

# City of Bay Village

Council Minutes, Special Meeting  
Council Chambers 7:30 p.m.

August 17, 2015

Paul Koomar, President of Council, Presiding

Present: Henderson, Clark, Koomar, Lee, Lieske, Tadych, Vincent, Mayor Sutherland

Also Present: Law Director Ebert, Director of Public Service/Safety Thomas, Fire Chief Lyons, Operations Manager Landers, Bob Greytak, CT Consultants

Prior to the meeting, President of Council Koomar called for an agenda review. During the review, Mr. Tadych commented that the contract for the City Hall Parking Lot Project will be brought forward again this evening. More details have been received about the Licursi Construction Company from the administration, which have answered Mr. Tadych's questions.

Councilman Henderson read the following letter he prepared regarding the project:

“Memo

To: City Council  
From: Tom Henderson, Ward 4 City Council Representative  
Date: August 13, 2015  
Regarding: City Hall Parking Lot Project  
CC: Debbie Sutherland, Scott Thomas, Bob Greytak

I am going to vote against the City Hall Parking Lot project. Here are three reasons you should, too:

**First**, On March 24, 2014 during the Committee Session immediately preceding Special Meeting of Council in which Council passed Resolution 14-35 authorizing the City to apply for the Ohio EPA's Surface Water Improvement Fund (SWIF) grant, the City's Service Director, Scott Thomas, told Council “there are no matching funds” required by the grant.<sup>1</sup>

Subsequently, on August 3, 2015, Mr. Thomas informed Council that the City would have to spend \$64,408, in addition to \$120,000 SWIF grant, to complete this project.<sup>2</sup> Although the *grant* does not require matching funds, the Administration should have made it unambiguously clear on March 24, 2014 that the *project* would require additional funds from the City. I consider that a material omission.

Also on March 24, 2014, Mr. Thomas told Council there would be “no loss of existing parking spaces” as a result of this project.<sup>3</sup> On August 3, 2015, Mr. Thomas informed Council that 7 parking spaces – over

---

<sup>1</sup> March 24, 2014 Committee Meeting of Council Minutes, page 4

<sup>2</sup> August 3, 2015 Committee Meeting of Council Minutes (unapproved draft as of 8/10/15), page 2

<sup>3</sup> March 24, 2014 Committee Meeting of Council Minutes, page 4

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

10% of the existing parking spaces – will be eliminated.<sup>4</sup> Although I believe Mr. Thomas’s statement on March 24, 2014 was most likely made in good faith, it was, nonetheless, inaccurate. I am also uncertain at this moment whether the parking lot to the west of City Hall is – or should be – included in this project.

In my opinion, Council received a combination of ambiguous/incomplete and inaccurate information immediately prior to our vote on March 24, 2014. Therefore, I feel no obligation to vote in favor of this project even though I voted in favor of the grant application. The terms of the deal have changed.

**Second,** On August 3, 2015, Mr. Thomas told Council that just one company, Licursi Construction, Inc. (LCI), bid on the City Hall Parking Lot project. When asked why, the City’s Consulting Engineer, Bob Greytak, explained that “it is hard to find contractors to bid [at] this time of the year.”<sup>5</sup>

In my opinion, the City should have sought bids at a time of year when it is *not* hard to find contractors to bid on projects. Such action may have led to the receipt of multiple bids. As the Mayor recently said, in reference to an unrelated project regarding audio equipment, when the City is spending taxpayer dollars it is obliged to undertake projects “as cost effectively and efficiently as possible. We can’t do that without a second quote, and maybe a third quote.”<sup>6</sup> I agree with the Mayor on that point.

It should be noted that LCI is the same company that installed the tennis courts near City Hall. Those courts do not drain properly. The City has had in its possession, since October 2013, a memo which, in my opinion, if accurate, appears to indicate that LCI informed the City at an appropriate time that the tennis courts would not drain properly. Rather than address the issue, the City instructed LCI to proceed with the project as planned because “they did not have the funds.”<sup>7</sup> The Administration never asked Council to vote on appropriation of additional funds to correct the error. That should have been done. Council routinely authorizes additional funds when the actual cost of a project exceeds its budget.

