



**COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
MARCH 7, 2016**

Committee Members Present: Rick Rodgers
Dennis McGlone
Joe Kernan
Dennis Pierson
Paul Tousley
Scott Pelot
Charlotte Whipkey

Also Present: Mayor Mike Zita
Valerie Wax Carr
Ron Messner
Justin Markey
Karla Richards

The Committee Work Session convened on Monday, March 7, 2016 at 7:00 PM, in the Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Charlotte Whipkey, President of Council. Following a salute to the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance, there was a moment of silent prayer.

General Topics of Discussion:

ODOT Consent Legislation Cleve-Mass. Road Widening

Mr. Pierson discussed the issue and questioned any cost overruns if they are our responsibility and Mr. Dave White said anything we ask for additionally outside of the scope of the project we will have to pay for. Mr. Pierson moved to add this to Councils next agenda, with emergency language seconded by Ms. Whipkey. Mr. Kernan called a point of Order for clarification as to who is on the Committee assignments as they are appointed. Mr. Kernan stated he is concerned we are not following the Committee assignments as they should be followed and since this is a Committee Work Session and that anything that falls into a Committee needs moved, seconded only by a members of that committee, not all members of Council. Mr. Markey agreed and that Rule 110 states the definition of Committee Work Session are meetings for those standing Committees. All members of Council can address the items; however only those on the Committee have a vote. Ms. Whipkey clarified the Council Rule of three (3) members and that in order to place something on the next Council agenda the Committee Chair makes the motion, the Vice-Chair or third member seconds that vote. Mr. Markey concurred and that Committee of the Whole is only addressed at the beginning of the Council Meeting agenda.

Mr. Pierson asked if that was because of the action taken to change that Rule earlier this year? Mr. Markey concurred that Ms. Whipkey established these Committees earlier, which is different from the seven (7) member assignment the last two (2) years. Mr. Rodgers stated understanding rules that he sees what is going on here and he believes the intent here is to restrict some other members of Council from moving forward issues forward to an agenda because we are not assigned to that Committee; specifically the Nash Heights vacuum sewer discussion. The President of Council has chosen to and he believes only one (1) member in favor of vacuum is now on that Committee. Some on Council have spent numerous hours on the subjects and probably have the widest knowledge in this matter. This newly elected President assigned someone to this Committee as the Chair who did not even bother to visit the facilities for vacuum stations although given many opportunities. It's just Norton politics but the people out there are the ones suffering for it.

Roll Call: Yes: Pierson, Whipkey, Tousley
 No: None

Motion passed 3-0.

ODOT Consent Legislation-St. Rt. 585

Mr. Pierson discussed this is slated for 2018 and the State is asking for our authority on the project with the State picking up the costs and referred to the Service Committee for comments. Mr. Tousley asked Mrs. Carr about the detailed boundary and Mrs. Carr replied it's to Hametown Road and under the bridge of St. Rt. 21. Mr. Tousley asked if it was possible to ask for additional work to finish the small section of the Wooster Road area at the same time at our expense. Mrs. Carr responded we could certainly look into it as a separate contract. Mr. Pierson asked if this area is a State highway or a local one? Mr. White stated that St. Rt. 585 extends going up on the ramp to St. Rt. 21, and is all State highway. Once we pass the ramp to Rt. 21 onto Wooster Road that is a local road and is our responsibility and felt it made sense if we could work on that at that time. Mr. Pierson moved to add this to Council's next agenda, with emergency language seconded by Ms. Whipkey. Ms. Whipkey clarified that anyone on Council can comment on any subject however they are not part of the vote unless they are on the specific committee and Mr. Markey concurred all of Council can discuss the subject. Mr. Kernan reminded the public that if they wish to have input on anything on the agenda, they need to do so while we are discussing the matter, rather than later on the agenda which is for non-agenda items. Mr. Rodgers stated that as he was seated on Council a few years back, he would be the first to admit they were not as formal as they seem to be now; however there was a free flow of information and discussion on any topic. Mr. Rodgers stated we did not follow the rules, they were not hard fast. In looking back we never had the three (3) only members voting, maybe because we didn't have the three (3) member committees, but he didn't believe we followed it when we did have; he, as President, didn't have votes on some matters as he knew someone that was absent would oppose his position.

That might go to character and all the while it was to serve the people and he has always allowed for the public to be involved. What is going on here tonight may not affect you now, but it may later and you should pay careful attention as to what is going on here tonight and felt this was all brought up by the Administration and Mayor Zita in particular. Mayor Zita asked to be recognized and Mr. Pierson, as Chair, refused to do so. Mr. Kernan clarified that as an Attorney he is all about following the Council Rules and is exactly why he said it the way he did. He wants the public to come and speak if they desire; no one said they would not be heard, but they need to do so at the specific point in that discussion and raise their hand to be recognized. The rules are in place to allow the meetings to run smoothly, everyone can be heard, and we can be out of here before 11:30. If it were construed that he was trying to silence someone, that is not the reason for this; the reason is that we have rules and we need to follow them. Mr. Rodgers stated he did not construe it that way; his point is we have had a free flow of conversation in the past two (2) years, he believed the people benefited from it, and it worked well. As far as a smooth meeting, due to the contentious subjects in the last couple of years, that did not seem to work to that end. We should have more respect for people that did not sign in to speak, to allow them and we can still follow the Council Rules. Ms. Whipkey called a point of order, because we are off topic and not discussing agenda items. As always the public has a right to come forward and speak and ask to be recognized. The only thing changing tonight is just designating the voting to the three (3) member Committee and as President she is using her option to follow the three (3) member Committee rule as it was intended to be used. Ms. Whipkey stated if you look back into the minutes there were four (4) of us constantly stating they did not want to change to the all seven (7) lineup. There is no one that will be denied the right to speak at any meeting, however it's up to the Committee to decide if the item moves forward to an agenda or not. Mr. Pierson pointed out the public may not understand the Rules all of the time and he did not believe they all did, but they should have the right to speak. Mr. Pierson stated the Council President has the right to maintain order should it get out of control. Mr. Pierson stated that we also went to Committee of the Whole of seven (7) so the committees would meet and in the past the three (3) member standing committee never met in the first place. Although other cities use the three (3) members and the Municipal League suggests that method, we continue to do this the old way. Mr. Tousley asked about the Rules and a statement if you are signed up to speak on something on the agenda only and he always understood that you can speak on anything you want at any meeting, and asked for clarification from Mr. Markey. Ms. Whipkey noted at a Regular Council Meeting that means if they sign in to speak that they can speak on any topic during the public speaking. At a Committee Meeting they can chime in anytime on the agenda items as we are going thru them. When it comes to the Public Comment section at the end of the meeting it is reserved for any non-agenda items as they already had the opportunity to speak on the agenda items. Mr. Tousley asked for Mr. Markey to clarify that in the future if not now. Mr. Rodgers noted that you just witnessed the question from Mr. Tousley as posed to the Law Director and he still has not found the specific section in the Rules. When the question was posed earlier this evening about who could vote, within seconds the Rule number was recited and clear right then.

