



COMMITTEE WORK SESSION OCTOBER 2, 2006

Committee Members Present: Ken Braman
Tom Jones
Dennis McGlone
Bill Mowery
Scott Pelot
James Price
Mike Zita

Also Present: Mayor Joseph Kernan
Claude Collins
John Moss
Jeff Pritchard
Karla Richards

The Committee Work Session convened on Monday, October 2, 2006 at 7:02 PM, in Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Council President, Michael Zita.

COMMITTEE WORK SESSION GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Comprehensive Plan Presentation by Mr. David Hartt of D. B. Hartt Inc.

Mr. Pelot introduced Mr. David Hartt and John Dahlgren of D. B. Hartt Inc., who gave a brief power point presentation on the status and update of the Comprehensive Master Plan (See attached). Mr. Hartt expressed that this Comprehensive Master Plan does not change any laws, nor does it change any rights of the property owners. Mr. Hartt stated that generally a Comprehensive Master Plan is approved by the Planning Commission as well as Council. Mr. Hartt stated that the general consensus of the residents involved in the work group was the city needs sewer and water, diversified tax base, and improved roads. Mr. Hartt announced the next open public meeting for the Comprehensive Plan Group is Thursday, October 12, 2006 at 6:30 PM at the Community Center. Mr. Pelot thanked Mr. Hartt for his excellent presentation, and encouraged the residents to attend the meeting next Thursday.

Salt Storage Facility

Mr. Braman stated the city has talked about purchasing some type of a salt storage facility for some time, and Mr. Weinsheimer was present for his overview. Mr. Weinsheimer stated he has been researching this for approximately six (6) to eight (8) weeks and intended to put this into the 2007 Budget. However, his research indicated that it was economically feasible to do in this years Budget. Mr. Weinsheimer submitted photographs of several existing storage facilities along with an estimate from W. G. Dairy for \$66,293.56. Mr. Weinsheimer stated that he and Mr. Collins visited the facility on Boston Mills Road recently and they discovered two (2) more on the way there. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that New Franklin, Copley, Boston Mills, Richfield, and ODOT locations at I-271 at Rt. 303 already have these same facilities in place. Mr. Price inquired about the security and the cost of a permanent dome.

Salt Storage Facility Continued:

Mr. Collins indicated that this temporary structure would be secured in the back lot of the current location, which is surrounded by fencing and a locked gate. Mr. Weinsheimer estimated the costs for a permanent dome would be approximately \$220,000.00 and can store up to 2,600 tons of salt. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that this storage facility would cost approximately \$67,000.00 and since this is not a permanent structure there would be no maintenance issues, no lighting. Mr. Zita inquired as to the longevity of the canvas cover, and Mr. Weinsheimer stated that it is pro-rated for fifteen (15) years. Mr. Zita questioned if we need to notify Mr. Bernard, the current property owner of the Service Garage, and Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that since it is a temporary structure, we are not required to notify Mr. Bernard, however we would inform him of what we are doing. Mr. Collins stated that in about a year and a half, we hope to purchase this facility. Mr. Weinsheimer stated that we currently house approximately 1,500 tons of salt at the old facility, and this new facility could hold up to 2,600 tons of salt. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that on average we use approximately 5,400 tons of salt per year. Mr. Weinsheimer stated that the Salt Institute in 2002 recommended storing 50-60% of usage and the new recommendations are for 100%. This facility would store approximately 50% of our total usage. Mr. Price inquired as to the open face on the structure, and inquired if a cover for the front is needed. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that it is recommended that the structure be installed with the openings facing east, adding that the reason for the opening is so that trucks can back right up to the structure. Mr. Collins elaborated in the safety and integrity of the structure. Mr. Jones inquired as to the maximum height inside the structure. Mr. Weinsheimer stated that it would be roughly thirty-five (35) feet. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that the pictures show the block foundation at two (2) to three (3) high, however he intends to build this with four (4) rows of block. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that the concrete blocks would be purchased from A.C.E. Ready Mix, a Norton business. Mr. Braman asked how many of these types of temporary structures did he get prices on? Mr. Weinsheimer stated that he did contact one other vendor and the prices ranged from \$120,000.00 to \$140,000.00. Mr. Jones stated that he felt this was a good idea. Mr. Moss stated that the salt need was lower than anticipated for this year and that what is left in the 2006 Budget is enough for the purchase of this structure and to fill it with salt. Mr. Price inquired as to the time line on getting this installed. Mr. Weinsheimer indicated that construction would start the first week of December 2006 and would take one full week to complete, providing we place the order some time next week. Mr. Weinsheimer asked for emergency language and waiving of the second and third readings. Mr. Collins stated that he would be coming back to Council in the near future seeking permission to sell the old facility. Mr. Braman moved to place this item on Council's next agenda with emergency language and waiving the second and third readings, seconded by Mr. McGlone.

