

COUNCIL MINUTES November 15, 2010

The regular Council Meeting was held on Monday, November 15, 2010 at 7:00 PM in the Euclid Municipal Center Council Chamber. Council President Holzheimer Gail presided.

Invocation was given by Minister Carl Brewster from Imani Church of Christ.

Members Present: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.

All present.

Others Present: Law Director Frey, CS&ED Director Pietravoia, Finance Director Brett, Service Director Smith, Recreation Director Will, Police Chief Repicky, Fire Chief Cosgriff, Asst. Director Bock, Deputy Director Gliha, Clerk of Council Cahill.

COMMUNICATIONS

Council received Notice of a Hearing regarding the transfer of ownership to J. Dawson Enterprises, Inc., dba Midway Bar & Grille, 20670 Lakeland Blvd. for Dec. 3, 2010.

ADMINISTRATION REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS

President Holzheimer Gail – You will notice the Mayor is not here this evening, he is home, not feeling well, so we hope he feels better quickly. I will turn it over to Law Director Frey.

Director Frey – We have three brief announcements tonight. We'll start with Director Will.

Director Will – I'd like to start off by informing everybody last Wednesday, November 10th, the Mayor and some of the members of the administration were able to attend a ceremony held at Landerhaven where the Cleveland Clinic hospitals, Euclid Hospital, Hillcrest and Huron, pick different community representatives to honor them for their community service awards. Sherri Zagorc and Donna Perdzock were two of the people awarded. It was great to see two people from the Euclid area were honored. I want to send out congratulations on behalf of all of us and let everybody in the public know they were awarded these wonderful community service awards.

I'd also like to thank Bill from Blue Sky Bicycles for hosting the Cycle cross event this past Sunday. There was over 100 racers in it. If you had an opportunity to look at it, it was a quite interesting event. Thank you Bill for putting that together.

On Saturday, November 20th, we will have our Skate with Sully, the Lake Erie Monsters Mascot at the C.E. Orr Ice arena. It will be from 1:00-2:30. Admission with two non-perishable food items for the Hunger Center will be free. Or it is \$4 without the food donation. There will also be door prizes every 30 minutes. This Saturday at the ice arena, come skate with Sully the Lake Erie Monsters mascot.

On Wednesday, December 1 at 6:30 PM, the City of Euclid will be hosting the Holiday lighting ceremony. The Holiday lighting ceremony will take place at Fire Station #2 off of Chardon. Santa will be there, we'll have story telling, there will be entertainment and treats. That event is free, Wednesday, December 1 at 6:30 PM at Fire Station #2. Thank you.

Director Smith – Our final shred day of 2010 will be held on November 20th from 9:00 AM until Noon in the parking lot here behind City Hall. Five boxes maximum per resident please.

Also next week, due to the Thanksgiving Holiday, Thursday's trash collection will be delayed one day until Friday. The Friday collection will be delayed until Saturday.

Director Brett – Tomorrow the City will be selling \$7,040,000 in bond anticipating notes for a variety of projects, mostly the waterline projects. These are rollovers from May. We expect a pricing of about 1%. We will benefit from the same thing that's killing us on our interest earnings will benefit us on our borrowing. We will do that tomorrow and it will settle November 30th. Then around December 15th we will sell Special Assessment notes of \$885,000 to the bond retirement fund. Those are what are on schedule for the Finance Dept.

Director Frey – That is all of the administration reports for this evening.

REPORTS & COMMITTEE MINUTES

Councilwoman Scarniench moved to receive the Police Report of September 2010; Monthly Finance Report thru October 31, 2010; Board of Control Min. of 10/25/10 and 11/1/10. Councilman O'Neill seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Council President Holzheimer Gail stated this is the Committee of the Whole for Legislative Matters Only.

Mr. Jeffrey Beck - 25540 Chatworth. Item #1, the donation of the land. I was wondering what the value of that land is. I'm not sure legally or anything but I see where it says mortgage release areas, is there a mortgage tied to this that the City would have to pay off? Or would this be a free and clear donation? Thank you.

Director Pietravoia – I can respond during the presentation.

Mr. David Carlson – 19500 Edgecliff Dr. I am here this evening representing the Euclid Chamber of Commerce. We are delighted with the Lakefront Development Plan. We are excited that you proceed with that, not just this phase but all the subsequent phases as well. Thank you.

LEGISLATION

Ord. 164-2010 (205-10) Donation of Lakefront Land

A emergency ordinance to accept the donation to the City of Euclid of approximately 1.6 acres of lakefront land from Horizon House, LTD. and Harbor Crest, LTD., Owners, and authorizing the Mayor to execute all documents necessary to accept the donation of such land identified as the “mortgage release areas” (as shown in Exhibit A-1 and A-2) along the shoreline of the Waters Edge and Harbor Crest Apartments located at 24101 Lake Shore Boulevard and 24455 Lake Shore Boulevard, respectively. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik, Council President Holzheimer Gail, Councilpersons Langman and O’Neill)

Councilman O’Neill moved for passage, Councilman Langman seconded.

Director Pietravoia – I’m very pleased this evening to be able to bring forward to Council and the community two important pieces of legislation. This first one for land donation and the second one for the purchase of land that will be another step toward the implementation of our Waterfront plan. As council knows, we adopted the plan officially and are taking steps to being the implementation. This is an important step. It was recommended specifically in the plan by JJR in the near term that we take steps necessary to either acquire land or gain the proper easements necessary to go forward with the public improvements along the waterfront, specifically being the lakefront trail, the re-establishment of the beach, eventually the development of a marina and all the upland facilities that are necessary for the marina.

In moving forward the implementation of the plan we continued negotiating with the owner on the eastern end of the planned area. The K&D Group also known specifically in terms of ownership as Coastline Investments. Both for the purchase of the final two, what we refer to as the bowling alley parcels. Also at the same time we impressed upon them that it would be important from our perspective if they were serious about providing either an easement or a donation that this would be the time to accomplish it at the same time we go forward with acquisition.

The first piece on the agenda tonight is the donation of two parcels of land. All of Council should have received a map with your legislation indicating the exact boundaries of the land areas. These were prepared by McSteen the engineering firm that works for Coastline and K&D, to show the exact boundaries of the parcels involved. The total between the two areas, these are lakefront shoreline parcels, in front of the Water’s Edge and in front of what is owned as Horizon House and Harbor crest. They total 1.6 acres. We did a rough estimate to address Mr. Beck’s question, we did a rough estimate of the value based on the market value of the land as it is reported in the County Auditor’s records. We determined that the two combined well exceeded \$300,000. These are not official appraisals, it was the closest we had to try to determine or assign a value for purposes of accepting the donation at this point in time.

We also negotiated during the process regarding maintenance of these parcels, we felt it was very important because of the location and where they are situated. Until we proceeded with the actual construction of the waterfront improvements, we asked the owners if they would continue to maintain those areas and they did agree to the maintenance of those areas.

I would like to discuss in a little more detail the acquisition, Council President I don’t know if you would like me to do that now or when we get to that piece of legislation?

President Holzheimer Gail – You can address them both if you’d like.

Director Pietravoia – For the record, I wanted to report in this case since we were acquiring we did have an appraisal done, this is common practice we’ve done this in the past when we acquired other parcels and the land areas are parcels 644-06-007 and 644-06-008. These are long bowling alley shaped parcels that extend from Lake Shore Blvd. to the shoreline. These combined with the two that we already own, we

would have control of all the land on the eastern end of the planned area. They together total 2.24 acres of land and they were appraised at \$470,000, that's the combined price for the two parcels. I'm pleased to report that this was a little bit less than we had originally anticipated. That combined with the donation of the other parcels has put us in a very strong position financially. We have enough grant funds with the remaining dollars from the State Capital Grant. The new grant Council just approved a couple of meetings ago from ODNR, we have enough funds and actually will have some funds remaining after this purchase.

For the record there was \$195,000 remaining from the \$500,000 capital grant. The ODNR grant was for \$350,000. We're estimating after the acquisition that we'll have about \$75,000 in funds remaining. A portion of the State Capital Grant under the rules for the ODNR grant is permissible to be used as our local match. There's another savings where we won't have to take funds out of our own capital or general fund for this acquisition. The acquisition will be completely covered by grant funds.

Those dollars that are remaining, Mr. Gliha, our Assistant Director, and I will be continuing our conversations with the State. We know we'll need some of those dollars for part of our due diligence and those are eligible costs. For example on the two bowling alley parcels we'll do a Phase 1 environmental assessment. Councilwoman Jones had some questions about that. We did already receive some proposals and we have actual estimates and the firm that we would like to select came in at \$1,000 per parcel. The cost for those two parcels would be \$2,000 and it can come out of the State Capital grant funds.

We'll also be doing a boundary survey. That's also eligible for this funding. With regard to the donated land, when the apartments were originally purchased they had Phase 1 environmental assessments completed. They just turned over those reports to us at the end of last week. So we'll be reviewing them and if they're not adequate for today's purpose we'll have a Phase 1 redone but we're fairly confident that those are going to be sufficient, particularly because it was represented that they didn't find any issues in the lakefront portions that we would be acquiring.

The question for Mr. Beck regarding the mortgage release areas. Just as the name implies, these properties do have mortgages on them, the entire parcel with the apartment buildings. Before any portion can be sold off, the mortgage holders had to agree to release those areas from the mortgage itself. There would be no money owned by us in terms of paying off a mortgage, it is simply a permission that's granted by the mortgage holder and it is referred to as a mortgage release.

President Holzheimer Gail – To be clear, his question was then we get it free and clear there's no cost ongoing?

Director Pietravoia – Correct. The only immediate costs would be if we had to do any work related to survey or environmental assessment. They had also completed the survey by McSteen, those were the drawings that were submitted with the legislation. So those will be reviewed by our Public Service and Engineering divisions. I do not believe we'll have to do any updating to those. This matter would come back at a later date through Planning Commission and City Council for the lot split to create the parcels that would be donated to the city.

I think I've covered the majority of the points that I wanted to cover in an overview. At this point both Mr. Gliha and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Councilman Langman – Director Pietravoia, what was Coastline's original purchase price for the two bowling alley parcels?

Director Pietravoia – The two combined totaled over \$500,000, I believe it was around \$530,000.

Councilman Langman – Because of current market conditions we are seeing a substantial savings over the original purchase price. I think it is very important to execute both of these items and to approve them to move lakefront development forward. We have the appropriate firm that is advising and guiding us. There's a wonderful plan in place to make it happen. These are part of the steps that we need to do to make it happen. If we're going to see marinas, lakefront trails, renovated park and the associated economic investment than this is one small part of making that happen. I hope we can have unanimous approval for both.

Director Pietravoia – To Councilman Langman's point about the values. The appraisal that was completed indicated there was about a 20% reduction in values even from just the short time ago when we purchased the other parcel on the eastern end of the plan area.

President Holzheimer Gail – I want to again, although Director Pietravoia did thank Coastline Investments and K&D properties, this is certainly a very strong statement that they're willing to work with us in making our lakefront improvement plans happen. This is a great step forward in my mind to have control of not only the lakefront parcels but all of the parcels to the east. So it is a good day for lakefront development.

Councilman Wojtila – The exhibits don't have any reference to mortgage release series that I could see. I assumed it was just the shaded area by the definition. Then, the one exhibit caught my eye, the State of Ohio owns property right next to the parcel B. Is that an area we are also looking at acquiring?

President Holzheimer Gail – Are you looking at Exhibit A-2?

Councilman Wojtila – Yes.

President Holzheimer Gail – To the left of Parcel B, there's a small parcel that is marked, State of Ohio.

Director Pietravoia – We'll investigate that, that's on the northern end of E. 238 St. The majority of that land is privately owned, but we will investigate the parcel there that is showing State of Ohio. It maybe a portion of that, I know it wouldn't be the entire area, but a portion of that 043 could be submerged land.

To your question about the mortgage release, two documents were prepared, first McSteen prepared a mortgage release map and then they actually did a very detailed survey and produced these maps which would be used for a lot split purposes. The two areas are the same, the mortgage release and the lot split. Council is more commonly used to seeing the lot split parcels so that is what we have provided. We have the other maps and I'll be happy to email them to you if you'd like to see them.

