



**COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 7, 2013**

Committee Members Present: Dennis McGlone
Charlotte Whipkey
Scott Pelot
Bill Mowery
John Conklin
Todd Bergstrom
Don Nicolard

Also Present: Mayor Mike Zita
Rick Ryland
Laura Starosta
Karla Richards
Ann Campbell

The Committee Work Session convened on Monday, October 7, 2013 at 7:02 PM, in the Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Don Nicolard, President of Council. Following a salute to the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance, there was a moment of silent reflection.

General Topics of Discussion:

Appoint Assessment Equalization Board Members

Mr. Mowery indicated we are not ready with the names of candidates and moved to pull this from tonight's agenda and continue at the next work session, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Roll Call: Yeas: Mowery, Pelot, McGlone, Whipkey, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Ms. Whipkey moved to add Roof Repair to the agenda, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Motion passed 7-0.

Roll Call: Yeas: Whipkey, Pelot, McGlone, Mowery, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Non-Bargaining Salaries

Mr. Mowery discussed a memo received from Mr. Nicolard and his recommendations. Mr. Nicolard stated he has also discussed his memo with Mr. Ryland and Police Chief Hete and that Chief Hete had recommended the schedule for the part time officers. Chief Hete had indicated he had researched other departments and felt this was within range and he recommended the increases. Mr. Mowery also discussed the “me too” clause and Mr. Nicolard stated he felt it’s a good thing to have and felt it should include all department heads. Mr. McGlone asked what this cost would be for implementing the part time police officers and Mrs. Starosta replied about \$37,000.00 and about \$10,000.00 for additional salaries for Mrs. Richards and Mrs. Campbell. Mr. Pelot asked about the larger increase for the part time officers and Mayor Zita reminded Council about the past memo from Mr. Ryland relating to finding alternate means for these increases. Mrs. Starosta explained there were more pay grade steps in Mr. Ryalnd’s original memo and they have been reduced to three (3) in Mr. Nicolard’s memo. Mayor Zita stated he is more concerned with how Council intends to fund these increases and agrees they are needed. Mayor Zita stated he did not want to see them given out just to find out we have no funding to issue them. Mr. Pelot stated he had some issues with the ranges of 15 years for the part time police, this seems stagnant. Ms. Whipkey agreed with Mr. Pelot and she questioned the pay for full time and Mrs. Starosta replied it varies but average is about \$20.00.00 per hour. Mr. Nicolard asked Mrs. Starosta if we could find the money for these increases and she replied right now she is focusing on the road program. Mayor Zita asked Council what cuts do you intend to make? Ms. Whipkey asked what do the office workers make and Mrs. Starosta replied some are at \$15. 00 and some are at \$17.00. Ms. Whipkey stated it’s not that she was implying the office workers are not important, they just do not put their lives on the line everyday like the officers do. There was discussion on how long its been since the part time officers had an increase and Mr. Ryland replied in 2008. Mr. Mowery asked the current rates and Mr. Ryland said some are at \$13.00 and up to \$14.00 plus. Mr. Nicolard moved to rate the part time officers to probationary from 1-10 years at \$17.50; 11 to 14 years at \$18.50 and for 15 years and up to \$20.00. Mr. Mowery asked can these employees be assured it would not be taken away like last time? Mr. Pelot stated we should move forward with this now and get the time to have better idea of where the funds will come from. Mr. Nicolard stated its been five (5) years since these people had raises. Ms. Whipkey clarified that we are talking about less than \$50,000.00 and suggested taking money from the internet device fees. Mrs. Starosta stated those funds come into the General Fund and goes out over numerous places within the budget. Mayor Zita stated we need to find alternative funds to bring into the General Fund, we either do that or reduce services. It would be an additional expense from this point forward. Mr. Bergstrom stated we put the dollars in place and we look at the budget, and maybe cut a part time position. Mr. Bergstrom stated we do believe the rates are appropriate and tell the Police Dept. this is their budget and they will have to live with the new amount. Mr. Conklin cautioned if we take away a part time position and we need overtime, aren’t we taking this away from the wrong place? Mr. Nicolard stated if we don’t take these into consideration soon, you may have one less car on the road anyway because these officers will be looking at employment elsewhere. Ms. Whipkey stated that there were several changes in employees recently. Mr. Mowery stated he wants to be sure we can give the raises and not be sending them back.

