

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CITY OF NORTH CANTON, OHIO
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING

**TRANSCRIPT OF
APRIL 6, 2020, MEETING
VIA TELECONFERENCE**

- - - - -

Transcript of Proceedings of the North Canton
City Council, taken by me, the undersigned, Laurie Maryl
Jonas, a Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public in
and for the State of Ohio, at the North Canton Civic
Center, 845 West Maple Street, North Canton, Ohio, on
Monday, April 6, 2020, at 7:00 p.m.

- - - - -

**Premier Court Reporting
Canton 330.492.4221 Akron 330.928.1418
www.premierreporters.com**

1 APPEARANCES:

2 (Via teleconference)

3 Daniel Jeff Peters, Council President, Ward 2

4 Daryl Revoldt, Council Vice President, At Large

5 Doug Foltz, Ward 1

6 Stephanie Werren, Ward 3

7 Dominic Fonte, Ward 4

8 Mark R. Cerreta, At Large

9 Matthew Stroia, At Large

10 Patrick A. DeOrion, Director of Administration

11 Timothy L. Fox, Director of Law

12 Jina Alaback, Director of Finance

13 Robert G. Graham, Engineering Services

14 Catherine A. Farina, Deputy Director of
Administration and Development

15 Stephan B. Wilder, Mayor

17 - - - - -

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. PETERS: Okay. Good evening, everyone.
2 I'd like to welcome you to the North Canton city
3 council committee of the whole meeting Monday,
4 April 6, 2020, 7 p.m. We are live streamed and we
5 are having a telephonic meeting.
6 Ben, could you please call the roll.
7 MR. YOUNG: Member Revoldt?
8 MR. REVOLDT: Present.
9 MR. YOUNG: Member Fonte?
10 MR. FONTE: Here.
11 MR. YOUNG: President Peters?
12 MR. PETERS: Here.
13 MR. YOUNG: Member Foltz?
14 MR. FOLTZ: Here.
15 MR. YOUNG: Member Werren?
16 MRS. WERREN: Here.
17 MR. YOUNG: Member Stroia?
18 MR. STROIA: Here.
19 MR. YOUNG: Member Cerreta?
20 MR. CERRETA: Here.
21 MR. YOUNG: Seven present.
22 MR. PETERS: All right. Fantastic.
23 First up, Community and Economic Development.
24 Chairman Revoldt. Floor is yours.
25 MR. REVOLDT: Thank you very much, Jeff.

1 Everyone has in their packet draft
2 legislation for reestablishing our community
3 reinvestment area. You should also have the housing
4 study which accompanies that draft legislation. For
5 those who are listening, the question is why would we
6 be interested in doing this, and there are two basic
7 answers, for the record.

8 The first is that the CRA is designed to
9 improve the housing stock in a community. And
10 pursuant to the Community Reinvestment Area housing
11 study, over half of the homes in North Canton, about
12 7,500, are 50 years old or older. And their values,
13 at least half of those homes are valued at less than
14 \$150,000. I pulled up some valuations from the Stark
15 County auditor some months ago, and if you look at
16 the property valuation between 2009 and 2018, in
17 North Canton it only grew by \$11 million over the
18 decade.

19 And what does that mean? Well, it means for
20 our school system that every time it has to go back
21 for property, it's a heavier burden on the existing
22 property owners because they have to -- they have
23 to -- they have to meet an amount. We can't spread
24 out the costs more. For the city, obviously, there
25 are a plethora of policy issues that are associated

1 with an aging housing stock. So if we look at the
2 legislation that has been drafted, it basically, in
3 Section 4, speaks to our desire to encourage
4 knockdowns, demolitions and rebuilding. We've
5 excluded from the ordinance -- proposed ordinance --
6 minor exceptions. Those really don't add much;
7 they're an administrative headache.

8 MR. YOUNG: Excuse me, Chairman Revoldt.

9 MR. REVOLDT: Pardon?

10 MR. YOUNG: Excuse me. Councilmen Fonte and
11 Stroia, I believe, have something they wish to state
12 before we continue.

13 MR. REVOLDT: Yes. Well, can I finish and
14 then we'll go on?

15 MR. FONTE: Hey, I need to be -- step out of
16 the meeting. So I'm no -- there's no comment here
17 from me. I'm just going to abstain.

18 MR. REVOLDT: Okay.

19 MR. STROIA: Same here. This is Stroia. I
20 need to abstain.

21 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Duly noted. The record
22 should reflect that two members of council have
23 withdrawn from the discussion and will likely not
24 participate in votes in the future.

25 So at any rate, we've got -- we've got some

1 language, and you may have it in your packet, we did
2 a little change this afternoon, I'll have a clean
3 copy for you later, but it talks about demolition and
4 subsequent new construction. And what we're doing
5 is -- first of all, is we're stating in the ordinance
6 you've got to demolish the property. And second is
7 the new construction has to be valued at at least
8 \$250,000. So we believe that that effort may help
9 our schools by adding more taxable real estate long
10 term to the -- to the -- to the tax rolls. So that's
11 really kind of it from -- from my standpoint.

12 I think it -- as we look at the language in
13 Section 4, what we've tried to do is avoid the
14 problem that we had down on Harmon where somebody
15 just waltzed in and put up a house but it may not
16 have had quite the value that we thought would be
17 useful for the community. So and by having
18 demolition, it means that if you're out in one of the
19 newer developments on the east side, unless the
20 property's demolished, you're not eligible for the
21 abatement. So that's kind of it. I'll be happy to
22 take some questions right now or open the floor up
23 for comments.

24 MR. FOLTZ: Chairman Revoldt. Foltz.

25 What we're saying is if there's a vacant

1 piece of property, they wouldn't be eligible for
2 this.

3 MR. REVOLDT: That is correct.

4 MR. FOLTZ: Because that was --

5 MR. REVOLDT: What we want to avoid, Doug,
6 what we want to avoid is the kind of situation we had
7 over on Summit and Woodland and Glenwood.

