



COMMITTEE WORK SESSION MAY 21, 2007

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

Also Present: Mayor James A. Price
John Moss
Jeff Pritchard
Karla Richards
Ann Campbell

The Committee Work Session convened on Monday, May 21, 2007 at 7:00 PM, in Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Council President, Dennis McGlone. Following a salute to the flag and the Pledge of Allegiance, there was a moment of silent prayer.

Committee Work Session General Discussion:

Summit Ridge Development-Tap in fees

Mrs. Hlas announced that Ms. Pat Rakoci of Pride One Development (Summit Ridge) was present to address Council. Ms. Rakoci distributed a copy of the economic study and map of the overall project, (see attached). Ms. Rakoci stated that they need help with the tap in fees so that they can start construction. Ms. Rakoci indicated that they would hope to begin moving dirt within the next thirty (30) to sixty (60) days, and get the road in by November in 1-A, 1-B and possibly 1-C. Mr. Doug Loehr, also of Pride One Development, discussed the problems with obtaining builders. Mr. Loehr indicated that they have talked to ten (10) different builders and the biggest problem we have is the up front cost of tap in fees, and this is our only hurdle with getting the project started. Mr. Loehr stated that today he met with Mayor Price, Mr. Ryland to discuss ways to address this issue that is equitable for both sides. Mr. Ryland stated that they discussed a proposal to defer \$500,000.00 in up front tap in fees, or the first one hundred (100) to one hundred and fifty (150) homes. By deferring that amount, it would allow for the developer to get the project started. Mr. Ryland indicated that at no point would the city lose any money, the city would be made whole. Mr. Ryland stated that the key to this is that the city would not be shorted from any of the anticipated tap in fees, it only delays when we receive the fees from the developer, and it also shows a positive reaction on the city's part to get builders and developers to come into the city. Mrs. Hlas concurred with the ideas of the plan, and asked when would the city actually get reimbursed?

Summit Ridge Development-Tap in fees continued

Mr. Ryland stated that it could be done in several different ways; it could be a five (5) or seven (7) year term, at completion of the project, or an additional fee added to each of the tap in fee. Mrs. Hlas asked how Council felt about the idea? Mr. Mowery indicated that this project has been in the works for some time. Mr. Mowery stated that the city would be under no risk, we just deferring our money owed to us. Mr. Ryland clarified that there is always a risk, the developer could go bankrupt, however he does not see this happening. Mr. Loehr stated that the real estate is there, and the lots are in place and ready to go. Mr. Loehr stated that we have been around for nearly eighteen (18) years and we are an employee owned company with forty six (46) employees. Mr. McGlone stated that if the city cannot do something to help, this developer may just leave town. Mr. Loehr stated that we cannot get financing unless we have builders under contract. Mr. Loehr indicated that they have a lot of up front money already invested for the project. Mr. Zita stated that he was very supportive of this project, however he questioned the impact this may have with past or present developers within the city. Mr. Ryland stated that there would be no impact because the city is going to be made whole, and we are not lowering the fees or abating the fees. Mr. Ryland stated that this is a large project with 514 homes and if someone else were to come to us with this size of a project it is something worth taking a look at. Mrs. Elaine Tompkins, a Norton resident, stated that she was sympathetic with this however we went down this road with a previous development that has not come to fruition. Mrs. Tompkins stated that the city borrowed over \$510,000.00 for the Johnson Meadows project nearly five (5) years ago and we have received nothing out of that. Mrs. Tompkins stated that the reason for mentioning this is so that when considering this option, you should consider certain benchmarks, premiums, and penalties built in to protect the city. Mr. Ryland reminded everyone that there is always a risk, however the first part of this project involves over \$350,000.00 to bring in water and sewer lines. If things were to go belly-up, those improvements would still be under ground for the city to be used later on. Mr. Pelot stated that he agreed with the idea of deferral it sets a positive city image that we are willing to work with developers and builders. Mr. Jones stated that this is a very large development, however we are still paying on the loan for the Johnson Meadows project. Mr. Moss concurred that we have borrowed the money for the Johnson Meadows project and anticipate that they will get this project done, and we a sitting on the edge of our seats, and if they don't, the five year time frame would be up. Mr. Jones discussed the fact the our tap in fees are the third highest in comparison to other communities. Mr. Moss clarified this statement, adding that if you are looking at the combined Barberton/Norton fees, then yes that is correct, however if you are only looking at the Norton fee, this is not the case. Mr. Jones stated that he wants to be assured that the utilities installed belong to the City of Norton, if this project should fail. Mr. Jones asked Mayor Price if he felt comfortable with this arrangement, and Mayor Price replied yes. Mayor Price stated that he agreed with Mr. Pelot's statement regarding the city's image and potential growth with 514 homes. Mayor Price stated that he initially had concerns with the impact on our schools, however that has been addressed. Mayor Price thanked Mr. Ryland, and Mr. Moss for coming up with this idea. Mayor Price stated that Mr. Ryland has come up with an excellent idea and he wants Council to move forward on this. Mr. Jones stated that with Mayor Prices' comments, he would support this. Mrs. Hlas asked Mr. Ryland if he would be able to come forward with a detailed plan for the next work session on June 4, 2007. Mr. Ryland stated that we would be able to accomplish this relatively quickly from our end, they may need to work out some other details with the City of Barberton.

