



COMMITTEE WORK SESSION FEBRUARY 18, 2014

Committee Members Present: Scott Pelot
 Dennis McGlone
 Danny Grether
 Dennis Pierson
 Paul Tousley
 Charlotte Whipkey
 Rick Rodgers

Also Present: Mayor Mike Zita
 Valerie Wax Carr
 Laura Starosta
 Karla Richards
 Ann Campbell

The Committee Work Session convened on Tuesday, February 18, 2014 at 7:00 PM, in the Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Rick Rodgers, 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:

Replacement Vehicle Program for Police Cruisers

Mr. Rodgers indicated that this is for general discussion as he would like to have an ongoing cruiser replacement program and noted that Chief Hete was present. Mr. Rodgers also welcomed Mrs. Carr to her first day at City Hall. Mr. Rodgers discussed our current towing contract has a \$50.00 administrative towing fee on all vehicles towed for the Police Department, and understands we generate about \$10,000.00 annually. Chief Hete concurred that amount was correct. Mr. Rodgers indicated he would like to see at least this amount roll over to purchase a new vehicle. Mr. Pierson noted this issue is in his Committee and would like the Finance Directors input on why we are paying bills out of the general fund, when they have a budget. Mr. Pierson clarified that it wasn't about the money, it's about the budget and knowing where we are at. Mr. Pierson noted for each vehicle impounded collects a about \$15.00 per day and Chief Hete concurred and added that it was only vehicles that were impounded as a result of an arrest that were subject to the administrative towing fee and storage fees. Chief Hete stated since our legislation was in place, the goal was to assist in the Police Dep. Chief Hete noted we are constantly out there scouring for good used vehicles, and are mindful of the City's budget.

Mr. Pierson asked if we have ever looked at going along with other communities for buying all at once at discounted rates? Chief Hete replied that the problem is each agency is driving different vehicles and are replaced at different times. Ms. Whipkey stated what she understands is that we are going to take the \$50.00/\$15.00 and place this in a specific vehicle replacement fund, and Chief Hete concurred. Mr. McGlone asked when was the last new vehicle purchased and Chief Hete stated last year around November, and we also purchased a used one from the City of Hiram. Chief Hete also commented on how grateful we are to Fred Martin Motors that donate a vehicle about once a year and this year we just received a free pass for car washes on all cruisers. Mr. Pelot asked if we do use State min, bids for new vehicles and Chief Hete concurred it was within one hundred dollars or so, adding that upon investigating, the price we get from Fred Martin is about as good as we could do. Chief Hete indicated we do have one new vehicle to purchase in the budget this year and he would also be inquiring if they intend to donate one more this year. Mr. Rodgers noted this is a good start and we need to keep this momentum going forward. Mr. Pierson asked what is the average price for a new vehicle and Chief Hete replied about \$24,000.00. Mr. Pierson asked if he felt this was relatively low or high in prices and Chief Hete replied he believed we are right in line. Ms. Whipkey asked how much we expect to receive into this fund annually and Mrs. Starosta indicated she has worked on this with Mr. Rodgers and does not have that figure available tonight. Chief Hete stated he believed we had \$1,000 from January and had 3-4 vehicles impounded that would most likely go for trade-ins as they could not sell them outright. Mayor Zita reminded when we do this we take it from the General Fund to purchase new vehicles. Ms. Whipkey stated we do not want this money in the general fund floating around and wants this to be used for this specific purpose. Mr. Pierson stated Chief Hete's budget should have a line item and if we need to increase his budget then let's do so. Mrs. Starosta reminded Council the Police Dept budget comes entirely from the General Fund. Mrs. Starosta suggested if a separate fund is desired by Council, you could set it aside for all capital improvements; cars, body cameras, equipment, etc. Chief Hete noted in his budget he does have a line item for the new cruiser this year, and would like to be able to have something to use where he does not have to come back to Council to ask for use. Mr. Rodgers noted some communities have a mileage threshold when they get rotated out. Mr. Rodgers asked the Mayor, Chief Hete to get together and work on what is needed for legislation and bring it to Committee next meeting. Mr. Pierson asked if we get collections back from using the Attorney General collections to add to this, and Ms. Whipkey stated she would like to see those collections coming into the road program and other equipment. Mr. Pierson noted he would like to see some of this spread around to various departments for their needs.

Boards & Commission Appointments-Appreciations

Mr. Tousley explained that we have a request for several appointments to Boards & Commissions and Resolutions of appreciation for the various Boards. Mr. Tousley stated we have (1) new appointment and five (5) reappointments. Mr. Tousley stated it was requested for emergency language and only for the respect to those wishing to serve he would do so. Mr. Tousley stated he is not pleased with this and he had told the residents he would not be rushing things through. These appointments will be expiring in 2017 so he would hope the Administration would be more timely when those are ready.

Mr. Tousley moved to place all of thirteen (13) of these resolutions on Councils next agenda, waiving the second and third readings with emergency language, seconded by Ms. Whipkey.

Roll Call: Yeas: Tousley, Whipkey, Pelot, McGlone, Grether, Pierson, Rodgers
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0. Ms. Whipkey clarified Mr. Tousley's comments that Council does not appreciate the request to move so quickly on this. However, we do have a Charter amendment that eliminated term limits and these terms begin on March 1, 2014. If we do not go along with this they will not have a quorum for their first meetings, so this is why we are doing this and it will not have a major impact. Mr. Pierson stated he has an issue putting his name on appointed representatives that he does not even know, they should be present to introduce themselves, and questioned one candidate overall. However he would go along with this under protest. Mayor Zita stated five (5) of the candidates terms ended on Thursday, which is why his memo was dated for Thursday. Mayor Zita added that those that did come forward were about that same time, however he still has a few more appointments pending confirmation and will bring those later to Council. Ms. Whipkey stated that none of these people are totally new, they have served before. Mr. Pierson stated that still does not preclude them from being present to ask any questions Council might have. Ms. Whipkey noted she does not recall this being necessary in the past as the questions were generally generated privately, and they are basically locked in with the Charter as it stands now. Mr. Pierson indicated he might be looking into changing that Charter section in the near future.

AFSCME Clerical Union Tentative Contract

Mr. Tousley explained this was to approve the tentative contract and moved to place this on Councils next agenda, seconded by Mr. Pierson. Mrs. Richards asked for clarification on emergency language and Mr. Markey noted it is requested by labor negotiations so there is no chance of a referendum. Mr. Tousley and Mr. Pierson modified their motions to reflect this clarification on emergency language and adding the emergency language.