8 MR. FOLTZ: Correct.

9 MR. REVOLDT: They want to put up those homes
10 and, you know, they wanted an abatement. There was
11 no reason to abate those homes. They weren't
12 eliminating any blight.

13 MR. FOLTZ: Yes. No, I concur. That was a
14 very volatile issue with the schools and we had a lot
15 of discussion on council floor on that and so, you
16 know, I'm happy to see there's, you know, other
17 incentives versus just build a house on vacant
18 property, so I concur with that.

19 MR. REVOLDT: And I think it -- I think it
20 illustrates that we did listen, and as we go to this,
21 and I think the second thing, as many of you know,
22 we're looking at some new economic development
23 projects or prospects, and while I don't expect that
24 we'll be deploying this in each and every one of
25 them, particularly smaller projects where it's

1 probably not that valuable, but it's good to have
2 this in our arsenal in case we need it because --
3 we'll get to the timeline in a minute -- it's better
4 to have it ready to go and not use it than to need it
5 and not have it.

6 And in the commercial -- the commercial, as
7 you'll notice, I think Ben has put up, you'll notice
8 that the process has been mapped out. So by taking
9 the statute, mapped it out to ensure that we don't
10 have mixups about who's supposed to do what before
11 the abatement's granted.

12 MR. PETERS: That's -- that's key, Daryl.

13 MR. FOLTZ: Yeah.

14 MR. REVOLDT: Yeah. And so, I mean, we
15 could -- we could have this attached to the minutes,
16 and frankly, we could have it attached to the
17 ordinance as an attachment.

18 MR. FOLTZ: Yeah. No, I concur. I think
19 it's well done. I think it shows, you know, the
20 process and procedures that need to be in place and
21 it's defined and people can follow it. Our residents
22 can follow it and our developers can follow it and
23 understand what the expectations are for everybody
24 and so I like that very much.

25 MR. REVOLDT: So my sense is, again, this

1 will be used sparingly. I would challenge everybody
2 who's listening in the community, the CRA is one
3 residential tool. There may be other things that we
4 could do, and I would certainly welcome some input on
5 how we might encourage property owners to demolish
6 properties. I've seen this work in Atlanta, I've
7 seen it work in other communities. I know that it
8 works. We've just got to get the ball started up
9 here.

10 MR. PETERS: Yeah.

11 MR. CERRETA: Daryl, Cerreta here.

12 Good idea. Now, this is just for the
13 residential part of it; correct?

14 MR. REVOLDT: No. This will do both. But as
15 you'll notice that the map that's in front of you,
16 the CRA process flow chart, talks about the process
17 on the commercial side. And again, I think that's
18 where we had a little bit of problem in the past was
19 getting the thing done legally. So what we're trying
20 to do is make sure that there's no misunderstanding
21 about what's required.

22 MR. FOLTZ: Right. Well, you have my support
23 to move it forward, Daryl. I don't know if there's
24 any questions or comments.

25 MR. REVOLDT: Here's what we need to do then.

1 Ben and I tinkered with some language today. I spoke
2 to our economic development consultant. We have some
3 other language, I'm particularly looking at Section 4
4 that deals with the residential side. We'll have
5 finalized, or language for your consideration, get it
6 out to you sometime in the very, very near future.
7 And then what I'd like to do, Jeff, if we can, is set
8 a first reading for the 20th of April. That gives us
9 two weeks out and we'll have three full readings on
10 this to entertain public -- public opinion.

11 MR. PETERS: Okay. April 20, first reading.

12 MR. REVOLDT: Yes, please.

13 MR. FOLTZ: One followup, Daryl, if I could.
14 Is there somebody in the northeast Ohio or somewhere
15 in the state that is utilizing this similar language
16 in their city or CRA area?

17 MR. REVOLDT: You know, Doug, I'm not. We
18 have been consulting with The Montrose Group, who
19 specializes in economic development. It was very
20 encouraging when we broached this language. They
21 thought it might work.

22 MR. FOLTZ: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. DEORIO: Chairman --

24 MR. REVOLDT: So, Jeff, if we could do that.

25 MR. PETERS: Yeah. Yep. That sounds good,

1 Daryl.

2 MR. REVOLDT: We'll just get started and I'll
3 have a clean copy to everybody for their
4 consideration and input.

5 MR. PETERS: Okay. Sounds good. And Ben,
6 can we make sure we get Matt and Dominic back in?

7 MR. YOUNG: Yes. I will now unmute and let
8 them rejoin.

9 MR. FONTE: Thank you.

10 MR. REVOLDT: Would you like me to proceed,
11 Jeff?

12 MR. PETERS: Yes, sir. Please.

13 MR. REVOLDT: All right. The second item on
14 the Community and Economic Development agenda is the
15 discussion of property acquisition. In consultation
16 with administration this morning, we have concluded
17 we'd like to defer this discussion to a later date.
18 So we're not prepared to proceed.

19 MR. PETERS: So no action. Okay.

20 MR. REVOLDT: No action. None.

21 MR. PETERS: Okay. All right. Very good.

22 MR. FONTE: I lost my video feed. It's
23 Dominic.

24 MR. PETERS: Okay. I'll pause until we get
25 Dominic back up on video.

1 MR. FONTE: I'm going to relog in. Is that
2 what I should do?

3 MR. YOUNG: I can see you.

4 MR. FONTE: I lost the screen then, that's
5 what happened. All right.

6 MR. PETERS: Can you refresh?

7 MR. FONTE: There we go. Okay, smiley.

8 MR. PETERS: Looking good, Dom. All right.
9 Thank you.

10 MR. FONTE: All right.

11 MR. PETERS: Next up, we'll do Ordinance,
12 Rules & Claims. Chairman Stroia.

13 MR. STROIA: All right. Hey, we met --
14 myself, Ben and Tim met for several hours, and I just
15 kind of wanted to open this discussion up for we met
16 basically about simplifying, uncodifying and
17 potentially bring back the three-person committee
18 meetings. So I think this is a good time to make
19 these changes and I'm opening up the discussion for
20 whatever the floor wants to talk about for it.

