AGENDA

Date: February 25, 2019
Time: 7:30 p.m.

AGENDA

Agenda, Bay Village City Council
Committee Meeting
Conference Room, Bay Village City Hall
Dwight Clark, President of Council, Presiding

ANNOUNCEMENTS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Alex Margevicius, Commissioner, Cleveland Water Department.

Laura Sherman, SES Sustainable Energy Services
Electricity for Municipal Buildings and Street Lights

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE-Mace

Amendment to Section 333.11 of the Codified Ordinances — Texting While Driving.

FINANCE & CLAIMS COMMITTEE-Tadych

Amended Annual Appropriation Ordinance.

Administrative Compensation.

Building Department Change Fund.


Abarta Coca-Cola Beverages, LLC Agreement.

New Accounting Software.

PLANNING, ZONING & PUBLIC GROUNDS & BUILDINGS COMMITTEE-Maier

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, STREETS/SEWERS/DRAINAGE COMMITTEE-
Stainbrook

Queenswood Bridge Replacement Project — Payment to the Ohio Department of Transportation.

Sunset Drive Neighborhood Improvement Project.

RECREATION & PARKS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE- Winzig

SERVICES, UTILITIES & EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE-DeGeorge

MISCELLANEOUS/AUDIENCE
CAHOON MEMORIAL PARK TRUSTEES

Approval of Fourth of July Fireworks Display Contract with Hamburg Fireworks Display, Inc.

Approval for use of Cahoon Memorial Park on May 27, 2019 for the 2019 Memorial Day Services.

Request of The Bay Village Foundation to hold a Memorial Day ceremony on the north side of Cahoon Memorial Park from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m., on Monday, May 27, 2019.
City of Bay Village

Council Minutes, Committee Session
David L. Tadych, Vice President of Council, presiding
February 11, 2019
Conference Room

Vice President of Council Tadych called the meeting called to order in the Conference Room of Bay Village City Hall at 7:30 p.m.

Present: DeGeorge, Mace, Maier, Stainbrook, Tadych, Winzig, Mayor Koomar.

Excused: President of Council Clark

Also Present: Law Director Barbour, Finance Director Mahoney, Director of Public Service and Properties Liskovec, Police Chief Spaetzel, Fire Chief Lyons, Recreation Director Enovitch, Community Services Director Selig, Building Director Eric Tuck-Macalla, Engineer Don Bierut.

AUDIENCE

Clare Banasiak, Tara Wendell, Tom Kelly, Jan Saurman.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Koomar announced the appointment of Nick Dios to the Tree Commission for a term of three (3) years expiring February 11, 2022. Mr. Dios is a Certified Arborist, has a multitude of experience and a great deal of interest in giving back to the community.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Janine Rybka, Director, and Brent Eysenbach, Stormwater Program Manager, Cuyahoga County Soil and Water Conservation District regarding services provided to the City of Bay Village.

Ms. Rybka thanked Council and the administration for the opportunity to be present this evening, and for partnering with the Cuyahoga County Soil and Water Conservation District for the past fifteen years. The Cuyahoga County Soil and Water Conservation District is a government agency, celebrating their seventieth year. They are the original environmental agency in Cuyahoga County. Their work is government to government, on behalf of the communities they partner with under Memorandums of Understanding. The program that the Soil and Water Conservation District implements for the City of Bay Village is the mandated Storm Water Management Program, under the Clean Water Act. Since 2003, communities like Bay Village, fifty-six out of the fifty-nine communities in Ohio, are MS4 communities, which stands for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System. The water that goes into the storm sewers during a rain storm does not get treated and finds its way to Lake Erie. There are six minimum control measures, four of which are implemented by the Soil and Water Conservation District. These include public involvement, public education, and water pollution prevention. The core idea is
to prevent pollution, to keep the pollution out of the storm drains for the protection of the water ways.

The public involvement and public education program involves newsletters, fact sheets, target mailings, and posters regarding water quality and the prevention of environmental degradation to the waterways. Ms. Rybka asked that the Council and Mayor feel free to provide ideas to the Soil and Water District as the District implements their outreach strategy. The public involvement programs also involve stream clean-ups, school programs, and teachers’ workshops.

Brent Eysenbach, Stormwater Program Manager, advised that he does the technical side of the stormwater permits, Minimum Control Measures (MCM) 4 and 5. MCM 4 deals with the stormwater pollution prevention plans on construction activities. When there is a new development in the City, the plans are sent to the Soil and Water District for review for compliance with all of the various regulations. Many of the engineering firms in the area know what is required, and a good product is expected. When the Building Department places their stamp of approval, it is the guiding document for how the project will go. Inspectors go out during the construction activity, and the technical inspectors interface with the contractors and project managers to build a proactive, positive, cooperative relationship, letting them know why it is important to keep their construction site clean. When enforcement activity is needed, the Soil and Water District works with the Service Director within the constructs of the codified ordinances to make sure the enforcement is happening correctly.

Minimum Control Measure (MCM) 5 is the bio-retention and post construction storm water management. Bio-retention and permeable pavement are the most noticeable measures in Bay Village. They look at post construction installation first, and erosion and sediment control inspections always. The inspectors understand that the bio-retention cell and the permeable pavement base will need to function correctly so it does not spin out of control. They work with the construction and project managers to be sure that the materials being delivered are appropriate and the subcontractors doing the installation are installing correctly. At the end of the construction activity there is a transition meeting with the design engineer, the project manager, and the owners, to educate them about the specialized maintenance that is required. When the transition meeting is completed, they work with the cities on a yearly basis, inspecting all of the post construction facilities within the cities and provide follow-up to owners at that point to make sure the installations are working in perpetuity and the way they should be working.

Ms. Rybka stated that Jaimie Johnson of the Cuyahoga County Soil and Water Conservation District is a Watershed Coordinator and is working on the nearshore tributaries, developing a nine point source implementation strategy, once known as the Watershed Action Plan. Public meetings are being held and once the document is approved, Ms. Johnson can apply for grants to do things such as stream restoration.

Mr. Winzig asked if there has been a measurable improvement in water quality through all of the efforts of the Cuyahoga County Soil and Water Conservation District. Ms. Rybka stated that there has been improvement with industrial waste. Mr. Eysenbach stated that with the watershed and the chemical monitoring they do, there has been improvement through behavioral changes in
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terms of littering, oil and things going down drains, and people collecting their lawn clippings rather than blowing them into the street and subsequently the drains. The City of Rocky River recently had an issue with flushable wipes clogging the Rocky River Wastewater Treatment Plant. A mailing was done from Mayor Bopst to talk about the flushable wipes not being so flushable. Mayor Koomar noted that a similar education piece will be done in Bay Village.