When he stated earlier that some on this Council and Administration are complicit in this move to block the will of the people by denying all of us the ability to vote on the Nash Heights vacuum; it's exactly what he meant. If you don't think this was contrived and brought together before the meeting, then he has some property to sell you. Ms. Whipkey stated Mr. Rodgers needs to look at his agenda as it states Public Comments is a section for non-agenda items. Ms. Whipkey stated she has informed the public at every meeting if they wish to speak to raise their hand so we can recognize you. Mr. Rodgers stated that is why he warned the public to pay attention to. Mr. Tom Kornas, 3771 Brookside Drive, Norton, Ohio, asked if you are saying that we cannot speak freely no matter what is on the agenda item? Ms. Whipkey stated no, if you are signed in to speak for Public Comment, you can also do so on each agenda item by raising your hand. When we get do to the Public Comments later on the agenda, this would be for your comments on something that we did not go over earlier. Mr. Kornas asked if he could speak about the vacuum system during the Public Comment and Ms. Whipkey stated no as it was on the agenda. Mr. Markey noted he now had a moment to review Rule 202-Committee Work Session; which states discussion is not limited to agenda items only. During the public comment you can speak on any topic and it is not limited to the agenda items. Mr. Kernan pointed out that is why we have a Law Director. Mr. Kernan stated it like a double negative here. Ms. Whipkey stated we should change both agendas and Mr. Markey suggested to just state Public Comment. Ms. Sherry Smith, 3794 Easton Road, Norton, Ohio, asked with all of these rules when we do speak will we be getting a response back? Ms. Whipkey replied yes most of the time we will. Sometimes there may be something where we may need to fall back and regroup if we don't have an answer immediately.

Roll Call: Yes: Pierson, Whipkey, Tousley
 No: None

Motion passed 3-0.

Mr. Paul Reese, 4052 Wadsworth Road, Norton, Ohio, asked does it state on this sign in sheet, or somewhere that we cannot speak on anything and Mr. Kernan replied no however we have answered your question already. Mr. Reese stated how would we know this unless it's on the sign in sheet? Ms. Whipkey stated its always been stated that you can speak during the agenda items and Mr. Markey stated we need to clarify that you can raise their hand to be recognized and Mr. Pelot suggested we put out a list to that affect. Mr. Markey added that if we were going to clarify it, it should say during Committee Work Session you can raise your hand during agenda items and during public comment you can speak on anything you want.

Approve Codified Updates for 2015

Mr. Tousley discussed this is just organizing the legislation and is something we have to do every year, and the State has changes that need to be in compliance.

Ms. Whipkey clarified this is not just for the State's changes it is also for all of our Ordinances and Resolutions we adopted this year. Mr. Tousley moved to place this on Councils next agenda, seconded by Mr. McGlone.

Roll Call: Yes: Tousley, McGlone Rodgers,
 No: None

Motion passed 3-0.

Appoint Assessment Equalization Board Members

Mr. Pelot stated that Council needs to appoint the Assessment Equalization Board to hear any objections relating to the assessments to their property in the Nash Heights project. If someone has their home which may sit on two (2) different roads they may want to object to having to pay twice. The members from the community would hear the objection and under the guidance of the Law Director; they will make final decisions if it is a valid objection or not. Mr. Pelot stated that we have no objections as of this Friday, and this is just being proactive for when we do receive objections. Mr. Pelot asked Mrs. Richards if any have been received today and Mrs. Richards replied no. Mr. Kernan asked if we had any names for the board members and Mr. Pelot stated he has list of the people that did serve on this Board in the past. Mr. Kernan stated before it can go to the agenda we need to put the names on the legislation. Mr. Pelot stated that we have Lance Apple, Shellie Leach, Mark Spicer, Sandy Chrissant, and Jim Bennett. Mr. Pierson asked what's the criteria for selecting the members? Mr. Pelot stated that they need to be freeholders of land in the City. Mr. Markey stated that disinterested means they have to be free holders owning property within the City and have no interest in the project. Mr. Rodgers called a point of order, as he felt this was assigned to the wrong chair; the legislation says it's to be introduced by Mr. Tousley-Personnel Chair? Ms. Whipkey stated this is a utility issue and that needs corrected. Mrs. Richards indicated it should be corrected to utilities because it's tied to the project. Ms. Whipkey stated that it's Council that appoints the board members, however the Mayor can recommend names, but ultimately falls to us and to determine if in fact they are freeholders or not. Ms. Whipkey stated she would support Ms. Leach as a member from Ward 4. Mr. Pierson argued that he wanted to see more disinterested parties from Ward 3 as it was not represented. Mr. Kernan moved to table until the next Committee Work Session meeting since we have no names at this point, seconded by Mr. Pelot. Ms. Whipkey stated this would not even be used unless someone comes forward with an objection. Mr. Tousley asked about the number of days to respond and if more that fifteen (15) days are needed and if Council has the right to extend this time? Mr. Markey stated it was from the date of service; he felt this could be looked into but is in the Ohio Revised Code. If Council were to look at changing this, it's something he would need to look into further. Mr. Pierson asked about a person in the fringe area and how they would be affected? Mr. Pierson discussed a situation where the property is deeded, and if they chose to go forward because one of the parcels goes across their front porch. Mr. Pierson stated it did not seem fair on a second assessment because of the second parcel if they wanted to be included.

Mr. Markey stated that if they are not part of the legislation they have no right to object, if they are in the project then they would have that right to object after they received the letter. Mr. Markey added he is not aware of the situation and they may need to discuss it further later. Mr. William Paluch, 3740 Shellhart Road, Norton, Ohio, stated that he just got back from vacation for the last four (4) months and he found his assessment letter for \$11,000.00 and he cannot afford this and asked what programs do you have for him? How is he going to pay for this? Mr. Pelot stated that you can put this on your property tax for the next thirty (30) years, and there may be some low interest loans that he could apply for. Mr. Paluch stated that won't work and he likes the way hypocrites that ran for office raised their hands and said we cannot do anything for you; you just don't care and 75% of the people in Nash Heights feels as he does. Then people give themselves a \$2,000.00 increase and Council doesn't vote on it; shame on you people. Mr. Paluch, stated that before Ms. Whipkey ran for office she was talking about giving \$5,000.00 back to the residents on Greenwich Road. Mr. Paluch stated he cannot afford this and if there is some form he was supposed to fill out then he would like to fill it out now relating to his finances because you neglected to send that form out. Mrs. Carr stated that form was sent out with the surveys and not only was the neighborhood not eligible but that program is no longer available. We are trying to get with the County and get some CDBG Funds to help and at that point you are more than welcome to fill out the paperwork to try and get some help with the actual installation of the line to your home. Mr. Paluch stated that as long as you steal money from peoples' pockets, you will do it. Mr. Paluch added the people in this day and age won't vote and referenced the last election in the Mount Vernon district as an example that only 186 showed up to vote which was a disgrace. Mr. Jack Gainer, 3920 Wadsworth Road, Norton, Ohio, noted his Son-In-Law owns the property along Greenwich Road going west and he thought the pump station is to stop at Shellhart. Mr. Gainer stated that his Son-In-Law did receive two (2) letters for the two (2) parcels, assessed on both, and questioned this. Mrs. Carr noted that his Son-In-Law did respond to the survey for the fringe properties and he requested to be in the project so the first parcel would be eligible. Mrs. Carr noted that if you have two (2) parcels you would be getting two (2) separate letters unless the parcels were combined. Mrs. Richards added that if they were separate buildable lots, there would be letters for both. Mr. Gainer explained as it is now, the one parcel is unbuildable although it would have been buildable if the sewers had went to Rt. 21 as previously planned and he had intended on building on it. Mr. Pierson stated it had failed the percolation test, to which Mr. Gainer concurred and that it would not allow a septic system to be installed so he was wondering about the second assessment if there is not going to be a sewer there. Mr. Carr responded they would go back and look at the map closer as fringe properties. Mr. Gainer stated the bottom line was they were told they couldn't get sewer. Mr. Reese asked didn't we resolve this same issue three (3) years ago that when you are getting two (2) bills from the County for taxation and you could combine your parcel? Mr. Pelot stated that if you combined your parcels at the County into one lot, and filled out the card to do so, you would be billed one time and Ms. Whipkey concurred. Mrs. Carr added that if you look at the lists you can see where the lots were combined by the second lot would have no assessment attached to it.