Further, the Administration did not disclose this memo to Council until *after* our vote on August 3, 2015 regarding whether or not to authorize LCI to install the parking lot. In my opinion, the Administration’s decision to withhold this information from Council until August 5, 2015 was inappropriate, particularly given that it was requested during a July 29, 2015 Finance Committee meeting.<sup>8</sup>

*I am no longer primarily concerned about LCI. I am concerned about authorizing a large, taxpayer-funded project – particularly one involving Ohio EPA funds – after receiving just one bid. The Mayor recently reminded all of us, and the public, that the City needs two or three quotes for large, taxpayer-funded projects. I cannot, in good faith, explain to my constituents why this project is “special” and I cannot defend the City’s choice to seek bids at a time of year when it’s hard to find contractors to bid.*

---

<sup>4</sup> August 3, 2015 Committee Meeting of Council Minutes (unapproved draft as of 8/10/15), page 4

<sup>5</sup> August 3, 2015 Committee Meeting of Council Minutes (unapproved draft as of 8/10/15), page 2

<sup>6</sup> June 22, 2015 Special Meeting of Council Minutes, page 4

<sup>7</sup> October 29, 2013 Memo TO: Daniel Galli FROM: Licursi Construction, Inc. RE: Cahoon Park, “10/01/12”

<sup>8</sup> July 29, 2015 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes, page 9

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

**Third**, perhaps most importantly, it is important to look at the big picture. After the Council meeting on August 3, 2015, the Mayor informed Council, via email, that “[t]he parking lot is in bad condition and Council will have to appropriate \$120k + to do a basic improvement”<sup>9</sup> if we do not authorize this project.

Although I understand that from the City’s perspective it may seem less expensive to spend \$64,408 of our residents’ tax dollars on this project [or possibly more if there are problems under the parking lot similar to the problems under the tennis courts] by combining those funds with another \$120,000 from the Ohio EPA, it’s important to remember that our constituents have provided *all* \$184,407 of those dollars. The people of Bay Village pay taxes to *both* City of Bay Village *and* the State of Ohio.

In my opinion, spending *50% more total tax dollars* to install this new parking lot surface instead of completing a “basic improvement” is *not* a responsible use of our constituents’ money. I do not believe that the incremental benefits outweigh the incremental cost. Further, while I strongly encourage the City to seek grants that reduce the expenditure of our residents’ tax dollars for worthwhile projects, I do not believe that we should spend *more total taxpayer dollars* simply because the State has offered them.

**In Closing**, I oppose this project. I ask that you vote “NO” with me. We received ambiguous/incomplete and inaccurate information prior to our vote to authorize the application for this grant. The City received just one bid for the project. The Administration withheld information from Council about a prior project involving this contractor, and this parking lot surface costs *50% more* than a basic improvement.

*The next time I’m in front of my constituents, I will tell them I voted against this project because I believe we should dedicate this money to the streets and sewers in front of their houses – not to an expensive new parking lot surface where city employee”*

Mr. Henderson stated that he would like to thank Mr. Thomas for his detailed reply to his memo. He appreciates that, and agrees with his point that he has been aware that this project’s total cost exceeds the amount of the grant since at least October, 2014. August 3, 2015 was not the first time he became aware of that fact. However, he still believes it would have been appropriate to make it unambiguously clear on March 24, 2014 that additional funds were likely required, rather than focusing on the fact that the grant does not require matching funds.

Mr. Henderson advised that he also appreciates the Mayor’s response to his memo. While he does acknowledge that an attempt to receive local bids was made, and there may be no legal reason to rebid this project, the combination of issues surrounding this project, not any single issue alone, is what caused him to lose confidence in this project.

Law Director Ebert commented that the parking lot is not just used by city employees. The tennis courts are packed every day of the year. The overflow from the swimming pool and baseball diamonds use the lot as well. The lot is well used by the residents for various activities in the City.

Director of Public Service/Safety Scott Thomas, read the following response to Mr. Henderson’s memo.

---

<sup>9</sup> August 3, 2015 E-mail TO: City Council FROM: Debbie Sutherland RE: Council Meeting

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

“To: Councilmen Tom Henderson  
From: Public Safety/Service Director Scott Thomas

Date: August 13, 2015

Regarding: City Hall Parking Lot Project

CC: Mayor Debbie Sutherland, Members of Bay Village City Council

Mr. Henderson, I am disheartened that you would omit factual information in regards to the City Hall Parking Lot Project so I would like to add the following to your statement.

First, you are correct that on March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014, I informed City Council that “there are no matching funds” in regards to the grant. However, I believe you may have a different definition of “matching grants” than I. When we applied for the grant, we clearly were awarded the amount of \$120,000.00. NO where in the grant did it say the City was required to match that amount. In fact, based on our proposal, the City was awarded the maximum amount given out by the Ohio EPA.

