

**REGULAR CAUCUS MEETING
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2015**

The meeting was called to order by Council President Patten at 7:30 p.m., the clerk called the roll and the following Members of Council answered:

HIGGINS, TROYER, SALVATORE, MENCINI, BURGIO, POWERS, D'AMICO

Also in attendance were Mayor Coyne, Service Director Cayet, Safety Director Brynes, Finance Director Cingle, Law Director Jamison, Engineer Piatak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETINGS:

DISCUSSION:

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE SALE OF PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 344-03-055 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Mayor Coyne

Mr. Troyer asked Council President Patten why these items were not introduced at the previous Council meeting, like normally done, and assigned to a committee.

Mr. Patten responded since Council was off for such a long period of time I thought it was important to get these items onto a Caucus agenda and Council can make the decision on what to do with the legislation.

Mayor Coyne stated this is a small parcel in the Fairlawn area that is a nightmare for the city to maintain and a resident is interested and an appraisal was done and it was determined that it is not a buildable lot in the city. The resident is willing to pay this price for this parcel and the city feels is fair because it costs more for the city to maintain.

Mr. Salvatore clarified that the parcel is not buildable.

Mayor Coyne responded that's correct, the city can't build a house on the lot because it's too small.

Mr. Salvatore stated one of the neighbor's is going to buy the parcel?

Mayor Coyne concurred.

Discussion:

Mr. Jamison stated to expound on that, looking at the purchase agreement included is certain deed restrictions so that the city has guarantee that the parcel will not be used for putting hazardous materials on it, no junk automobiles or boats, etc., and any structure that will be put on that parcel has to be approved by the city. The reason the city did this is so the resident now or later doesn't decide to split the parcel. The neighbor purchasing the parcel has a lot that is only 30 feet wide and has lived in Brook Park for approximately 35 years and the resident would like to expand and invest on his property by either expanding his house or build a garage.

Mr. Salvatore asked is the appraisal in line with the sale price?

Mr. Jamison responded yes, we had the city's appraiser, S.G. Gallas & Associates, look at the parcel and determined that due to the nature of the parcel whatever price the city could get would probably be the most appropriate price.

Mr. Salvatore asked if the resident plans on joining this parcel with the existing parcel.

Mr. Jamison responded I'm not sure if there is actually going to be a merger of the parcels that's why the deed restrictions were included so that the city can control the resident not putting a house or something else on the parcel; this deed restrictions will be for the current owner and any future owners.

Mrs. Powers stated she is familiar with that piece of property and I think that any property the city owns and is for sale, or many other things the city does, should be advertised. The resident who lives directly across the street from this parcel told me this spring that he would be happy to purchase this parcel so he doesn't have to look at the mess everyday. There was someone else interested and on page two of the agreement – Restrictions on use of the land (a) no evacuation, building or other structure shall be commenced, built or installed on said property, unless approved by the City of Brook Park. It does not say it is not buildable and a few years ago I looked at the deed at the County Records Office and it did have a house on it; the parcel is 150 feet wide and 109 deep which is wider than the property next door. So it could have another building built and it is up to the city to decide whether or not it would be a house, garage, etc. That is my objection I think that the city should start advertising things for sale because maybe the resident across the street would pay the city more for the parcel, had the resident known the parcel was for sale.

Mayor Coyne stated Councilwoman; I think it would be an extraordinary for someone to expend money on a lot across the street. The resident interested if he would want to build a new house and take down the existing house and

Discussion:

consolidate the lots and build something there he could do that. My understanding as this stands right now presently he couldn't build a house he couldn't build a house if it would be required according to city ordinances at this time. It's been my experience even when trying to give property away to residents' they would not take it because they would increase their tax liability; so it's not as simple as you think. From my standpoint if that gentleman is really interested he can come forward and speak with city personnel but I doubt that he would want to pay more than the gentleman purchasing the parcel. It seems to me of a good common sense transaction between a citizen and the City of Brook Park and in my view it's of no value to anyone else.

Mrs. Powers stated the only problem I have with it other than not being advertised is the verbiage unless approved by the City of Brook Park. If you look at a house on West 148th Street there is a house almost as big as the entire lot and don't want to see that happen anywhere else.

