



COMMITTEE WORK SESSION FEBRUARY 17, 2015

Committee Members Present: Scott Pelot-Excused
 Dennis McGlone
 Danny Grether
 Dennis Pierson
 Paul Tousley
 Charlotte Whipkey
 Rich Rodgers

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

The Committee Work Session convened on Monday, February 17, 2015 at 7:00 PM, in the Council Chambers of the Safety Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Rick Rodgers, 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:

In Site-DB Hart Presentation Community Reinvestment Corp.

Mr. Grether turned this discussion over to Mrs. Carr for the introduction and details. Mrs. Carr had invited them to attend several weeks ago. Mrs. Carr stated we have two (2) presentations that compliment each other. In Site and DB Hart will present their overviews of the CRA and that Jennifer Syx was here from In Site Development which may also be able to assist in the discussions regarding the Planning Director position and Mrs. Carr suggested we at least put them on a contractual basis in the interim with the city's direction as far as filling this position. Mrs. Carr noted the steps with a Community Investment Corporation in efforts to move forward. Mrs. Carr noted that DB Hart will also present and they were involved with the 2006 Master Plan, and Mr. Hart is present for their discussion. Mrs. Carr noted there is no pending legislation with either of these issues. Ms. Syx introduced her counterpart, Mr. Jordan Warfield. Her company was developed in 2014 to help communities develop. Ms. Syx provided everyone with a power point presentation, (see attached). Ms. Syx stated what they suggest is developing the entire city as a CRA with commercial and industrial, no residential.

Mrs. Carr added that when she originally sat down with Ms. Syx it was evident that the zoning in Norton is a hodge podge and all over the place which is why we felt it was best to have the entire City be determined a CRC, which is what most cities are doing. Ms. Syx discussed the aspects of a revenue share with the School district if new payroll exceeds \$1 million dollars and the City would share in that revenue. Ms. Whipkey asked about the properties involved with a JED and Ms. Syx stated that would need to be reviewed. Ms. Syx stated once the city receives CRC that is an excellent marketing tool to be used to bring in businesses to your community. Ms. Whipkey stated this sounds similar to a TIF and Ms. Syx stated that a TIF is more for public improvements and a CRC benefits residential property. The companies pay a fee of \$500.00 annually to the City of Norton and it is specific to be used for economic develop purposes and can be used to market the CRA. Mr. Grether asked if the business fails to uphold their end of the deal what happens? Ms. Syx stated if they have not met their numbers, you really don't want to kick them while they are down, you would want to grant a 1 yr extension and the TIRC Board has the authority to reduce their abatement. Ms. Whipkey asked how long have CRA's been around and Ms. Syx replied that the CRA's have been around since 1994. Ms. Whipkey asked if there are penalties if the business fails to reinvest it perform and Ms. Syx stated that would be very unlikely, they will want to stay because of the incentives and she has never seen this happen. Mr. Pierson asked for a copy of the presentation and Ms. Syx stated she would get a copy to Mrs. Carr. Mr. Grether also noted that if Council has any questions to direct them to Mrs. Carr to forward to Ms. Syx. Mr. Rodgers asked about the notification with the school and if they can reject it or sue the City? Ms. Syx replied they cannot sue the City. Mrs. Carr stated that although she has not had extensive discussions with the School, they are aware of this and are in support as this is another tool the City has to implement. Mrs. Carr distributed the original proposal from Mr. Hart from the 2014 Cleveland-Massillon Road Corridor study that does have some revisions and if we retain In Site there would be further revisions. Mr. Kevin Kerns, 3732 Golf Course Drive, Norton, Ohio asked if a CRA would change the zoning and Mrs. Carr replied no. Mr. Kerns asked how the development of CRA would impact the residential properties? Mr. Grether we have to currently look at the zoning code and there are some residential homes in a B2 district. The CRA does not have the authority to change our zoning; that falls to the Planning Commission and the BZA. Mr. Grether reminded everyone the City of Norton maintains control here. Mr. Kerns was mostly concerned that the residents in a commercial area would not be forced to pay higher taxes. Mr. Hart stated he merged with CT to assist them in their planning needs and explained his history with DB Hart and CT Consultants. Mr. Discussed the Cleveland Massillon Road Corridor and the important impact this can have. Mr. Hart expounded on the results of the study, the strengths and weaknesses, tax revenue potential, etc. There would be a process of identifying all of the possibilities, the objectives and the alternatives. They would propose joint meetings with the Planning Commission and Council and of course would all be open to the public and outline a plan for a land use concept that lays it all out. Mr. Hart also noted another option to develop zoning text amendments for the future and his firm would prepare some of those proposals. Mr. Hart reiterated Mr. Grether's statement that this proposal would not change any zoning laws, which is determined by the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Mr. Rodgers asked Mr. Hart if he really knew what zoning would be best in this area and Mr. Hart declined at this point and deferred that for after a study. Mr. Hart stated there many factors that need to be looked at. You will have a wider road, the school moving you will now have better growth that we did not see in the past. There are also marketing factors that also need to be considered. Mr. Hart stated that even in his blueprint required zoning changes the City may not want to rezone that area all at once. Mrs. Carr stated as we formulate these plans we need to keep the school in discussions since they own a lot of this property. Mrs. Carr noted she has only spoken with the school initially and they have not made a decision as to what they want to do with the practice field. The City has encouraged them to put this property up for sale. Mrs. Carr asked Council if they were supportive on this and if so she could have legislation prepared. Mr. Rodgers stated this subject would continue for discussion for the next work session and hold off on legislation. Mr. Grether moved to have legislation prepared for that next work session, seconded by Mr. McGlone. Ms. Whipkey asked if In Site and DB Hart are the only ones we are looking at? Mrs. Carr replied that DB Hart/CT Consultants have done work with us in the past and can work off of that. Mrs. Carr noted that although In Site is a newer company, Ms. Syx has extensive knowledge on Planning and has consulted with many other communities. Mr. Tousley asked if we would have a first reading next Monday and Mr. Grether replied no, this is just a work session. Mr. Pierson expressed concerns with moving forward on this and that the School has not been brought into this discussion.

