

**REGULAR CAUCUS MEETING
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO
HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2021**

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, SCHMUCK, ORCUTT, TROYER, MENCINI, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETINGS:

1. REGULAR CAUCUS MEETING MINUTES HELD ON MARCH 9, 2021.

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

ROLL CALL: AYES: Mencini, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt, Poindexter, Salvatore

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

DISCUSSION:

1. ORDINANCE NO, 11190-2021, AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF RECREATION TO PREPARE BID DOCUMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND THE MAYOR TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS AND ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE CITY OF BROOK PARK'S MUNICIPAL CAMPUS OUTDOOR AMPHITHEATER AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella. **Note:** Moved by Council from the April 6th Council meeting for discussion purposes.

Mr. Troyer stated have a few fixes, one that needs to be done. Not against this legislation great amenity. One question is this just going to cost \$100,000.00? What is the expected actual cost?

Mayor Gammella responded that's the reason going out to bid to see what it would cost. Going to be somewhere right around little or little over that's the reason to go out to bid to find out.

Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Cingle is that going to be a problem if it goes a little over?

Mr. Cingle responded depends on how much it goes over. If it's a few thousand-dollars over monies can be moved around at the appropriate time.

Mr. Troyer continued great, another issue not with the legislation but in general. With the location and direction of the amphitheater, have heard from other people, see it turns more. Concerned with Home Days celebration it seems to me that it is directed towards houses and people may not enjoy that, at different times or at all.

Discussion: cont.

Home Days goes late and if the amphitheater is going to be used for that I think it should be turned more towards the parking lot, possibly the recreation director can address that issue.

Mr. Elliott responded sure, can I also go back and talk about the cost? Last Saturday I emailed the Community Grant submittal form that was submitted earlier. Taking a minute to go through that and will address the total cost of this amphitheater going through this. The whole idea of everything put together and ultimately this discussion came about due to the acquisition of the property and agreement with Berea City School District in 2019. In 2020 an informational worksheet was submitted on a project through Representative Bride Sweeney's office. The city was fortunate and successful with this grant and many thanks to Representative Sweeney's office. Originally, the city was trying to get \$160,000.00 but due to COVID-19 the city was fortunate to receive \$100,000.00. Submitting all the information that identifies the City of Brook Park along with myself as the contact officer and Mayor the signer of documents for the city. A description of the overview scope for this project was provided that included the project name, city amphitheater project, general site preparation is minimal, utility work that will have to be done, project does include installation of a concrete pad, stairs and ramp for ADA (American Disabilities Act) and the entertainment structure consists of 50' foot shelter with support posts and tongue and groove roof, some landscaping and assorted plantings. In the capital bill all monies distributed to municipalities throughout the state; Brook Park was one of 145 projects that included culture. The city had to have a total project budget estimate prepared by a construction or design professional and working with three different companies to get different prices on different sizes of the amphitheaters with the focus goal of spending \$100,000.00. The grant also talks about prevailing wage and if assistance is needed can the city provide. A property schedule needed to be turned in as well as if the property is owned by the city, answer yes. There is a risk management piece and the city had to show proof or insurance to the state. The commission the city was assigned to is the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission and in the end the city had to state anything else that would support this project and a recap was given of everything the city sees on the campus. The attachments break everything down and give an itemized cost of \$99,657.20. One thing that isn't part of that cost is some of the electrical and tried very hard to take advantage of some things that are within the city, for instance, the NOPEC grant the city receives every year. Didn't include that originally or ask them to do that price because thought the city could incorporate the electrical because that entire campus needs to have an electrical plan, due to other features, and could probably due the electrical with the NOPEC grant. There are two different amphitheaters priced a wood structure and a steel structure, do have other quotes. All that had to be done for the purposes of this packet and the commission was provide this information and an estimate of the real cost and will try our best to stay within and as close to that amount of money as possible. As everyone knows when going out to bid sometimes that may change due to competition of this project.

Discussion: cont.

