

**REGULAR CAUCUS MEETING
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2016**

Council President Astorino called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., the clerk called the roll and the following Members of Council answered:

SCOTT, BURGIO, SALVATORE, TROYER, POWERS, McCORMICK, MENCINI

Also in attendance were Law Director Horvath, Building Commissioner Hurst, Service Director Cayet, Finance Director Cingle, Engineer Piatak and Mayor Coyne.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETINGS:

1. Regular Caucus meeting held on January 5, 2016.

Motion by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Troyer, to approve as printed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Mencini, Troyer, Powers, McCormick, Scott, Burgio, Salvatore

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

2. Regular Caucus meeting held on January 12, 2016.

Motion by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mrs. McCormick, to approve as printed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Mencini, McCormick, Powers, Troyer, Salvatore, Burgio, Scott

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION:

1. ALL ACCESS PLAYGROUND – COUNCILWOMAN POWERS

In attendance: Brook Park Resident, Jack Thomas

Mrs. Powers stated Mr. Thomas has attended several past meetings to talk about this all access playground and thought that the new Council Members should be informed.

Jack Thomas

15913 Remora Blvd.

Mr. Thomas stated this is an idea that was presented to the previous Council called 'Embrace Them All'. This idea was well received by the past Council Members and with many members of the community who thought this topic should be brought forward to the current Council. There are approximately 220 all inclusive playgrounds in the United States and my hope is to have the City of Brook Park add to that list. For those members who did not hear of this before and for further clarification this would be on city property; not on school grounds. Also, the entire

Discussion: cont.

concept is to encourage the inclusion and interaction of people with special needs and those without. Everything from the surface of the playground to the equipment, restrooms and changing facilities are geared towards accommodating everyone in one facility. Councils' across the country, throughout research done, agree that this is the best way to integrate people from diverse areas of life and different ways of life into acceptance and respect for each other. During research of this project there are many avenues for grants from organizations targeted just for these project to national organizations known as the Christopher Reeves Foundation, The American Disability Act and The American Playground Association; there are numerous resources available. Also in seeking funding projects can cost as little as \$3,500 or escalate to \$3 million dollars depending on the scope of the plan. One of the largest areas of concern is the acquisition of the property and the city has the luxury of already having sites to choose from to complete this project and would like to incorporate what equipment is already there to fit in right beside any new equipment put into place. Mayor Coyne suggested previously to meet with the grant writer and Recreation Director Fields and plan on doing that but a plan has to be made before and that is where the current Council comes in. At this time I am asking for approval to allow me to contact several different planning organizations showing the City of Brook Park has an interest and asking for assistance with coming up with a preliminary design that would incorporate items the city already has and ascertain costs prior to making any decisions or bringing to Council to make those decisions. Including in those costs could be equipment such as what is called Sway Fun that is a 12 inch high glider (teeter-totter style) with a ramp for wheelchair accessibility. This equipment will allow youths in wheelchairs to use by themselves or with assistance; one of the biggest advantages is also provides for an adult in a wheelchair to participate playing with their children who may not have a special need. Another piece of equipment is called Fun Group that is a free-standing basketball unit with one side being for wheelchair use and the other side is elevated for those who do not have disabilities; key is playing side by side each other. There are elevated sand tables that are used beside sand boxes and there many variations and options including what is called a Big Dig that has hand controls for those who can't reach into the sand to form sand castles, there is also a Wheel-Thru-Arcade (looks like a jungle gym) but is for wheelchairs. All this equipment can be placed next to climbing equipment so that all children can play together and promotes upper body strength. Those who are able can maneuver their wheelchair through a maze using only arms and hands, another piece of equipment is called the Liberty Swing with several available variations that children or adults can be locked and enjoy swinging by themselves with no special training or someone being onsite. Ideally these are made to be incorporated with swings for people that have no disabilities to play right alongside. These are a few ideas and there are numerous ones to choose from and would like to come to the next Council meeting to show video of what is possible and hopefully, by that time, there will be some idea of what

Discussion: cont.

the city needs to do as far as square footage, costs and if city equipment in place can be used. Mr. Thomas continued it is time to do the right thing to lean forward because there are a few of these in the State of Ohio; one toward Columbus and one in Chagrin Falls. A woman in Chagrin Falls had an idea similar to this for her son and that dream turned into H.O.P.E. (Helping Others Play and Enjoy) and this mother and son have been featured on numerous magazine covers and NBC Today Show.