Mr. Mencini stated is the city going to be looking at doing this a little bit more? I'm referring to the house recently demolished on Michael Drive; there are two abutting residents that might be interested in purchasing that property.

Mayor Coyne responded the city could do that but I don't believe the city owns that property right now. When the city had the lots behind Claudia and Sylvia Drives the city was finally able to get to the people over there. It's always best, in my view, that the city can convey that to them so the answer to your question is if the city has control of the property and there's been many inquiries the answer to your question is yes. For instance, the city has the lifelong problem of the property behind the old Wengler Playground and what that status is and what is has been; so in all instances the city tries to do this. If the city can do this I think it's the best interest of the city and the neighborhood to get residents' that will add it to their property.

Mr. Jamison stated with the Michael Drive property that was always a challenge in dealing with that house. In the course of that whole proceeding that is now owned by Woods Cove which is a company that buys up tax liens from Cuyahoga County, for properties delinquent in their property tax. The property on Michael Drive is not owned by the city so the city doesn't have that ability. Just for this Council to remember this was the property about four or five years ago that the city actually purchased. There was a small rental house on this property that was dilapidated and an eyesore to the neighborhood and there was concerns of people breaking in and doing various activities. The city took it upon itself to purchase that property a number of years ago and after acquiring the property tore the house down and put it on the market for sale and in talking with Economic Development Commissioner Dolan there has not been one, other than

Discussion:

the interested resident, to acquire that property. In answer to the Michael Drive property the city doesn't have the flexibility on that parcel and in regards to this property this resident purchasing the parcel wants to reinvest in the total property and continue to stay in Brook Park. Currently the way this resident's lot is being 30 foot wide he is unable to do anything with his lot; so it makes sense for the city to allow this gentleman buying it to basically redevelop his property and move forward. The last thing in regards to the restriction unless approved by the city that was put in there intentionally. So the city can control what goes on that lot; so that the city doesn't run into the situation of someone building a house that is too big for the parcel; that's the reason that was put in there so the city has more control in terms of how that gets done.

Mr. Burgio stated I reviewed the purchase agreement and am glad the restrictions are in there and it seems like a win-win for the city as well as the resident.

Motion by Mr. D'Amico, supported by Mr. Mencini, to place on the next Council agenda. Members of Council voted AYE. The motion carried.

2. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CONSULTING ENGINEER TO PREPARE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND THE MAYOR TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS AND ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE 2015 SIDEWALK REPAIR PROGRAM AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Mayor Coyne

Mr. Mencini stated this will be a continuation of where the sidewalks were marked from last year. Will applications be sent out to get this done?

Mr. Piatak stated the city is picking up with the city previously did when broken up into phases. Right now the city will pick up with Phase 2 which is between Engle and Smith Roads from the northerly to southerly border. Those sidewalks were marked and tallied and will be getting the plans, specifications and out to bid. Once the city receives the bids then there will be a sidewalk price known so that letters can be sent out to the residents' as far as cost per sidewalk block.

Mrs. Powers stated last year two different residents came in and talked about sidewalk replacement versus sidewalk leveling. Since the residents' are having to pay for this and it would be much less expensive to have the sidewalk blocks leveled rather than replaced. Shouldn't letters be sent out to the residents' who have to do this and let them decide which way they want to go with the blocks that can be leveled. Some of the sidewalk blocks are broken and need to be replaced but there are some that just need to have a corner leveled. Since it's the citizens' money in paying the city's portion and paying their own portion

Discussion:

shouldn't they be allowed to make that decision as to how much money they want to spend on either replacement, repair or leveling.

Mr. Piatak responded city personnel went through this phase and inspected the sidewalk blocks. Sidewalk blocks were identified that need to be replaced, need to be leveled and identified sidewalk blocks that the edges can be grounded. As far as what is going to be more cost-effective that will be found out when the project is bid out, the intent is to have those options in the program. The city has not done that in the past as far as the leveling and grinding but is an option worth looking into.

Mr. D'Amico stated this program was initiated in 2002-2003 and was a great program that worked out and there were no complaints because of this being a split program; talking with residents they are anxious to get this program back.