The other documents include the estimate, certificate of property insurance with Wichert Insurance, letter from the city's finance director showing the city can meet the obligations and through the county the city had to provide if the parcel the amphitheater is on valued at more than \$50,000.00, answer yes. The last page is a draw-down schedule since this is a reimbursement based grant that the city has to make payments with me being the administrator per legislation and will be working with state representative to make sure everything gets paid for. In speaking about the location when doing the master plan and created the renderings where the amphitheater is located on the greenspace right along Engle Road can that be turned for sound to amplify differently, answer yes. This is a working document and was to be where staff, committee, residents and Council representatives provide ideas and implement as possibly can, put this somewhere to make sense and benefit residents. An architectural firm met with city officials many times to help locate all these features and ideas in places that make sense. The gazebo located on that space currently was built in 2008 with a lot of concerts and different events on that property over the years, not worried about the sound being a nuisance to people who live nearby there. The library has already contacted the city with the possibility of doing book fairs and the city has been the host for science fairs, on top of music, dance and other events.

Mr. Troyer thanked Mr. Elliott for the explanation and had concerns with the city matching \$50,000.00 and thank you for explaining that the city's land is worth \$50,000.00, so there is no problem with that.

Mr. Elliott stated as Mr. Cingle mentioned it could be more such as \$105,000.00, 110,000.00 the city would be responsible for anything over the \$100,000.00. The city is trying to contain this as best as possible. I have spoken with the city's service director on some things the city can do but it's difficult and are trying to be creative in finding other ways to help contain those costs. With the estimate included in the packet provides a very good idea on where the city would be.

Mr. Troyer stated to Mayor Gammella there are brochures that include pictures of what the wooden and steel amphitheater would look like and would like copies of both. With the mention of shifting it a little I would like it turned basically 180 degrees or 160 degrees if putting the back of the stage in the southwest corner. Or aim it east, like the gazebo, so there are the same effects on what the concerts at the gazebos had. A few amendments to fix this would be to insert what fund this would be put in section 3 and also to have the contract not to exceed \$105,000.00, \$110,000.00 or whatever the Mayor and finance director agree on.

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mr. Elliott good explanation of the application process, saw one estimate from Snyder Recreation, Inc. dated March 1, 2021. Has the city had any contact with that company since that date and how long does that estimate hold for?

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Elliott responded yes, spoke with that contractor on Friday and also spoke to another contractor on Monday regarding prices previously provided. There is concern that Mr. Poindexter shared last meeting with the increased price of steel and wood, both are in the same neighborhood cost-wise. Visiting a few cities with amphitheaters one being steel and one being wood when the city goes out to bid will decide which one will be done. To answer your question those prices are still good.

Mr. Orcutt continued another question is the state going to hold the city to the start and stop dates that are on the application?

Mr. Elliott responded that is something very difficult to set and is on a sliding scale and currently the city cannot meet those dates, would probably be backed up to August at this point due to ordering. The length it takes to go through the bid process and any modifications the city makes the state understands. The state's biggest concern is when this grant submittal form is provided is everyone knows what this entails and amount of work that goes into this project. It's a good indicator to the state that the city knows what we're doing and if it has to be modified and make some changes they understand.

Mr. Orcutt stated good to hear, for this project and the \$100,000.00 from the state to enhance the city's central park is something that will be essential to the community and help identify Brook Park in this region. Mr. Orcutt agreed with Mr. Troyer that the legislation needs to be amended especially with the information provided with the tight schedule for beginning this project. Would rather have a quality project done the right way but certainly would like to see the bids come back to see exactly how they will orientate the amphitheater.

Mr. Scott stated to Mr. Elliott on the bids it has the four surface-mounted benches those aren't permanent, correct?

Mr. Elliott concurred and stated on that estimate under description speaks to Omni Partners that is a cooperative purchasing program. This particular contractor included that which is a state contract that they will go out and do a lot of the bidding. When that is done as part of their project the city can get some benches like coming up the front of the recreation center. There are other cooperative purchasing and don't believe in the bid the city will have some of cooperative purchasing and may not get some of those discounts. If just working with that company who works with one of the cooperating purchasing representatives the city may would get that but going out to bid that won't be available to the city.

Mr. Scott asked if there is permanent seating on the application.