Roll Call: Yeas: Tousley, Pierson, Pelot, McGlone, Grether, Whipkey, Rodgers
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Pelot pointed out that discussion should be before the motion and vote so if anything needed changed or tweaked it could be discussed before moving forward. Mr. McGlone agreed and asked for clarification on what exactly we are voting on here, what are the percentages, and the details of the contract? Mr. Tousley turned this over to Mayor Zita for the details. Mayor Zita noted it's a two year contract retroactive to January with 1% increase for 2014, noting the recipients, and 1.25% for 2015. The probationary wages are one dollar less. Ms. Starosta commented that the safety division secretaries/secretary position had an adjustment in excess to the 1% and 1.25% increases as a market rate adjustment.

Ms. Whipkey asked about the assistant Clerk of Council and asked if this relates to all Secretaries in the office now. Ms. Whipkey noted we do not currently have a replacement for a Dep. Clerk of Council and questioned if these Secretaries could fill that position if needed for Dep. Clerk of Council and Mrs. Starosta indicated she was not sure and would get back to Council on that.

Legal Defenders Agreement for 2014

Mr. Rodgers indicated this was necessary for any indigent defendants in Mayor's Court Mr. Rodgers moved to place this on Councils next agenda with emergency language as it is dated the first of the year and needed passed as soon as possible to cover those individuals, seconded by Mr. Grether. Ms. Whipkey asked if we are waiving second and third readings and the motions were restated.

Roll Call: Yeas: Rodgers, Grether, Pelot, McGlone, Pierson, Tousley, Whipkey
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Contract for Jefferies Towing

Mr. Rodgers indicated he wanted to discuss the issues relating to city owned vehicles. We have a current contract in place since 2011. Mr. Rodgers indicated he felt we may be taking advantage of the contractor as he had agreed to tow all city vehicles at no charge. The contractor indicated he would have to charge for larger (over 1 ton vehicles) and there was a verbal agreement with him and Mr. Ryland that he would be paid. There have been issues with getting paid for two dump trucks he had towed and at this time Mr. Osborn has indicated he would not tow the larger trucks for free. Mr. Rodgers indicated this needs to be clarified and he understands there is a contract. Mr. Rodgers stated this is a Norton business and he has 5 employees paying into payroll taxes. Mr. Rodgers asked the Administration to please review this contract and report back to Council to make it more fair to the business. Mr. Pelot asked what dump trucks were towed and Mr. Rodgers indicated it was the city's dump truck. Ms. Whipkey stated she believed the ability of the company to tow the larger trucks was part of the reason the City entered into the contract as the prior towing contactor was not able to provide this service. Ms. Whipkey stated she had an issue with the statement that the business was developed in Norton as he moved here and was an established business before coming into Norton. Ms. Whipkey reiterated the owner signed the contract stating he would tow all City vehicles for free and inquired as to whether Mr. Rodgers was wanting the City pay for the past tows. Mr. Rodgers stated absolutely and it goes beyond that as the company has not been paid for the impounded tows, which was not a part of the contract and should have been paid. Mrs. Carr stated she would like to have a bit more history on this issue such as bids, exchanges for free towing, etc. and she would like time to review for more details. Mrs. Carr indicated that it is common that a towing contract with the police that the towing is for free and some cities have had a fee involved for the larger vehicles. Mrs. Carr also expressed concerns with an expiration date and Ms. Whipkey noted it renews yearly each November and would have just renewed unless one of entities wanted out.

Mr. Pierson stated he was confused why our Police Chief was refusing payment attached to our maintenance department's cost as opposed to the Service Department handling not paying for these towing services. Mr. Rodgers stated he understands Chief Hete presented the billing statements to the company and said the City would not pay them. Mr. Rodgers added he had a copy of the bills and they were dated from April of 2013. Mr. Grether inquired on the company re-contracting with the City with the payment matter still hanging out there. There was discussion on the terms of an automatic renewal or if this was a contract roll over. Mr. Grether asked if this contractor has come into City hall with this issue and Mayor Zita replied not that he was aware of. Mrs. Carr noted she was surprised this was an issue when he just renewed in November. Mrs. Carr asked if Council President would at least call her on this matter and any others like this to her first before bringing to Council floor in the future. Mr. Rodgers agreed, but in this case he had gone to the Mayor and Mrs. Starosta about the issue before Mrs. Carr came on board and that he was going to the floor with it for discussion. Mr. Grether objected to this process and felt it was not right to throw Chief Here under the bus with no investigation and this should have gone to Committee and/or the Administration for discussion. Mrs. Starosta stated she was not aware these issues were outstanding and thought only a change in the contract was to be discussed to haul the larger trucks. Mrs. Starosta asked about the statements and Mr. Rodgers stated he received these invoices unpaid from the contractor. Mayor Zita concurred that he did not understand there were outstanding bills. Mr. Rodgers stated he had informed them of the billings during the discussion held with them and apologized for seemingly throwing Chief Hete under the bus and that was not his intent. Mr. Grether stated if there are any outstanding debts he was not sure if the Chief should have a role in that matter and he hopes the Administration should get this under control, and was confident Mrs. Carr would get this under control.

Storm Water Services –Summit County

Mr. McGlone discussed the recent information Council received from Summit County Public Health relating to our concerns with their contract. This all started from last November and the vote failed 4-3 on January 27th. We were going to look at using private companies and Mr. Rodgers indicated to him that is really not an option at this point and would need to look at the Summit County contract again. Mr. McGlone noted we all received a follow up email from Mr. Pruett on Mr. Tousley's questions and asked if he was okay with the response. Mr. Tousley stated he had not received it till late and it appeared there were assurances, but he also stated the County was not willing to make any changes. Mr. McGlone moved to place Ord. #115-2013 on Councils next agenda under Reconsideration or Prior Legislation as an emergency as we are working without a contract, seconded by Mr. Pelot. Mr. Markey stated the prevailing vote and Mr. Rodgers moved to place this on Councils agenda, seconded by Mr. Pierson.

Roll Call: Yeas: Rodgers, Pierson, Pelot, Grether, Tousley
Nays: Whipkey

Motion passed 5-1. Ms. Whipkey asked about rights to the property owner on page #2 for getting access to the property and the County could pursue legal action to gain access and Mr. Markey stated that would be correct.

