AGENDA

Agenda, Bay Village City Council
Committee Meeting
Conference Room
Paul Koomar, President of Council, Presiding

Date: December 19, 2016
Time: 7:30 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Reappointment of J. Terence Burke to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a five year term expiring January 1, 2022.

Reappointment of Kevin Krol to the Architectural Board of Review for a three year term expiring February 24, 2020.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE-Vincent

Heritage Home Loan Program – 2017

Grant Application Approval – Dwyer Memorial Senior Center Generator

FINANCE & CLAIMS COMMITTEE – Clark

Amended Appropriation Ordinance 2016

Ordinance 16-84 Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Administrative Compensation Ordinance

PLANNING, ZONING & PUBLIC GROUNDS & BUILDINGS COMMITTEE-Lieske

Bay Presbyterian Church request for approval to install banners on existing utility poles celebrating 100th year Anniversary of Bay Presbyterian Church.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, STREETS/SEWERS/DRAINAGE COMMITTEE-Henderson

RECREATION & PARKS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE-Mace

SERVICES, UTILITIES & EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE-Tadych

AUDIENCE

MISCELLANEOUS

-continued on next page-
CAHOON MEMORIAL PARK TRUSTEES

Bay Village Kiwanis - Bay Days 2017
Set up for Bay Days, Wednesday, June 28, 2017
Set up for Bay Days, Thursday, June 29, 2017
Bay Days Friday, June 30, 2017
Bay Days Saturday, July 1, 2017
Bay Days Monday, July 3, 2017
Bay Days Tuesday, July 4, 2017
Fireworks Tuesday, July 4, 2017
Rain Date at the discretion of the Cahoon Memorial Park Trustees
City of Bay Village

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

December 12, 2016
7:40 p.m.

Also Present: Finance Director Mahoney, Police Chief Spaetzel, Recreation Director Enovitch, Operations Manager Landers.

AUDIENCE

The following audience members signed in this evening: Tara Wendell, Dennis Driscoll, Claire Banasiak, Lydia DeGeorge, Jeff Gallatin, Richard Majewski.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE-Vincent

Mr. Vincent reported that an Environment, Safety and Community Services Committee meeting was held this evening at 5:30 p.m. with John Skory, President of The Illuminating Company, and Karen Kirsh, FirstEnergy Service Company in attendance. Mr. Skory and Ms. Karen Kirsh provided valuable information to the committee members and audience present regarding power outages. The primary reason for the outages are trees. They advised everyone who sees a tree growing near power lines to call the Customer Care line and they will send someone out to trim the trees. There are plans for general maintenance which is scheduled every four years and due to begin again in 2017. There are traditionally more problems at the end of the four year period, which is where we are currently. The four year maintenance includes tree trimming and inspections using infrared diagnostic equipment. Transformers are located between every six to eight homes.

Mr. Vincent stated that The Illuminating Company has received an LED tariff from the State of Ohio so it will be cost effective to improve City lighting with LED lighting. There is a $301.00 charge per light to make the conversion. Finance Director Mahoney was asked how many street lights the City has. Mrs. Mahoney stated that the charge by CEI is per street light, and not based on the electricity used. It was questioned whether a reduction in electricity would relate to the cost to the City. Mr. Tadych noted that Mr. Skory related that the conversion must be done by area rather than one light at a time to insure proper lighting and safety for drivers.

At the Environment and Safety meeting this evening, Police Chief Spaetzel provided a comprehensive update on deer management issues and plans for culling.

Mr. Vincent advised that AT&T now provides fiber which makes the speed of the internet connection very fast compared to what it was. He suggested going to AT&T to see if they will
do some sort of partnership at our City spots to improve the Wi-Fi. If we can get 100 megabytes per second, or a thousand in our City, that is something we should look into.

FINANCE & CLAIMS COMMITTEE – Clark

Amended Appropriation Ordinance and Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Mr. Clark advised that at the Finance Committee Meeting held this evening at 6:30 p.m. the committee discussed the final appropriations amendment for the year 2016. Discussion and review was also held to complete the 2017 Capital Budget, with the expressed intention of making sure we do not deficit spend, although there is the capacity to do so. If there is a shortfall for Capital expenditures, it will be taken from funds that are available such as Municipal Buildings and the Infrastructure Improvement Fund. The Capital Budget has been tidied up to include a renovation of all of the parks public restrooms and to include a placeholder for funds to modernize and upgrade the technology and reduce manual labor at the pump stations.

The Annual Appropriation Ordinance will be placed on second reading this evening.