Ms. Rybka and Mr. Eysenbach were thanked for their presentations this evening.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE-Mace

Amendment to Section 333.11 of the Codified Ordinances – Texting While Driving.

Mr. Mace will present an ordinance this evening for first reading to amend Section 333.11 of the Codified Ordinances concerning texting while driving. The Law Director has drafted an ordinance that will change texting while driving from a secondary offense, which means that a person can only be cited for something when they are being cited for another offense, to a primary offense. A primary offense will enable an officer to cite a driver who is seen texting while driving.

Law Director Barbour stated that the only change is in Paragraph (c) of Section 333.11, which has been removed and the subsequent sections renumbered.

Ms. DeGeorge stated that Section (b) No. (4) reads as though it could be referring to texting: “A person reading, selecting, or entering a name or telephone number in a handheld electronic wireless communications device for the purpose of making or receiving a telephone call;” Ms. DeGeorge asked how that is not considered texting, if the person is entering a telephone number or name.

Mr. Barbour stated that this is exactly the same as the Ohio Revised Code section.

Ms. DeGeorge asked Police Chief Spaetzle about the penalty if someone is stopped and cited for texting while driving and three weeks later the same person gets stopped for the same offense. Chief Spaetzle stated that all offenses are minor misdemeanors.

Mr. Mace stated that the words Ms. DeGeorge quoted from Section (b) (4) were taken from the original ordinance. The committee did not think there was going to be any change to that section and the only change that was required was Paragraph (c) to make the offense a primary offense. To Ms. DeGeorge’s point, there may be a need of reviewing a change to delete the entering of information to a handheld device.

Mr. Barbour stated that the only thing discussed in the committee meetings was primary or secondary offense. The remainder of the body of the ordinance was not reviewed. Mr. Barbour is sure that there is a reason why Section (b) No. (4) is in the law.

Mr. Tadych stated that the ordinance will be introduced for first reading this evening, with changes, if necessary, for the second reading.
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Mrs. Stainbrook asked if the offense, texting while driving, becomes a primary offense by removing Paragraph (c).

Mr. Barbour stated that all offenses are primary offenses unless you include the language in Paragraph (c) which makes it a secondary offense.

Ms. DeGeorge asked if someone will visit the high school and provide an education piece when the ordinance is passed to educate the teen drivers.

Mayor Koomar stated that the teen drivers do know because in their driving classes they are taught about the specific rules for drivers under 18 texting while driving, which results in a suspension of driver’s license. Mayor Koomar will follow up with Ms. DeGeorge’s suggestion. The Mayor noted further that there is stricter enforcement for drivers under the age of 18.

Ms. Maier advised that the City of Avon has installed pole banners about distracted driving. The banners state that there is a $150 fine for distracted driving. Ms. Maier suggested that this may be the way to get the message out.

Mr. Barbour asked if it is the desire of Ms. DeGeorge to eliminate Section (b) (4), because currently the way it reads is that you are allowed to use your handheld electronic wireless communication device for the limited purpose of entering a name or telephone number. The phone can be held in the hand to enter a name or phone number, but the driver cannot talk on the phone while holding the phone in their hand. It has to be hands free except for entering of the contact, such as a name or telephone number.

Mr. Tadych asked how the police would be able to tell the difference.

Chief Spaetzle stated that the driver would be stopped for probable cause. The Police Officer would then talk to the driver to best determine what the driver was doing. He noted that it is a difficult law to enforce. Officer discretion and education at the roadside becomes necessary.

Mr. Barbour noted that there is another exception for using the device for navigation purposes. Under the same theory, that should be excluded as well. There is a section regarding wireless messages received via radio waves. Mr. Barbour assumes it is some type of radio between a truck and a dispatch. He noted that the problem with some of these things is that the legislative history is not going to contain the thought process as to why these particular sections were adopted. There are not often places you can look for these kinds of laws to learn why certain sections were included.

Ms. Stainbrook asked if the State of Ohio has a handheld cell phone ban while driving. Mr. Barbour stated that it is illegal in the State of Ohio to talk on a handheld cell phone while driving. We call it texting while driving, but the state code talks about using a handheld cell phone, without referencing texting. Mr. Mace noted that it has to be cited as a secondary offense.
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Ms. Stainbrook asked if Ohio is clearly separating talking on the phone from texting. Mr. Barbour stated that Ms. Stainbrook is correct. Ms. Stainbrook stated that she thinks Paragraph (4) should stay in because it specifically references talking on the phone, and since Ohio doesn’t have a ban on it that it should remain.

Ms. Stainbrook confirmed with the Police Chief that Ohio does not have a law that allows her to be pulled over because she was seen talking on the phone. But, if the police thought she was texting and she was pulled over and claimed to be just making a phone call, the police would take that into consideration. Chief Spaetzle stated that his interpretation of Paragraph (b) (4) is having a contact on the phone, scrolling to make the contact and talking. Ms. DeGeorge said that she would call this distracted driving. Chief Spaetzle stated that it could be called distracted driving, but to keep in mind that they also have a distracted driving ordinance if there is an accident or egregious contact for enforcement.

Mr. Barbour noted that at times it may be necessary to activate something on the phone to use it for the hands free purpose.

The ordinance will be introduced and placed on first reading this evening, with further investigation by the Law Director. Further into the meeting this evening, Mr. Barbour noted the example of the ordinance of the City of Shaker Heights, Ohio and suggested review of this ordinance for possible adoption of portions by Bay Village.

Mr. Tadych suggested that the Environment and Safety Committee further review the ordinance while it remains on first reading.

Mr. Mace stated that a meeting of the Environment, Safety and Community Services Committee will be held on Wednesday, February 27, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. and will include the review of the Shaker Heights ordinance at that meeting.

Transfer of Liquor Permit from 583 Bistro to Thyme Table, 583 Dover Center Road.

Mr. Mace will present a motion to not request a hearing on the application for the transfer of the liquor license held by Dover Bay Enterprises, doing business as 583 Bistro, to Thyme Table of 583 Dover Center Road, without objection of the Chief of Police.

Mayor Koomar noted that Bay Village resident Michael Smith has taken over the premise at 583 Dover Center Road, with a soft target for opening sometime the first half of April, 2019.