Mr. Salvatore thanked Mr. Thomas for bringing this information to Council and requested addresses to take a look at some of the playground equipment talked about. Do you have a recommendation for a site in the city to put this play area?

Mr. Thomas responded using the recommendations for square footage this play area would fit very well at Kennedy Park using most of that equipment and only having to add seven or eight new pieces. The main thing that would have to change is the structure of the ground to be accessible to all wheelchairs; that wouldn't be cost-prohibitive because the city owns the property. Also the play area on Middlebrook Blvd. (McGovern Park) would be large enough for this type of play area. When people are aware of this type of play area being in the city they will come from all over to see this; which is a good avenue for the city to show what we are about.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Thomas if two locations are being proposed.

Mr. Thomas responded no, just one location and don't know which one would be the best one right now; that's why I'm asking to get some expert opinions on both the size and what the restrictions might be; that's why I'm asking for permission to speak to someone this is the equipment the city has and equipment to be added how much square footage is needed.

Mr. Mencini stated as previously stated I have a great niece with special needs who lives in Brook Park and also involved with Brook Park Memorial School's playground. With the \$35,000 figure seems to be on the low end.

Mr. Thomas responded that figure was used based on information from the Internet from people who already have property in place and it all depends on how much equipment will be put in and what the base would consist of for wheelchair accessibility. There are corporations that have paid monies to have equipment installed for instance campground people paid \$50,000 to have the Liberty Swing look like a camper; so there are a lot of variables.

Mr. Mencini stated in your presentation you mentioned available grants that are not always guaranteed. If the play area is higher than the mentioned \$35,000 how would the city go about getting the other funds.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Thomas responded that there is a program called boundless.org that gives an entire brochure on how to go about this and how the funding might have to be broken up. There are certain organizations that will help with only the groundwork and other organizations that will help with the restroom/changing facilities only and also others that with equipment only.

Mr. Mencini stated at Brook Park Memorial the team reached out to a lot of people and some reciprocated and others that the team really counted on didn't give much; some were companies, some were organizations and some were businesses, individuals were very good. My point is if the city starts running into some high numbers and currently watching funds and was wondering if there were any other plans such as fundraising.

Mr. Thomas stated that something that needs to be talked about down the road but the first step would be allowing me to talk to these companies for some idea with the square footage the city has available; what the costs would be.

Mayor Coyne thanked Mr. Thomas and stated I appreciate the groundwork that has been done but I don't know if the city can authorize you to speak on their behalf. That's why I suggested taking this to the city's Recreation Commission who are in a position to make these evaluations to make recommendations to the Recreation Director, Council and myself on providing for the play structures of the city. We appreciate you doing all of the groundwork and would ask that you get the information to the Recreation Commission who can request the Recreation Director or Engineer to look at what your thoughts are and do a cost estimate and if it is feasible to be placed as suggested. Then all that information can be given to the city's grant writer to see if the monies are available. The city has millions of dollars of structures in a very small area at the school that can't be utilized by residents' during the school day which I think is ludicrous because people are being curtailed who pay the taxes to run the schools; not being able to use them. So possibly coordination with the schools and the city to see the best way to address these issues as presented. My suggestion to Council is to allow Mr. Thomas to gain all the information he wants but he cannot be an agent of the city clearly, but can get that information to the proper people to analyze, determine the feasibility and real costs and if Council wants to fund. The city's major problem, however, is once the city has this would be with maintaining these apparatuses because while the city would be helping some people who really need this there are other people who have a need to destroy things; no matter how much good will the city has. So that is also what the city will have to determine is whether the equipment can be maintained. Also this would be coordination between the city and the school board because most of the property that the city would have to expand there is some uncertainty on what is city property and what is school property at Kennedy Park; currently there is a peaceful coexistence.