Roll Call: Yeas: Grether, McGlone, Pierson, Tousley, Rodgers
Nays: Whipkey

Motion passed 5-1.

Appointments to Boards & Commissions

Mr. Tousley discussed the several reappointments, the Resolution of appreciation for Mr. Courson, and one (1) new appointment for Mr. Prather. Mayor Zita noted that his office had sent out notices to all Boards and Commissions members last week to attend this evening and noted that Mr. Don Welch and Mr. Prather were both present. Mr. Pierson asked Mr. Welch what he felt was his first responsibility on the Board and Mr. Welch replied to maintain the current codes and regulations as set by the Council. Mr. Welch stated that when the public comes to us that are asking for a change in the current situation and they must prove to us the need, and we have to determine their need and if it is justifiable and if will affect the surrounding properties. This is what we make our decision on and we always welcome comments from the neighbors. Mr. Pierson asked on a percentage basis what is more important as far as the input from the City of the people living in that area? Mr. Welch stated he recalled having about five (5) residents come to the public meetings since he has been on the Board. Mr. Welch stated he would like to have more public involvement on issues. Mr. Pierson asked Mr. Welch if he was involved in the rezoning of The Fathers House and Mr. Welch replied no. Mr. Tousley asked Mr. Prather to step forward and noted that Mr. Prather had served our Country and thanked him for his service. Mr. Tousley asked why Mr. Prather wanted to serve.

Mr. Prather stated he wants to be able to help people and achieve their potential and may have aspirations to possibly serve on City Council someday. Mr. Prather stated he has a strong desire to serve, and he was instrumental in making some changes while serving our Country. Ms. Whipkey noted his expertise in the cemetery business, and can appreciate that experience which will be very helpful to the Board. Mr. Prather stated his experience to help families and the pressures they can be under and thought his experience would help in this aspect. Mr. Tousley asked if Mr. Courson was contacted about when to receive his appreciation, and Mayor indicated he has not responded back as of yet. Mayor Zita suggested moving ahead with his resolution. Mr. Tousley moved to place Res. #14-2015 through Res. #20-2015 on Councils next agenda for a first reading, seconded by Ms. Whipkey.