Mr. Koomar stated that Council will look for adoption of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance and the Supplemental Appropriation Ordinances on December 19, 2016 which will eliminate any need for a Council meeting for the remainder of December.

Bailey Communications Contract

Mr. Clark stated that he was not present at the Council meeting on December 5, 2016 to be part of the discussion regarding the Bailey Communications Contract. He did review the minutes of the meeting and the long, detailed discussion held regarding the renewal of the contract. Mr. Clark will proceed with the presentation of the ordinance to renew the contract with Bailey Communications at the Special Meeting of Council to be held this evening.

Mr. Mace asked if it is necessary to pass a three-year agreement. Mr. Mace noted that this evening at the Finance Committee there was discussion about the website design. The Bailey Communications contract does not include anything in the area of the website. That may be an area that a full time person could undertake. Mr. Ebert stated that there will be further discussion about the website. Improvements need to be made.

PLANNING, ZONING & PUBLIC GROUNDS & BUILDINGS COMMITTEE-Lieske

Updated Draft of Codified Ordinance Chapter 1158

Mrs. Lieske distributed copies of the Certificate of Result of Election held November 2, 2010 regarding the zoning amendment pertaining to lands in the Retail Business District to allow Attached Housing that complies with Chapter 1158 with a minimum development site of one (1) acre and the density of development not exceeding eight (8) units per acre. The election issue was successful.
Mrs. Lieske stated that the revised version of Chapter 1158 refers to ten (10) units per acre. Mrs. Lieske asked Mr. Ebert if the eight (8) units per acre would override since it was passed by the voters. Mr. Ebert stated that the eight (8) units per acre would override. He stated that the ballot language also speaks of Chapter 1158. This is another reason to get the revised version passed because it has regulations for setbacks and many things we want to have going forward. We would have to comply with those also.

Verbatim:

Mr. Tadych: But wasn’t what they voted on what is going to restrict the building of the area over in the Shell (property).
Mr. Ebert: Correct.
Mr. Tadych: So this really has nothing to do with the development of the Shell (property). The new 1158. Because they didn’t vote on that. It was not in effect when they voted. (Ebert interrupted and said we had 1158 on the books, it is still on the books as we speak today.)
Mr. Tadych: The old 1158. So that is what the building over there is going to have to be. Right?
Mr. Ebert: It specifically says 1158 in density. Correct.
Mr. Koomar: Density.
Mr. Tadych: On the whole thing. All 1158. The old 1158 is what they voted for, not the new 1158.
Mr. Ebert: The preliminary discussion that I had, they are going to be complying with the new 1158 regardless.
Mr. Tadych: I don’t think they can without the residents (Ebert interrupted – The density’s got to be. It actually going to be better than what they are doing. It is much improved, Dave.)
Mr. Tadych: But, I don’t think they can legally. The residents voted for 1158.
Mr. Ebert: Yeah, they can comply with that it can be more restrictive and make it better. It doesn’t affect.
Mr. Tadych: Okay, as long as you agree that 1158.
Mr. Ebert: 1158 is what it was when it was passed on the Shell Station.
Mr. Koomar: Things have come up where there are changes in 1129 in terms of the approval process. I know Planning Commission has updated that since it was passed. Riparian setbacks have come into play and have been passed. Anything here that would require like 1158 updates of a public meeting, of where air conditioners are placed, things like that. The density, the voters have said for that piece of parcel overrides it all, but as we pass all those other pieces of legislation those also play into that property. You can’t say Riparian setbacks didn’t exist when they passed it, now they have come along and we are going to look the other way from an EPA perspective. That doesn’t fly. It is the current code on the books when they submit.

Mr. Koomar stated that things have come up where there are changes in Chapter 1129 in terms of the approval process and the Planning Commission has updated that since it was passed. Riparian setbacks have come into play and been passed. Anything here that would require Chapter 1158 updates of a public meeting, of where air conditioners are placed, things like that. The density, the voters have said for that parcel, overrides it all and as we pass all those other pieces of legislation
those all play into that property. You can’t say riparian setbacks if they didn’t exist when they passed it and now they’ve come along and we are going to look the other way from an EPA perspective. That doesn’t fly. It is the current code on the books when they submit.

Mrs. Lieske addressed Mr. Ebert and stated that she thought last week he said there had been a discussion about twelve (12) units. Mr. Ebert stated that there was preliminary discussion about what the developer wants to put in there. But, he has to comply with this because that is what was passed by the voters as far as what the density per acre can be. He is going to be less, which actually makes more green space than what he proposed in discussions preliminarily. He will be more in compliance that the legislation.