Mr. Charlie Zenner, 3853 Valley Drive, Norton, Ohio, stated that when we first discussed the assessment letters and if we have an objection to the project is this the time to say something about it? Mr. Markey stated if you an objection to the assessment, he would file it at this time. Mr. Zenner discussed if this cost is for gravity, but ~~and~~ if we went with the vacuum and those costs to go with vacuum would be cheaper as Mr. Tousley has noted it could save about \$4500.00, so wouldn't these costs go down. Mr. Markey explained that would require Council to pass a new Resolution of Necessity for the vacuum and new letters would have to go out. Mr. Zenner questioned not doing the bids for the vacuum to see which was cheaper and Mr. Pelot explained that the legislation that was turned down for vacuum was for the same amount of \$11,200.00. Mr. Zenner argued that if vacuum is cheaper the letters going out should be less than the gravity cost, it has to be less. Mr. McGlone stated that vacuum was supposed be \$15,900.00 and we knocked it down to \$11,200.00. Mr. Zenner stated that the assessments cannot be the same as the vacuum was cheaper than gravity to begin with. Mr. Zenner stated that the Nash Heights and Gardner Blvd area is what built the City of Norton. Mr. Zenner stated that Barberton workers lived in Barberton, but their supervisors and salary employees moved into Norton into these areas. That is why all of the other residents have moved into Norton. Mr. Zenner stated you are turning your back on the people who help build this city by turning the vacuum down, what do you have against the vacuum system. Ms. Whipkey interjected and pointed out that Mr. Markey had offered to accept Mr. Zenner's objection and she would like to get back on the topic of the AEB adding he could come back to this later. Mr. Pelot asked if there was any further discussion for the Assessment Equalization Board and stated that Mr. Pierson stated he wants to see more wards not affected involved. Mr. Pelot suggested if any resident is interested to let the Clerk of Council know.

Roll Call: Yes: Kernan, Pelot, Tousley
No: None

Motion passed 3-0.

Subsidize Future Utility Assessments

Mr. Pelot stated that this request was discussed briefly recently that the City would pick up additional costs for any future projects. Mr. Pelot noted the City already pays for a portion of the project and he is not sure this is really appropriate. Mr. Rodgers asked who brought this forward and Mr. Pelot stated Ms. Whipkey asked for this to be listed on the agenda. Mr. Rodgers asked who prepared these numbers and where did this all come from? Mr. Whipkey stated there are no numbers listed in the legislation. Mr. Markey stated that the language states that above and beyond the City's required minimum share of 2% and this would go beyond that amount in the future. Mr. Rodgers stated this all goes back to the meeting that he missed, where we in good faith, had negotiated with other members of the Council on several levels; one we were having two Resolutions of Necessity and there was what he thought was an agreement from Council to move forward.

The other was the idea he had come up with is that of 42% cost on future projects for the residents share which we all kind of talked about. He is not saying we had an agreement there, but we all discussed it and you went back on that. If you didn't like the 42% then we should have negotiated that. Mr. Rodgers stated it keeps coming back to what percentage of the peoples tax credit roll back to use, which right now he believes is at zero. Mr. Rodgers stated he was going to move something forward on this again although he did not know how with the new Committee rules, but this doesn't make any sense. If you are going to do something to help the residents, just do it, you don't need a resolution saying you will or defining your responsibilities. Mr. Kernan agreed with Mr. Rodgers, if we are going to do something that needs to be done when we have discussions on the project as it comes up and should be talked about then; no matter what amounts, if any, are in it, it is just a piece of legislation saying we are planning on maybe, possibly doing this and it could be overridden by a future Council. Mr. Tousley stated that he agrees aggress with this and the he felt this was intended to show the residents we are committed, however he sees that as more of a lack of commitment because there are no numbers listed in the legislation. Mr. Kernan moved to remove this and not pursue any further, seconded by Mr. Pelot. Mr. Tousley agreed with removing this but not the point of not to pursue this any further.

Roll Call: Yes: Pelot, Kernan
 No: Tousley

Motion passed 2-1.

Budgetary Transfers

Ms. Whipkey stated that we need to move about three (3) items from the General Fund into various funds. One is for \$100,000.00 into the Service Department Fund; another is \$15,000.00 into the Community Center Fund, and the last one of \$500,000.00 into the Road Program Fund. Ms. Whipkey explained that the State Auditors has been after the City to keep these accounts in a positive number and in order to do so we need to move these over. There were some repairs for the Community Center and the \$15,000.00 is to cover the share that was not covered from funds coming from CDBG funding, and the others were to cover costs to the Service Dept. and the Road Program in order to meet the obligations coming up. Mr. Messner stated we can set a budget, but in the monthly cash position reports, which you all get copies of, if there is not enough cash to support the budget and transfers from the General Fund have to be done. What has happened in these areas is that in the fall when budgets get tighter and tighter and all departments cut back and do not purchase as much. Come January all departments are running full with brand new budgets and they are making purchases, which can cause a temporary shortage. In essence we have run past the cash balances in these various departments for these funds. This requires that he transfer funds from the General Fund in order to have a positive cash flow. In the Service Dept, those funds will be coming in from gas tax in the months ahead and will add revenue to that pot and the same goes for the Community Center.