Summit Ridge Development-Tap in fees continued:

Mr. Pelot stated that he would rather see this agreement include a set term for the repayment rather than at full build out. If the project extends from seven (7) years to possibly ten (10) years, it would be longer for the city to get their money for the tap ins. Mr. Pritchard stated that he agreed with the term arrangement. Mr. Pritchard stated that depending on the outcome of our other utility studies and reports and the timing of potentially constructing new facilities, we would be in need of a revenue source and adequate funding for that. Mr. Pritchard stated that the City of Norton and the City of Akron are the only communities involved with a JEDD and in order to be fair we need to really split the Norton fees separately from the Barberton fees. Mr. Pritchard stated that he was in agreement with this and as long as the city is made whole, this should be worked out rather easily. Mr. Loehr thanked Mr. Ryland and Mayor Price for taking the time to sit down with them and work this issue out, and for council to meet with Ms. Rakoci. Mr. Loehr stated that he no longer felt that Norton has a bad image. Ms. Rakoci also thanked each of the Council members for their time.

Ord. #93-2006 Sewer Connections

Mrs. Hlas stated that she spoke with Mr. Pritchard today and apparently his version and Council's version of Ord. #93-2006 are quite different, and that Mr. Pritchard still is not ready to bring this to Council. Mr. Pelot stated that he felt it was double dipping with the right-of-way fee and the sewer application fee. If you are paying for the application of a sewer permit you are obviously working within the right-of way. Mr. Pritchard stated that it is not double dipping and this has been discussed with Mr. Lyons. Mr. Pelot suggested tying these fees together so it does not appear that you are paying twice for the same thing. Mr. Pritchard stated that he has added ten (10) pages to this and it is something that should not be rushed into. Mrs. Hlas asked if Ord. #93-2006 has had any readings on Council, and Mr. McGlone stated that it has. Mrs. Hlas suggested we get rid of Ord. #93-2006 because when this comes back to Council it would probably be later on in the year and should have a new number. Mr. Pritchard agreed that this is a good idea because the new version would address a whole host of new items. Mrs. Hlas suggested that at the next Council meeting Ord #93-2006 should be tabled indefinitely. Mr. Jones stated that it was Mr. Collins who originally created Ord #93-2006 and we have had four (4) different versions of this. Mr. Jones questioned Section A-the Administrative Officer having sole authority, and that he felt that any one person should not have this authority. Mr. Jones suggested that the new version list the City Administrator, Municipal Engineer and maybe the Chair of the Utilities Committee. Mr. Pritchard stated that Mr. Collins wore three (3) hats with his position and one of them was the Director of Public Service, which is over the Municipal Engineer. Mr. Ryland agreed with Mr. Jones, with something this big, it should also include the Municipal Engineer. Mr. Braman questioned if the results from the feasibility study would have any impact on this legislation? Mr. Pritchard replied no. This new version would address general provisions, connections, etc. Mr. Pelot briefly discussed the OSHA safety requirements and questioned if this would be spelled out within the legislation or revert back to OSHA standards? Mr. Pritchard replied that OSHA prevails; however we could have some control on our end.

