There was a Pre-Council celebration held at 7:00pm to welcome new members of City Council and to congratulate re-elected members of City Council.

Mayor Infeld called the regular meeting to order at 7:36 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Mrs. Susan Pardee  
         Mr. Steven Sims  
         Mr. Mark Wiseman  
         Mrs. Michele Weiss  
         Mrs. Pamela Cameron

Absent: Mr. Phillip Ertel

Also Present: Law Director Luke McConville  
               Finance Director Larry Heiser  
               Clerk of Council Kelly M. Thomas  
               Police Chief Steven Hammett  
               City Engineer Joseph Ciuni  
               Community Development Coordinator Patrick Grogan  
               Mr. John Rach

MOTION BY MR. SIMS, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON to excuse the absence of Councilman Ertel. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from Council meeting December 21, 2015

Mrs. Pardee noted the following insert and corrections for clarity

on page 3 of 6, under item F in the second paragraph
- insert “about surveying residents” after with Mayor Infeld and before and was glad
- correct two original concerns to “three” original concerns
  - (1) cost cited by the Planning Commission
  - (2) the door to door delivery method
  - (3) Council’s ability to add questions
- correct the word precedent to “unprecedented”

at the top of page 4 of 6
- delete “because they got a set up”

MOTION BY MRS. CAMERON, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS to approve the Council minutes of December 21, 2015 as corrected and amended. On roll call all voted “aye,” except Mrs. Weiss who “passed.”

Comments from Audience

There were no audience comments.

Mayor’s Report to Community

- The City received a letter from Father Niehoff, President of John Carroll University which provided a brief State of the College for the year thus far and noted that JCU will be serving as a host facility for 500 people from the Republican Convention.
Project Love is looking for teen leaders – the website is www.nominateyourteen.com

Congregation Beth El, a local Cleveland Heights Synagogue in Cleveland Heights will be conducting a food drive the weekend of January 17th from 10am until 2pm. The location is 3246 Desota Road, Cleveland Heights. All collected food will be given to the Heights Emergency Food Center.

Hopes to present the State of the City report at the next City Council meeting.

**Agenda Item:**

**A. Motion to Appoint John Rach as a member of Council and the Administering of Oath.**

Vice Mayor Pardee explained the process that Council went through in making the appointment of Mr. Rach to Council. Mrs. Pardee reported that the Clerk of Council sent out press releases to the media dated October 19, 2015 once Council was aware that the opening existed because of the number of petitions that were filed and accepted by the County Board of Elections. After the close of the November 3, 2015 election resumes and letters of interest were accepted between November 5, 2015 and November 19, 2015 with eighteen University Heights residents responding; all of whom were strong candidates, many with much experience and enthusiasm for University Heights. Council members and Councilwoman elect Michele Weiss met on November 30, 2015 to review the candidates. Out of that meeting Council interviewed seven candidates on November 8 and November 15; one of those candidates was John Rach.

Mrs. Pardee stated that Mr. Rach has been a member of the City’s Board of Zoning Appeals since 2012, besides meeting monthly on BZA he has been part of the work to update the City’s zoning code and master plan. Mr. Rach also served on the Steering Committee for the NOACA Pedestrian and Bike Friendly lanes project. By profession Mr. Rach is an architect with a Master of Architecture and Environmental Design as well as holding a Master Degree in Business Administration from Kent State. Mr. Rach currently works for CBLH Design as a Director of Marketing. In addition to serving on the programming committee of the Northern Ohio Society of Health Care Engineering Mr. Rach is the President Elect and past Treasurer of the Northeast Ohio Chapter of the Society for Marketing and Profession Services.

Mrs. Pardee noted her belief that Mr. Rach will be a great asset as a member of Council and in service to the City of University Heights.

**MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS** to nominate Mr. Rach to the University Heights City Council for a term of two years, ending December 31, 2017. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Judge Goldberg stated a few words about Mr. Rach, noting he will be tremendous asset to the community and administered the Oath of Office to Mr. John Rach as a University Heights Councilman.

Mayor Infeld added that it was very exciting to see Mr. Rach continue in his service to the City in a different capacity, which means there will be an opening on the Board of Zoning Appeals.