Ms. Whipkey stated she is against the contract due to the costs involved. The County stated the previous costs for Norton were \$30 and \$25 as a total cost we were always paying \$55.00 when every other community was paying \$20.00 per test for a total of \$40 and this is a large increase and we should negotiate a better deal as they had stated it was negotiable. They were making money from us versus other communities. Mrs. Carr stated we can go back to the County and find what they are charging all communities. Mrs. Carr stated it's an option to look at their fee schedule but it's always good to befriend those people as it can help us in the long run. Ms. Whipkey clarified that with the new contract we would be paying the same rates as the other communities. Mayor Zita stated this may have been because we did not have a full years contract. Mr. McGlone asked if this enough time for addressing this by next week and Mrs. Carr replied yes, she is more concerned with not having a contract in place and there are consequences for such and they do not fool around with these types of things.

Shellhart Waterline Petition

Mr. McGlone refreshed this issue and the proposed costs of \$11,000.00 and if the city picks up a little more of the intersection costs of \$15,200.00 it could be adjusted to \$9,480.00 Mr. Pelot stated he came to City hall and looked at the engineering plans and that this is a proposed water line of about 550 total feet figured at roughly \$240-\$250 a linear foot. Mr. Pelot noted that in 2008 the Greenridge and Gardner waterlines were assessed roughly \$3,000 per home even with the 50% grant money used on the 2008 project that is still a large jump. Mr. Pelot noted other residents are also interested along Greenridge and perhaps the overall costs could be lowered if they were added into the project. Mr. Rodgers asked about the cost of the grant if it wasn't a replacement project, and Mrs. Starosta noted this project did have a business district and that may have impacted the costs overall due to a different assessment formula for businesses as opposed to one residential unit. Mr. Pierson asked if the engineering information had a hard cost per foot and Mr. Pelot noted no, he and Mr. Arters looked on the GIS mapping and came up with the total of 550 feet. Ms. Whipkey asked if parts of Shellhart would be included on the expanded list of residents. Mr. Pelot stated he noted there would be no grants out there for this new waterline and Mayor Zita concurred. Mr. Pelot asked about the costs of fire hydrants and Mrs. Starosta replied those costs are generally included in the assessments but the City can choose to participate and pick those up. Mr. Pierson asked if any of the costs of the fire hydrants were included in the \$15,000 reduction discussed earlier and Mrs. Starosta replied no, only the intersection costs. Mrs. Starosta indicated she did not know the cost of a fire hydrant at this time. Ms. Whipkey asked about an expansion about a second petition if there was interest and Mr. Pelot indicated if these residents were comfortable with revised figures for Shellhart he would take the format of the first petition by Mrs. Buzelli and go out to get signatures. Ms. Whipkey asked how we can give the residents a better cost if we do not know if the additional interest is still there with the other residents, shouldn't the petition be done first as they are not bound to go forward. Mr. Pelot stated he was hoping the engineer was being conservative on his initial assessment. Ms. Whipkey explained that her problem is we do have a procedure of petitioning and getting a cost as opposed to circumventing the process and giving them a cost first.

Mr. Rodgers indicated we need to ask our Engineer to concur with Environmental Design Group on better figures with greater numbers, for all involved. Mr. Pierson stated we also need to make the residents aware there will be other costs to consider such as connection costs, tap in fees-permits, etc. Mr. Pelot stated he did explain to the second round of interested residents he spoke with there could be additional costs close to \$4,000.00. Mr. Rodgers stated our city and the City of Barberton need to look at our tap in fee structures and do what we can to reduce them. Ms. Whipkey asked Mr. Markey for any enlightenment. Mr. Markey stated the City could choose to do this project on its own initiative and assess for the engineering fees and costs of the improvement Ms. Whipkey stated she would much rather see the petition done saying the people wanted it and get a cost and the people have a voice. Mr. Pelot stated to his knowledge the City is not pushing for this it's the residents that came to him because he lives in this area and was concerned. His concerns were if the other residents could somehow join the residents from the first petition round, and if we could reduce the costs for all of the residents that would be beneficial, by making it bigger. Ms. Whipkey stated she does not want to get into the position of a legal suit later because we did this a little off of the procedure and no one would be forced into it as other areas in the past. Mr. Pierson suggested having a town hall meeting to discuss in detail with all of the residents, then if you have a grand majority to at least move forward or not. That has been the problem we have had in the past, we don't involve them and then we tell them its happening and they have to pay for it. Mr. Pelot agreed, but we need better figures to share with them. Mr. Pierson suggested contacting local well drillers and find out how deep it needs to go to drill new wells and that is a cost to compare with going to city water. Mr. Pelot asked Mrs. Buzelli if she has a cost for a new well, and Mrs. Buzelli stated she has spoken with Pugh Well drilling for about 10 months and we were told his figure was approximately \$8,000.00 to \$9,000.00. Mr. Rodgers asked about the depth and Mrs. Buzelli stated her current well was 172 feet and the casing has a leak so acid and iron is contaminating the well. Once this has occurred we need to drill a new well and line it with PVC piping. Mrs. Buzelli stated that is what started the petition process. This was accepted by the City and we are waiting for that certified letter telling us what the estimated cost would be and that's where we are now. We are grateful that Council did not like the cost is considering ways to decrease the costs. She would have petitioned the other streets if she had known, but it seems we are at a stalemate. Mrs. Buzelli stated she appreciates that Council is trying to make the best decisions possible and be fair to everyone. Mrs. Buzelli stated at this point she really doesn't know what to tell her neighbors as she feels she has an obligation to let them know what the next step is and where we are; she would like something concrete to take back to them and where we are. Mr. Rodgers indicated we are trying to find a way to get this cost down to a lower number. Mrs. Buzelli asked for a time frame and Mr. Rodgers stated right now our first priority is to get with engineering for better costs. Mrs. Buzelli asked if she would be correct to state the next step is to explore expanding the project for lower costs and Mr. Rodgers replied yes. Mrs. Buzelli asked if a second petition would be circulated. Mr. Grether stated as Ward 2 Councilman he has spoken with many residents and he has expressed his opinion on how this should move forward and he believes Ms. Whipkey agrees with him that the procedures should be followed. He believes the next step is to send certified letters to the residents.