FINANCE & CLAIMS COMMITTEE-Tadych

January 2019 Financial Reports

Mr. Mace will present a motion to acknowledge receipt of the January 2019 Financial Reports of the City of Bay Village prepared by Finance Director Renee Mahoney.

Mr. Winzig made the following clarifications on the reports submitted by Mrs. Mahoney:
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Page 1 – The Star Ohio $363,973 should match what is on Page 2.
Page 2 – The very right hand column should be 2019 interest earned.

Mr. Winzig stated that a number of the public utilities appropriations are over expectation. Mrs. Mahoney stated that blanket purchase orders are entered for the year for utilities. Those were put in based on last year’s numbers, and the appropriations are higher than the original budget.

Mr. Tadych commented that a Finance Committee meeting will most probably be held when there are two months of reports to review.

Amended Annual Appropriation Ordinance.

Mr. Mace will present for first reading this evening the ordinance to make appropriations for current and other expenditures by the City.

Mrs. Mahoney stated that the changes are for the Capital Budget for 2019. It has not changed drastically from what was discussed last week. The main thing to know is that the Debt Service Funding level at $2,583,302 is down. Mayor Koomar stated that the Finance Committee wanted to reduce the debt projection to the $2.5 million range so projects have been adjusted down a bit. They are not quite sure when the new Finance system will hit; they will have a payment this fall and will manage to it, but rather than taking out the debt in April and not using it, it is easier to come back and look at it when there are firm numbers and make an adjustment when they can.

Mrs. Mahoney stated that other changes are the web site improvement which was shifted back to 2019 from 2020. Mayor Koomar stated that it is hoped to start on it this fall, and there are municipal vendors that will spread it out over three years. Also, the Rose Hill Foundation Project, the Cahoon Shed Project and the trail grants should be completed in the summer with time in the fall to vet vendors for web site improvement. The Mayor noted that there are vendors that do municipal web sites, and all cities are somewhat similar. Mrs. Stainbrook stated that she is glad to see the web site improvement included.

Mrs. Mahoney stated that more details are included in the packets regarding the rifle upgrade from the Police Chief. Engineering costs for the Sunset Improvement Project is the final change from the week of February 4, 2019.

The Amended Annual Appropriation Ordinance will be presented for first reading this evening with final reading and adoption on February 25, 2019.

Ms. DeGeorge asked about the application of Casino money for the Reese Park Tennis Courts to be converted to Pickle Ball Courts. Ms. DeGeorge stated that a Sunset Improvement Project meeting was held this evening. Over the weekend, Ms. DeGeorge went over the last three meeting minutes for the Public Improvements Committee, which, when referencing grants, included discussion regarding applying for the Casino money for the Sunset Project.
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Ms. Maier stated that it had come up at one of the meetings, but it was a nominal amount. Mayor Koomar that the Casino money has been applied for the Pickle Ball Courts under the strategy that it would improve tennis courts use for all ages and all uses and specifically designating Pickle Ball Courts for the 60 and over group, although popularity of this activity is spreading to all age groups. Mayor Koomar noted that there should be a response to the Casino money application very soon.

Administrative Compensation.

Mr. Mace will introduce an ordinance for first reading this evening amending the rates of compensation of the Administration Department.

Mr. Winzig noted that the ordinance should read “2019” rather than “2018.”

Approval of Labor Contract with the Police Dispatchers Union.

Mr. Winzig will introduce an ordinance this evening and move for adoption with inclusion of the emergency clause for the approval of the labor contract with the Police Dispatchers Union.

PLANNING, ZONING & PUBLIC GROUNDS & BUILDINGS COMMITTEE-Maier

Ms. Maier announced that a meeting of the Planning, Zoning, Public Grounds and Buildings Committee will be held on Monday, February 25, 2019 at 6:15 p.m. Agenda items include Home Based Businesses, and the Vacant Housing Ordinance, hoping to use the experience of Building Director Eric Tuck-Macalla with other communities. Ms. Maier has also spoken with the President of Council about the skate park lighting. There has been a request by resident Dan Overfield who organized the pilot for the lighting of the skate park. Mr. Overfield is interested in applying for funding through the Bay Village Foundation. The topic has been discussed at the Recreation and Parks Committee but it is also a matter of the Planning, Zoning, Public Grounds and Buildings Committee.

Minutes reflecting the installation of the skate park will be provided to the members of the Planning and Zoning Committee for historical knowledge reference.

Mr. Tadych asked if there has been any information presented regarding cost on lighting. Ms. Maier stated that Mr. Overfield wants to contact electrical contractors to see a ball park figure, but also wants feedback from the City before making that contact. The application for the Bay Village Foundation is due at the end of February, with a limit of $5,000.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, STREETS/SEWERS/DRAINAGE COMMITTEE-
Stainbrook

Sunset Improvement Project

Ms. Stainbrook advised that a meeting of the Public Improvements Committee was held this evening with an agreement by the members of the committee that a motion will be requested
from President of Council Dwight Clark for the agenda of Council of February 25, 2019 moving
the Sunset Project from the Public Improvements Committee to the Committee of the Whole.
This will formally move that project to the Committee of the Whole for consideration of options
and review of information from the administration and the engineering contractor.

Approval of contracts for the furnishing of Road Maintenance Materials: Aggregate, Concrete
and Asphalt.

Ms. Stainbrook will introduce three ordinances for contracts for road maintenance materials at
the Special Meeting of Council this evening.

Director of Public Service and Properties stated that small increases are expected year to year,
with concrete being the largest increase this year.

Mr. Winzig noted that pricing of concrete depends on when it is ordered and how far the truck is
driven. He asked if that factor is manageable. Mr. Liskovec stated that a good example of that
influence is the sidewalk program. Every time the truck is moved from site to site additional
expense is incurred. They try to best manage that type of work.

Ms. Stainbrook asked Mr. Liskovec his thoughts on changing the rates that are charged residents
for the blocks of sidewalk replacement. Mr. Liskovec stated that there may be a change due to
the increased cost of the concrete. Mr. Liskovec will keep Council posted.

Mr. Tadych noted that the cost of gasoline is down, and asked if this has affected the cost of
asphalt. Mr. Liskovec stated that the cost of asphalt is actually up, by $3.00 to $4.00 per ton.

RECREATION & PARKS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE- Winzig

Mr. Winzig had no report this evening.

SERVICES, UTILITIES & EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE-DeGeorge

Ms. DeGeorge had no report this evening.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. DeGeorge advised being contacted by a resident this week regarding a sign in Cahoon
Memorial Park that used to read “Bay Residents and Guests Only.” That section of the sign has
been blocked out.