Mr. Messner noted when it comes to the Road Program, this past Council President wanted a budget of \$1,000,000.00 and we don't have the cash value of \$1,000,000.00 sitting in that account. Somewhere along the line he has to have that \$1 million there, and he is now putting \$500,000.00 in there now as we are already working on Silver Springs Drive. Soon we will be working with the County Engineer, and there will be the need for another transfer somewhere along the line to get this account in the positive. Mr. Messner reminded everyone you approved a \$2.6 million budget in the transfer sections last year and these are some of the early items this year. Mr. Messner stated last year he only transferred funds just a couple of times and now the Auditors are asking for more transfers throughout the year to be in a positive balance for each and every month if possible. Ms. Whipkey asked if we have time or need to waive readings in order to get this to the State by March 30, 2016, and Mr. Messner replied if we can dispense with Mr. Tousley's normal rule not to waive, we could pass at the second reading. Ms. Whipkey stated she is inclined to call this boiler plate type legislation and asked Mr. Markey his opinion. Mr. Markey responded that it is in keeping with being consistent with the budget, he would agree. Mr. Pierson asked about pulling the funds from the Mayor's Court account and Mr. Messner replied there is no Mayor's Court and that budget no longer exists. Mr. Pierson argued that there was money in that account according to the last statement and Mr. Messner stated it's in the General Fund and always was. Mr. Tousley asked about the \$15,000.00 overlap in the Community Center Budget and that we voted for that last year so is it budgeted for this year? Mr. Messner clarified that this transcended into two (2) years. We came right down to the end of the year where the construction had to be completed; however the \$45,000.00 funds from CDBG did not come in until late January. Mr. Messner stated that we ended up bringing the negative balance forward into 2016 so he has to deal with it now as the project went to the very end of the year. Mr. Rodgers clarified that when Mr. Messner budgeted for the Community Center, he did not have the final bills and then was short the \$15,000.00 needed when it was finished to which Mr. Messner concurred. Ms. Whipkey moved to place this on Councils next agenda for a first reading at least for now with emergency language, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Roll Call: Yes: Whipkey, Pelot, Pierson
No: None

Motion passed 3-0.

Nash Heights-Vacuum Sewers

Mr. Pelot opened this discussion for any member of Council to comment. Mr. Rodgers discussed the vote on February 17, 2016 where the vote failed on the vacuum sewer. The word was out that because of the operation and maintenance costs this would not go thru. Mr. Rodgers reminded all of Council members present then, with the exception of Mr. Kernan, that you all voted for the expense of additional costs for engineering for \$174,000.00; we had many discussions over many months on it. Regarding the O&M, it was always told to the public, who had questions on it, that as soon as all the O&M costs were in we would discuss it.

Instead of going for bids to see what the true cost of the build was, you turned it down. We are concerned now with the \$15,000.00 shortage in the Community Center account, and rightfully so, yet we can waste \$170,000.00. Mr. Rodgers stated he would like this Resolution to be reconsidered and voted on and passed. You owe it to the people of this community. Mr. Rodgers handed out copies of the O & M costs (see attached) prepared by Mr. Demboski from EDG. Mr. Rodgers stated that the press has asked for communications for Council emails which they were all provided as a matter of public record. Mr. Rodgers stated that the O & M analysis performed for this used by EDG was based on studies from PDH engineers and they are cited as a reference for the work. In the last 25 years there were only two (2) technical manuals that include data on vacuum systems; EPA Manual 1990 and WEF 2008. Mr. Rich Naret a current employee of Airvac-Bilfinger was the author of both and went through stringent peer reviews by other industry experts. In the last ten (10) years there have been only three (3) online accredited courses for professional engineers to take to maintain their credentials and Mr. Naret is the author of all three (3) courses. Mr. Naret and Mr. Demboski spoke with each other about Mr. Demboski's analysis and over all Mr. Naret stated the EDG analysis was very well structured and hit on everything it should have and for the most part were based on industry published data. However;, Mr. Naret found a few line items that were misrepresented which have a major impact on the twenty (20) year O & M for vacuum. Mr. Naret presented Mr. Demboski with more updated and current information and Mr. Demboski indicated that he would take this into advisement and would re-evaluate this new data. They both agreed that the information needs to reflect industry data on the actual operating systems. Additionally the company (Air-Vac) has mentioned they are willing to provide extended warranties for valves and controllers and free first refills for all valves and controllers in an attempt to provide the residents of Nash Heights with an even more cost effective vacuum system. Estimated O & M costs as stated in the publication Centralized Wastewater Systems to be only 26-27% higher in vacuum compared to gravity in comparison to the EDG figures showing them to be 80% higher. Mr. Rodgers stated that some on not all of Council understands about vacuum sewers, and not all have visited their facilities. There's been a lot of talk about different parts of the country and the world with problems with vacuums, but in our neighborhood such as areas of Mahoning County, Portage County, and down towards Franklyn County have nothing but high reviews of the system from the people who operate them on their efficiency and ease of operation. We can take apart the cost summary from EDG, but in speaking with Mr. Naret, the biggest difference in these figures is the valve rebuild costs, which the company recommends, is ignored by EDG and EDG goes with new valves rather than rebuilding them which is a cost of over \$400,000.00 a year. AirVac knows what it takes to operate these systems. There is also an overage in the costs for hourly maintenance labor costs which is also over \$300,000.00 to \$400,000.00 over the twenty (20) year time frame. It all makes a difference if we look at the true costs of differences between the two systems. Mr. Rodgers stated someone on Council had mentioned that Barberton doesn't care what the cost of the system, but is concerned with the extensive maintenance costs, but he does not represent Barberton. Mr. Rodgers stated that he was involved in the negotiations of the \$11,200.00 figure, as well as the 42% discussions.

In a giant leap of faith, in his mind, as the bids came back and if the vacuum was cheaper and functional, he believed this Council or whoever was sitting here when it came time for the final assessment, would realize that savings should go back in part, if not all, to the people who were paying it. So you have these numbers in front of you, although it is hard to read, and there is enough here now to reconsider the vacuum sewer and get that out for bid. We need to have Bilfinger and EDG present to go over these numbers and do what we said we would do for nearly two years. We all agreed to have them bid out to truly find the cost for both systems; at least that is what most of you voted on. He doesn't know what changed that; he believed it was an election, but your vote is your vote. Ms. Whipkey stated the O & M cost is not the only reason as was stated in the papers. The fact is, we have to deal with Barberton and Barberton has to issue the PTI (Permit to install) and they say they will not do this for vacuum. We also know we cannot get a thirty (30) year loan as they do not consider them to have a thirty (30) year life, in addition to some issues found in other communities from people that are qualified. Ms. Whipkey stated that even with all of the letters recently in the local papers, she did not hear from one (1) resident that indicated they wanted vacuum; all she got was people saying no to the vacuum and basically that is what she heard prior to this. We said we would look at it and we did. Ms. Whipkey noted that costs for \$174,000.00 for additional engineering costs would have had part going towards further engineering on the gravity as there were overlapping areas and would have been straightened out. Ms. Whipkey stated, although she does not see the AirVac O&M costs offered here, we had the O & M costs since September from EDG and we waited and waited for AirVac as we did not get anything from AirVac until December. Ms. Whipkey stated she believed Mr. Rodgers had the AirVac information before the rest of Council received it from him and Mr. Rodgers responded he objected to that as he did not withhold information from anybody. Ms. Whipkey stated many times that she has stated she wanted to hear from the Nash residents, but the residents of Nash Heights were never offered the ability on what system they preferred and those that did said no. Ms. Whipkey stated at the July 10, 2015 with Mr. Pruet for the fringe people meeting many people came forward then and said they would rather tie into gravity and not vacuum. Ms. Whipkey stated she has had many more say they didn't want vacuum than did want it, so she believed she did listen to the people. Ms. Whipkey stated she heard from seven (7) residents over the weekend that said they don't want vacuum. Mr. Pierson asked if these were Nash Heights residents because if they weren't this does not matter. Ms. Whipkey responded that some were and some weren't. Ms. Whipkey stated we didn't take a poll of those that did speak in favor of the vacuum as to whether they lived in Nash Heights. When she asked for a poll, you, Mr. Pierson responded they did not understand the process so why should we ask the Nash Heights residents and it was up to Council to decide. Mr. Pierson responded he did not believe he had said that and wanted to see it and Ms. Whipkey supplied him excerpts from the minutes. Ms. Whipkey stated you guys were all on the Committees so if the O & M costs were so important and a selling point then why didn't you bring this forward before now? Ms. Whipkey stated that all along she has said the O & M costs are not the only reason she voted against vacuum. Mr. Rodgers stated that Ms. Whipkey is wrong on numerous counts, number one being the thirty (30) year loan issue.

