

# City of Bay Village

Council Minutes, Committee Session  
Conference Room  
Paul Koomar, President of Council, Presiding

March 21, 2016  
7:30 p.m.

Present: Clark, Henderson, Koomar, Lieske, Mace, Tadych, Vincent, Acting Mayor Ebert

Excused: Mayor Sutherland

Also Present: Finance Director Mahoney, Police Chief Spaetzle, Safety/Service Director Thomas, Recreation Director Enovitch and Operations Manager Landers.

## AUDIENCE

The following audience members signed in this evening: Dick Majewski, Lydia DeGeorge, Russell Thompson, Jeff Gallatin, Clair Banasiak, Richard Fink, Denny and Tara Wendell.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Law Director Ebert** distributed a memorandum to Mayor Sutherland dated March 21, 2016 he prepared regarding the Bay Park Beach Company (Park) easement between the Park and the City of Bay Village. The easement would grant the City a right-of-way and easement over land owned by the Park in order to address the Sunset Area Improvement Project. The memorandum includes an attachment of the proposed easement with penciled in notations from the Bay Park Beach Company trustees for consideration. Mr. Ebert stated that the Park Association struck the word “utilities” in the second full paragraph so as to suggest that the Easement cannot be used for “utilities,” just drainage, sewer and waterline facilities and devices. The City cannot agree to this change and additional meetings will be held.

Mr. Tadych asked Law Director Ebert when the easement was sent back by the Bay Park Beach Company. Mr. Ebert stated that it was approximately two weeks ago, and he is still waiting for the appraisal to be returned. Mr. Henderson asked about the consideration of \$10.00 for the grant of easement. Mr. Ebert stated that whatever the value of the appraisal of the property comes back, he is assuming that the Council will take that value and adjust the assessment accordingly. The assessments are very large. In consideration of reducing it, the Bay Park Beach Company will grant an easement for the street right-of-way. The \$10.00 notation is just legal verbiage for consideration in granting the easement.

Mr. Henderson commented that he sent an email today to Director of Public Safety/Service Thomas, Consulting Engineer Bob Greytak, Finance Director Mahoney, and Law Director Ebert asking for updates on matters they were working on in order that the Public Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee might be able to schedule their next committee meeting. Mr. Henderson has heard back from Law Director Ebert but has not heard back from Mr. Greytak, Director of Public Safety/Service Thomas, or Finance Director Mahoney. A Public

Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee meeting will not be scheduled until the reference materials for a meeting are received.

Mr. Koomar asked if multiple appraisals have been requested. Mr. Ebert stated that there is just one appraisal being done. Mr. Koomar asked how the appraiser was selected. Mr. Ebert said the appraiser was chosen from three that he knew. Two were not available. If an issue comes back with the appraisal being too high or too low, an additional appraisal will be sought. The Council is making a determination as to how to reduce the amount of the assessment and the appraisal is one of the tools for that purpose. Mr. Tadych noted that when he was Chairman of the Public Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee it was recognized that the proposed assessments were too high for the residents and there must be a determination as to how much of the project the City is going to absorb. Mr. Tadych asked Mr. Ebert the name of the company that is doing the appraisal. Mr. Ebert stated that he would prefer not to divulge that publicly at this time.

## **ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Leslie Selig, Director of Community Services – Dwyer Memorial Kitchen Restoration and plans for future programs including providing meals for seniors twice per week

**Leslie Selig, Director of Community Services** stated that she is present to discuss converting the residential kitchen in the Dwyer Memorial Center to a commercial kitchen. There is a commercial dishwasher that was purchased a few years ago. The range and refrigerator is essentially worthless because it cannot be used for food service to the seniors or the community. CT Consultants visited in September and looked at what would be required to bring the kitchen up to standards. They came back with an estimate of approximately \$174,000. One way to reduce that amount would be through the purchase of used appliances as opposed to brand new. In this particular budget it is asked that \$20,000 be appropriated for engineering plans to get the project underway. The remainder of the funding would come from a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), which will be written and submitted by CT Consultants by the September due date. Director Thomas stated that this work would be part of the existing annual contract with CT Consultants. The CDBG grant can go up to \$150,000 for the participating municipality.