Mr. Mowery wanted to have legislation stating this, and Mr. Pelot stated you could make it come back to Council as a safety gap. Mr. Ryland stated that is not fair to do to these officers, and Mr. Ryland reminded everyone that it was Council that asked for this. Mr. Mowery moved to place the raises as stated for part time police officers on Councils next agenda with emergency language, waiving the second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Pelot. Mr. Pelot asked about the retroactive to the first pay in January. The previous motions were removed and properly stated to also include the first full pay in January 2013. Ms. Whipkey stated they all deserve raises, just has an issue with waiving the readings and she just wants the public to have their input first.

Roll Call: Yeas: Mowery, Pelot, McGlone, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: Whipkey.

Motion passed 6-1.

Clerk of Council and Dep. Clerk of Council:

Mr. McGlone stated in the past when we gave raises there were separate pieces of legislation for each employee and all of Council was in agreement. Ms. Whipkey asked why we are not also addressing the Clerk of Court position? Mr. Nicolard stated that this issue was not discussed. Mayor Zita clarified that the Admin, Assistant and is not the Dep. Clerk of Council and we need to be clear about this in the legislation. Mrs. Richards indicated that Mrs. Campbell is in fact the Dep. Clerk of Council which was approved by legislation. Mrs. Starosta disagreed stated she had resigned from that position a few years ago. Mrs. Starosta stated she wants to be clear because the only Personnel Order she has on record is for the position of Administrative Assistant. Mr. Pelot asked when the last pay raise was for the Clerk of Council and Mrs. Richards replied 2008. Ms. Whipkey asked Mrs. Richards if her position requires specific training, and Mrs. Richards replied that she does attend International Institute of Municipal Clerk training annually at Kent State University. Mrs. Richards indicated the training is required to maintain her Certified Municipal Clerks degree and she is currently working towards a Master Municipal Clerk degree with is the next level. Mr. Whipkey asked so you have to maintain that and Mrs. Richards replied, yes once you receive it you have to maintain that. Ms. Whipkey asked if this is a requirement of the position and Mrs. Richards stated it is not a requirement, but is something she does as part of her job. Ms. Whipkey asked are there any actual requirements for you job as far as the City is concerned? Mrs. Richards replied yes as spelled out in the job description. Ms. Whipkey asked if that also included specialized training and Mrs. Richards stated that she is required to be a Notary which she maintains as well. Mr. Mowery moved to place the job title of Clerk of Council on Council's next agenda with the same stipulations for retroactive to first full pay of January 2013, at a \$2.00 per hour increase, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Roll Call: Yeas: Mowery, Pelot, McGlone, Whipkey, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Mowery discussed placing this on the next agenda with the same \$2.00 per hour increase. Ms. Whipkey asked what are the requirements for this position, training, etc? Mr. Ryland stated she does the same training as the Clerk of Council does and has the confidentiality aspect of her job that others do not have. Mr. Bergstrom asked Ms. Whipkey if she was interested in the qualifications or training? Ms. Whipkey stated both and she knows that Mrs. Richards is a Certified Municipal Clerk and asked if Mrs. Campbell is also? Mr. Ryland stated she had to have the computer knowledge when she walked through the door to be able to do things that she does. She attends the same Clerk of Council training that Mrs. Richards does, and they have attended Kent State together. Mr. Ryland stated that Mrs. Campbell is privy to a lot of confidential issues that others are not and there is a lot of responsibility that goes along with that. Mrs. Starosta added that she is also a Notary. Mr. Mowery asked Council if they wish Mrs. Campbell to present her position and what all she does? Mr. Nicolard stated he is aware of what all she does and how long it's been since she has received a raise, which has been since 2008. Mr. Nicolard noted this is more like a cost of living raise, not just a merit raise because he knows they both give a lot to the positions. Mr. Pelot noted that Mrs. Campbell does a lot of extras like evening meetings that are not listed in the job classification. Ms. Whipkey asked if these are hourly or salary rates and Mr. Nicolard stated these are salary positions based on a 40 hour week, with no overtime. Mr. Bergstrom reminded everyone these positions we are dealing with not the person. Ms. Whipkey clarified that these positions have insurance and Mr. Pelot replied yes because they are full time. Mr. Mowery moved to place the job title of Administrative Assistant with the \$2.00 per hour raise, retroactive to the first full pay in January 2013, with same wording as the Clerk of Council position, seconded by Mr. Pelot. Ms. Whipkey asked about the pay increasing for the Administrative Assistant as going from \$16.82 up to \$18.82, and Mrs. Starosta concurred.