Mayor Koomar stated that the park is usually open to invited guests, which is broad when taking
into consideration Bay Challenge Cup and other events of that nature.

Mr. Tadych asked if the City has blocked the words or the sign been vandalized.
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Ms. DeGeorge stated that the words “Bay Residents and Guests Only” is blocked out. It is the sign going back towards the police station in Cahoon Memorial Park. It appears to have been blocked out rather than vandalized.

Mayor Koomar will investigate and keep Council advised.

AUDIENCE

There were no comments from the audience this evening.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

David L. Tadych, Vice President of Council

Joan Kemper, Clerk of Council
Contract

Contract entered into this ______ day of __________ A.D. 201____ at _______ (AM/PM) by and between Hamburg Fireworks Display Inc. of Lancaster in the county of Fairfield and State of Ohio party of the first part and City of Bay Village in the county of Cuyahoga in the State of Ohio party of the second part, witness to:

The said party of the first part in consideration of the promises and agreements of said party of the second part herein set fourth hereby covenants and agrees to furnish one fireworks display on the agreed date Thursday, July 4, 2019 and time 9:45 PM. The attached sheet describes the items in the display show and presents the total cost of display including insurance. A rain date will be agreeable with both parties, rain date Friday, July 5, 2019. In the event of inclement weather, the display will be rescheduled to the mutually agreed date and the party of the second part will secure the extension of the permit from the local authorities. Postponement fees are fifteen (15%) percent of the contract price. The postponement fee will be waived and the paid deposit will be applied to the mutually agreed upon rain date in the event the decision to postpone is mutually agreed upon and the party of the first party is notified by the party of the second part within a minimum of twelve hours prior to display date and time.

Should the party of the second part elect to cancel the display there is a cancellation fee of twenty-five (25%) percent of the contract price. The party of the second part agrees to procure and furnish a suitable place to display the said fireworks in accordance with the current National Fire Protection Association codes 1123, 1124, and 1126. The party of the second part must also furnish police, fire and crowd security persons in securing adequate crowd control, auto parking and proper supervision of the danger zone, as secured by its agents until Hamburg Fireworks Display Inc., advises that the security is no longer necessary. Hamburg Fireworks Display Inc., reserve the right to terminate the display in the event that persons enter the secured danger zone and security is unable or unwilling to enforce the safety regulations.

In consideration whereof said party of the second party hereby promises and agrees to pay the sum of $11,000.00 for the display show, on or before display date. Upon acceptance of this agreement a sum of which is equal or greater than 50% of total contract amount, will be due. A late fee of two percent (2%) will be charged after 10 days of display date.

Hamburg Fireworks Display Inc., reserves the right to substitute shells of equal or greater value in the event a substitution is necessary.

In witness whereof, the said parties have hereunto set their hands to duplicates here of the day and year above written.

By________________________
On behalf of Hamburg Fireworks Display Inc.

By________________________
On behalf of company / Sponsor / Agent

Witness________________________
Bill To:  
City of Bay Village

Ship To:  
Bay Village, Ohio

Phone:  
740-654-2666  
Sales Rep: Ken Sprague

Fax:  
Cell: 740-808-2666

Your PO #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5&quot; SALUTE FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3&quot; SALUTE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>3&quot; ASSORTED COLOR, FANCY, SPECIAL SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4&quot; ASSORTED COLOR, FANCY, SPECIAL SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5&quot; ASSORTED COLOR, FANCY, SPECIAL SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>6&quot; ASSORTED COLOR, FANCY, SPECIAL SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8&quot; ASSORTED COLOR SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5&quot; SALUTE FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3&quot; ASSORTED COLOR CRACKLING FINALE SHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3&quot; ASSORTED COLOR &amp; SALUTE FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>3&quot; SALUTE FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8&quot; ASSORTED COLOR FINALE SHELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1&quot; MULTI-SHOT COLOR &amp; EFFECT FINALE BOX (100 SHOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5&quot; MULTI-SHOT COLOR &amp; EFFECT FINALE BOX (100 SHOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5&quot; MULTI-SHOT COLOR &amp; EFFECT FINALE BOX (100 SHOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3&quot; MULTI-SHOT COLOR &amp; EFFECT FINALE BOX (100 SHOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1&quot;/1.5&quot; MULTI-SHOT FAN EFFECT FINALE BOX (100 SHOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>E-MATCH 15' OR 5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATCH 10 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30 MINUTE FUSEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- TOTAL PRICE INCLUDES: INSURANCE CERTIFICATE, EQUIPMENT, DELIVERY, LICENSED EXHIBITOR AND REGISTERED ASSISTANTS
- BALANCE DUE ON DATE
- 2% LATE PAYMENT CHARGE APPLICABLE W/10 DAYS PAST DUE

We Appreciate Your Business!

Estimate Total 11,000.00
OVERVIEW

1. Action Requested
Amendment to Resolution 18-97 passed on November 26, 2018 for additional appropriation of $5,971.50 for the construction of the Queenswood Bridge project.

2. Previous Action
Resolution 18-97 passed on November 26, 2018 authorizing the payment of $60,562.00 as an estimate for the City’s share of funding required for the project.

3. Background/Justification for Current Action
Per the results of the public bidding process, low bidder came in $1,243,617.30 which is above the State estimate of $1,144,000. As stated in the terms of the Municipal Bridge Fund Grant, the city is responsible for 5% of construction and in addition the city elected to have ODOT administer the project at a rate 5% of the cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost:</td>
<td>1,243,617.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funding (95%):</td>
<td>1,181,436.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Share (5%):</td>
<td>62,180.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Administration and Engineering (7% of construction):</td>
<td>87,053.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funding (96.5%):</td>
<td>82,700.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Share (5%):</td>
<td>4,352.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Share:</td>
<td>66,533.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Paid:</td>
<td>(60,562.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Due:</td>
<td>5,971.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Financial Impact
Expenditure of $5,971.50.