**B. Election of Vice Mayor and Oath of Office**

Mr. Wiseman stated that Vice Mayor Pardee has been doing a tremendous job as Vice Mayor for the past 2 years.

**MOTION BY MR. WISEMAN, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON** nominating Mrs. Pardee as Vice Mayor for a period of two years. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Judge Goldberg stated a few words about Mrs. Pardee and administered the Oath of Office to Mrs. Pardee as Vice Mayor for the City of University Heights.

**C. Election of Council Representatives to Boards and Commissions**

Mrs. Pardee announced the following Council Representatives to the various Boards and Commissions.

- Planning Commission – Councilman Mark Wiseman; alternate Councilman Phillip Ertel
- Board of Zoning Appeals – Councilwoman Michele Weiss; alternate Councilman John Rach
- City Beautiful Commission – Councilwoman Pamela Cameron
- Financial Advisory Committee – Councilwoman Susan D. Pardee
Parade Committee – Councilman John Rach
Recreation Advisory Committee – Councilwoman Pamela Cameron

MOTION BY MR. SIMS, SECONDED BY MR. WISEMAN to approve the announced listing of Council Representatives to the City's Boards and Commissions. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

D. Announcement of Appointments to Council Standing Committees

Mrs. Pardee announced the following Council Standing Committees for the next two years as follows:

Building Committee: Chair Mark Wiseman, Pamela Cameron, Susan Pardee; Phillip Ertel, alternate
Civic Information Committee: Chair John Rach, Susan Pardee, Mark Wiseman; Michele Weiss, alternate
Finance Committee: Chair Susan Pardee, Steven Sims, Michele Weiss; Mark Wiseman, alternate
Governmental Affairs Committee: Chair Michele Weiss, Pamela Cameron, John Rach; Steven Sims, alternate
Recreation Committee: Chair Pamela Cameron, Phillip Ertel, John Rach; Susan Pardee, alternate
Safety Committee: Chair Phillip Ertel, Steven Sims, Mark Wiseman; Pamela Cameron, alternate
Service/Utilities Committee: Chair Steven Sims, Phillip Ertel, Michele Weiss; John Rach, alternate

MOTION BY MR. RACH, SECONDED BY MRS. WEISS to approve the announced listing of Appointments to Council Standing Committees. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

E. Announcement of Council Liaisons to Committees and Commissions

Mrs. Pardee announced the following Council Liaisons to Committees and Commissions as follows:

Planning Commission: Mark Wiseman, alternate Phillip Ertel
Board of Zoning Appeals: Michele Weiss, alternate John Rach

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON to approve the announced listing of Council Liaison to Committees and Commissions. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

F. Ordinance 2016-01 Reappointing Kelly M. Thomas as Clerk of Council (on emergency)

Mrs. Pardee stated that Mrs. Thomas has served the City for a number of years in many capacities and was happy to reappoint her for a continuing two years as Clerk.

Mayor Infeld added that per City Charter the Council Clerk also has several administrative functions within the city. The Council Clerk also serves as Secretary to the Planning Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals, Record Retention Commission, and Civil Service Commission.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MR. RACH to Approve Ordinance 2016-01 Reappointing Kelly M. Thomas as Clerk of Council on emergency. Roll call on suspension of the rules, all voted “aye.” Roll call on passage, all voted “aye.”

Judge Goldberg stated a few words about Mrs. Thomas and administered the Oath of Office to Mrs. Thomas as Clerk of Council for the City of University Heights.

G. Ordinance 2016-02 Reappointing Luke F. McConville as Law Director effective February 1, 2016 for a Term expiring as the end of January 31, 2018 (on first reading)

Ordinance 2016-02 was placed on first reading.
H. Motion Authorizing the Mayor to enter into an agreement with the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission to provide professional planning services for a University Heights Community Survey, in conjunction with the Master Plan process, at a cost not to exceed $8,400 (tabled from December 21, 2015)

Mayor Infeld stated that this was first presented to Council on June 1, 2015 and again at the last Council meeting on December 21, 2015 at which time it was tabled. At the request of Council Mr. Glenn Coyne, Executive Director and Mr. James M. Sonnhalter, Manager of Planning Services from the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission were present to review the survey project.