Mr. Markey stated we had the opportunity to prove our case for the thirty (30) year loan issue with the mini-update when we submitted our response to the EPA, and we have not heard their reply. Mr. Rodgers stated that Ms. Whipkey still disputes the O&M costs yet she is the same person that insinuated an employee of Portage County probably wasn't telling the truth because he spoke favorably of the vacuum system; you called him out for his integrity and honesty because it did not suit your idea of what the system is. Ms. Whipkey received no response as to which employee Mr. Rodgers was referring to. Mr. Rodgers disputed the statement about Barberton and that they will not apply for the permit to install. Right now we have no agreement with Barberton and we can build our own, send the sewage to Barberton, and apply for the PTI and Mr. Markey concurred this was correct. Mr. Rodgers went on that the need to make sure Barberton gets what they want from Norton, you are from Norton, not Barberton, and if you are so worried about Barberton go be on their Council. Mr. Rodgers stated he has heard from the residents and mostly the Nash Heights residents and the vast majority want the best possible deal. Mr. Pierson asked if EDG if going with gravity wouldn't be the most financially advantageous for them and the fact they also serve Barberton so isn't that a conflict of interest? EDG has a lot more in stake in this project than they should have, just like a meeting he had been at where they worked for Barberton when they worked to increase their water pressure which could have been done differently at lesser cost to Norton and Mr. Pierson noted the project never did move forward down Hametown Road. Mr. Pierson spoke on the twenty (20) years versus the thirty (30) years and stated there would be enough savings that it wouldn't make any difference if it did break. His point is that EDG has a lot more to say in this than they should have as they work for us as a consulting firm. He is not saying they are dishonest, but let's face it; they like to get their bonuses at the end of the year. Mr. Pierson discussed Portage County vacuum systems, which are sixteen (16) miles away, and they have the school system and residents both on vacuum systems with fewer problems than the gravity lines. Mr. Pierson went on to say that as far as bringing up areas 600 or more miles away like Barrel, Alaska and Plum Island to compare, he did not feel that was comparing apples to apples when you have systems that do work in Trumbull, Mahoning, and Portage Counties. Mr. Pierson stated that we seem determined to spend an additional \$1,000,000.00 and there are some poorer residents that will move out which will have an impact on property values. Mr. Pierson added there are ten to twelve defaults in Nash Heights already and he guarantees there will be more as the younger and elderly people cannot pay for it; he believed there were a couple of people on Council that could afford it either. Mr. Rodgers noted the article in the Beacon about the State of Ohio's economy and what's been happening over the last fifteen (15) years. Mr. Rodgers discussed the recent information from Summit County (see attached) and the median income levels. Mrs. Carr stated this information is handed out from the Summit County Public Health each year and she had just attended their meeting. Mrs. Carr noted that all of Council receives this report every year. Mr. Rodgers stated the annual median income of \$62,000.00 for Norton and a mean income of \$68,750.00. Mr. Rodgers stated that at least the Beacon's article had it right today, if you look at everything in these times; Norton is not immune to this. It's about the people and what they can afford.

A lot of people on Social Security are running their households on \$1,000.00-\$1,500.00 a month and challenged Council to try running their house on that. This is not about Rick Rodgers, Dennis Pierson, and Paul Tousley against the others; you guys won the election, that fight is over and you need to think about the people. Mr. Tousley discussed the MOU from Barberton as of 11-04-14 and in Section (k) Vacuum Sewer it reads: *Norton will acknowledge that an annual operation and maintenance charge may be charged to Norton residents receiving sanitary sewer service from a vacuum sewer system. This additional operation and maintenance charge will be reviewed annually by Barberton and subject to adjustment to reflect the actual expenses incurred for maintaining the vacuum system during the previous year. Barberton will provide Norton with an annual accounting providing evidence of Barberton's actual operation and maintenance expenses.* According to that Barberton had signed the MOU and did not have an issue with vacuum. We still don't know about the thirty (30) year finance issue, this is all the more reason to let the vacuum system go out for bid and find out the real truth. So what is the harm with looking into that? The \$1.2 million is essentially \$100 saved for every person in this City, and asked that we just let this play out and at the end of the day if vacuum is more then so be it and he would like to re-introduce that legislation. Mr. Pierson noted the Fund 127 is for maintenance and construction of the pumping stations and questioned if we can we use that for maintaining a vacuum system and Mr. Markey he did not see a reason we could not use that. Mr. Pierson asked how much is in that account now since the Adair lawsuit case was won? Mr. Markey noted the Adair case is not over, it is going back to the Court of Appeals and we have not won anything yet. Mr. Pierson again asked how much was in the fund and Mr. Markey stated off hand somewhere near \$1,000,000.00. Mr. Pierson stated that according to EDG this is a \$2,000,000.00 cost and you have half of that right there in this fund. Mr. Tousley stated in Randolph they indicated they don't charge their residents a maintenance cost for their vacuum sewers because they have no maintenance issues as they believed it was equal or less to gravity. Mr. Pelot asked if there was documentation to that effect and Mr. Tousley answered there was not. Mr. Tousley stated there was a gentleman that ran something like thirty-one (31) gravity stations and one vacuum station where he had indicated he spent less hours at the vacuum station than the gravity ones with ten (10) of the gravity systems being newer than the vacuum. Ms. Whipkey asked Mr. Tousley asked if he was referring to the Randolph issues was they were not charged an assessment fee because they are all in agriculture district and are exempt and she recalled on their property tax bill there is a sewer maintenance fee, but there is no assessment because an agricultural grant. Ms. Whipkey also noted that in Randolph they indicated less time was spent on the vacuum, but there are only eighty-eight (88) residents connected to vacuum which is forty-four (44) vacuum pits; and 800 plus on gravity systems; the numbers alone would indicate there would be more with the gravity as there are more of them. We are talking about nearly three-hundred (300) here in Nash Heights. Ms. Whipkey also discounted the previous statement by Mr. Rodgers that the numbers from EDG were loaded when her statement on the employees in Randolph was in relation to them giving detrimental information due to their employment positions.