Roll Call: Yeas: Mowery, Pelot, McGlone, Whipkey, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Me Too Clause:

Mr. Mowery stated this is an excellent idea and Mr. Nicolard agreed with Mr. McGlone's earlier comments and felt that all non-bargaining personnel should receive the same compensation on average as the bargaining units. Mr. McGlone stated if we had this in place, we would not even be discussing it now. Mr. Nicolard agreed this would have been budgeted because it would have already been addressed. Mrs. Starosta stated that on average the bargaining union contracts end at different years and time and it might be easier to take a contract relating to the job environment; such as the Police bargaining unit and address the part time officers, and suggested grouping them all together. The Administration employees would follow the Clerical unit, and so on. Mr. Nicolard stated with that being said maybe we should tie all non bargaining together, and not as his memo stated with only Mrs. Richards & Mrs. Campbell. Mr. McGlone stated he did not feel you can tie the unions and non unions together. Mr. McGlone stated the proper way to do this is when the unions are complete then another piece of legislation should come

forward to address the non-bargaining employees. Mr. Nicolard suggested we wait and see what Mr. Kostoff can come up with. Mr. Ryland agreed with Mr. McGlone, if you settle the appropriate contract then you address the appropriate group next. If the Clerical unit got 3% raise then we would come to Council asking for the Clerk of Council/Admin. Assistant with legislation for that same amount. Mr. Ryland stated he does not agree in tying them all together with strictly a me too clause. Mr. Ryland commented that back in 2002 this was done with the Police & Fire Depts., as more like a parody issue. Mr. Pelot expressed concerns with what would tie the Administration into coming back to Council each time? Mr. Bergstrom stated it should be stated in the legislation that this must come back to Council, and Council felt we need to have Mr. Kostoff review this for clarity. Mr. Ryland reminded everyone that all of the collective bargaining units must come to Council for approval and this would be your trigger mechanism to address the non-bargaining in that same area.. Mr. Pelot stated you could tie these two (2) positions here to when the Clerical bargaining unit is finalized, etc., but questioned where do you tie in the Administration? Mr. Ryland reminded that all of the collective bargaining units must come to Council for approval, so at that time you could address all of those other positions. There was discussion as to where and when the Administrative staff should be addressed and Mr. Bergstrom agreed and felt this is something the Mayor should bring forward to Council. Mr. McGlone stated at Summit County they had only one union and once this was done then all of the rest of the employees received raises. Ms. Whipkey still had concerns with the Clerk of Court position since he is non-bargaining, and questioned if he was the only worker bee not getting a raise? Mr. Mowery asked if this person also has not had a raise since 2008? Mr. Mowery asked who is in this position now and Mayor Zita replied its Jim Mitchell, but reminded everyone we are talking positions here not personnel. Mr. Bergstrom asked if the Clerk of Court salary was in line or behind the eight ball and Mayor Zita stated he felt this was fine where it is at. Mrs. Starosta reminded everyone that in Mr. Ryland's memo it was suggested to combine the Clerk of Court and Clerk of Council positions to one full time position. Ms. Whipkey stated that is not going to happen. Mr. Nicolard stated we should send this issue to the next work session for further discussion and Mr. Mowery wanted to get feedback from Mr. Kostoff on this as well. Mr. Bergstrom discussed having more talk about the Clerk of Court position then also and Mr. Nicolard agreed and Mr. Mowery stated he felt this position also deserves an increase. Mrs. Karen Harley, 3432 Harper Avenue, Norton, Ohio, asked about how often the union contracts come up and suggested that each year the non-bargaining come up for a small percentage. Mr. Ryland replied that they stagger and are either a two (2) or a three (3) year contract. Mrs. Harley stated she has worked for union and non-union companies and this was done automatic so they get the same, or a standard annual increase of a certain percentage so at least you got a percentage every year. Mr. Bergstrom cautioned doing this automatically. Mr. Pelot stated when you put something in place like this; it gives the unions a tool for bargaining for the next round and ground zero will be right there.