Discussion: cont.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Mencini, that item number one was discussed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Mencini, McCormick, Powers, Troyer, Burgio, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

2. SUBSTITUTION COMMITTEE SHEETS AND COUNCIL RULES FROM THE ORGANIZATION MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 4, 2016 – COUNCILMAN SALVATORE

Mr. Astorino stated Councilman Salvatore asked for this per Council President Astorino. As a slight introduction this item appeared on the January 19th Council meeting for approval of minutes of preceding meetings. Council was to approve the Organizational meeting that was held on January 4, 2016. Just prior to that Council meeting Councilman Salvatore approached me had some concerns about a last minute change that was made and asked for it to be moved to a Caucus meeting and removed with the intent to bring forward to this Caucus meeting for some discussion.

Mr. Salvatore stated my original request was to discuss the rules and as far as the substitute committee sheets I wasn't too sure that exactly what you were trying to accomplish and that's why I talked to you before the meeting. I don't recall Council discussing that prior to that meeting as far as renaming the committees. I really want to talk about Council Rules and think that there is so much confusion and so many different variations...

Mr. Astorino stated discussion of the rules isn't proper at this time. You had asked to place the minutes from the January 4th Organizational meeting onto the Caucus; that's what you asked me to do and that's what I did at the last Council meeting I removed it from the agenda and said that we would talk about the Council minutes; so the discussion is of the Council minutes. When Council minutes are talked about, as most of us know, if there are any corrections, additions and/or deletions that's what we do because Council minutes are reflecting what happened at the Organizational meeting. It's not meant that we talk about, discuss and say we want to change this or change what happened; it is just to adopt the record of what happened on January 4th.

Mr. Salvatore stated I understand what you're saying Mr. Chairman but also asked the clerk to add to the agenda the Council Rules and on tonight's agenda it does say Subcommittee sheets and Council Rules from the Organizational meeting. The clerk informed me that she called you and you said you would put it under your name and you can discuss both of them. Mr. Salvatore clarified with the clerk if that is what she told him and the clerk concurred. Mr. Salvatore stated as far as if you want to take them in order the way we're written on this agenda I definitely would like to talk about the rules.

Mr. Astorino asked for clarification of what is to be discussed about the rules because there is a process that is in the rules for amending them. If you're talking about changing Council Rules this would not be the time to do that.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Salvatore stated I'm not talking about changing Council Rules I'm saying what I want to talk about, Mr. Chairman, is changing the rules from the improper fashion before and all I want to do is correct it. I want to get everybody on the same page and I'm not trying to start a war I'm trying to fix what I think is broke. I think we made some rule changes at an Organizational meeting that shouldn't have been made and don't think they were made in the proper fashion. That's all I'm asking is to take a look at passing the original set of rules and going one by one over the changes like the ones Mr. Mencini and yourself suggested; I'm not opposed to these rule changes I just want to get a procedure in place that Council has been following for years. I'm willing to wait until the law director has a chance and not sure if the law director is prepared tonight to deal with it or if it's for a later date but I'm willing to wait for the law director to rule on exactly the proper procedure. If it was handled properly and if everything is in order and if the Law Director says it's okay than that's good. I felt that Council needed to follow the set of rules that we didn't follow. I'm asking for consideration for Council to take a good hard look at what was done at the Organizational meeting and put it back the way it was and start over; that's all I'm asking. I'm not trying to say anybody made a mistake because several Members of Council are brand new and not going to know every rule, policy and procedure at the first meeting; especially in the first ten minutes of a meeting. I'm not here to start any headaches I'm here to fix things and just making a suggestion to Council to reconsider, take a look at the rules and the way Council did it and do it again under the format that is already in place. That's all I'm asking Mr. Chairman and Members of Council is to reconsider putting the Council Rules back under Verbal Approval and amend them under the procedure that is in place which is to be introduced at a Caucus meeting under discussion and placed on a Council meeting under Verbal Approval.