Roll Call: Yeas: Braman, McGlone, Jones, Mowery, Pelot, Price, Zita
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

Funds Transfer Ordinance

Mr. McGlone stated that this ordinance is to transfer funds for the Community Center and the Historical Fund, and turned this over to Mr. Moss for further discussions. Mr. Moss stated that this transfer ordinance is not something new, it usually is processed a little later on in the year. Mr. Moss stated that all of the amounts are within the 2006 Budget, and this activity provides for permanent movement of the funds. Mr. Braman questioned the reference to Brentwood Water Fund in Section 1. Mr. Moss indicated that this was an error from a previous ordinance, and would be removed and corrected.

Funds Transfer Ordinance Continued:

Mr. Price inquired as to how much did it cost to operate the Community Center in 2005. Mr. Moss indicated that it cost \$43,689.00. Mr. Price stated that it appears that we cannot afford to keep this facility running. Mayor Kernan stated that he had discussed this issue with Mr. Collins, and it is something the city gives back to the community for their use. Mayor Kernan stated that the last time this issue was discussed we received a ton of calls from concerned residents and civic groups. Mayor Kernan stated that every time we do something for the community, it costs us to do it, and gave examples of the ball fields, parks, and roads. Mr. Price suggested we lease this facility out to someone who could handle it and turn a better profit. Mayor Kernan stated that this idea would not work because who ever would take it over would have to raise the rental fees, charge fees for those who currently pay no fees, and increase the fees as well. Mayor Kernan stated that the city could possibly make this more profitable or to break even, however he felt the city or the community would not like it. Mr. Price stated that he does not like taking the \$18,300.00 out of the Rainy Day Fund, and would rather move all of the money out of the General Fund. Mr. Moss stated that it is proposed this way because that is the way it was proposed in the budget. Mr. Moss indicated that if Council wanted to pull this all out of the General Fund, it could be an option. Mr. Price stated that he felt the Community Center should be open and available as a place for our kids to go, play pool, hang out, etc. Mr. Price stated that he felt we could do better with the Community Center and the lost revenue. Mr. Price discussed the community facilities for the residents in Independence, Ohio; they have an Olympic size pool, recreation center, and the residents pay \$1.00 per year to join for a family. Mr. Price did acknowledge that they have a lot of revenue from hotel tax that helps pay for that. Mr. Price discussed the Steiner facility in Wadsworth, and asked Mr. Moss about the arrangements at this facility. Mr. Moss indicated they are subsidizing at about .60¢ on the dollar, they also have membership options, free usage, low-income free usage, per day usage, etc. They also have specific program fees. Mrs. Elaine Tompkins, a Norton resident asked for clarification on the figures stated earlier for 2005, and was the revenue considered in this figure? Mr. Moss indicated that it was not, the revenue for 2005 was \$9,400.00 in addition to the transfers to cover the shortage. Mrs. Tompkins stated that actually we are looking at approximately \$35,000.00. Mrs. Tompkins agreed with Mr. Price that the transfer should come out of the General Fund and not the Rainy Day Fund. Mrs. Tompkins stated that the Rainy Day Fund should be supplemented and not depleted. Mrs. Tompkins stated that Council without going back to the residents opted to change the use of the Rainy Day Fund. Mr. Moss stated that he would be glad to go back and review the minutes to determine the reason we chose to do it this way before the actual vote. Mr. McGlone inquired if we have used the Rainy Day Fund for anything else this year? Mr. Moss indicated that it was used this year to support some debt costs. Mr. Pelot inquired as to the balance in the Rainy Day Fund, and Mr. Moss replied it is \$153,045.39 as of 9-30-06, and corrected his earlier statement, we have not spent anything out of the Rainy Day Fund this year. Mr. Pelot stated that by taking out \$18,400.00 out of the Rainy Day Fund, we are giving something back to the residents, and he has no problem with this. Mr. McGlone questioned if we have the money in the General Fund, if we don't take the \$18,400.00 out of the Rainy Day Fund? Mr. Moss stated that the carry over balance at year end is really not sufficient for the level of funding that we have and he felt we should not be spending more out of the General Fund. On the other hand, we are not going to overspend our account, there is money there, so if it is the right thing to do then maybe we should do it, and suffer through with a lower carry over balance at year end. Mr. Moss stated that ultimately through good budgeting, we need to get that level up. Mr. McGlone stated that he was ok with taking the \$18,400.00 out of the Rainy Day Fund this year only and from now on take it from the General Fund. Mr. McGlone moved to place this on Councils next agenda, seconded by Mr. Pelot.