Accept County Amounts & Rates

Mr. Nicolard stated this is something we do every year and turned the discussions over to Mrs. Starosta for the details. Mrs. Starosta stated that we do this annually and the County asks us to accept their amounts and rates for next year. The Fiscal Office needs this back by November 8, 2013. Mr. Nicolard moved to place this on Councils next agenda, with emergency language and waiving the second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Roll Call: Yeas: Nicolard, Pelot, McGlone, Whipkey, Mowery, Conklin, Bergstrom
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Amend Section 234.08 Law Enforcement Trust Fund:

Mr. Mowery turned this discussion over to Mrs. Starosta for the details. Mrs. Starosta explained the fact that this deals with uses of the Law Enforcement Trust Fund and has restrictions by ORC and Council. Mrs. Starosta asked that we amend the uses to follow ORC which has been updated. We last addressed this in 1989. Mr. Nicolard moved to add this to Councils next agenda, with emergency language and waiving the second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Conklin. Ms. Whipkey asked again for clarification as to why we need this other than to follow ORC and Mrs. Starosta explained item #5 they could use the funds for other uses such as materials and training without having to come back to Council for authorization. Mrs. Starosta stated she believed their intention is to purchase a vehicle. Mrs. Starosta explained that items 1-3 would allow them to use funds for the DARE program, as in ORC. Just the second part of item 3 has been updated, it expands it for them to use funds for things like meth labs, training, equipment, etc. Ms. Whipkey discussed the Charter requirement of \$15,000.00 or more and asked if they could spend that much without coming to us and Mrs. Starosta replied yes, if it met the current requirements. Mrs. Starosta stated if it is a contract in excess of \$15,000.00 it still has to come to Council. Mr. Ryland gave an example of there could be something like an ongoing investigation and that cost is \$17,000.00 they could spend it, nothing else is required. Ms. Whipkey discussed ORC 3745.13 and chemical spills and involving the EPA, the uses for drug laboratories, and asked if someone was illegally dumping their septic out onto the yard, would this be something it could be used for and Mr. Ryland replied no, this would be considered an EPA hazardous waste regulation and shifts over to the Fire Department. This happened with the last flooding we had a spillage and the Fire Dept and EPA were involved and the billing was taken back to the business facility.

Roll Call: Yeas: Nicolard, Conklin, McGlone, Whipkey, Pelot, Mowery, Bergstrom
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

ODOT Consent Legislation:

Mr. Bergstrom explained this is necessary for the routine maintenance along our highways and clarified this is for one piece of consent legislation for I-76. Mr. Ryland

concurrent this is for ongoing maintenance, mowing, striping, etc. Mr. Bergstrom moved to add this to Councils next agenda, with emergency language and waiving second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Conklin. Mr. Bergstrom asked if the issue of trading off on the responsibility issue has ever been addressed and Mr. Ryland replied, no it is an ongoing discussion.