Acceptance of Stonewyck Phase II

Mr. Braman stated that it appears that Stonewyck Phase II is ready for dedication and he drove around this development today. Mr. Pritchard stated that the applicant has submitted a punch list to the Municipal Engineer and that approximately 99% of those items are completed. Mr. Pritchard stated that the remaining issues are with the seeding and some minor debris needs to be removed. Mr. Pritchard stated that the only question he has is if the seeding has to be redone, adding that we need proper coverage from the city's standpoint. Mr. Ryland agreed with the seeding and erosion issues along the retention pond. Mr. Pritchard asked Council to consider waiving readings. Mr. Pritchard stated that they have seven (7) or eight (8) lots for sale waiting for the dedication to take place in order for them to proceed. There was discussion if the seeding issues could be written into the legislation, and Mr. Zita discussed the bonding issue in place. Mr. Ryland stated that he and Mr. Pritchard drove the entire site and walked around and the seeding and erosion issues are all they noticed. Mr. Ryland suggested that these issues could be a direct result of the one (1) inch of rain we had recently and this might have washed the seed away. Mr. Pritchard stated that we do have a maintenance bond in place, however Council could request they take another look at the retention area to assure that it is protected and seeded properly. Mr. Pelot inquired if the roads are done and if they have been inspected? Mr. Pritchard stated that the roads are done and were inspected. We had the contractor come back out to perform some minor modifications and repairs, and various city officials also have inspected this. Mr. Braman moved to place this on Councils next agenda waiving second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Zita.

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

Motion passed 7-0.

Fire/EMS Levy

Mr. Mowery stated that he talked with the Administration earlier today, and turned the discussion over to Mr. Moss for the details. Mr. Moss explained the detailed figures in the documents he presented (see attached). Mr. Jones asked Mr. Moss what he suggested, and Mr. Moss indicated that he decided on a new three (3) mill levy. Mr. Moss stated that he projects that in 2009 the city would be in the hole over \$500,000.00 in the Fire/EMS fund. Mr. Moss stated that to try and cut that amount from the budget is not going to work unless you have a reduction in services. Mr. Moss stated that by cutting staff it reduces our response time for the residents. Mr. Moss stated that it only makes sense to let the residents decide if they would support a new 3 mill levy in order to continue the services we now provide to them. Mr. Moss stated that Station #1 needs extensive roof and building repairs, it really needs to be replaced. Mr. Jones discussed the poor condition of the rear retaining wall, and Mr. Moss stated that this wall has bowed out, and is in poor condition. Mr. Moss stated that he projected the cost to replace the existing Station #1 would cost approximately \$1,400,000.00. Mr. Moss stated that a 3 mill levy would bring in \$800,000.00 each year. Mr. Jones stated that he did not see the dispatcher fees in the information provided and Mr. Moss indicated that those fees are rolled into the personnel costs. Mr. Jones stated that Mr. Moss brought this situation to Councils attention last fall and that we would need additional funding. Mr. Jones stated that the Fire/EMS Dept. is funded strictly by levies, and Mr. Moss replied not strictly. The Fire/EMS Fund does receive some additional revenue however it does not amount to very much. The additional revenue comes from EMS run fees we collect and that comes back into the fund to pay for the services. Mr. Zita explained that EMS run fees are charged to non-residents and is received from insurance companies.

Fire/EMS Levy continued:

