cityofnorton.org

By electronic mail submission only

RE: Charter Review Commission Appointment
Letter of Interest
Thomas A. Marino II

Dear Mayor Zita:

Please allow this Letter of Interest to serve as a factor in your consideration of me as a prospective appointee and member to our City's Charter Review Commission, pursuant to Art. VII, Sec. 7.01. I write this letter with the backing of Councilman Kernan, my neighbor and friend.

My name is Thomas A. Marino II, and I and my wife are the owners and residents of 3553 Glenbrook Drive, Norton, Ohio 44203. I do not hold any other office or appointment within our City, in accordance with the statute.

Beyond meeting statutory requirements for the appointment, I submit to you that my background, experience and interest meet or exceed what our City would look for in members to this commission. First, I am an attorney and have the experience reading, drafting and construing legal documents and statutes. By way of example, I have submitted to our state congress a proposed revision in the probate code to permit self-proving affidavits to authenticate decedents' wills.

Second, some of my law firm's largest clients' interests are statutory-based, so some of my multi-million dollar cases turn on statutory interpretation, understanding and construction.

My professional experience aside, I have personally wanted to get involved with our City, and meeting the needs and addressing the issues our town faces vis-à-vis this commission, is one way.

I take responsibilities given me very seriously. I submit to you and, by the grace of a majority of approving members of Council, that appointment to this commission would be treated no different.

I thank you for your consideration of me in advance. Please do not hesitate to contact me at any time, with any questions or concerns. I'd be happy to forward recommendations, too, upon request.

Respectfully,

/s/ Thomas A. Marino II

Thomas A. Marino II,
Citizen of Norton

Zimbra **annc@cityofnorton.org**

Re: Charter Review Commission

From : Ann C. - Admin <annc@cityofnorton.org> Mon, Jan 25, 2016 09:32 AM
Subject : Re: Charter Review Commission 1 attachment
To : Andrew Mullins <Andrewmullins@neo.rr.com>

Mr. Mullins:

This is to confirm that your letter of interest for the Norton Charter Review Commission has been received. Thank you!

City of NORTON

Cheers,
Ann M. Campbell
Administrative Assistant to Mayor/Administrative Officer
Webmaster
Public Information Officer
City of Norton
4060 Columbia Woods Dr.
Norton OH 44203
330-825-7815 **x314**
annc@cityofnorton.org

From: "Andrew Mullins" <Andrewmullins@neo.rr.com>
To: "Ann C. - Admin" <annc@cityofnorton.org>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2016 8:10:57 AM
Subject: Charter Review Commission

Good morning,

I would like to be considered for a position on the Charter Review Commission. As a recent retiree, I can devote the necessary time this post will require. Furthermore, my past managerial experience in large firms involving perusal of contractual and technical material, gives me an advantage that would serve well in this capacity. Interacting with various divergent personalities in an objective manner while remaining goal focused is another facet of my past work responsibility. With these qualifications, I feel that my participation on the Commission would be mutually beneficial to Norton and achieving my personal efforts to improve our community.

If any additional information is needed, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for considering this application.

Respectfully,

Andrew Mullins
516-581-0868
2886 Wilbanks Drive
Norton, OH 44203

City of NORTON **Cityof-Norton.png**
56 KB

CONNIE J. NUTTER

3500 Shellhart Road
Norton, Ohio 44203
330-322-6187

January 22, 2016

City of Norton
Attention: Mayor Zita
4060 Columbia Woods Dr.
Norton, OH 44203

Re: Letter of Intent

Dear Mayor Zita:

This letter formally informs you of my intent to be included on the Charter Review Commission. I hold no other office in the city and have been a citizen of Norton for over eight (8) years.

Should you have any questions, or wish to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Connie Nutter

Connie J. Nutter

Zimbra **annc@cityofnorton.org**

Re: Charter Review Commission

From : Ann C. - Admin <annc@cityofnorton.org> Fri, Jan 22, 2016 11:53 AM
Subject : Re: Charter Review Commission 1 attachment
To : Orendas5 <orendas5@aol.com>

Mr. Orendas:

This is to confirm that your letter of interest for the Norton Charter Review Commission has been received. Thank you!

City of NORTON

Cheers,
Ann M. Campbell
Administrative Assistant to Mayor/Administrative Officer
Webmaster
Public Information Officer
City of Norton
4060 Columbia Woods Dr.
Norton OH 44203
330-825-7815 **x314**
annc@cityofnorton.org

From: "Orendas5" <orendas5@aol.com>
To: "Ann C. - Admin" <annc@cityofnorton.org>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2016 11:09:20 AM
Subject: Charter Review Commission

January 22, 2016

Mike Zita
Office of the Mayor
City of Norton, Ohio
4060 Columbia Woods Drive
Norton, OH 44203

Attn: Ann Campbell
Administrative Assistant

Regarding your search for candidates to serve on the Charter Review Commission for the City of Norton - please consider this my letter of interest to become a member of the Commission.

I am a life-long resident of Norton, graduating from Norton Schools. I care about Norton and want to see it progress to be the city it can be.

It would be my privilege to serve my community as a member of the Charter Review Commission.

Thank you for your consideration.

Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Orendas
5186 Taylor Road
Norton, OH 44203

330-825-5077