Mr. Astorino stated to Mr. Salvatore I'm glad to hear you keep saying you don't want to start a war I'm not looking to start a war either and I don't know when you say that if you think I'm doing this; I'm not sure how you address that and make those comments. What I did was removed the Organizational meeting minutes from last week's Council agenda and moved them to this agenda for discussion because you expressed to me a concern that was made at the last minute on what was provided.

Mr. Salvatore concurred.

Mr. Astorino stated I thought I explained it that evening and will explain again in front of Council; what we did is have the minutes before us and attached to those minutes was a list of the different committees assignments made at the Organizational meeting. The committees were titled the 2016-2017 Standing Committees and in speaking with the clerk those committees should not be titled Standing Committees because per Council Rule #5 that states all Regular Standing Committees shall be comprised of the Council of the Whole namely the four Ward Councilmen and three Councilmen at Large; that's seven people. The list that was provided is a list of three people on a committee so I said we couldn't title it Standing Committees because that is not the list of Standing Committees the standing committees is a committee of the whole. So I asked the clerk to make the change and call it the 2016-2017 Select Committees to reflect another section in the

Discussion: cont.

Council Rules that gives the Council President the authority to appoint members to select committees; the only committees that are mentioned in our rules are Standing and Select Committees. So my change was changing the title it didn't change the assignments made it was correcting a mistake on the title of that list. The only item coming before Council was approval of those minutes and if there are other concerns that can be set for another Caucus meeting but it was my belief that tonight was to simply explain that process because it was done that day and there were concerns with Council approving the minutes; when truly approving the record for what occurred on January 4th. Council is not changing anything that happened on January 4th Council would simply put it into the record.

Mr. Salvatore stated the sub-committee titles would be added to the minutes, that sheet had sub-committees listed.

Mr. Astorino responded the minutes reflected that committee assignments were made.

Mr. Salvatore stated those were called Select Committees and that was never discussed then they couldn't be a part of those minutes so Council shouldn't approve those minutes in that form until corrected.

Mr. Astorino stated that could be referred to the law director for reference.

Mr. Salvatore stated then another meeting can be held and that can become part of the minutes for approval. I have no problem with waiting for the law director's opinion and have another meeting on this.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Troyer, that item number two was discussed and wait until the law director's opinion.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Troyer, Powers, McCormick, Mencini, Scott, Burgio

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

3. 2016 COUNCIL BUDGET - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT, COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Astorino stated the 2016 Budget process is fast approaching and wanted to bring this up for discussion to get some feedback so Council can give the Mayor and Finance Director an idea as to what Council would like to see in the budget. The fixed categories are the Clerk of Council and Assistant Clerk of Council part-time payroll costs as well as line items that deal with Communications, Professional Services, Repair & Maintenance, Travel and Education, Office Supplies, Miscellaneous Executive, Tools & Minor Equipment and Contracts. In reviewing the Appropriations that existed for 2015 and my suggestion is that similar if not the same appropriation requests for consideration to be included in the budget.

Discussion: cont.

Mrs. Powers stated I think that Council needs to take a lot of time to study this and make some changes and I, for one, want every person who can have a lower income. For the last two years I've listened to how badly the city needs money and cannot justify spending the same amount of monies like in the past; especially what I consider overinflated salaries.

Mr. Astorino stated for clarification what is being looked at tonight would have just been the items that would just address Council and the Clerk of Council. In speaking of the 2016 Budget it is just for those two items; not for the General Fund Budget. Prior the Mayor has asked for input as to what Council is asking for in the budget so this would be how Council operates as well as the Clerk of Council operations, it's not the overall budget. Last year under Contracts the Appropriation was \$21,792 with the intent of having a Council newsletter and/or publications. During the orientation meetings that topic was discussed that Council was in favor of doing that and this would make the Administration aware of doing those newsletters so when the Budget is prepared it would include those types of items.