If we do not have enough supporting that then we can look at combining the project, if we had followed the procedures this may have been off our agenda three weeks ago. Mr. Pelot disagreed, if there is a flaw in the system we need to address it, and be responsible for the residents. Mr. Pelot we could have sent the letters out and said take it or leave it, but that is not our job; our job is to do our best to get the best prices. Ms. Whipkey asked so we are looking at a larger project to reduce prices, so are we going to look at the total area or just what is going to be added to the original area. Mr. Grether clarified that he never felt the \$11,000.00 was a correct figure, but that is the dollar that came back and to follow the process is the next step. This is a petitioned project and if they want to go out and get more residents involved they can do that. Mr. Grether noted that Mr. Pelot could be a beneficiary to this proposed project. Mr. Grether noted we do not have the answers and if we close this loop in the process then this could move the project quicker and fix the whole issue. Mr. Rodgers stated we need to ask the engineers point blank if these projects are combined would the costs come down, then we can go on with the petition process. Mayor Zita clarified the reason the process has not moved forward is he had asked Environmental Design if there was something we could do to reduce the estimate of \$11,000.00 and that is where the intersection costs and corner lot came up, which is why he came to Council first before sending out those certified letters. Mr. Grether asked if we were looking to pick up the intersections or not, have we even decided that and Mayor Zita replied no it would set a kind of precedent. Mr. Rodgers suggested at Mr. Grether's suggestion Administration go forward with the certified letters now before any more talk about combining petitions we get an answer if more would be less. Mr. Pierson mentioned a meeting last week with Environmental Design about the Old Stone Jail project and from what he learned and compared with initial information, those costs don't jive and we need to look at this further. Mr. Grether stated he proposed the city picking up more of the intersection costs as these folks do pay into the water sewer fund which would be closer to reducing their costs to \$9480.00. Mrs. Karen Harley, 3432 Harper Avenue, Norton, asked how much would it cost to take a total count of the liner feet and the cost for putting in a water line, other than actually laying the pipe? Mrs. Harley stated it always seems to be the more you buy the cheaper the price, and you still don't have to tie in as you do with sewer. How much more could it cost to get a proposal for the whole entire area, whether its 100 homes, maybe then it would be down to possibly \$5,000.00 Mrs. Harley stated she still believes you do not have to tie into a waterline until you want to, which was confirmed by Council and Mr. Markey. Mr. Grether stated so now you are going from a citizens petition to a city driven project and that is not the intent. Mrs. Harley stated she understands that but at least you would have a proposal for the costs and then they could say if they were okay with starting a petition. Mr. Grether asked Mrs. Harley if she was okay with using her tax dollars. Mrs. Harley stated yes if it would solve a problem like that; she grooms for people in the Fair Oaks area and she knows they have terrible water. If it will get rid of that, she does not have a problem with it because her city taxes are not just to help her, it is to help everybody and she pays her taxes for everything in this city and for all of the residents.

Ms. Whipkey stated she understands what Mrs. Harley is saying, but the issue here is we are setting a precedent here that if you want something done instead of you doing a petition drive saying you want it we will go out see what it will cost you first, then if you decide the price is right you will do a petition and if you don't you won't do the petition. Ms. Whipkey added that is circumventing the way it was designed to be. Mayor Zita stated if we go out and ask them to design the entire Norton Acres and get a price of \$5,000 and then we decide on the three streets where the line is going to be put on, the price for the whole allotment is not going to be the same price that the three streets would be. He is not sure if we are comparing apples to apples here. Mr. Grether stated as Ms. Whipkey indicated we have a system in place and we need to follow it. Mr. Grether then asked for the Law Director's input. Mr. Markey stated you have already defined the issue here and you would be setting precedence by not following the procedure and although not a legal binding precedence it would create complaints in the future for making exceptions for one group and not another. Ms. Whipkey stated she found it interesting that Engineering Design Group has taken it upon themselves to expand the Old Stone Jail project but why didn't they do the same with this area and save all this. Mr. Pierson stated they are selling their services and it could make them more money if they would give us a proposal to give us an idea perhaps we could circumvent the system. He understands there is a process and perhaps we should follow it and send the letters out, at least we could have a baseline and then maybe we could do more later after that point. Mr. Rodgers stated we have the ability to work on the costs for the citizens and Mrs. Buzelli urged the City not to send out those letters until you have better figures, as it could result in scaring people away. Mr. Grether addressed Mrs. Carr stating we have a system in place, we have our letters ready to go out and even if we spend the next six weeks asking for a lower cost, and even if Mr. White gives us a lower number tomorrow could we even use his numbers out after a proposal has been given by an engineering firm. Mrs. Carr stated there is a procedure; it is a common procedure used throughout Ohio in terms of public petitions and that needs to be followed, it's unfortunate that we are in the middle here and now there is an opportunity for decreased cost. Mrs. Carr indicated a rough estimate could be done, but you would not want to do a formal design as there would be a cost. Mrs. Carr suggested if Mrs. Buzelli was concerned with scaring people away that she could kill the project, but if people really need water you could go through the procedure, let it be voted down and then start over. It seems more communication is needed and let the citizens know they do have some responsibility with petitions for projects. Mrs. Carr stated that doing water projects a block at a time is not always the best, and by doing a broader project will lower the costs. Mrs. Carr indicated we do need to follow procedure here. Mr. Jack Gainer stated he does not see what the problem is here, you have 60% of these residents that want to move forward with water. Mr. Gainer stated he does not see why Mr. Pelot or anyone else on Council cannot go looking for more residents. Mr. Gainer stated if you take a second petition around you could certainly get more to join in and explain as it stands it's estimated at \$11,000.00 unless more want in on it. Mr. Pelot clarified that he does not want the water, he could care less about the water, he is just doing it because he lives there. The engineer could reduce it because xxx amount of homes could be involved and could be reduced from \$11,000.00 down to \$9,200.00.

Mr. Rodgers indicated the city needs to send those letters out as it does not mean that is the final deal and we will continue to pursue other avenues for cost. Ms. Whipkey asked hypothetically if she lived in this area could she go out tomorrow and start a second petition for expanding the project and could these same people sign it again? Mr. Markey stated so you are saying you do not want the process to be abused, people just continually submitting petitions? Mr. Markey added he believed the City could choose to not accept it since the first petition is not formally closed. Ms. Whipkey asked when he says the City, doesn't he mean the Council and Mr. Markey concurred. Mr. Pierson asked if we weren't duty bound by law to do an engineering study and Mr. Markey replied he would have to look at our procedures and see how it is laid out. Mr. Pierson stated he hated to drop this other \$7,500. Mr. Markey explained it was like a Charter change, people can continue to submit things; we may not like it but not a lot you can do to stop them. Ms. Whipkey as long as they got 60% of the properties, it would still be something we would have to consider; she was wondering if there would be any legalities that would stop that scenario. Mr. Markey said we could assess the cost of the engineering studies and that would stop them, he believed. Mr. Rodgers asked if we were getting that letter out now and Mayor Zita said they could get them out tomorrow if Council chooses.

