

**REGULAR CAUCUS MEETING  
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO  
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 2018**

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

**SCOTT, BURGIO, ORCUTT, STEM, MENCINI, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE**

Also in attendance were Law Director Horvath, Service Director Garner, Economic Development Commissioner Adams Mayor Gammella, Recreation Director Elliott, Engineer Piatak and Finance Director Cingle.

-----

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETINGS:**

1. Regular Caucus Meeting held on March 27, 2018.

**Motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Mencini, to amend page 13 by removing paragraphs eight and nine due to redundancy.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Poindexter, Mencini, Salvatore, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The amendment carried.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to adopt as amended.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried as amended.

-----

**IV. DISCUSSION:**

1. DIVISION OF LIQUOR CONTROL - **C TRFO FROM PERMIT NO. 3274888 FOR A D1, D2, D3 AND D3A TO GOODWIN FOOD & SPIRITS, LLC LOCATED AT 13311 BROOKPARK ROAD, BROOK PARK, OH 44142 FROM 1981 - 13311 BROOKPARK, LLC, DBA AMBERS CABARET, PERMIT NO. 6548557 LOCATED AT 13311 BROOKPARK ROAD, BROOK PARK, OH 44142 FOR A D1, D2, D3 AND D3A. Postmark Date 04/27/2018**

Mr. Salvatore asked Law Director Horvath if she was able to find out the ownership?

Mrs. Horvath responded she is still working on this and thinks this is an important license to pay attention to. I attempted to contact Denise Fry and have been unsuccessful by phone so a letter has been sent asking she contact the law department. This may take another week to determine all the factors involved.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Burgio, to move to the April 17, 2018 Caucus Prior to agenda.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Burgio, Scott, Orcutt, Stemm, Mencini, Poindexter  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**Discussion: cont.**

2. REQUEST APPROVAL OF LOT CONSOLIDATION AND LOT SPLIT FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AT PERMANENT PARCEL NUMBERS 344-03-076, -077, -078 AT 5211 WEST 149th STREET LOCATED IN THE U1-A5. Received from the Planning Commission on April 3, 2018. **In attendance:** Margaret Young.

**Margaret Young**  
**4266 Wooster Road**  
**Fairview Park**

Mr. Poindexter thanked Ms. Young for coming this evening, and stated originally you requested that all five lots be consolidated into one lot.

Ms. Young responded yes, what happened on that is I was going to build a 72-foot-wide ranch with a three-car garage with 3 1/2 bathrooms, one being in the basement. Wayne Homes the general contractor for that house told me that I would not be able to get the bathroom in the basement without adding additions onto it. The house was over \$200,000 and with the additional charges I decided this was not the place to be building my house and chose a different location. I went through the expense for consolidating all five lots, having trees removed, and the survey. There will be a lot of money tied-up for this consolidation and then to decide not to build was a very expensive decision. When I purchased the property there were five sub-lots with two of the lots being 50-foot combined in one permanent parcel number, the third lot was 25-foot lot; I did not want to build on a 50-foot lot because it was too small for a ranch with a two-car garage. What I did is consolidated the five lots back together at the corner of West 149th Street and Elm. In speaking with Building Commissioner Hurst he informed me there were side-line clearances on the corner lot of 11'; I didn't want the house to be that close to the sidewalk and decided to add the corner lot for an extra 5' and the middle lot being at 60'. At the Zoning Appeals meeting I was told that no variances would be granted for side-line clearances and the home would have to be built within the confines of the 60' with a 16' sideline, 30' setback and 21' to the rear. The plans are to build a ranch with a 12-course basement and two-car attached garage as large as possible, probably about 1300 sq. ft. with a full basement.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Burgio if there were any concerns from the Planning Commission?

Mr. Burgio responded Building Commissioner Hurst answered all the questions as well as Ms. Young's explanation to the Planning Commissioner members and the request passed unanimously.

Mr. Mencini thanked Ms. Young for building in Brook Park.

Mr. Salvatore thanked Ms. Young for building a new house in Brook Park and is in support of this project.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Scott stated Ms. Young came before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) and the request passed unanimously, the BZA has no issues as Ms. Young presented the project. Mr. Scott thanked Ms. Young for building in Brook Park.

Mr. Orcutt thanked Ms. Young for coming this evening and stated the Fairlawn area has a lot of character and this is a great plan for that community and neighborhood. For clarification, the building of two homes are there intentions of having family members moving in?

Ms. Young isn't sure and my sister just moved in a nursing home in Strongsville and is unhappy and is aware of the building of these two homes. She would like to live next door to me; so once these homes are built if she still wants to move in she will become a resident of Brook Park.

Mr. Orcutt stated this is something that will be done over the summer?

Ms. Young responded yes, we're going to break ground immediately; Wayne Homes and I are under contract since August, 2017.

Mr. Orcutt welcomed and thanked Ms. Young for building in Brook Park and stated this is a great plan, great for that neighborhood and supports this project.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to have legislation drafted and placed on the next Council agenda.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Poindexter, Stemm, Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt.

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

3. **PAYMENT TO BRANDON REYNOLDS FOR LIVESTREAMING OF MEETINGS  
(\$100.00 per evening)**

Mr. Vecchio stated there is an outstanding balance for the month of March along with covered appropriations for April, May and June; that would cover the Reynolds' doing the livestream along with payments to BoxCast. This also includes the potential of having one special meeting per month, five meetings for April, May and June for a total of \$2,200 appropriation until the end of June.