In my mind, a match means you have to match the amount awarded or some percent of that award, this clearly was not the case.

Second, On October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2014, during the 2016 proposed budget hearing, the City Hall Parking Lot SWIF Project was discussed and ultimately approved by Council. You were present during those budget hearings. The following is from those Minutes.

“The City secured a \$120,000 grant from the EPA. Another \$120,000 is required to get the project done successfully, bringing the total project to \$240,000. It will include landscaping and methods to get the water away from the parking lot and filter down so that it is not such a burden to the storm water system. A new base will be poured and the extending roadway to the Bayway Cabin and other city facilities will not be included in the project.”

When I came to Bay Village, the City Hall Parking Lot was an issue brought to my attention by both residents and my staff. (*Mr. Thomas interjected here that the City enforces parking lot issues, driveways and sidewalks, yet our own parking lot was falling apart. This was brought to his attention many, many times.*) Upon reviewing the Parking Lot, it clearly needed to be addressed, and still does. I would like to point out that the Parking Lot is not just used by City Employees. It is also used by many of our residents who play tennis, baseball, and use the pool. The Parking Lot is also used as a central gathering area for the many activities this wonderful City offers. To say otherwise is incorrect. In fact, these are some of the reasons the grant was awarded to the City of Bay Village.

Third, you are correct that on March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015, I told Council there would be “no loss of existing parking spaces” as a result of the project. At that time, the initial study showed that NO spaces would be lost. However, in May of 2015, I was told by the designing engineer that some spaces may be lost due to the electrical situation in the parking lot. When I asked how many, I was told it had not yet been determined but that it was hoped to be 10 or less. I was advised that

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

to change the configuration of the current lighting system in the parking lot was expensive and that it was not recommended. I truly felt that 10 or less parking spaces would not have a great impact on the project. Having said that, I apologize for not notifying council in regards to this and not knowing the exact number of spaces that would be lost. This was an oversight on my part but certainly no attempt to mislead anyone.

Lastly, we cannot control how many contractors will bid on a particular project. Ideally, it would have been great to have more, but we did not. There are going to be times when only one or even no contractor will make a bid. That certainly is not the fault of the City.

Mr. Henderson, ultimately, you will make your own decision as to which way you vote on this matter. However, I felt it worthy to express my side of the story in response to yours.

Respectfully

Scott E. Thomas

Bay Village Public Safety/Service Director”

Mr. Thomas added that he contacted the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency on Friday, August 14. He spoke with the head of the Coordination of all the grants that were sent state wide. The first comment to him was “I see you have a problem with Council on this project.” She read notes and clippings from newspaper articles. She said to Mr. Thomas: “I cannot understand why Council did not pass this project. However, if they do reject it, please let me know immediately so I can distribute this money to other cities in the State of Ohio that really want this project.”

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Thomas if he stated that the maximum grant amount was \$120,000. Mr. Thomas stated that he did make that statement. Mr. Henderson stated that there are numerous other recipients of this grant program, such as South Euclid, and the City of Defiance, that received more than that. Mr. Thomas responded that grants were awarded based on population, but that is what he was told.

Mr. Henderson stated that this gets to his general position that he closed with, is that it is not any one, single issue that caused him to lose confidence in this project. It is a combination of issues and the timing of which he became aware of various facts, such as the one we just talked about, right now, or the memo from Licursi Construction from October, 2013, which was not disclosed to us until after we voted on this on August 3. It is not one issue, it is the combination of the issues and the timing of them.

Mr. Vincent asked Mr. Thomas if he asked the representative of the Environmental Protection Agency if Council were to approve the project in March of 2016 if we could still keep the grant money even though the project is not completed at that point.

Mr. Thomas stated that the project expires on June 30, 2016. If we were to wait, that project could not successfully be completed. Mr. Vincent asked the time period to put the project out to bid to get it done by June 30, 2016. Mr. Thomas stated that they would have to start the bidding process all over again, and they would not have time to do that. Mr. Vincent asked the cost of

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

rebidding. Mr. Thomas stated it would be \$1,500 plus additional engineering costs of \$5,000. Mr. Greytak stated that the engineering costs would be for CT Consultants to produce new drawings to bidders, to account for the plan holders, to issue any addendums, to ask questions, and to create a new contract.