Roll Call: Yeas: Tousley, Whipkey, McGlone, Grether, Pierson, Rodgers
Nays: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Safe Routes To Schools

Mr. Grether explained that this program is a federal program that is managed at the State level for safe walkways to the schools. Mrs. Carr noted this is an 80/20 split and our portion is \$73,736.00 and the deadline application is due by March 2, 2015. Mr. Tousley asked for clarification on the funds having been already included in previous estimates. Mrs. Carr explained that as part of the overall GPD contract this is a portion of total project. Mrs. Carr stated we have been making some payments on some improvements but not part of the sidewalks. Mr. Tousley asked how did we get to that estimate of \$368,680.00 and Mrs. Carr noted these were probably engineering estimates. Mr. McGlone asked if sidewalks on both sides of the road and Mrs. Carr noted it's for both sides. Ms. Whipkey asked if the sidewalks are assessed to the residents, and Mrs. Carr noted she would look into that and get back to Council. Mr. Rodgers asked if it seems like this approval is looking like this would be approved, especially with the schools. Mr. Grether noted that on the ODOT website DOT.gov there was an extensive information. Mr. Grether noted a typo in the heading on the drafted legislation and Mr. Markey noted this would be corrected. Mr. Grether moved to place this on Councils next agenda for waiving readings, with emergency first reading, seconded by Mr. Rodgers.

Roll Call: Yeas: Grether, Rodgers, McGlone, Pierson, Tousley, Whipkey
Nays: None

Motion passed 6-0.

2015 Road Program with Summit County

Ms. Whipkey stated that the County has recommended several roads and the crack seal process for Johnson Road from Hametown Road to Medina Line Road; Summit Road from Barber Road to the Barberton Corporation line; Gardner Blvd. from Hawthorne to the Barberton Corporation line.

Ms. Whipkey asked where Hawthorne Road runs and Mr. Grether explained it's near the former Cristo's and Sweet Henry's. Mayor Zita noted that he did not believe there is to be any crack sealing as Ms. Whipkey earlier stated. There was brief discussion as to the difference from motor paver and other processes. Mrs. Carr indicated she would ask Mr. White to provide details. Mr. Rodgers noted there would be an inspector on site this time and questioned the fees of \$500.00. There was discussion as to the roads determined and Mrs. Carr noted that the County came up with these along with the input from Mr. White. Mr. Grether wanted to offer Summit Road to the Barberton Corp. line because that road is a complete mess. Mr. Rodgers noted the proposal from the County is \$800.00 and with the inspectors fee. We only have \$500,000.00 available so we could end up short by about \$325,000.00. Mrs. Carr agreed and this is what the proposal shows and she would be willing to work with them in the inspector fee issue. We could also consider doing some roads as an alternate bid. Mr. Rodgers stated we need to leave these selections of roads up to the engineers. Ms. Whipkey moved to add this to Councils next agenda for a first reading, seconded by Mr. Rodgers. Mr. Pierson asked when the bids are done would there be performance bonds and Mrs. Carr replied yes.

Roll Call: Yeas: Whipkey, Rodgers, McGlone, Grether, Pierson, Tousley
Nays: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Petty Cash Accounts

Mr. Rodgers turned this discussion over to Mr. Messner for the details. Mr. Messner indicated that in preparation of the audit he noted there was no policy or procedure in place. We have several departments that do have a petty cash established. There is one person in each department that is responsible for balancing quarterly as well as year end. Mr. Messner noted he would like to have this passed and in place due to the State Auditors being in shortly. Mr. Rodgers asked what would the Police Aid to Justice account be used for? Mr. Messner indicated this has been used in the past to offer paid rewards for tips for information from the public. Ms. Whipkey clarified this is not monthly that is annually and Mr. Messner concurred. Mr. Messner explained they cannot exceed these limits; the amounts used can be replenished as needed with proper documentation. This is the total limit they can have at any given time without coming back to Council. Mr. Tousley clarified that throughout a years time that department could spend more and Mr. Messner concurred and there has to be documentation. Mr. Pierson concurred that funds can be expended as long as all is in balance. Ms. Whipkey asked if these dollars are actually within each departments budgets and Mr. Messner concurred. Mr. Messner noted as Finance Director he does have the authority to move money around within that budget from line item to line item. Mr. Messner noted there is not a budget line titled petty cash. Mr. Rodgers noted this is all about accountability and Mr. Messner concurred, and there is document and if there is ever an issue of abuse he has the power to take this fund away. Mr. Messner asked Council for waiving of second & third readings. Mr. Rodgers moved to add this to Councils next agenda, waiving readings with emergency language, seconded by Ms. Whipkey.