Mr. Orcutt asked what is the outstanding balance currently?

Mr. Vecchio believes it is \$300.00 for March.

Mr. Orcutt clarified we owe them \$300.00 plus an additional \$2,200.00.

Mr. Vecchio responded that would include \$400.00 for BoxCast and an additional \$1,500.00 to cover those months. Any unused monies will go back to the General Fund.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Scott clarified the total of the invoice should be \$700.00.

Mr. Vecchio concurred.

Mr. Poindexter stated Council approved \$100.00 per evening billing and noticed on the invoice March 27th showing two separate billings in the amount of \$100.00; one Caucus and one Special Council meetings.

Mr. Vecchio responded per the original contract \$100.00 per evening for regularly scheduled meetings and then the special meeting called additionally into that would be an additional \$100.00.

Mr. Poindexter clarified Council's verbal approval that was adjusted from the original to \$100.00 per evening.

Mr. Vecchio responded correct, the regular scheduled meeting and there were three special meetings called for March 27th, 28th, and 29th back to back; that's where the additional \$100.00 for that special meeting on March 27th.

Mr. Poindexter commented he understand the \$100.00 charge for March 28th and 29th those are different nights but March 27th was the same night as a Regular Caucus meeting where they were here already.

Mr. Salvatore asked if the contract expired on that evening, Council under verbal approval extended the contract to \$100.00 per evening.

Mr. Vecchio clarified at the February 20th Council meeting there was a motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Burgio, to verbally approve \$100.00 or \$2,400.00 with \$250.00 for BoxCast. Mr. Poindexter asked that Council is voting to approve \$2,400.00 and taking \$100.00 to pay the Reynolds'. Mr. Vecchio responded the Reynolds' would be paid on a per-evening basis along with BoxCast of the \$2,400.00; the approval is to pay the Reynolds' \$100.00 per evening and the monthly BoxCast bill of the \$2,400.00 budgeted. Mr. Salvatore stated the \$2,400.00 has already been appropriated so Council is approving \$100.00 so the person livestreaming the meetings gets paid the motion carried. The additional monies will be made under a second motion but come out of the \$2,400.00 already appropriated. Payment to BoxCast was next for the monthly invoice payment for meetings out of that \$2,400.00 and approved.

Mr. Orcutt agreed with Mr. Poindexter of Council giving verbal approval for payment to the Reynolds' of \$100.00 per evening? Mr. Orcutt stated something that should be looked into with the invoicing if this has happened before?

Mr. Vecchio responded no, through this time it's been for each meeting, after the February 20th Council meeting verbal approval was granted. So this would be the one

**Discussion: cont.**

additional and if I'm understanding correctly. Council is looking at an additional \$100.00 to be removed?

Mr. Salvatore stated this could be moved to the next Council agenda under verbal approval and Council can approve the amount at that meeting through the month of June.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to place on the next Council agenda under verbal approval.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Poindexter, Mencini, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

4. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH GREATER CLEVELAND AUTO AUCTION, PUBLIC AUCTIONEERS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISPOSING OF OBSOLETE CITY VEHICLES AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Mencini, to place on the next Council agenda.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Mencini, Poindexter, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**Motion** by Mr. Scott, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to go out of the Regular Order of Business to item number five - Legislative Committee.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Poindexter, Salvatore, Mencini, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, MENCINI:**

1. A RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ADMINISTRATION, MEMBERS OF COUNCIL AND THE ELECTORATE OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK SUPPORT A RENEWAL OF THE 2019 CUYAHOGA HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES LEVY AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Council President Vecchio.

Mr. Vecchio stated this is a Cuyahoga County renewal, there are no additional taxes to residents for services provided out of MetroHealth that includes Life Flight, Children Services, Services for less-fortunate families and the MetroHealth Burn unit.

Mr. Poindexter stated in addition to providing care to underprivileged families, MetroHealth has one of the best trauma units in the area. So supporting them we are supporting a lot of good things to our community and I am in support.

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio stated to expand on Mr. Poindexter's comments, I believe in our vicinity MetroHealth is the only Level One Trauma Center, meaning anyone with severe injuries are taken to MetroHealth. Mr. Vecchio asked for co-sponsors and by a show of hands Council as a Whole and Mayor Gammella.

Mr. Mencini commented this is for a great cause and taking no monies out of pockets of the residents, advertisement is on cleveland.com and the Plain Dealer.

**Motion** by Mr. Scott, supported by Mr. Burgio, to place on the next Council agenda.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Burgio, Orcutt, Stemm, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried to go back to item number four - Discussion.

**Discussion: cont.**

5. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND  
 APPROPRIATIONS **Note: Moved by motion from the April 6, 2018  
 Special Caucus meeting.**

Mr. Orcutt started off with the Economic Development breakdown of \$365,000. What was left in that fund was money for HMAP (Home Maintenance Assistance Program) and Grants. Mr. Orcutt stated to Mr. Cingle currently for HMAP there is \$50,000 balance and for Grants there is a \$80,000 balance?

Mr. Cingle stated my recollection was \$40,000 for HMAP and \$80,000 for Grants of which \$30,000 has already been expensed; leaving \$50,000 for Grants.