Motion by Mr. D'Amico, supported by Mr. Higgins, to place on the next Council agenda.

Mr. Patten stated that Mr. Troyer had his hand up before the motion was stated.

Mr. Troyer stated to Engineer Piatak this is Phase II between Engle and Smith Roads.

Mr. Piatak concurred.

Mr. Troyer clarified that would be from Brookpark Road to Sheldon Road.

Mr. Piatak responded north to south, yes.

Mr. Troyer asked how many sidewalk blocks does this entail?

Mr. Piatak responded I do have them tallied but as far as the blocks that were identified, again this is an optional program, if the city sends out the letter and the resident decides not to participate the blocks will not be done.

Mr. Troyer stated he likes the fact of the option of which way to repair either by grinding or lifting is a good thing and get the best deal.

Mr. Piatak stated the city has 1,634 blocks identified to be replaced; 518 edges to be ground and 222 to be raised or leveled.

Mr. Troyer continued the whole city has not been inspected just Phase II?

Discussion:

Mr. Piatak responded the whole city last year with a little lighter criteria and when that didn't go through the city re-inspected them this year and narrowed it down to what is called Phase II; which would be the Engle to Smith Roads.

Mr. Troyer asked Engineer Piatak if there are numbers of how many there were last year for the whole city?

Mr. Piatak responded I don't but can go back and look at my notes from last year to see what the tally was.

Mr. Troyer asked what is the expected cost per block?.

Mr. Piatak responded that's kind of crazy because the city has paid from \$5.00 a square foot to \$6.00 to \$7.00 a square foot. I'm anticipating somewhere in the \$6.50 to \$7.00 range but won't know until the project is bid.

Mr. Troyer continued to replace is four inches thick, correct?

Mr. Piatak concurred.

Mr. Troyer stated you don't have an estimated general expected total cost of this Phase II.

Mr. Piatak responded no, because I am in the process of getting a ballpark estimate on the grind and the leveling but it would be $1,634 \times 5 \times \$6.50$ should be the remove and replace number.

Mr. Troyer stated to Finance Director Cingle which fund is the money coming from for this project?

Mr. Cingle responded it's from the Economic Development fund.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mayor Coyne this is the voluntary program if people don't want to participate they don't have to?

Mayor Coyne responded that is correct but technically every sidewalk that is marked is in violation of city ordinance and is the resident's obligation to replace the sidewalk. The city will offer the program and go through the phases and after that if people fail to participate in any of the phases. Then the city will fix and assess those residents for the repair. When the city did this program when I was Mayor before the city found cement contractors that lived in the city couldn't do it as cost-effective as the city could do it because of the numbers the city was doing this program at. What the city saw is that residents' improving other parts

Discussion:

such as driveways, porches and steps and as always the citizens are free to talk to the contractor and while the city doesn't pay for those improvements the citizens can negotiate some great prices. The improvements that were made could be seen and had a secondary effect of not only getting the sidewalk problem taken care of but also other issues were addressed because the city was able to get such a good price.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mayor Coyne if Council can co-sponsor.

Mayor Coyne responded yes, whoever would like to.

Mr. Higgins stated I was kind of surprised that Councilman Troyer would ask about the funding of this...

Mr. Troyer – 'Point of Order'...

Mr. Higgins – Him and Mrs. Powers voted against this...

Mr. Troyer – Again, 'Point of Order' we have a motion...

Mr. Patten – We don't have a motion on this.

Mr. Troyer – We had a motion from before.

Mr. Patten – I didn't recognize it because you had your hand up.

Mr. Higgins – Thank you Mr. Chairman, my point was the Councilman asked a question and he voted against the funding this project for this project for the residents'; both him and Mrs. Powers.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mayor Coyne I've been telling the residents' the same thing that if there is a crack in their driveway that they want done and can talk to the contractor to work and negotiate a deal.

Mayor Coyne concurred but the city also wants the contractor to be timely in the city's work but it usually works out very well; so yes they do but that is between the citizen and the contractor. The city has nothing to do with that but we encourage the residents' to take advantage of that.

Mr. Troyer stated I voted for this program in the past and will vote for it again.