Mr. Sonnhalter noted that the community was looked at in great depth in terms of demographics, land use, zoning and getting a feel as to where the city wants to be with capital improvements, park projects, etc. There were meetings with the Project Team (Council and Administration), Steering Committee along with public meetings. Mr. Sonnhalter streamlined the process stating that conversations have been held with the project team to make sure the project is heading in the right direction; from there the project is presented to the Steering Committee for refinement and then to the public for their input. Mr. Sonnhalter added that Council will also be provided with brief updates.

The project phases which include current conditions, community vision, policies, implementation and final plan were explained and reviewed.

Current Conditions provides an analysis of where the community is today based on obtained information. Community Vision is in the final draft stage and provides information of where the community is going in the next 10 years. The Policies Phase is the current phase and it is where the goals and action steps that were defined are developed to achieve the desired Community Visions. The Implementation Phase is currently underway and should be finish in February or March of 2016; this is where the priorities are established, the “how to manual” is developed. The Final Plan Phase is where the final document with the City’s roadmap for the future.

Mrs. Pardee stated that Council questions were in regards to if the survey would be for the entire community and asked at what point would the community-wide survey usually be conducted in the process.

Mr. Sonnhalter replied that the survey will be distributed early on towards the beginning of the process so that the questions that are asked reflect where the community wants to go. The survey is another tool to gather that input.

Mrs. Pardee noted she had three (3) questions and noted that the community wide survey had not been conducted yet.

1. With the draft policies and actions being planned to be presented in early March 2016 could Council, if Council were to choose to conduct that kind of survey and have any information that were to come forwarded be implemented and included in the draft policies and procedures or is it too late?

Mr. Coyne replied that at this point in the project regarding the survey the discussion is at the point of “we have goals, objectives, and policies – how do we make this happen.” Mr. Coyne continued to say that the survey questions could be tailored towards those types of questions. The questions can be tailored to be more direct to implementation and outcomes than opinion. The plan can be finished and then do the survey. In that case the survey would still have value and help the City in day to day work of the City. Mr. Coyne noted that there is plenty of value in the survey, beyond even if the master plan isn’t done. But, ideally the survey would be done at the beginning to get a community feel as to what is important and then enter into the planning process. Mr. Coyne added here with the Steering Committee, Planning Team and the Public meetings thus far that element is not missing.

Mrs. Pardee commented that she respected that information has been gathered from those who have attended the meetings, but questioned whether that was really representative of everyone. Mrs. Pardee stated she liked the idea of tailoring the questions towards what is already believed to be the policy direction but was wondering if there was a way to add “do you agree or disagree with this direction” to each of those questions, as a check to make sure when contact is made to the households that weren’t involved in the process. There’s a finite number of people who are actually activity involved so there are a lot of people who are out there who are not and may know very little about this noting they may have strong and useful opinions that could help.
2. Mrs. Pardee commented that the proposed survey is about 12 pages and asked if Council could add questions at the end of the survey since this is such a great opportunity. Questions like; how do you like to get your information, how would you like the city to communicate with you, etc. little things like that could mean a lot to Council’s understanding of the public in terms of communication.

Mr. Coyne replied that the categories of questions work pretty well. But each City has its own unique issues/questions. Mr. Coyne stated he wouldn’t want to add on a whole bunch of new questions, but that additional questions could be added within the already existing questions. The questions are setup so there aren’t so many open-ended questions but multi-choice, fill-in the blank and strongly agree/disagree questions.

3. Mrs. Pardee noted her understanding was to try to have the survey reach all households and not a representative sample.

Mr. Coyne stated that a statistically random sample of households could be done and added that it is amazing how few households you need to have returned back to have a good statistical response. But in this case since it has been so long since a survey has been done and will probably before it will happen again, the Administration asked that the survey be a team effort. The County would write the questions, conduct the analysis and generate the report and the Administration would handle the distribution to all the households.

Mrs. Pardee asked about the ability to complete the survey on-line with unique identifiers.

Mr. Coyne replied that most cities with a senior population the mail option has won out, but that they have the technology to do on-line surveys.