Mr. Vincent stated that he is only asking questions to do his job. He does not feel that Council is doing a disservice to a project in the City by asking questions. Isn't that what we are here for? Asking questions about the process does not mean we are pushing back like you are doing a terrible job. This is what Council is here to do. Mr. Henderson is not trying to point out that we are all doing something horrible here by rushing the project through. We are trying to learn how the bidding works, how the engineering works, and how much it costs. My asking questions does not mean this project is horrible and we will never get our parking lot done. We are just asking questions.

Mr. Lee asked if the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency ever extends these grant deadlines. Mr. Thomas stated that there is always a possibility. With this grant they have federal monies, as well as state monies combined. It could be a possibility, but there is no assurance.

Mr. Vincent stated that in his experience doing lobbying he worked with one person, similar to the call made by Mr. Thomas, and he did have success.

Mrs. Lieske stated that at the Council meeting two weeks ago she asked what it would cost to rebid and remembered the \$1,500, but does not recall the \$5,000 being mentioned. Mr. Greytak stated that he began to answer that but someone else spoke up and he did not have an opportunity to finish his statement.

Mrs. Lieske stated she also asked a question about doing some testing with the soil to see if that could be taken care of so we wouldn't have those concerns. Mr. Koomar stated that he did pass that along to our acting Mayor at that time. Since there was moisture at the tennis courts would we potentially uncover that issue in the parking lot? Or, because we are digging it out to hold the retention basin do we eliminate the issue altogether?

Mr. Lee noted that this was discussed two weeks ago and it was an apples to oranges comparison. Mr. Greytak noted that material will be removed in order to get the new drainage in for the permeable pavers and the retention basin for the storm water.

Mrs. Lieske stated that she recalls that conversation but had also talked to Mr. Ebert about trying to be careful, thinking back to the time when the Middle School was built and it was discovered that this particular area was a cow pasture and we had to haul out soil. Even though the parking lot would go deeper, is there anything that could be done so we know going in what we are likely to experience so we don't come back with additional monetary costs.

Mr. Greytak stated that you can spend all kinds of additional money trying to make sure that the conditions are perfect, probably spending more money than the potential risk. He would recommend that no more money be spent on trying to investigate the soil. We will be taking out a lot of the soil that was a problem with the tennis courts and replacing it with clean fill and stone. We will not have an issue similar to the moisture with the tennis courts.

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

Mr. Koomar asked how deep they will be excavating; Mr. Greytak responded that they will go down 18 inches below the current asphalt.

Mr. Vincent asked if new drawings are required every time a bid is advertised; or can we use the drawings we already have. Mr. Greytak stated that they have to produce the drawings for the contractors. The contractors buy the drawings. It takes time and money to do that.

Mrs. Mahoney stated it is important to note that other contractors did take the drawings out, two or three others, but chose not to bid.

Mr. Koomar stated that obviously we would have like to see this go out to bid sooner, and have additional bidders, and we will strive for that in the future. The engineer's estimate was \$240,000 and that successful bid, the only bid we received, was \$186,000. It is a little different if they came in \$1,000 below the estimate or \$2,000 above; you would wonder if you would be getting competitive bids because of only receiving one. In this case, it is a pretty competitive bid in my eyes. That factors in to how I will look at this decision. If we put it out to bid again, who is to say that the contractor knows they were the only bidder, where they are going to come in this time.

Mr. Henderson responded that if they came in with anything materially higher than an inflationary style adjustment we would definitely ask why. Regarding the relationship between the project's budget and the bid, that is a common theme we have seen so far this year in the streets project. The actual cost of our projects have come in below the budgeted and estimated amounts. The goal in finance is always to come in as accurately as possible, plus or minus five percent. Our goal is not to have a budget that is larger than it needs to be, because it means budgeting difficulty. I am not terribly surprised that this bid came in lower than budget. Regarding timing issues, this is the second time this summer we have been in here voting on some issue a second time. Both of these have timing issues tied to them. The City Council salaries earlier this year also could have been taken care of and not made into an issue had we taken care of those things earlier.

Mr. Ebert stated that the one thing that has worked out well for the City is that the timing of this project is occurring after the tennis program. In the spring and summer, those tennis courts are used night and day, all day long. If you bid this project in the spring, you would have displaced the whole tennis program for not only the high school but also the residents. From a timing standpoint, it is the best time because the tennis season is basically over.

Mr. Ebert continued, stating that historically not all projects come in under the engineer's budget. We have had projects that have come in higher. We look to the engineer to give us what they believe the outset is and hopefully it comes in lower.