Mr. Clark stated that it was communicated to Council that there is a high probability that the City would receive that grant. Mrs. Selig stated that this is correct. This is an area where we don't serve our seniors. We want to be able to provide congregate meals to the seniors. North Olmsted, Rocky River and Fairview Park are currently providing meals. The biggest issue is nutrition, which plays such a key role in the life of a senior in being able to prevent and manage chronic illnesses such as heart failure, diabetes, hypertension, and cancer. The statistic is that 50% of seniors who are discharged from nursing homes and hospitals are malnourished. Bay Village is slightly higher at 16% of population than the national average of 14% of adults ages 65 and over. It benefits everyone to keep the community independent and healthy.

In terms of the congregate meals, if you provide food to seniors they will come. The meals will be served at the Dwyer Memorial Center. Four hot catered meals are provided per month presently from the Town Center in Avon Lake. He can only serve up to 70. There are always at

least 70 with a waiting list. Serving meals to the seniors provides the staff at the Dwyer Memorial Center an opportunity to observe the seniors to see what other services they may need.

There is an additional grant that the staff wishes to apply for: the Elderly Nutrition Program provided by the Administration on Aging. The grant is available every two years with the next cycle in 2018 and 2019. On a linear progression basis, the kitchen would be up and running and the second grant application would be submitted. The grant would pay 100% for the food being served to the seniors. The Western Reserve Area on Aging contracts with the catering company and they provide the actual meals. All the staff has to do is heat them up, serve them, and clean-up afterwards. The meals are already prepared and re-heated by the staff. This is what is done in the other cities that provide these meals. Mrs. Selig stated that looking to the future and other uses for the building and additional opportunities, with the baby boomers coming to fruition as seniors, the activities in the building are going to change. A kitchen will be crucial.

The nutrition grant from the Administration on Aging requires a match of 40% by the City. North Olmsted and Fairview Park are serving a similar sized group of seniors that Bay Village will be serving. The City of Bay Village would incur a cost of approximately \$11,000 to \$12,000 per year for two part time employees: a kitchen manager and an assistant kitchen manager. Meals would be served on Mondays and Wednesdays which would then give the seniors in the West Shore Community hot meals Mondays through Fridays, by using the offerings of Bay Village and the neighboring cities of North Olmsted and Fairview which are also done two times per week.

Mr. Henderson stated that earlier Mrs. Selig stated that the grant would cover 100%. Mrs. Selig stated that the CDBG grant would be for the kitchen. The Administration on Aging grant would pay 100% for the food; the City of Bay Village cost would be for the labor. As the grant is written you have to calculate an estimate of how many people will be served. It is \$1.50 per meal and that is the amount of the grant that is being requested. In our case it is \$10,500 and the grant pays for 100% of the food. The City must match that by 40%. In our case the program would be so small it is more than a 40% match by the staffing cost. If we were serving 5 days a week it would be a lesser amount we would require for matching costs.

Mr. Henderson asked if this means that the total program including the cost of food and labor, the City must cover at least 40% of the total. Mrs. Selig stated that the City must cover only 40% of the amount that we are asking for and we are asking to cover the food. If the food is \$10,500, the City would cover \$4,000.

Mr. Tadych asked Mrs. Selig how she estimated the cost of \$11,000 to serve food in two more years. Mrs. Selig stated that this is from looking particularly at North Olmsted's numbers because they are so similar. They have both the part time kitchen manager and assistant manager and that is what they are paying out. We will also have in-kind funds which it is assumed that \$10,000 of Director Selig's, and Assistant Director Lupica's time to help supervise and manage the program will qualify. Another \$6,000 in-kind for volunteer time to help support the program will all be written into the grant.

Committee Meeting of Council  
March 21, 2016

Mr. Clark asked after taking this all into account, what is the City's cost to operate the program. Would this be the \$11,000 to \$12,000 per year to cover the personnel cost? Mrs. Selig stated that the amount is correct.

Mr. Henderson addressed Finance Director Mahoney and stated that what he would like to see in the future as Capital expenditure items like this are presented, if we know ahead of time that there are going to be on-going operating expenses afterwards to have that fully presented up-front. What happened on this particular item is that it was presented as a one-time Capital expenditure cost without consideration presented to Council for the on-going operating expenses. If it hadn't been asked for three weeks ago we would not have had this presentation this evening. Mr. Henderson stated that it is not that he is opposed to the program, but he does want to point out for future reference that when we speak of Capital expenditures that we know have operating expenses he wants to make sure we look at in totality.