Councilman Gilliam – Director Pietravoia, I just have one question. In the actual ordinance the language, it says the owners have agreed to continue maintenance of the donated land after transfer to the City as they are currently being maintained until such time. So this is something that could go on one year, two years, three years, depending on when we're actually able to develop this land? There is no clause in there that after a certain number of years that they would be able to excuse themselves for responsibility of the property?

Director Pietravoia – That's correct. I do want to make one point of clarification. After discussing it further with the current owner, the bowling alley lots we talked about a scenario similar to what we do up at Century Corners where we would have them mow the frontage closest to the street and the sidewalk and the balance of the lot would basically be allowed to go back into a natural state. It is a fairly common practice on large parcels like this. On the bowling alley parcels that's what they've agreed to and on the mortgage release areas, they've agreed to continue to maintain those entire areas as long as necessary. As the Council President indicated, this is part of their indication of their continued partnership with the city to see the waterfront development actually occur.

Councilman Gilliam – So will all four parcels be maintained in the exact same way, the frontage towards the street will maintained? I just want to make sure that I'm clear, you said something about the bowling alleys, the frontage from the bowling alley lots would be cut down and then the rear would be allowed to grow. Is that the same for, I know one of the other parcels is basically asphalt, I just wanted to make sure we were clear on that.

Director Pietravoia – The other two parcels are along the shoreline and for the most part, other than maybe a small portion of each, they are already in a natural state. That's why the agreement was to continue maintaining them as they currently exist. Those portions that are mowed will continue to be mowed. The area that is wooded or in a natural state, would remain that way.

Councilman Gilliam – Alright, thank you.

Councilwoman Scarniench moved to close debate, Councilman O'Neill seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilman Wojtila moved to suspend the rules, Councilman Langman seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call: Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.
Passed.

Ord. 165-2010 (204-10) Amended –Purchase 24555 & 24601 Lake Shore

An emergency ordinance authorizing the Mayor of the City of Euclid to enter into a purchase agreement and to execute all other documents necessary to acquire properties from Coastline Investments Ltd. located at 24555 Lake Shore Boulevard (Permanent Parcel No. 644-06-007) and 24601 Lake Shore Boulevard (Permanent Parcel No. 644-06-008), totaling approximately 2.24 acres of land, at a cost of Four Hundred Seventy Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$470,000.00) for the public purpose of the assembly of land for public improvements related to lakefront development in the Euclid Waterfront Improvements Plan. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik, Council President Holzheimer Gail, Councilpersons Langman and O'Neill)

Councilman Langman moved for passage, Councilman O'Neill seconded.

President Holzheimer Gail – Director Pietravoia, I know you made your comments earlier, anything else to add?

Director Pietravoia – Just a couple of comments, I did want to address one of Councilwoman Jones' questions. She was concerned that once we conduct an environmental assessment, if we found anything that caused concern, did we have a right to get out of the agreement. I wanted to go on public record indicating, yes, the way the agreement is written, we would have the ability to get out of the agreement. Although there are other options and that would be depending on what we find, we could still go forward even with the environmental concern that's noted, or we could negotiate a lower price depending on the outcome of the study. Or, the third would be that we could just get out of the agreement altogether, so we are protected in that way.

Also, I wanted to indicate again in order to keep things moving, especially with the great news about the donation, I would like to suggest an amendment to Section 4 of Ord. (204-10). In Section 4, we have actually already solicited proposals and we solicited three, received two back for the environmental assessments. After of our evaluation the recommendation is to go forward with Earth Consulting, Ltd. They have done other work for us both on the lakefront and other parts of the city and they submitted the lowest and best proposal at \$1,000 per parcel. If we actually amend that to write that into the legislation, I will be able to instruct them to go forward immediately with the environmental assessment that is needed.

Councilman Langman – Director Pietravoia, you mentioned the environmental assessment that needs to be done. If you or Mr. Gliha could refresh my memory; when the home was demolished, I know there's a septic system on that property, was that removed at the time of demolition?

Director Pietravoia – Yes that was removed, I believe Mr. Bock might have been involved in inspecting that. I see him nodding, yes it was removed.

Councilman Langman – I believe the other parcel had an old burial shadow gas well on the property, was that also addressed around the same time?

Director Pietravoia – The parcel that we already purchased? The eastern most parcel?

Councilman Langman – Was that the parcel that had the gas well?

Director Pietravoia – They had discovered that there was a pipe that gave an indication of a gas well. If there is a gas well or was one on the second parcel that we're purchasing through this legislation this evening, that would come out through this environmental assessment. We would be able to deal with it at that time then.

Councilwoman Minarik – To go along with Director Pietravoia, I would like to make a motion in Section 4, it would read, is hereby authorized to contract with Earth Consulting Ltd. for professional services.

Director Frey – That's what I've written in, yes.

Councilwoman Minarik moved to amend as stated above. Councilwoman Scarniench seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call on Amendment:

Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho,
Holzheimer Gail

Amendment passed.

President Holzheimer Gail – Any other questions?

Councilman O'Neill moved to close debate, Councilman Van Ho seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilman Gilliam moved to suspend the rules, Councilwoman Scarniench seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call: Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho,
Holzheimer Gail.

Passed as amended.

Res. 166-2010 (207-10) Coastal Management Assistance Grant Application

A resolution directing the Mayor of the City of Euclid or his designee to submit a Coastal Management Assistance Grant application and, should such grant be awarded, to execute a Grant Agreement with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources to accept and expend a reimbursable grant in an amount up to One Hundred Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$100,000.00) to supplement funds already awarded for public improvements to the Sims Park fishing pier and multi-purpose trails that increase public access to the lakefront. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik, Council President Holzheimer Gail, Councilpersons Langman and O'Neill)

Councilman O'Neill moved for passage, Councilman Langman seconded.

Director Pietravoia – To go along with our first two items, I'm very excited again to be able to bring forward an opportunity to go after funding so that we can in fact begin the implementation of the waterfront plan. Working with JJR they identified an additional grant, this is on an annual cycle by the Coastal Management Division of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources. The deadline for the grant is this Friday. The maximum as indicated in the legislation that we might be eligible for is \$100,000. We would use the funds to supplement what we've already been awarded for both the trails and the pier; at least that is how we're writing the application. The State may decide and if they award us another grant that they'd to apply it to one or the other, but JJR is advising that we go after funds for both.

There is no risk involved here because we are intending to go forward with those two projects, the trails and the fishing pier expansion and extension. The dollars that we would fund through our capital program to implement those items would more than cover the required match for this particular grant if we are successful in receiving the full \$100,000. We're seeking tonight authority, not only to apply, but also to accept and expend, since this is very similar to the first grant, we occasionally when we bring these forward we do wrap those all into the same piece of legislation. Councilwoman Jones had a question about why we did this one differently. Occasionally when they are grants that we're familiar with and we know the stated purpose is something we've already discussed and agreed to, we do wrap in the accept and expend in the legislation.

Asst. Director Gliha has been assisting with this as well as the staff at JJR and we're ready to make our submission by Friday pending Council's approval tonight.

Councilwoman Scarniench – If there's no objection, can we put everybody's name on it?

President Holzheimer Gail – Any objections? No, we will add all of Council as sponsors. Another example of JJR's good work. We appreciate their work and they have certainly helped us move forward with our process. Seeing no further questions.

Councilman Van Ho moved to close debate, Councilman Langman seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call: Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.
Passed.

Res. 167-2010 (208-10) Annual Action Plan CDBG 2011

A resolution approving the Annual Action Plan for the FY 2011 Entitlement Year under the Community Development Block Grant Program of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development as recommended by the Citizens' Advisory Committee appointed by the Mayor of the City of Euclid and authorizing the Mayor to submit said Annual Action Plan to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Sponsored by Councilpersons Minarik and Holzheimer Gail)

Councilwoman Minarik moved for passage, Councilwoman Scarniench seconded.

Director Pietravoia – As much as we're excited about the waterfront, there are other areas of the city that need attention and fortunately we're the recipient of a grant each year from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, referred to as our Community Development Block Grant. Asst. Director Gliha, we're fortunate to have his assistance with this. He's been overseeing this program since its inception and he's here tonight specifically to give you a brief report on this resolution and our FY 2011 Action Plan.

Asst. Director Gliha – It is sort of unbelievable that the year 2011 marks the 37th year that the city has participated in this program. Time does fly by. For the 2011 budget process and planning process HUD told us to budget on the amount that we had received in FY 2010 and that was \$1.158 million.

As in the past, we have a Citizens Advisory Committee and that committee is comprised of the following seven members: Council Liaison Mary Jo Minarik; Council President Holzheimer Gail; Mr. Edward Dickson; Mr. Patrick McLaughlin, Mr. Willie Brown, Ms. Laura Gorshe; Mr. Stephen Caviness, have participated in our various meetings.

We did hold three committee meetings and two public hearings. At the first public hearing, as we have in the past, we reviewed past performance of the Block Grant. We went and entertained new proposals and established programs and budgets for FY 2011. The programs that were recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee are as follows: Senior Programs funding \$180,000; Storefront Renovation Funding \$141,500; EDCOR administration, that's the administration of the low interest loan program and of some of the NSP rehab programs they are working with us on, \$50,000; municipal beautification \$136,500; our in-house rehab program, health safety and well being, \$370,000; neighborhood programs \$50,000; administration \$200,000; planning \$30,000. In addition also have to include in the annual action plan the anticipated EDCOR revolving loan program income, which is the funds that go right back into making additional loans. We're estimating a total of \$225,000 for a total of \$1,383,000 for this year.

The final dollar amount has been over the years for the 2011 grant, it will be pending Congressional approval of the CDBG budget. Shortly thereafter HUD will process the grant contract for the city and we will be able to start expending dollars. As has the past couple of years that has happened in late March, early April. We don't anticipate, especially with the new congress coming in, anytime sooner than that. But we do have carry over funds from our 2010 grant that will keep our programs going until we get the new line of credit and be able to start implementing 2011 programs.

We would recommend and appreciate it if Council tonight passed the Resolution authorizing the Mayor to submit the Annual Action Plan so that we can be on time with our submittal to HUD and keep the process moving. With that, if there's any questions, I'd be glad to answer them. Thank you.

President Holzheimer Gail – Thank you Mr. Gliha for your hard work. Mr. Gliha is a wealth of knowledge when it comes to anything block grant and has done a great job of staying on top of the regulations, what we're able to do, what we cannot do. The Block Grant program basically can fund two main areas, activities to eradicate slum and blight and activities that serve low to moderate income residents or areas. We're pretty limited in how we can spend the money, but we have done some very successful programs through the years, certainly through the low interest loan program and Karen Tomsic is here who is the Manager of EDCOR. Through our storefront renovation program, through our municipal beautification program, the senior programs and the many health and safety and programs that enable people to stay in their home and stay in their community.

We are fortunate to get this money. Mr. Gliha one of the questions was, I know with the Census and with the uncertainty of whether we will be at 50,000 population, I don't believe we know yet, but do you have any indication if that will mean anything to our block grant entitlement?

Asst. Director Gliha – Of course all the entitlement cities, especially in northeast Ohio have been rather nervous and we did inquire of HUD and we have been unofficially, unofficially told the entitlement communities will be grandfathered in. What that will mean to our exact grant amount come FY 2012, we're not sure. We will continue to be an entitlement community.

President Holzheimer Gail – I also would like to thank the members of the committee, Councilwoman Minarik and the residents who did put a lot of time in reviewing proposals, reviewing performance last year and making suggestions and participating in the meetings. I do want to acknowledge them as well.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Director Gliha, can you tell me how much of the storefront renovation money is already committed to some place?

Asst. Director Gliha – These dollars will be free for new projects in 2011. Of course with all the activity going on downtown, those are dollars committed from either our 2009 grant or the 2010 grant and in some cases the CDBG-R grant. These are free dollars and we intend to strike out and move further into the community.

Councilwoman Scarniench – What about the municipal beautification, is that going to be the same thing?

Asst. Director Gliha – Same thing.

Councilman Langman – Mr. Gliha, I know you just said we were unofficially officially told we would be grandfathered in, but as you know Congress controls that process and we have quite a different Congress being seated. Do we have any feedback from our federal delegation that that in fact will be the case, the entitlement communities will be grandfathered in?