Roll Call: Yeas: Bergstrom, Conklin, McGlone, Whipkey, Pelot, Mowery, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Appoint Council Representative for EPA Negotiations

Mr. Mowery stated the most likely candidate would be someone that is At-Large since they would be here longer on Council to address this. Mr. Nicolard nominated McGlone, and Mr. Mowery nominated Ms. Whipkey. Ms. Whipkey stated that she had asked Mr. Kostoff if two (2) attending as elected officials, and there was discussion about the Sunshine Laws and Ms. Whipkey stated this is not an actual committee. Mrs. Richards indicated she also understood that two (2) were permitted but more than this would be a problem. There was also discussion that Mr. McGlone and Ms. Whipkey are not on any other Committees of Council other than the Mine Committee which is an inactive Committee. Mr. Bergstrom stated he was fine with it, and that the purpose is to go there and listen. It was decided to have Mr. McGlone and Ms. Whipkey as the representatives and Mrs. Richards indicated she would concur with Mr. Kostoff. If there is a problem with this, it could be re-addressed on Tuesday.

Mandatory Contributions Fire & Police Pension Funds

Mr. Mowery turned this discussion over to Mrs. Starosta for the details. Mrs. Starosta explained that we currently have legislation showing what the contribution rate is and the Ohio Police & Fire Pension has asked for an update with the new rate they adopted. It's listed in sections 1-3 of each piece of legislation presented. Ms. Whipkey clarified that the City holds no responsibility with this and Mrs. Starosta concurred, other than we collect the funds from the employee payroll and submit it to the pension fund. Mr. Mowery moved to place Ord #71-2013 on Councils next agenda with emergency language and waiving the second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Roll Call: Yeas: Mowery, Pelot, McGlone, Whipkey, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Mowery moved to place Res #70-2013 on Councils next agenda, seconded by Mr. Pelot, waiving second and third readings and with emergency language.

Roll Call: Yeas: Mowery, Pelot, McGlone, Whipkey, Conklin, Bergstrom, Nicolard
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Sewer Benefits Per Parcel Discussion

Mr. Conklin stated this topic of discussion was requested by Ms. Whipkey and turned the discussion over to her for the details. Ms. Whipkey stated that she wants something presented by an ordinance or a resolution that anyone being assessed that have double assessments. She was told some of these residents may have a buildable lot so they are being charged twice, and she does not care how many lots they own. There are at least three families that are affected by the recent assessment notices. Ms. Whipkey discussed the letter everyone received from Ms. Scalise about combining your parcels. Ms. Whipkey stated she knew of one resident that had already done this however on this recent assessment listing he is being charged twice. Ms. Whipkey stated that she does not believe a person should have to go through the BZA or the Assessment Equalization Board to get this removed. If you have one (1) household and (1) hook up that is (1) benefit. The letter from the County implies that if your lots are combined this you would be perfectly fine but when she contacted the County via email, she did not have warm and fuzzy feelings about this whole process (see attached) Ms. Whipkey stated that she wants something put out there to the people that they will have only one assessment. If they later change the use of their land and decide to sell or build on that vacant lot, then that's different. Mayor Zita stated if this all comes back to the city, it all comes down the residents that live here paying for those additional costs. Ms. Whipkey stated that we are all going to be looking at this in the future. Ms. Whipkey stated the only ones it does not effect are the ones already in the allotments, it's on their bill and they agreed to it when they bought their homes. If we assess these residents like this there is no way they will be able to hang on to their property. This county letter does not tell them they are safe, and she wants something from this City in writing. Ms. Whipkey stated that when you bought your house with sewer and water already on it you were happy with that price and not to have the city come back later and tell them we are now going to add \$200-300 more a month in property taxes. Mr. Mowery stated he agreed, this leaves some residents up in the air on this. Mr. Bergstrom stated we should be able to put this into the legislation that if you sell or build on your lot, they you have to pay the City back. Mr. Bergstrom discussed the twenty (20) year plan and that we do have several large parcels, and we would need to look at these again and questioned if the study was based on buildable lots or not and Mr. Ryland replied it was done on buildable lots. Mr. Pelot asked what constitutes a buildable lot and Mr. Ryland replied its 100 ft of frontage. Mr. Ryland stated he owns one lot that is large and could be subdivided into three (3) lots and totally understands what Ms. Whipkey stated. Mr. Ryland suggested the payback to the City applies when that lot gets built on and that Agricultural Districts are treated in this same fashion, they are exempt until they sell or change use of their land. Mr. Ryland suggested having 2 pieces of legislation; one to address this for now and another one for how this is addressed later on. Mr. Pelot questioned how would you address an apartment complex, and Mr. Ryland replied that is a whole separate issue here and would require a rezoning. Mayor Zita clarified the letter came out from Summit County relates to taxes and is not in connection with the sewer project. Mayor Zita stated you would still have multiple deeds. Mr. Jack Gainer, 3920 Wadsworth Road, stated he is certain Mr. Ryland's comments are correct for the benefits. Mr. Gainer discussed the large lots owned by Mr. Seiberling and