Mr. Elliott responded no, this is just the entertainment structure.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Scott continued if Council amends this legislation title by inserting 'not to exceed' and also expressed concerns with 'entering into a contract'. I think that will speed up this process and the contract won't have to come back to Council if it exceeds the \$100,000.00, would feel a bit better by adding some sort of verbiage in there.

Mr. Salvatore thanked Mr. Elliott for the time to go over this with him and think there is enough information and data to satisfy any concerns I had. All that is left to do is get this out to bid to find out the final pricing. As for the position of the amphitheater there is plenty of time how it should be located. My question is there won't be any permanent seating in the original design, correct?

Mr. Elliott concurred.

Mr. Salvatore continued can permanent seating be added at a later date?

Mr. Elliott responded yes, there will be an opportunity and probably the best time to do that once the amphitheater is seen and make the determination on how the seating should be. Once the project is constructed there will be opportunity to look and determine where and if seating is wanted.

Mr. Salvatore asked for the locations Mr. Elliott looked at where other amphitheaters are located.

Mr. Elliott responded yes.

Mr. Mencini stated there are people on Engle Road that won't make a big thing about it due to Home Days and year-round activities. Have heard Master Plan and also heard will work with the residents' and Councilmembers. A survey was done for the pool area but didn't do a survey for a Master Plan for Kennedy Park, city's main park. Also didn't do a survey where the amphitheater would be located and if not mistaken don't think any Engle Road residents were asked. Am for this and don't want to lose the grant but agree with my Mr. Troyer and Orcutt with my question being is this sketched in stone where the amphitheater will be located. This needs to be right because it's going to be there for a long time and will look beautiful from Engle Road. With the previous administration when those buildings came down Council was told that would be green space. One of the things that I brought up was the former Council Chambers could be a senior center and was told no the building must come down, then told it would be green space. I asked about 1½ years ago when this project was starting to form would this go to the public and was told by the Mayor yes the public will have a say in this. Then Mr. Elliott gave a great presentation on this but didn't think it was sketched in stone. Also asked about the football field why it was needed when the city doesn't have football anymore, why necessary in the middle of the campus. Was told it was going to be turf with a multi-use and don't see that. Not against this but

Discussion: cont.

when hearing Master Plan and Councilman of Ward 2 I was shown and see the renderings at the recreation center. When asked my thoughts and I give my thoughts that tends to be the end of it but also wanted the residents to have a say with a lot of this. Unless someone can inform me with the Master Plan did we go to the residents? Another thing will there be bathrooms for the seniors?

Mr. Elliott responded first of all, there have been many opportunities and have heard a great deal from the very first time I presented to City Council in February, 2020 and said this is a work in progress as well as a beginning and starting point. This all came about when the city made the agreement with the school district and able to acquire the parcel from I-71, Holland and Engle Roads and Sylvia Drive. Made great sense and the Mayor asked the recreation staff to get an idea to put this together. We met with architects with many thoughts put on paper and brought to Council and asked and stated to all of Council, at that time, this is a work in progress. The city wants to review and wants Council to review and tell the administration what you like, tell us what you don't like, share your ideas and thoughts. Through the way besides the amphitheater grant the city applied for the city also applied for a grant with Cuyahoga County for an outdoor fitness area. For that grant there was a public meeting with over 100 people attending but it was the flyer that the Mayor distributed and mailed to the city; the Mayor's newsletter had the six different renderings. That piece stimulated a great amount of discussion as well as displaying the renderings, all winter long, and people stopping in and giving different ideas shared with the recreation staff, lot of feedback. Did we send out a survey but received more response from the newsletter, public meeting and displaying of the renderings then probably in a survey, we all know sometimes people don't want to fill out the card. Mr. Mencini mentioned why the city still has a football field that will be turf. Again, it's a Master Plan with ideas and the city was approached at one point that I may have or may not have shared with Council. The school district had some interest in doing a 50-50 project with a multi-use turf-field, that thought came from conversation with the previous school system administration, that dialogue can still continue. The city did not play any football games this past season but there are football meetings with football representatives from other cities and will be playing younger children at the football field. In the recreation center's capital budget there were goal posts included in the budget so the recreation department is very interested in returning some of that. Also, the football field was moved and regraded that field because the baseball field went a little deeper than originally thought. Talking with an apprentice program, Iron Workers, will hopefully help us by taking down and dismantling those bleachers to either be moved or stored for placement somewhere else were appropriate. That whole campus is an idea and something the city is working towards so want to hear everybody's thoughts. The amphitheater location is not in stone but seemed to be the best place and made sense to be a musical place. The last 13 years this city has done musical concerts at the gazebo and seemed to be a natural with the convenient parking. There was mention of the