Motion by Mr. D'Amico, supported by Mr. Burgio, to place on the next Council agenda. Members of Council voted AYE. The motion carried.

Discussion:

Mr. Patten asked for co-sponsor and Council Members Troyer, Mencini, Higgins, Burgio, D'Amico, Salvatore and Council President Patten raised their hands.

3. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO HIRE AN INSPECTOR FOR THE 2015 SIDEWALK REPAIR PROGRAM AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Mayor Coyne

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the next Council agenda. Members of Council voted AYE. The motion carried.

4. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 937 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES ENTITLED 'SENIOR CITIZENS AND PHYSICALLY DISABLED SERVICES AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Mayor Coyne and Councilman Salvatore

Mayor Coyne stated as discussed this city needs to change the way services are delivered and this is an issue of long-standing time honored tradition. That the city provide assistance to our senior citizens that cannot afford to pay for these services and for the longest time it was provided by service department workers; and since the reduction of the workforce so the manpower is not available to do this. The Law Director, Finance Director, Councilman Salvatore and Council President Patten helped put this legislation together and our concern was how can we provide assistance to those who need it and still work within the budget the city has. Council out of the Economic Development Fund and Noise Insulation Fund provided the funding for this program. The City of Seven Hills brings in licensed contractors and gets a lowest price that all contractors must provide to the seniors. This city will do that and come up with a subsidy for them based on the number and based on the annual appropriation of Council. Finance Director Cingle did the research on what is the poverty level of assistance and the city used the formula used by Southwest General Hospital. There are some things in the old Ordinance, the first one being passed in 1977 by a younger Tom Coyne, and the purpose of it always was not to provide service to people of a certain age it was to provide assistance to people who needed that assistance. For example if I was retired right now under the old Ordinance as it exists right now with my pension, my pension would not count, and I would be eligible to receive the assistance of this program, I don't think that's right, so is this means-tested; yes it is. I think you will see here and we went through this and worked hard to try and come up with the criteria and that's where the \$30,000 and \$40,000 figures that would be used as the criteria to be used as the hallmark for assistance. I think it's fair and is almost the same line of income that is used at Southwest Community Hospital and other public agencies. Those who are retired and can afford to pay should pay and those who can't should receive assistance

Discussion:

from the city and we'll be able to help more people if those who can pay for this do pay which I thought was a great suggestion from the Council President. However, again, if the city gets this seasonal price from these vendors those people who do not qualify for the assistance will be eligible to participate in the program at their own cost. Let's say the city negotiates a price of \$200.00 a season and the city gives \$85.00 or \$90.00 subsidy; most people who paid over the last winter were between \$300.00 or \$400.00 to have driveways plowed. So if the city can negotiate that with the selected contractors who fall under the city ordinance, so the seniors are protected under that criteria, the city thought that was sound and make sure that this clearly an assistance program. The city's charge is to make sure that this will help the most people and will get to the people with the greatest needs.

Mr. Jamison stated other communities were looked at to try and reshape this program and essentially what this program will do is. The city will entertain contractors who want to participate in this program to come in and be screened. The city will then determine what number of companies the city wants to participate in this program and for those individuals that will qualify either by economic or income guidelines or who decide to sign up. The city will assign the routes to these companies and there will be a set of guidelines that the contractors must follow and also guidelines for the participating residents' to follow. There was one item that came up after this legislation was prepared and in talking with various seniors about this potential program an amendment is needed. What this amendment basically says is that anyone who doesn't qualify for the income guidelines but still wants to take advantage of the group rate the city establishes city-wide. Those individuals will be entitled to participate in the program but won't receive any contribution towards the yearly or per push cost. This will allow for residents' over the income guidelines but still want to take advantage of the group rate residents' will be allowed to do that. For those individuals or couples that need assistance but do not have the income to pay for this type of service the city will assist them in two ways: One will be to establish a group rate and each year the proposal is as Council annually appropriates the amount of money that is going to go into basically assisting these individuals; then that will go right to the contractor. The reason the city fashioned it this way is the city does not want to get into a situation where the city would have to issue 1099's to individuals receiving this benefit because it possibly could be considered as income; so the city decided to pay directly to the contractor. For example if this service costs \$300.00 for a season the city would then pay \$100.00 for each participant directly to the contractor and the participant would be responsible for the \$200.00 balance; for those residents' who don't meet the income guidelines they would pay the \$300.00. The city fashioned this after different communities in terms of this city sort of controlling what contractors are allowed to come in and to develop good routes for the contractors to follow. The

Discussion:

contractors will have to register with the city per ordinance passed previously relating to registered snow plow contractors or individuals and the fee requirement of \$10.00 was taken out of the legislation. Mr. Jamison stated the proposed amendment would be placed in the legislation as 937.04 (d).