It was noted by Mrs. Selig that the cost of engineering of \$20,000 is included in the amount of \$174,000. Mr. Henderson stated that next year we would then expect to see \$154,000 in the budget.

Mr. Tadych asked why kitchen appliances are needed for reheating meals. Mrs. Selig stated that you have to have refrigeration for the food. A convection oven, refrigerator and dishwasher are required. Three sinks are required for the washing, rinsing and sterilizing of the food. There is a separate hand sink. The hood is the biggest issue of all to make sure that everything vents properly. Grease traps are also required.

Mr. Koomar asked the prospects in 2018, 2019 and 2020 in terms of residents served per year. Mrs. Selig stated that to begin with they would be serving 140 meals per week.

Mr. Vincent asked if the seniors call ahead for reservations. Mrs. Selig stated they have to make a reservation and the senior center is not allowed to charge for the meals, as part of the stipulation of the grant award. They are permitted to take a \$1.00 donation to offset the cost of dishwashing soap and utensils.

Mr. Vincent asked if the seniors are all Bay Village residents or are from the entire West Shore area. Mrs. Selig stated they are all from the West Shore area and residency is not required. Mr. Vincent asked if Mrs. Selig has any idea how many Bay Village residents come to these meals. Mrs. Selig stated that she believes it is 70% Bay Village seniors.

Mr. Henderson asked Mrs. Selig her contingency plan if the grants are not received. Mrs. Selig stated that if the grant is not received for the kitchen the program could not proceed. If the grant for the food is not received, Mrs. Selig does not have a contingency plan at this point. There is the possibility of going outside to get caterers to come out and then charge for the hot lunch. Mr. Henderson asked how many entities will be applying for the grant. Mrs. Selig stated that she does not have that information. Mr. Henderson stated that he is concerned with having a \$174,000 kitchen that is not being used. Mrs. Selig stated she feels confident that we would be awarded that contract. Mr. Henderson asked if we would know whether we received the grant

before the next budget cycle. Mr. Clark stated that he would hope that information would be available.

Mr. Mace asked if this kitchen would be of assistance in the administration of the Meals-on-Wheels program. Mrs. Selig stated that the Meals-on-Wheels program is administered through the Bradley Bay Health Center.

Mrs. Lieske asked what type of experience CT Consultants has with this type of CDBG grant application. Director of Public Safety/Service Scott stated that CT Consultants is a large company and they have multiple types of services available. Mrs. Lieske stated that she would like to know how many CDBG grant applications CT Consultants has submitted and how many were awarded, and what they were for.

Mr. Vincent asked if we would be using the kitchen for the other three days of the week. Mrs. Selig stated that she would like to start a breakfast program. If we have group activities, food can be sold during those activities.

Mr. Clark stated that this is something the Community Services Advisory Board had tasked Mrs. Selig to do a while ago, and she brought the idea here. What Mr. Clark is hearing is that there is support across the table to do this. The lesson learned is that when we look to construct a project like this we look at the entirety from step one to the final step on the Capital and operating side. The City subsidizing \$12,000 per year is miniscule when considering serving that part of the population, and slotting in with other communities offers the opportunity for seniors to have hot meals five days a week. Mr. Clark noted that we should find out if we get the grant before going to the next cycle of project approval.

Mr. Henderson stated that he would echo Mr. Clark's comments in support of the project, but in the future would like to look at projects in full. The budget must be passed in 10 days and this is relatively late in the cycle to be having this particular discussion. We have had discussions for six months about other projects, and he would prefer having these discussions earlier in the cycle rather than when we may or may not pass the budget.

Mr. Koomar asked about the timeline for the grant. Mrs. Selig stated that it opens in September and the application must be in by the end of October. The award will be announced by the end of the year.

Mr. Vincent stated that it would be valuable to start some discussion about the use of the kitchen the three days of the week that the meals will not be served.