Funds Transfer Ordinance Continued:

Roll Call: Yeas: McGlone, Pelot, Braman, Jones, Mowery, Price, Pelot
Nays: None

Motion passed 7-0.

2005 CAFR (Comprehensive Annual Financial Report) Review

Mr. McGlone stated that we have all received the report last week, and asked if any Council Members have questions. Mr. Moss stated that the city is required by Ohio Law to produce a financial report each year, and ours is in the form of a CAFR (Comprehensive Annual Financial Report). This report is available at city hall, on the website and for sale. Mr. Moss stated that this is our report and it is not an audited financial report. The audit process is past the testing stages and is now in the final review and approval stages. Mr. Moss stated that he anticipates receiving an audit opinion on this report as it exists, and that it would be an unqualified audit opinion. Mrs. Elaine Tompkins discussed the management letter as it was addressed to the Mayor and Council, and it was determined that Council never received the management letter. Mr. Moss stated that what Mrs. Tompkins had been given was preliminary and that Council does not have this document. Mrs. Tompkins stated that she has a problem and that the same thing keeps occurring. Since Council is essentially responsible for the expenditures of the city by ordinance, we need to get a better process to avoid over appropriating based on income plus the carryover. Mrs. Tompkins stated that it is significant and has been done over the last four (4) years that we had a CAFR. In 2002, the year-end was not closed properly it was dramatic. In 2003 it also had some problems, a new Finance Director who again did not get closure on things. In 2004 sort of reduced again and the comments were that it would be watched and would not happen again. In 2005 it was worse, the over appropriations was unbelievable. How does Council know what is practical to appropriate, because this looks like a major shell game going on. Money is being moved here and there, and Council has no possible way of knowing when they are over appropriating until the very last minute. Mrs. Tompkins stated that this could be the exact reason the original Charter stated that we do not transfer money until year-end. Mrs. Tompkins discussed Custodial Credit Risk that was **not** mentioned in the management letter. Mrs. Tompkins stated that last year she discussed having only \$300,000.00 insured and it came to pass that they have certain things the State allows them to put in a combination of funds in other banks and is covered in some sense. However, Custodial Credit Risk for deposits is a risk that in the event of a bank failure the city will not be able to recover deposits or collateral securities that are in the position of outside parties. At year end the amount of the city's deposits were \$4,197,533.00. The bottom line is that only \$300,000.00 was insured by the bank. The CAFR goes on to state that nearly \$4,000,030.00 was exposed to Custodial Credit Risk because it was not collateral. It further states that the city has no policy for Custodial Credit Risk beyond the requirements of the State Statutes, and they suggest changing this. This needs to be looked at very closely and addressed because this is money being exposed that belongs to the entire community. Mrs. Tompkins stated that she has issues with the current Finance Director signing this 2005 CAFR; it should be corrected to state that he is signing on behalf of the past Finance Director. Along this same line Mr. Braman and Mr. Jones were not even on Council in 2005 and should be remedied, as they were not responsible for 2005. Mrs. Tompkins suggested someone internally review these documents before it goes out for printing. Mrs. Tompkins stated that the Auditors suggest the city set up some type of an Audit Committee and she felt this was a good plan, and was recommended to the Mayor several times. Mr. Zita inquired as to when Council would be provided a copy of the management letter? Mr. Moss stated that officially the management letter is released with the audit opinion and he expects to have this any time.