Discussion: cont.

amphitheater being over by I-71 in the middle of the green space. That would be very difficult for seniors and other people to get back into that area to listen to music. We want people to see this, this should be a city jewel and motorists driving down Engle Road should see the welcome script of Brook Park and the gazebo that is decorated for every holiday. This nice amphitheater and whole stretch should be seen, even the water feature, we want the community to be proud of some of this and want to make very accessible. Putting an amphitheater by I-71 is a parking nightmare due to no parking, difficult for people to get back there and don't think would be very well attended. Want to place where it easy accessible, easy parking and don't think it will be a nuisance in any way and certainly don't want to do that. Many of Council coaches and the baseball fields with lights are right in people's backyards and have been for many years. This amphitheater is not even close to homes and is tucked back away to get back further and surely can be turned. A plan has been provided as a starting point and good positive input is what the city is after. I am very passionate about this and think the citizens want this type of park and attraction in this city. Councilman Salvatore has stated for years the City of Brook Park does not have a downtown and Mayor Gammella reminded everyone about a month ago that the central park is the next best thing. This is the largest gathering place in the community so let's get as many features and attractions on this property so residents' can enjoy themselves now and many years to come.

Mr. Mencini stated living here over 25 years these problems didn't start yesterday. I agree and want this and don't care they drive down Engle, Sylvia and Holland want them to stop and look. This is a great master plan and like it and you stated people have replied and you are correct people called me they liked what was in the newsletter. Did anything change from the first presentation until today with all the input from people. You're 100% right we want people to stop and say how nice and as still have the schools to deal with as well as other things. Maybe we should have been slowly working at this for quite a while so when hearing master plan, I want the community involved also, reason for bringing up the survey. Wanted to make the point that this should be a community-involvement thing.

Mr. Poindexter commented my thoughts on what I would like to see from the amphitheater. Disagree with Mr. Elliott I think the amphitheater would be best on the east-end of the football stadium backed up to I-71. If there are large concerts, Home Days and the crowds needing to be socially distanced as current; that crowd could spill onto the football field to provide added space. Everyone is focused on concerts and that amphitheater will be more than just concerts. People can rent out for weddings and may want a little privacy on a Saturday afternoon wedding away from the middle of the park. There might be plays and drama clubs using the amphitheater for performances and may not want the distractions driving by during performances. There is parking coming around the former Brook Park Memorial school side (BPM) and when the walking path is installed there will be easy access for seniors and

Discussion: cont.

everyone, as well as the restrooms at Kennedy Park. All those issues aside I want to see the amphitheater built and don't care it's proposed now, that would be good, think it would be better backed up to the interstate. This is something that everyone will like and have a lot of events there, quite frankly, don't know if I want to put a cap on the price. If the city can get more bang for the buck and it costs \$100,000.00 more and get a better amphitheater let's see what the bids bring back. Let's build the best amphitheater for the best bid price the city can get and anything amount that goes over \$100,000.00 there will be more questions asked. If the city can get a better sound system or lighting and it costs \$30,000.00 or \$40,000.00 more it may be worth it and agree to appropriate the funding. I support this project and ready to move forward on the legislation as is.

Mrs. Schmuck stated I am excited for this project that will be a great start for the change of the City of Brook Park. Big fan of Coe Lake (City of Berea) and this reminds me of Coe Lake and the communities coming together. Also, agree with Mr. Poindexter of not putting cap on it, more bang for the city's buck is good. Build as best as possible and believe this will profit the city and give back to the residents' as well.