Mr. Tadych stated that he brought up at the last meeting the question of insurance liability that the City has in feeding folks for no cost to them and what would happen if something would go wrong. Mrs. Mahoney stated that she contacted the City's insurance agent and he was supposed to get to our carrier to see if it increased our liability at all and he hasn't gotten back to Mrs. Mahoney.

Mr. Clark stated that there was also an ancillary benefit of a retrofit of the storage capacity which is sorely needed. Mrs. Selig stated that the kitchen has a very small pantry area that has a terminal water leak. If we get a heavy snowfall the water comes in. There is also another storage room for wheelchairs and walkers. If the pantry wall can be bumped out to make better use of the room for storage, the center would be well-served.

Mr. Vincent asked if there is a sprinkler system in the room now. As part of the retrofit it would be beneficial to have that installed.

Community Services Director Selig was thanked for her presentation this evening, and acknowledged the importance of providing the good nutrition and socialization for seniors.

Memorandum of Understanding – Local Government Safety Capital Grant Program (Regular Meeting Agenda for March 21, 2016.)

Law Director Ebert informed Council that there is nothing that needs to be done by City Council, but today he was asked that Mayor Sutherland sign the Memorandum of Understanding by 5 p.m. this evening. The Memorandum of Understanding is for a grant for a data system for law enforcement. Mr. Henderson asked if matching funds are required from the City's budget and Mr. Ebert stated that the matching funds would be from the Westcom Budget to which the City contributes funds. Mrs. Mahoney stated that Westcom is its own entity. Mr. Koomar noted that the City of Westlake needed to take action on the grant program because Westcom is in their borders, and other cities, as members of Westcom, just needed to sign off on the Memorandum of Understanding.

**PLANNING, ZONING, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS COMMITTEE**

**Mrs. Lieske** had no report this evening.

Mr. Henderson asked where Chapter 1158, Attached Residence District, stands at this point.

Mr. Koomar stated that the Law Department has incorporated the Planning Commission changes to the ordinance. Those edits were forwarded to the Planning Commission and Mrs. Lieske. The question was asked regarding when the moratorium expires and it was expressed that it may expire sometime this month. Mr. Koomar suggested that Mrs. Lieske speak with Planning Commission Chairman Mark Barbour and to bring this Chapter 1158 back to the Committee of the Whole for an update.

**PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, STREETS, SEWERS AND DRAINAGE COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Henderson** stated that there was a discussion by the Public Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee about process for the Sunset Area Project. Mr. Ebert has provided via email an update regarding the items he had asked about. He asked Director of Public Safety/Service Thomas and Finance Director Mahoney if they had any updates relative to the email Mr. Henderson sent this morning. Mr. Thomas stated that he has prepared a report for Mr. Henderson. Mr. Thomas' report includes the engineering information from CT Consultants as

Committee Meeting of Council  
March 21, 2016

well that Mr. Henderson had requested. Mrs. Mahoney stated that she was off work for a few days last week and had to attend a funeral this morning. Mr. Henderson stated that his intent is to gather the information they had talked about at the Public Improvements Committee meeting and then move forward with an additional Public Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee.

Mr. Koomar asked where we stand on communication with the residents of Bruce/Russell/Douglas regarding that EPA mandated project. We started with one ordinance regarding the work on private property. Mr. Koomar questioned Mr. Thomas as to where it stands with the thought process relative to cost and the communications with residents.

Mr. Thomas stated when they presented Options 1, 2, and 3, they communicated with the residents at Bruce/Russell/Douglas and let them know that the project is in the Public Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee and the options available. Once the decision is made by Council, they will have a better understanding of what kind of cost will be involved. For example, Option 2, which is the upsize of the storm sewer. It appears that we would have the space to go a little bit lower and make it larger for a 100-year storm. Once we have the 84 homes that need to be disconnected from the footer to the sanitary sewer that can be gravity fed. The only thing to be done at that point is on the homeowner side to block that with a plug and then be gravity fed with a new lateral line to the storm sewer. We will get those costs but we need to decide which option will be chosen. If we choose Option 3, which would be the sump pump system, then we have costs associated with that. We can provide those quickly. Option 1 would be a new and larger sanitary sewer line would mean no improvements on the private side.