Mr. Sims asked if adding the electronic process would impact the cost of the project.

Mr. Coyne replied yes, there would be a cost impact.

Mr. Wiseman commented that conducting the survey is fantastic and that it accomplishes two things; (1) provides a lot more input then what is received at meetings; (2) tells residents that the city is actively trying to find out what their opinions are even if they don’t fill out the survey. Mr. Wiseman added anything that can be done electronically is fantastic as just about everybody has access to the internet. Noting the budget was for $8,400 Mr. Wiseman said a certain amount of that could be budgeted to mail out the survey to residents who request it. Whatever can be done to reach everyone in the city should be done, the more questions that can be asked the better.

Mr. Wiseman noted that he would like Council to be able to see the survey before it is sent out.

Mrs. Cameron asked if the previous master plan from 1994 had any impact in this project.

Mr. Coyne replied yes along with the master plans from other agencies.

Mr. Rach asked since the survey is 12 pages if it would be overwhelming and what has been the Planning Commission response rate with other surveys and how much time would completion take.

Mr. Coyne responded that the most recent surveys the response rates have been 46, 48 and 52% with the same size booklet. It should take 20 to 25 minutes to complete. In most cities a reminder card is sent 3 to 4 weeks after the initial mailing.

Further discussion was held regarding the survey delivery.

Mrs. Cameron asked if the John Carroll student community would be included.

Mr. Coyne replied yes, if they are living within a University Heights household.

Mrs. Weiss asked if the survey questions are global or more specific, such as capital spending or strategic planning.

Mr. Coyne replied that the questions would be very specific to University Heights. Such as city services, issues, etc. The survey would steer away from questions relating to the schools.

Mrs. Pardee asked Mayor Infeld if at the last Council meeting when this was discussed if she was thinking that the survey would be done using the statistical sampling and be only mailed to those 490 households.
Mayor Infeld stated that she presented this to Council on June 1 before the planning process began. At that time Mayor Infeld stated she spoke to the Planning Commission about their typical survey about $30,000 where they would take care of all aspects of the survey for all 4900 household. It was at that time Mayor Infeld thought that ($30,000) cost would be more than what would be acceptable to the Council. The $8,400 proposal was based on the City taking on some of the functions of the Planning Commission that are listed in the original proposal; where the city would do the collation, coping and distribution of the survey since this was during the summer months and there is a hand delivery method. Mayor Infeld stated she re-proposed a community survey at the December Council meeting and noted the survey will go to all 4,900 households. At the December Council meeting Council asked if the Service Department would be delivering the survey to the residents and Mayor Infeld said she replied that since it was now wintertime it would probably be better to have the surveys sent bulk rate at an additional cost beyond the $8,400.

Mrs. Pardee commented that Council was opposed to the survey being delivered via hand delivery and would like for the survey to go to every household in the city. Mrs. Pardee also added that Council would like to know how the survey will be delivered. Mrs. Pardee added that it was important that the method of delivery be known before the $8,400 for the Planning Commission is approved. Until Council is certain in their minds how the survey will be delivered, Council shouldn’t even vote to go forward, which is why Council asked for the County representatives to come. Mrs. Pardee stated she would be happy to move forward, take this item off the table and approve it assuming it can be done as bulk mail. Or depending if Council finds that cost so high, back off potentially to the statistical sample being mail, letting people know there are location pickup /dropped off at various locations or mail in at their own expense and then add on the online opportunity. Bulk mail maybe perfectly responsible but there needs to also be another method.

Mayor Infeld reminded Council of a previous survey that was previously done regarding City services where surveys were mailed to a statistical sample of households. Separately surveys were available for pickup and return at City Hall and at the library. Survey Monkey was also an option for residents. Mayor Infeld stated that the only thing before Council for approval was the concept of the survey design and tabulation with the cost of $8,400 to use the expertise of the County Planning Commission. The copying and distribution cost would be at the city’s expense. If this is above the Mayor’s spending authority that cost would come back to Council for approval.

Mr. Wiseman noted that he thought this is being done with the grant the City received from the County for the Planning Commission to do this and asked if the survey was part of the master planning process as is done for other cities.