Proposed Charter Amendments

Charter Section 4.02-Qualifications (Administrative Officer)

Mr. Tousley noted there are drafted proposals for 4.02, 5.03, and 5.09 from Council for discussion. Mr. Tousley deferred this discussion over to Ms. Whipkey for the details. Ms. Whipkey explained the change to strike the reference that requires the candidate to move into the City within six (6) months. This would remove that requirement and the Supreme Court has recently ruled on that. The change would also allow us to broaden the pool of people eligible for hiring. Ms. Whipkey moved to place this on Council's next agenda, seconded by Mr. Rodgers. Ms. Richards noted that in order to have any of these proposals on the May Primary ballot the legislation must be adopted and filed at the Summit County Board of Elections by March 7, 2014 at 4:00 PM. Ms. Whipkey and Mr. Rodgers modified their original motions to include the emergency language. Ms. Whipkey stated that she was not in favor of waiving the readings, and would rather see Special Meetings take place to address this. We could always waive the readings next week. Mr. Grether and Mr. McGlone stated there is no reason not to waive the readings, if approved it's going to the voters to decide. Mrs. Carr stated whether it is her or anyone else interested in this position, this is unconstitutional and by leaving this in your Charter you are opening up to legal challenges and has been challenged in the past with all rulings saying it was unconstitutional.

Roll Call: Yeas: Whipkey, Rodgers, Pelot, McGlone, Grether, Pierson, Tousley
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0

Charter Section 5.03 (A) Board of Control-Composition & Duties

Ms. Whipkey discussed the details and the last time we dealt with the Board of Control by initiative petition the bidding requirement was removed and that is being addressed.

We are also looking at the composition of the Board as it currently consists of the Mayor, President and Vice President of Council, City Administrator, and the Finance Director. This proposal removes the non-elected officials from the board, as voting members, and puts the Council Finance Committee in their place with the City Administrator and Finance Director present as consultants. Ms. Whipkey then explained the changes to Section B requiring competitive bidding at \$15,000 added and anything from \$10,000 to \$15,000 requiring Board of Control approval and a majority vote of Council approval. Currently Norton has to follow State code for competitive bidding which is \$50,000. The changes would result in Council being more aware and responsible of the finances and increase transparency. Ms. Whipkey moved to place this on Council's next agenda, with emergency language, seconded by Pierson. There was discussion about the makeup of the members and Mr. Grether asked for clarification on what is stricken and what is new in bold. Mr. Markey noted in the past the ballot language will list the new language. The legislation may show such changes but the final ballot language will not. Mr. Grether stated he understood the intent, but expressed his concerns with Mrs. Starosta's qualifications and degrees and this is her function to advise the Council on all financial matters and who on Council has that expertise on such matters? Mr. Pierson pointed out that the officers would be there in a consulting position so they would have input. Mayor Zita stated this is not how the Board of control has been established to go through the Board of control and then to Council, this allows an issue to get stopped at Council. Mr. Pierson stated this was all brought about because of the misspending and abuse that has occurred in the past. Mr. Markey stated by having the Board of control in the State and in most other communities this was designed as a secondary Administrative control measure before going to Council; here, you would have the Board of Control essentially controlled by Council and then coming to Council to be voted on again. Mr. Market suggested keeping the approval language in but it was a little too much for Council approving it twice and thought the composition should remain the same as it would still have the same oversight protection, although Council could submit what they desired. Mr. Pelot stated the meetings are public now; there are two (2) balances of powers here, and you should have a balance of powers and our Constitution addresses that; you cannot have one body being the controlling body over it. Mr. Rodgers asked where does the Constitution state that and Mr. Pelot clarified he meant to say that it was our forefathers. Mr. Rodgers stated in all higher forms of governments it's the elected members of the Ways and Means Committees and that is our concern as stewards of the people's money; this all arose from past practices and it is a legitimate concern. Mrs. Carr stated the first question she had when accepting this position was that she does not understand your composition of the Board of Control and today this proposal makes it even stricter. Effectively you are voting with something twice with this proposed changes and that is inefficient in terms of government; and two, you are changing the balance in the checks and balance purpose as administration puts forth expenditures and you have the right to reject it.

Charter Section 5.03 (B) Board of Control-Approval of Contracts & Expenditures

Whipkey discussed the details of \$15,000.00 for competitive bidding being added.

Ms. Whipkey explained the changes to Section B requiring competitive bidding at \$15,000 added and anything from \$10,000 to \$15,000 requiring Board of Control approval and a majority vote of Council approval. Currently Norton has to follow State code for competitive bidding which is \$50,000. Mr. Grether asked for clarification on what is stricken and what is new in bold. Mr. Markey noted in the past the ballot language will list the new language. The legislation may show such changes but the final ballot language will not. Mr. Grether stated he understood the intent, but expressed his concerns with Mrs. Starosta's qualifications and degrees and this is her function to advise the Council on all financial matters and who on Council has that expertise on such matters? Mr. Pierson pointed out that the officers would be there in a consulting position so they would have input. Mayor Zita stated this is not how the BOC has been established to go through the Board of control and then to Council, this allows an issue to get stopped at Council. Mr. Pierson stated this was all brought about because of the misspending and abuse that has occurred in the past. Mr. Markey stated by having the Board of Control in the State and in most other communities this was designed as a secondary Administrative control measure before going to Council; here, you would have the Board of Control essentially controlled by Council and then coming to Council to be voted on again. Mr. Market suggested keeping the approval language in but it was a little too much for Council approving it twice and thought the composition should remain the same as it would still have the same oversight protection, although Council could submit what they desired. Mr. Pelot stated the meetings are public now; there are two (2) balances of powers here, and you should have a balance of powers and our Constitution addresses that; you cannot have one body being the controlling body over it. Mr. Rodgers asked where does the Constitution state that and Mr. Pelot clarified he meant to say that it was our forefathers. Mr. Rodgers stated in all higher forms of governments it's the elected members of the Ways and Means Committees and that is our concern as stewards of the peoples' money; this all arose from past practices and it is a legitimate concern. Mrs. Carr stated the first question she had when accepting this position was that she does not understand your composition of the Board of Control and today this proposal makes it even stricter. Effectively you are voting with something twice with this proposed changes and that is inefficient in terms of government; and two, you are changing the balance in the checks and balance purpose as administration puts forth expenditures and you have the right to reject it. Mrs. Carr stated that with the lowering of the figure to \$15,000.00 it may end up costing you more money by forcing something to go to bid, advertising, etc. The \$50,000.00 is quite common in most communities and for her and Mrs. Starosta not having voting power really concerns her. Mr. Rodgers stated the reason of our mistrust and concern was brought about by past practices, and he is glad Mrs. Carr is here now and hopes these same issues can be prevented. Mrs. Carr indicated changes to your Charter are very serious and should not be done on a whim and hoped this is not the case. In the Falls we always used the \$50,000.00 level for bidding and anything over \$5,000.00 had to go through the Board of Control. Mr. Markey stated each city does it differently, but most cities track the ORC which is the \$50,000.000 level and with lower board of controls to limit spending. Mrs. Karen Harley, as a citizen she would vote no because that is putting all her eggs in one basket. She does not like the idea of you taking all of the responsibilities and making the final decision too. Doing away with the Board of Control is basically what you are doing, giving all of this to Council.