Mr. Henderson asked within Option 2 as described with the 100 year storm and the gravity-fed connections, is one of the items attempted the total cost prescribed to the homeowners, regardless of whether paid by the homeowners or paid by the City. We want to make sure that the City has adequate debt capacity to do both Bruce/Russell/Douglas, on the estimation of expenses, as well as he Sunset Area Projects before we move forward with Sunset because Bruce/Russell/Douglas is an EPA mandated project. Is that number associated with the work on private property part of the numbers that CT Consultants Bob Greytak has estimated? Mr. Thomas stated that it is, and a lot of it based on footage and how far you have to run a new lateral line per household. If we get an actual footage cost for each home, we will know. And then we would obtain the exact cost of what it would be for disconnection of the footer from the sanitary line.

Mr. Henderson expressed appreciation to Mr. Thomas for working on the process chart. Council needs this information to create a game plan to make sure that Council is comfortable with the game plan, and there is nothing missing from it, and then Council can execute a consent plan. Mr. Henderson stated he wants to make sure that plan is fully drafted to the point where he is comfortable with it personally and then he will take it to the Public Improvements Committee for review, making sure they are comfortable with it, and then be in a position to bring it up to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Koomar stated that he is personally aware of a meeting that Director Thomas and Consulting Engineer Greytak held last September, and an email the Mayor sent out to approximately ten

residents in the area. He asked Mr. Thomas if there are additional communications he is unaware of. Mr. Thomas stated that they ended up getting about 25 more emails. They are now at 35 or 40 that were sent out. The last communication was sent out before the end of the year.

Mr. Koomar reminded Mr. Thomas that they talked before Christmas that it was important to go out and get all of the addresses and do some type of communication to the residents of Bruce/Russell/Douglas and at least give them an update. Mr. Thomas stated that they told them that they still need the option picked. Mr. Koomar stated that ten were told to his knowledge, and maybe another 25, and asked about the other 180 homes. Mr. Thomas stated that they have to communicate with them directly but they need more information to tell them. Mr. Koomar suggested that they could have told them what they told the 35 residents. Mr. Thomas stated that they asked for information in regard to the emails and they were the only ones that gave us emails. Part of that is we ask that they have communication with the City, too. Mr. Thomas stated that they will do the best they can to get that information out. Mr. Koomar stated that the first letter they got was that they had an assessment of \$3,500; it didn't really start the process. Mr. Thomas stated that they have done a second letter. Mr. Koomar asked that a copy of that letter be put in the Council packets next week. It will be very helpful when questions are received from residents. Mrs. Lieske asked that the list of to whom the letter was sent be included.

Mr. Koomar asked Mr. Scott if he sent out a letter to all the residents asking for email addresses after the Mayor's December email. Mr. Thomas stated that he would have to check the date, but they have sent out letters.

## **FINANCE AND CLAIMS COMMITTEE**

### Amending Section 125.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Bay Village – Departmental Petty Cash Funds

**Finance Director Mahoney** stated that this proposed ordinance is a change to the Finance Department cash and change funds. The swimming pool concession stand in the past had \$200 in change funds. There are four drawers for cash at the concession stand. Their start-up has been \$50 for each drawer. They are requesting \$400 in start-up cash, or \$100 for each drawer, which is returned to the Finance Department at the end of the summer.

The Recreation Department Office \$25.00 change fund is requested to be increased to \$50.00.

The Community Gym change fund is requested to be \$20.00.

Mrs. Lieske asked if there is a routine established for depositing the concession funds on a daily basis. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the daily income is deposited and the \$400 starting money is kept in a safe.

Mr. Vincent asked if the Finance Director has looked into a point-of-sale system. Mrs. Mahoney stated that it is included in the Capital requests. There is a system currently but it will be

upgraded to include inventory and touch screen. We currently take credit cards for amount of \$20.00 or more.

Mr. Henderson asked Finance Director Mahoney to elaborate on the cash control process. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the change fund is for change. The start-up money is locked up each night and every day the income is deposited. Deposits are reconciled to daily reports by the Assistant Finance Director and Mrs. Mahoney does the bank reconciliations every month.

Mr. Henderson asked if there is a receipt mechanism now before the electronic system is put into place for every transaction. Mrs. Mahoney stated that they do have receipts at the concession stand. The new system will just be an upgraded system. They have always had an electronic system.