Mrs. Lieske asked if there will be a preapplication meeting with surrounding property owners, and who will be the surrounding property owners. Mr. Ebert stated that the adjacent property owners would be the shopping center and the people behind the creek on the west side.

Mr. Koomar stated that when he first got on Council, Council had voted to put on Cahoon Ledges and then after that point the developer decided to do a public hearing. Anybody in the Donald area and the shopping center owner were notified. And, it was posted as a public meeting held in the Council Chambers with an opportunity to present the plans and have the residents ask questions.

Mrs. Lieske stated that her next question has to do with the timing of everything. It was indicated that this could move along quickly. We are facing now the holidays, nothing has been submitted, so it would likely go into January and then we are talking about the new Master Plan being ready in February or March. So, how likely is it that something would actually come forth prior to the new Master Plan. Mr. Ebert stated that he will try to reach out and find out when the plan will be submitted.

Mr. Koomar stated that when they had a conversation the developer indicated to him they were ready to go forward with purpose. Mr. Koomar went to the Master Plan meeting and the Council update will be sometime in March, mid-March, which is when Council would start to digest that report and decide what recommendations they would want to implement in terms of new adjustments to Chapter 1158, which he could see taking until June. By then, he will have moved forward with his application. The idea was, Marty and I talked about this offline, is that you get in the public hearing and the setbacks and the improvements we have all made on that code into potentially this project, and then obviously Council will have to go back and decide what they want to do with other areas that the Master Plan might address in terms of alternative housing.

Mrs. Lieske stated that the Council was also thinking that this revision would primarily be in the Business District area. When we look at the wording for the new one, it talks about locations identified in the current approved Master Plan and the 2004 Retail Improvement Strategy. Is that our understanding that all those locations would apply because we have more discussions that it would just be this area, but I didn’t see the language that would limit it to that.

Mr. Koomar stated that it has been out for a long period of time and the idea was that it is mainly this area. Mrs. Lieske stated that there are other areas that are specified too. Mr. Tadych noted that as you can see by the election it was approved in Ward 1 and Ward 2, mostly residential, and if not
Mr. Koomar noted that it encompasses the Clague Road properties too, correct? Mr. Tadych stated that is correct.

Mr. Mace stated that he has things to add on the Chapter 1158 consideration this evening. It has been a long time since we have been mulling over this. It is not been on anybody’s plate for a while. The first reading was in November of last year and then six months followed to a second reading. Another six months and here we are to consider this tonight for a third reading. I had to go back and find my second reading. I have a blue line item here, which I think is a red line, or what was proposed to be an amendment. It is 1158.05 talks about in (E) at that time about public hearings for the Planning Commission and then also the Planning Commission’s decision, and (G) was the City Council’s action upon receiving from the Planning Commission. And, now, on the new amendment we have 1158.05 (D) as the Planning Commission review. As it was in the prior one, the old (E) and (F) are gone and (E) now is City Council action and the whole Planning Commission is gone as far as public meetings and their review. Mr. Mace stated that it was put on him to go over the plan to see how he liked it and going over the plan without the Planning Commission having a decision or any process or public hearings. Mr. Mace stated that he is not in favor of that.

Mr. Koomar read Chapter 1158.05 Review and Approval (C) Development Plan: The development plan shall contain, at a minimum, the information specified in Section 1129.01. Item (D) Planning Commission Review: The complete application and all required documents shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and approval under Chapter 1129. The applicant shall attend the review meeting and present the proposed project to the Commission. Mr. Koomar stated at that point that is making sure that the applicant understands that they have to revert to the entire Chapter 1129 which includes the entire approval process and public hearings. The sections that had been here that had caused us a lot of grief earlier on is that after the initial public meeting the Planning Commission made a recommendation and it went to Council and the Council voted on it, which is not what we historically have done. We have also left it to the Planning Commission and the voters to rezone the property. The Master Plan coming out indicates that many cities have adopted that and have bypassed the voters and it has gone to Council. When former Mayor Sutherland brought this to Council with a professional planner, we liked the density and setbacks but he had inserted that new process into this chapter, which I had a problem with because that is something we had debated. It is something that we had agreed upon was the process. That is what I had them take that out because it is redundant. If you are already going through Chapter 1129 and another process and the Council votes on it, it is inconsistent. So, we said let’s take out that part, and take it back to Chapter 1129. That is what Mark Barbour (Chairman of the Planning Commission) had signed off on to leave it as is.