Mr. Vecchio stated I am in favor of this and agree in part with everyone and disagree in part with some of the stuff mentioned. One of the things that I believe is if you build it they will come. In this case something will be put in place for everyone with multiple uses, as mentioned, by Mr. Poindexter. And, as Mr. Elliott said this needs to be the focal point that needs to be seen and traffic for this city is Engle Road. It's not Sylvia or Holland and not backed up against I-71 for no one to see or try to see from a distance. I think that it being a focal point figuring out the logistics and how to turn it to make it somebody for everyone is great. Council along with the Mayor's office and recreation department can work this out and think as Mr. Poindexter and Mrs. Schmuck mentioned capping this with an amount just behooves us to move forward with something that sets Brook Park apart from everyone else. Willing to help out in any discussions where I can be a part of this.

Mr. Troyer stated again as a responsible Council we either have to remove the 'enter into a contract' or have a limit, me doing my job. Getting it done faster is just having a limit on this, not against doing something more but one or the other. Thanked Mr. Elliott for the information provided, great to have this, but one more question. The city gets the done wherever it's located and not against looking at another place but do believe should face east of where it's proposed. Will landscaping have to be changed for the crowds? What other costs down the line besides for electrical and don't think there is lighting there now, or is there? What will this entail down the road with the cost of items?

Mr. Elliott responded there is border with the tree grant the city received. How that is placed and where placed would help with the sound concern. To answer that question

Discussion: cont.

to set an amount at \$110,000.00 or \$112,000.00 or a price like that. I understand the goal is to contain and be as close to the \$100,000.00 as possible. The electrical that is not included, at the next Caucus Prior to meeting I can provide a harder number so all of us are comfortable in not going beyond that, after speaking with the finance director. Currently, the only thing not included is the electrical because of the NOPEC grant.

Mr. Troyer continued for the seating people will bring their own chairs and so forth?

Mr. Elliott responded correct, currently there is no seating people would bring their own chairs. There is a lot of good to that with the maintaining the space but in the future may look at not being a bad thing to put some seating in there.

Mr. Troyer stated to Mr. Cingle the city only has so much money appropriated for this amphitheater. The budget would have to be amended to have any monies higher than \$100,000.00, correct?

Mr. Cingle responded correct, \$100,000.00 has been appropriated for the amphitheater, however, within the Parks & Playgrounds cost-center. There is ballfield fencing at \$30,000.00 with maybe not all fencing being done this year. There is also a ballfield groomer at \$20,000.00 that may come in less. So there may be some room to free up some monies in that cost-center; or in another cost-center as moving through the year.

Mr. Salvatore stated listening to all the comments and presentations and think the goal should be build the best quality theater as possible and not restrict to a certain dollar amount now. The city wants to build something that is going to last with the next generation still have something to be proud of 20-years from now, that was done now. I don't want to restrict the amount of the bid by saying if it goes over \$110,000.00 it won't get done. Think take it out to bid and whatever the price and bring it back in order to move forward. The position of how the amphitheater will be is irrelevant at this point. Need to get the numbers back with summer being right around the corner and if done in a timely fashion can be used by the end of the year. There are so many opportunities that this theater can be used for that would benefit all ages and not limit to a concert or two. Other cities have children's play and like the idea mentioned of weddings, there are so many opportunities to bring people together.

Mr. Vecchio clarified this legislation is for the city to go out to bid, that is all Council is being asked of currently and get those bids back.

Mr. Poindexter stated Point of Clarification. The legislation Council is speaking about is actually to advertise for bids and 'enter into an agreement'.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio interjected there is 'enter into an agreement' but I'm saying the main portion of this is to go out to bids. Mr. Troyer and Mr. Scott already brought forward to remove the enter into an agreement portion; this legislation is to mainly go out for bids.

Mr. Poindexter clarified the amendment hasn't been made yet so it still stands.

Mr. Vecchio concurred and mentioned the crux of this legislation is to go out for bids.

Mr. Orcutt stated listening to all the discussion, obviously to have an amphitheater electricity installed. From what I've taken in this evening it sounds like Mr. Elliott, Mr. Cingle and the Mayor need to meet to find out where those funds are to make sure that can happen. Mr. Orcutt suggested to place this under discussion on the April 20th Caucus Prior agenda to hear back from the administration on the electrical that is needed.