others, and is not in favor of charging extra because of the 100 ft range. Mr. Gainer stated he knows of some who have parcels smaller than 100 ft and would not be assessed, so how could this be fair?. Mr. Gainer stated you should not be paying up front for a parcel that has no home on it, but in the future that property owner that owned the land at the time the sewer came in should be responsible, not the new owner of that parcel. Mr. Jim Lino, 5058 Grove Avenue, Norton, spoke about a situation where people live in between 2 roads, so do those residents get hit twice for the assessment? Mr. Nicolard clarified we are assessing only by parcel. Mr. Pelot stated it's by house address and where your front door sits. Mayor Zita stated in the past we have adjusted parcels like this. Mr. Bergstrom stated he did not have a problem with Ms. Whipkey's idea, however the costs change and was not clear how this all plays out. Mr. William Paluch 3740 Shellhart Road, Norton, stated there are a couple confusing issues here and one issue is their are multiple fees. Mr. Rodgers stated that it seems like you have lowered the assessments on these residents. The residents on Greenwich were assessed around \$11,800.00 and he questioned if everyone is paying the same assessment? Mr. Ryland clarified the tap in fees and inspection fees have not changed. The assessment figures can change by project. Mr. Paluch asked what is he getting for \$2,700.00 fees? Mr. Ryland stated this is a rate that's been set by Council many years ago and is considered an impact fee. Mr. Paluch stated that several meetings ago Mr. Ryland stated if we received grant money for Nash Heights we would not use this. Mr. Rick Rodgers, 4034 Wadsworth Road, stated Mr. Bergstrom brought up a good point about that study and was confident they used every parcel in the City, not by the number of households. If we don't use the parcels as indicated then the City could be liable for the remainder. Mr. Rodgers stated like he has said all along we need to slow this down. Its now coming up that the numbers are not working, they are not going to work. Ms. Whipkey asked to continue this for the next Work Session for further discussion. Mr. Bergstrom stated he would like to know with the changes for 3-4 parcels how the numbers would change. Ms. Whipkey discussed there are several that are listed as vacant and some are being charged up front for the full assessment. Mr. Bergstrom suggested looking at the data from the past. Mr. Ryland stated once you go past St. Rt. 21 the numbers can be staggering. Mr. Conklin asked Mr. Ryland to take a look at Phase II to see how many parcels we could be looking at for the next meeting. Mr. Ryland stated he is not making any promises.

Roof Repair-City Hall **Added to the Agenda**

Ms. Whipkey stated that Council has received new quotes because the insulation was not up to our code for building standards. Ms. Whipkey stated we have a quote from Wooster Roofing at \$36,550.00 and Premier Roof Systems at \$35,800.00 and the difference was a total of \$690.00. The latest company of Premiere has suggested a complete tear down and asked if the other companies suggested this as well and Mr. Ryland replied yes. Ms. Whipkey noted that Buxton Roofing did not respond this second time around and Mr. Ryland concurred. Mr. Ryland stated they are both providing the same services, one is from Norton and the other is in Wadsworth. Mr. Conklin asked if the weather plays a factor here and Mr. Ryland stated this is a big factor. Mr. Bergstrom asked about time frame involved, and Mr. Ryland replied about a weeks time with good weather. Mr. Nicolard and Mr. Bergstrom wanted Wooster Roofing Company Mr. Pelot stated if we are trying to save money here, he would rather go with the other company. Mr. Conklin