Mr. Orcutt going off his notes starting at \$365,000 with \$200,000 for the Senior Snow Plowing and Grass-cutting services leaving \$165,000 with \$5,000 for property taxes the city has to pay taking that total down to \$160,000. A \$30,000 grant was paid out to Ques Industries taking the total to \$130,000; my understanding is \$50,000 for HMAP and \$80,000 in Grants.

Mr. Cingle clarified last week there was discussion about reducing the amount by \$40,000 to be potentially utilized for transfer to the Roads Program.

Mr. Orcutt asked if there was a vote taken.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio responded there was no vote on that and your numbers are correct, the last numbers I have is the total down to \$130,000; \$80,000 for Grants with \$30,000 paid to Ques Industries, \$50,000 in HMAP along with \$5,000 for Real Estate taxes.

Mr. Orcutt suggested I don't think all the grant money be taken away and believes a good portion of that money should remain for Economic Development Commissioner Adams to work with. This will help when the city is in contention with businesses coming to the city. It would be too much for Mr. Adams to say we will find that money and then get it approved; I think it's better Mr. Adams have some money there to utilize at the table. Mr. Orcutt wants to keep \$50,000 in Grants and agree with the suggestion by Mr. Salvatore to move \$10,000 out of HMAP and leave \$40,000 in there and sharing \$10,000 per each ward (for streets).

**Motion** by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Salvatore, to remove \$10,000 from HMAP and \$30,000 from Grants totaling \$40,000 to Fund 545.

-----  
Mr. Vecchio asked Mr. Orcutt in the motion did you want to specify the \$10,000 for each ward?

Mr. Orcutt responded I believe that the discussion was to have separate legislation for that.

Mr. Salvatore clarified legislation is already on the books that can be amended. The original intent was to do a 50/50 split to get larger projects done on homes because it is very difficult to get something done with \$5,000.

Mr. Vecchio suggested to Council if you're going to pull out the current legislation for amendments you may not want to appropriate that at this time.

Mr. Poindexter hopes that more can be added to the \$10,000 per ward, but until that time, it would be better to keep the \$40,000 together to possibly fix one road completely. Rather than fixing roads at \$10,000 because those monies wouldn't do much to fix a road; I would like to see one whole street completed instead of dividing those monies.

Mr. Salvatore stated I don't think \$40,000 is being pulled out just to appropriate for one street. What we're trying to do is get the original number up so that a whole street can be done; hopefully, when all said and done there will be an additional \$300,000 to \$400,000 in the Roads Program.

Mr. Scott stated I agree with Mr. Orcutt monies are needed in the HMAP. We took away the sidewalk program and I can't see taking all the amenities to improve houses. We need to keep monies in the HMAP, monies in the Grants Program to give people insight

**Discussion: cont.**

to come to the city. If we need to find more grant money something could probably be done. We do need to leave monies in the HMAP to give something back to the people, we can't take everything away from them.

Mr. Mencini stated on that point with the wards and streets in Ward 2 one of the worst streets is Delores between Holland and Sylvia. To crack-fill, that wouldn't go a lot but would help for \$11,100. Because to reconstruct would be \$500,000 and to resurface would be \$161,000. Dividing this money up may not seem like a lot now but does add a little bit but won't solve the problem.

Mr. Poindexter commented he doesn't want to pull the monies out of HMAP and is in favor of leaving the full \$80,000 in HMAP, however, he does realize the need to get roads repaired and to meet halfway to pull the \$40,000 out. I would like to see the \$40,000 stay lumped together to get more work done for the dollars, than dividing it up into \$10,000 increments.

Mr. Orcutt stated for clarification what we have left over in that fund was \$130,000 and what we're doing is not taking everything out of that fund; \$90,000 will be left in Economic Development. The motion I made was to reduce the Grant amount from \$80,000 to \$50,000 and move that \$30,000 into Fund 545. This is just the start, there are monies that I think I found that we can put into the Roads Program, give monies to the administration for Grants and monies to the residents to improve their homes. From what I heard there are five residents that have already applied for that program.

Mr. Vecchio clarified the \$40,000 is the full amount will go into Fund 545.

Mr. Salvatore stated the way the monies are appropriated is probably for a later date. All we're doing is appropriating \$40,000 and if Council decides to do something in one ward that can be decided at a later date. As far as the sidewalk program it's not that we're doing away with it, we've had an extensive sidewalk program the last few years so that 50/50 program can be shelved for now and brought back out next year or the year after.

Mr. Cingle stated my understanding of the motion is to reduce the Fund 243 - Economic Development Fund by \$40,000 to be transferred from the General Fund to Fund 545 - Street Improvement Fund.

Mr. Orcutt concurred.

-----  
**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Orcutt, Salvatore, Poindexter, Mencini, Stemm, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Orcutt stated at the last meeting, Council appropriated \$5,000 for Tax, Legal and Finance leaving a balance of \$3,998.00. Could those three be transferred to Fund 545?

Mr. Cingle responded I don't believe there is a balance there, that \$5,000 each was unrestricted as the total amount in that proposed appropriation document submitted to Council. The difference between the amounts that were to the left of the \$5,000 figure was the total amount.

Mr. Orcutt clarified all Council did last week was appropriate those monies for \$5,000 each?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Salvatore clarified to Finance Director Cingle the difference between what was discussed and what was appropriated for those three areas that money goes back into the General Fund?