Ms. Whipkey discussed the competitive bidding in the past, and the last time this section was amended they left it out so we were at the \$50,000 level for a time and prior to that it was the \$15,000.00 figure due to the Charter stating we would be \$10,000 below the State recommendation and we would currently be at \$40,000 if we still had the clause. Ms. Whipkey noted she understood the reason for the way the Cuyahoga Falls did this as you have roughly 50,000.00 residents and more businesses; we are a much smaller community and we need to bid out more at a lower level as there has been unhappiness how proposals went out and came back. Mrs. Carr also discussed their rule of getting three specific bids or proposals, was that not followed here or is it not written? Ms. Whipkey stated that there were no rules, that she was aware of, for the number of proposals taken, we just put it out there and see what comes back. Mr. Rodgers indicated in the past it seems like inside information was shared with bidders and some were told to come back with better quotes. Mrs. Carr stated these issues are more managerial and can be controlled without a Charter change. Mr. Rodgers stated he had in mind of perhaps having a list of standing vendors that are notified for proposals and any coming back our opened at the same time. Ms. Whipkey stated we need this Charter change to put the competitive bidding back in because currently we are bound by State law and if the State raises it to \$100,000 next year, we will be bound to \$100,000. Ms. Whipkey stated that she would not change her mind and will argue to the bitter end for a competitive bidding limit be put in place. Ms. Whipkey pointed out the fact that the expenditures, not bidden out, could be changed as to the figures or those figures could go straight to Council. Mr. Rodgers suggested we table this and address it in the November election to get this right. Mr. Grether suggested maybe having 3 council members, and keep the three (3) in Administration. Mr. Markey stated he still does not see the need to change the composition of the BOC, and this is a double control. Ms. Whipkey stated it appears that what Mr. Markey is suggesting to leave 5.03A as is and just make the changes to the expenditures. Mr. Tousley stated he understands Mrs. Carr's concerns and that if you have any uneducated voters voting on this causes him real concerns that they will not see the old Charter versus the new Charter and it's critical the people are not being manipulated. Ms. Whipkey made a motion modified from the original motion, nothing in A will be changed only the proposed items in bold in Section 5.03B and Mr. Rodgers seconded. Mr. Pelot expressed his concerns with lowering this and the costs involved with legal advertising and God forbid if this is something we must act on quickly. Mr. Pelot felt this is more of a knee jerk reaction one way or another. Mr. Jack Gainer, 3920 Wadsworth Road, does not really have an opinion and clarified that anything over \$15,000 you have to go out for bid, and Ms. Whipkey concurred. Mr. Gainer asked what if you have an emergency waterline repair that is \$16,000.00 you are forced to go out for bid and how can you hold off on the repairs to that line for the public. Mr. Rodgers asked what if it's a \$100,000.00 emergency, is that ok to bypass? Ms. Whipkey stated these measure were in place until the last Charter amendment, we were bound to that \$15,000.00 and the reality is if there was an emergency we could immediately step in and do something on that. I do not believe anyone is going to hold gun to our heads if we had to move quickly to get the people out of trouble. Mr. Rodgers asked if we could use emergency language on this and Mr. Markey stated he believed ORC had an exception built in for emergencies not requiring competitive bidding, but if you want it directly in there by Councils determination of an emergency.

Ms. Whipkey moved to amend and adding 5.03 Competitive bidding, expenditures below competitive bidding, as well as language to allow Council/Administration to address an emergency situation and waive the competitive bidding with emergency language, seconded by Mr. Rodgers.

Roll Call: Yeas: Whipkey, Rodgers Pierson, Tousley
Nays: Pelot McGlone, Grether,

Motion passed 4-3.

Charter Section 5.09 Administrative Department Removals

Ms. Whipkey discussed the details and this adds language that the Administrative Officer, Solicitor, Directors of Finance, Public Safety, Public Service, Personnel, and Community Development, and the Municipal Engineer by the Mayor, but what we are proposing is also by a motion of 5 members of council could remove one of those positions. Ms. Whipkey moved to place this on Council's next agenda, with emergency language seconded by Mr. Pierson. Ms. Whipkey stated she has discussed this with Mr. Markey and the way it is written it seems to give Council the power to remove someone without a reason but the Mayor has to follow section 9.04. Council should also consider correcting that to follow the same for Council. This would actually bound Council to have the same specific reasons for removal as the Mayor does. Mr. Rodgers clarified the Mayor can remove only for those specific reasons and for cause. Mr. Markey stated the language needs to clarify that both the Mayor and Council must show cause. Mr. Rodgers indicated Council should be bound by the same cause and keep a balance allowing Council to act if the Mayor did not. Mr. Markey concurred. Mr. Pelot stated again you are taking away the checks and balances; if the Mayor is not doing his job then he should not be re-elected. Ms. Whipkey asked how by removing the Mayor how would a new Mayor fix the issue? Mr. Pelot stated if he knew why the Mayor is removed in the first place then he would not continue in that manner and would remove the individual. Mr. Rodgers stated this does create a good check and balance because if the Mayor is not doing what should be done it allows Council to do so. Ms. Whipkey stated it's a super majority of Council here and if it takes 5 votes to approve the appointment it also takes 5 votes of Council members to remove someone. Mr. Grether asked Mr. Markey how much liability is Council putting on themselves with this kind of power. Mr. Markey stated it is no more a liability than as it is currently with the Mayor with just cause. Mr. Rodgers clarified this is not to allow a witch hunt, this is about accountability to the citizens. Mr. Pierson stated that no one should be in a position for life. This would be an extremely serious matter and if someone is not performing, they should be removed with just cause. Mayor Zita stated one issue is the section of a hearing before Council. If Council were to terminate them, it is the Council that holds the hearing and puts the fox back in the hen house to make a decision. Mr. Rodgers stated he felt it would only confirm Council's decision or perhaps change the outcome. Mr. Pierson stated this could be a benefit and would cause Council to reconsider their original vote.