21 MR. YOUNG: If I may, Jina and I have some
22 information regarding the codified non-verbatim
23 minutes. So I'll let Jina start.

24 MS. ALABACK: We pulled how much we've been
25 paying the court reporter, and we began that in

1 middle -- around April of '18. It was over \$6,000.
2 In 2019 we had the court reporter doing verbatim
3 minutes for council meetings, planning, zoning, board
4 of control, and the CRA, the Tax Incentive Review
5 Council, and we were at 22,840. We were looking at
6 that cost for verbatim minutes because there's a
7 reason that you made that decision, to look at maybe
8 changing that, having a full-time clerk back on
9 staff, if we're talking about that. So Ben has a
10 second piece of that.

11 MR. YOUNG: Yes. So Catherine and I have
12 been speaking with two primary automated clerk
13 software program providers. And those are CivicClerk
14 and Granicus, and we have received two quotes from
15 CivicClerk Plus and one from Granicus, which you can
16 see onscreen how it would break down cost-wise to
17 replace our current court reporter system with an
18 automated minutes-generating software that would give
19 summary minutes instead of verbatim minutes.

20 MS. FARINA: CivicClerk is a software program
21 that we already engage with. Our website, it is
22 based from CivicPlus. And then we also manage our
23 recreation rentals through CivicRent. So it's a
24 software program with multiple platforms geared at
25 municipalities. And then Granicus is another option

1 that we are still looking into.

2 MR. FONTE: So what's the benefit, guys? Do
3 we save money or what's happening? Explain. So I'm
4 looking at 23,205.

5 MR. YOUNG: Yes. The total in 2019 plus the
6 CSE and water board only had costs in 2020 so I added
7 them to give a more accurate reflection of all the
8 boards that use this.

9 MR. PETERS: Hey, Ben. Can you touch on what
10 the difference is between CivicClerk Standard and
11 Premium?

12 MR. YOUNG: So CivicClerk Standard only
13 includes automated minutes and agenda preparation.
14 What the Premium adds is electronic voting,
15 electronic packet disbursement to you, the council, as
16 well as something called staff reports, which we
17 don't currently use as a city in our legislative
18 process.

19 Granicus includes all of those things plus a
20 city boards and commissions management module in one
21 software program. They don't have two different
22 levels.

23 MR. FOLTZ: Okay. This Councilman Foltz.

24 Now, will this process, or these new
25 programs, still do verbatim minutes? Will that be

1 recorded the same way or how -- is there going to
2 need to be an adjustment there?

3 MR. YOUNG: So there would no longer be
4 verbatim minutes. There would only be summary
5 minutes. However, if council or a member of the
6 public wanted verbatim minutes, let's say that
7 someone put in a public records request for verbatim
8 minutes from this date, then we would essentially
9 staff that out to Premier Reporting and charge the
10 cost of the transcription to the initial requester.

11 MR. PETERS: Now, would what that cost be,
12 Ben?

13 MR. YOUNG: We can't say for sure, although I
14 can tell you that it averages out to about \$200 per
15 half-hour meeting.

16 MR. PETERS: Okay.

17 MS. ALABACK: There would be a recording of
18 the meeting available.

19 MR. YOUNG: Yes. So not only will we have
20 the YouTube recording, but the software I use to
21 stream to YouTube records prior to the streaming.
22 So, for instance, tonight YouTube has dropped 41
23 frames, which is .1 percent of our video, and that
24 just -- what that means is there's just a couple
25 spots where the public, if they're only watching the

1 stream, it will seem to jump one millisecond forward
2 and they might miss one syllable in some of the
3 words, but the recording that I have from the
4 streaming software includes those 41 dropped frames.

5 MS. ALABACK: Ben, can you unmute Dominic?

6 MS. FARINA: So another thing important to
7 note, if you haven't noticed already, our interim
8 clerk, Ben, is highly technical, so these type of
9 programs, you know, they streamline a lot of
10 processes. It's a fresh new way to do things that
11 with online, you know, for adding agendas, minutes,
12 everything a lot more streamlined, and he is someone
13 that absolutely would run with this and organize
14 things better and utilize this technology available
15 to us.

16 MR. FONTE: So -- Dominic.

17 Real quick. So looking at the premium
18 package, it says 7,500 down there. Is that what the
19 cost is gestimated at? Am I reading that right?

20 MR. YOUNG: So those are quotes that we have
21 received from the company. So they have told us that
22 one year of service would cost 7,500. So each quote
23 is for one full year of license.

24 MR. FONTE: And we're spending 23,205 now;
25 correct?

1 MR. YOUNG: Correct.

2 MR. FONTE: That makes sense for me.

3 MR. FOLTZ: That's for verbatim minutes.

4 That's different. We're not getting that with these
5 new programs. And that goes back to our discussion
6 three years ago.

7 It's Councilman Foltz.

8 You know, there's -- there's discussion on
9 how these are archived, and I always thought there
10 was merit to having something written out that people
11 could access. I understand there's other technology
12 improvements that can be used here, but I don't know
13 if I really changed my thought process on that. I
14 enjoy the streamlining of the software that you might
15 be able to do with everything else, but I think
16 that's my real discussion point to consider is not to
17 have that written document available to the public
18 whenever we want to give it to them. Or archived
19 forever when no one here is around. So those are
20 some of the discussion points that happened three or
21 four years ago also.

22 MR. PETERS: Hey, Ben, I've got a question
23 regarding the verbatim based on request. And Daryl
24 and I -- and I think Daryl, I think he spoke at
25 council meetings about this at length before. That

1 if there was an issue discussed on council floor that
2 could potentially go to litigation, that it's
3 important to have the verbatim minutes. So we would
4 still have the ability to go back and retrieve the
5 verbatim minutes for a meeting, whether it be two
6 weeks ago or two years ago? Would I be correct in
7 that?