Mr. Troyer stated there was discussions of someone running the Council website and laptops for Council at some point, not sure if this is the year for that. Also, having better equipment in the Council Chambers for power point presentations but definitely funding this year for the Council newsletter and website to get up and running.

Mrs. McCormick concurred with funding in the budget for a Council newsletter that is important to communicate with the community.

Mr. Mencini concurred with Communications.

Mr. Salvatore stated if monies are going to be put in the budget for newsletters and website before getting to that point Council should come up with a set of rules and regulations that Council will be followed. What is going to go into the newsletter, how is it going to be distributed; who is going to be responsible and what is going to be said. The politics must be kept out of it because there are a lot of things that have to be answered before determining how much money is going to be spent.

Mr. Astorino stated there were discussions about forming a Communications Committee and there are three members that will be reviewing the items and working with all of Council to make sure the newsletter is done in a professional manner.

Discussion: cont.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, that item number three was discussed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Troyer, Powers, McCormick, Mencini
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

4. ORDINANCE NO. 8863-2002, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO WORK WITH THE CUYAHOGA COUNTY TREASURER TO ISSUE TAX CREDITS TO HOMEOWNERS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Councilmen Patten & Mooney

Mr. Astorino asked Finance Director Cingle for background information on how this might impact the city.

Mr. Cingle responded as discussed last week the tax credits were given two or three times at \$250.00 per household if homeowner didn't have any issues with the city as far as delinquencies. Council reviews this legislation at the end of each year, usually in November after looking at the financial condition of the community and decide if a tax credit will be given for that year; this is strictly Councils' decision on whether or not the credit is given. The way the credit is administered once the city has the list of eligible homes a check is written to the county for payments to be credited to the tax duplicate which reduces the taxpayers' property taxes usually for the first payment due in January.

Mr. Astorino stated the reason this appears on the agenda I think with everything that is going on within the city the last few years it is clear that we need to invest into our community; that is the reason for addressing this at the beginning of the year. I was hoping to get some feedback from Council because my feeling is that one of two courses of action should be taken on this legislation. Council should either repeal the ordinance to not make it something that appears before Council. At a later date if Council decides to do this new legislation can be introduced at a later date. I'm not sure if this Council can repeal this legislation because I'm not sure if this is part of the Airport/NASA settlement.

Mr. Salvatore stated the purpose of this legislation that I was part of from the beginning and this was a refund from the monies received from NASA and is to be reviewed on an annual basis; this legislation was reviewed in November, 2015. With bringing this legislation out now for review of this year I would ask Council not to repeal and keep the legislation on the books. Because I'm hoping that we can move this city forward and get into a position that the city has an excess amount of monies to give back to the people at some point; hopefully if that is kept in mind and as goal perhaps that can be obtained.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Mencini stated concurred with Mr. Salvatore and stated giving monies back would be much later because there are a lot of items ahead of this Council.

Mr. Troyer stated this legislation should be repealed and if my memory serves me correctly the \$250.00 was given twice; the first year and then a few years later and everyone felt that there were political reasons being given. So I think we should repeal so there is no possible political reasoning and also I would rather tax properly so that we're not overtaxing people and don't have to give it up. People should keep their money and be taxed properly and spend properly. Down the road if there is an access taxes can be adjusted at that time to be refunded and can come up with legislation at that time. This legislation should be repealed and the city should get the taxes straight and do the right thing so that we don't have to give it back or be in a situation that the city has too much.

Mr. Burgio stated this was placed on the ballot that the voters of Brook Park passed; so I'm not sure if this is a Councilmatic action since the voters voted for this.

Mr. Astorino asked for clarification of the voters voting on this matter.

Mr. Burgio responded this issue was placed on ballot and the voters voted for this.

Mrs. McCormick concurred with Councilman Troyer and stated if and when the time comes that monies can be refunded legislation should be introduced at that time; now would be a better idea to repeal.