Roll Call: Yeas: Rodgers, Whipkey, McGlone, Grether, Pierson, Tousley
Nays: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Agricultural District Renewal

Mr. Grether noted the City has received an application for a renewal and discussed the details and the process required by the Ohio Revised Code. Mr. Grether noted this application is at 3580 S. Hametown Road and is at 83 acres. Mr. Grether moved to add this to Councils next agenda for a first reading only and that a Public Hearing will occur on March 9, 2015, seconded by Mr. Tousley.

Roll Call: Yeas: Grether, Tousley, McGlone, Pierson, Whipkey, Rodgers
Nays: None

Motion passed 6-0.

Amend Section 1042.03 Sanitary Sewer Connections

Mr. Pierson stated this was discussed at length back in November and stated that we need remove the local control and allow the State to control. Mr. Pierson stated he would like to rescind this altogether and have discussion on it later. Mr. Rodgers noted that this allows the City to order connections to sewers. Mr. Markey noted that currently either the City or the Health Department can require connection. Mr. Markey stated he recalled the previous discussion was to remove the City's role, and restore it back to the Health Department who has that authority anyway. Mr. Markey clarified that the Health Department enforces the State laws. Mr. Pierson stated that due to all of the things going on at the State level, he would like to just let that process take place. Mr. Pierson moved to rescind this legislation entirely and Mr. Markey stated he recalled preparing an ordinance taking the City's role away and leaving this up to the State. Mr. Pierson restated his motion to just get rid of this, and it was decided to have the legislation presented at Committee of the Whole next week and we can move it to the agenda. Mr. Markey stated with this the City of Barberton cannot do any ordering to the Norton residents to connect. Mr. Pierson stated that we do have protection here because the Health District has the authority not the City of Barberton.

Building & Zoning Department Services

Mr. Rodgers turned this discussion over to Mrs. Carr for the details. Mrs. Carr stated that she has researched several options and has suggested contracting with the City of Barberton as we have been working back and forth with them for some time. Mrs. Carr noted by keeping our Building Department in house she has concerns because we are overspending with the limited revenue coming in and that Mr. Messner had prepared a cost and revenue breakdown (see attached). Mrs. Carr noted if we do keep it in house we would have to restructure that department and increase fees.

We also looked at going with Summit County and others have done so. Currently there are several communities that do contract with the county. They would collect all fees and their location for permits is out on Tallmadge Road, which is not convenient to our residents. Mrs. Carr discussed the arrangements with Barberton and they agree to give us 10% of the revenue over the next five (5) years. Mrs. Carr stated we still need to look at the lack of a Planning Director. Mrs. Carr stated that we clearly told Barberton that they are not to be our zoning enforcement, although we currently do not have a Zoning Inspector on board and she noted that Mr. Ernie Reynolds has been very helpful in this area. Mrs. Carr noted that Ms. Whipkey had asked for a breakdown of the fees between Barberton, Norton, and Summit County. Mrs. Carr noted that in looking at all of the fees, she felt Norton is not charging like the others in some areas. Mrs. Carr explained the process for a fence permit if we were to contract with Barberton. Mr. Rodgers noted he had this conversation with Mrs. Carr before Mr. Arters left. We do have some zoning issues in the City that really need to be addressed. Mr. Rodgers stated he has heard from some residents as well as some on Council and he is leaning more towards the County. Mr. Rodgers stated he felt that Barberton would probably be going with the County in the next five (5) years. Mrs. Carr stated maybe so but in the next five (5) yrs we would at least be getting some revenue. Mr. Pierson asked if we went with Barberton now and then they do end up going with the County how does that affect this agreement? Mr. Markey stated if Barberton went with the County you would have to reestablish an agreement with Summit County. Mr. Pierson asked who makes a decision and fees say for a pool permit, and Mr. Markey stated it would be their building code and fee structure would be applied, and Mr. Pierson stated that would be the same if we went with the County. Mr. Pierson stated the only advantage is collected some revenue for the next years or so. Mrs. Carr stated that a chief building official has to sign off on plans, and the County has about two (2) or three (3) on staff. Mrs. Carr stated the only thing she has heard from local residents is that if they want to build a deck they have to go to Tallmadge. Mr. Rodgers asked if the County has some permitting available online? Mrs. Carr replied, they may have some available, she would have to check on that, Mr. Pierson questioned about the revenue and if there was an opening for the City to be named in a potential lawsuit. Ms. Whipkey stated she has tried to look up some of these items up on line at Barberton, and it's very confusing. Mrs. Carr noted she could provide the legislative comparisons from both cities. Ms. Whipkey noted the one area for heating and air condition Barberton goes by BTU and wondered how the County handles that. Mr. Messner clarified that the fees the information he provided was not just for permits, that is contractor registration fees, inspection fees, etc. so the overall revenue is not as much. Mr. Pierson asked if excavators need to pull permits and Mrs. Carr noted that depends on what is being done. Mr. Pierson stated with the pending sewer project coming, there is going to be a lot of permits pulled then. Mr. Grether stated he for one is not supportive of going all the way to Tallmadge, and discussed the benefits of having someone close to Norton available for final inspections on some issues. Mr. Rodgers stated having been in the building trade for a few years, and having working with Barberton, and Norton and the County, he has always had a good experience working with the County. Mrs. Carr stated she even asked Barberton if they were willing to go with the County anytime soon and she was told they are not looking at that.