Mr. Ebert stated that the Master Plan Committee said that they know that it is a difficult pill to swallow, but the referendum petition should go out of the Charter, like most cities. The reason being, is that you get a developer in with a great plan and he says he can’t put it in because of having to wait six months to go to the voters. And, he has to spend all this money with all of the artist renderings and everything else to go forward, and it may not be approved by the voters. He would go to another city that doesn’t have that provision. You have to rely on your Planning Commission and Councils to vent those processes, rather than to have to go to a vote. That is what
the Master Plan is going to say. You have an archaic process and you are going to miss good developments who want to come to the City and they are not going to wait a year.

Mr. Koomar stated that there will probably be a reference to it in our Master Plan saying that this is really the current standard that most cities follow. Mr. Ebert noted that it would require a vote of the people to change the Charter. Mr. Koomar stated he heard feedback from Council and the Planning Commission that they would like the latitude to do their job and make sure a project is done well and to give them the latitude to manage the project going forward.

Mr. Mace stated that he just wants to make sure we weren’t getting rid of that process that needs to be there for the public meetings to make sure the public is informed. Mr. Koomar stated that having been on the Planning Commission for the pool, police station and the Middle School, he can state that after there is a public hearing to have to turn around and vote on it at that particular time he found troubling. In regard to the Middle School, there were many, many concerns of the residents on the traffic flow and the pattern for drop off and pick-up. Based on that public meeting, the traffic consultant reworked the parking lots again and tried to increase capacity. That was probably six or eight weeks in the making before they came back with a final plan that was incorporated into the overall plan. That is one of the reasons, Mr. Koomar stated, that he didn’t like that flow on the document either, because a lot of good information comes out of the public hearing of the residents. To turn around and have to say that you have to vote on it that night with a lot of caveats, you don’t get the best project. Mr. Mace stated that he just wanted to make sure that process is still there.

Mr. Henderson stated that when Council looked at this previously there were many maps placed out from the 1999 Master Plan. Across from my home, for example, the area was marked for townhouses. That area has since been developed into a center for health care. What has changed since that time frame? We still do not have a new Master Plan. I thought I recalled that the Planning Commission recommended finishing the new Master Plan before doing anything to change Chapter 1158. That was one of their written recommendations to Council.

Mr. Koomar stated that in talking to Planning Commission Chairman Mark Barbour multiple times in the last few weeks, his take was they didn’t want to just put recommendations back and not do a Master Plan. Mr. Ebert has had some discussions with the developer and it sounds like they have a potential deal on the land that is moving quickly and he asked that it be placed on the agenda because his belief was that a lot of the good work that has happened in Chapter 1158 should be incorporated in that project because it looks like it is going to move forward in the near future. It would be a shame not to incorporate the setbacks and a lot of the improvements we have worked on to get it into that project. When the Master Plan is done, we can obviously go back and Council can look at it. When Mr. Ebert asked me to put it on the agenda, I copied Mrs. Lieske. One of the reasons Cahoon Creek failed is because that developer failed to put forward a public hearing and give us a better sense architecturally of what would be done. The residents didn’t understand what was going to be there and what it was going to look like. If we are going forward for this project and it has already been rezoned, it still would be great for this person to come in and know the residents are vested in how this project is going to look. The new Chapter 1158 would do that.

Mrs. Lieske stated that the pre-application meeting in the new Chapter 1158 stating that prior to development plan approval the applicant shall conduct a meeting with surrounding property owners
for the purpose of explaining the proposed development and soliciting comments and suggestions relative to the proposal is good because the residents will be able to see what the plans will be. In line with that, Mr. Koomar said that if the new Chapter 1158 does pass, that doesn’t mean we need to wait ten more years to make any changes. Things would be fresh in mind when the new Master Plan is adopted to go through and see how we need to line things up.

Mr. Koomar stated that his hope would be that as soon as we get that copy the Planning and Zoning Committee picks it up. Mr. Vincent commented that it is something to think about in March or April, even before the final Master Plan comes out if they can give us an update on what is included we can start thinking about what we may want to revise. Mr. Koomar stated that Mrs. Lieske has the idea of wanting the County Planning Commission to present at a town hall meeting. There is no better way for us to present the final product to the residents so people can start having their own opinions and be back on the recommendations.

Mr. Henderson asked Mrs. Lieske if she recommends adoption of the new version of Chapter 1158 under these current situations.

Mrs. Lieske stated that she thinks that at this point in time with what is happening with the Shell Station property perhaps it would be better to have it in place for that and then look at it as an ongoing process where we take another look to line it up with the new Master Plan.