8 MR. YOUNG: Yes. And actually, I would hope
9 to back up all of the recordings indefinitely. So 80
10 years from now someone could pull up the video and
11 watch you guys have a council meeting.

12 MR. PETERS: Okay. So we're not really
13 losing anything per se from the verbatim standpoint,
14 it's just that weekly it would change to just a
15 summary unless it was a hot-button issue that we
16 would need to go back and get verbatim.

17 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

18 MR. REVOLDT: Can I join you?

19 MR. PETERS: Yeah, Daryl, please. I'd like
20 to hear what you have to say on that one.

21 MR. REVOLDT: Let's go back. Doug -- Doug
22 has carried us back three years. Think about how
23 contentious matters were because we didn't have good
24 minutes.

25 MR. FOLTZ: Yeah.

1 MR. REVOLDT: I would argue that a summary is
2 only as good as the person who's doing the
3 summarization.

4 MR. FOLTZ: Uh-huh.

5 MR. REVOLDT: And our goal here is to not
6 only explain what happened, but why it happened. I
7 fear that summaries by and large don't capture the
8 whys. You know, we have -- we have put this issue of
9 recordkeeping to bed and I would really hesitate to
10 reopen that issue, A. B is this: I'm old-school.
11 I'm a Luddite. I appreciate technology, but I like
12 to have a record of our proceedings that's complete
13 and full in our possession, not somewhere else out
14 there.

15 You know, one of the problems that the State
16 of Ohio has had over the years is that every time it
17 goes out and creates a new software program, it's
18 always contingent upon the people in state employ who
19 manage it. Those people go away, they have problems.
20 I would argue that we're delighted we've got Ben.
21 What happens when Ben goes away? Or we have a
22 turnover in the leadership team. And then what
23 happens? What happens to your recordkeeping? I am
24 very, very reluctant, folks, to encourage us to look
25 at something that's like this. I think we're just

1 going to create problems for ourselves.

2 MR. CERRETA: So, Ben, you're saying that
3 this program will save us 20 grand, just about. Or,
4 I'm sorry, what am I saying? Yeah, close to that.
5 About 19,000 bucks. And if somebody wanted the
6 minutes, they can get it at any time?

7 MR. YOUNG: Yes. So we essentially treat it
8 like the public records request. So if someone would
9 request the minutes and then we would send the
10 recording to be transcribed and then charge the
11 requester for the cost of the transcription.

12 MR. CERRETA: How long would it take to get
13 those when somebody requests it? Do you know that?

14 MR. YOUNG: It would depend on Premier
15 Reporting's workload and how quickly their staff can
16 get to it.

17 MR. FOX: They normally turn those around in
18 about a week and a half, two weeks. And the
19 important part about the cost is that it, just like
20 in the court system, if one requests a transcript
21 from the recording, they pay for that, that first
22 one. And I believe it's right around 4.75, \$4.75 a
23 page, roughly. But, once that first one is done, you
24 have a verbatim transcript, now that's a public
25 record and anyone that asks for that record

1 afterwards would simply pay whatever our public
2 record cost is per page, and right now we
3 (inaudible).

4 MRS. WERREN: Ben, let me ask you. Have you
5 researched what other communities are doing? Because
6 I think we did that three years ago and we really
7 found that we were one of the only communities that
8 was doing verbatim minutes for those scripts. And so
9 I guess I'm thinking if we have the digital
10 recordings and people can access at any time then
11 there is a permanent record.

12 MR. CERRETA: Stephanie is right.

13 MR. YOUNG: Yes. We are one of the few
14 municipalities around that still has verbatim minutes
15 for every meeting, no matter what's being discussed
16 or what kind of meeting it is, committee or regular.

17 MR. FOLTZ: Well, Councilman Foltz here.

18 That's a good point. Because if we go,
19 Daryl, we'll go old-school, when you had committee
20 meeting minutes, the committee chair transcribed some
21 basic notes and then those weren't verbatim. The
22 council meetings were verbatim but not the committee.
23 And maybe that's -- that's something to look at as
24 far as a middle ground; that you would still have
25 verbatim for council meetings with public discussion,

1 you know, on the floor.

2 Second point would be, I would have to really
3 see CivicClerk Premium, Standard, or the other -- the
4 other vendor, how good are they when there is a
5 public request? Because I thought, and Pat, maybe
6 you could weigh in. I thought when we tried to do
7 this a different way there was a lot of confusion
8 about who said what when when someone did ask for
9 verbatim minutes. It was too confusing for that to
10 be, I don't know, transcribed in a way that was --
11 that we needed, I guess. You know, there was words
12 omitted; it wasn't sure who was talking at what time.
13 So those are things to look at as far as the future
14 of that. I mean, I'm not in favor of it right now.
15 I'm in favor of the other streamlining that you guys
16 want to do with the program, but that's just me. I'm
17 one vote, but I'm just letting you guys know. It's
18 been some good discussion.

19 MR. REVOLDT: This is Daryl. Can I come in?

20 MR. PETERS: Yeah, Daryl.

21 MR. REVOLDT: You know, one of the things
22 that we've done over the last year is we have a
23 verbatim transcript and we have a record of what's
24 said and who says it. We've walked away from having
25 the committee chairman complete -- complete a

1 legislative report. And we're required to have a
2 report, but the minutes in their -- in their complete
3 context serve as that report. So if we're going to
4 go to something that's far more abbreviated, then
5 we're going to have to go back and we're going to
6 have to go back and rethink how we have those
7 committees function and if there's going to be a
8 report. I think your rules (inaudible).

9 MRS. WERREN: But, I think, Daryl, the
10 problem was that everyone was doing their reports
11 differently. Some people would write two sentences,
12 some people didn't know they had to do the report. I
13 don't feel like that's going to help anything.