Mayor Gammella commented myself, Mr. Elliott and Mr. Cingle have had those discussions and they will continue.

Mr. Orcutt concurred and stated the conversation of electricity for the amphitheater is part of finding the most quality product for the residents.

Mr. Troyer stated this discussion went a lot of different directions, if Council removes 'enter into a contract' that's fine don't need to put a limit on it but will take more time, since the city needs to go out for bids and come back to Council for approval. My point of having a limit was just to if that's what the city is getting is \$100,000.00 that's what the grant is for. Let's put that limit and don't have to worry about entering into contract since Council knows what the amount will be. If asking the recreation director and Mayor to come up with something little more fancy that's fine too. Don't think that's what they want or maybe they do then don't even need Council. If this legislation is passed without 'enter into an agreement' Council can also eliminate section three (3). The reason I want to say this tonight is because if these are things that Council wants to do the law department can come up with clean legislation for passage at the next meeting. Not against a different area, okay with not having to exceed \$100,000 as long as the 'enter into a contract' is gone.

Mr. Salvatore suggested since this legislation has had its' first reading, don't recall, then it automatically goes to second reading. Don't need to change the legislation or have new legislation prepared let's deal with what is in front of Council and make the necessary amendments with the proper motion at the time for passage. This can be put on the Caucus Prior to agenda for discussion and is already on the Council for second reading. Can do both discuss prior to the Council meeting and make the necessary amendments for passage.

Discussion: cont.

Motion by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Mencini, to have Ordinance No. 11190-2021 on for discussion for the April 20th Caucus (Prior).

ROLL CALL: AYES: Orcutt, Mencini, Troyer, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott, Schmuck

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Mr. Troyer commented don't like amending or passing legislation, kind of a problem with that. Concerned that the correct wording won't get in on the signed copy. Would rather have a clean copy of legislation when Council passes.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Troyer put in print as to what your verbiage is you would like and send to everyone so it's in front of everyone ahead of time.

Mr. Troyer responded yes, but it's simple, remove 'enter into a contract' wherever listed and eliminate section three (3).

Mr. Vecchio understood and reiterated send to everyone so they have it and then if Council decides to amend, at that point, and then pass.

2. UPDATE ON THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR THE NATATORIUM ROOF AND WALLS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY AND THE RECOMMENDATION OF CONSTRUCTION RESOURCES, INC. (Mayor Gammella)

Mayor Gammella stated we've been working on this and referred to Recreation Director Elliott.

Mr. Elliott stated a committee was appointed and an RFP (request for proposals) went out with four (4) proposals. Participants on the committee were Service Director Garner, Recreation Director Elliott, Building Commissioner Hurst, City Engineer Piatak and Mayor Gammella. The committee unanimously selected Construction Resources, Inc. and the representative, an instructional engineer, mechanical engineer and roofing people visited the site. The committee asked the representative after viewing the site to prepare a proposal of all the work needed to go into the site. That proposal is before the committee and will have to come before Council for passage. The committee likes the chosen contractor and think it's the right person and if Council would like the representative to come to a meeting for to present or for a question/answers of what was found thus far, that can be done but there will be a fee for his services that will have to be approved as well.

Mr. Mencini asked if Mr. Elliott is asking for this representative to attend a Caucus meeting?

Mr. Elliott concurred and stated a Caucus meeting gives more time for any questions

Discussion: cont.

or information needed to be shared won't be hurried.

Mr. Mencini continued great group chosen for this committee and went with another group chosen by the former administration for the recreation department, will go with this group because this has to be done.

Mr. Vecchio asked Mr. Elliott to reach out to Construction Resources for representatives to attend the May 11th Caucus meeting.

Mr. Elliott concurred.

Mr. Troyer stated the title reads update on requests for proposal the Mayor didn't need Council's permission but the legislation was authorizing the Mayor to hire a consulting firm to perform a comprehensive study to prepare plans and specifications for work to be performed on the natatorium roof and walls and declaring an emergency but didn't say anything for request for proposal. To Mr. Elliott please provide me with the original study that the consulting firm gave to Council with specifications from all the companies that provided any kind of information. This is a public records request for all that information and also my biggest question is when will this go out to bid?