Mr. Koomar stated that he also thinks it is an opportunity to pass this and apply it to the project, and people can see and touch and feel an actual project with these standards and understand how it works. Even out of that, we may even find an enhancement, but my guess would be that the setbacks and placements would make it a better project. It is important for the residents to see a quality project go through. That is the goal in putting it on the agenda and having the best standards out there for what we want to see in Bay Village. I would hate to see them develop it and six months later we pass something and say we had the opportunity and we chose not to vote on it. I would rather take it as a step process and say as soon as it is presented to Council it goes back to committee for refinement.

Mrs. Lieske stated that her concern had been until she saw this today the wording in terms of the density and how that would line up. So, it is more restrictive with what was passed then than what is in our new version. The more restrictive eight units per acre is what would stand. That was the concern she had before.

Mr. Mace stated that he would like to point out that from this survey that we got we don’t have to wait for the Master Plan. This type of housing is in demand for our City.

Mrs. Lieske added that we said before this is the perfect location for something. Mr. Ebert stated that he thinks this will turn around on the west side of the creek. Mr. Tadych stated that he wished it was only for the west side of the creek. Mr. Ebert stated that not much could be built on the east side of the creek. Mr. Tadych stated that what he is saying is that it is for the whole City. Mr. Ebert stated that those are prime locations that have been identified as a good place for attached housing.
Mr. Vincent stated that he thinks it is a nice revision, heading in the right direction and now we can chip away. It doesn’t have to be something we ignore for thirty years.

Request of Bethesda-on-the-Bay Lutheran Church to replace their banners on poles along Wolf Road.

Mr. Ebert stated that these banners have not been replaced for a very long time. The Church would like to take them down and they don’t have a bucket truck. We have done that for other churches. A motion for approval will be presented by Mrs. Lieske at the Special Meeting of Council this evening.

SERVICES, UTILITIES & EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE-Tadych

Carillon Clock Tower Chimes

Mr. Ebert stated that the Carillon Clock Tower Chimes are not working and he has received quotations to restore the chimes to working order. Estimated cost is $10,000. Mr. Tadych suggested that there may be an organization in the City that might want to sponsor the second part of the clock rehabilitation, or even a family that might want to have their name associated with the chime restoration. Mrs. Mahoney stated that there was a power surge that caused the chimes to fail.

CAHOON MEMORIAL PARK TRUSTEES

Bay Village Kiwanis - Bay Days 2017

Set up for Bay Days, Wednesday, June 28, 2017
Set up for Bay Days, Thursday, June 29, 2017
Bay Days Friday, June 30, 2017
Bay Days Saturday, July 1, 2017
Bay Days Monday, July 3, 2017
Bay Days Tuesday, July 4, 2017
Fireworks Tuesday, July 4, 2017
Rain Date at the discretion of the Cahoon Memorial Park Trustees

Mayor Ebert stated that he contacted the fireworks company to determine the cost for cancellation of the fireworks due to weather and scheduling a rain date for the fireworks. The company would agree to waive the 15% postponement fee if the display is cancelled due to inclement weather at least twelve hours prior to the display and apply as a deposit for next year’s fireworks. If the City postpones after the twelve hour minimum the 15% postponement fee and a 25% cancellation fee would apply. The question is, the way Bay Days is going to fall this year, the fireworks are scheduled on July 4, the last day for the Bay Days. Would it be desirable to have the fireworks on July 5, knowing there is no carnival or any civic organization that is going to reap the benefits by having a lot of people there?
Mr. Vincent noted that a twelve hour prior cancellation would have to occur at 9:30 in the morning.

Chief Lyons stated that if a patch of weather comes through the fireworks can be held off until as late as Midnight, if necessary. Unless the National Weather Service advises in the morning that there is a monsoon due that evening, a postponement due to weather wouldn’t come until a last minute that decision.

Mr. Koomar asked that the Cahoon Memorial Park Trustees give this further thought.

Mrs. Lieske suggested having the fireworks before the Fourth of July as some communities do and then the back-up could be the Fourth of July.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

__________________________________   ____________________
Paul Koomar, President of Council         Joan Kemper, Clerk of Council
December 13, 2016

Mayor Debbie Sutherland
City of Bay Village
350 Dover Center Road
Bay Village, Ohio 44140

Re: Renew your contract for the Heritage Home Program™ by February 1st in order to be included in our spring mailing to homeowners.

Dear Mayor Sutherland,

As 2016 draws to a close, it is time to renew the contract between Bay Village and the Cleveland Restoration Society for the Heritage Home Program™ in 2017.