Asst. Director Gliha – We have not spoken with anyone since election night, so the official information that I was receiving from HUD was before then. I think we've all read and we've all heard that Congress is going to take a hard look at all of the domestic grant programs. We have to remember that this program was actually created under President Nixon, so it has a long history of being supported by both the Democratic party and the Republican party. We're pretty confident that the program will continue on.

Councilman Langman – Although some of the youngsters in the audience may not know who President Nixon was, it was a long time ago. Let's hope that the program continues as is; it is a great benefit to us. It should be interesting to see how the new Congress unwinds as far as all of these spending initiatives. Thank you.

Councilman Gilliam – In support of Asst. Director Gliha, I believe Cleveland Heights is still considered grandfathered entitlement city even though they're under 50,000. I'm hopeful that clemency or that particular grandfathering will happen in the City of Euclid. I have a quick question for Asst. Director Gliha. There is a program existing in Euclid running out of Shore Center called Youth Build. What they're required to do and they're funded by the Department of Labor, what they're required to do is increase neighborhood stability by working on homes or apartments, rehabbing them for low and moderate income. I ran the program at a previous position where we were able to go in and partner with local governments and utilize different funding streams of federal dollars, to if nothing else, to do demos, to do rough finishing and things of that nature. I want to put that out on the table as a way to stretch, not only our rehab dollars but our NSP dollars that can possibly be used. These individuals are between the ages of 18-24, they're being trained by certified builders in Richfield and they're going to be looking for potential homes to work on whether it be in Cleveland, but they're currently housed at Shore Center in Euclid, so I would like to discuss with you about possibly sitting down and partnering to see whether or not we can stretch our dollars in conjunction with the contractors that exist. I wanted to put that out there.

Asst. Director Gliha – We'd be very interested in talking with you.

Councilwoman Jones – Did you mention what the current balance of the 2010 funds are?

Asst. Director Gliha – As of today, I was estimating that we would be carrying approximately \$347,000 from our FY 2010 grant over into 2011.

Councilwoman Jones – Those funds have not been allocated for anything yet?

Asst. Director Gliha – If we break it down by how the budget was comprised in FY 2010, my estimates for senior programs would be \$20,000; storefront renovation \$95,000; municipal beautification \$180,000; health safety well being \$10,000; neighborhood programs \$25,000; administration \$12,000; planning \$5,000. We traditionally carry those funds over as they've been budgeted in the FY 2010 process but we do have the ability to move the dollars around if a certain program needs a few dollars and a certain program doesn't need those dollars.

Councilwoman Minarik moved to close debate, Councilwoman Scarniench seconded. Yeas: Unanimous

Roll Call: Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.
Passed.

Ord. 168-2010 (206-10) Extend Time Period to Expend HOME Funds

An emergency ordinance amending Ordinance No. 96-2010 passed June 21, 2010 authorizing the Mayor of the City of Euclid or his designee to enter into an amendment to the existing Agreement with the Board of County Commissioners, Cuyahoga County, Ohio (the County) to extend the time period through December 31, 2011 to expend HOME administrative funds in the amount of Seventeen Thousand Two Hundred Two Dollars (\$17,202.00) on a reimbursement basis for HOME administrative expenses incurred by the City and /or EDCOR on behalf of the City. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik)

Councilman Van Ho moved for passage, Councilwoman Scarniench seconded.

Director Pietravoia – This is a fairly simple housekeeping piece of legislation. The County had agreed that if we didn't expend all of the dollars in 2010 they were agreeable to extending the time period for the contract through the end of 2011. That's what this legislation would make it official by the City Council authorizing the extension of that existing contract.

Councilman Gilliam – Two basic questions. I understand that the County is allowing for this extension. Normally this money is supposed to be spent in the current calendar year, correct, I mean according to the terms for reimbursement?

Director Pietravoia – There is flexibility in the time period that the dollars can be spent. But our actual contract that we authorize, the original piece of legislation only authorized us through the end of 2010. There was always an intent that the dollars could be spent into 2011 if necessary but our original piece of legislation did not recognize that.

Councilman Gilliam – This is basically reimbursement back to the City for expenses, correct?

Director Pietravoia – Yes, for administrative expenses in operating the HOME funded programs.

Councilman Gilliam – The only reason why I question was just concern about the fact that this was deemed an emergency ordinance and I understand timing is the nature of it, but I do know that we knew that this was going to be expiring in 2010 and we're making an emergency ordinance. I guess was it an error on our part as far as submission? Was it just the processing? My only concern is at this point we made it an emergency ordinance when this may have been addressed earlier. That's my comment, I don't necessarily need a full laid out determination on what happened, but I'm just concerned about sometimes we put out emergency when it is at the last minute. I said, we, not anybody in particular. We run into these issues where we almost feel compelled to do this. I just wanted to make that comment.

Director Pietravoia – The County Commissioners need to act on this prior to the end of the year. In order for us to get it to them in time, we couldn't wait the normal 30 day period. If we had brought this forward sooner, we could have potentially avoided the emergency nature of the legislation, but other than that, nothing would have changed.

Councilman Gilliam – I also understand with the changing of the County government, there are some issues that have to be addressed as well. Thank you kindly.

Councilman Gilliam moved to close debate, Councilman O'Neill seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilman Van Ho moved to suspend the rules, Councilwoman Jones seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call: Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.
Passed.

Ord. 169-2010 (209-10) Purchase Agreements for NSP Rehabilitated Houses

An emergency ordinance authorizing the Mayor of the City of Euclid or his designee to enter into Residential Purchase Agreements for the sales of rehabilitated houses under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), after approval by Board of Control. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik)

Councilman Van Ho moved for passage, Councilman Langman seconded.

Director Pietravoia – This is the other federally funded program that we receive significant dollars, City of Euclid received \$2.5 million in the first round of the Neighborhood Stabilization program. This is aimed in particular at dealing with the abandoned, foreclosed properties in the community. We also were notified of an upcoming award in 2011 of a little over a million dollars in future NSP funding. I'm pleased to report and we have Marty Castelletti here with us this evening, the program manager, that we have two homes that are essentially complete and another 13 that are in process, they are under contract and work has started on the rehabilitation of those additional 13 homes with several of those also nearing completion. We're at a point now where we need to take our next step and get authorization from Council to actually sell the homes that are completed. We did go through a RFP process for real estate broker services. We received five proposals from area realtors. We narrowed that down and made an award at Board of Control for two area realtors, Smythe Cramer represented by Lenny Vaccaro and Remax represented by Annabelle Neshkin. We'll be entering into agreements with those two individuals shortly. In order to sell the properties, our local ordinance required whenever the city sells property it owns that each sale comes before Council unless some other procedure is approved. This was similar to when we were purchasing the properties and we came forward and with council's cooperation and authority we passed legislation that gave us the ability to go through Board of Control for each purchase. We're looking at a similar process now where we would work with the two realtors that have been retained. They will provide a broker's opinion of pricing for the properties. That will also have to conform with the NSP rules.

Based on that we would then work with them to market the properties, accept offers and this legislation will give us authority to actually sign the agreements and make the sale. We would bring each of those individually to Board of Control as they occur. I believe that covers the nuts and bolts of how the process would work. Either Marty or I would be happy to answer any questions.

Councilman O'Neill – I know the goal here is to sell the property with what we have invested in it, but if we don't get any bids on the property for the amount that we have invested and we end up selling the property for less than the city's investment with the NSP funds, do you need to bring that back to Council for approval? Or do you have the authority to go ahead and make the deal?

Director Pietravoia – As this is structured we would have authority to go ahead and make the deal. The federal government has put out additional guidance on the sale of the properties. Marty maybe able to comment on this but they have a recommended phasing of the reduction in pricing based on a time period that has past. I don't recall the exact percentages or timing but Marty should be able to comment on that.

Mr. Castelletti – The timeframe is every 30 days we're allowed to drop the price by 10%. Don't have to necessarily follow that timeframe, I guess it depends on the time of the year and what the market is doing.

Councilman O'Neill – Ideally we sell the property for what we have invested in it. I appreciate that, it keeps the process moving a lot faster by not having it come back to Council. Thank you.

Director Pietravoia – Just to add, we have seen evidence from the private rehabilitation that is going on in the community. Actually smaller homes in some cases that are being sold for about the same price that we've invested in the NSP homes. I think it shows that if you have a quality product with the amenities that the buyers are looking for that we can achieve those prices. I'm hopeful that we will be able to get close to, if not our asking price.

Councilwoman Minarik – On the two realtors, Smythe Cramer and Remax, the two homes that we have right now for example on 195 and Friday, one is going to be valued much higher than the other one I'm assuming. Are the realtors going to be competing against each other, or how is that going to work so that it is not unfair if one gets the higher priced house and the other gets the lower priced house?

Mr. Castelletti – We haven't really decided who is going to get which house, but as with any properties realtors can bring in other people and then they split the commission. Being that both these properties are going to be listed by two different realtors, any other realtor can come in and also bring in their client and then they split the commission.

Councilwoman Minarik – That was my question, they both can move on these homes.

Mr. Castelletti – Yes.

Councilwoman Jones – So the realtors is only working off commission, there's no financial agreement that the city is making between these two realtors?

Mr. Castelletti – That is correct. We decided when we went out for RFP that we would keep it at the standard commission rate that way we stay competitive. If you have a realtor out there that is trying to selling a house and they see one of our NSP houses and it is only going to pay a 6% commission, they may pass it up so we wanted to keep it competitive.

Councilwoman Scarniench – First of all Mr. Castelletti you've done a great job with this program and I'm going to ask the same question I ask all the time, when are we going to see these houses?

Mr. Castelletti – I would say in about two weeks we'll have the open house.

Councilman Gilliam – Mr. Castelletti just a couple of quick questions. If I heard you correctly that once the house is listed every 30 days you can drop the price and you used the term 10%. Is that up to 10% or you have to drop it by 10%?

Mr. Castelletti – That is up to 10%. We're probably going to try to hold out a little bit longer and also maybe drop the price. That will be dictated by each realtor.

Councilman Gilliam – The NSP program, I'm just curious, regarding to closing costs and things of that nature, how is that going to be handled in this process when a potential buyer wants to sign a potential purchase agreement? Is Euclid deeming that the actual buyer be responsible for closing costs? Is there some type of split with government money? I just wanted to get clarity on that.

Mr. Castelletti – That is up to us and I would imagine that would be negotiated in the price of the house.

Councilman Gilliam – This is an ethical question but I just wanted to point this out and there is no indication from the city staff, but we have two realtors, Smythe Cramer and Remax, are we going to be a little bit, how do I say practical and make sure that there is no collusion where I work for Remax and I'm the seller agent and Councilman O'Neill is from Smythe Cramer and he's the buying agent. I like to have equity across the board but I don't want to get into a situation where they are trying to "maximize" their profit on the backs of individuals buying homes in Euclid.

Mr. Castelletti – They will be completely aware of what the NSP rules are and we could also potentially add an anti-collusion agreement into the contract.

Councilman Gilliam – It is just a thought that is out there. The situation may not even come to that but there's a possibility of it and I didn't hear it being expressed this evening so I was just making sure it was brought to the table.

Councilwoman Jones – Are these agreements between Remax and Smythe Cramer, is it for a certain time period? I know we have a number of NSP homes to rehab and that could be the number of years the program could continue and go on. So will it always be these two realty companies or will that change based on performance?

Mr. Castelletti – We will probably offer a contract with a set time and at that point we could either renew it or it could go back out for RFP and pick a couple of new realtors. You're correct, it could be a several year program. Depending on their performance we could potentially go back and look for more realtors.

Councilwoman Jones – This ordinance is just for the two homes that are ready to sell now?

Mr. Castelletti – This ordinance would be for any of the NSP homes to be sold. The realtors would be a separate issue where we're just hiring them to do the sales of homes. It is two separate issues.

Councilman Van Ho – As I read this, this is just to give the Mayor authority to act and a fiduciary responsibility to try to get the best deal for the city, is that correct? It has regardless of what realtor were to be involved?

Director Pietravoia – That's correct Councilman Van Ho. In acting though it is actually the authority to sign an agreement to sell as well.

Councilman O'Neill – Two questions. One is more of a statement. When it comes to the listing of property, basically whether it be Smythe Cramer or the other realtor, basically they're listing the property. Any realtor can bring any client in and purchase that property and then they split the 7%, it is 3.5 and 3.5. So all the other one is doing is they're just getting the listing which is the preferred thing as a realtor you want to be listing the property then you have every realtor out there working for you. It is more of a statement. My question is, I know we're busy with the administration and all that, but what precludes us from listing a house ourselves for sale by owner, us being the owner?