Mr. Lee stated that he believes Mr. Henderson has raised a lot of very good points. There are a lot of ways this project could be managed better, but at the end of the day the big picture is that we can't get a new parking lot like we are talking about by spending only \$64,000 of our City's taxpayers' money. The EPA funds are also from the State of Ohio, but that is a grant and if we don't get that another community is going to take those funds. It is a good expenditure of money

to complete the project at that price. You will not get a better opportunity to do the project. The contractor has completed other projects. Our City Engineer and our Service Director are recommending this bid package to us and the Mayor and Council should hold them accountable to complete the project according to specifications. We don't want surprises; we've had too many surprises. As Mr. Henderson said, this project has been full of a lot of question marks and when you add all those up that is why he is opposed to it. But, for me, I think we should expect the City Engineer and Service Director to deliver now on this project and it is a good project at the end of the day. When you look at what has been done to this building in the last few years: the lobby and the side entrance doors, the first floor and the SAFEbuilt space, the landscaping and the new signage, the new roof from the insurance claim, the city hall clock tower that has been repaired, there have been a lot of improvements made to this building in the last couple of years. A lot of that has been funded with outside funds. This is another opportunity to improve city hall and be good caretakers of this building and this portion of our City, and that is why I am supporting it.

Mr. Henderson stated that he completely acknowledges the accuracy of Mr. Lee's statements, and the same thing that was said by Mr. Thomas, that if we forego these funds it is likely that the state will take these funds which have already been taxed and collected and give them to someone else. However, he thinks we all need to understand that price and volume are related to supply and demand and if we work toward reducing demand then perhaps it gives people at the state level the opportunity to reduce the supply. Otherwise, if demand side economics had no reality to it, all the things people say when they talk about the environment and they talk about reducing the use of carbon emissions or reducing anything we don't want, that is demand-side control. They are trying to influence volume through demand. At that economic level this is why I am opposed to spending 50% more on this project relative to a standard project, regardless of where the funds came from.

Mr. Clark stated that he thinks we have learned from these stops and starts on this project. It will serve as a benchmark for us going forward in the scrutiny of projects like this. We can sit and cut down the minutia for the project we are discussing today, but when we are talking about improving the very essential core of Bay Village, for the price that we are paying, and the fact that we are covering about one-third of the entire cost for something that is vital to the city hall improvement, the pool, the parking lot, the Play-in-Bay, the fields, these are the reasons why we attract people to live in Bay Village. For us to get caught in the minutia that's been here, we've learned a lesson going forward about the capital bidding process, if we use this as a way of being positive, as opposed to negative. If we vote this down, we embarrass everybody.

President of Council Koomar called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m. with a roll call and Pledge of Allegiance led by Dwight Clark, Councilman-at-large.

## **AUDIENCE**

The following audience members signed in this evening: Dick Majewski, Jerry Barnett, Mark Chernisky, Surge Vanderhorst, Marty Mace, Conda Boyd, Lydia DeGeorge, Pamela Cottam,

Russell Thompson, Denny and Tara Wendell, Chandra Neely, Jeff Gallatin, Richard Fink

Mr. Koomar called for comments from the audience.

Pam Cottam, East Oakland Road, stated that she is very impressed that after all the discussion that went on about needing more than one bid for the recording device, that Finance Director Mahoney came up with four or five different vendors. That was after a lot of discussion, a lot of dissension, and a lot of time wasted. I am impressed by the fact that it took so long to get quotes for a project that is \$17,000, but here we are talking about a major project. Mr. Clark mentioned minutia and this is a good lesson going forward, but we have heard many times that we don't have time, so Council is forced to make decisions right away. Why is there no due diligence when it comes to really looking into issues? One of the reasons I came to this meeting tonight is because two weeks ago I had heard what happened here. There is only one contractor after all we have heard in the last few months. Renee Mahoney's speech saying that in order to do her job she has to get three or four contractors; this is only the right thing to do. I applaud that and I understand it. I would like to know, since it is partly my money, and I do live here, why three or four contractors cannot be found over the past year. It does take time, and sometimes you have to call them back three or four times.

Mrs. Mahoney stated that the difference between public bid and going out for quotes is that the public bid is advertised, vendors come in and get the plan, and it's up to them. It is a sealed bid at a certain time. They present them to our receptionist, usually at Noon, you open the bid, that's it. That is how a public bid works. Whether you have one or no contractors, it is out of your control. Our bid like the microphone system, obviously you see I did get them. I was questioned why I was going to do that. Because it was an expensive project, but it is not subject to public bid. So, that you go out for quotes separately.