14 MR. REVOLDT: Well, it's right now what
15 you've got is we have the verbatim transcript of the
16 council of the whole meeting. That is the report.

17 MRS. WERREN: Right.

18 MR. REVOLDT: And that gives you the cleanest
19 and clearest sense of what council considered and why
20 it acted. You don't need anything more.

21 MRS. WERREN: But you still have that. You
22 just have to listen to it.

23 MR. REVOLDT: You'll have the minutes.

24 MR. YOUNG: And we would generate summary for
25 council meetings -- committee meetings as well. Not

1 just council meetings.

2 MR. REVOLDT: Ben, I'm sorry, I just -- I
3 just don't think summaries are good. And here's the
4 other thing.

5 MR. PETERS: Can I weigh in here?

6 MR. REVOLDT: Can I continue just for one
7 more? I'm going to go way back. One of the reasons
8 that we record those council meetings is because
9 we've had executive abuse misleading council. And it
10 was imperative that we captured everything that was
11 represented when council was -- was prior to action.
12 Because we were misled. I'm going to be kind about
13 it. We were lied to. And that's the reason we went
14 to recording the council of the whole meetings.

15 MR. DEORIO: Can I speak?

16 MR. PETERS: Yes. Go ahead.

17 MR. DEORIO: Oh, thank God.

18 All right. Listen, we did this three years
19 ago. And the problem that we have is that summary
20 minutes are more problem than what they're worth.
21 Now, if you look at your graph, you have one item
22 that applies to you, council. The administration has
23 the other five things: planning, zoning, TIRC,
24 housing, water boards, this, that and the other. And
25 what you're asking someone to do, and we tried this.

1 We tried this. This is the way it used to work with
2 planning commission, there would be summary minutes.
3 It's who is summarizing it. And then we're in a
4 position where we have to oversee what's being
5 summarized. How do I know, as the administrator,
6 that those summaries were correct unless I'm sitting
7 there listening to it, too, and making
8 contemporaneous notes while the meeting is going on
9 to know what it should be summarized as. It is a
10 complete hassle.

11 So we -- since you guys were going back to
12 verbatim minutes, back then three years ago, we in
13 the administration, the mayor at that time, said
14 we're going to be consistent. If they're doing
15 verbatim, then we'll do verbatim on everything else.

16 And to Daryl's point, you know, three years
17 have gone by. We put this issue to rest. In the
18 grand scheme of your budget, you're talking about
19 \$16,000. \$16,000 difference.

20 MR. FONTE: I've got a question.

21 MR. DEORIO: Is that worth all the hassle
22 that you're going to go through to save that? It
23 seems like we're tripping over dollars to pick up
24 dimes.

25 MR. FONTE: Stepping over a dollar to pick up

1 a nickel.

2 Hey, question. So why don't we just let
3 everything ride the way it as, and as technology
4 evolves maybe we'll have verbatim minutes through AI,
5 in another year or so we can revisit this when the
6 technology is a little bit better. I think Daryl is
7 correct. If we have an issue we'll have to go back
8 on, that's the only way we're going to be protected.

9 MR. REVOLDT: You know, let me just add --
10 may I? This is Daryl.

11 You know, I'm looking at our -- right now our
12 codified ordinances. And it's very clear in 111.06
13 that legislation may be placed on the council agenda
14 only upon the clerk's receipt of applicable
15 committees' favorable report. So, you know, what
16 we've done is we've taken that report requirement out
17 of our meetings and we've put it into the -- in
18 effect into the transcript, and I believe that's the
19 smart way to do it so we have a good record of what
20 we've done and why.

21 MR. PETERS: Well, Daryl, if I may, and I'll
22 go back to what you said, and there is some history
23 where council was lied to. And you also mentioned
24 it's more important about why it was said than what
25 was said. And the committee is where the meat of the

1 legislation is done. So I would tend to agree with
2 you on that one. However, you know, I do like the
3 fact that we can go back and get the verbatim if we
4 want. But to your point in the codified ordinances,
5 that verbatim minutes are our committee report at
6 this time.

7 MR. FOLTZ: Yeah. Catherine.

8 MS. FARINA: I wanted just to say I really
9 appreciate the discussion on this. And I think where
10 Jina and Ben conferred on the court reporter versus
11 automated software was to kind of, you know, look at,
12 you know, the funding for this. But keep in mind, no
13 matter how this discussion comes out, one of the
14 things that we wanted to look at with either Granicus
15 or CivicClerk is just this automated-type software is
16 beyond just minutes. It keeps track of board
17 appointments, you know, open and filled seats and
18 applications. It has all your council meetings,
19 videos, agendas. It's digital access with a
20 searchable portal. There's just a lot of other
21 functions and we could even shoot you information on
22 both of those platforms to look at because it was
23 beyond just the minutes. It was really automating
24 the clerk.

25 MR. REVOLDT: If this is to automate the

1 clerk and we can push the minutes aside, I'd consider
2 it.

3 MR. FOLTZ: Yeah.

4 MR. REVOLDT: If we had better management of
5 that clerk's office through some software, hey, I'm
6 all on board. I just don't think the minutes should
7 be the propellant for this change. It should be
8 better management in the office.

9 MR. FONTE: So maybe you're looking at CC
10 standards. Or what you guys need.

11 MS. FARINA: What was that, Dominic?

12 MR. FONTE: Maybe what you could do is, you
13 know, get the standard package for everything with
14 the exception of the minutes and we continue the
15 verbatim minutes like we've been doing and see if it
16 makes you more efficient, you know, and saves you
17 money on that side. Then we can afford that extra.
18 We can always --

19 MS. FARINA: We can get you more information.

20 MR. FONTE: We can also see a report to
21 understand what you're talking about.

22 MS. FARINA: Yes, Ben can do that.

23 MR. YOUNG: Yes. So the intention wasn't to
24 immediately stop verbatim minutes but rather to pick
25 one of the softwares, move forward over the summer,

1 see how we can adapt it, because both companies are
2 offering to give us 90 or 60 days of free access
3 before we commit and then see whether or not it
4 really did improve how council meetings function.