Director Pietravoia – If we did that, I think the biggest disadvantage is it wouldn't go into the multiple listings. There's a huge benefit to be gained by having a professional realtor that could help with the negotiations, help with all the paperwork. There's a lot of hand holding that goes on typically in the purchase of a home. The brokers are usually the ones that are assisting with all of that.

Councilman O'Neill – If we were to in the future list a house ourselves and then maybe we employ a realtor just to do the closing and give them a nominal fee just to do the paperwork or the hand holding. It is a thought for the future. We'll see how this goes and maybe possibly we could entertain that somewhere down the road and save some of that money. Thank you.

Councilman Van Ho – Two things that pop up. First of all if we were to try to sell it ourselves, you'd see it sit on the market for a good long time because the multiple listing brings realtors from not just Euclid but all over to try to sell your house. Then a technical question, doesn't Lenny Vaccaro work for Howard Hannah not Smythe Cramer?

Director Pietravoia – We keep saying Smythe Cramer, it is Howard Hannah. I'm showing my age.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Councilwoman Jones brought up a good question. Should we not put a time limit on this that we're going to be involved with these two particular realtors? Usually if I put my house up for sale, you sign a contract for three months, whatever. If they don't sell it you can sign up with them again or you can change. What if we put a time frame like a year so that at the end of the year we can go out again and hopefully we would have sold some houses, maybe some other people would want to be involved in the program. I really think there should be some kind of a time put into this.

Director Pietravoia – A couple of points. That is not part of the legislation tonight but we do appreciate the input. While it was approved by Board of Control, we didn't have a specific time limit and we haven't entered into those agreements yet. So we can entertain, I think a year would be practical in this market, that would give us a chance to see how they are going to operate and if necessary after a year then we could go after other realtors. There's nothing to say that we couldn't bring on other brokers at the same time as well. This is not exclusive in that regard. In fact we originally intended to hire one broker and decided after we saw their proposals to go with two and hopefully that will help expedite the sale of the properties.

Councilman Wojtila – I do realize this legislation is not about the listing agreement, but the question is, why don't the listing agreements have to come before council, because of the dollar amount? The Mayor enters into a listing agreement, the City enters into a listing agreement with a realtor.

Director Pietravoia – With the actual real estate brokers. Yes, that was the case. We brought it before Board of Control because of the anticipated dollar amount.

Councilman Wojtila moved to close debate, Councilman Van Ho seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilman Langman moved to suspend the rules, Councilman Gilliham seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll call: Yeas: Gilliham, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho,
Holzheimer Gail

Passed.

Ord. 170-2010 (125a-10) Amended Consolidated Compensation

An emergency ordinance setting the benefits and compensation to be paid City of Euclid personnel, other than employees of a collective bargaining unit, and rescinding Ordinance No. 129-2005 and all amendments thereto, and all other legislative enactments or administrative directives inconsistent hereto, and enacting in lieu thereof the within ordinance to be known and cited as the 2010 CONSOLIDATED COMPENSATION ORDINANCE. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik) (Recommended for passage as amended by Executive & Finance Committee) (Second Reading)

Councilwoman Scarniench moved for passage, Councilwoman Jones seconded.

Director Frey – We went back after the last Council Meeting, Council person Van Ho provided some comments and thoughts. We went through the compensation ordinance again, made a couple of either grammar or formatting type changes. We made one point of clarification under who was included or not included under the coverage of this ordinance. So we have prepared for tonight (125b-10) that we would ask you to kindly consider for passage tonight. I know we've indicated to Councilman Gilliham's question, we indicated this an emergency ordinance. We don't anticipate this taking effect until January 1, 2011, so it need not be an emergency, necessarily, but certainly if we don't act on it tonight, it would need to be an emergency to be in place by the time. I hope that we'll act on it tonight.

We did include in the (125b) version, we added in the 5th week of vacation. I know that was a point of discussion at the last meeting. I would ask Council President for the members of Council to determine whether they want to include that provision in here as a 5th week of vacation. We did remove in the (b) version the car allowance for directors. As I said, we made some other formatting and points of clarification but no substantive changes from what we sent out the last council meeting and what we sent again to the members of Council this past week for your review prior to tonight's meeting.

Again we have the count, 84 full time non-union employees that are covered under this agreement. Of those 84 employees, 27 of them are in status with the city of 27 or more years. There are seven that are in the status of 15-19 years. As you can see we're getting to the point where longevity is going to stop being an issue relatively soon. The change that we have proposed in the longevity section of this will affect only those seven employees. The vacation change that we have in here will affect 47 of the 84 employees, they have not yet reached a fifth or sixth week of vacation service. If we allow the 5th week,

then we are increasing the amount of paid time off but we are not increasing an expense because we historically have not replaced those people when they are on vacation.

I'd be glad to answer questions. I'm hoping that we've discussed this and we can move on it this evening. I'd ask for your support in whatever version we want to go but I would recommend that we move with (125b) with its changes if Council is in agreement.

President Holzheimer Gail – We talked about this at the last meeting and the two committee meetings that we did hold, but there was a committee that worked very hard within city hall, made up of staff. Council provided suggestions and this was, there was a lot of thought, a lot of research put into this. It is not meant to be punitive in any way, but really to work at more closely aligning our time off policies with the market place and just establishing a better structure for our consolidated compensation ordinance. I'm happy with (125b), but I know there are some questions about the 5th week. My suggestion would be that we discuss that amendment specifically by itself and then I believe we could do the other amendments as a whole because they're primarily grammatical, re-ordering or re-numbering with the exception of removing the car allowance which is already gone. Any comments?

Councilwoman Scarniench – I think you said it exactly the way it is. We have had a lot of discussions and I appreciate the discussion. I really think that (125b) is the right way to go and I won't have a problem with separating the vacation as a separate vote and leaving everything else in. I would make the motion to amend that we accept (125b).

President Holzheimer Gail – Do we want to do the vacation piece separate?

Councilwoman Scarniench – Don't we have to approve to talk about it first?

President Holzheimer Gail – We could either move to accept the amendments as in (125b), but I thought we wanted to talk about just the 5th week of vacation by itself first. Just take that piece, that was the understanding I had. Law Director Frey, do we need to state the exact language? In (125b) it is listed on page 6.

Director Frey – It is section 13 Vacation .4, vacation duration. In the (125b) version we've added a provision that would for employees hired on or before January 1, 2000 not having completed 15 years of continuous service shall be entitled to and receive a maximum annual 5 week vacation upon completion of their 20th year and thereafter. That is a longer period of time than what is in the current compensation ordinance to get to five weeks. It is a category of individuals that have been here for 11 years at least. They may have bridge time, time of other public employment service that they brought with them. They don't yet qualify for five weeks, that would get that fifth week after they've reached their 20th year of service under this amendment.

President Holzheimer Gail – Why don't we talk about just that amendment first. Vote on just that amendment separately.

Councilwoman Scarniench moved to amend the Vacation Duration as stated by Director Frey. Councilman Langman seconded.

Councilwoman Scarniench – I'm really adamant about this. I feel very strongly about this. As everybody knows, over the years, I've been here a long time, sitting in the back of the room, I have complained about how much time we get off. My husband worked 41 years and only got 5 weeks, working for Cleveland Heights. I get that, but I think it is important that the fact is that since 1996 we have been cutting the non-union employees all the time, they have never gotten back what was taken away from them before. They have nobody to speak for them.

We're talking about 11 people who've already completed 10 years and then you got 18 people and I'm not sure how many of those would actually fall into the category of being able to get the 5th week. I know person for sure, January she would actually get her 5th week. I don't think that's fair not to give that to them. Eventually it is going to be that we only have the four weeks so we're only talking about a specific number of people and I hope everyone will approve this. Thank you.

Councilwoman Minarik – I have a couple of problems with this, one is that if we give this, they're getting 4 weeks. They're already getting almost three weeks of paid time off, when you consider the National Holidays and the two personal days, that's 14 days, that's almost 3 weeks. So, now we're going to be up to 8 weeks of paid time off, that is unreasonable in the public sector when people are being laid off, people are losing their homes, when are getting no more than maybe 4 sick days a year, maybe no more than 3 weeks or 4 weeks of vacation. It is unacceptable in my opinion that a public employee should get double the amount of paid time off as the taxpayers who fund that employee's position. I am very much

opposed to adding the fifth week. It will increase the productivity if we begin to limit the vacation and the paid time off. Mayor has made it very clear that our non-union employees work more than 39 hours a week. Well maybe part of it is because right now they're getting 7-8 weeks of paid time off. That is unreasonable.

Crain's Cleveland Business editorial today talked about the retirement benefits of teachers. It is all over the news. The perks that public employees are getting is totally out of balance with the private sector. It is the private sector that pays for these employees. In addition, the retirement benefits that public employees get are very, very generous, all right, as opposed to social security benefits where for the third year in a row there is no wage raise. The maximum you can collect from social security is \$28,000. We already pay life insurance for our employees, okay we pick up that tab. We pick up 14% of their pension pay-ins. Social security doesn't do that. We are very generous with our non-union employees. Ask anyone in the private sector, we are more than generous.

I am adamant in saying cap it at 4 weeks for those who have not yet earned their 5th week. I will be voting no on the amendment.

Councilman Van Ho – A couple of things, first of all Director Brett, if I'm correct, public employees pay more for their part of the retirement than do social security recipients?

Director Brett – Yes they do. Normally unless that person is an independent contractor. Normally in the private sector 7.6% of the employee's gross salary goes to social security. The employer matches that with 7.6. In the private sector 1.045 goes to Medicare. In the public sector, if that person has been hired since 1982 or switched jobs since 1982 then they now pick up that same Medicare contribution. So in essence public sector employee is paying the 10% pension contribution and 1.045 Medicare. I don't want to make this sound political, but bear in mind, me for example, I have my 40 quarters in for Social Security, however when I retire, I won't see a dime of that because of the windfall pension laws that say that for every \$4 of pension I make, I lose \$3 of social security; that's kind of another thing. So again, this is to balance the argument made by people that say our benefit packages are rich. We do lose money on those two.

Councilman Van Ho – I will be voting no also but it is because of what I said at the last meeting. I don't think that, we always reach down and take money from the non-represented people because it sounds good because after all they make those big salaries. As I said at the last meeting, I think we should have the compensation and so forth, the study to cover everybody and then make the decisions. I don't see the rush to do this. We need to be fair to our employees. I will be voting no also but not for the same reason. I support Councilwoman Scarniench on her idea. We made these promises to these people years ago and now all of a sudden we're going to yank two weeks worth of vacation. That just doesn't seem right. If it was a mistake that was made 20 years ago, yes we need to honor those agreements.

Councilman Wojtila – If we could just be clear on the amendment. The first amendment is going to be the 5 weeks versus the 4 weeks. Councilwoman Scarniench was in favor of that, Councilwoman Minarik was against that.

Councilman Van Ho – Although I'll be voting no on the whole resolution because of the very base, but I agree with Councilwoman Scarniench, we ought to keep our promises.

Councilman Wojtila – Thank you and I wanted everybody to be clear. The first motion we will be making will be the amendment for the 4 weeks versus the 5 weeks.

President Holzheimer Gail – That's the amendment that's on the table, that is what our discussion is supposed to be about at the moment.

Councilman Wojtila – I will keep it to that. I will be voting no on the amendment. Simply put, the purpose of this legislation is supposed to align our time off policies with the market place. Those aren't my words, those are the words that Director Frey nicely put in his summary email. So I support that, I'm agreeing with that. I will be voting no on the amendment.

Councilwoman Minarik – Now I have a question. (125b) has 5 weeks in the ordinance. So, if we agree with the 5 weeks, it stays. So actually we should be voting

President Holzheimer Gail – We're not asking you whether you want to do (b). The motion on the table is only about the 5 weeks.

Councilwoman Minarik – Insert the five weeks into; okay that's

President Holzheimer Gail – Not into (b) into (a) which is what is on the agenda.

Councilwoman Minarik – I see, I see, I see.