5. Implementation Plan
Payment to be executed upon council approval.

6. High-Level Timeline/Schedule
Immediately
Ohio Department of Transportation
Official Bid Tabulation
Jerry Wray, Director

Project No. 194000
P1D 109480
CLY CS Queenswood Drive
Federal
Type: CULVERT REPLACEMENT
Letting Date: 1/10/2019
Completion Date: 10/31/2019

Contract Awarded To: BLACK HORSE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION INC
Award Amount: $1,243,617.30
Engineer's Estimate: $1,144,000.00

**Bidder 1**
BLACK HORSE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION INC
5185 WOOSTER ROAD WEST
Summit
NORTON, OH 44203
Bid $1,243,617.30

**Bidder 2**
ECLIPSE CO LLC
11554 EAST WASHINGTON ST
Geauga
CHAGRIN FALLS, OH 44023
Bid $1,564,859.15
Minutes of a Meeting of
Public Improvements, Streets, Sewers and Drainage Committee
held February 11, 2019
6:15 p.m. Council Chambers

Present: Councilwoman Nancy Stainbrook, Chair, Councilwoman Lydia DeGeorge, Councilwoman Sara Byrnes Maier.

Also present: Mayor Koomar, Councilman Tadych, Councilman Mace, Councilman Winzig, Law Director Barbour, Director of Public Service and Properties Jon Liskovec, Engineer Don Bierut, Director of Building Eric Tuck-Macalla, Finance Director Mahoney.

Audience: Mary Deutschman, Dorothy Stewart, John J. Cook, Eric Ripley, Kevin & Deb Busdiecker, Karen and David Brill, Jerry Dowling, Bill Barack, Mary Wise, Jan Rybka, Brent Eysenbach, Lynn Bennett, Rick Michaels, Tom Kelly, Suzanne Graham, Clare Banasiak, Tara Wendell.

Councilwoman Stainbrook called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m., introducing herself as Chairman, and Ms. DeGeorge and Ms. Maier, as the other members of the Public Improvements Committee, and acknowledging the presence of Mayor Koomar and the administrative staff.

Sunset Area Improvement Project

Mrs. Stainbrook advised that there are handouts in the back of the room relating to the topic this evening. Copies are attached to these minutes as if fully incorporated herein.

The first handout advises the application of Ohio Revised Code 727 to the Sunset Improvement Project, and defines the assessment calculations for the project. The next document is a Cost Sheet, describing the total list of project costs, with nothing changed from September, 2017 when distributed at the September 11, 2017 Public Improvements Committee meeting. The third handout is titled, “Assessment Amounts based on Front Foot, Based on ORC,” which explains the assessment process for the project.

The agenda for this evening will include the District One Public Works Integrating Committee (DOPWIC) grant request results, the project status, and time for audience questions. If the committee agrees, there will be a committee recommendation out of the Public Improvements Committee.

DOPWIC Results

Ms. Stainbrook stated that the District One Public Works Integrating Committee (DOPWIC) provides funding through grants and loans. The City applied for this funding, and scored better than the City had ever scored, but were just short of scoring well enough for funding. Kathryn Kerber, Administrative Project Leader for the City of Bay
Village did a lot of the grant work. The City scored 69, and funding started at 71. Mayor Koomar added that a lot of time was spent internally and with the DOPWIC Committee, insuring that no stone was left unturned. The scoring system is straight forward, a function of how many projects for which applications were submitted. Five or ten years ago, there were project that scored in that 69 range that received funding, but it is dependent on how many projects were submitted. Due to the many needs there are, the bar, over time, has risen slightly.

Mrs. Stainbrook thanked the administration and Kathryn Kerber, noting that there is a lot that goes into applications for this type of funding, and there was a lot of work done on behalf of the City and the project.

**Current Sunset Improvement Project Status.**

From that perspective, the project stands as is, regarding the overall scope of the $3.25 million project. The City portion of that is $1.8 million, and the assessed resident portion is $1.4 million.

City Council and the administration have been working on the Capital Budget which includes large infrastructure projects that are considered Capital improvements. Included in that budget, is $489,000 allotted for limited infrastructure improvements for the Sunset Project. Mrs. Stainbrook cautioned that this Capital Budget has not yet been approved. There have been many Finance Committee meetings related to the budget, and it will come before Council and the administration and it is expected that those dollars allocated will be considered as part of critical infrastructure most in need of repair related to the project.

**Ms. Maier** stated that it is important to understand that this is a temporary solution to the issue that would help with the roadway surface. It is not fixing the underlying issue, by putting in sewers or fixing water lines. It is getting a better surface on the roadway as a stopgap measure. The project costs have not shrunk; this is more of a temporary solution.

**Mayor Koomar** stated that one of the things being looked for is that back in 2010 funding for cities was reduced at the state level. Federal portions have shrunk as well. Cities have been advocating to have some of those funds restored. Those funds helped projects like the Sunset Project that were larger in scope. The State of Ohio is at a maximum for their Rainy Day Fund, so with a new administration, the City is looking forward to see what may come out of that situation. There was a lot of talk during election time about restoring some of that funding back to the cities. As of late last Thursday, that process at both levels is not going to more very quickly. There needs to be some type of relief provided to the residents for the roadway and make some limited, additional improvements underneath the roadway to provide a good surface and utilities until some of the funding flows through to go further on the project. The administration put this forward based on the thinking that if the DOPWIC funds are not available, and the whole project cannot be done right now as is, something substantial needs to be done to improve the roadway and underlying utilities so they are functioning as we look to
continue this funding battle.

Director of Public Service and Properties Liskovec stated that in consultation with Chagrin Valley Engineering, represented by Don Bierut, Consulting Engineer, they are suggesting recycling the existing surface and adding a two inch overlay on top of the recycled surface. This is considered to be a seven-year fix, possibly longer, and will provide a much more pleasant driving experience in the neighborhood. There are a couple of areas underground that also need to be addressed. These improvements are along the sanitary sewer line to make sure everyone stays serviceable until funding is released through the state and the City can start planning long term to put together a project that will meet everyone’s expectations.

The Mayor added that there will also be some water line replacement under this plan. Some of the north-south streets, Kenmore and Rockledge, have water lines coming off of Lake Road that will need attention. Mayor Koomar noted that it would not be in the best interest to dig up the new surface to make water line repairs. The idea is to make the improvement last for a number of years and take care some of those areas that are critical.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that from an engineering perspective if you are looking at a limited infrastructure improvement you are looking at some of the worst areas most in need of repair, and pavement for the neighborhood.

Mr. Bierut explained the asphalt recycling process. He stated it is basically a large machine that comes down the street, pulls the asphalt up, mixes it up, rejuvenates it and puts it back down. It is basically the same pavement that is there today, rejuvenated and put back down, with asphalt put over the top.

Mrs. Stainbrook called for questions from the members of the Public Improvements Committee.