2005 CAFR (Comprehensive Annual Financial Report) Review

Mr. Pelot questioned how Mrs. Tompkins received a copy of this letter, when Council did not? Mrs. Tompkins stated that she received a copy because she asked for one. Mr. Moss stated that Mrs. Tompkins received an advanced draft and he would see that Council has a copy if they wish. Mrs. Tompkins stated that in the past when she picked up her copy of the CAFR, the management letter as well as the city's audit was also included. Mr. Moss stated that she would have received this at a later point in the process, after it was actually approved. Mrs. Tompkins stated that was not correct. Mr. Moss stated that she could not have received the audit opinion until the Auditor of State released it. Mrs. Tompkins stated that there has been a lot of dialogue on this, with the associates in Canton, the Auditors office in Columbus, etc. Mr. Zita suggested we hold off on this discussion until Council has received the official management letter, there were no objections from the members. This matter will appear on the next Committee Work Session for October 16, 2006.

Sewer Fees Discussion

Mr. Price stated that although we will be discussing this tonight, he wanted to leave this on the agenda. Mr. Doug Loehr, Owner and CEO of Pride One Norton, was present and voiced his concerns with the extensive tap in fees here in Norton. Mr. Loehr indicated that the expensive tap in fees has caused three (3) potential builders to pull out of this project due to the tap in fees. Mr. Loehr indicated that Pride One has also put a hold on this project due to the additional expenses. Mr. Loehr went on to explain that in most cities, the average tap in fees are approximately \$3,000.00 to \$4,000.00. Mr. Loehr stated that for Norton they are approximately \$8,000.00. Mr. Loehr stated that he would like to meet with city officials to get a breakdown on exactly what these fees are. Mr. Price indicated that some other communities might have their own utility departments, which we do not and asked Mr. Loehr what he is used to expecting. Mr. Loehr cited examples in Medina County; Medina City and that the fees are relatively close because Medina County controls the sewers and tap in fees. Mr. Pritchard stated that Summit County still has the old school type of agreements, and they have gone to JEDD districts in order to capture more revenue. Mr. Lehr stated that he would be more than willing to provide the city with a listing of what other community's charge. Mr. Loehr stated that he has never seen a community charge as much as Norton does for their tap in fees. Mr. Loehr discussed the inactivity with the Rondy property (potential golf course community) and felt the reason for the delay could very well be the excessive tap in fee charges. Mr. Loehr discussed the double fees Barberton is charging for Norton residents and stated that this was totally unfair, nor does it make sense. Mr. Pritchard indicated that Pride One has two items to complete on their project before they can break ground. Mr. Price asked how many homes are being developed? Mr. Loehr stated that Phase I is a total of 78 homes, with a variety of styles and the total project at full build out has 400-500 range in the next 8-10 years. Mr. McGlone was concerned when Pride One was made aware of our tap in fees, and Mr. Pritchard stated that they were informed from the very beginning. Mr. Collins discussed the \$8,000.00 fee and was unsure where Mr. Loehr obtained this figure from; the City of Norton fee is \$3,800.00, in addition to the fees Barberton charges, however the total of \$8,000.00 is not a true number. Mr. Loehr stated that he felt these fees need to be restructured. Mr. Pritchard indicated that we have discussed these fees and we have some issues with Barberton to resolve. Mr. Pritchard stated that we have discussed where the money goes from the aspects of both cities. Mr. Pritchard stated that the city has been negotiating with Barberton for quite some time and there are some inherent issues within the agreement and we are trying to resolve these issues. Mr. Pritchard mentioned Cuyahoga Falls as another city that has similar fee structures. Mr. Moss stated that the city pays out a lot, we pay 40% of some of our income tax revenue, which over the past four (4) years has averaged about \$100,000.00.