Mr. Cingle responded no, what happened was we reduced the unrestricted dollars to the budget approved by Council. The Law Department had \$217.00 spent in law books earlier in the year so that amount has already been paid through capital. We are now appropriating another \$5,000 for the purchase law books out of that line item so the total appropriation approved by Council would be \$5,217.00. The \$5,688.00 for the Tax Department is the copier lease and the Finance Department \$8,093.00 was for a computer and the copier lease.

Mr. Orcutt stated Fund 401, line item 423 - S, C, M & R (Street Construction Maintenance Repair) Construction Contracts (Emergency), the amount left was \$150,000 for construction contracts emergency fund?

Mr. Cingle concurred and reiterated those funds would be used for emergency purposes.

Mr. Orcutt continued Council appropriated monies for the pump station improvements, plow blades and rear-loader.

Mr. Cingle responded at last weeks' meeting and from my notes are Mechanics - \$10,000 for Miscellaneous Tools, Sanitation - \$45,000 for the rear-loader lease, Sewer & Drains - \$100,000 for the pump station improvements, Snow Plow blades - \$20,000 and the Senior Bus lease of \$25,000.

Mr. Orcutt concurred and stated there is still \$150,000 that have not been decided what to do with and talked about those monies being for the emergency fund; example given was Fayette.

**Discussion: cont.**

**Motion** by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Salvatore, to move \$75,000 of those monies to Fund 545.

Mayor Gammella commented the \$150,000 is there for a reason, in case of a water break or things of that nature. I think that would handcuff us a little bit but if you're okay with items possibly lagging due to no funds. Again, Council appropriates the funds but I would like to hear the service director's opinion on this?

Mr. Garner stated those monies are for emergency's i.e. road collapse due to a sanitary or storm issue or the buckling of a street. These things can't be foreseen and he would rather not look for the money when needed most.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Finance Director Cingle in recent years what was the largest amount needed for an emergency?

Mr. Cingle stated last year there were two sewer repairs done late last year on Fayette and Forestview Circle and when Rademaker collapsed that amounted to \$90,000. Mr. Cingle reiterated his statement from last week by saying this is the last item that should be looked at, there are still three departments to discuss for capital needs; Recreation, Police and Fire. Once Council makes a determination of what dollars to appropriate for those departments then we can see what's left to determine how much is possibly needed for additional street improvements, that's my suggestion.

Mr. Poindexter agreed with Mr. Cingle, that money is there in case of an emergency. Maybe later in the year if there has been no emergency; Council could reconsider taking monies out of that fund. There is still a long way to go for 2018 and he wouldn't like spending half of those monies right now. That's my opinion and won't support taking that out right now.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Cingle in 2014 when there was a collapse on the far west end where did those monies come from?

Mr. Cingle responded he doesn't recall and would have to research.

Mr. Scott stated after some figuring on my own, I didn't come up with \$75,000. I think we should wait for that until the last to make our final decision on our draw for that. I would feel more comfortable taking care of the other three funds and come back to that one, I do feel monies will be taken out of it but not sure if it will be \$75,000.

Mr. Orcutt reiterated those questions have been asked already, I've asked for averages, how much it costs for an emergency and for examples. I also asked if the Fund Reserve Policy was made and we have that; there is still \$363,000 more dollars. So thought went into this and I want to get some roads done for the people and have worked on this and am ready to do this Capital Budget. If Council wants to go through and do

**Discussion: cont.**

police and fire first, I'll rescind my motion. Just so Council knows when I made that motion I made it off of questions asked to the finance director both in private and in these meetings.

Mr. Orcutt rescinded his motion and stated we can come back to it, hopefully this evening.

Mr. Salvatore stated I don't want to paint a picture that sounds like Council doesn't want to take care of an emergency; it took a while to get that \$4 million-dollars into that reserve fund. If anything serious ever happen and we needed to go into that fund, that's where we would go by a vote of Council. Don't ever think that if an emergency hit that we wouldn't be able to take care of it because we will. I'm ready to move forward and will not rescind my second, I think we should call the roll and also think we're headed on the right track, this city is well protected and thinks the safety nets are in place.

Mr. Vecchio reiterated there is a motion on the floor to reduce the S, C, M & R Fund - Construction Contracts (emergency fund) by \$75,000 and putting those monies into Fund 545.

Mayor Gammella interjected that motion was rescinded by the person who made the motion.

Mr. Vecchio commented in order for the motion to be rescinded the second would have to be rescinded first.

Mayor Gammella asked for clarification of that statement.

Mr. Vecchio stated when the motion was made it was seconded, the second would have to be rescinded to take that back.

Mayor Gammella stated the motion is not made if it's rescinded, the second is just a status second.

Mr. Vecchio stated the second would be the status. When the motion is seconded that's the status, therefore, the motion is valid. When the motion is rescinded and the second is not rescinded the motion is still there, that would be the point.

Mayor Gammella disagreed.

The clerk called the roll on the motion by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Salvatore, to move \$75,000 of those monies to Fund 545.

**Discussion: cont.**

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Orcutt, Salvatore, Stemm, Burgio, Scott

**NAYS:** Poindexter, Mencini. The motion carried with a vote of 5-2.

Mayor Gammella stated for the record, that was a huge mistake and that's all.

Mr. Scott moved onto the Recreation Department items consisting of \$15,000 - Kitchen Area-Community Room, \$15,000 - Front desk improvements, \$15,000 Concession Stand Improvements and \$21,552 - Miscellaneous Equipment/Copier lease. To Mr. Cingle can any of three items be moved into a separate fund such as Fund 525 or Fund 700, where it won't be such an impact on anything?