Mr. D'Amico stated to Law Director Jamison one concern is if there is a 62 year old person who may have qualified before and is totally disabled is there any way with the monies being put forward for this program to include them in the amendment; so those residents' aren't left out.

Mr. Jamison responded statistics were looked at for last year and there were 1,028 individuals' sign up for the program. Out of those 1,028 participants for the people who were under the age of 65 there were only 40 claiming a disability. In speaking with the person who takes in the applications and helps coordinate the program I was informed that the bulk of those 40 people were ages 63 or 64 who didn't qualify due to closeness in age; then those 40 people would get a doctor's excuse that it's not good for their health to shovel snow. So the monies that Council had appropriated to maximize for people really needing this and looking at the bigger picture there weren't really a lot of people who were applying that were asserting any kind of disability. That's why the city didn't include them in setting this program up because there wasn't a high number to begin with and the people that were close to the break-age. If you want to disabled the amendments can be made but it might affect the dollar amount that can be given out for assistance; because the more people included in the program the amount contributed to the assistance is going to go down. The purpose of this being done this way is to maximize the ability to help those that require that kind of assistance.

Mr. D'Amico stated I appreciate that but just wanted to have discussion so that the city takes a look at everything.

Mayor Coyne stated the city would certainly like to provide assistance to the physically disabled and looking at the existing ordinance it's kind of easy to qualify. One of the complaints from the drivers and people working the program is in Section 2 number 3 'Does not reside with an able-bodied individual capable of removing snow. City drivers would go to a residence and there would be three or four automobiles parked in the driveway; which may open to challenge. I think what Council should do is get the senior program started and see how it goes and address the disabled program separately; to see if there is another avenue. It is pretty easy for people to meet the criteria and it puts the resident's and city in a difficult situation and in talking to the drivers that is one of the abuses that they saw quite frequently. So I would like to start with the seniors and then see where the city can go with another program.

Discussion:

Mr. Salvatore concurred that language should be looked at in the future to provide for the necessary amendment for the totally disabled.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. D'Amico, to amend the legislation by inserting letter (d) to read 'Any senior citizen who does not qualify pursuant to Section 937.02 herein because their annual income exceeds the guideline amounts then they shall be entitle to participate in the snow removal assistance program, with the exception that they shall not receive any benefits set forth in Section 937.04 (c) herein. In allowing said senior citizens to qualify for the snow removal assistance program it is the intent of this ordinance that they shall be responsible to pay to the private snow removal firms or individuals the total amount owed for said snow plowing services'.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, D'Amico, Burgio, Mencini, Troyer, Higgins
NAYS: Powers. The amendment carried with a vote of 6-1.

Mr. Salvatore stated this is an important topic and I would really like to see everyone support this so the residents' can be made aware of this program. This Council has worked towards this and there were many discussions. Councilman Salvatore invited Members of Council to co-sponsor this legislation.

Mrs. Powers stated that she is in favor of the snow plowing for the seniors but not as it is written in the legislation.

Mr. Patten asked Mrs. Powers if she will co-sponsor yes or no; there is still more discussion to take place on this matter.

Mrs. Powers responded yes.

Mr. Troyer stated to Finance Director Cingle what was the cost of the senior snow removal program in the 2013-2014 season?

Mr. Cingle responded that he does not have that information with me this evening but can provide an answer tomorrow.

Mr. Troyer continued do you remember having around \$3,400 to \$3,500 a incident?

Mr. Cingle responded I do not recall that.

Mr. Troyer continued and you wouldn't remember how many events of plowing of snow for that season?

Discussion:

Mr. Cingle responded no.