A petty cash policy is being formalized by the Assistant Finance Director. Receipts for small expenditures are submitted to the Assistant Finance Director for reimbursement. When the fund needs to be reimbursed, a purchase order is issued. The Director of Finance reconciles the account.

Mr. Henderson asked if there is any thought to ever putting inflators into these ordinances rather than having to revisit them manually. Mrs. Mahoney stated that she does not believe that step is needed.

Mr. Clark asked that Council be given a copy of the updated policy.

Enacting Section 125.55 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Bay Village – Unclaimed Monies Fund

Mrs. Mahoney stated that most cities have an Unclaimed Monies Fund. When uncashed checks remain uncashed after doing due diligence, the money is moved to an Unclaimed Monies Fund. If the owners are not found after six years, the money can be transferred back to the City's General Fund.

Enacting Section 125.56 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Bay Village – Federal Forfeiture Fund.

Mrs. Mahoney explained that the Federal Government mandates that if you are going to accept Federal Forfeiture Funds you should have a Federal Forfeiture Funds account. Last year about \$14,000 was transferred from the Local Law Enforcement Trust Fund to the Federal Law Enforcement Trust Fund. If the police work with the federal agencies on a federal forfeiture crime the police department shares in the federal forfeiture funds. The auditors have pointed out that they would like an ordinance setting up the Federal Forfeiture Fund. Mr. Henderson asked how the money can be expended once it is in the fund. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the Police Chief has the authority on how to spend the money following strict guidelines. Many times it is used on equipment, officer education, or matching funds for a grant. It cannot be used for general operating of the police department. There is the amount of \$10,000 budgeted for expense from that account in 2016.

Mr. Henderson asked how it would work if the Annual Appropriation Ordinance were passed prior to enacting the Federal Forfeiture Fund. Mrs. Mahoney stated that they already have Fund 297 from last year but never officially passed a separate ordinance. Mrs. Mahoney did not think a separate ordinance was required but the auditors did not agree.

Discussion for certain capital expenditures and personal services

Mr. Clark stated that there has been a proposed ordinance prepared for Council to approve certain Capital expenditures and personal services contracts. This was originally included in the appropriations ordinance as Section 5, and after considerable discussion it has been lifted out of the annual appropriation ordinance and placed in a specific ordinance to be approved and adopted by City Council. The threshold is \$20,000. Mr. Koomar suggested the ordinance be placed on first reading. For example, the consulting contracting with Bailey Communications has always been of interest to Council and we are trying to capture that, but at the same time there are other expenditures that come up in daily business that are operating. Mr. Koomar noted that Council is not concerned with items needed for operating expenses but is concerned with the larger consulting fees.

Mr. Ebert noted that the ordinance is strictly a draft and he would like the Mayor to be present when the ordinance is entertained for adoption by Council.

Mr. Henderson stated that Section 2 of the ordinance states “which are not subject to state bid limitations.” Mr. Ebert stated that professional fees are not subject to state limitations. The City joins into the state bid amount when purchasing various vehicles.

Mr. Koomar stated that items over \$50,000 that are subject to the requirement of the state for bidding are approved by Council for advertising for bids and for approval of contract after bids are received. What we are looking at with this ordinance is all professional services and consulting services and Capital items that are under that state bid threshold of \$50,000. It has always been a good way for Council to keep current on the projects that are outstanding. Change orders are submitted as part of the project and by approving them you keep current on what is happening with the contract.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Koomar how much volume of activity this ordinance will create. Mr. Koomar asked Finance Director Mahoney to run a vendor listing of 2015 for all expenditures above \$20,000. Let’s see what we spent last year and apply the language to those expenditures and make sure we are not catching things that are unintentional. Mr. Henderson stated that he appreciates that this needs to be done.

Finance Director Mahoney stated that procedurally she will not be approving any purchase orders. Exhibit B of the annual appropriation ordinance lists every Capital item purchased. In 2012, before Mrs. Mahoney started and the only difference in the separate ordinances being approved is that the vendor the item was being purchased from is lifted. Mrs. Mahoney stated she will not go out to debt until the Council passes those separate ordinances. Mr. Koomar stated that the budget gets passed, we know the vehicles we are approving, and those come

forward early in the year long before the debt comes out. Mrs. Mahoney stated that she does not understand the point of doing Exhibit B and then separate ordinances. Mr. Koomar stated his recommendation is to pass the ordinance this year and next year have all of the detail in the budget book about trade-ins and vehicles to be purchased. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the detail is in the budget book and by passing the ordinance Council is passing the budget book.