Mrs. Carr stated that she would want a guarantee with Barberton about this potential written into the agreement. Mrs. Carr stated that so far Barberton has been very responsive to our concerns. Ms. Whipkey discussed the 2013 expense and revenue information and it appears we were in the whole \$107,000.00 and Mayor Zita concurred. Mayor Zita stated even if we go with Barberton, the collaboration with us it may allow them to continue with us even longer. Mr. Grether agreed with continuing to collaborate with Barberton as much as possible. Mr. Rodgers asked wasn't there a merger vote done in the past about merging with Barberton? Mr. Rodgers stated he continues to hear from residents numerous times we need to stop getting into Barberton's footprint. Mrs. Carr stated that in looking at our options it seemed to make more sense with going with Barberton. Mr. Rodgers stated that he felt we need to move into the Planning Director and an assistant. Mrs. Carr stated that even with the letters of complaint recently received there is still some confusion from how this Council wants the zoning enforcement. Mrs. Carr stated the persons writing the letters clearly don't want to have complaint driven enforcement. Mr. Rodgers stated we all need to have common sense here with the enforcement. Mrs. Carr agreed and you need to have someone with diplomacy and you can't treat one neighborhood differently from another. Mr. Pierson stated if we have laws we need to enforce them. When residents have been told time and time again to correct their situation and nothing is done, they need to be sent to the prosecutor. Mr. Tousley asked if it were impossible to deal with Wadsworth and Mrs. Carr stated she honestly did not look at Wadsworth. Mr. Markey noted that the difference in the Counties is not an issue here. Mr. Grether asked about the salary expenses related to this department, and Mrs. Carr stated it would be the two full time positions salary and benefits, expenses related to fuel, certifications. We could also utilize the secretary in other ways to help in the community development side. Mrs. Carr stated what she would like to see is in hiring a Planning Director/Building & Zoning. Mr. Pierson suggested we sub contract an inspector and Mrs. Carr agreed and if we do that even part time that is more than what we were doing in the past. Mr. Robert Copen, 2518 Sue Lane, discussed the comments about Barberton and we should keep our own department. Mr. Copen stated he has had issues with Mr. Arters and his handling of the gaming parlors. Mrs. Carr noted that since Mr. Arters left Mr. Messner has been handling these issues. Mr. Copen argued that the legislation states the Administrative Officer is to handle these, and Mrs. Carr stated she believed it states or her designee. Mrs. Carr stated she would check on the issue with the gaming issue and Mr. Arters would not be addressing them in the future. Mr. Copen asked where are the other three (3) parlors that we are supposed to have a total of seven (7) and there is a waiting list. Mr. Messner noted there is one new one that is building under construction and is in the planning process. Mr. Copen stated that we need to keep this zoning and planning all in Norton. Mr. Copen discussed how past electrical inspections were handled and he did not want to see us just turning things over to Barberton. Mrs. Carr stated if we keep it in Norton the fees would need to be doubled. Mr. Jack Gainer, 3920 Wadsworth Road, Norton, Ohio, discussed the deficit in this department, as with the Law Dept, and others and asked if all departments have deficits? Mrs. Carr stated that not all departments have a revenue source. Mr. Gainer asked why Cuyahoga Falls went to the County and Mrs. Carr stated we were losing money and we had to decide to either raise fees or turn it over.