5 MR. PETERS: Well, Ben, I'm certainly
6 intrigued by the possibilities here and the
7 capabilities that this will allow us. I would be --
8 I would be in favor of a trial run, you know, on the
9 side to mirror what we're doing now.

10 Daryl, what do you think?

11 MR. REVOLDT: Well, again, you know, if we're
12 going to look at the software as a management tool, I
13 support that. I think that's great. Particularly if
14 it allows better tracking of legislation, public
15 hearings, et cetera. I think that's one of the
16 clerk's principal jobs. And if we read our job
17 description, you know, that -- this would help him
18 achieve that potential. I really don't think I'm
19 prepared to support walking away from transcripts.
20 We've had -- and as Pat put it, we had huge problems
21 with planning commission. Because is the person who
22 was summarizing those planning commission meetings
23 wasn't capturing it.

24 MR. FOLTZ: Right.

25 MR. REVOLDT: And it wasn't being done

1 timely.

2 MR. FONTE: I would say it sounds like we
3 have a decision here, the way it's going. I think it
4 makes sense. Let's move on to something else. What
5 do you say?

6 MR. REVOLDT: Okay.

7 MR. YOUNG: If I could just make one last
8 point of -- we could maintain verbatim minutes for
9 all of admin's boards. The biggest motivator to
10 looking at it was that 50 percent of council's budget
11 is dedicated to the court reporter at this time. Of
12 a \$42,000 budget, \$20,000 is allocated just to pay
13 for verbatim minutes every year.

14 MR. REVOLDT: Yeah.

15 MR. PETERS: That's okay.

16 MR. REVOLDT: That's okay. That's a cost of
17 doing business.

18 MR. PETERS: Hear, hear.

19 MS. FARINA: Okay. We can get you more
20 information on these software programs, how they
21 integrate with all the other platforms we use with
22 streaming and we can discuss further later.

23 MR. FONTE: Thank you.

24 MR. PETERS: Okay. Thank you. Sounds good.

25 Chairman Stroia, anything more on that?

1 MR. STROIA: Just it kind of took a turn to
2 the minutes and everything, but what -- how about
3 some discussion on the three-person committees and
4 some structure on that. Any feedback from that?

5 MR. CERRETA: What's the concern about the
6 way it is now with the committees?

7 MRS. WERREN: Yeah.

8 MR. CERRETA: I think it's kind of nice you
9 got everybody involved. Why go to three people?

10 MRS. WERREN: Well, we did. When we first --
11 I first started we had three-person and then this
12 was --

13 MR. CERRETA: So what's the concern right
14 now?

15 MR. STROIA: What's my concern? Are you
16 talking to me?

17 MR. CERRETA: Yeah. Who wants to go through
18 to three-person committee meetings? Right now it's
19 kind of open, gives everybody a good input. Is there
20 an issue right now that we're having?

21 MR. STROIA: I mean, personally, I think it
22 would cause a lot more participation. I think it
23 would encourage discussion.

24 MRS. WERREN: It doesn't.

25 MR. STROIA: Give me some feedback. I mean,

1 tell me why does it, why doesn't it.

2 MR. CERRETA: Matt, we were at three before
3 and then you just have three people on a committee
4 discussing. You know, like right now. We would only
5 allow those three people to discuss it in their
6 committee. If we're talking about -- let's say the
7 verbatim minutes right now, it would be those three
8 people discussing it and then you can open it up to
9 someone else not part of that committee. Whereas now
10 anybody could be. And you just have more feedback, I
11 believe, in the way it is now rather than the old
12 three-person, and that's the reason we went to the
13 open kind of process. You have seven people now
14 trying to help and make the decisions for the
15 community rather than three people.

16 MRS. WERREN: Well, is there something that
17 started this conversation to go back beyond that?
18 Just more engagement or --

19 MR. PETERS: Well, I know one of the issues
20 we had was if we were having a meeting to discuss
21 whatever the topic was and, say, only two members
22 were able to make that meeting; however, if they both
23 served on the same committee, that meeting could be
24 open -- well, you could be in violation of open
25 meeting law if the press wasn't made aware of it.

1 And it was kind of -- we did that to kind of take
2 that out of it.

3 MR. FONTE: Is it not working good the way it
4 is right now? Matt?

5 MR. STROIA: Are you talking to me?

6 MR. FONTE: Whoever wants to chime in. I
7 didn't really think there was a problem before, but
8 if you think there is a problem, please, put it on
9 the table so I understand.

10 MR. STROIA: I mean, personally I think it
11 would work better, but when I watch the way other
12 councils work there's more discussion. I mean,
13 there's more activity and, I mean, it doesn't have to
14 be a three-person committee, it could be whatever,
15 but now's the time, when we're looking at our
16 procedures, to have the discussion about it. That's
17 why I bring it up.

18 MR. FOLTZ: Well, that's -- let's have that
19 discussion again. I guess when you're looking at --
20 I'm sorry, Matt, I couldn't have the discussion we
21 talked about earlier this week because of conflicts
22 at work, but discussing a format of meeting minutes,
23 now we're talking about the whole process of
24 committee chairs and rules of council, so to speak,
25 which doesn't mean we can't look to update those, but

1 I think, you know, that again, is an older system in
2 place where the committee chair ran the meeting, then
3 it went to vice chair, then member, and then open to
4 the floor and there was still participation. But
5 I -- maybe you're right, there was more of a
6 committee participation because that -- it had to
7 come out of that committee unless you had four votes
8 to move it forward. So just kind of the process that
9 is there that's evolved. So there's good and bad to
10 both of those, I think. I shouldn't say good and
11 bad. There's just a different process for both of
12 those type scenarios, you know, committee-run
13 meetings. Back -- back 20 years ago, if you weren't
14 on that committee, you didn't have to come to council
15 of the whole.