Thank you for your participation in 2016. The following statistics reflect the services we provided to Bay Village residents this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>CRS staff time (hours)</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>$595,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance (without site visit)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$24,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inquiries by Homeowner</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Above</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td><strong>$619,530.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since our free advice and assistance to homeowners is the heart and soul of the program, we are pleased with these results.
The following statistics reflect our 2016 loan activity in Bay Village. We are dissatisfied with these results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Loans – with Escrow</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>CRS staff time (hours)</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan Applications Withdrawn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>$188,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Applications Declined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Applications Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the Above</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td><strong>$258,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, 2016 was a busy year for both Bay Village residents and for Heritage Home Program™ staff. Based on the above statistics, our staff spent a total of 108.7 hours with Bay Village homeowners.

We note that we have not had an approved loan in Bay Village so far this year. The best way to make the program a success is to market it to your residents. The more we get the word out to your residents about the Program, the more they will use it. In other communities with below-average statistics, we have seen dramatic increases in homeowner participation when coupled with an improved partnership with the local government. We would like to schedule a time to meet with you and discuss new marketing methods.

We hope you will continue your participation in our program into 2017. The fee will be $6,038.00 for 2017. This price reflects a 2% increase from last year’s fee. In 2017, we estimate that 4,748 houses in Bay Village will be eligible for the program. The cost for the 2017 renewal includes 2 direct mailings to homeowners. Thus, the cost for our services (excluding mailing cost) is a modest $ 0.67 per house for the year.

We are not sending you a revised Agreement at this time. Please note that your existing Agreement provides for automatic renewal unless you decide otherwise.
Marketing the Program to Bay Village Residents

Marketing the program is the most important part of making it a success. As always, we will be sending our informational postcard to Bay Village residents to inform them of the services available to them.

Of all marketing options, the most successful is a letter from the mayor. These letters contain information on our services and are sent to houses in the community that are over 50 years old. This is a great way to let citizens know that you are providing this service to them. I cannot stress enough how successful these letters have been. We are now encouraging every community to consider such a letter. We have tracked the results after sending a mayor’s letter in other communities and have seen an average increase of 64% in homeowner inquires and an average increase of 80% in loan applications. If you would like to replace our direct-mail postcard with a letter from the mayor that would be sent at Bay Village’s expense, please let us know and we will revise the invoice for 2017.

In 2016, we organized regional information sessions in order to present information on the Heritage Home Program℠ directly to residents. These presentations gave homeowners the opportunity to meet us in person, receive a presentation on our services, and ask questions. We plan to repeat these regional information sessions in 2017. If Bay Village has a meeting space and is willing to host us, please let us know.

Finally, please consider attending our Mayors’ Breakfast on January 20th from 8:30am – 10:30am. The event will be held at the Cleveland Restoration Society, 3751 Prospect Avenue. I hope you’ll join us to celebrate the completion of another successful year. Please RSVP to Elizabeth Cardarelli at ecardarelli@clevelandrestoration.org.

Thank you for being a loyal partner in the Heritage Home Program℠. Please call or email me with any questions or comments.

Very truly yours,

Thomas A. Jorgensen
Chief Operating Officer
(216) 426-3108
tjorgensen@clevelandrestoration.org
End of Year Report

Bay Village

From 1/1/2016 to 12/1/2016, the Heritage Home Program provided 27 Site Visits and 5 Technical Assists to residents in Bay Village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Staff Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquiries</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.3 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$595,180.00</td>
<td>72.9 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assists (without site visit)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$24,350.00</td>
<td>3.5 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Signed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Withdrawn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$188,000.00</td>
<td>12.0 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Declined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>1.0 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Staff Time: 108.7 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mailed 4,635 cards in March 2016 and again in September 2016.
- On May 5, 2016 HHP staff presented to residents of Bay Village.
End of Year Report

Bay Village

2016 Featured Site Visits

If February, a site visit occurred at 344 Canterbury Road. The homeowner was interested in repairing the interior. Projects included; interior plaster repair, bathroom repairs, and adding a pulldown ladder to the attic.

588 Humiston Drive received a site visit in June. The homeowner was interested in redesigning the front porch. Heritage staff shared ideas for a new porch covering that was in keeping with the architectural style. The homeowner also shared plans for an addition to the rear of the home that would allow for aging in place. Heritage staff reviewed the plans and contractor bid.
Cleveland Restoration Society  
Cleveland, OH 44115  
3751 Prospect Avenue, 2nd Floor  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill To</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Deborah Sutherland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bay Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Dover Center Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Village, OH 44140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Management fees for Heritage Home Program (SM) Jan. 1 thru Dec. 31, 2017</td>
<td>$6,038.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have questions, please contact Tom Jorgensen at 216-426-3108.  