Mr. Rodgers responded that Ms. Whipkey's statements were questioning the integrity of employees doing his job and it couldn't be spun any different way; his statements on the numbers from EDG were based on Mr. Naret's statement that there were discrepancies which he did not see as being wrong at all. Mr. Rodgers stated that in Portage County, Lima and Jeromesville they have no additional maintenance costs because of vacuum system. Mr. Rodgers noted the project in Jeromesville; it was done by Nationwide Realty which is a subsidiary of Nationwide Insurance, and the gentleman that oversaw this project has offered to come to Norton and speak about this project. Mr. Tom Kornas, 3712 Brookside Drive, Norton, Ohio, stated that he felt Ms. Whipkey was unprofessional and owes the members of Council an apology. Mr. Kornas asked why is this Council not allowing this to go out for bid? We are waiting for an answer. Ms. Whipkey stated she already given her answer and that she does not believe the O & M is the only reason and she felt this is not a good solution. Mr. Kornas retorted that she might not believe it was, but they might and they were the ones that would pay for it. Mr. Kornas stated if we are going to save some money then why not let it go out for bid? You spent \$175,000.00 for a study then why not find the final costs? You should not even bring Barberton up. Ms. Whipkey stated again the O&M is not the only reason, the thirty (30) year loan is in question and likely won't be approved; Barberton will not put out the PTI for vacuum. If we were able to do the vacuum on our own, why didn't we buy the stinking lines to begin with? Ms. Whipkey stated she has never mentioned the problems from Alaska, she only mentioned the problems in Plum Island and in Michigan. Ms. Whipkey asked why is it that Mr. Kornas has never come to the podium stating he wants vacuum before now in the last two years? Mr. Kornas had no response. Mr. Paul Reese, stated you had EDG draw plans to build vacuum and plans to build gravity and you don't know what the costs are individually. Mrs. Carr stated the new redesign for vacuum was about \$175,000.00. At that time she did suggest going out to a third party and Council decided not to do that based on recommendations from AirVac. This Council directed us to go with EDG. Mrs. Carr took issue with the negative comments about EDG and Mr. Demboski who is not even being present tonight to defend his records and that is unprofessional as he could have been here. Mr. Pierson stated that Council went with EDG because going with another firm would have cost more dollars. Basically what this comes down to is that with all the discussion on Barberton has painted you into the corner with them and are ready to accept what you get from them and has heard that said by members of Council. Mr. Reese asked about the cost difference for gravity and Mr. Rodgers said was \$400,000.00 for design and then Council authorized an additional \$175,000.00 to look at vacuum. For the record, AirVac, because EDG had already designed most of the project, it made sense to let them continue with the extra work involved. Mr. Reese stated you just added \$577.00 to every home in Nash Heights and by not sending this out your cutting off your competition and maybe gravity would come in a little cheaper. Who's going to eat that \$577.00? Mr. Kernan stated if we decided not to look at vacuum and waste \$175,000.00 and then we end up going with vacuum then we are wasting \$400,000.00 for what was spent on gravity; so either one we pick, we will waste money somewhere and Mr. Carr concurred. Mr. Rodgers stated we spent \$400,000.00 on gravity and \$174,000.00 on vacuum, so the waste would have been the difference between the two.

Mr. Rodgers stated let's ask the people of Nash Heights if you were charged an assessment of \$11,200.00 for gravity and \$5,000.00 for vacuum, if the final number was \$5,000.00, would you care if you are wasting \$400,000.00 to \$500,000.00 dollars, and if there is a savings. Mrs. Carr stated the reality is we have spent this money to design both systems and in reality one will be rejected in the end. Mr. Paluch, 3740 Shellhart Road, Norton, Ohio, said when you sent out these assessments, they came to him pretty quick and it would have been nice Charlotte for you to send out notices to the residents in the area to see how they felt. You hear all these numbers and statements of who does and does not want vacuum, but you have nothing to back it up; it is only hearsay. Is this too late for that and Mayor Zita stated you would also be wasting another \$2,000.00 in certified mailings to send out new letters for vacuum. Mr. Rodgers argued that it not too late we can reconsider that and send out new letters. Mr. Rodgers stated this was an underhanded deal by some on this Council and this Administration to fail that Resolution and asked Mr. Markey of both of those letters could have gone out together? Mr. Markey stated it is possible that you could have sent both letters in one envelope, it could cost more due to weight and he reminded Mr. Rodgers that the Administration does not vote on legislation. Mr. Rodgers stated we could have had it all in one Resolution, to which Mr. Markey answered that was not possible as it was separate projects and required separate legislation even with the same costs. Mr. Rodgers stated the deal in this town from these people was to deny you the opportunity to bid on vacuum sewers. Mr. Paluch clarified that Mr. Pelot's comments were either system the assessments were \$11,200.00, and Mr. Pelot clarified that he stated the legislation spells it out this way. Mr. Paluch argued that what you are saying is that even though the vacuum is a savings of about \$4,500.00 you are willing to keep that. Mr. Paluch asked who drew up these resolutions? Mr. Rodgers stated that he was part of this. The bottom line on assessments is at the end of the day when the project is completed you will have the final cost and you can base your assessment at that time on the final cost. Mr. Rodgers stated he goes back to a leap of faith that this Council and or future Councils will do just that, and not to pocket that money. If there is savings of potentially \$4,000.00 to \$5,000.00 per benefit why would the City spend more? Mr. Paluch stated it was called greed. Mr. Rodgers stated that the Administration could have sent both resolutions at once. Mr. Rodgers stated at the end of day when the final construction is done you will have the final assessment costs. Mr. Rodgers stated that is when you will know what your assessment figure will be. Mr. Paluch asked if it's too late to put this issue back on the ballot and Mr. Markey stated that he has no idea what date or time frame he is looking. Mr. Paluch stated he has an issue with some higher paid City officials getting paid and they don't even live here and that is a disgrace and un-American. Ms. Whipkey asked for clarification from Mrs. Carr on a third engineering firm doing the studies so we could have had unbiased study and Mrs. Carr responded they had already talked to Arcadia on it and had talked to Mr. Rodgers internally and would have to check the minutes as to whether it was done on the floor. Ms. Whipkey stated she did not recall it on the floor. Mr. Pierson stated they would not accept the EDG firm's work and we would have had to pay more and asked Mr. Rodgers' for confirmation to which Mr. Rodgers' agreed. Mrs. Carr pointed out that Mr. Pierson showed biasness against EDG continuously and Mrs. Carr stated that EDG is not doing any work in Barberton, they contract with CT Engineering.