Roll Call: Yeas: Whipkey, Pierson, Tousley, Rodgers
Nays: Pelot, McGlone, Grether,

Motion passed 4-3

Council Room AV Upgrades

Ms. Whipkey indicated she has contacted Eric in our IT-Department and is waiting to hear back Eric has contacted someone else about the sound quality and they have examined the system. The software company has new software coming out that would improve what we have and we should be looking at those when available. Some minor adjustments could be done and she discussed looking to see what we can do with what we have to make some improvements before spending unnecessary dollars. Mr. McGlone stated he missed last meeting and has a newer computer with a very good operating system and he watched the meeting and the quality of audio was very good and the picture was not bad. Ms. Whipkey stated she also asked Eric about this and he indicated no matter what we were putting out if you do not have the capability of picking up at home, is the way she understood it.

2014 Road Program

Mr. Pelot discussed the road listing prepared by Mr. Ernie Reynolds-Supt. Of Service Department (see attached). Mr. Pelot indicated that in discussions with Mr. Rodgers and Mr. Dave White-Municipal Engineer on the total costs. Mrs. Starosta commented she has not compiled the exact numbers but roughly we have \$350,000.00 available and will be looking at other funding. Mr. Pelot stated it appears the City of Norton can still submit their request of roads to Summit County for joining in on their program for this year. Mr. Rodgers stated that the County needs our legislation earmarking the total dollar amount we have to spend as soon as possible like at the beginning of March, not the end. Mr. Rodgers stated Mr. White suggested the more we have, the more we can get for our dollar so taking this entire list and a total of \$475,000.00 and the more money we throw into the legislation the more roads we can do. Mrs. Starosta indicated in her discussions with Mr. Rodgers last week, he indicated taking the extra funds from Time Warner account and asked if Council would entertain a one time transfer for now to address the urgent need and later take time to work on details on splitting the costs later on. Mr. Rodgers moved to redirect \$100,000.00 from the Time Warner Fund into the 2014 Road Program to arrive at \$450,000.00 with emergency language and waive 2nd and 3rd readings and also increasing the 2014 Budget, seconded by Mr. Pelot. Ms. Whipkey asked if we had \$100,000 there available and Mrs. Starosta stated she would check the receipts and would communicate to the President if the funds were not available. Mr. Grether asked if there will be a replacement of that \$100,000.00 coming back to the TWF and Mrs. Starosta replied no. Mr. Tousley asked if there were any indications of the savings amount going with Summit County and Mr. McGlone stated he believed it was a big savings with Mr. Rodgers concurring according to the statements from Mr. White. Mr. Larry Perkins, asked if anyone has studied how a single trash hauler has affected the roads and whether we came out ahead or behind. Mayor Zita stated he was unaware of any such study.

Roll Call: Yeas: Rodgers, Pelot, McGlone, Grether, Pierson, Tousley, Whipkey,
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Service Department Staffing

Mr. Tousley stated that Mr. Rodgers has asked for this discussion and turned this over to him for the details. Mr. Rodgers stated when he visited the road department it was brought to his attention they need more staffing, they are over worked and doing a lot of work. Mr. Rodgers stated they are doing a good job with the snow plowing and cannot fault them here. Mr. Rodgers indicated in the past several years they man power has been diminished. Mrs. Carr asked about the time frame he was looking at because without being involved in their activity she needs time to look into this, maybe a restructuring is more in need, instead of hiring more staff. We need to see how we are operating first and this can open you up on being creative, and we need to look at all aspects and perhaps part time levels first. Mr. Rodgers asked Mrs. Carr, Mayor Zita and Mrs. Starosta to look into this.

Unfinished Business:

Mr. Grether noted the 3rd reading next week for the Wolf Creek Watershed and he has been hearing from a lot of residents and businesses owners. There are a lot of dollars being lost when businesses need to shut down due to the flooding. Mr. Grether noted the impact from Mr. Comunale and Fred Martin with the payroll taxes business brings in. Mr. Phil Canfora stated there are a lot of questions on the formation of such a district that are unanswered. Mr. Canfora stated the Ohio Revised Code Section 6101 was written back in 1913. Originally there were 54 Districts and now there currently about 20 remaining and they all had to follow the same code with the same questions we have today; he would like to see those answered also, but sometimes those questions cannot be answered. Mr. Canfora stated we either need to do this or not do this. Christopher Columbus had discussed the difficulties of discovering new land if you are afraid to go off shore and that is what we need to do here. Mr. Tousley stated he had a resident call him to ask if the City has ever contacted the Army Corp of Engineers about the flooding? Mayor Zita noted Mr. Dave White would know that answer. Mr. Rodgers stated he contacted the Chippewa District and he asked how it was working and it was a favorable response. One concern was taking private lands and most of our problem waters are running over private lands; Chippewa just had easements and did not take the property. He also made some calls to the Muskingam District thinking we could become a sub-district to that District and is hoping to get some feedback from them. Mr. Rodgers indicated Mayor Judge in Barberton wants to form a task force and there will be more information forthcoming. The resolution from us is for support and in both of the Copley and Barberton resolutions stipulate we all need to support this and has concerns if we back off or out this off now. Mr. Rodgers stated we need to take this first step of support and stay involved and stay in the loop. Mr. Rodgers stated he would like to see this move forward, and is concerned it could deplete someone's life savings due to the flooding. Mr. Pierson indicated he had listened to Mr. Rozelle's comments and seems there is a lot of he said, she said and he has asked Mr. Rodgers to secure a contract from Copley and Barberton for Mr. Markey to address. Mr. Grether mentioned his concerns as a former real estate agent and the percent of a mill and the clarification that it is per parcel not per benefit so if you own three you could be assessed three times. Ms. Whipkey stated this is all the more reason to combine your parcels.