Mr. Cingle responded no, none of these items. They all come out of the Fund 341 - Recreation Department. As I stated earlier with the Concession Stand improvements the Recreation Director was thinking about buying some game room equipment and video games; those could come out of Fund 250.

Mr. Scott clarified the Concession Stand Improvements?

Mr. Cingle responded not the entire Concession Stand Improvements, there was going to be some video games that were going to be purchased for a couple of thousand dollars.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Cingle if the Front Desk/Registration Area can come out of Fund 700?

Mr. Cingle responded no, that is a Recreation Center improvement and should stay in that Recreation Center line item.

Mr. Scott commented Fund 341?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Scott stated the Community Room/City Council Kitchen would come out of Fund 341?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Cingle, couldn't all those three items from Fund 250?

Mr. Cingle responded no, we went through that, mainly it's program related. So none of those three cannot be expended out of Fund 250.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Cingle I understand with Fund 250 - Special Recreation Fund that we can't take that out and let's say put it into the General Fund to be moved. I

**Discussion: cont.**

don't want to keep rehashing that but there's a nice chunk of change in that fund. Nothing can be moved, correct?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mr. Cingle, a letter was left on my door of an email chain asking some of these same questions. For the record, I would like to finally put this rest on that fund. People feel Council can move those monies where they want. I would like to know because if we can I'll start moving those monies but am taking your word that those monies can't be touched.

Mr. Cingle stated that is a Special Revenue Fund so the monies in there are restricted for the purpose of programs. So there cannot be money that is allowed to be transferred out of that fund into, let's say, the General Fund and then transferred to another fund i.e. roads, for example, that cannot be done. A response in writing will be submitted to the person who sent the email as well as the Members of Council and the Mayor.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Cingle, what prevents us from taking that money? Is there a federal, state or local law prohibiting us from transferring that money?

Mr. Cingle responded it's a Special Revenue Fund just like when the Police Chief was here and talked about the Federal Forfeiture Fund and Law Enforcement Fund; those monies are restricted by purpose. If you eliminate that fund and I would have to do further research. But you would have to eliminate the fund, unwind it and then from there spend the monies and close that fund. I would have to talk to the auditors to get clear direction on that. The way that fund is established is a Special Revenue Fund and those monies are restricted for Recreation Center Programs.

Mr. Scott asked if a motion could be made to pull the \$15,000 - Concession Stand Improvements/Game Room Area out of Fund 250? I don't think that would be a major impact on that fund.

Mr. Cingle interjected the monies cannot be expended from Fund 250 for that purpose. Those monies can be used for Game Room Equipment but not for any physical improvements for bricks and mortar cannot be expended out of Fund 250.

Mr. Salvatore stated at last week's meeting there was some dialogue about the Recreation Center kitchen and possibly reducing those funds instead of \$15,000 down to \$5,000 or \$6,000. Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Elliott if he still felt comfortable about possibly doing something in that range; getting the kitchen done in-house.

Mr. Elliott stated on the front desk and kitchen I did get quotes from a local company and Lowes and that's what was quoted. Can we potentially do that improvement for a little bit less, the answer is yes, I think we may be able to do that. My concern is as

**Discussion: cont.**

Council goes through capital that once this is ready and we do a project, for instance, the kitchen. At the end of the day maybe we can get that done for about \$10,000 or \$12,000; leaving extra monies to be transferred to another account. I did get quotes and that's what it is but along the way if we can utilize service department crews for demolition purposes and so forth, we will do that. To reduce some of these items literally jeopardizes the project. I will go wherever Council wants to see if these can be done at a cheaper price and have gone to a handful of places and think the quotes are competitive and fair.

Mr. Poindexter stated I know remodeling a kitchen in a home you're hard-pressed to do for \$10,000 so a kitchen for a Recreation Center for \$10,000 sounds reasonable. I would like to see these items get done especially while the Recreation Center is being enhanced. It is going to be busier over there and some of the space will be confined and participants at the Recreation Center will be confined to certain areas. I don't think \$15,000 is unreasonable for each of these projects and as the Recreation Director mentioned they may be able to get done for \$12,000 and transfer the remaining \$3,000 at a later time.

**Motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Mencini, to appropriate \$15,000 - Kitchen/Community Room, \$15,000 - Front Desk Improvements and \$15,000 - Concession Stand Improvements.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Poindexter, Mencini

**NAYS:** Stemm, Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt. The motion failed with a vote of 2-5.

Mr. Scott stated can we possibly take \$20,000 or \$25,000 out of the \$65,000 and restrict that to \$45,000? I know Mr. Elliott said he didn't want to do that but I am in favor of taking a little bit here and a little bit there; if need be then we'll find a couple of bucks to put here and there. I know we're restricting Mr. Elliott but maybe we could take \$25,000 or something like that and he can go ahead with the \$45,000.

Mr. Vecchio clarified the motion is to reduce three Recreation Center items discussed from \$45,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. Scott concurred

Mr. Mencini commented I would like to see this down to \$10,000 but want to see these projects moving.