Motion by Mrs. McCormick, supported by Mr. Troyer, to draft legislation to repeal Ordinance No. 8863-2002.

Mayor Coyne stated first of all this political accusation lacks merit, this legislation compels the legislative and administrative body to review the finances and is not political at all. This should be a goal for every government body that if there is enough revenue to give taxpayers relief that's what should happen and that's why this legislation is here. In this particular instance this agreement that most people don't want to recognize without it this city would not be functioning today; just take \$6 or \$7 million dollars out of the city's operating expenses. Many Council's since I left have talked to me about this being a goal of the city and hopefully we will be able to do that again. The politics is that no Council will ever do that they will find a way to spend those monies in some way. At least annually this legislation has to be reviewed and I think that is the safeguard for this city and I'm not aware of anyplace in this state that this ever occurred for its people like it occurred in this city. So I would ask Council to keep this legislation on the

Discussion: cont.

books if you're serious about giving reliefs and fair tax treatment to your people you will not repeal this legislation.

The clerk called the roll by Mrs. McCormick, supported by Mr. Troyer, to repeal Ordinance No. 8863-2002.

ROLL CALL: AYES: McCormick, Troyer, Powers
NAYS: Mencini, Scott, Burgio, Salvatore. The motion failed with a vote of 4-3.

Motion by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Scott, that item number four was discussed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Mencini, Scott, Burgio, Salvatore, Troyer, Powers, McCormick
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

PLANNING COMMITTEE – CHAIRMAN, TROYER:

1. REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE 'PREMIER AUTO BODY AND COLLISION, LLC AT 14100 BROOKPARK ROAD LOCATED IN THE U7-B DISTRICT WITH ONE CONDITION THAT A DETAILED PARKING AND LANDSCAPE PLAN BE SUBMITTED TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND FORWARDED UPON RECEIPT TO CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW.

In attendance: Agent: Joseph Streibel. Received from the Planning Commission on January 21, 2016. (Note: Legislation in the form of A Resolution is required for Conditional Use Permits per Code Section 1121.34 c)

Mr. Hurst stated I met with the property owner last week and he is in full agreement this can be done, obviously, it will take some time to get the landscape architect on the property because there has to possibly be some removal of the parking lot. The owner will comply with what the city required for both parking and landscaping which will improve the corner of Laich Parkway and Brookpark Road; this is an older building and the owner will clean up the outside. My recommendation is that the property owner is compliant with everything the city has asked for.

Mr. Astorino stated for clarification this is Councilman Troyer's committee who will be chairing this part of the meeting. I wanted to give some introduction because the memo about this item was received by the Council office last Thursday and when looking at the Council Rules as to how this is to be handled; the deadlines for delivery to the law director for preparation of legislation is not later than 5:00 p.m. the Tuesday preceding the meeting at which such legislation is to be introduced. What is being looked at tonight is for Council to give approval to draft legislation for approval and the issue that I see a problem with is the Council Rules is the request

Planning Committee - Chairman, Troyer: cont.

for legislation would have to be to the law department today at 5:00 p.m.; so Council will need to take action on suspending the rules to get matters accomplished. These are not rules that changes were made for this year this the rule that has been existence on how Council handles legislation. Before giving it to Councilman Troyer as Chairman I wanted to make Council aware that by rules that the deadline has passed that our rules established.

Mayor Coyne stated all we're looking for is the consent of Council to move forward; because legislation can't be drawn up until Council gives concurrence.

Mr. Hurst stated the first meeting of the Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals was an Organizational meeting that was held January 4th there was not a regular meeting scheduled until February which would have pushed this project back even further. So the Planning Commission had a special meeting in the middle of the month for this item because they came to the Planning Commission and was approved to move to the January 4th meeting. Once the landscaping plans are received they will be forwarded by the time Council acts on this.

Mr. Burgio asked Mr. Troyer if the Planning Commission had any other concerns that were not mentioned.