Ms. Maier stated that it is important to be clear that this is not a long term solution and we still have to find that long term solution and funding. This is something that makes the area more passable in the meantime, which has been a huge concern for residents. It is important for the residents to know that we are trying to find the different angles to fund the improvement wholly.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that from a timing perspective, Council must first approve the Capital Budget and then understand the scope of the work to be done in order to arrive at the timing. Mrs. Stainbrook stated that she does not want to assume that this is the option that is going to be chosen by Council from a project perspective. Mr. Liskovec and Mr. Bierut were asked what the timing would be if the Capital dollars are approved and this is the option chosen by Council. Mayor Koomar stated that the Capital Budget will go on first reading this evening for consideration, and will be passed on February 25, 2019. This is when the funding would be available. Mr. Bierut stated that he would say a June or July start of construction would be realistic after the bidding process is completed.
Public Improvements Committee
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Mrs. Stainbrook thanked the Mayor for the administration’s intent to go after additional funding. We are all hopeful that the fund limits of the Rainy Day Fund of the state have been reached, and hopefully some of those dollars will be coming back to municipalities.

Mrs. Stainbrook suggested that the Sunset Drive Storm Sewer and Roadway Improvements Project be moved from the Public Improvement Committee of the Whole. This committee will request that the President of Council put a motion before Council to request that this project move to the Committee of the Whole where it can be considered by the entire Council. From a strategic perspective, the Capital Budget goes on first reading his evening, with a possible vote for adoption on February 25, 2019. That would allocate dollars, and Council, as Committee of the Whole, would decide on how those dollars would be used and the scope of the project.

Ms. Maier stated that she likes the approach suggested by Mrs. Stainbrook. To be clear, if Council agrees to move forward with this project, it is possible that in five years we might be in the same exact position of trying to still find funding.

Ms. DeGeorge stated that she agrees with everything that was said. It would be a temporary fix, and a fix that was asked for by a couple of the residents at the last meeting. That was taken under consideration when looking at the whole picture.

Mrs. Stainbrook opened the floor for audience questions.

Bill Barack, 320 Kenmore, stated that in the previous meetings there was discussion about the City floating a bond issue to cover their portion. All of a sudden, tonight, it seems like, “Oh, we didn’t get the DOPWIC funding and now we can’t do anything.” He asked what happened to floating a bond issue to cover the City’s portion. Mr. Barack stated further, “Second question, this is not a 2019 Project, it is a 2019 – 2020, and at that, if you approve the project as a go ahead, $500,000 would cover probably most of the expenses that you could incur this year. And then, we are talking about 2020. What is your thinking about bond issue and multi-year project where this is just not you have to pay for it in 2019?”

Mrs. Stainbrook answered that if this goes to the Committee of the Whole, there could be consideration that the full project still is an option, as well as, perhaps, using the not-quite-half-million dollars as a phase, if you want to call it that, limited infrastructure. If it is a whole project, then we are bonding out. If it is comfortable to do the entire project, as is, as described in the original assessment documents and the total scope of the project, then that is a bonding out project. The Public Improvements Committee is recommending that this project be moved to the Committee of the Whole so that Council can consider all of those options, with the Council of seven members.

Mayor Koomar stated that this project is a 2019 project to be completed in 2019. Looking at the other City’s needs, relative to issuing long term debt, we have a lot of other needs in the City that we are balancing right now. This year, and next year in particular, we are faced with some large pieces of City equipment, a fire vehicle that is
going on 23 years old that we have to purchase, that we delayed for a few years. When we talked to the Finance Committee about their comfort level with the amount of debt we could issue this year, going for a long term project and trying to handle all of those needs of those pieces of equipment that we have to do this year, the numbers don’t work. So, looking at this, and saying, let’s put down a good roadway that is going to last for seven or eight years, let’s make some infrastructure improvements, and some limited storm water, sanitary, and water line improvements that would fit into the larger project when it is done, and supplement it now without having to tear up the roadway when it is done. It would increase the useful life of the utilities underground and allow us to look for more funding. Issuing debt right now on that project, and trying to balance these other expenditures we need to do in 2019, the numbers won’t work. The recommendation of our Finance Committee, with our Council President, and Mr. Tadych as Council Chair of the Finance Committee, was to say what can you do to improve this area and give the residents some relief. Anything we do underground will be a perfect fit with the longer term plan. We would be biting off a little piece of some of these areas that need some improvement and take care of those now.

Mr. Bierut stated that any underground improvement would be reflected in the assessed plans. We wouldn’t be tearing those out if we found additional funding. They would supplement that plan.

Mayor Koomar stated that to be clear it is the recommendation because the administration, while there will be some improvements, looks at this as more of a repair, although a longer term repair. The residents will be pleasantly pleased with the driving surface after what they have been putting up with. This will be part of the City funding; there will not be residents’ responsibility of this as proposed by the City administration.

An audience member asked, “Why not?”

The Mayor responded that it is a repair and if we are going to make a long term Capital improvement in a number of years that would be the appropriate time to consider an assessment.

The audience member stated that they have what used to be storm sewers, and they have streets. You just need to repair that. “Isn’t it all repair?”

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that the whole project would be repair and replace.

Mayor Koomar stated that under that project there would be new storm water lines added.

Director of Public Service Liskovec stated that the storm and water repair is limited at best for that area.

The audience member asked exactly what the City is preparing to do there for the storm water.
Mr. Liskovec stated that there is a limited stretch that would be undertaken on Sunset Drive which would basically be the building block for the whole target area. The way the project is designed, everything is actually funneled in toward the Sunset/Rockland intersection and contributes to the storm water run-off. There would be a starting point there, and also some of the sanitary lines would need some improvements underground, and also the water lines.

Mayor Koomar added that the sanitary lines, along with the storm, are things that we look at that we want to insure they are functioning. One of the things in this is that there is a section of line that is on private property. Our goal would be to get easements from six or more property owners so we can maintain those lines. But, there is a section that is in worse shape, and that is the section that Mr. Liskovec mentioned we would want to go in and replace that right now to make sure it functions for the foreseeable future.

Jeff Foster, 329 Kenmore, asked if the engineering has been done on all these improvements, and, if so, can the residents have a review of those drawings. Second question is for the mill and overlay, are our roads a good candidate for that judging the sub-straight of what is there and the condition of it?