President Holzheimer Gail – (b) includes those changes already but that's not what is on the table. What is on the agenda, what technically is in front of us is (a). The motion on the floor is to include the section identified on page 6 of (b), that's what it would look like if it passes.

Just for clarification point. I think it is a fair compromise. To Councilman Van Ho's point, these employees have been with us for awhile. When they were hired they were told about a certain package. We've worked towards getting that inline. This to me is a fair compromise to those employees who have been here, who have worked hard, who have given up pay cuts over the years. But it also continues to move us forward so I will support the amendment.

Any other questions? I want to make sure we're clear, what we're voting on. The amendment is to add the additional 5th week for those employees who were hired on or before January 1, 2000 but they would not receive that 5th week until the 20 years of service. We're just voting on that amendment.

Roll Call on Amendment:

Yeas: Gilliham, Scarniench, Jones, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail

Nays: Minarik, Wojtila,

Abstain: O'Neill

Amendment passed.

President Holzheimer Gail – So that language is now in the ordinance that is in front of us which is technically (125a). The other suggested changes we have before us are what is indicated in (125b). I believe are not major substantial changes, but I'll review them and I hope we can adopt the other changes as listed in (125b) as a whole.

On the first page it includes reference to the employees of the Municipal Court being exempt from this ordinance because they are by Charter or by ordinance I believe it is.

Director Frey – The Court is a separate appointing authority. The Judge has indicated that she will in all likelihood adopt most or all of this ordinance to cover the municipal employees. But this Council does not have the authority, the City does not have the authority to set the terms and conditions of employment for the Court employees. That's the reason for this.

President Holzheimer Gail – The other item is page 9, it deletes Section 2 under expenses which is about the Director's car allowance. To be clear, they currently are not receiving a car allowance but this was the suggestion to officially take it out of the ordinance. Then the renumbering that happens because of that.

On page 10, was a change in order to read better and be clearer, one paragraph was changed into two so that required some re-ordering of numbers and a small provision, except as provided above. Those are pretty minor changes. Do people feel that we could vote on those as a whole? Yes?

Councilwoman Scarniench – As far as (125b) is concerned, I think this is a good compromise for what we had. We have taken away some personal days, we've added some Bereavement days. We've adjusted as far as the vacation time, I think it is very important. Our staff works very hard all of the time and it is not fair to them and I agree with Councilman Van Ho, but I will go ahead and vote for this now that we made the change because it is a start, it is a beginning. It is going to say one big thing to the unions when it is time for them to start talking that we can't keep doing things as usual. There has to be changes because we can't go on the way it is.

Councilman Van Ho – Technical question. We're taking this out about car allowance. Will a Director be able, assuming Director Frey would have to drive to Columbus for some meeting. Would he be able to expense that back to the City for mileage?

Director Frey – Yes, we provide the mileage as whatever the IRS reimbursement rate is. That's true today for any city employee not using a city vehicle for that purpose.

Councilman Van Ho – I just picked you out as an example.

Director Frey – I just wanted to make one other point. The Exhibits A & B that belong to the ordinance, we have several positions that have changed or been added like the Recycling Collectors. So what will end up in the final version will be updated to those described positions. Exhibit B is the range of rates, we went back to the old scale, that's already been done in (125a); that will be in (125b). Essentially we have not changed those from the 2005 compensation ordinance pending the outcome of that wage analysis. We will update Exhibit A the described positions to include those recently included positions.

President Holzheimer Gail – Would somebody like to make the motion to amend to include the other amendments as listed in (125b)?

Councilwoman Scarniench moved to amend as stated. Councilwoman Jones seconded.

President Holzheimer Gail – These are all the items other than the 5 weeks which we already voted on.

Roll Call on the amendments:

Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O'Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.
Amendments passed.

President Holzheimer Gail – Ready to vote on the ordinance?

Councilwoman Scarniench – I make the motion to pass (125b) as amended.

President Holzheimer Gail – We already have that on the floor. Any other discussion before we close debate?

Councilman Gilliam – Excuse me Director Frey, I just had a quick question just for fluency of this actual document. I know we voted on the amendments. When I look at .4 allowance of Sick Leave; (125b) page 7 allowance of Sick Leave. Then I look at page 9 Bereavement Leave. We use the term immediate members of the family in Bereavement and then we don't use those same particular words in absence of sick leave. It appears that immediate family is extended in Section 17 to include grandmother, grandfather, grandfather-in-law, grandmother-in-law; but there's a possibility of those individuals living in the home of a potential employee. If they were exposed to anything contagious, they would be eligible under the sick leave process. I'm just curious was that an omission or is there an intent behind this? My concern is, with people leaving with extending families, taking families in, grandparents whatever the case maybe for economic reasons or health reasons, it is a little bit confusing to an average worker. If my grandmother lived with me and she's sick, I can't take sick time; but if she passes, I have bereavement time.

Director Frey – To answer your question Council person Gilliam, we made the conscience decision to extend those who were covered in the bereavement leave. I could certainly, I think better argue that the allowance of sick leave should be confined to household members only. I think that's how we tried to address that. Before we would recommend tonight a change, I would want to make sure that any change that we suggested for Section 14.4 doesn't run afoul of the Family Medical Leave act. I would ask to just leave it alone for tonight but I will look at it and if we need to correct it, we will correct it in a subsequent piece. I want to make sure that we don't have a Family Medical Leave question.

Councilman Gilliam – Understood, my goal was not to amend it but just to bring that point forward.

Director Frey – We did in fact make the change in the bereavement leave, that was a conscience decision. I'm not sure we addressed the sick leave on the family side. Okay I'm getting a text. Sick leave usage is defined by Code. So that maybe by the Ohio Revised Code. I'll confirm that and send you an email.

Councilman Gilliam – I'm glad to hear we have a code specialist outside texting information but thank you. I just wanted to bring it up for clarification.

Director Frey – I'll make sure we clarify it.

Councilwoman Minarik – I would just like to commend the administration. When I first introduced my version, it was very drastic. I think this is a good compromise, though I am disappointed that the amendment for 5 weeks is included. I will be supporting this because it is a great start. It does not hurt the non-union employees in a monetary way. It begins the process of closing the gap between the public and the private sector work place. Thank you.

President Holzheimer Gail – All right, I think we're ready to vote on Ord. (125b).

Councilwoman Scarniench moved to close debate, Councilman Gilliam seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilwoman Jones moved to suspend the rules, Councilwoman Minarik seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Ord. (177a-10) Scavenging Permitted Failed

An ordinance amending Section 941.15 of the Streets, Utilities, and Public Services Code of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Euclid to permit scavenging on a limited basis. (Sponsored by Mayor Cervenik and Councilperson Langman) (Recommended for passage as amended by Housing and Building Standards Committee)

Councilman Langman moved for passage, Councilman Van Ho seconded.

Councilman Langman – I think my colleagues have seen my emails and my comments during the committee meeting, so I want to turn it over to the administration for their comments. At the last committee meeting Asst. Law Director Sweeney explained why the administer favors, so I'd like to hear what Law Director Frey has to say.

Director Frey – As I bundle (125) for another day, thank you Council. Asst. Director Sweeney represented the Department of Law, I know the Executive Office Dave Brooks also weighed in on the Police Department's perspective on scavenging. Two things are important to note. One that it is, we believe an opportunity to reduce items from the solid waste disposal stream. By making those reductions, reducing our cost for dumping the solid waste that is part of our contract that we're under right now having both the pick up and disposal components to it so that we think that's an advantage. We wanted to appreciate that the neighbors don't want unfettered access to what they've put out for trash collection. So to accommodate the discussion at the last committee meeting, the change was made to reflect in (177a) that the time for scavenging would be between the hours of 8 AM and 8 PM. Well you could go up to 8 PM the night before and no sooner than 8 AM the day of collection. It would essentially ensure that this occurs in the daytime. This time of year it is still going to be dark at 8 PM, but we thought this was a workable compromise time that would not disturb the public peace. It would accomplish what we wanted as a goal of removing items from the disposal stream but not disturb the public peace. I know there was discussion at the last committee meeting about putting a sunset provision in this and I would suggest to Council that if we find that this doesn't work or it has flaws that we revise it. Whether we outright repeal the change or we make some further revision. I think this is a good start to this process.

President Holzheimer Gail – Chief Repicky, any comments from the Police Dept.?

Chief Repicky – The time was suggested by the Department, but also I concur with Director Frey but in addition that the recycling material is not included in the scavenging. I recommend passage.

Councilman Langman – I prefer the term scrappers myself or curbside shopping in deference to Councilwoman Minarik. I would like to thank the Mayor and the Law Dept. for helping to draft this. As the Law Director said, it is all about tonnage. If we're serious about reducing the tonnage that goes to landfill, this is away to address it. Whether we'll see a huge reduction or not, because we all know that happens now. But I think by making this change we can encourage more of this. Usually what scrappers are looking for are the heavier items, metals, appliances, furniture and that does weigh quite a bit and adds to our fees to actually dispose of. I'm happy with the compromises. We can monitor this and repeal or change as we see fit. I know at the Committee Meeting Capt. Brooks indicated as much that they can report back to Council if there's any issues with that. I think most folks that do this to supplement their income are honorable people, they're law abiding citizens. I think we'll have very few issues but in any profession you may have one or two people that use this as a pre-text to do other things. I hope we can pass this tonight and add this to our recycling efforts.

Councilwoman Scarniench – I will be voting no on this. I've stated it over and over again. I haven't spoken to one of my constituents that thinks this is a great idea. They do not want people to be allowed in their yards for anything. Right now people do it and it is not legal, but we don't really do anything about it unless there's an issue. If we go ahead and do this, it is saying, it's okay you can come in Euclid and do whatever you need to do to help yourself. People don't want it. They absolutely don't. If we could hold off on this and let the recycling get started, maybe six months from now I could change my mind. But I think we're trying to do to many things all at once and we don't know what is going to happen. Now we're going to have the recycle bin that's sitting there and who's going to keep monitoring that they don't take that which we desperately need to be able to recycle. I think we're trying to do to many things at once so I will be voting no.

Councilman Langman – Just to clarify this change does not give anybody permission to go onto your property. It is to take items that are on the public right of way for disposal. That is a non-factor, no one is allowed to go on your property to grab something the way this is proposed. I think recycling, the bins and this matter are two separate matters. The money is in the metals, not in the plastic. We may get something just on the volume, but for the average person and we've seen some of the scrappers around, they're not picking up plastic bottles, they're looking for metal cans. Again, I have to emphasize this does not allow anybody to pick through your garbage bag or garbage can. That does not change at all. I don't think waiting matters one way or the other and I don't believe this will allow nefarious people into the city. Our streets our public, they can come in here any time and look. I don't think we should use this as a pretext to think that this is going to keep out all the bad people that might be wanting to come into the city. Again, this is an opportunity to reduce tonnage that is basically free, it doesn't cost us anything to allow this. They're taking something that somebody is discarding and they're taking it from the public right of way to reduce the cost to us to the citizens, to the city of disposal. I think it is something I'm willing to look at and to review it, but I think other communities do it and they don't have those problems. I was speaking with someone who lives in Twinsburg, they've had scrapper legislation for year, no problems at all. I know other communities do it. I don't think this is a radical change.

My final comment is, it bothers me when we say we have a law on the books but we're not going to enforce it, we're just going to kind of wink and nod at it. I don't know how the Law Director feels, but I think you get into dangerous ground when you say, well we're not going to enforce a particular ordinance because somebody could very well call us on that and then we would be forced to prosecute. I have a tough time saying we'll just wink at this particular ordinance and we just won't enforce it. I hope we can pass it. I think it is sensible legislation, legislation that other communities do. Thank you.

Councilman Gilliam – In looking at this particular ordinance there are a few things that I noticed that I have a concern about. It specifically says that a person can begin scrapping basically only until 8 PM on the day prior to collection. I took my Ward for example and said that Monday is our collection day. At 5:00 we're allowed to put out the trash on Sunday. That's about a 3 hour window for individuals to come in and actually if this were to pass, to actually look at the metals and things of that nature. Then on trash day, you cannot start until 8 AM.

Now we prohibited scavenging for a reason, but I would probably bet that there wasn't a lot of enforcement of this because some people in the neighborhood did like it and did not report it. At this point I feel our Police Department's resources should not be basically looking at this as a major issue, when you look at the priority of calls that come in. Should there be an enforcement of the law? Yes, but when a judgment call is made, scavenging is not going to be on the top of anybody's priority list.