Mr. Gainer stated that not all departments may need to increase their fees. Mr. Gainer stated he would not have an issue with an increase in our fees to maintain the department if inspections and such were done timely and properly. Mr. Gainer stated you cannot expect every department operate without a deficit. Inspections are to ensure that the next person who gets that property gets a safe one. Mr. Pierson asked if we have a total number of the types of permits issued last year? Mr. Rodgers continued this discussion to the next Committee Work session and encouraged the residents to talk about this with Council next week. When we talk about fees and taxes we need to think about what is going on around us, and with the recent pension changes coming and some residents could lose as much as sixty (60) percent, and those good days are gone and we have to be very careful.

Unfinished Business:

Ms. Whipkey discussed the sewer and storm water issues, although they are two (2) different things. However, when residents have to tie into a new sewer, their storm water is also needed to be addressed. Ms. Whipkey asked if they are separate isn't this an added expense and Mrs. Carr concurred. Mrs. Carr noted that under if you have a sanitary sewer with a direct connection of storm water, that is illegal by State law and Federal regulations, since 1964. If anyone has a direct connection like this it must be separated. Mrs. Carr stated whether you are replacing your septic or connecting to a new sewer line, you are not allowed to have that connection. Mr. Rodgers noted the point is this is an added expense. Mr. Pierson asked about the classification and hiring for the Assistant Fire Chief. Mrs. Carr stated there are six (6) to nine (9) people that could be eligible for the position. Once the test is done, it depends on what candidate is chosen and what pension system they are in. The City pays 24 % under that and with PERS it is 14% and we cannot determine a candidate as to what pension they want to be in. If the candidate is currently in PERS they would not be forced to the other union. Mr. Pierson asked about the Nash Heights funding and the grant information and that he had contacted Mr. Demboski on this and has not had a response. Mrs. Carr stated that Mr. Demboski had explained all of this in an email and she believed Council was copied on this. Mr. Pierson replied that he never received that email. Mr. Pierson commented about recent quotes from the Norton Post, and that residents in certain neighborhoods are entitled to special grant funding. Mr. Tousley indicated that he has concerns with the two (2) resolutions of Necessity and if the residents are to get two letters or one? Mr. Markey stated that we can do one or two. Mr. Tousley also had concerns with the \$8,000.00 figure in the letters and is this etched in stone. Mr. Pierson stated he also has concerns on how this is reported to the residents in addition to the concerns for the tax credit rollback money. Mr. Pierson stated this amount is not up to the Administration, this is Councils decision. Mr. Pierson took issue with the costs thrown out there of \$15,000.00 or \$17,000.00 and urged the Administration to be more careful with the information being shared and how it's presented to the public. Mrs. Carr stated that we very clearly explained the numbers of \$15,000.00 and \$19,000.00 and were totally transparent with these actual estimates. We very clearly stated that the \$8,000.00 is a subsidized number that can be applied to either system; and was based on the discussions with the MOU and Barberton. Mrs. Carr stated the real assessments are between \$15,000.000 and \$19,000.00.