Sewer Fees Discussion

You also have the City of Barberton claiming that we have underpaid them and they feel we need to pay more than this, which is an issue pending with the courts. In addition to this, the city has an open obligation to maintain the entire infrastructure and to maintain Barberton's infrastructure if our usage would go up. Mr. Moss stated that at some point we may want to consider getting some expertise in here to consider developing and recommend to Council what options are realistic. Mr. Pritchard stated that as an addition note, the Comprehensive Master Plan is a major component of the utilities. Mr. Pritchard stated that one of the companies working on the Master Plan is Floyd Browne, which has an excellent reputation for engineering for water and sewer development. Mr. Pritchard stated that the issue is that you have to get your ducks all lined up before moving forward. Mr. Jones stated that we are hearing the same issues all of the time, here we have a developer that cannot seem to be able to move forward. Mr. Pritchard stated that he could agree; however he cannot change what was done within the city in the past. Mr. Loehr stated that their project is on hold due to a combination of things, tap in fees, builders pulling out, slowing down in the housing market, etc. Mr. Pritchard asked if Pride One had approached Barberton City Council regarding their tap in fees? Mr. Loehr stated that they did and were told by Barberton that "we are here". Mr. Loehr stated that until you get total engineering costs for your development, you really do not know what your total costs are going to be. Mr. Loehr stated that in addition to the high tap in fees, they also have a lot of permit fees for the project. Mr. Loehr stated that he liked developing in the City of Norton, the staff has been nothing but great to work with and he has no issue with the city. Mr. Loehr stated that if the city had its own utility department or at least total control it would be a fair tap in fee. Mr. Lino, a Norton resident, inquired of the tap in fees included the connection costs, and Mr. Moss stated no, this is an additional cost. Mr. Lino stated that Council needs to remember that in the future when negotiating a deal, that you don't always get what you want, case in point is the deal with Barberton. Mr. Price stated that we all hear about the problem, but what is the solution? We need to brainstorm and do something, and would like to keep this item on the agenda. Mr. Pritchard discussed contacting Floyd Browne and asking them to attend our discussions and ideas on how the city could move forward. Mr. Jones inquired about the sewer issues for the residents on Weber Drive. Mr. Pritchard stated that the plans are for the sewer line being installed by the Millers. No one will have to connect to the sanitary sewer line unless if and when the Barberton Health Dept. has determined that their septic system has failed, or if they chose to connect on their own. Mr. Pritchard stated that one resident in this area had contacted him regarding the time line because this resident wants to connect. Mr. Jones inquired about the cost to the residents to connect in that area and that he heard the number was extremely high. Mr. Pritchard stated that he has also heard of these high numbers, however he would love to know where they came from. Mr. Pritchard would not speculate on the true actual costs due to so many variables involved. Mr. Price discussed having some of the residents getting together and if they all do it at the same time it would be cheaper for them. Mr. Price stated that there already is a mechanism in place for this, it is a special assessment process, however the city is responsible for all of the engineering expenses involved. Mr. Pritchard asked to have those "high numbers" that were quoted to the residents verified in writing. Mr. Jones discussed the special assessment process and wondered if this would be helpful with Pride One? Mr. Pritchard indicated special assessments are typically geared for small projects, such as water lines, sidewalks, etc. Mr. Pritchard stated that it would not apply for Pride One. Mr. Collins elaborated and stated that Pride One is not running lines outside of their development, and is not a public improvement. Mr. Pelot stated that if the city did not charge tap in fees, we would have very little money for matching funds to secure grants, therefore costing the residents even more for projects. Mr. Collins gave the example of the 2000-2001 Barber Road sewer project, this was an assessment project and grant money was involved.