Lydia DeGeorge, West Oakland Road, stated that she knows this point is moot, but she has been looking over the EPA awards to the different cities, and what the different cities were going to use them for, for this water surface grant. Before the City applied, and applied with the intent of having the City parking lot redone, did they look at any other possible areas of town where that money could be spent for improvements? And if so, where, and if not, why.

Mr. Greytak stated that they had received notification that the Ohio EPA was going to be awarding SWIF grants from water improvement funds. It is a competitive grant and the EPA, usually around February, has a meeting where they invite all the cities to come in. They talk about the project, they talk about what they are looking for as far as funding the project, and the type of projects they are looking for. Because this is a new program, they are interested in getting projects done that are very visible to the public. Storm water improvement is so important to the health of our Great Lakes, they want projects that are highly visible to the public. A lot of the grants that they have done have been in city hall parking lots, city hall properties, public parks, and places where people congregate. There is an educational component to the project. Signage will go in after the project is completed explaining why it was done and the benefits to the environment. This grant application was a natural fit for this type of project. We talked to the EPA, and told them what we were thinking about. They encouraged the application, and said not to apply for more than \$120,000.

Ms. DeGeorge asked if being visible was a stipulation of the grant, because she would think that for water surface issues we have plenty of opportunity in the City of Bay Village to utilize that money somewhere else.

Mr. Greytak responded that there is a public education component to the whole program. The EPA wants to get these types of projects in places where they are very visible to the public. When they look at the applications, they determine if this is fulfilling the mission they have with the storm water improvement funds, and one of them is public education. If you score low on public education, you may not get the grant.

Mr. Koomar asked where the city hall parking lot currently drains. Mr. Greytak stated that it drains to the west.

Dave Semler, Russell Road, stated that he agrees, being a commercial contractor in the area, that sometimes you only get one bid. Mr. Semler asked about the maintenance costs, noting that permeable pavers tend to clog up. Will we have to invest in other equipment to keep it so it doesn't clog up? Have soil borings been done on the site? If everybody worries about water, have these borings been completed to learn what is going on with the soil?

Mr. Greytak stated that they have enough ancillary information about the area. They are not concerned about water in regard to this particular project. The permeable pavers are there to accept water. We are trying to collect water there to start with, so we are not concerned about water.

Mr. Semler stated that if the subgrade is wet, you might have to take out additional soil.

Mr. Greytak stated that we are talking about a subgrade just a few inches below the asphalt. Anytime you open soil you have the possibility that you are going to have bad subgrade. We don't think we are going to need to take out the soil to accomplish the project per the specifications.

In regard to the maintenance costs, Mr. Greytak stated that everything has maintenance costs. With an asphalt parking lot, every year you should seal the cracks.

Mr. Semler asked if that cost has been identified to the City.

Mr. Greytak stated that the cost is there regardless whether this project is being done or not. The parking lot should be sealed. Mr. Ebert stated that this is done as part of the normal maintenance program throughout the streets.

Mr. Greytak explained that permeable pavers need to be swept out and there is another minor process which is the extent of the maintenance.

Mr. Semler stated that he worked for a real estate company and they went away from permeable pavers because of the maintenance. They started doing bio-retention measures instead.

Mr. Greytak stated that he has plenty of examples of projects where they have permeable pavers, they have to be swept out and rejuvenated like everything else. The Cleveland Clinic in Avon has the largest permeable paver parking in the area.

Mr. Henderson asked the maintenance costs of this project relative to a standard project. Mr. Greytak stated that it is a wash; there is no extra cost. Only the last row of the parking lot will have the permeable pavers.

Mr. Semler stated that in yesterday's paper there was an article about vacant homes. The only thing we have in our City is our housing stock; that is where we generate our taxes. Mr. Semler stated he was shocked to learn we have 113 vacancies in the City.

Mayor Sutherland stated that they definitely do not agree with that number. That number is determined from post office information. When we get the addresses we actually send one of our inspectors out to check every single one. What they don't take into account are people who are out of town for a period of time and have their mail forwarded. They don't take into account somebody who is a renter so the mail to the owner may be piling up at that house. It is very misleading. We go out and double check every single one of those. There is no way we are even close to that number.

Mr. Koomar asked what the correct number would be. Mayor Sutherland stated that she would say we are probably less than 50 vacant homes. The Mayor stated that if someone passes away, or the property is involved in divorce proceedings, it creates a whole different situation.