What I'm looking at is, as Councilman Langman has stated, there's no cost to the city. I'm not even looking at the social costs. All I'm looking at is this; I don't think this would be enforced any more based on the previous history. Individuals in my ward have told me they know who the scrappers are and some actually help the scrappers get rid of that stuff because it is an easy way for them to just remove it. They complain about the possibility of intensive traffic or more traffic in their neighborhood and they have a concern about that as well. The ultimate fear was not that a scavenger is going to come into my neighborhood and rob me, people live in cul-de-sacs, people live in quiet neighborhoods and they pointed those things out to me.

Now I think this is good legislation but I stand on the point that with so many changes coming about with recycling and the education piece needed to be done and then we have to evaluate this, why this may encourage the reduced tonnage for solid waste, I think at this point we're running into major issues. I've stated before, we have residents in this city who do not follow the garbage rules as we speak. If scavenging is allowed, I have constituents who put their trash out on Saturday and I have no way to rectify that situation. But if someone calls and says my trash is out illegally on Saturday but they're scavenging on Saturday and not Sunday, there's just too much confusion for our police department to enforce.

As I stated before, this is a good piece of legislation but I think the implementation of it right now is not appropriate and there maybe some more teeth in it based upon the results of our recycling efforts. If we're seeing people do certain things, scavenging can be allowed on a permitted basis based on the results of our recycling and solid waste removal. I will be voting no, not because I think it is bad legislation, I just don't think it is appropriate at this time.

Councilwoman Minarik – First of all I would like my name added to this as a co-sponsor, I have already mentioned it to Councilman Langman. It is a simple piece of legislation that really been made complicated. We're letting people do what people have been doing for decades and it is part of America. I do disagree with Councilman Langman when he said that there is no cost to the city by implementing it. There is a cost to the city. This year we're paying \$39 a ton. Next year I believe Director Smith it is going up to \$41.50 or \$42 a ton. Every year for the five years of the contract with J&J our tonnage costs are going up \$2.50 per ton.

So for every ton that the scrapper does not get, it is costing the city about \$40 a ton. That's a lot of plastic and aluminum cans. However it is not a lot of hot water tanks and washers and dryers and other heavy metal objects or lawnmowers and stuff. Today Board of Control we approved the purchase of plastic recycling tubs over the course of four years it is approximately \$88,000. In 2011 we're going to be paying \$15,000. The following year \$18,000. That's another 375 tons that we have to eliminate otherwise there's a cost to the city. Anything we can do to reduce the landfill is a good thing. This legislation saves the city money. In a time where we're scrunching every dime and every nickel I think this is a very good ordinance.

Again, if you're not going to enforce the law, you shouldn't have the law in place. When we have the six inch for grass, the Housing Inspector are told, if you're going to cite one house for six inches, you have to go down to every house on that street or the city can be sued for not justly following through on treating everyone equally.

If people are putting their garbage out before the time they're supposed to, you are allowed to call the city and I think it is housing or engineering and they will come out and the person will be cited. There are laws on the books. Not to enforce some of these laws is ridiculous and I don't want to have to go to jail or pay a fine. I would ask that my colleagues think about the economic impact of this ordinance that it is a good thing for the city and pass it.

Councilman Van Ho – I will be voting no because I think this is bad public policy. I agree with Councilwoman Scarniench. I would love to save some money, I've spent 30 years trying to do that. But I think the public perception of come out and go through Euclid's garbage isn't worth the little bit that we will save. I'll vote no.

Councilman Gilliam – My comments are just plain and simple. There are many laws that exist in any city of codified ordinances, there are many processes and procedures. It is not believable that we can identify every offender, every day, cite them and fine them, it is just not possible. It is not to say that we don't have good staff or good police or good fire, it is almost impossible to do that. We have littering signs all over the city, yet people still litter.

My statement is this, the current prohibition of scavenging is not being enforced because there is not a resident demand to call these people in. Now if scavenging were allowed, it still has to be resident driven. I do not think that whether we have prohibiting of scavenging or the allowance of scavenging is going to make that huge of a difference. I agree with Councilwoman Minarik that we're looking at tonnage and reducing cost. But if the city really wants to look at ways to cut costs, garbage may not be the way to do it at this time, we may have to look at other areas. The reality of it is, \$2.50 is a lot of money for many, but at the same time, there are other areas where the city can save money. Putting it on the back of scavenging is not a plausible reason for me.

Councilwoman Jones – Some of the comments that have been made I agree with. I want to bring up a couple more. One of my concern is a safety issue. We have informed residents and talked to residents about letting the police know or letting someone know when it is unusual behavior in their neighborhoods. For those that may not be home throughout the course of the day when the trash collection happens, they're not going to be there to see it. But there are some residents who are. Residents who are there on a regular basis would know. Would they know this person is a scavenger or not? Maybe, maybe not, if it is somebody on a regular basis. I'm not saying that everybody who comes into the city is going to cause any crimes or burglaries but there is that potential of that happening.

I would vote no on this right now, but I would like to revisit it later. What I would like for us to do it is to get the recycling program in place. Get that going, figure out are we accomplishing the goals that we want to do with the recycling program. There is a certain amount of tonnage that we want to establish and collect. We need to get that under our arms first to be able to determine are we collecting the amount of recycling that we need to. Revisit this at a later date because one of my other concerns is that because someone is coming by and doing the scavenging for whatever items might be out there, that's not going to stop them from also taking what is in the recycle bin or the recycle bin altogether. Whether that will happen, I don't know. Will it happen even if this is provided with that provision or not? I don't know. But I would like for us to get the recycling underway first and then we revisit this. Determine are we actually accomplishing the goals that we need to from the recycling without having to worry that scavengers are now prohibited to come into the city and maybe picking up other things than just the things that they should be. I know even though it says in here in the ordinance that such recyclables are not supposed to be picked up, but again if something doesn't see that and report that to the police, it is going to go unnoticed just like the current scavengers do now. I would prefer that we wait and revisit this after we get the recycling onboard and going.

Councilman Langman – Some final comments. This has nothing to do with the recycling program because it requires no effort from the staff to do anything. To say that we're going to wait while we get our arms around it, the actual recycling program that was passed by the majority of Council, yes that will

take time and effort and education and so forth. But this, if it is to pass, it is almost invisible to most residents. I have to disagree that we have to wait while we get our arms around something else because this doesn't require anything. It is in essence a free move for us to reduce tonnage. No it will not be the magical savior of the budget, but the recycling items that we're going to take to the transfer station will be ultimately sold through the consortium is not the magical bullet for the budget either. These are tools to help make sure that recycling is successful. You can wait. You can wait, 3 months, 6 months, whatever. The parameters aren't going to change, they simply won't. Either you believe in this or you don't.

We've had many, many discussions on this via email, committee meetings and so forth. I will make a motion to close debate.

Councilman Langman moved to close debate, Councilman Wojtila seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilman Langman moved to suspend the rules, Councilman Wojtila seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call: Yeas: Minarik, Wojtila, Langman, Holzheimer Gail

Nays: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, O'Neill, Van Ho

Failed.

Ord. 171-2010 (203-10) CT Consultants Engineering Services

An ordinance authorizing the Director of Public Service of the City of Euclid to enter into an agreement with CT Consultants, Inc., 8150 Sterling Court, Mentor, Ohio 44060, for the purpose of performing routine engineering services for the year 2011. (Sponsored by Councilperson Wojtila by request of Service Director)

Councilman Wojtila moved for passage, Councilman Langman seconded.

Director Smith – At this time I am seeking your approval to enter into a one year contract with CT Consultants. This request pertains to routine engineering services that are provided on a regular basis. This would include 8-10 hours consult per week. Preparation of estimated budgets and various technical services. Preparation of various grant applications and things of that nature. For your awareness this request does not include any specific projects. The retainer fee is \$3500 per month. The same fee as the previous two years.

Last year during the course of discussing this particular contract, there was some interest in obtaining statements and qualifications. We have done that at this time. Although this agreement includes routine services in addition to specific projects any specific project would come back before Council for approval. This is strictly routine consulting services. Part of the reason I feel this would and I'm recommending this is for some stability at this time. I know Director Brett is the new person on the block now, it is no longer myself. We have a lot of projects in the works that are coming to fruition and I think stability at this time would be very prudent and to pursue this contract for one additional year. I appreciate your consideration.

Councilman Van Ho – Director Smith I think I talked with you and we're going to put this out for an RFP this year so that all the other firms would be eligible in 2012?

Director Smith – Last year we actually discussed going out for a request for proposals and we did do that this year. We received a number of statements from various firms. There's numerous firms out there that would be well qualified in addition to CT to offer this service. As we talk about specific projects I would need to come back before the Council to make that award for individual projects. This specifically covers the routine services and at this point in time I feel that CT's the appropriate firm to select.

Councilman Van Ho – Will we be going out for these ordinary services in 2012 or not?

Director Smith – We can.

Councilman Van Ho – I think we should because \$3500 that's \$42,000 a year, that's a fair amount of money.

Director Smith – We can do that.

Councilman Wojtila – Director Smith, how many responses did you get then?

Director Smith – I don't recall the exact number but I'm going to say approximately 24 or 25.

Councilman Wojtila – The routine services in Section 2 A 1, talks about 8 to 10 hours a week. Currently do we utilize CT for about 8-10 hours a week?

Director Smith – That’s a fair number.

Councilman Wojtila – I remember not liking this agreement last year and still not liking this agreement because of the percentage fee basis on projects. I know you say you’re not going to do that although the legislation enables it because we’re approving the agreement. Also letter D talks about consulting services during construction. I believe those are services that are really if you look at letter C on page 5, those are services that are contemplated in the fee structure identified in Section C. Section C page 5 should reference in addition to B6, B7, B8 & B9, it should reference D1-D7.

Director Smith – Some of this question I would defer to Director Frey. But I have, there’s absolutely no intent having an award to CT on a specific project without coming before Council. I have no objection in removing some of that other verbiage if there would be more of a comfort level with doing so and strictly having it pertain to the routine services if we can do that.

Director Frey – The legislation authorizes only, it says the purpose of performing routine engineering services for the City of Euclid for the year 2011. What you have attached to the legislation is the agreement for 2010. We have not entered into an agreement yet with 2011. Obviously we will indicate to CT that we’re not going to include those sections that relate to project work in this agreement. We’ll have them draft the agreement so that it is solely for the routine services. This was the 2010, we don’t have a draft new agreement for 2011.

Councilwoman Minarik – Last year Councilman Wojtila had wanted to see other applicants to give us a basis for comparing the rates that CT charged. Of the 24 or 25 respondents, were they all in the \$3500 a month retainer fee? Qualification-wise, were they as good as or any better than CT?

Director Smith – We did not review the rates for many of the other firms. They simply provided their statements of qualifications. Any of the rates could be negotiated from many different levels.

Councilwoman Minarik – Why did you not ask for what their rate would be?

Director Smith – Typically when you’re dealing with a professional you look to qualifications and make a selection whether you’d like to short list it or not and then negotiate a fee. We’d be more than capable of negotiating a like fee. I’m not saying we would do better but just with the level of service that we’ve been obtaining from CT, I felt comfortable with the fee, it is the same fee that has been out there for the last several years. In looking at some of the other fees on the market that I’m accustomed to seeing through different discussions, I feel it is a reasonable fee.

Councilwoman Minarik – CT is the best of the 24 or 25?

Director Smith – I would not say that they’re the best. I think there are several firms that have submitted statements of qualifications, tremendous amount of professionals, tremendous amount of knowledge. I would say there are several firms that are more than capable of providing the same level of service. I would be a proponent of CT for this particular agreement mainly because of the stability at this point in time. Again with myself being relatively new but also with the vast amount of projects that we currently have underway or in the pipeline, that was one of the other reasons for the stability. As you know we’ve recently, or in the process maybe they’re not completed in their entirety but the 214 project, the 248 project, the 264 project, the GCRTA project, the Consent Decree, there’s just a tremendous amount of work that we have pending, Issue 1 projects, we have several others in the pipeline. I think there’s a time and place if there’s a desire to make a change in a consultant I don’t believe now is that time.