16 MR. PETERS: Right.

17 MR. FOLTZ: If it wasn't in your committee
18 you didn't have to attend it, you just came to the
19 council meeting. I mean, that's the way it worked.
20 Daryl, you'll have those memories; right?

21 MR. REVOLDT: Well, you know, I guess I would
22 make two comments. Number one is, I would like to
23 see us look at our rules and think about -- think
24 about how we operate.

25 But number two as a subset on the committee

1 thing, let's just -- you know, what happens is, if
2 you've got a committee of seven, you basically put
3 the political authority in four people. And one of
4 the reasons we had three-person committees is it
5 diffused the authority across the entire council.
6 And that's not a bad thing. It was a way -- I
7 believe it was a way to ensure that no members got
8 left out of a role in the city business.

9 Doug, you may remember, we've had members
10 before who have just gotten cut out.

11 MR. FOLTZ: Yeah.

12 MR. REVOLDT: Really unhealthy. So I don't
13 know.

14 MR. CERRETA: I think we're going backwards
15 with this kind of thing.

16 MR. REVOLDT: Well, you know, Mark, again,
17 I've lived in both. I can appreciate the advantage
18 of both. But as long as everybody gets to weigh in
19 at the council meeting, council of the whole meeting,
20 the three-person committee is not that big a deal. I
21 can argue a case for both of them. But
22 participation, if you've got a -- if you've got a
23 three-member committee and you can't get ahold of a
24 chairman, well -- or the chairman elects not to
25 return phone calls, you know, that really puts --

1 puts pressure on participation. So that's my two
2 cents for tonight.

3 MR. PETERS: Okay.

4 MR. CERRETA: So that's not changing
5 anything. If that's --

6 MRS. WERREN: I'm not even --

7 MR. YOUNG: If I may, one of the things
8 Councilman Stroia and I discussed at our meeting on
9 Wednesday is that the current structure of only
10 committee people could potentially stifle a minority.
11 So right now we don't have a very strongly contested
12 council where there's a clear bloc of three versus a
13 clear bloc of four, or two blocs of three with one
14 swing vote. But if we were to ever if get in that
15 situation then the bloc of four could prevent the
16 bloc of three from ever getting anything on the
17 agenda.

18 MR. REVOLDT: That's correct.

19 MR. PETERS: Yeah, that's certainly an
20 interesting take, and I've seen that happen in some
21 of the communities around us.

22 MR. CERRETA: Yeah, that's that political
23 crap. So I would just as soon stay with all of us
24 making a good decision.

25 MR. FONTE: Let's stay on track. Let's get

1 the mission accomplished. Come on. Moving on.

2 MR. PETERS: Okay. Well, Dom, we'll go with
3 you for now. Is there anyone else wants to comment
4 on that before we move on?

5 MR. REVOLDT: Let's continue the
6 conversation.

7 MR. PETERS: Okay.

8 MR. REVOLDT: Not tonight.

9 MR. PETERS: All right. Okay. All right.
10 Moving on, let's go to Street and Alley
11 Committee. Chairman Fonte.

12 MR. FONTE: So what we have here, guys,
13 something exciting heading into the corridor to Walsh
14 University. 4,700 linear feet, 8-foot wide
15 decorative concrete, 36 decorative light posts and,
16 you know, so there's going to be the bridge, there's
17 a lot of components here. It's over \$2 million worth
18 of work. And the breakdown of how that's going to
19 look, guys and ladies, we have 2,049,000 is the
20 estimation of the project. We have 1.524 million
21 from ODOT grant in the bank waiting for us to move on
22 with the project.

23 We also -- Rob applied for the municipal road
24 fund of 75,000, and then once we see exactly how much
25 that's going to be, our portion will be around 450

1 towards the 200 -- \$2 million project. And this
2 would be on an emergency because we want to try to
3 get estimates and quotes as quick as possible. But
4 it's going to be a fantastic corridor all the way
5 from Marquardt Avenue through the Hoover Trail area
6 where the bridge is all the way up to Washington
7 Square where the post office will be.

8 So Rob Graham is on the line, if there's
9 anything he wants to add, or anyone else feel free to
10 chime in. But we want to get it on an emergency as
11 soon as possible.

12 MR. GRAHAM: All I would add, Chairman Fonte,
13 is, as I described on the legislation request, the
14 last page in your packet, the portion of the work is
15 also the rehabbing of the roadway bridge, and that's
16 owned by the Stark County engineer, so anything above
17 and beyond our granted, so that's 450 of our money,
18 the county commissioners would be reimbursing us for
19 that.

20 MR. PETERS: And, hey, Rob, I've got a
21 question for you regarding that. I think Member
22 Cerrera brought this up a couple months ago when we
23 first started discussing it. That wooden structure,
24 the walkway across that.

25 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah.

1 MR. PETERS: What kind of structure --
2 because that's kind of ugly. What are we looking at?

3 MR. GRAHAM: What we're doing, what we're
4 proposing to do with that pedestrian bridge, and
5 yeah, it's hideously ugly, is number one, the railing
6 is way too high. It only needs to be about 4 1/2
7 feet high. So what we're going to do is basically
8 shorten it up and kind of keep the bulk of the
9 railing there but shorten it up, get rid of those
10 long bolts, cut those off that are sticking out where
11 it looks like we could impale people on the side, and
12 then we're going to paint it gloss black is what
13 we're proposing. That would match the streetlights,
14 and the county engineer's vehicular bridge is going
15 to have a gloss black railing. So that's what we're
16 looking to do with that. Kind of salvage what we
17 can, but trim it up so, you know, when we had our
18 site walk last summer, you know, you stand on that
19 bridge, you can't even look down and see the fish or
20 whatnot that's in the stream channel. And, you know,
21 it's got to be high enough to provide the safety you
22 need, but the thing now is, you know, 5 1/2 feet
23 high. You can't look over.