Mr. Bierut stated that the plans for the assessment project were done a year or two ago by CT Consultants. While those are being incorporated into this option, they wouldn’t be used for that; it would be limited. Secondly, Mr. Liskovec and I had a conversation today about milling and resurfacing the roadway which you see many times on a curbed street or on an asphalt street that needs a better surface. In this case, that wouldn’t work, just scraping two inches and putting two inches on would be a very, very temporary fix. The recycling type project would pull the entire thing up, eight or nine inches thick, put it back down and compact it. The asphalt that is pulled up and recycled has new asphalt put in and rejuvenated so it looks like brand new asphalt coming out, it is put down, and it is rolled with a roller. If there are soft spots those have been dug out and fixed, and then it is resurfaced with asphalt over the top. It is more extensive than we typically know as a mill and fill.

Mr. Foster stated that he just wants to point out that there are areas that have no base. For the first section, he was referring to the first scope of work, the $489,000 that Council is currently talking about, if there is an opportunity for the residents to see what that scope of work is so they have an understanding especially when talking about a summer time construction project. The neighborhood comes to life in the summer so they would like to have some level of expectation of what they will see.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that this all has not been finalized yet, there are still some questions to that option. As this moves forward and goes to Council there will be a lot of discussion about those details.

An audience member stated that there is hardly any time. February 25, as we talked earlier, and then going out for bids. When would we expect that the drawings that will go out to bid will be done?
Mr. Bierut stated that the drawings will be done in April or May.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that there will be meetings of the Committee of the Whole related to this project and we will move forward from there.

Mrs. Stainbrook asked if there were any further questions.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that she would like to request, and she will follow this up with Council President Dwight Clark, that the Public Improvements Committee requests a motion for the meeting of February 25, 2019 to officially take the Sunset Project from the Public Improvements Committee to the Committee of the Whole. Ms. Maier and Ms. DeGeorge expressed agreement.

Mrs. Stainbrook encouraged everyone to follow the process and, if not already on the list of notifications, to sign up with the Clerk of Council, Joan Kemper, to stay on top of meetings that will be held related to City Council and the Committee of the Whole.

A resident stated that it was stated that if this all falls into place, this construction will be done in June. Mr. Bierut stated that it would be early summer.

The resident asked if the project scope will be for three months, six months, or six weeks.

Mr. Bierut stated that the project will run for ten to twelve weeks.

Mary Wise, Sunset Drive, asked if there is a reason they can’t wait until August or September.

Mr. Bierut stated that the sewer work can be done anytime. The asphalt is temperature dependent. The later it is done, the more the risk of not getting it done. The recycling process requires a core temperature of a little earlier.

Rick Michaels, 24817 Sunset, stated that he is one of the people who advocated this several years ago. He thanked the committee for listening, and besides being a repair it is a lot of pay back because they have all been struggling with horrific conditions. He would also like everyone to recognize that it is recompense for what has been neglected in the past. There are places where there, pretty much, is no asphalt. There are places in the Sunset, Rockland area where it is concrete merged with asphalt. He would assume that this would be dressed somehow right. Last week the construction project that is going on at the end of Rockledge is rough on Rockledge. Mr. Michaels says he assumes that by the time the project would get to Rockledge the construction project would be sufficiently underway so that it doesn’t destroy fresh asphalt.

Ms. DeGeorge asked if the temporary fix will affect any type of funding the City might go for down the road. As they continue to look at grants and other sources, would a temporary fix be looked at negatively on that application?
Mayor Koomar stated that from a DOPWIC perspective, it would because of the roadway component. But, knowing how competitive that has been and that we really have done our best, he would not view that as a true, viable option. Many times when we are looking at new storm water for managing that, and sanitary lines, programs coming down the pike from the federal and state government that have not been determined yet, many times for those underground lines that are in need, not knowing what those will look like, we will be in the best shape we can be. The Mayor stated that he does not feel we can afford to wait any longer and not have the residents have a better driving surface.

Mr. Bierut stated that eleven projects were funded by DOPWIC, which aren’t many. Sixty to seventy percent of the money was given to the City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. Everybody has needs, including Cleveland and Cuyahoga County, and we are not afraid to ask. Mayor Koomar stated that the City of Euclid was funded and a component of that is economic health, which we are never going to score better on. They are in true economic hardship and need, and they are always going to score above us.

Mr. Bierut responded to the question, “Does fixing it hurt us going forward?” He stated that it doesn’t help, but he does not think the area can be ignored with hope that if we let it get worse we will get funded. It is plenty bad now, and did not get funded on this round.

Karen Brill, 24901 Lakeview, asked if this project is ever going to happen. She stated that there has been talk about this going back to the 1950’s. “Are we looking at another sixty years? Are we going to wait to put in storm sewers until Lakeview just falls into the lake and then you don’t have to worry about that street?”

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that as the Mayor mentioned, we are trying to work with funding, we are trying to provide Capital Budget dollars to repair the areas that are in most need of repair. Mrs. Stainbrook cautioned everyone to understand the process of how this works. The committee is just recommending that this goes to the Committee of the Whole. Once it gets to Committee of the Whole, there could be support for completing the entire project, there could be support for a phased project, and there could be other ideas that come up as part of Council related to this project. There is a lot still to be determined from a Council standpoint. The administration has done a really good job of working with the engineers to come up with a phased solution to start with getting us by for seven years in terms of asphalt and infrastructure. Now, Council has to look at all of those options and come up with a recommendation.

Mrs. Brill stated that she feels like by the time we do this Lakeview will have eroded into the lake because there are inadequate storm sewers and her home will be worthless. She stated that this literally keeps her up at night, and she does not feel good about that.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that she was on Council fifteen years ago and this was also a topic then, but she does have to say we have made a lot of progress in 2018 and now, starting in 2019. We have come a long way from where we were. This project has been talked about for thirty years.
Ms. Maier stated that the cost has been the biggest hurdle. Hearing what people were saying that the assessment fee was too high for the homeowners to bear that is why the DOPWIC application was put in to see if that was a viable alternative. The City is going to keep seeking other alternatives because that is such a huge number for people to have to bear. The City is not in a position to pay for the entire project. The ORC information that was handed out this evening is for that cost share and the City was even going to a very beneficial approach to the cost share advantageous to the homeowners to try to lower that number. The City is going to continue, should this smaller project be done at this point that gives a little time to seek out other sources. The City has ramped up their grant seeking abilities and tried to assemble more funding to lower the cost for the City and for the residents. It could be done, if the assessment came through and the project was bonded.

Kevin Busdiecker, 25035 Lakeview Drive stated that forty percent of the project are corner lots. Following ORC 727, this adversely taxes or bills these corner lots. ORC 727 doesn’t have to be followed. There are other options the City can use for assessing that work fairly to any individual in this project.