Richard Fink, Wolf Road, asked Mr. Greytak about his comment on the extent of the permeable pavers in the parking lot. Mr. Greytak stated that the only portion of the parking lot that is getting permeable pavers is the row of parking adjacent to the tennis courts. Mr. Fink asked if the rest of the parking lot will be just asphalt paving. Mr. Greytak responded affirmatively, noting that bio-retention will be included in the raised island in the center of the parking lot. Mr. Thomas added that ADA accessibility features will be included in the parking lot upgrade.

Surge Vanderhorst, Ednil Drive, stated that he came to the meeting this evening to speak to the Council concerning certain issues. Mr. Vanderhorst has lived in Bay Village since 2008, and hasn't had any issues. Last fall there was a significant storm with heavy rainfall and he got water up to his sewer. Thankfully, the City came out and ran the camera through the storm and the sanitary sewer and found no issues leading up to his house. In June of this past year, he awoke one morning and found seven inches of water in his basement. He spoke to his neighbors about seven houses down, and they all had the same problem. For years, none of these neighbors have ever had an issue and all of a sudden, they have an issue. The City came out on June 6, everything was perfectly fine. On June 10 we had a major rainstorm and it happened again. Mr. Vanderhorst stated that he is trying to figure out what he needs to do to resolve this. If putting in something to stop the backing up is required, that is something he will have to do. The real concern is what is going on downstream. When the City workers come out they say if you haven't had a problem maybe it is something between here and where it dumps off into the city or the main sewer. Mr. Vanderhorst stated he is asking, since this is an issue that just started last

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

year, is there any way we can get some additional funds, perhaps going around the corner with the cleaning through Sadler into Ednil, since all the issues started after seven years. There has to be a blockage down there, whether it is the sanitary sewer or the storm. Both of them have to be checked to make sure it's flowing.

Mr. Koomar stated that he has passed Mr. Vanderhorst's address along to the Service Department. Mr. Thomas stated that the storm sewer crosses over Bradley Road and goes down Bradley Road. Since Mr. Thomas spoke with Mr. Vanderhorst, the Sewer Department has been going down Bradley Road and checking the storm sewer. They found a little bit of blockage in there, and have taken care of that. Specifically also in the Huntington Woods area, they have checked that area and have some areas they are taking a closer look at and will continue to clean and photograph. On Wolf Road today they have taken out hammers, bricks, boxes, clothing, and mop heads from the sewer. The crew will push forward and if they find something that needs a contract for cleaning they will come back to Council to ask for the funds.

Mr. Thomas further noted that Mr. Vanderhorst's sanitary sewer heads down Wolf Road which might be connected with some of the issues in the Wolf Road sewer. Mr. Vanderhorst stated that on June 6 when the City came out they found that the foundation drain definitely went out to the storm. Mr. Vanderhorst did have plugs in his drain so the water came up under the concrete.

Mr. Semler asked if the storm sewers in Bay Village are designed for 30, 45, or 100-year storms, and what the classification would be of the recent storms that the City of Bay Village has experienced.

Mr. Greytak stated that most of the storm sewer system was the former combined sewer that is a remnant of the sewers that were constructed in the 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's. If you look at some of the older areas in the City, the storm sewers don't appear to be more than a 2-year designed storm. We have had 150-year storms this past June. This past year there is not a storm sewer in the City that is going to pass a 150-year storm.

Mr. Semler asked what the storm sewers in the newer areas would be designed to accommodate.

Mr. Greytak stated that the Ohio Department of Transportation recommends for residential areas a 5 to 10-year design storm sewer. Mr. Semler stated that the City of Brecksville has 75-year designed storms. Mr. Greytak stated that he knows that Brecksville has a lot of flooding issues. Mr. Greytak explained that typically in a storm sewer design, if it is a 10-year design storm, the hydraulic rain line will be checked. You will see what happens in a 100-year storm, and typically you look for what happens in a 100-year storm, where does the water go, and provide a pathway for the water if the sewer system can't take it. Mr. Greytak stated that he doubts that this was done in the 1920's and 1930's.

Mr. Vanderhorst stated that it was recommended by plumbers go to the City of Westlake's Engineering Department for suggestions. He asked if there is anything similar in Bay Village for recommendations, noting that he is in a position now where he must invest a lot of money into a solution.

Mr. Greytak stated that they can work with Mr. Vanderhorst on that. The City of Westlake is still having flooding problems like every other Westshore community. Mr. Greytak told Mr. Vanderhorst not to put a stopper in his floor drain. The pipe will be built up with pressure underneath the basement slab and you could vault the slab. He suggested putting a standpipe up from the floor drain six or seven feet so the water rises up in the pipe preventing the severe pressure under the slab. Mr. Greytak suggested that Mr. Vanderhorst contact him for further information.