Mr. Moss explained that because of the citizens investment in our Fire/EMS Fund, we are allowed to waive the co-pay after insurance. Mr. McGlone asked Mr. Moss why the levy situation came up so fast? Mr. Moss stated that it is a result of a delayed reaction to a few things; one is a new union contract which set costs we cannot control, and the level of service and staffing which has changed from 8-5 and call ins when necessary to the station being staffed 24/7 which resulted in extra personnel costs. Mr. Moss indicated the reason for the change in the level of service is the increase response time. Mr. Ryland stated that right now our average response time is six (6) minutes, if we do not staff the fire house this adds an additional six (6) to eight (8) minutes which is the difference in a house burning down or the loss of life. Mr. Moss stated that we simply cannot sustain this level of expenses to keep it solvent and we have already cut out the capital equipment purchases, which you cannot continue to do over a long period of time. Mr. Jones asked with a 3 mill levy what is a \$100,000.00 valued homeowner looking at, and Mr. Moss replied \$91.88 per year. Mrs. Elaine Tompkins stated that this is proposed as a new levy, however actually this is an additional levy in addition to the current levies already in place. Mrs. Tompkins expressed her concerns with the proper terminology when proposing this to the public. Mrs. Hlas questioned what the current millage of the existing levies are? Mr. Moss replied that the effective rate was originally at 4.6 mills and it is down now to 2.24 mills. Mr. Jim Lino, a Norton resident, spoke regarding the laws in the past where only property owners would be able to vote on a levy, and what this would mean. Mr. Moss stated that in the past they used to have that, you had to be a free holder or property owner in order to vote. Mr. Pelot questioned if the Administration looked at doing a five (5) year term for the additional levy instead of ten (10) years? Mr. Moss stated yes, adding that the last levies were passed in 1995 and 1988. Mr. Moss stated that with a five (5) year term your capital equipment costs and debt associated with it would be rather high. Mr. Jones inquired about grant money being available for maintenance on the building and equipment. Mr. Moss indicated that you can get a grant for just about anything, however you have to have the matching funds, know about them and get to the top of the list. Mr. Moss stated that our new Chief has been very aggressive in trying to get some of these grants going. Mr. Jones inquired on what the split would be on a grant, and Mr. Moss indicated that there is no standard, it could be 50/50 or 20/80, and it just depends. Mr. Mowery stated that we could continue this discussion at the next Work Session and more information could be gathered about the breakdowns of the money for the services provided. Mr. Jones suggested we display the information on Channel #15 and get this out to the people. Mr. Jones asked how do the people feel? Do they want to call in and tell us as Council and Administration? Mr. Moss stated that he would give this some thought and come up with some ideas on this. Mrs. Campbell stated that she was planning on getting this up on the website. There was discussion on the time line in order to get this on the November ballot. Mrs. Richards stated that this item would have to be on the June 4, 2007 Committee Work Session in order for a first reading to occur on June 11, 2007, a second reading on June 25, 2007 and the final reading on July 9, 2007. This would be the very last time for readings in order to hit the November ballot. Mr. Ryland stated that we are still looking into the language and make sure we have this right, and Mrs. Tompkins has suggested some things we also want to look into with changes to the Ohio Revised Code. Mr. Pelot suggested having Chief Calco present for those discussions. Mr. Moss stated that Chief Calco would be honored to come in and give more information on what they are doing. Mrs. Hlas asked if Station #2 was manned, and if this additional levy would address this? Mr. Moss stated that Station #2 is not manned and the levy would not address this. Mrs. Hlas asked if Station #1 was ever not manned and Mr. Ryland stated that Station #1 is manned 24/7. Mr. Pelot inquired about Station #2 with the bridges being out and if a police officer is at this location?

Fire/EMS Levy continued:

Mr. Ryland indicated that a police officer is on the west side 24/7 and they do use Station #2 to make calls, but there are no Fire/EMS personnel at this location. Mr. Zita stated that we do have mutual aid offered from Chippewa Township and Doylestown.

Codified updates

Mr. McGlone discussed the need to adopt legislation to accept the recent Codified Updates, which is through December 31, 2006. Mr. McGlone moved to add this to Councils next agenda, waiving second and third readings, seconded by Mr. Zita.

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

Motion passed 7-0.

Unfinished Business:

Mr. McGlone briefly discussed the memo from Mr. Moss regarding the purchase of recycle containers and asked if this was something we need to discuss tonight. Mr. Moss indicated that there was no need to address this tonight. Mr. McGlone indicated this would be on the agenda for the next Work Session.

CRC Res. #6-2007-Equalization Board

Mr. McGlone stated that Council had discussed this at the last meeting and there were some questions raised needing feedback from Mr. Lyons. Mrs. Hlas asked if everyone read the comments from Mr. Lyons? Ms. Megan Booth, member of the Charter Review Commission, stated that she was not aware of Mr. Lyons' comments. Mr. Pelot questioned the reference of a rotating board, and if this was intended to be a standing board? Ms. Booth stated that it would be like the jury selection but modified. This is what the citizens wanted; they wanted to provide everyone the opportunity to serve. Ms. Booth asked to have a copy of Mr. Lyons' comments and Mrs. Richards provided her with a copy. Mrs. Hlas stated that the bottom line is that Mr. Lyons' comments were that the Ohio Revised Code provides for Equalization Boards and he would prefer to stay with the existing system. Ms. Booth stated that they did look at how other communities are doing this, as well as having input from citizens that attended their meetings. Mr. Pelot questioned the need for a standing board and we have only had three (3) assessments in the last ten (10) years. Mrs. Hlas stated that the current process under the Ohio Revised Code has worked well the last two times. Ms. Booth asked if the system is not being used because the citizens don't understand how this process works? Mr. Zita stated that the only time an Equalization Board is used is when there is an assessment project. Mrs. Hlas stated that she is not in favor of this amendment where it stands. There was no motion for Council to take action on this proposed amendment. Mr. Pelot asked if anyone knew the Ohio Revised Code section relating to Equalization Boards and Mrs. Richards stated she believed it was Section 731.29.

Rescind Ord. #95-2006 Merging Parks & Recreation Board with Cemetery Board

Mr. McGlone stated that this was discussed at the last meeting, and Mrs. Richards was to look into the status of this ordinance and the potential costs.