Sewer Fees Discussion continued:

Mr. Collins stated that at the time the city had no funding and we had to borrow our 50% share and we are still paying on this loan, and will be for 20 years. Mr. Collins stated that the issue with Gardner Blvd Phases were all done with grant money and assessed for long term, however we had our 50% matching share because of these fees being collected. Mr. Braman inquired if Summit County would be involved with the Weber Drive sewer line project? Mr. Pritchard stated that it would connect into a Summit County sanitary sewer line. Mr. Braman inquired if the residents in that area would be paying three (3) different fees? Mr. Pritchard answered that is possible. Mr. Braman inquired if there would be lateral lines to make it easier for future hook ups? Mr. Pritchard stated that typically there are some agencies that have different construction standards. Mr. Pritchard stated that Summit County prefers not to put in taps or laterals because it protects the integrity of the system when they do the air testing. If you have lateral lines you have a greater potential of leakage. Mr. Pritchard stated that it's not such an issue to make a tap into the sanitary line. Mr. Braman stated that the depths could be twenty (20) feet, and that would be an issue. Mr. Pritchard stated that is a fairly deep line, and in most cases would not be so deep, it just depends on the location, depth, topography, where it is within the system, and many other variables that come into play. Mr. Braman gave the example of Wooster Road West as being very deep, as well as the one along Greenwich Road. Mr. Pelot stated that we do have some deep lines in order to serve larger areas, however, we also have sanitary lines within the city that are so shallow that you cannot extend the system. Mr. Pritchard stated this is the exact reason why you need to have engineered designed plans for the sanitary sewers, water and storm sewers, you just cannot use a manhole just because it is there. Mr. Alex Stavarz, a Norton resident, questioned the comments by Mr. Pritchard regarding the lateral lines not being a good idea. Mr. Pritchard indicated that is up to the engineer such as Summit County or whoever has the policy or their design criteria, and that the city does not have specifications on how to make that system. If it is a Summit County system, it would be their determination and it is their call. Mr. Stavarz discussed the sewer line on Greenwich Road near the Albrecht Plaza, and that another contractor who worked on this job indicated that it was the city that made the decision not to put in lateral lines. Mr. Stavarz stated that from what he understood the person was paying for the line said they would put laterals in but not at their expense. Mr. Stavarz stated that someone chose not to do that, they just ran the line straight up through there and made the connections for their own purposes. Mr. Pritchard stated that he could verify if this was a Summit County decision or who. Mr. Stavarz stated that testing the line has nothing to do with if a lateral line is installed or not. They run laterals along all of the properties on Barber Road, and they were tested and they do work. Mr. Stavarz discussed the costs for the residents to hook up along Weber Drive, and he stated that they would likely be paying all three entities and would likely be close to the \$8,000.00 figure. Mr. Moss stated that when you have government entities installing a line, the city could request lateral lines or over sized lines as an option. Mr. Moss stated that because of the lack of revenue and at that time this was not an option and the only option would have been to access the property owners along the line who didn't want it in the first place. Mr. Stavarz stated that the city could have done that on their own, and he was not certain that the property owners to the north were given this option. Mr. Stavarz stated that if they were told it would cost them \$15,000.00 to hook up later or \$3,000.00 now to get this lateral in position for them to use at a later point, it would be a no-brainer. Mr. Moss stated that those residents who opted not to hook up fifteen (15) years ago have seen a huge increase in costs for contractor fees, permits, materials, etc. Mr. Moss stated that delaying this was not a wise financial decision for them. Mr. Stavarz stated that he felt it would have been a whole lot cheaper to put the lateral lines on and in place for future use, rather than go back and have to re-construct each one of those laterals one at a time.