Mr. Elliott responded the whole purpose for a representative come to the next Caucus meeting is for all of Council is to be able to communicate to everyone. The number one reason is to be to communicate to everybody and the representative a chance to communicate the information. There might be some information exchanged at that meeting for the bid specifications to be put together.

Mr. Troyer continued this is for the roof and the walls; does it have anything to do with the pool besides a possible moisture barrier?

Mr. Elliott responded it's the roof and the walls.

Mr. Troyer can't wait to hear all of this as everyone knows been on board to get the roof and the walls done since last term on Council. Don't argue about the pool let's get the roof and walls done that is very important to the recreation center. Will be asking at the next Council meeting about the other roof that seems to still have plenty of leaks, let's not use the same roofing company.

Mr. Salvatore asked if there is a possibility to call a special meeting for April 27th since there is nothing scheduled, correct?

Mr. Vecchio responded there is nothing scheduled but would think in order for the contractor to give a presentation Council should give a little bit of time.

Discussion: cont.

Mayor Gammella commented the contractor would need at least to May 11th to provide Council with a good comprehensive report.

Motion by Mr. Scott, supported by Mrs. Schmuck, that this was discussed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt, Troyer, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, MENCINI:

1. AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE EDITING AND INCLUSION OF CERTAIN ORDINANCES AS PARTS OF THE VARIOUS COMPONENT CODES OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES; PROVIDING FOR THE ADOPTION OF NEW MATTER IN THE UPDATED AND REVISED CODIFIED ORDINANCES; PUBLISHING THE ENACTMENT OF SUCH NEW MATTER; REPEALING ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS IN CONFLICT THEREWITH; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Council President Vecchio.

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

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Troyer, Mencini, Poindexter, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

SAFETY COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, TROYER:

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO CREATE A 'SAFE EXCHANGE ZONE' BY THE BROOK PARK POLICE DEPARTMENT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Councilman Mencini, Council as a Whole and Mayor Gammella.

Mr. Mencini stated been holding onto this for a while and have talked to a few colleagues and police officers about this legislation. What started this for me is someone approached me stating that drugs are being sold by the (American Legion) memorial and driving by frequently have never seen it. If people want to exchange items, the police do a great job on watching all city parks. But, my concern is if people are exchanging items the city would have a safe area. This could also open up an exchange of children or a sale item on EBay or possibly the selling of an automobile. These people could meet at the safe zone that doesn't have to be supervised but to have cameras would be good. One of the police officers suggested there is probably room over at the police department as long as it doesn't inflict with any job duties or anything at the police station. There is plenty of room at the police station lot but exactly where to put the safe zone I don't know. Many other cities have a safe exchange zone and thought it would be something Brook Park should have before something happens down the road and also to protect the residents.

Safety Committee - Chairman, Troyer: cont.

Mr. Salvatore stated this is a good start and has a lot of potential. The other cities that have this safe exchange zone is it located on city property?

Mr. Mencini responded from what I've seen some of their Councils' made areas with the administration, so there are some on city property. People are exchanging items now maybe at Brookgate Shopping Center or the Recreation Center parking lot.

Mr. Salvatore interjected my question is leading more towards the legal ramifications, this is a good idea. Just want to make sure that the city isn't put at risk if there is a risk for the city being on city property. Does this have to be manned?

Mr. Mencini stated my question back is how would the city be at risk?

Mr. Salvatore stated my question wasn't going to go to you it was directed to the law director. Like this idea but want to make sure whatever way it is done the city gets the best results without creating any liability. To Mrs. Horvath have you researched this being on city property or having something like this on private property? What would be the difference between the two?

Mrs. Horvath agreed with both Councilmembers Salvatore and Mencini and stated this is a good idea and think the city needs to do properly. I think there should be a sign in the safe zone reading this area is monitored by camera only. Also, think the city should have an emergency (phone) number prominently displayed in case something does occur. The city may not have any personnel able to react from the police station at that time. My feeling is this space at the police station is probably being used currently for exchanges of children as well as other exchanges. Also, think that the legal risk if the city does these exchanges properly and people understand that no one is directly monitoring the exchanges the city can do with minimal risk. Also, looking at this piece of moving through the pandemic and transitioning to more normal times. If deemed can check further with the regard to liability and send Council something in writing.