Councilwoman Minarik – Going back to that meeting with the EPA with CT. I think any good engineering firm could probably pick up on the actual projects. But we’re about in the middle of CT Consultants study or their whole thing with the CSO’s and the EPA. That would be difficult for someone. Let me rephrase that. Would that be a difficult project for a new engineering firm to walk into the middle of and pick up?

Director Smith – I would agree with that. I think there’s the time and place for transition and with the start there are several other projects coming in the pipeline that I think they’re certainly a tremendous amount of good consultants out there that could perform those projects.

Councilwoman Minarik – Will we go out for RFP’s next year?

Director Smith – As far as going out for RFP's, the specific intent, we have at least two projects that are going to require design services in the near future. The intent is to utilize the proposals that we have on hand and I believe the authorization, maybe Director Frey can help me, but the pool of consultants that we have on hand is for a two year timeframe if I'm not mistaken.

Councilman Van Ho – First of all, is CT coordinating the RTA project?

Director Smith – CT would not be coordinating necessarily the RTA project. That was a partnership between two different firms. CT had a portion of the project. As far as the design, there was another firm City Architecture I believe is the name of the firm that provided some of the service and we currently have the firm of Michael Benza doing the construction management at this time.

Councilman Van Ho – I'm a little bit confused. Are you or are you not going out for RFP's for this particular service next year? I understood you to say yes, but then I understood you to say no; I'm not sure.

Director Smith – I have no problem if there's a desire specifically to go out again for request for qualifications. If I'm not mistaken, I can confirm this I believe when we went out this time it was for a two year timeframe. The list of 24 or 25 statements would remain in effect for two years. Obviously there's nothing that says we couldn't go back out next year and I have no problem with doing so. In the past the verbiage was if a consultant would like to update their package they would have the right to do that.

Councilman Van Ho – I cannot speak for the rest of Council but CT has been consultants for us since I've been on Council. I think we should look because familiarity sometimes breeds contempt. If nothing else it sends a message out, don't even try for this, CT's got it locked. I'm not saying that if we go out that CT couldn't be the successful proposal, I would just like to see it face competition.

Councilman Wojtila – So what we'd be approving is we'd be approving \$3500 a month or \$42,000 a year for routine services from CT Consultants for the calendar year 2011. At ten hours a week that's \$80.77 an hour is what we'd be paying CT for their services, which I don't know Director Smith if you want to comment on that. It doesn't seem like a bad number to me; it could be better, it could be worse. I did think that we would re-do the routine services so that we wouldn't have the same agreement. I know this isn't the agreement. This is the agreement we're approving. We're approving just the routine services as outlined in the ordinance. This is last year's agreement. We're only talking about, I shouldn't say only, we're talking about routine services. If other qualified firms had submitted lower amounts which I think is where Councilwoman Minarik was going, maybe that would have been, a lot of us would have been a little happy to save some money in using still a qualified firm but for routine services we'd be paying less than the \$42000 annually. Certainly on projects, other than the Consent Decree on project specific basis where we need to go out and get proposals like Councilman Van Ho mentioned the RTA. I don't know what the RTA project is. If we're talking about the streetscape project at 222, that's the project. But we're also getting proposals now on a much larger project which is the downtown project. I'm sure we're getting proposals from many different firms, not only CT. So I guess having said all of that, I guess I can support this because it is just routine services but we definitely on specific projects we need to have requests for proposals sent out, thoroughly evaluated with the proper firm selected and not just be going to CT. I'm not suggesting we are, but I think there was some mis-communication. I do know when we approved this last year we talked about doing that. We went out and got statements of qualifications, we didn't get proposals. Now we have a list of qualifications and we stick in the file and we can use those when we request proposals on future projects. It is routine services of \$42,000, I'll support it but we need to be a little bit clearer next time.

Councilman Van Ho – One question for the Law Director. If there are federal funds involved do we have to do Brooks method?

Director Frey – I'm not familiar with what that terminology means.

Councilman Van Ho – Brooks method means you select the most qualified architect or engineering firm and then you negotiate price. You have a budget figure and if you can't make that budget then you break off negotiations but you don't hire an AE firm because they are the lowest priced.

Director Frey – Depending on the project funding source that maybe the case. I'm not familiar with us having to use that on any of the projects and many of those projects have had federal funding included. The Dille Rd. 204 project, I don't believe that was the case.

Director Smith – Specifically when we’re referring to the downtown project, I forget Director Frey the specific name of that project, but when we’re referring to that particular project and those funds although we’re coordinating that from a local agency standpoint, we still have to follow the ODOT guidelines. That particular project will be posted on the ODOT website. We were required to provide our rating criteria for the consultants. That’s published sheet as well so each consultant is aware of the scoring criteria and the weighted point system associated with that. From that viewpoint, that is something that will be a little different from the statement of qualifications. Those statements do not pertain to that particular project. We’ll follow the ODOT guidelines in our selection and it is based, it is not price based, it is qualification based.

Councilman Van Ho – They are in affect following Brooks.

Director Smith – I’m not familiar with that term but that’s the process. It is a qualification based selection. The price is negotiated thereafter. You have a problem coming to terms with the price with a selected consultant, then you have the right to move onto the second or third until you feel comfortable with the price.

Councilman Van Ho moved to close debate, Councilman Wojtila seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Councilman O’Neill moved to suspend the rules, Councilwoman Minarik seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Roll Call: Yeas: Gilliam, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, O’Neill, Wojtila, Langman, Van Ho,
Holzheimer Gail

Passed.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

President Holzheimer Gail – That completes legislation and brings us to the Committee of the Whole where you may speak to anything for the good of the city. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Jeffrey Beck – 25540 Chatworth Dr. Last Saturday was the annual Yard Charge put on by Scouting. For those of you unfamiliar with Yard Charge, the Scouts come around and rake the leaves of those residents who cannot do it themselves. Last weekend we had over 100 participants and we raked about 80 yards in the City of Euclid. The following units in Scouting Participated. From Ss. Robert & William Pack 54 and Troop 54 and two Girl Scout units. From our Lady of the Lake Pack 143 and Troop 143. From St. John of the Cross Pack 161 and Troop 367. This is a great way that scouting gives back to the community and a very successful time last weekend. The weather was pretty decent and I would like to congratulate all of the Scouts that were involved. Thank you.

President Holzheimer Gail – Seeing no other comments we’ll move forward with Councilmen’s Comments.

COUNCIL MEMBERS’ COMMENTS

Councilman Gilliam – A couple of announcements. This is related to Ward One. The Heritage Park Neighborhood Association will be having their meeting on Tuesday, November 16 at 7 PM at the Euclid Historical Society. The Euclid Village Neighborhood Association will be having their meeting on Wednesday the 17th at 7 PM, Indian Hills Elementary school. There will be a Ward 1 meeting on December 14th at 7 PM, tentatively scheduled at the Central Middle School. That is all I have to report at this time. Thank you.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Friends of Sherwood Forest meet this Wednesday at Glenbrook at 7 PM for those of you that live in that neighborhood. The Mayor called and said please let everybody know about a wonderful event the Lake Shore Garden Club put on this weekend, Friday and Saturday. Unfortunately I didn’t get to go there, but it was called Winter Magic and he says it was absolutely wonderful. They did such a fine job, they even make little turkeys and pumpkins that they take over to Hospice. It was a wonderful event and he wanted me to make sure that I congratulated them.

I did get to see the Cycle cross for a few minutes a couple of different times. It was awesome and there was so many people here so congratulations, I hope this becomes a yearly event over there.

To the Police Dept. at church yesterday some of the ladies from the 196 area send their kudos. Last week there was a few incidence, one was a strange person in the yard and the other had to do with a fight and a party and the police conducted themselves wonderfully. They actually could hear what was being said and they were very gracious and very nice to the people at the party. I said I would pass it along. I don’t know who the officers were but they were very impressed with the officers.

I would like to send out my deepest condolences to Mr. & Mrs. Bill Ucic on the loss of their granddaughter last month; nobody should have to see their child or grandchild pass away so my sympathies goes out to the family.

Also, just this past weekend, Our Lady of Lourdes lost one of their members, the religious family, Sister Mary Camilla, sister for 70 years, she was 91 years old. I send my sympathies out to all of them at Lourdes Shrine. Thank you.

Councilwoman Jones – I want to say thank you to the Euclid Hill Villa Group for their Bazaar and Bake sale that was this past Saturday. The Mayor was there and he said thank you for all the bake goods that he was able to buy for him and his wife to share. I did hear it was a great event, although due to family commitments I wasn't able to make it but I've heard a lot about it. Thank you to Euclid Hill Villa Group for putting that on.

I also want to say Thanksgiving Day is a time where you don't have to worry about where you're going to go for a good meal. Imani Church is offering Thanksgiving Dinners, Thursday, November 25 from 11:00-2:00 PM on Thanksgiving Day. This is the sixth year of having an annual Thanksgiving Dinner. Imani Church will deliver meals to Euclid residents who are elderly or handicapped and can't get out. Two meals per household. Imani will also come and pick you up and take you to their location for the meals if you don't have transportation. To make your reservation, you can call 216-732-8204. I'd like to wish everyone a Happy Thanksgiving Holiday.

Councilwoman Minarik – I want to thank you Director Smith, E. 215 and Mr. Bock looks very nice the way it has been repaved. Director Will I want to thank you for the trees on E. 200 Street and they're called Zacovas and they will grow 30-40 ft. They're beautiful.

The other thing I wanted to make a couple of announcements. I was at the E. 185 Block Watch which is Cleveland, very interesting. I'm not sure Chief Repicky if these stats hold true in Euclid, I've been asking for stats by beat. But according to Commander Drummond of the 5th District, residential burglaries in that section which is 185, Grovewood, Collinwood area, the biggest time to be concerned is Tuesday through Friday from 10 AM until 3 PM. I don't know if those stats hold true in Euclid but they seem to think that was peak time.

Wednesday the LaSalle Theater if you missed the open house last winter, the LaSalle Theater is having another party this week, Wednesday from 6:00-8:00 on 185 ST. The purpose of the party is because they've discovered an antique trunk while cleaning it up and they're having a guessing contest as to what is in the trunk. You can place your guesses at Arabica on 185th. There will be light refreshments, it is open to the public, it is free of charge and there has been much done on the inside of the theater since the open house last winter. That should be exciting.

The Slovene Home for the Aged, this is all Cleveland stuff I hope you don't mind. But 185 is still my neighborhood. The Slovene Home for the Aged purchased two years ago 2 ½ acres behind Save a Lot which was going to be for Tops. They're expanding their facilities, additional parking, they're going to go from two rooms to single rooms. The exciting part is that they're bringing in approximately 260 jobs or that's going to be the total jobs, I can't remember exactly. It is going to be great. It is not on their website yet but you can see the whole design and where it is going in three phases over the next 2-3 years.

The other exciting thing is Hospice, which is also in our backyard, it was in Crain's last week but it was also announced that the Brush property on St. Clair was donated to Hospice of the Western Reserve. They are moving all of their executive offices from 185 down to ST. Clair. What it will do and this is very exciting, it is going to bring in 200 new jobs to the area and the current facility is going to then be all beds and hospice care. That is very exciting, they're staying in the neighborhood relatively speaking, they're staying in my neighborhood. Those are two great things that are happening that can have a positive impact on Euclid.

Director Smith, I do still have a question. I had asked about how Maximus missed the water consumption in Appendix D for 2009. Not sure if you've discovered that they've found that out yet as to what the water consumption was. Then, Chief Repicky, I was very jealous sitting in that Block Watch group because Councilman Polensek stood up there with all of his police reports and he knew the times that the robberies were occurring, he knew what was going on in the car to car drug deals. He knew everything that was going on and I've been asking at least for the four beat reports so at least in Beat A, which is shared by several of my colleagues, we can have a handle and actually help our residents know what is going on in their neighborhoods, by the times of day, types of crimes and things to look out for, that type of information. If we could get that, it would be appreciated. That's about it except the Downtown Christmas lights, I don't know whether they're being tested or on for good, they look wonderful. Regarding Thanksgiving, it is a day to remember so much to be thankful, but good grief, this is America. Every day we should be so thankful that we can sit here as a body and have debate and go back and forth and disagree and nobody is going to shoot us and we're not going to jump over the desks and beat each other up like so many countries do. This is a country and I think especially with the election that happened on November 2nd, I'm always impressed by this. The transition of power is always peaceful in America. Whether if it is from Republican to Democrat or Democrat to Republican, maybe

some day it will be another party that's around, I doubt it. It is still a peaceful transition and that's what we need to be very, very thankful for. This is America, a great country, my time is up. Thank you so much for putting up with me.