Sewer Fees Discussion continued:

Mr. Zita agreed, adding that if we would have expanded Cleveland-Massillon Road ten (10) years ago, it would have been a whole lot cheaper than it would be now. Mr. Stavarz stated that Mr. Zita was missing his point, his point is relative costs. The costs of going down and making a special excavation twenty five (25) feet in the ground just to hook on one lateral is far more expensive than it would have been to hook the lateral on when the original excavation was made and they were already there. Mr. Zita stated that this might be the case, however someone would have to pay for that extra expense. Mr. Stavarz stated that you have money for ball fields and parks and this would have been a small cost at the time. Mr. Price stated that if you have a project going on, you need to notify the residents with their options of paying today or in the future. Mr. Price stated that it appears the residents were not informed with this last project. Mr. Price stated when it comes time for the Weber Drive project; all of these residents need to be informed of their options so they can make a good decision. Mr. Price stated that he wanted to leave this on Matters Referred until we could have someone from Floyd Browne Group present for the discussion. Mr. Stavarz suggested that Council adopt legislation requiring the city and other developers or whoever extends a main sewer line be required to put the lateral lines in at the same time the main line is being installed. It is better off for the residents and this community to do this at the time of construction rather than at a later time. Mr. Price inquired if there was any grant money available for this? Mr. Pritchard stated that it is project dependent and may not always apply. Mr. Pelot inquired how many residents could tap into a lateral line, could three (3) or four (4) households pool their money together and do this? Mr. Pritchard stated that typically it is one connection per lateral, and would be an engineering question that could be addressed when Floyd Browne attends the next discussion on this.

OLD BUSINESS:

Mr. McGlone inquired about financing on the Johnson Meadows Project. Mr. Moss indicated that the renewal for the note would be presented at the next Committee Work Session. Mr. Moss stated that we are looking at renewing our note to finance the project and in two years from now this project has to go into an assessment process. Mr. Moss stated that it is his understanding that the church wants to go forward next year, however there is no guarantee this will be done, no can he guarantee that the amount we financed in the past is going to be enough to build the road. We should consider going forward and re-financing one more time because we don't want to be caught short with no money in place if they do begin the project.

Mr. McGlone inquired about the status of the 2007 Budget, and where does this stand? Mr. Moss stated that his office has been busy preparing work sheets for each department and would be submitted to each department shortly. This will be reviewed by the Administration as far as projects and needs, etc. Once this has been reviewed it would be presented to Council within the next few months. Mr. Moss discussed the 2006 Budget and that what was budgeted for salaries is insufficient given the raises that have occurred when initially there were no raises within the 2006 Budget. Mr. Moss explained that what he has done was to create spreadsheets to reflect the actual costs for salaries that are currently in place. Mr. Moss stated that a budget increase would be required for 2006 and he would be bringing this to Council in the very near future. Mr. Moss stated that there might be other expenses that the need this year exceeds the current budget.

Mr. McGlone discussed the Norton Aggregation Program and the recent letters for one year plan and then another letter for a two-year plan. Mr. Collins stated that originally the price was struck for \$11.99 5 per MCF for one year plan with WPS Energy. Since then the price has fallen and about a week ago Buckeye Energy struck another price with WPS for \$10.95 per MCF for two (2) years.

Old Business Continued:

Mr. Collins indicated that letters would be issued shortly for that new rate. Mr. McGlone clarified that you are in it unless you opt out.

Mr. Zita discussed the Gardner Blvd. Phase III project and inquired as to the delay, he thought it was to begin in September. Mr. Collins stated that the contractor has decided to hold off until around November 1, 2006. Mr. Collins indicated that as soon as he has a confirmed date a press release would be issued soon.