Mrs. Lieske asked if the maintenance of the pavers can be done by City employees. Mr. Greytak said it can be done by City employees.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

Mr. Koomar stated that there was a gas leak on Lake Road at Canterbury this past week resulting in road closure for a few hours. Mr. Koomar noted that a resident that lives in the area often leaves their 7<sup>th</sup> grader at home while they run to the store. The resident was caught off guard because he couldn't go back to his house for a few hours. He was hoping there would have been notification from the City in regard to the event.

Fire Chief Lyons stated that there was a gas leak on Thursday, August 13 with the Water Department accidentally hitting the gas line. They called out the Fire Department who did evacuate five homes in the area to make sure all were safe. Lake Road was closed from Douglas Drive to Elmwood Drive for about one-hour and a-half. The resident contacted Chief Lyons to ask why the Ready Notification system was not used. The Chief explained to the resident that this was a focused situation and was just a minor inconvenience. The Ready Notify system contacts about 1,000 people in the City, so Chief Lyons made the decision that it was not a city-wide emergency. Chief Lyons noted that the Ready Notification system in the City of Bay Village is reserved for true emergencies in the City.

Mr. Koomar noted that in this day and age people are looking for information. The City of Westlake used an emergency notification when there was a water main break on Porter Road. It is a highly traveled road and residents were asked to stay away from Porter Road. The residents in Westlake really appreciated the information. The same would be true of Lake Road.

Mr. Lee stated that the City transitioned to the Ready Notify system from Nixle about a year ago. He asked if the new County Ready Notify system allows notifications to be sent to just certain streets, or does it have to be city-wide. Chief Lyons stated that he believes there is a geographic component and he will follow up with the county administrator. Mr. Lee stated that when the transition was done it was stated that one of the benefits of the new system was that it had much more flexibility and functionality. Obviously, we saved money too because Nixle cost us additional funds. He suggested to Chief Lyons that if there is a way to target to communications that may solve the concern of over-notifying a concern that is not a critical situation.

Mr. Koomar called for approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of Council held August 3, 2015. **Motion** by **Clark** to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the Special Meeting of Council held August 3, 2015, and approve the minutes as prepared and distributed. **Motion**

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

**passed 6-0-1(abstention by Mr. Vincent).**

**Mr. Tadych** read and introduced **Ordinance 15-62** authorizing the Mayor to enter into an agreement with Licursi Company for the construction of the City Hall Green Parking Lot Improvements, and declaring an emergency, and moved for adoption.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Koomar called for a vote on the motion for adoption of Ordinance No. 15-62.

Roll Call on Suspension of the Charter Rules:

Yeas- Clark, Henderson, Koomar, Lee Lieske, Tadych, Vincent

Nays -None

Roll Call on Suspension of the Council Rules:

Yeas – Clark, Henderson, Koomar, Lee, Lieske, Tadych, Vincent

Nays – None.

Roll Call on Use of the Emergency Clause:

Yeas- Clark, Koomar, Lee, Tadych

Nays –Henderson, Lieske, Vincent

Roll Call on Adoption:

Yeas– Clark, Koomar, Lee, Tadych

Nays–Henderson, Lieske, Vincent

Mr. Koomar announced adoption of Ordinance No. 15-62, **without** the emergency measure, by a vote of 4-3

In compliance with Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code, Mr. Clark **MOVED** to convene to Executive Session for the purpose of discussing Contracts, specifically refuse collection.

**Roll Call Vote: Yeas- Henderson, Koomar, Lee, Lieske, Tadych, Vincent, Clark, Nays – None. Motion passed 7-0.**

Also present in Executive Session were Mayor Sutherland, Law Director Ebert, Safety/Service Director Thomas.

Council reconvened in an open meeting at 8:55 p.m. Present were: Clark, Henderson, Koomar, Lee, Lieske, Tadych, Vincent.

**Motion by Vincent** authorizing the Director of Public Service to advertise for bids for a refuse collection contract.

**Motion passed 7-0.**

Mr. Koomar expressed the wishes of Council to Mr. Don Landers for a very happy birthday on August 18, 2015. Mr. Landers received a well-deserved round of applause.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Special Meeting of Council  
August 17, 2015

---

Paul Koomar, President of Council

---

Joan Kemper, Clerk of Council