President Holzheimer Gail – Director Smith, do you have an answer to the consumption?

Director Smith – I can forward you that information. After the last meeting you had two questions. Number one was the actual consumption that was included in one of the tables, I just don't recall which table it was. The second question was with regards to the payment of the report if there was two years or not. Through some discussions with Mr. Fink of Maximus we confirmed that there was some adjustment in the price but it was certainly for one year. The two years were covered by one price. So there's not a double payment for the report included within that.

Councilman O'Neill – Regarding that trunk at LaSalle, maybe we can get a hold of Geraldo Rivera and he can help us figure out what is in that thing. Thank you to Doug Price and K&D Group for the donation of those properties. It does show that they are committed to the project. It gives us more money to go ahead and do other aspects of that lakefront development so thank you again to them.

I would remind residents as the holidays are coming that when you get gifts around Christmas, Birthdays, whatever, to tear the boxes up. Don't put a box out on the tree lawn that depicts a television set. Typically robbers will break in when they see flat screen TV's, they see large items of value and they see around the holidays that you've got a beautiful box where that particular item came in so they know you've got it in the house. I would not put the box out on the tree lawn, I would tear it up and put it in the garbage.

I would remind the residents as the winter is coming, which means snow, that it is your responsibility to shovel your sidewalks. If you've got elderly neighbors that cannot do that, please it is a good time to get to know them, knock on the door, give them a hand. These folks typically can't get out on a regular basis and if they don't have a snowplowing company we have them through the Housing Dept. or even on the website I believe there's a listing of certified registered snow plowing companies within the city.

There's a new restaurant opening up officially today. It is the old Copper Top, renamed called the Paragon. Redid the inside a little bit. I stopped in yesterday and talked to one of the owners, Matt Quinn. They've got pretty good wine list for those folks who drink wine, they're going to expand it hopefully about 100 different types of wines within the next year. They got a patio that they spent a fair amount of money on and hopefully it will get going by the spring of next year.

Other than that I just want to say if I don't see you before Thanksgiving, have a Happy Thanksgiving and with that I'll say goodnight.

Councilman Wojtila – Could we get an update on the recycle effort; when we think we'll start curbside recycling?

Director Smith – Where we currently stand, our truck is due in this Wednesday or Thursday. The recycling bins will be shipped later next week. Everything has been put in place from that standpoint. We've hired, we're in the process of completing the hiring process for the three employees. We've gone through the interview process so I'm pleased to say that it would appear the first week of December we will be up and running.

Councilman Wojtila – I thank you for your email. I had a question from a resident today when we thought the last day of leaf pick up would be. Director Smith responded but I think it is good information for everybody, approximately the 10th of December. We have about 4 weeks left of leaf pick up. I know there are still a lot of leaves on the trees in my yard. That was good news so thank you for getting back to me, that's good information.

Last item, on the Public Service Committee meeting, we're looking at perhaps the week of 12/6. The Council President and I had talked about, that's actually our first meeting in December, so maybe the following Wed. December 8. We've still got our eye on it but it is looking like it is going to be that.

Finally I would like to congratulate Bridget Wilhelm who is a Euclid Resident and a member of the Lake Catholic Girls Volleyball High School State Champions. Congratulations Bridget Wilhelm. Thank you.

Councilman Langman – I just wanted to thank the Shore Board committee for putting on a wonderful Harvest Fest a couple of Friday ago on the 5th. It was very well attended. The students from the culinary school really did a fantastic job. I think everybody that was in attendance appreciated their efforts. I know Director Pietravoia was there, the Mayor was, Councilwoman Minarik, Councilwoman Jones and the Council President were there. Dr. Jones from the public schools was there. It was a very fine evening to benefit the Shore Cultural Centre.

Director Smith, 248th, I noticed they put down grass that is not growing. Folks on the street are also concerned about street lighting so can you update please?

Director Smith – The two issues, with the grass, I was out there the other day myself and had a conversation with her site inspector. We're not aware that any of the germination has occurred. I will assume that it will not, that it is going to be dormant through the season. We've reached to the Soil & Water District to touch base to see if they have any thoughts on any needed mulching in order to get it through the winter season and early spring. We'll see what recommendations they come up with. Of course the contractor will be responsible next year for the restoration of any areas that do not.

Regarding the street lighting, I know you asked that question at the last Council meeting as well and I had told you that we had an understanding from the contractor that the installation would occur within the next two weeks, namely it should be completed at this time. I called to say that my thoughts on that might be a little bit different based on some payment matters that I'm aware of. When I say the payment matters, namely we are paying the contractor who then forwards the monies to CEI. I know right now we have outside legal counsel involved with the 248 contractor and we have forwarded that information to them because within the last week we have received an email correspondence from the contractor that CEI has been unable to schedule the work until February of next year.

Councilman Langman – February did you say?

Director Smith – That is correct.

Councilman Langman – That is not acceptable unless we're going to give all those folks a waiver on their light fee assessment. Waiting until February and I know it is not you, per se, Director Smith, so don't take it personally. But say you're going to have to wait three months to get streetlights installed during the winter months, that is simply not acceptable. I don't know what we can do to leverage a speedier installation but, I don't think any resident on that street will be happy with that answer.

Director Smith – Councilman, I understand your concerns. I know we've discussed this matter on more than one occasion and we will certainly take it up with our outside legal counsel. We do have a contractual relationship and that's going to have some impact on this matter.

Councilman Langman – When will we get additional information that will be past onto the residents?

Director Smith – I would have to say, I'm not exactly sure when we're going to be meeting with the counsel, he just received that information within the last couple of days. I would say by the next council meeting I would be able to provide you with some possible direction.

Councilman Langman – Will we be able then to drop a letter to the residents informing them of this particular timeframe whatever it turns out to be?

Director Smith – We can do that.

Councilman Langman – Director Smith, I know again, it is not your fault and you and Mr. Bock have done a good job riding herd on the project. There is still one matter outstanding that we discussed a bit but needs resolution and that is with the parking lot draining at the Boulevard Presbyterian Church. As you are well aware, Pastor McCabe has some concerns about how the construction impacted drainage and there is some debate about who is responsible. That's not really my concern at the moment. It is the fact that it has been two weeks and we've given no feedback to the Pastor so that the Church can take the appropriate action. I know the Mayor talked to the Pastor the day after the last Council Meeting. I have not heard from the Mayor and the Pastor has not heard from the Mayor. I want the administration within the next couple of days to contact Pastor McCabe and explain the administration's stance, whether it is the contractor's responsibility or the churches responsibility. After all, one of our principle jobs is to clear up confusion. On this matter we haven't done it. We need to take care of it again by Wednesday at the latest. I will expect a reply to that as to where we stand with this issue.

Director Smith – With regards to those comments. There has been communication with the Pastor of the church. Unfortunately I tend to think that maybe the communication was not what the Pastor of the church wanted to hear as far as the responsibilities for the problems. They were very clear that they were not necessarily associated with the project, nor were they the contractor's responsibility to correct. I know the Mayor after some of the discussions and some of the emails that occurred between yourself and myself, had communication with the Pastor and I'm not fully aware of all of those discussions so I would have to differ to the Mayor.

Councilman Langman – Again, I will emphasize, the issue is not who is responsible. The issue is clarification. The Pastor or any resident deserves that from us, no matter if they're confused or not. As you know I asked you and Mr. Bock to provide that clarification and that was declined. I think we've extended the period of uncertainty for the church and that's unnecessary. We need to provide clear information, where the administration stands and why, so the Pastor understands so that they can then take the appropriate action. As we should do for any resident, that's what I'm expecting out of the administration. I'm not an engineer, I'm not a construction guy, neither is the Pastor. You on the administration side have that expertise. We need to share that with any party, in this case the Pastor, who has questions or might be confused. Again, those are my expectations and I expect them to be addressed in the next few days. With that, I will wish everybody a Happy Thanksgiving and goodnight.

Councilman Van Ho – My first comment is, Chief Repicky on a regular basis I seem to get complaints about 240th and Stephen. Can we look at that curve again? I'll give you the email I received, it is just symptomatic. I can count on one or two of those complaints every three months or so and we've been looking at that and looking at it and see what we can do.

I may have missed it because I was out of the room, Director Smith, where are we on the leaf pick up? Are we on schedule because I have a couple of people on Glen Forest and Hartland that think you don't love them.

Director Smith – We're hit and miss with the leaf pick up as far as the schedule. We update the city's website on a daily basis. If there are any particular questions that people do not have access to a computer they can certainly call into the Service Dept. The other question that was asked is when the leaf collection ends. That will be approximately December 10th.

Councilman Van Ho – This is aimed really at the people watching. Last month the city had 76 foreclosures on homes. Foreclosure actions, I should be specific. I would say to everybody out there who is having problems, call 2-1-1 and get 2-1-1 involved, they can help a lot, on forestalling or possibly helping you avoid foreclosure.

Director Pietravoia I'll give you this one, an email about a house on 900 E. 237 that they're saying has been abandoned for quite awhile and the neighbors believe that it should probably be demolished. Can you take a look at that and give me some answers?

One other thing, I would ask any of the residents of Ward 8 who have a family member in the Service, give me a call and give me an address. We're going to try to put together some type of care package for them at Christmas. Not just the ones that are overseas, I don't care if they're serving in Sandusky or Saudi Arabia, please call me 289-2286 and we're going to do our best to get it out for Christmas. With that I'll say goodnight.

President Holzheimer Gail – A couple of updates. We received the monthly budget report with our council packet, so I would ask Council members to take a look at that. Rather than have a Finance Committee meeting this month, we'll wait until December unless there are any outstanding issues. We're on a good trend, we had another positive month in terms of actual revenue versus anticipated revenue; we were up \$166,000 over budget, which is three months in a row we've been ahead of budget. That's good news but we do have budget issues coming up. I know we had initially talked about doing the budgets in December but after talking with the Mayor, it looks like we will wait until January to do the budget for a couple of reasons. There are some things changing that we don't know about, don't have final answers on. I don't know if that's at the State level or local level, changes in grants, changes in potential funding levels. It also allows us to have the true end of the year numbers to work from. At this point if you would like to mark your calendars, we will plan to have an Executive Finance meeting on December 13th and we will go over the monthly report at that point, talk about any end of the year amendments that might be needed, hopefully not. Potentially a temporary budget to get started with 2011 and then begin any discussions in preparation for the 2011 budget. My hope is that we can start on some of the big issues ahead of time so we're prepared for the budgets. Potential dates for the budget will be Wednesday, January 19th; Monday, January 24th, Wednesday, January 26th. I am told that the budgets are in process and Directors are working hard on them. This way we should have actual numbers to work from and I don't know Director Brett if you have anything else to add to that?

Director Brett – It always put you at an advantage, not only do you have the actual numbers from the prior year, you also have the prior year's encumbrances and a better grasp. We'll have our Schedule A to the County which tells us what we're going to get as far as property taxes. So you have a lot more information at that point. We are working on them now as far as expenditures and rough estimates. Some of the estimates of revenues we can plug in right now, or pretty close. We're doing what we can ahead of time.

President Holzheimer Gail – That’s the plan at this point. The Mayor did indicate that he would send an email about some of the potential things that maybe in flux. He would have been here tonight except he is not feeling well and we don’t want the germs as well. He did ask that I extend Happy Thanksgiving wishes to all of the residents and everybody here. I would like to do so as well. I hope that everyone does take the chance, we should be thankful for so many things that we have and let’s also try hard not to forget those who are less fortunate. The Hunger Center does a wonderful job and they have bins around the city, if you would like to donate canned goods or non-perishable item at any of the bins or at the Hunger Center. I am sure they would be happy for your donation.

Just finally I would also like to thank the Shore Cultural Centre Board for their Harvest Fest, that was a fun evening. The following week, last Friday the Euclid Hockey Association put on a very nice benefit as well that was a lot of fun. Thanks to them for their hard work and Happy Thanksgiving to all.

ADJOURNMENT

Councilman O’Neill moved to adjourn. Councilman Gilliam seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Attest:

Clerk of Council

President of Council