stated this only leaves a few weeks of good weather and with the snow in the Midwest, he has concerns. Mr. Ted Weinsheimer, 2951 Givens, Norton, Ohio, stated that we need to look at this roof ASAP and get it done, and it's never been in the Budget and it needs to be addressed. Mr. Rick Rodgers, agreed with Mr. Conklin's concerns with the weather, and asked if you are familiar with a term "spiking the contract" ? Ms. Whipkey stated we need to make the legislation dependant on whoever can do the job first. Mr. Nicolard stated that he cannot sell Wooster Roofing Company down the road over a \$600 difference. Ms. Whipkey asked if Wooster could get stated now and Mr. Ryland stated we have used them before and is confident they could start immediately. Ms. Whipkey moved to place this on Council's next agenda, waiving readings with emergency, for Wooster Roofing Company, seconded by Mr. Nicolard seconded. Mr. Ryland indicated that he would talk with Wooster Roofing Company tomorrow.

Roll Call Yeas: Whipkey, Nicolard, McGlone, Pelot, Mowery, Conklin, Bergstrom
 Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Unfinished Business:

None

New Business:

Mr. Mowery stated a resident on Rangely called and asked Mr. Mowery to ask for compassion on the sewer project, it will bankrupt him and destroy his livelihood and would not mention his name at this time. Mr. Mowery thanked those who called him and texted him regarding the loss of his brother in law. Mr. Mowery dispelled the rumors this weekend that he is withdrawing or pulling out of this election, this is not true he is running and has no intention of resigning. Ms. Whipkey asked about political signs on City owned property and asked about the signs along the rail road tracks on Cleveland-Massillion and other areas. Mr. Nicolard stated you are required to ask permission from the land owner and the land owner has the right to remove your sign.

Mayor Zita stated that the City has just locked in the Nat. Gas Aggregation rate of 4.776 for the residents for the 2013-2014 season.

Topics for the next Work Session:

Non Bargaining Salary Issues-Clerk of Court & Me Too Clause
Appoint Assessment Equalization Board Members

Public Comment-Agenda and Non Agenda Items:

Rick Rodgers, 4034 Wadsworth Road, Norton, Ohio, stated that Mr. Bergstrom had stated the negotiations with the EPA and the purpose was to listen, and that's wrong this is to negotiate not be dictated to by the EPA. Mr. Rodgers talked about trust in the City and thanked the personnel for information about a loan request. Mr. Rodgers discussed a response to former Mayor Koontz pertaining to his inquiry of sewers. Mr. Rodgers stated that Mr. Koontz was all behind the tax increase and was involved in contriving the issue

with the septic systems in Nash Heights. Mr. Rodgers stated that Mr. Koontz was here about a month or so ago was here peddling his wares to the City and is consulting and asked if this is true? Mr. Rodgers indicated he noticed there was a packet of information waiting for Mr. Koontz. Mayor Zita stated if that's the case, then Mr. Koontz requested public documents like any other resident. Mr. Rodgers asked if he paid for them and Mrs. Starosta replied yes, as is done with all records request. Mr. Rodgers indicated he would like a copy of that receipt. Mr. Rodgers stated we need to slow things down. The people representing Council on the EPA meetings need to go there and listen.

Mr. Ted Weinsheimer, 2951 Givens Drive, Norton, Ohio, thanked the City and members of the Administration for all of the support for the Cider Festival it was a great time and he was sorry for those that missed it. Mr. Weinsheimer offered his condolences to Mr. Mowery for the passing of his brother in law.

Adjourn

There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM.

Don Nicolard, 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.