Mr. Troyer continued I have some of those numbers that we were looking at from September 15, 2014. Senior Snow Removal was \$3,400 per event that doesn't include overtime for the holidays; so figure \$3,500 times that by ten (10) events totals \$35,000; 20 events a year is about \$70,000 and \$85,000 into this program. The question is shouldn't we consider restoring previous benefits with retire limits that would probably cost the city less and can be done for less; that's just a consideration.

Mr. Higgins stated obviously Councilman Troyer was at a different meeting than me when we discussed doing the snow plowing in-house. As a side note I know we don't have the manpower to do it because we're out doing our main roads. My comment previous to that was under Mayor Coyne previously I was the service director and as the Council President served in that position and know how important this program is. I know Councilman Mencini plowed driveways and our current service director plowed them while I was the service director. This is an important service and I applaud my colleagues and Mayor for bringing this forward and trying to get this done; so I'm going to urge Councilman Troyer and Councilwoman Powers who voted against funding this program earlier this year to get on board.

Mr. Burgio stated I'm looked over the legislation and may have overlooked the requirement as to how much snow falls; like the previous legislation.

Mayor Coyne responded the city is going to do that by policy and the contractors are currently reviewing the policy for any problems and the program will be patterned after two inches. As Mr. Higgins said the problem in later years is that the residents' expected this service to be there simultaneously with the plowing of the streets and that just cannot occur. The employee numbers are just about where they ought to be so, therefore, the city can deliver this service but I don't know how much it is going to cost. I think Councilman Troyer is accurate about \$70,000 I think I remember \$79,000 or something like that. The point is that it's wear and tear on the city equipment; gasoline and other costs that the city has to occur. The fact of the matter is if we want to deliver these services they have to be done under a different way under city guidance and use of the city's ability to aggregate the purchase of these services for residents'; I just think it's a better way to go.

Mr. Burgio commented that he likes the way it's structured and helps the people who need it the most.

Discussion:

Mrs. Powers stated just a few comments, number one last year we had absolutely no money to do anything extra so I'd really like to know where this money came from to sponsor this year. Also, the way its' written it says the senior citizen must be at least 70 years old most seniors at age 60 or 62, in my opinion, are not able to go out and shovel snow and I think any doctor would concur with that. To have \$30,000 income for one person living in the house or \$40,000 for two people living in the house. What does that mean for the person living on Social Security alone which gives them \$12,000 to \$14,000 a year. Are they still going to be charged the same as someone who is making \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year. What do we do about the people who can't shovel and can't afford these prices?

Mayor Coyne responded there was great thought given to exactly what you just said. If you remember correctly monies were moved out of the Sound Insulation Program that had been sitting there to fund these various initiatives for this year; because that's where the monies were at. We closed our reserve issues and balanced our budget and laid-off people and how to still fund these programs; that was the suggestion we made and Council authorized. Again, what you just said this program is not for people that can afford to pay for the service. For example, Mayor Elliott and I are both retired and would qualify for this and for us to get assistance would be ridiculous because we can afford to pay for this service. There are approximately over 1,000 people on the program that are 70 years and older and that's why the criteria; this program is to assist those people on low Social Security to get assistance; that's how the program is fashioned. So it's not there to provide the most service to the most people it's there to assist people to get service that they cannot afford. Again, this was Council President's Patten amendment to say why can't our people who may be of that age and have the money why can't they enjoy the lower price; I think that's fair. This gives the residents', just like the sidewalk program, the ability to take advantage of the city bringing in these contractors to make sure that a good price for the residents' because they know they will have 50 or 100 driveways. If there is one contractor that does all of them it might be a better price than that; it's just how the economy of scale works out. All of these things that you talked about have been taken into consideration and try to fashion; it's not perfect and will there be flaws the first time around that might be but it's a start in beginning to address a problem that has been recognized and the city wants to address without using the city's limited employees for a reasonable price this is the best way to proceed and better than doing nothing.

Mr. Mencini stated he began working for the city in 1981 and Mayor Coyne started this program along with Mr. Hufsey and 40 driveways; by the third snowstorm the city was up to 80 driveways and at the end, I believe, the city

Discussion:

was up to 1,300 or 1,400. On this program the city has some hard parameters and the Mayor says people can still qualify and am in support of this program.