Total $6,038.00
Thursday, December 15, 2016

Cuyahoga County
Dept. of Planning and Community Services
Cleveland, OH

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the Council of the City of Bay Village, Ohio, please accept this letter of support as our endorsement of the City of Bay Village's application for securing grant funds in the amount of $50,000 through the Cuyahoga County Supplemental grant program.

We applaud the city's proposed installation of a generator at the Dwyer Senior Center, so that the senior center may act as a heating and cooling location in times of emergency.

We are confident that the safety of the city's seniors will be enhanced with the addition of a generator at the Dwyer Senior Center.

Please allow this letter to serve as our support for the grant request. We respectfully request the City of Bay Village be considered for this funding opportunity to help further both our mission as public servants to provide for the safety and well-being of the residents of the City of Bay Village, with sensitivity to the needs of those most vulnerable, the senior population.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Koomar, President of Council
City of Bay Village, Ohio
Memo

To: Mayor and Council

From: Renee Mahoney CPA, Director of Finance

Date: December 7, 2016

Re: Anticipated Year End Appropriation Adjustments

I am anticipating needing to adjust the following appropriations on the final ordinance for 2016 to be presented to Council on December 19:

General Fund

The only major request at this point would be for Council to consider up to a $1,000,000 transfer from General Fund to General Reserve. This would put the General Reserve Fund up to $1,888,829.22 which would then give the City a healthy balance of about 2 months of expenditures which is the suggested amount published by the Government Finance Officers Association. The goal would be to leave about $1,000,000 in General Fund as well, which would be consistent with prior years’ balances.

Sidewalk Repair (Fund 245)

The sidewalk program was brought in house in 2014 and there has been a learning curve in the appropriate accounting of labor and supply expenses to this fund. There will need to be an adjustment to the Personnel and Other lines to cover the expenditures for the 2016 program. The final costs of this will be calculated the week of December 11. The receipts to the fund have been sufficient to cover the expenditures in the fund. We will also be assessing the need to increase the per block cost to the residents for the 2017 program.

Equitable Sharing Fund (Fund 297)

The Police Department has been participating in an Ohio Criminal Justice System (OCJS) grant that is a reimbursable grant. The grant expenditures are reimbursed on a quarterly basis. In order for the fund to have a year-end positive balance an advance from the General Fund to the
Equitable Sharing Fund will be necessary. This advance will be repaid in January once the funds are received. Anticipated amount of advance will be no more than $10,000

Pool (Fund 520)

The Pool Fund has exceeded its budget by an estimated $19,000. The major sources of this increase were in Personnel (8.13% increase), Utilities (58.77% increase) and Repair and Maintenance (10.74% increase) over 2015 expenditures. The fund balance is sufficient to cover the increased expenditures. Current analysis is attached.

Cahoon Park (Fund 810)

The HVAC at the Osborn House needed to be replaced at a cost of $5660. Utilities for Cahoon Park were originally budgeted at $54,100 where the 3 year prior average was $59,000. Anticipated utility costs for 2016 are $62,000 therefore need to increase the appropriation in total by $13,560 to cover HVAC and utility expenses. Cash funds are available in this fund to cover additional expense.
City of Bay Village  
Pool Fund Analysis  
Through December 9, 2016  

Revenue  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520.000.46610</td>
<td>Pool Fees - Passes</td>
<td>159,762.00</td>
<td>136,000.00</td>
<td>205,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.000.46611</td>
<td>Pool Fees - Daily Admission</td>
<td>44,926.75</td>
<td>56,413.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.000.46620</td>
<td>Pool Fees - Learn to Swim</td>
<td>33,980.01</td>
<td>29,980.01</td>
<td>29,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.000.46625</td>
<td>Pool Fees - Misc</td>
<td>28,020.00</td>
<td>25,022.00</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.000.46630</td>
<td>Pool Concessions</td>
<td>66,758.18</td>
<td>72,886.43</td>
<td>69,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.000.49010</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.000.49060</td>
<td>Misc Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>383,018.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>327,052.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>341,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>352,862.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520.403.51112</td>
<td>SEASONAL WAGES - SWIMMING</td>
<td>180,949.27</td>
<td>186,039.65</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.52210</td>
<td>PERS - SWIMMING POOL</td>
<td>25,747.83</td>
<td>15,268.12</td>
<td>26,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.52300</td>
<td>MEDICARE - SWIMMING POOL</td>
<td>2,614.07</td>
<td>2,726.73</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.52500</td>
<td>WORKERS COMPENSATION - SW</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.53100</td>
<td>PUBLIC UTILITIES - SWIMMI</td>
<td>20,075.84</td>
<td>15,934.30</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.53600</td>
<td>REPAIR OR MAINTENANCE A B</td>
<td>32,414.93</td>
<td>12,400.05</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.54210/54900 OPERATING SUPPLIES AND OTHER EXPENSES C</td>
<td>34,011.08</td>
<td>45,353.60</td>
<td>39,000.00</td>
<td>43,806.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.54520</td>
<td>CONCESSION SUPPLIES - SW</td>
<td>29,569.15</td>
<td>28,782.99</td>
<td>32,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.57700</td>
<td>REFUNDS- SWIMMING POOL</td>
<td>421.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>508,823.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>321,204.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>333,500.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>352,324.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Income/(Loss) Operations  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>2016 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24,195.49</td>
<td>5,825.98</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>538.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital/Maintenance Expenditures  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520.403.53600</td>
<td>REPAIR OR MAINTENANCE - S Silico Pads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.403.55200</td>
<td>EQUIP REPLACEMENT- MISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Income/(Loss) including Capital  