**Motion** by Mr. Scott, supported by Mr. Salvatore, to reduce the three Recreation Center items discussed from \$45,000 to \$25,000.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Salvatore, Mencini, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio

**NAYS:** Poindexter. The motion carried with a vote of 6-1.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Cingle stated for clarification when putting this Ordinance together, there was \$45,000 with \$15,000 for the Kitchen Area, \$15,000 for the Front Desk Improvements and \$15,000 for Concession Stand Improvements, totaling \$45,000, that was reduced down to \$25,000. What about the \$19,000 unrestricted in Miscellaneous Equipment. Is that staying in the Recreation Fund? So it would be \$25,000 plus \$19,000 for a total of \$44,000?

Mr. Scott stated I have no qualms with that we have to pay that much anyway.

Mr. Cingle stated so that \$19,000 is unrestricted in case the Front Desk Improvements or Kitchen Area comes in a little higher than \$15,000; some of that \$19,000 can be used for that.

Mr. Stemm moved onto Police and Fire and asked the Mayor if he was able to get a breakdown of the items that were expiring on the list of items mentioned last week. The PPE and bullet-proof vests as well as a breakdown of cost per vehicle to lease?

Mayor Gammella didn't have that information with him.

Mr. Scott stated Mr. Cingle and I talked about this and I have a breakdown on the leases. One F-150 and two Explorer Interceptors to lease them is \$38,500. One F-150 and one Explorer Interceptor is roughly \$27,000 and one F-150 and three Explorer Interceptors is roughly \$50,000. In talking to Police Chief Foster about the F-150 as of right now the state has not come in with the reduced price on the F-150.

Mr. Cingle stated my understanding that state pricing hasn't been made available yet for the truck.

Mr. Scott stated these prices for the truck are basically the sticker price?

Mr. Cingle responded that was estimated I think it was \$43,000 total with the changeover, wrap and everything needed. Those prices may come in lower once the state awards the bid.

Mr. Salvatore asked what is the purpose from switching from a van to a truck?

Mr. Scott responded Chief Foster said what that van originally was a prisoner transport van that SWAT (Special Weapons and Tactics) was using. The chief said going to the truck is the fact that the SWAT manpower is not what it used to be; the Southwest Taskforce. The chief said it would be easier in case an emergency traffic signal isn't working to throw the generator in the back of the truck. The truck seats four and can also pull a trailer. The chief felt the larger van seating isn't necessary because they don't have the force they used to due to that being a joint venture.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mr. Cingle because of what that truck is going to be used for would that be an item for the Forfeiture Fund?

Mr. Cingle responded that's a question for the chief, I would say no, it's not, but would rather have Chief Foster answer that.

Mr. Salvatore stated it sounds like something that should be doable to get funds from the Forfeiture Fund to purchase it. It would make better sense to me to stagger vehicles instead of buying them all at once; we did that the last time and the vehicles all reach the mileage where they're no longer functional at the same time. I think we really need to know that answer if the Forfeiture Fund can be used for this truck.

Mr. Stemm stated to Mr. Scott do you have a breakdown for just one Explorer to lease or just the package?

Mr. Scott stated these are numbers that the Finance Director and I talked about earlier today.

Mr. Stemm stated to Mr. Cingle do you have that breakdown?

Mr. Cingle responded I don't run it by individual vehicle but from what the Police Chief provided. The Explorers are \$34,002 estimated vehicle price, the options, the wrap and changeover and the F-150 is at \$42,900. I don't have it by individual vehicle just in total.

Mr. Stemm requested that information of the vehicle breakdown.

Mayor Gammella asked Mr. Stemm provide a list to be submitted to the chiefs.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Scott, in your discussions with the chief do you know what was specked out? Was it a two-wheel drive F-150 or a four-wheel drive?

Mr. Scott responded no.

Mr. Burgio asked Mr. Cingle if the leases are for the same years?

Mr. Cingle responded yes, they would be three-year leases; the projections were runoff for a three-year lease.

Mr. Burgio stated all vehicles even the senior van?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Vecchio moved onto the Fire Department.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Stemm asked Mayor Gammella for a breakdown for the \$150,000 on the west-end fire station. If a cost could be provided for the door alone and other aesthetics.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to take a five-minute recess.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Poindexter, Stemm, Salvatore, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott.

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Mencini, to reconvene the meeting.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Mencini, Poindexter, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Mr. Vecchio stated onto the Fire Department.

Mr. Salvatore thinks there is more work to do on the Police Department with talk about the vests.

Mr. Vecchio responded we stopped because of the questions on the truck and leases.

Mr. Mencini continued with the Police Department by stating he is in favor of the Outside Vest Carrier for \$10,000, that is one item absolutely needed to protect the patrol officers.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Burgio, to approve the Outside Vest Carrier in the amount of \$10,000.

Mr. Orcutt commented he thought that was approved last week.

Mr. Salvatore responded no and thinks part of that money comes back to the city after purchase.

Mr. Cingle concurred and this is a contractual item so it has to be purchased.

Mr. Stemm stated the Outside Vest Carrier for \$10,000 is just a garment that goes hand-in-hand with the bullet-proof vests replacements, that's my understanding. The outer carrier goes over the bullet-proof vest and can be taken off when in the station; the bulletproof is the caviar. Eight bullet-proof vests are \$8,000 and the Outside Vest Carrier is \$10,000 for a total of \$18,000.

Mr. Cingle responded yes, based on the original capital budget request that Chief Foster put together; the bullet-proof vests are \$8,000 and the Outside Carrier was \$10,000, totaling \$18,000 for vests.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Cingle the \$10,000 wasn't included in the uncommitted fund because it's 100% reimbursed?