Mrs. Carr added that EDG does work for Copley and was Mr. Pierson going to hold that against them. Mr. Pierson responded we were not involved with Copley and Mrs. Carr corrected him that we were in the Watershed and Little Farms. Ms. Whipkey asked again if we had the third party engineer discussion on the Council floor and Mr. Rodgers responded he believed it was during Executive Session. Mr. Tousley clarified that Mr. Markey has stated that once an assessment has been made you cannot raise the figure but you can lower these costs and Mr. Markey concurred. Mr. Tousley stated later on that does not mean that these figures cannot be negotiated down. Mr. Zenner asked Mr. McGlone and Mr. Pelot why they voted no as he has already heard from Ms. Whipkey. Mr. McGlone stated because the real numbers were \$15,819.00 and \$19,329.00 and now they are both at \$11,200.00, he does not like vacuum lines at twenty (20) years, and he was never really told what the maintenance would be. He had actually wanted to purchase the lines from the beginning; now Barberton is in control for the maintenance and he does not believe Barberton is going to pass to go with the vacuum. Mr. Pelot stated his concern was the final costs for vacuum and although you may save money up front but it will be more costly to maintain this and a shorter life. History shows if you do your diligence the gravity system which is what he has seen, once you calculate all of these costs, he feels that gravity is the way to go. He is not just looking at today he is looking at the future of the product. Mr. Rodgers asked where did he come up with the numbers on vacuum and the longevity, and Mr. Pelot replied it's right here in the documents you presented from EDG. Mr. Rodgers added that those figures are exactly what he corrected in his earlier statements. Mr. Pelot pointed out that if you look around you see the gravity systems are lasting fifty plus years around us. Mr. Zenner stated that when this discussion first came up the costs were \$8,000.00 and he was ready to write the check right now for that amount. Mr. McGlone stated that was if the MOU that was with Summit County went through. Mr. McGlone stated the estimates have already come down from \$15,819.00 to \$11,200.00 so do you really think this is going down much more? Mr. Zenner stated all we are asking is to let this go out for bid and figure out what's best for us. Ms. Smith noted that if you went out for bids at the community center and the trash haulers, then you should be bidding this out as well. So if you bid everything else then why didn't you do it for vacuum that day? She wanted to put it into her budget for the future and when would she need it. Mr. Kernan pointed out that both systems were for \$11,200.00 so she could go ahead and budget it. Mayor Zita stated the project has to be completed before we can submit the assessment figures to Summit County and that is only done in September. That may not take place until January of 2018 or 2019 and Mr. Markey concurred. Ms. Smith stated that some of her neighbors are saying they will just walk away and let their house go into foreclosure and she questioned what will that do to her property value? Mr. Kernan stated that we had the same comments when President Obama got elected that people would leave this country and that did not happen. Mr. Rodger's stated he figured it out that to send out another round of letters at a cost of about \$8.00 each to mail out another letter with the Resolution of Necessity (for vacuum) and that he would be willing to share in the costs of this and let this go out for bid and find out what the numbers are. Mr. Kernan stated honestly he cannot see the difference for the people of Nash Heights as it's \$11,200.00 whether it's vacuum or gravity.

It does not seem likely that anyone is going to change their minds after listening for the last hour and the last five years. It would take at least six (6) votes to pass another Resolution of Necessity for vacuum and that's just not going to happen. The best thing for this community is to move on and we have been talking about this for five (5) years. Mrs. Smith agreed to move on for the \$11,200.00. Mr. Rodgers stated that if the project runs over the \$11,200.00 amount they will pay more and he was corrected as once an assessment is made, the price cannot go up. Mr. Rodgers asked then where is the City going to get that extra money? Mr. Markey and Mrs. Carr both replied from the taxpayers. Mr. Rodgers stated that we taxpayers fund this City will pay this whole bill. Ms. Whipkey even if it goes over, we cannot raise your assessment of \$11,200.00 no matter what, its guaranteed not to increase. Ms. Whipkey discussed the foreclosure issue raised by Ms. Smith, and that she had read online somewhere that yes, you can walk away from your home and foreclose you may escape for the moment but eventually that can come back to haunt them. They can come back and be held accountable for the amount they walked away from. Mr. Markey stated that if someone forecloses the bank will try to locate them and collect depending on what type of collateral they might have. Mr. Pierson stated that if they file Chapter 13 they have it wipes out this debt in either five (5) or seven (7) years. Credit card companies will come after you but they will reestablish credit and the end result is the devalued property values throughout the City. Mr. Kernan stated he practiced in bankruptcy when he was in private practice. If someone walks away from their mortgage, the bank forecloses and they get less than what is due on that mortgage. The balance of the mortgage is due back to the person who is liable on the mortgage. If they file for Chapter 7 bankruptcy, that can be wiped out. If they have any other assets, the bankruptcy trustee can come after that. Or they can file Chapter 13 and they can pay it back at a percentage over time. Mr. McGlone stated that sometimes the banks just give up and move on. Ms. Whipkey stated her point is they will not really be farther ahead if they do this. Ms. Smith asked of neighbors on both sides walk away what does that do to her assessment costs and Mr. Pelot stated her costs would not increase because someone walks away. Mr. Rodgers stated the money for the studies are included in your assessment because they are going to take the money they paid for the studies out of the roll back funds and then reimburse the roll back funds. You are also paying for all of the road improvements for every one of those streets in excess of \$500,000.00. Mrs. Carr corrected Mr. Rodgers statement because the road improvements are not part of the assessments. Mr. Rodgers asked isn't that part of the money we borrowed? Mr. Markey stated yes but the question was; is the road pavement part of the assessment and that answer is no, it is part of the City's share. Mr. Rodgers argued if the City's share is 26% and you take that \$500,000.00 out of it, that would take up \$500,000.00 more. Mr. Rodgers stated the point is you are all paying for this and everyone else will be getting free road paving because we don't assess for that. Mr. Larry Perkins, 3844 Neitz Drive, Norton, Ohio stated that if you stop paying your mortgage the bank will send you papers offering you about five (5) different options for ways to work with you. Mr. Tousley stated tonight we found out the O & M costs are slightly skewed. How do we know if the estimates were not slightly skewed? If we let it go out for bid and they are skewed in the same direction, then we could save substantially more.

Mr. Tousley moved to reintroduce a Resolution similar to Res. #3-2016 capping the vacuum assessment at \$9,000.00, Nash Heights residents will get roughly a \$1,200,000.00 savings and the citizens at large will get the same savings, seconded by Mr. Kernan.

Roll Call: Yes: Tousley
 No: Kernan, Pelot.

Motion failed 1-2.

Unfinished Business:

Ms. Whipkey noted that the Charter Review Commission will be meeting this Wednesday March 16, 2016 at 6 PM and their meetings are open to the public. They will have a set of Rules before them to approve. Those rules do state that the public will have opportunities to comment at those meetings. Mrs. Carr noted the new statics from Summit County Public Health Dept., as discussed in the brochure earlier this evening. Mrs. Carr indicated that she would provide Mrs. Richards with a copy of the more detailed report and it's also located on their website. Mrs. Carr stated there will be free water testing kits coming within the next month and will be available to test their well water. Mr. Pelot discussed residents looking to install newer water meters, so they can get more accurate sewer readings and asked for more information on that. Mrs. Carr stated that there is a small fee of around \$300.00 to replace their meters and they need to contact Barberton for that. Mr. Pelot stated from what he is hearing you can reduce by about \$26.00 a month if you have maybe three (3) people in your household and are not using a whole lot of water, then you can get your sewer bill reduced by installing this. Over a year or so of time you can recover the initial cost for the new meter. Ms. Judith Lyn Lee asked if we can use this to test City water as well and Mrs. Carr stated she thought you could test both.