A - $4,860.20 - In 2015 there was an error in the meter for water. When the meter was installed it wasn't installed correctly and the City did not pay part of the bill until it was corrected which wasn't until January 2015  
B - $4,000 - est. water usage greater than 2015 - found to have a leak in the pool which will need to be corrected  
C - In 2016 the number of days with 90+ degrees was 24 as compared to 3 in 2015. Hot sunny days burn up pool chemicals which is shown by an increase in over 2,800 gallons of chlorine used as compared to 2015. The cost of pool chemicals has increased significantly from 2014 with an almost $10,000 increase from 2014.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of Council
FROM: Paul Koomar, President of Council

DATE: December 15, 2016

Re: Bay Presbyterian Church
   Request for 100th Anniversary Banners

Bay Presbyterian Church has requested the installation of banners in celebration of their 100th anniversary in January, 2017, with a culminating event in late September, 2017. The date for installation of the banners depends on their ability to get them made, but they would like them up as soon after the beginning of January as possible.

The banners will be 2 ft. x 6 ft. and would be installed on existing utility poles at the following locations:

- Eight on Columbia Road beginning at the intersection of Columbia and Wolf and ending at the intersection of Columbia and Lake Road.
- Eight on Lake Road beginning at the intersection of Columbia and Lake, continuing east until the entrance to Bay Presbyterian Church off of Lake Road.

They would also like to install banners on the light poles in their church parking lot.
1179.09 AUXILIARY DESIGN ELEMENTS.

(A) City Council may authorize the Review Committee to adopt rules governing the display of Auxiliary Design Elements for activities, having regard to the limitations established by this Section and the character of the activity and of the surroundings in which it is located.

(B) Rules may be enacted for the following Auxiliary Design Elements, subject to the limitations established for each sign:

(1) Awnings, canopies, and marquees are permitted for all activities in all areas. However, any letters over 3 inches in height which are displayed on an awning or canopy are debited against the items of information allowance established by Section 1179.04. A single identifying double-faced name plate sign may be suspended from a canopy, at right angles to an establishment or store unit. Dimensions of such a sign shall be no greater than 12 inches high and 74 inches wide and shall be centered at the symmetrical center line of the canopy ceiling. Such signs shall be surface mounted to the underside of the canopy.

(2) Temporary window signs are permitted for all except industrial activities in all areas. They may not exceed 15% of the area of the window in which they are displayed and must be attached to the inside of the window. Temporary window signs are not debited against the items of information allowance established by 1179.04. ("Temporary" for purposes of this Chapter is considered to be 30 days.)

(C) Permitted are the following types of illumination and mechanical movement for all activities in all areas, subject to the limitations indicated in this Section:

(1) Colored light. White is the only color of light which is permitted for institutional activities or in areas designated as residential or within 500 feet of such areas.

(2) Mechanical movement refers to animation, revolution, movement up and down, or movement sideways. Signs which move mechanically may be permitted only for motion picture theaters, amusement and recreation services, or as permitted in areas of special control. Windblown devices such as pennants, spinners, and streamers are not permitted for any activity.

(3) Flashing signs which consist of a light which is intermittently on and off are prohibited.

(4) **Banners are prohibited except by permission of Council.**

(5) Illuminated surface colors. Internal illumination. i.e. a light source concealed or contained within the sign, and which becomes visible in darkness through a translucent surface.

(6) Indirect illumination, i.e. a light source not seen directly.

(7) Floodlight illumination, provided that the flood light or spotlight is positioned so that none of the light shines onto an adjoining property or in the eyes of pedestrians or motorists.

(8) Neon tube illumination, i.e. a light source supplied by a neon tube which is bent to form letters, symbols, or other shapes.