24 MR. CERRETA: So Rob, what would it take to
25 spruce that up a little bit, put some stone on that

1 and make that presentable when people come into our
2 community. Because even that sounds like a band-aid
3 on something that's really ugly.

4 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah, that would be talking a
5 whole different scope. We'd have to look
6 structurally because you're adding a lot of weight to
7 the structure. If we were to look at some kind of
8 decorative stone, and that would almost be a project
9 on its own, then we can certainly look at that
10 someday.

11 MR. PETERS: Hey, Rob. There are some
12 decorative stone that is made from a material that's
13 lighter weight. Could that be something we can look
14 at?

15 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah, we could certainly look at
16 that. But it still has to function as a guardrail,
17 you know. If a kid does hit it on a bike, it can't
18 be styrofoam and he blasts through. So we would have
19 to take a hard look at that, see what we could do,
20 look at the structural calculations on the bridge
21 itself. Look at the remaining width. One of the
22 things, you know, we don't want to lose the existing
23 width that we have by losing a foot on each side for
24 the wider stone. So all great questions, all things
25 we can look at as we move forward.

1 MR. FONTE: The decorative railing will make
2 it look really nice. I know what Mark's saying.
3 This may not be the application for it, is my guess.

4 MR. GRAHAM: We could even -- it's not a big
5 expense to do what we're doing but we could certainly
6 look at anything. And we will have adjacent do it
7 that retaining wall, if you recall, just east of
8 that, that kind of ugly wall is coming down and the
9 project will construct a newer decorative wall.

10 MR. CERRETA: It just seems sad that we're
11 redoing that whole bridge and that thing is really
12 not changing much.

13 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. I mean, it will be better
14 than it is, but it's certainly not a full-blown
15 structural redo. Again, something we can look at.
16 I'm not opposed.

17 MR. CERRETA: I'm not throwing it at you, but
18 these are the character things that makes our
19 community a little bit higher and stronger when you
20 come in and you see those kind of little things that
21 you put in place like that. What we're doing here is
22 just we're putting paint over, you know, something
23 that smells.

24 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. Absolutely. It's a
25 relatively inexpensive treatment that gains us some

1 esthetics, that is for sure, but not the full-blown.
2 We can certainly look at that in the next couple of
3 weeks, see if there's any affordable --

4 MR. CERRETA: I'd like you to do that, if you
5 could. Because if you do it later, we're not doing
6 it later.

7 MR. GRAHAM: I agree.

8 MR. CERRETA: Yes. You just redid something.
9 People are going to say, "You just redid the bridge.
10 Why are you redoing it now?" This is the time.

11 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. Okay.

12 MR. DEORIO: We don't have the funds budgeted
13 for that.

14 MR. CERRETA: Pardon? I couldn't get that.
15 What was that?

16 MR. DEORIO: This year's budget was laid out
17 last year. There's no money in the budget to do the
18 other couple hundred thousand-dollar bridge.

19 MR. CERRETA: Okay.

20 MR. FONTE: It's not in the budget.

21 MR. CERRETA: Well, let's create the budget
22 for God sakes. It's what we do. Let's find some
23 money somewhere and let's fix it.

24 MR. REVOLDT: This is Daryl.

25 Rob, quick question for you. We have grant

1 money on this project?

2 MR. GRAHAM: We do. We have a lot of grant
3 money. We have up to 1,524,000, or 80 percent of the
4 project cost, from ODOT sitting in the bank waiting
5 to spend.

6 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. It's ready to go?

7 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. And we also applied for
8 municipal road funds. We think at a minimum it will
9 be 75,000, but last year for Easthill we got over
10 200. 203,000.

11 MR. REVOLDT: Yeah. So those who are
12 concerned about the state of the economy, is we
13 basically have \$1.5 million in the bank for this
14 project. And the potential for significant
15 additional monies to complete it.

16 MR. GRAHAM: Yes.

17 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Perfect. So we're not
18 spending a lot of our money, in other words.

19 MR. GRAHAM: Right. Of the 450 we've
20 allocated of ours, even a portion of that, the county
21 commissioners will be reimbursing us for the work on
22 the roadway bridge outside of those grants.

23 MR. REVOLDT: All right. Very good. Thank
24 you, Rob. I just wanted to clarify that.

25 MR. PETERS: Well, with that being said then,

1 Rob, if you could research it a little more to see
2 what our options are on the bridge, what the costs
3 would be attached to that, and if we come out to the
4 good on this maybe we could apply those funds to
5 that.

6 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. Absolutely. I'll take a
7 look. And we have to keep the plans moving forward
8 because we have to be under contract to not
9 jeopardize the federal money this fiscal year, so by
10 June 30. So I don't want to put the brakes on
11 everything, but we could certainly keep looking ahead
12 and then have a change order once we have someone,
13 you know, under contract.

14 MR. REVOLDT: We could go ahead, and what's
15 your recommendation, Rob is -- this is Daryl. That
16 we have legislation Monday night calling this an
17 emergency; correct?

18 MR. GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

19 MR. REVOLDT: In the interim, you will
20 backfill with that information.

21 MR. GRAHAM: I will see what alternatives are
22 out there for our decorative bridge railing, yes.

23 MR. FONTE: Thanks, Rob.

24 MR. PETERS: Okay. Sounds good. Are you
25 good, Dominic?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. FONTE: Yep. Moving on.

MR. PETERS: Okay. Very good. So that concludes our committee of the whole agenda. I'll entertain a motion and second to adjourn.

MR. REVOLDT: So moved.

MR. FOLTZ: Second.

MR. PETERS: All in favor, say "aye."

("Aye" in unison.)

MR. PETERS: Okay. We are adjourned.

- - - - -

(Meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.)

- - - - -

Attest:


Benjamin R. Young
Clerk of Council

Daniel Jeff Peters
City Council President