Mrs. Stainbrook stated that this committee has talked in the past that ORC 727 is the recommendation to be used for that calculation. It is most defensible in court. A lot of the other options are very subjective so if it were challenged it might not be favorable in court. The question of how that calculation is to be drawn is off the table. We talked about that last June, as ORC 727 being the calculation as to how those will go forward. Regarding the specific calculations, if we are doing an assessable project, there will be an Equalization Review Board that will validate the calculations themselves. Many times residents have questions about their individual calculation on an assessed project. There will be a board established that would confirm accuracy of those calculations.

Mr. Busdiecker asked Mrs. Stainbrook if she is saying that other City residents got 40% assessments on corner lots. Mrs. Stainbrook stated she is not saying anything about corner lots. She is saying that for this project ORC 727 is what will be used for those calculations.

Jeff Foster asked if there were any recommendations for us city wide as to how we can get over that hump in the funding range of DOPWIC.

Mr. Bierut stated it is unfortunate, but given the financial stability of the community it is very difficult to overcome that challenge. There are communities like Euclid and others that receive many more points. The Bay Village project scored the maximum amount of points in every category, except for the financial situation of the City.

Mayor Koomar added that Mayor LoCastro in Bratenahl is the head of the DOPWIC Committee and Mayor Koomar has attended some of those meetings. There is always the discussion of how everything should be weighted. The City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County get the lion’s share of the programs, which leaves very little for communities like
Bay Village, Rocky River, Westlake, and others. Only those with economic hardship are able to sneak in. There is a lot of debate about what that scale ought to be. They are going to stay with this for at least the next two years. They were also in the habit of tinkering with it and you never had a sense of how you were going to position yourself for the next year because they changed the rules every year. They want to standardize that, but that is not going to change until 2021 which is another reason we brought this project forward. We are trying to be realistic on the short term funding options.

Mr. Michaels asked if there are other projects that are going to be down the road, projects that are going to be completed this summer.

Mayor Koomar stated that the standard road overlay program with an allocation of $700,000 debt that is done every year will be done again this year. The Sunset project would be an addition to that and the Finance Committee has been open to issuing notes this year above and beyond what we normally do, but we have the capacity do that and thought we needed to take care of Sunset.

Mr. Michaels stated that the steel plate on Columbia Road has been in place for going on two years now. The Mayor stated that project has gone out for bid and Finance Director Mahoney was able to get funding through the State Infrastructure Bank with a lower interest rate over ten years. We would expect construction to start in 90 days. Mr. Bierut stated that the culvert is being made. Mayor Koomar added that legal easements were needed from property owners, but because of the death of one of the property owners there was a delay.

Summary

The Public Improvements Committee is recommending that they request the President of Council make a motion to move the Sunset Drive Storm Sewer and Roadway Improvements Project to the Committee of the Whole where it will be considered for discussion and debate, and up for resolution.

There being no further comments, the meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m. Mrs. Stainbrook thanked everyone for their attendance.

[Nancy W. Stainbrook]
Chairman, Public Improvements Committee

[Joan T. Kemper]
Joan T. Kemper, Clerk of Council
FRONTAGES The project (physical address is part of the project scope)
Kemore: Based on ORC Language, this parcel will receive a 100% assessment on the Kemore footage since the property

342 Kemore:

163.40 x current linear footage assessment amount = total assessment cost

48.40 + 115.00 = 163.40

Lienthwise footage: 115.00

Breadthwise footage: 48.40

24915 Lakeview

Calculation Example:

will include both sides of a corner lot per the ORC.

The remaining corner lots in the project will be assessed at 100% of the front footage that, which for the purpose of this description,

50" x current linear footage assessment amount = total assessment cost

60"

Lengthwise footage (Forresty side) = 50"

Breadthwise footage (Lake Rd side) = 50" (footage assessed in 1994)

24928 Lake Rd

Calculation Example:

that is not included in the project (reference ORC 727 Note 9 Page 892).

727 they "bound and about the Improvement project. For these parcels, the lengthwise footage (parcel front/face) will be utilized as the straight front/face, or the project front/face with the parcels front/face a street.

24744 Lake Rd. 24800 Lake Rd, 24928 Lake Rd, 25008 Lake Rd and 25098 Lake Rd (will qualify for assessment since deeded by ORC

in the project area, there are five parcels that have side yards (lengthwise side of property) that are included in the project. These five parcels

As the language from ORC 727 is applied to the Sunset Improvement project, corner lots will be assessed one of two ways and include

September 2017: Application of ORC 727 to Sunset Project
## City of Bay Village
### Sunset Drive Storm Sewer and Roadway Improvements
Based on ORC With Park Assessment

#### Project Cost Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveying/Engineering/Bidding</td>
<td>$149,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspection/Testing - Roadway, Storm, Misc., Constr. Cont.</td>
<td>$133,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Permits/Advertising - Roadway, Storm, Misc., Constr. Cont.</td>
<td>$91,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Interest (3.25% of Loan Amount) - Roadway, Storm, Misc., Constr. Cont.</td>
<td>$65,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$91,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost - Roadway, Storm, Misc., Constr. Cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,421,024</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frontage Assessment Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost - Roadway, Storm, Misc., Constr. Cont.</td>
<td>$2,421,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Local Share (2%)</td>
<td>$48,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Intersections</td>
<td>$548,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable Project Cost - Roadway, Storm, Misc., Constr. Cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,823,838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Assessments</td>
<td>$1,414,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,414,229</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Front Foot Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessable Frontage (private property)</td>
<td>5,215.0 If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Foot Assessment (private property)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$349.73 /If</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary - Source of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funding (OPWC Grant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Financing through OPWC (0% Loan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Portion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Share (2%)</td>
<td>$48,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>$548,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess portion of property valuation</td>
<td>$409,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments</strong></td>
<td>$1,414,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Source of Assessible Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,421,024</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Portion - Roadway, Storm Sewers, Miscellaneous, Related Contingency** $1,006,795

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Construction</td>
<td>$203,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main Construction</td>
<td>$405,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Construction Contingency for Sanitary/Water (10%)</td>
<td>$60,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding/Construction Admin &amp; Inspection Testing (10%) for Sanitary/Water</td>
<td>$67,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Interest (3.25%) for Sanitary/Water</td>
<td>$23,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Permits/Advertising (5%) for Sanitary/Water</td>
<td>$33,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Contingency (5%) for Sanitary/Water</td>
<td>$33,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total City Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,835,179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,249,407</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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