New Business:

Mr. Kernan moved to allow Mr. Gainer to speak, seconded by Mr. Tousley.

Roll Call: Yes: Kernan, Tousley, Rodgers, McGlone, Pierson, Pelot, Whipkey
 No: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Gainer, 3920 Wadsworth Road, Norton, Ohio reminded everyone that Tuesday is Election day and hopes everyone gets out and supports the two school levies, Issue #14 and Issue #15. We have a good school system and we need to continue to support this, in addition to the Resource Officer in the schools that Council did approve to support. Mr. Gainer stated it has been proven across the country that School Resource Officers do help to save lives.

Topics for the next Work Session:

New Liquor Permit-Loyal Oak Park

Public Comment-Agenda and Non Agenda Items:

Mr. Reese, Kornas, and Mrs. Smith have left.

Mr. Paluch said lets talk about sewers, and it appears to him that someone on Council has a failing system that is not working. Is anyone going to make that person get a new septic system? Mrs. Carr stated she does not have the power to enforce this law, and that Council removed this requirement. Mr. Paluch commented that it's convenient that some rules apply to some but not to others. Mr. Kernan noted that the rule you are referring to is not a City issue that is a County Health Department issue. Mr. Pierson stated that the City never had that power this was always under the direction of the Summit County Health District. Mr. Paluch stated some of you just don't care about the residents of Norton. Ms. Whipkey stated it has always been stated that everyone in Nash Heights will have to connect; the only issue was how long they have to tie in. Mr. Paluch stated he lives in Nash Heights and he does not smell any raw sewage, why is that?

Mr. Kernan and Mr. Pelot moved to allow Ms. Judith Lyn Lee, to speak as she was not signed up.

Roll Call: Yes: Kernan, Pelot, Rodgers, McGlone, Pierson, Tousley, Whipkey
 No: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Ms. Judith Lynn Lee, 3227 Creekside Drive Norton, Ohio gave a brief update on the bottled water distribution for the Flint Michigan residents she is promoting. Ms. Lee stated that it was a little slow in getting this going in time as she is running for office and had been extended until after the election. We are still accepting donations for this need and in addition the residents in Flint are asking for personal hygiene items as well because they cannot use their water to bathe in at this point. Ms. Lee stated the issues for the school is very important and as a candidate she was also focusing on education and environmental issues.

Public Updates:

Mayor reminded everyone about the Fire Levy and it's not a new tax this is a renewal. This Administration has done everything we can to hold the costs down.

Adjourn

There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 9:52

Charlotte Whipkey, President of Council

NOTE: THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATIM

****ORIGINAL SIGNED AND APPROVED MINUTES ARE ON FILE WITH THE
CLERK OF COUNCIL.****

**All Committee Meetings will be held at the Norton Safety Administration Building,
unless otherwise noted.**



AGE:

Under 5 years	5.3%
5-9 years	6.0%
10-14 years	6.9%
15-19 years	6.8%
20-24 years	3.8%
25-34 years	10.5%
35-44 years	13.4%
45-54 years	17.2%
55-59 years	7.3%
60-64 years	6.5%
65-74 years	8.9%
75-84 years	5.7%
85 years and over	1.7%
Median Age:	42.6 years

INCOME & BENEFITS:

Total households	4,712
Less than \$10,000	3.3%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	3.3%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9.7%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	9.9%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	12.7%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	20.9%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	18.4%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	18.4%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	2.4%
\$200,000 or more	1.1%
Median household income	62,161
Mean household income	68,750

POPULATION: 12,052

Male	48.6%
Female	51.4%

RACE:

White/Caucasian	97.7%
Black/African-American	1.7%
Asian	0.1%
Other	0.1%
Two or more races	0.3%

Source: 2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.
Due to inherent limitations with estimated data, results should be interpreted with caution. Due to rounding, some percentage totals may not equal 100.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:

High school graduate or higher, in population 25+	90.9%
Bachelor's degree or higher, in population 25+	23.8%

LIVING BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

Percentage of families	3.9%
Percentage of people	5.5%

1

FOOD SAFETY

The Food Safety program investigates reports of food-borne illnesses, and licenses, regulates and inspects all food service operations and retail establishments.

2

HOME SEWAGE

This program provides inspection, evaluation and permitting for all phases of home sewage treatment systems, as well as point of sale inspections, liquid waste hauler registration and inspection, and storm water quality monitoring.

3

BCMH

BCMH is a program for children with complex medical problems. Participants receive regular contact from a public health nurse as well as administrative and financial assistance as eligible.

4

CLINIC SERVICES

Clinic services include immunizations, HIV and STD testing, refugee screening and TB testing and treatment.

5

HOUSING COMPLAINTS

Sanitarians in this program investigate complaint-generated issues involving landlord/tenant repair, vacant, dilapidated homes, insect/animal nuisances, and garbage/trash and other solid waste nuisances.

TOP 5

These are the top five Public Health Services provided to Norton residents in 2015, based on the number of recorded service hours.

COMMUNITY HEALTH IMPROVEMENT PLAN

In 2015, Summit County Public Health released an update to the Summit County Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP). This report is an extensive look at critical issues impacting health in Summit County. The report presents the background of each issue and discusses challenges and opportunities involved in addressing the issues. The goal is for the 2015 CHIP update to continue to be a guiding document for the whole community, allowing for better coordination of the many resources that exist in Summit County and advancing the goal of maintaining healthy lives for all Summit County residents.

This report is available on the SCPH website at www.scpoh.org/PAGES/REPORTS.html.



IN THE COUNTY

Below is a snapshot of select public health statistics for Summit County, based on research compiled by the Ohio Department of Health. Detailed information is available at www.odh.ohio.gov, including comparisons with state and national statistics, historical data and interventions.

HEALTH CARE ACCESS (PER 100,000 POPULATION)

Number of primary care providers	112.2
Number of dentists	56.7

HEALTH RISK FACTORS

Adults diagnosed with diabetes	9.0%
Adults diagnosed with high blood pressure	28.3%
Adults with a BMI \geq 30	29.2%
Adults who currently or have ever smoked	19.0%
Adults who reported excessive alcohol use	19.8%

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH

Percentage of high school graduates	93.3%
Percentage of adults 25+ with college degree	29.3%
Unemployment rate among residents 16+ years	6.8%
Families living below poverty level	11.4%
Households receiving public assistance	5.6%
Households without a car, located more than 1 mile from a grocery store	2.2%



CITY OF NORTON

2015 COMMUNITY REPORT

SUMMIT COUNTY



PUBLIC HEALTH