Mrs. Mahoney suggested that the wording in Section 2 of the ordinance prepared be clarified. It currently states "any and all amounts that exceed \$20,000 and previously appropriated shall be submitted to Council." An auditor would take that at its word. If it is only Capital, it needs to be spelled out again in that section. The word "Capital" will be added for clarification where necessary.

Mr. Clark stated that the \$15,000 Council was previously working with is considered too low, and some think that \$50,000 is too high. We have taken Section 5 out of the appropriation ordinance at the request of the administration and placed it in a separate ordinance. Council will now work on refining the language in the proposed ordinance. The ordinance will be placed on first reading in April.

#### Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Mr. Clark stated that final revisions of the Appropriation Ordinance have been prepared and amending changes were submitted to Council this evening. Mr. Clark walked through each section of the ordinance, correcting what was received in the packets over the weekend versus what was received this evening.

Total General Fund Allowing an additional \$5,000 for the hiring of a crossing guard.

Mr. Henderson stated that when Mr. Tadych and he had reviewed the copy they received over the weekend which was not the correct copy to review, they mistakenly thought the \$5,000 was for the trees. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the \$5,000 for the trees was in the copy received.

Mr. Henderson expressed that he was surprised last week when the concept of an additional crossing guard was introduced very late in the meeting and very late in the budget process. He asked the reason to add the crossing guard. Mr. Vincent stated that the Dover/Wolf intersection is probably the busiest section of town with folks of all ages crossing and truck traffic. It seems if all the other major arteries of the City have a crossing guard for consistency purposes it is a good place to have the guard. No crossing signs during certain times will be installed shortly. Mr. Henderson questioned if this is a permanent need for a crossing guard at this intersection or a temporary need because of the signs.

Mr. Clark stated that we are providing the funds to hire a crossing guard, whether the Chief agrees to do so is more of an administrative decision on his part. Mr. Koomar added that over the years that many motorists have not adhered to the No Right Turn on Red, especially going east on Wolf and south on Dover Road. As the Chief stated he would put the signs on all intersections for consistency, it became obvious that this was the only intersection that did not have a crossing guard. There have been many violations of the No Turn on Red during school

Committee Meeting of Council  
March 21, 2016

hours. From a safety standpoint, on any given day there are school children crossing at that intersection. If you know it is an unsafe situation, it is Council's job to fund those dollars to give the Chief the opportunity to put money toward correction.

Mr. Henderson stated that in the past two weeks of the six months of the budget process, with the discussion of the kitchen at the Dwyer Memorial Center and the discussion of the school guard we have discussed a revision of the head count of employees which he feels is late in the budget process.

Revenue Recognition for Tennis Court Maintenance, Fund 238 \$10,000 revenue in 2016, the first of six annual donations.

Equipment Replacement Fund 240 - The figure of \$805,320 is a reduction from \$826,995 solely for the savings on the net price on the Scareb Composter acquired by the City.

Equipment Replacement Fund – The difference of \$5,000 is the expenses incurred by selling items. Mr. Tadych stated that in the final version he would like to see the detail.

The difference in the ordinances over the weekend was \$6,121,000 and the revised number is \$6,109,000.

General Bond Retirement – No Change.

Capital Projects Fund 400 – One change under Public Improvements. It was \$82,700, and now is \$120,700 due to the change in the parking lot project. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the project is still under budget of the \$240,000 but needs to be completed by paying bills submitted by CEI and installing signs. An additional \$25,000 is to be appropriated. The pavement has been encumbered. Mr. Clark asked Mrs. Mahoney to submit a one-page memorandum since this is not something that was discussed over the last two weeks.

The Bay Lodge Floor of \$13,000 has also been added to Public Improvements due to the benefit of the lower price received for the Scareb Composter which makes those funds available.

Total Capital Projects Fund – The previous number was \$258,920. The revised number is \$296,920.

Enterprise Funds – The number of \$2,734,587 remains unchanged.

Total Insurance Fund Group - \$1,600,640 remains unchanged.