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Cingle responded the \$10,000 is for the Outside Vest Carrier and not reimbursable; the bullet-proof vests are. The Outside Vest Carrier wasn't part of the proposal appropriations. Mr. Cingle commented based on the Chief Foster's initial funding request from February 3rd he has seven new vehicles listed with two F-150's on that list. His total amount was \$260,000 and in the Law Enforcement and/or Federal Forfeiture Fund column he states that none of those monies can be expended out of either of those two funds, I will double-check with the Police Chief but that's the way he put together his proposal that none of those dollars can be spent on the law enforcement of federal forfeiture fund

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Mencini, to approve the bulletproof vests and the Outside Vest Carrier at \$18,000.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Mencini, Poindexter, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Mr. Scott stated if I'm not mistaken the chief said that the server replacements or something that was also needed because the other ones are obsolete.

**Motion** by Mencini, supported by Mr. Salvatore, to approve the Server Replacements at \$22,000.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Salvatore, Poindexter, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Mr. Vecchio stated we still have the building and jail surveillance camera system for 50,000 with 50%...this would be \$100,000 with \$50,000 being expensed from the Law Enforcement or Federal Forfeiture Fund.

Mr. Cingle stated with that \$50,000, 50% would be paid through the Law Enforcement or Federal Forfeiture Fund so total amount be \$100,000, those were the wish-list items. We are now digressing off the proposed capital for the Police Department which were the building improvements at \$100,000 with \$50,000 in capital and \$20,000 from the Federal Forfeiture or Law Enforcement Fund. So that's another \$40,000 and Council allocated \$18,000 for the Outside Carrier vests. So all that's left is the vehicle leases and Detective Bureau Improvements.

Mr. Poindexter stated at the last meeting, we were going to hold off on all the buildings until Mr. Salvatore proposed a plan and was wondering if he was ready with that plan?

Mr. Salvatore stated I met with the Mayor and is hoping to have a few more talks about making some decisions for new buildings in the area. I would like to see the 'For Sale' sign on Brookpark Road taken down on property that the city owns. As these talks continue that property will be needed and I'm not one for selling land right now. I don't want to say too much right now until after the Mayor and I meet a few more times.

**Discussion: cont.**

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Stemm, to move the remaining Police and Fire building improvements to the next Caucus Prior to agenda.

-----

Mr. Stemm stated to Mr. Scott the only items remaining are vehicles for the police, correct?

Mr. Scott responded also the buildings.

Mr. Stemm clarified buildings and police cruisers.

Mr. Salvatore and Mr. Stemm rescinded the motion and support.

Mr. Orcutt stated the last item is the Fire Department and General Government and Lands. On the fire department I would like to have more time and take a look at this breakdown.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Mencini, to move the remaining Police and Fire Building capital improvements to the April 17th Caucus Prior to agenda.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Mencini, Poindexter, Stemm, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

-----

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Cingle for a breakdown of the \$384,500 in Improvements and Reserves.

Mr. Cingle responded there is the \$110,000 change order that was approved by City Council for the Recreation Center. Those monies would be used for any unforeseen items that may come about. I know one of the whirlpools needs an improvement of over \$30,000 and there is a purchase requisition approved in the amount of \$12,000 for equipment that was moved from City Hall to the Safety Building. Those are items that we were not aware of at the beginning of the year when putting this budget together. I was here in 1995 when the renovations took place at the Recreation Center and even though these change overs are not that extensive, that couple of hundred-thousand dollars can be spent very quickly; that's why those monies are there. Whatever monies that are not used will roll over in 2019 and let me reiterate we have a large 2019 Roads Program of 2.3 million dollars to be funded by the city. So we need to start thinking about how much money you want to borrow if these reserves are used in 2018; the more we save this year the better we will be in 2019.

Mr. Salvatore commented the purpose for those monies was for the parking lot.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mayor Gammella stated speaking of the parking lot, sooner or later that parking lot is going to be needed. There are four parking spaces up front for residents and guests needing a place to park. We're moving City Hall employees over there; so sooner or later that parking lot is going to be needed. Also, when talking about the Recreation Center we need a roof on that pool. You have to protect that asset and it's insane to spend \$5.2 million dollars and put a roof on half the building. Also to cover a few other items is the demolition of City Hall and the Council Chambers, the moving expenses from City Hall to the new City Hall (Recreation Center), so there's a lot involved and I'll say it again. We have to get this Recreation Center project right. It's something I inherited and we're going to get it right because it's the center of the community and where people and families come. If we want to bring young families into this community, we need a very viable and functional Recreation Center and it costs money to do that.

Mr. Scott stated to Mayor Gammella I continue to hear about the roof over the pools and understands that. But, do we know what function we're going to be using for the pool? Is it going to be an indoor or outdoor pool? How at this point can we know what we're going to do with the roof and how the pool is going to be utilized? I'm in construction and know you just can't fix the roof without knowing what the pools will be used for. Are we going to fill the dive tank and use it as a community room? If that happens then we don't need a roof at that existing point where it's at right now. I did approve the \$5.2 million dollars for the renovation and knew that the pool roof wasn't going to get fixed but, at that point, we didn't know what the pool use was going to be. Have there been any indications as to what use we'll be using the pool? Are we going to have the roof up to the existing as it is now?