Mr. Troyer responded not really, there was some discussion on the paint booth and what type of venting which was talked about and everything seems fine. One topic I brought up is this company will be right next to all the nice dealerships and needs to have landscaping that matches what the other companies have; that was the brunt of the discussion. Mr. Troyer stated this company is coming from the City of Brooklyn.

Mr. Burgio asked if this is a vacant building.

Mr. Troyer responded I believe so, yes.

Mr. Mencini stated the company will be in compliance with the parking.

Mr. Troyer responded the company will be there will be a detailed plan that the Building Department is waiting for to forward to Council.

Mr. Hurst stated the parking requirement in the city's zoning code will be met with what is currently there and all the storage will be indoors or behind the building; there will be no junk vehicles outside in front of the building. There is a gate from the front side of the building to the back for security reasons and 95% of the business and vehicles being worked on will be housed in the building from the moment of delivery to pickup. This is a substantial business that is moving from the

Planning Committee – Chairman, Troyer: cont.

City of Brooklyn to Brook Park and viewed the operations in Brooklyn and the only body shop I would compare with would be Bruno's Auto Body which runs a clean place.

Mr. Mencini stated that was one of my concerns with the parking of one or two vehicles outside then the next thing it is 42 cars, so having the automobiles parked inside and in the back is compliant.

Mr. Hurst stated that is part of the occupancy permit.

Mr. Troyer commented the landscaping, parking and handicapped parking was discussed.

Motion by Mr. Burgio, supported by Mr. Mencini, to have the proper legislation drafted.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Burgio, Mencini, McCormick, Powers, Troyer, Salvatore, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Mencini, to suspend Council Rule No. 5 for legislation to be in the law department on Tuesday prior to the meeting by 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Troyer, Mencini, McCormick, Powers, Salvatore, Burgio, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

SERVICE COMMITTEE – CHAIRMAN, BURGIO:

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR REPAIR AND RESURFACE OF SNOW ROAD (PID 100238) AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Coyne **Placed in Committee 1/19/16**
(Note: Must be received by the Ohio Department of Transportation no later than March 1, 2016)

Mr. Burgio stated to Engineer Piatak the city is paying 20% of the cost of this project and the federal government is paying 80%, is that correct?

Mr. Piatak responded the city is fronting the design costs which have already been authorized and the split is 80/20 percent on the construction and construction administration.

Mr. Burgio stated this project has been approved and the funding is in place ODOT needs City Council approval to move ahead?

Service Committee – Chairman, Burgio: cont.

Mr. Piatak responded as far as the State goes yes the funds have been encumbered for the project.

Mr. Burgio asked for an approximate start time for the project?

Mr. Piatak anticipated a late spring – early summer start on this project.

Mr. Burgio stated this is approximately a three-mile long project that is in the heart of the city that the city really needs and will be nice when it's done. This is an important road in the city and I am glad to get the funding from the state. As far as traffic concerns will there be access to the street at all times or will there be road closures at any time? There are a lot of businesses in the Smith Road area do you foresee any problems?

Mr. Piatak responded I don't see any traffic detours with the two lanes of traffic and the middle turn lane. My intent and the way the plans are currently being developed is that there will be one lane of traffic in each direction that would allow turn movements. I don't anticipate any detours or road closures to eastbound traffic or anything of that nature there will always be at least one eastbound and one westbound lanes.

Mr. Burgio asked do you know where the project will begin; West 130th Street or Route 237.

Mr. Piatak responded it's my intent to break the project into two sections east of Smith Road to West 130th Street, being the first section; the primary reason for this is the RNC (Republican National Convention) in July. I didn't want to get anywhere near the airport during that timeframe so the westerly section would be the second section of the project after the convention is over.

Mr. Burgio asked will this include sanitary sewers is it reconstruction or just resurfacing.

Mr. Piatak responded this is primarily a mill-and-fill project there will be partial and full depth pavement repairs, curb repairs, catch-basin repairs and maybe some replacements. The concrete sections near Route 237 will remain concrete there will be some joint repairs in those areas. There is no sanitary sewer, waterline work or substantial storm sewer work, other than the catch-basins and casting adjustments, contemplated with this project.