Mrs. Carr stated that originally the letters went out with the \$8,250.00 based on the City buying the system from Summit County. After that occurred, the Council wanted to bid both types of systems, and for the assessments to be less than the \$8,250.00 figure. Mr. Pierson stated there appears to be a \$1.6 million dollar savings going with the vacuum system and it doesn't make sense with both systems being at \$8,000.00. Mrs. Carr stated that the \$8,000.00 is a subsidized number and if you want to go lower the funds have to come from somewhere. Mr. Tousley stated that is not true and when you show the numbers of vacuum being lower and there is a savings which has been very misleading to the public. Mr. Tousley stated it's misleading to state that if you bring the vacuum costs down you need more in subsidy. Mr. Markey stated that vacuum is cheaper than gravity, and no matter what this project will be subsidized. R. Markey discussed the negative debt service at gravity at \$3.8 million dollars in subsidy at the assessment cost of \$8,000.00 and the debt service for vacuum is at \$2.2 million dollars at the assessment costs of \$8,000.00. The point was if you want to go with vacuum at \$4,000.00 you as Council have to decide if you want to subsidize that with more funding. Mr. Rodgers noted that as Mr. Markey had stated we are not trying to pit one neighborhood against the other, and we need to get that out to the residents. This is a community effort being done by the City, and no matter what development we are talking about everyone is paying for it with the surcharge. That is what the surcharges were designed for. All of these surcharges are going into one pot and whenever something needs to be paid for it comes from this one fund. Mr. Pierson stated let's say it is at \$8,000.00 there is also possibly another \$10,000.00 in additional fees that each resident will encounter, and this is being glossed over. We are not being honest with the residents. Mr. Rodgers asked if the letters going out would have it the assessment numbers listed? Mr. Markey replied the tentative assessment that is on file will be what is stated in the letters; with the gravity or vacuum system at \$8,000.00. Mr. Rodgers moved to make an amendment; the letter should be adjusted to the vacuum cost at that \$1.6 million dollar difference. Whatever percentage that is, it should be reflected in that vacuum letter estimated. Mrs. Carr stated so what you are saying is to take the actual estimates of \$15,000.00 for vacuum and \$19,000.00 for gravity and do the percentage difference and lower that \$8,000.00 by that same percentage. Mr. Rodgers stated he would need to do some more calculating on that. Mr. Rodgers stated that the assessments for vacuum should be lower just because of the costs difference alone. Mr. Rodgers asked why would the residents in Nash Heights be paying surcharges for other future projects? Mr. Rodgers discussed the money being already aside to pay for future development. Mr. Rodgers stated we could make the estimated assessments what ever number we want, but the final assessment will be what the actual cost to build is. Mrs. Carr stated either way you are subsidizing from the \$15,000.00 to \$19,000.00. Mr. Markey asked who is the one receiving the benefit of getting a subsidy? Mrs. Carr stated the point is its subsidizing Nash Heights, and we are advocating that the savings should remain in the one pot to go for future project. Mr. Rodgers argued that it should come back to those residents in Nash Heights and if in another ten (10) years it's another community; then it should be done the same way. Why should the residents in Nash Heights be paying for future development in other neighborhoods? Mr. Markey replied the model we presented is for Nash Heights. Mr. Rodgers argued that model is not just for Nash Heights, it's for the package plants also.

Mrs. Carr briefly discussed the life cycle cost issues because we still have issues to discuss with Barberton. Mr. Rodgers argued that has nothing to do with what we are discussing here. Mr. Rodgers also discussed the \$1.9 million for future development listed within that model.

New Business:

Ms. Whipkey stated it was brought to her attention letters were sent to residents on Cleveland-Massillon Road by the Trans System real estate company. We paid them over \$100,000.00 for their services. Mrs. Carr noted there was legislation approving approximately \$140,000.00 and the review by appraisers of about \$10,000.00. Mrs. Carr stated with any state project there is an independent agent that negotiates with the resident. We as a city need to be independent from this process, and the last thing we want to do is to have the Council, Mayor, Law Director or any other city official try and negotiate the fee. ODOT requires the City to hire this agency in addition to the appraiser to make sure that everything is on the up and up with the figures, and we have very little to say in that. Ms. Whipkey asked what is Norton's part in these fees? Mrs. Carr replied no part at all. When a settlement comes in the City would have to approve that. Ms. Whipkey asked how can you have eminent on a temporary take? Mr. Markey stated it can be taken on any property and would only take place if settlement was not made. Mrs. Carr noted that Council would have to pass legislation to authorize it. Mrs. Carr noted that in working with ODOT the residents usually have two chances to agree and after that ODOT would then come to us and ask us to enter into eminent domain. Mrs. Carr cautioned all of Council to be very careful and not to get involved with the resident. Mr. Rodgers stated this all relates to the income verification issues like with Nash Heights, and we all are at fault by not communicating with the residents on the process. We should have been able advise the residents of what is coming in the mail. Ms. Whipkey stated she was not aware of any letters going out to the residents when she was contacted.

Topics for the next Work Session:

DB Hart & In Site
Building Department Services
Road Program information

Public Comment-Agenda and Non Agenda Items:

No one had signed up to speak.

Public Updates:

Mr. Rodgers reminded everyone about the Town Hall Meeting on Wednesday, February 25, 2015 at the Community Center from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM.

Adjourn

There being no other business to come before the Committee Work Session, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 PM.

Rick Rodgers, 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.