Mayor Gammella stated irregardless of what we do, the roof has to be fixed. It's going to affect the rest of the building sooner or later. You can't put a roof on half of the building and that's the situation we have there; as you know I would like the pool to reopen and think a lot of residents would. If we can't reopen the pool, then we still have to utilize that space in some capacity. Some of the things looked at was taking out the diving tank, as you stated, and put in a community room or possibly an indoor soccer field, tennis courts or a Pirate Ship Waterpark for the children to use in the wintertime. We would have to see what kind of support we get from the community and are currently getting estimates for all of that.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mayor Gammella talking about the parking lot and tennis courts. I know it's not on the table for this year but seems it will be on the table at some point. Are you talking about taking both tennis courts or just one?

Mayor Gammella responded we wouldn't take any of them. There is that grassy area between the new City Hall and the tennis courts, that's all that would be taken. Because the last thing I want to see is people parking on the grass, that won't be tolerated.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Salvatore clarified just the grassy area between City Hall and tennis courts.

Mayor Gammella concurred.

Mr. Mencini stated I concur with what you said about the pool, we need to take a look at that whole area because that community center is the heart of this city; we all believe the center could be a very viable area. With the four parking spots are they going to be for handicapped parking?

Mayor Gammella responded that people come to City Hall and if all those spots are handicapped there's going to be a fight to get in there. I'd like to be able to give the residents the courtesy of being able to park and enter City Hall.

Mr. Mencini stated with the pool I like hearing about the Pirates: for a lap pool and think this Administration and Council are the ones to move ahead. Let's finish this budget and see what we can do. With the tearing down of this building I'd like to see it as a senior center.

Mayor Gammella responded the problem is with that is the way the contract reads. Is these buildings have to be torn down for energy efficiency and the city can't put any more money into them. Now, the question arises do we want to try and bend that a little bit and say the city won't be paying the utilities. We will have someone renting the building and paying the utilities but then you're in the same situation you started with. I think the whole concept of this was to go from three buildings to one to save money. I think that would possibly violate the terms of that agreement if we had people renting them.

Mr. Mencini stated just save money at the Recreation Center for energy conservation and agree with you but I'm saying this building and City Hall.

Mayor Gammella interjected I understand but part of that contract is these buildings had to come down, that's how we're saving the money. That's why I've said from the beginning, to me, it's a no-brainer. When you move three buildings into one you're going to save money. These buildings, right now, have to come down and what I'm distressed at is there's no money to do it. These are the kinds of things we're going to have to face and wanted to make you aware of them now.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Piatak if there is any indication as to what roads are going to be repaired, as of today.

Mr. Piatak commented the list has been provided and I'm not aware of any changes.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Piatak if that is a concrete list and something that we're going to do?



**DISCUSSION: CONT.**

Mr. Piatak concurred.

Mr. Stemm reminded Council about Mr. Cingle's statement of the \$2.3 million dollars in roads that we're facing in 2019. So in talking about roofs on pools that aren't being used we have to figure out if this is a time-sensitive issue. A decision has to be made if there's going to be an outdoor pool or an indoor pool and are we going to renovate everything with a lower roof? I think we need to discuss these matters and remember the \$2.3 million dollars for roads in 2019.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mayor Gammella, last year numbers were mentioned for the roof over the pool area to be at \$3 million dollars, if I'm not mistaken. Along with additional costs for tuck-pointing around the outside immediate areas of the building. Have you seen that estimate or obtained any other estimates where possibly that number has changed?

Mayor Gammella I've seen that estimate and in my opinion it is way off. We are going to get three bids for that roof and come to Council with the best bid to discuss

Mr. Vecchio asked if there is a timeline you're looking at?

Mayor Gammella responded probably within the next few months.

Mr. Salvatore stated as long as we're talking about the roof over the pool. Is one of the options to eliminate the roof by making it an outdoor pool and putting an atrium over it when the city has more money?

Mayor Gammella commented outdoor pools are only good for four months out of the year but we will keep everything on the table and take a look at that. But, we have an asset sitting over there with half a roof and need to protect that asset.

Mr. Salvatore stated I think it's more complicated than that, it's not that simple. The conversation I've heard over the last year or so is anywhere from \$2 to \$3 million dollars to repair that roof. I look forward to see what the plan is.

Mayor Gammella stated let me go on record Councilman, I can't believe it's going to \$2 or \$3 million dollars to fix that roof. I can't believe that and think three competitive bids will show that.

Mr. Vecchio asked if any of the mechanicals or the pool itself have been looked at to see if there are any additional hidden issues?

Mayor Gammella stated the pool has been closed for four years so everything appears to be okay but won't know until fired up; just like with the whirlpools. We fired them up and ran them for a few days everything looked fine then we noticed some water was

**DISCUSSION: CONT.**

missing. In getting to the bottom of that one of the whirlpool tubs had to be pulled out and it turned out that's not part of this project and the city has to bear the brunt of the cost of \$30,000. The contractor told us July or August when that work will be done and that's unacceptable so the contractor is working with the city to get those whirlpools running. When we open those locker rooms it has to be right and we can't be closing them in another few months, it's has to be done right the first time.

-----

There being no further business to come before this meeting a **motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Stemm to adjourn.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Stemm, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED Michelle Blazak  
Michelle Blazak  
Clerk of Council

APPROVED April 24, 2018

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