Mr. Burgio asked if this project be simultaneously with the Michael Drive Reconstruction Project.

Service Committee – Chairman, Burgio: cont.

Mr. Piatak responded there hasn't been authorization for the Michael Drive Project so for right now that project is in limbo. On a side note the city made an application to the county for a \$150,000 grant to help with that project and to my knowledge the county hasn't moved forward with nominating any projects.

Mr. Troyer expressed concerns with the road being prepared properly underneath for a good base. Is the city going to have any control over that such as if there is more damage found; will that automatically be done. Or will the city be able to have a say in that matter, how is that going to work?

Mr. Piatak responded right now ODOT (Ohio Department of Transportation) will administer the construction. There will be quantities and details in the plans that the project manager from ODOT will be able to draw upon to say what joints are bad and need to have a full-depth or partial-depth removal. I anticipate having involvement in the project and to be the liaison between the state and the city; so that the city's expectations are met.

Mr. Troyer asked when the full-depth is done will that be cement or a combination of cement ground and asphalted?

Mr. Piatak responded my intent on full-depth repairs is if the base is concrete a full-depth will be replaced with concrete. So if a concrete joint is bad that joint will be replaced with concrete full-depth. Partial-depth repairs are typically ground maybe two or three feet wide and ground three inches deep to remove some of the top decay; three or four inches of that partial would be backfilled with compacted asphalt; so there is a different type of repair. There is also a full-depth asphalt repair but I would not intend on using any full-depth asphalt repairs in this project. Unless there was a section that the existing pavement makeup was full-depth asphalt and I don't believe there is any of that in this project.

Mr. Troyer asked Finance Director Cingle in Section 2 what fund is the monies needed coming from for this project.

Mr. Cingle responded it will come out of the Snow Road Resurfacing Fund that is already established; Fund 540.

Mr. Mencini stated to Engineer Piatak will the businesses on Snow Road be notified ahead of time?

Mr. Piatak responded notices or flyers could be put in the News Sun or the city's website to give a heads-up and anticipate the businesses will be notified.

Mr. Mencini asked if there will be any apron repairs like with the Smith Road project.

Service Committee – Chairman, Burgio: cont.

Mr. Piatak responded this is a curb-to-curb project and if there is an issue with changing the profile of the road. If there is a need to get into the apron for the new profile to match because maybe a gutter has to be changed for better drainage; or if there are some deficiencies in the pavement. For the most part the contractor will not be doing aprons with this project.

Mr. Mencini asked when the road is down to one lane with all the businesses over there at certain times of the morning and afternoon it can get hectic. Will the street lights be synchronized with the traffic flow of the single lanes such as Brookgate Shopping Center or the bowling alley?

Mr. Piatak responded the lanes will have to be reduced so the work gets done. I'm sure there will be some signal modifications and timing adjustments on the signals through there either with ODOT or the contractor to make the best of the situation. To say that any type of backup will be eliminated can't be said because if there are two lanes in each direction plus a turn lane that will not be during the construction phase.

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

Motion by Mr. Burgio, supported by Mr. Troyer, to go into Executive Session for the purpose of Personnel Matters.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Burgio, Troyer, Powers, McCormick, Mencini, Scott, Salvatore
NAYS: None. The motion carried at 8:10 p.m.

In attendance: Members of Council, Mayor Coyne, Law Director Horvath.

Mayor Coyne left at 8:50 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Mencini, to adjourn the Executive Session.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Troyer, Mencini, McCormick, Powers, Salvatore, Burgio, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried at 9:08 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Mencini, to go back to the Regular Order of Business.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Troyer, Mencini, McCormick, Powers, Salvatore, Burgio, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

There being no further business to come before this meeting Council President Astorino declared this meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED *Michelle Blazak*
Michelle Blazak
Clerk of Council

APPROVED *February 23, 2016*

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