Mr. D'Amico clarified to Mrs. Powers that the \$30,000 is a cap, residents' can earn up to that.

Mr. Troyer stated this is going to be in areas, districts or zones is that correct? We won't have one snowplow company doing one house on a street and another snowplow company doing another house on the same street?

Mayor Coyne responded we prefer not to but let's just say one contractor comes in and tell us what he's going to do; I'm going to do it for \$150,000 for the whole season and take everybody; I don't think that's going to occur but our suggestion that the city would determine the routes.

Mr. Troyer interjected that would be the best.

Mayor Coyne concurred and commented that this isn't easy work to do because of the different shapes and widths of driveways and things like that. So I don't see a rash of people proposing on this but there most likely will be enough to get a good price on this.

Mr. Troyer stated if this is the route that we're going this is a good plan because if city workers' are not going to be used this is a good plan and basically what I talked to a few people on this floor about this issue; I think the city should have zones and have them bid on a zone. I have a snowplow and it's easier to go from house to house rather than street to street or neighborhood to neighborhood; so it should be cheaper and we want to get this as cheap as we can for the residents'. I also would like to say that I've never voted against any senior program.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. D'Amico, to place on the Council agenda immediately following.

Mr. Troyer asked for the timeframe to get this project going?

Mayor Coyne responded we put the criteria out to some of the contractors and am waiting for feedback and will check to see who is licensed. There will have to be a meeting with the residents' who have qualified for the program in the past; probably have to have several meetings because of the numbers and move forward from there. I don't see a problem once we find out from the contractors what the prices are going to be.

Discussion:

Mr. Higgins asked Law Director Jamison can there be a program without funding for it?

Mr. Jamison responded my understanding is no.

Mr. Higgins continued my point to Councilman Troyer is if you don't fund a program...

Councilman Troyer – Point of Order...

Mr. Higgins – You're not voting for a program...

Mr. Troyer – Point of Order...

Mr. Higgins – You have to fund a program to have one, Councilman, that's all I have Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Patten – What's your point?

Mr. Troyer – Wasn't talking about what's on the agenda.

Mr. Higgins – Okay.

Mr. Patten – There is a motion to place under First Reading on tonight's Council agenda.

Mrs. Powers – Mr. Chairman...

Mr. Patten – Councilwoman Powers

Mrs. Powers – I have a question for the Mayor?

Mr. Patten – is it on the motion?

Mrs. Powers – Well, yes it's on what we're discussing he says that we...

Mr. Patten – I'm going to allow your question.

Mrs. Powers – I just wanted to know if this is going to be put out for bid so that any snow plow contractor out there has the opportunity to bid on it?

Mayor Coyne – No, only those that are licensed under our city program the city is going to ask them for proposals; technically this is an individual contract between the homeowner and the contractor. We are giving financial assistance just like giving someone a loan to fix their house or if the city gave somebody a loan to do their cross-connections. This is not a contract between the city any contractor that wishes to participate can go to the building department and qualify under the city ordinance put in last year and if they qualify they will be considered. The City of Seven Hills brought all the contractors in and told them that they

Discussion:

aren't charging \$250.00 for this we want a uniform proposal for this; the first day there were 15 proposals and then it went down to seven. The answer to your question is no we are not bidding this and if you have someone interested have them go down to the building department and give the qualifications to be licensed, bonded and insured and they will be brought in to discuss if they can meet the criteria to do the job.

Mrs. Powers asked will there be an announcement in the newspaper?

Mayor Coyne responded we will have it put on the city's website for people to be aware of. I'm not sure how many we have anymore because some of them have said they don't want to do it after last year and there are others that are very interested.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, D'Amico, Powers, Burgio, Mencini, Troyer, Higgins
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Mr. Patten stated that will appear under M-1 as Ordinance No. 9972-2015.