Mr. Braman inquired about the sidewalks project, and if this was put off until next year also? Mr. Collins stated that we did one portion along Columbia Woods Drive, which was the worst area, and a first priority. Mr. Collins stated that the Fire Department area would probably be next, then Norton Center.

Mr. Braman inquired about the size of the sewer line recently installed at city hall. Mr. Collins stated that it is a two (2) inch line with a force main and a grinder pump.

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Jones stated that Chief Calco has passed his probationary period, would he be required now to move into the city? Mr. Collins stated that this was partially correct and that Chief Calco has 90 days from the probationary period to move within a twelve (12) mile radius of the flagpole at city hall.

Mr. Pelot questioned if we could do anything with the Johnson Meadows Project to make sure we start getting money back. Mr. Moss stated that this is already in place, this is a special assessment project. They came in and petitioned us to finance this and they would pay for it on their taxes. It is a five (5) year program, at the end of the five (5) years we have to close our books and say this is what we have spent and they would have to pay it as part of their taxes. They do have an option of paying a lump sum or over ten (10) years with collection costs and interests. Mr. Moss stated that at the end of the five (5) year period the arrangement for the special assessment is over, you could do another one, or not. Mr. Moss stated that this one has to wrap up soon and the costs that have been paid so far include lots of interest, and some associated costs. Mr. Pelot asked if the city has received any payments so far from the church. Mr. Moss stated that they have not. Mr. Pelot asked how much has the city paid out so far? Mr. Moss answered \$166,641.83 and of that amount \$51,000.00 is interest.

Mayor Kernan announced the Public Forum for the Norton Comprehensive Plan Group on October 12, 2006 at 6:30 PM at the Community Center. Mayor Kernan stated that the Flu Shot Clinic would be October 30, 2006 from 9:00 AM from 12:00 Noon at the Community Center. The costs are \$17.00 for Norton residents and \$21.50 for non-residents. Mayor Kernan reminded everyone that there is still a job opening for the Building & Zoning Inspector and the details are on the city's web site at www.cityofnorton.org. Mayor Kernan stated that because of the Norton Homecoming being held on October 28, 2006, we have moved the date for citywide Trick or Treat to Sunday, October 29, 2006 from 5:00 to 8:00 PM. Mayor Kernan thanked the Cider Festival Committee; Mike Meden, June and Rick Maier, John Cunningham, Pat Snyder, Rob Snyder, Julie Miller and everyone else who worked in this years festival.

Mike Zita announced an annual pancake breakfast for the Norton Fire Department for Saturday October 6, 2006 from 7:00 AM to 12:00 Noon. Adult tickets are \$5.00, ages 5-12 are \$3.00 and children under 5 years of age are free. This is at Fire Station #1 at Greenwich Road.

PUBLIC COMMENT-NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Mr. John Carris Sr. asked what is the city doing with all of the dirt at the ball fields? Mr. Collins stated that all of the dirt has been spoken for.

TOPICS FOR NEXT WORK SESSION:

Mr. Zita asked if we are doing anything with the cell phone legislation, and Mr. Jones stated that he felt no one wanted to do anything with this, and suggested it be removed from the list. Mr. Jones stated that California is going to ban cell phones except for hands free usage. Mr. Zita stated that he has received more complaints about cats in Norton acres, there are supposedly eighteen (18) cats at one residence. Mr. Zita stated that we need to do something about this and he would be gathering information from other cities. Mr. Jones inquired if this would be a health issue, and Mr. Zita stated that is possible and that he would put a call into the Barberton Health District.

ADJOURN:

There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Michael Zita, President of Council

All Committee Meetings will be held at the Norton Safety Administration Building, unless otherwise noted. If you do not have access to Time-Warner Channel #15, you may request to view a copy of any VHS recorded meeting in Council Chambers. Please contact Ann Campbell in the Administration office to make the necessary arrangements at (330) 825-7815 ext. 14