Rescind Ord. #95-2006 Merging Parks & Recreation Board with Cemetery Board continued:

Mrs. Richards indicated that this has not been sent to the Board of Elections yet, she was waiting to send this down with other proposed Charter amendments, and that there are no cost involved if Council decides to rescind this legislation. Council would need to adopt new legislation to rescind it. Ord. #95-2006 is slated to go to the Board of Elections in time for their filing deadline and be on the November ballot as it was adopted. Mr. Pelot stated that the reason the Commission asked Council to rescind this was to keep the current number of members on the committee. Ms. Booth stated that she believed they wanted to keep everyone that was on both boards to remain on the new merged board. Mr. Zita discussed the total number of eight (8) members on the two boards and the legislation adopted has this combined board at five (5). Mrs. Hlas stated that Mr. Moss had suggested at the last meeting that the Mayor or Administration could address this until their staggered terms end it would go down to five (5) and stay at five (5) after that. Mrs. Hlas suggested we leave this as it is and let the Administration address it. Mr. Moss stated that the adopted legislation states (5) members. Mrs. Hlas questioned why did the Commission want to change it now after Council had already adopted this, and why didn't the Commission think this through before sending it to Council? Ms. Booth stated that it was well thought out, and that it was brought to our attention because they wanted to keep the same people on there. Ms. Booth stated that as with Council, sometimes things come up and you change your minds. There was discussion on the timing to rescind this and get this to the ballot. Mr. Jones recommended we rescind this and let the Commission have it back to review and bring it back to us when they complete it. Ms. Booth suggested getting together with the members and see if they can have the revision back to Council for the June 18, 2007 Work Session. Mrs. Richards advised that there would need to be a formal motion to rescind Ord. #95-2006 at Monday's Council meeting.

Ms. Charlotte Whipkey discussed the issue with the Equalization Board and asked about this being for assessed projects only? Ms. Whipkey stated that our road levy got voted down, so now they are hearing assessments on the roads. Mrs. Hlas stated that Council would have to pass that and Mr. Moss stated that Council would have to approve any assessed project, which there are none pending. Mr. Moss stated that there are no future plans for any assessment projects at this time. Ms. Whipkey stated that she was concerned about any future road levies being an assessed project. Ms. Whipkey stated that it seems Councils does not want to give the residents any kind of input on things that we will be subject to.

Mr. Jones responded to an earlier request from Mrs. Hlas to provide a copy of the price quote submitted to him by the Summit County Sheriff. Mr. Jones handed out a copy of that proposal (see attached). Mr. Jones stated that this proposal is a potential saving of \$1,400,000.00 per year. Mr. Jones stated that the reason he asked Mr. Moss earlier about the dispatchers under Fire/EMS is because the Summit County Sheriff would absorb not only the police dispatchers but also the Fire/EMS dispatchers for a cost of \$101,856,00.00. Mr. Jones stated that Norton's average Fire/EMS calls for 2003-2005 was 1184 at \$50.00 per call that's \$59,200.00. Mr. Pelot stated that he disagreed with a lot of the figures as proposed. Mr. Jones stated that this is something the community needs to take a look at. Mr. Jones stated that the Summit County Sheriff's Office is the fourth (4th) largest in the State of Ohio with over 524 employees. Mr. Jones indicated that he was not the only Council member that inquired about their services. Last March a Council member contacted the Summit County Sheriff's Office asking for help stating "The residents are complaining about the Norton Police".

Unfinished Business continued:

Mr. Jones stated that the savings of \$1,400,000.00 could be earmarked for water, sewer, roads, etc. Mr. Jones stated that the six (6) members of Council do not have the right to deny the Norton voters their right to vote on this issue. Mrs. Hlas stated that it was difficult to comment on the information Mr. Jones just handed out, however she is working on a spreadsheet. Mrs. Hlas and commented on the actual amounts spent versus the amount budget for the Norton Police Dept. in the last several years, and the grant money received, the fact the we are self insured, etc. and that some of those costs do not disappear. Mrs. Hlas stated that she has a copy of the City of Green's contract which is valid through 2008 and that \$165,993.00 was additional expenses above and beyond their contract price just for 2006. Mrs. Hlas discussed the possibility of losing our Mayors Court because we would no longer have a Police Dept., and that the State is trying to abolish Mayors Courts, that's approximately \$200,000.00 in annual revenue. Mrs. Hlas discussed the loss of income tax, which is approximately \$24,500.00 that would disappear. Mrs. Hlas stated that once you take apples to apples comparison the closest savings she comes up with is maybe \$100,000.00 to \$150,000.00 savings. We still have control with the budget of our own Police Dept., once you outsource you give up that control, and if you feel the Police Dept. budget is too high then cut it back. Mrs. Hlas stated that to say the savings is \$1,400,000 savings as indicated on page #4 is asinine because its not. Mrs. Hlas stated that the budget and actual are two (2) different things. Mr. Pelot stated that the Summit County Sheriff is not providing actual costs, they are proposing fourteen (14) officers instead of twenty-six (26). There was further discussion and Mr. Jones moved to place on Council's next agenda a proposal to allow the Summit County Sheriff to patrol the City of Norton and put it to the voters, there was no second to the motion. Mrs. Hlas reminded everyone that we have a contract with the Norton Police Dept. through 2008 and we would still have to absorb those costs. Mr. Jones stated that the Police Dept. contract was just settled back on April 19, 2007, and asked Mr. Moss what it cost the city to settle this contract? Mr. Moss stated that this contract was hotly contested because we did not have the resources to pay what they wanted. Mr. Jones stated the figure Mr. Moss gave him earlier was \$5,000.00 and Mr. Moss stated that was for the appeal process. Mr. Mowery stated that Mr. Jones was jumping way to fast and this is a disservice to the residents. Mr. Mowery stated that we need to compare apples to apples and these figures are not even close. Mrs. Tompkins discussed the actual figures spent from 2000 to 2006, and that police cruisers are not capital equipment, they are expendables. Mrs. Tompkins stated that there is a \$1,000,000.00 difference in the last seven (7) years actual figures. Mrs. Tompkins stated that Council needs to ask the Police Dept. the question as to why is there such a large variance in such a short period of time. The point is can we do this better and equally as well and cost effective for the city? Ms. Booth stated that the citizens should have heard this before the lawsuit by our own Police Dept. went through. Ms. Booth disagreed with Mrs. Hlas' comments about the loss of income tax, you would still have these people working in Norton and still paying income tax. Ms. Booth stated that some of the figures are misleading. Mr. Jones stated that he tried to get Council to address this tonight and put it to the voters, but they don't want to listen to it. Mr. Jones stated that Council has left him with no other choice than to take out an initiative petition and that he has approximately three (3) months to gather the four-hundred (400) plus signatures to get on the ballot this fall. Ms. Whipkey discussed the contract with the Police Dept. for 2006, asked when this was settled, the residents should have been told about this? Mr. Moss stated that it was effective in January 2006 however the salary issue was not resolved until the end of the appeal process and is now retroactive to 2006. Ms. Whipkey clarified that we now have to pay retroactive pay back to January 1, 2006 and they got their 3% raise, and Mr. Moss replied yes.

Unfinished Business continued:

Ms. Whipkey asked why it was not mentioned to the people, we have had several meetings since this was settled and not a word of it was mentioned? Ms. Whipkey stated that you sit up there and give the Mayor a raise, vote on levies, and then you deny the right of the people to vote on something that would help us. Ms. Whipkey discussed the insurance perks council members get if you are here long enough. Mr. Jones stated that he mentioned earlier that he was not the only one on Council that went back a year ago last March and asked the Sheriff for a quote for the City of Green as to what they could do for our city. Mr. McGlone stated that he was the one who contacted the Sheriff's office because he wanted to see the same thing Mrs. Hlas has, he wanted to know what was in their contract. Mr. Jones stated that Mr. McGlone also told the Sheriff that 'the residents of Norton are complaining about the Norton Police Department'. Mr. McGlone replied yes, and that he wanted to see the City of Green's contract, and asked what this has to do with it? Mrs. Tompkins discussed the impact on our property taxes and suggested we get more use from Summit County money coming in this community. We are spending a lot of money for duplicated services in Summit County and there has got to be a better way to handle our money. Ms. Booth asked for a side by side comparison for the Summit County Sheriff's proposal, and to let the public see the final spreadsheet and find out the exact numbers. Ms. Booth indicated that and she would like Mr. Moss to go over the numbers and make sure they are accurate. Ms. Booth stated that she would be more than happy to sit down and go over that information with a committee of citizens.

New Business:

None

Non-Agenda Items:

None

Topics for the next Work Session:

Fire/EMS Levy information, and Recycling Grant purchase of recycling containers

Adjourn

There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 PM.

Dennis McGlone, President of Council

****NOTE: THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATIM****

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.