5. ORDINANCE NO. 9967-2015, AMENDING SECTIONS 1705.01, 1705.02, 1713.02(a) OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES PROVIDING FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL INCOME TAX RATE FROM TWO PERCENT (2%) TO TWO AND ONE-HALF PERCENT (2 ½%); SAID ONE-HALF PERCENT (.5%) INCREASE SHALL BE LEVIED BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2016 TO BE LIMITED TO FIVE (5) CONSECUTIVE YEARS AND ALL TAXES COLLECTED FOR SAID INCREASE SHALL BE RESTRICTED TO EXPENDITURES FOR ROAD REPAIRS, ROAD CONSTRUCTION, SEWER REPAIRS AND SEWER CONSTRUCTION AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Council Members D'Amico, Mencini, Burgio, Higgins, Salvatore and Council President Patten. ****Per Section 3:03(b) of the City Charter this must be reconsidered by Council and placed on the 8/18/15 Council agenda under Item J**

Mr. Patten stated the Mayor's veto must be moved to tonight's Council agenda and will be read; the attachments outside of the veto will not be read as part of the veto but will be available for public view in the Council office.

Motion by Mr. D'Amico, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the Council meeting immediately following under letter J. Members of Council voted AYE. The motion carried.

Mr. Patten stated this will appear as J-1 on the Council agenda.

Discussion:

6. A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 7, 2015 AS THE ANNUAL APPRECIATION DAY FOR POLICE OFFICERS IN THE CITY OF BROOK PARK AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Councilman Salvatore and Council Members Troyer, Mencini, Powers, Higgins, Burgio, D'Amico, Council President Patten and Mayor Coyne

Mr. Salvatore stated the resolution speaks for itself to recognize the city's police officers for doing an outstanding job that a lot of times goes without notice. The police officers go out and do their job and in a lot of cases their lives are put on the line to protect our citizens. Mr. Salvatore continued that he would like to make this an annual event and requested the clerk if this legislation passes to mail out this legislation to other communities.

Mr. Mencini stated that he did a ride-a-long three years ago for three nights and their job is a high risk job.

Mr. Troyer stated my only issue with this legislation is that we're singling out certain workers in the city; there's a lot of other workers who work hard but maybe not as dangerous. I have to vote for this but I wish that maybe Council have it for all the workers of the city; instead of just one division.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mr. Troyer you don't have to support it if you don't want to. I've talked to other Members of Council and we want to do this month by month to recognize others that do hard and great jobs; we didn't want to cloud the issue by putting them on all at once to take away the thunder of what Council is trying to accomplish. There are other things in the works but don't feel that you have to support this if you don't want to.

Mr. Troyer stated to Mr. Salvatore that was my concern but if this is what Council is doing by looking at each department that's fine; of course this wasn't discussed with me and that's fine. I'm discussing here on the floor where Council is supposed to discuss things so the people can hear the discussions and now that the meetings are being live-streamed all people can hear the discussions. Now that I know that this is something that might be planned for other departments at different times I'm happy with it but I didn't want to single out any certain department because I think all city workers work hard.

Mrs. Powers stated I think there are no harder workers anywhere in this city than our private citizens who go out to work everyday that pay our salaries. So that we can sit up here and hopefully vote for them and what's best for them instead of just blindly saying yes all the time and I agree with Mr. Troyer because that was my problem with this legislation is why aren't the firefighters' and

Discussion:

service workers' being recognized. Then I thought why not recognize the citizens of this community that pay our salaries.

Motion by Mr. D'Amico, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the next Council agenda. Members of Council voted AYE. The motion carried.

- 7. A RESOLUTION HONORING THE BEREA-MIDPARK HIGH SCHOOL'S ACADEMIC CHALLENGE TEAM ON WINNING THE NEWS CHANNEL 5 SEASON CHAMPIONSHIP AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY Introduced by Councilman Salvatore and Council Members Troyer, Mencini, Powers, Higgins, Burgio, D'Amico, Council President Patten and Mayor Coyne

Motion by Mr. D'Amico, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the next Council agenda. Members of Council voted AYE. The motion carried.

There being no further business to come before this meeting Council President Patten declared this meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED Michelle Blazak
Michelle Blazak
Clerk of Council

APPROVED September 16, 2015

THESE MEETING MINUTES APPROVED BY BROOK PARK CITY COUNCIL ARE A SYNOPSIS, NOT TRANSCRIBED IN THERE ENTIRETY, ALTHOUGH ACCURATE.