Ms. Whipkey asked Mr. Markey one more time if we say yes today and find out later we don't like the numbers and we want out, will we actually be out? All she understood is that we have a right to file our objection in writing. Mr. Markey stated what Ms. Whipkey stated is correct, that decision is entirely up to the Court. Mr. Pierson stated that Mr. Rozelle had stated maybe you would be on that Board and maybe you would not, and Mr. Markey stated that is a possibility. Markey stated the Court will look at the overall district and the immediate areas to be addressed. Mr. Rodgers indicated the Copley Resolution states "Subject to approval and appropriations of funding by Barberton and Norton". Mr. Rodgers asked if we drafted something. Mrs. Richards reminded Council of the language in proposed Ord. #8-2014, Section 2 which states "*The City of Barberton, the Township of Copley and the City of Norton shall all participate in the petition process, review and approval of the initial filing of the petition of the City of Barberton, subject to approval and appropriation of funding by each of the City of Barberton, the Township of Copley and the City of Norton*". Mr. Markey stated that you either have the support of this Resolution or by a petition of 500 signatures. Mrs. Patricia Reese asked about the reference to parcel and if she owns a parcel with 20 ft of land and no house and another parcel with a home on it, would she be assessed twice? Ms. Whipkey clarified yes. Mrs. Reese asked if she combined her parcels into one number would she then and Mr. Markey stated if this is just an administrative combined parcel they may look at this as two parcels. Mrs. Reese stated to legally combine her land, then she has to pay a private surveyor and pay for the three sets of maps needed to file with the city and the County. Mr. Markey stated it will be the Board of Appraisers that will determine the process of assessment. Mr. Rodgers stated if we do not have a seat at the table going in from the beginning, then we will lose out. Mrs. Reese repeated her earlier concerns of paying over \$1,000.00 to combine all of her parcels and she is not the only one in this situation of multiple parcels. Mr. Rodgers asked how much flooding will the business be willing to sustain before the pull up and move out. Mr. Rodgers indicated Mayor Judge will form a committee with all 3 communities involved. We can actually hold a 4th or 5th reading to have the time for this committee to form. Mr. Rodgers stated this is in no way voting it down it just allows more time. June Maier, 1879 Caroline Road and also represents Barber Road flooding to the businesses owners. Mrs. Maier stated several years ago, Barberton, Copley and Norton were all given funding to dredge the creek, however she was not sure it was ever done. Mrs. Maier stated she believed the Army Corp of Engineers suggested dredging be done at Wolf Creek along Summit Road. Mr. Maier stated he has been here for this whole meeting and he was also involved in the meetings back in 1991 where this funding was handed out. Three people came to his house back then; Mr. Jones, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Crawford. Mr. Maier stated he had not committee to help him with this issue. Mr. Maier stated he attempted to leave that meeting and was held back, for whatever reason. Mr. Maier recounted the events of that evening, and cautioned Council to be careful when dealing with the government. Barberton and Copley got that money, but Norton did not. Do not get yourselves into a power struggle. Ms. Whipkey stated in 2012 we entered in to a mitigation contract with former Mayor Randy Hart where they were supposed to work on Wolf Creek and asked what happened with that? Mr. Markey stated those were the developers for the future Walmart project which is pending in the courts so he felt this is most likely put on hold.

Ms. Whipkey stated at the recent MAD meeting they discussed trying to do something to address the flooding and were at a standstill with it due to this movement going on. There was discussion of a member contacting the Army Corp of Engineers and look for avenues there. Ms. Whipkey stated although Mayor Judge intends to set up this task force, which is fine with her, she is more inclined to move forward with this if the three communities hash it out before proceeding to move forward with the water district move. Mr. Rick Maier stated he forgot to mention they wanted him to do something back then because there was no water on Caroline Avenue. In three days all of the sudden they had water. Mr. Gainer discussed the questions asked about the Army Corp of Engineers and as he understood there is nothing that can be started without their involvement and approval. This is something that without our cooperation this will never happen and we will continue to have this flooding. Mr. Grether stated he felt he and Mr. Gainer are not affected by flooding but cannot afford to turn our backs on the other residents/businesses. Mr. Canfora stated that Ms. Whipkey states she cannot support this effort, but the only effort he sees is the study and the city has the right to withdraw. How can you not support just doing a study. Mrs. Buzelli stated she does not have a flooding problem but has always heard we don't have enough industry. We have a lot of land and questioned why we cannot look into the future, we have to take a risk and do something and have to spend some money, without spending money we cannot go forward. Mr. Tousley stated we have all talked about rolling up our sleeves and helping people out; that is pretty easy to do with some else's money. He does not feel it is a decision for seven of us to make. The people in Nash Heights have sewers hit them, school levies, the problem needs fixed he agrees and he is not in favor of taking some one else's money to do it without their vote to do so. It does not mean he does not care of those of hurting and its just a matter of principals and is not fair to someone in the other side of town that is not flooding because someone built where it does flood. Larry Perkins Clarified if 500 people signed the petition it could still go forward.

New Business:

None

Public Comment-Agenda and Non Agenda Items:

Topics for the next Work Session:

None

Adjourn

There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 PM.

Rick Rodgers, 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.



The City of Norton - Inter Office Memo

TO:	Karla Richards, Clerk of Council Council
FROM:	Ernie Reynolds, Superintendent of Public Service ER
DATE:	2-11-14
SUBJECT:	Road Paving Program

WARD 1

MAIN STREETS Reimer Rd – From Hametown to Cleveland-Massillon Rd
SIDE STREETS Harris Rd, Carl, Lakeland,

WARD 2

MAIN STREETS Summit Rd – From Barberton Line to Barber Rd
SIDE STREETS

WARD 3

MAIN STREETS Gardner Blvd – Entire Rd
SIDE STREETS Creekside Dr, Columbia Ave.

WARD 4

MAIN STREETS Hametown Rd – From Eastern Rd to Greenwich Rd
Wooster Rd – Entire Rd
Taylor Rd – Entire Rd
Johnson Rd – From Hametown Rd to Medina Line Rd
SIDE STREETS Albert St, Burg, East Frontage

In my opinion, the above Main/Side Streets should take priority above all others. Any other Main/Side Streets that need maintained can be done by the City as required.