Total Trust Fund Group - \$89,400 remains unchanged.

Total Deposit Fund Group - \$52,000 remains unchanged.

Total of All Funds – The number over the weekend in the Council packets is \$26,862,989. That has been revised to \$26,894,514. The difference is \$32,000 in total.

Committee Meeting of Council  
March 21, 2016

Transfers and Advances - \$1,024,006 remains the same.

Street Construction Advances - \$175,000 remains unchanged. Mr. Henderson asked if this includes advances from last year as well as the plans for this year. Mr. Clark agreed and stated that the reserved funds can be revised when that is completed.

Exhibit A – Schedule of Budgets by Department in the General Fund - One change under Police The total of \$2,993, 781 has been revised upward by \$5,200 to \$2,998,981 for the addition of the crossing guard.

Exhibit B – Detail of Capital Expenditures – Equipment Replacement Fund change is due to the net purchase price of the Scareb Composter. The former number was \$821,995; the revised number is \$800,320.

Street Construction remains unchanged at \$700,000

Public Improvements Fund 490 - \$25,000 for the City Hall Parking Lot additional funds needed and the addition of \$13,000 for the Bay Lodge Floor.

Infrastructure Improvement Fund 494 represents the Queenswood Bridge and remains unchanged at \$130,000.

Fund 495 is a summation of the work being done at Rose Hill Museum, Osborn House, and Gazebo which will be funded from Municipal Buildings Fund – Total \$46,000 – remains unchanged.

Fund 580 for Sewers remains unchanged at \$280,000 from what was previously approved.

The grand total of \$1,877,020 is an increase from what was shown in the Council packets over the weekend of \$1,860,695. The difference is \$17,000 in total.

Mr. Clark stated that procedurally he would like to bring Ordinance 16-09 to third reading and adoption this evening. If there is a strong feeling of opposition on the part of Council, it will not be taken to third reading.

Mr. Henderson stated he appreciates the detailed explanation and even as we walked through it this evening there were additional changes. He does not support moving forward with this tonight and was expecting to see in his packet this weekend the final version with all of the changes discussed. What he did receive was a packet item with a memo from Mrs. Mahoney not addressed to anyone on the Finance Committee listing the changes discussed and the ordinance with it was the incorrect document. Mr. Henderson stated he preferred not to pass the budget this evening since they received the correct document at 7:30 p.m. this evening. Mr. Henderson noted further that he has not received a detailed copy of the budget book to reconcile the appropriations ordinance against. We don't appropriate at the detailed budget book level, only at

the level of control in the ordinance. He needs to reconcile the five page document with the several hundred page document before he is comfortable voting on it.

Mr. Tadych stated that when they did receive the document in their packet last Saturday, Tom Henderson and he were on the phone for an hour and one-half trying to reconcile what they were looking at trying to figure it out. It was very confusing and they finally decided there was something wrong. He feels they should receive it in the right way at the right time.

Mr. Koomar noted that Section 5 was pulled out of an old version by error. He apologized for that error and understands the need of extra time.

After considerable discussion, the Council determined to meet in Special Meeting on Wednesday evening, March 23, 2016 at 6 p.m. for consideration of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance.

## **RECREATION AND PARKS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Mace** had no report this evening.

## **SERVICES, UTILITIES AND EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE**

### Westlake/Bay Ecological Composting Facility Agreement

**Mr. Tadych** stated that he asked at a previous Council meeting that Exhibits A and C be included in the agreement. They are not included. Some of the wording has been adjusted which is good. He has read it through but it is difficult to compare when nothing is highlighted. Many changes have been made. The cost basis on the first machine has been changed from \$450,000 to an estimated \$396,650. Mr. Tadych stated that he would really liked to have seen what was going to be in Exhibit A and Exhibit C, but he will submit an ordinance for adoption this evening.

## **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

Mr. Richard Fink stated that he thinks the kitchen project at Dwyer Memorial Center is fantastic and long overdue. But, it is highly unusual for engineering costs to exceed 10% over the cost of the project. He asked if there were special circumstances. Mr. Thomas stated that he will follow up taking Mr. Fink's comments into consideration.

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

---

Paul Koomar, President of Council

---

Joan Kemper, Clerk of Council