Mr. Salvatore mentioned would prefer something in writing and thanked Mr. Mencini for bringing this forward, it's a great start.

Mr. Poindexter stated this is a great idea with internet shopping and Craig's list is prominent these days. Using this a lot there are times when feeling less secure when meeting people in certain neighborhoods and things of that nature.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Mencini this is a great idea especially with as much

Safety Committee - Chairman, Troyer: cont.

trading and purchasing going on from individuals. My question is did you visit any of the cities and seen these spaces; if so, what kind of signage or cameras have you seen and where are they located?

Mr. Mencini responded have seen two, one a while ago on far east side and one in a southern suburb with the signage reading exactly how Mrs. Horvath stated. Some of the cities didn't make it a safe zone alone by putting them more so closer to a police station or central campus of a municipality, where there are people they are not located in an isolated area. The reason this is being brought forward is to have a location where everyone feels comfortable and safe.

Mr. Scott stated 110% behind this legislation, are you looking at inside lobby or outside the police station?

Mr. Mencini responded outside, first thought was purchase of an automobile then though maybe a child exchange or things of that sort. Thought for the safe zone was outside close to a real safe area.

Mr. Scott commented proper signage and everything would be great.

Mrs. Schmuck stated to Mr. Mencini fantastic idea especially with all the internet exchanging and have been on Marketplace, as well as friends, and some of the places being very sketchy and felt unsafe. Glad that this is being brought forward to make everyone feel safe during transactions of this sort.

Mr. Troyer remembered this coming in the years 2016-2017, and thought the city had something like this but I guess never followed through. To Mayor Gammella you don't have any problem with this? Is this something that was brought to you.

Mayor Gammella responded no, first I heard about was seeing the legislation. However, the one caveat the city would definitely have to do is have this area have cameras with tapes. Where if something were to happen can refer to the cameras, think that would be the only expense. There may be cameras but would probably put additional cameras to make sure the city has footage.

Mr. Troyer continued the most obvious place would be the police station since there is already a camera there, might need some more, with the four, five or six parking spaces. That would be the most obvious place and maybe one closer to the interstate or Brookgate.

Mayor Gammella suggested having at the police station think that would send a pretty serious message.

Safety Committee - Chairman, Troyer: cont.

Mr. Troyer stated a quick amendment (in the title and section one) should read 'An Ordinance requesting the Mayor to create a Safe Exchange Zone, instead of authorizing. Because the Mayor could already do this if wanted to Council doesn't tell the Mayor how to administer the city.

Mr. Mencini stated to me that's fine, did talk to somebody within the administration and absolutely close to a police station with cameras, concur with the Mayor.

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

ROLL CALL: AYES: Scott, Poindexter, Salvatore, Mencini, Troyer, Orcutt, Schmuck
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

SERVICE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, SALVATORE:

1. A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ODOT CONTRACT FOR ROAD SALT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella. **Deadline date 4/30/2021.**

Motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mrs. Schmuck, to place on the next Council agenda for passage.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Troyer, Schmuck, Scott, Orcutt, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

NOTE: EXECUTIVE SESSION - MAYOR GAMMELLA - PURCHASE OF PROPERTY:

Motion by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Troyer, to go into Executive Session for Purchase of Property.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Poindexter, Troyer, Mencini, Salvatore, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt
NAYS: None. The motion carried at 8:35 p.m.

In attendance: Members of Council, Mayor Gammella, Law Director Horvath and Economic Development Commissioner Adams.

Motion by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mrs. Schmuck, to go back to the regular order of business.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Poindexter, Schmuck, Scott, Orcutt, Troyer, Mencini, Salvatore
NAYS: None. The motion carried at 8:53 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: AYES: Mencini, Poindexter, Troyer, Salvatore, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED *Michelle Blazak*
Michelle Blazak
Clerk of Council

APPROVED *May 11, 2021*

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

7,605 words