Mayor Infeld answered that the grant was for the professional planning services to produce the master plan. The survey is an extra cost. The survey is a completely independent cost.

Mr. Wiseman commented again that he would like for Council to see the survey questions before the survey goes out.

Mayor Infeld responded that Mr. Coyne stated that would happen but the timeframe if the Bay Village model was followed may be shortened to a four day turn around to be included in the master plan, or the other option would be to finish the master plan process and then separately conduct a survey to the community. Having the survey done while the master plan preliminary process is unfolding would be helpful to the end product.

**MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS to take agenda item “H” authorizing the Mayor to enter into an agreement with the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission to provide professional planning services for a University Heights Community Survey, in conjunction with the Master Plan process, at a cost not to exceed $8,400 off the table. On roll call, all voted “aye.”**

Mr. Wiseman noted that the provided MOU speaks about the hand delivery and asked if that needs to be noted that that has changed.

Mayor Infeld replied that could be left up to the Administration because if the distribution method becomes an issue because it exceeds her spending authority she will have to bring that cost back to Council. The method that would have worked in June which was hand delivery by the Service Department employees isn’t going to be possible due to weather conditions. The Administration would look to mailing the survey.

Mr. Wiseman replied that he asked that question because several council members are specifically not interested in relying on hand delivery for this. Therefore, Mr. Wiseman stated he would like to have the line regarding hand delivery in the MOU deleted out and have something that states a method of delivery will be
Mr. McConville suggested that in the MOU in sub section “c” that list hand-delivery method be deleted. So it reads distribute the surveys to all 4,900 households in University Heights. This would still provide Administrative leeway.

Mrs. Pardee stated she would not want to make any suggestion about bulk or what type of delivery because there is not enough information to know the cost. But asked that hopefully Council would be kept informed so they would have a good idea of where the mailing is going. Council can help promote this survey, what Council wants is for the households to fill it out. So Council needs to know what is going on so that they can go out to their networks and encourage people to fill it out and get it back to the City. The more this can be done the better for all involved; the planning process, the City, we want to gather this information and encourage the Administration to think about the questions that can be imbedded in there that might be useful, this may have already been done, but that could be gather the type of information that would be helpful for this particular city.

Mr. Sims commented that he believes that Council has received assurance that Council will have the opportunity to review the survey before it is distributed. Mr. Sims noted that this will only be a good idea if the information that is going to be collected can seriously be considered for incorporation into the plan. Otherwise, we need to be doing a totally different survey because the questions are designed to support the master planning process and if the master planning process is going to be completed before the survey is done then the citizens have been surveyed without purpose.

Mr. Coyne responded by saying time is of the essence and that the project is at step 3.5 of about 5. The next Steering Committee will be in February with additional public and Steering Committee meetings. It will be about a good 3 to 4 months before a draft plan is ready. If everyone proceeds pretty quickly the survey can be turned around pretty fast and the report can be done rather quickly. There will be a day very soon where the questions will be old information for the planning process, it will still be valuable but it will be more valuable to this planning process if action is taken sooner than later.

Mr. Sims commented that the bottom line is that if Council acts quickly in all likelihood it (survey) would be incorporated in a way Council would expect, but if we don’t get to a place where the survey gets out and get the responses back from the community then there is a better chance that there will be some good information but it would really be incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Coyne agreed and said there may be two parallel things but not quite duck tailed.

Mrs. Weiss asked for clarification on the next steps; Council will be provided with a draft copy of the survey, then Council has a quick turn-around of four days.

Mr. Coyne said they would be able to return the draft survey within 10 days so it would be ready for print at the beginning of February from their (County Planning Commission) side. Mr. Coyne added that it is hard to take an online survey and a mail survey and have the results mesh together. An online survey can always be done to provide results, although they will not be scientific.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON to approve authorizing the Mayor to enter into an agreement as amended with the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission to provide professional planning services for a University Heights Community Survey, in conjunction with the Master Plan process, at a cost not to exceed $8,400.

Mrs. Pardee withdrew her motion and Mrs. Cameron withdrew her second.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON to approve authorizing the Mayor to enter into an agreement as amended with the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission to provide professional planning services for a University Heights Community Survey, in conjunction with the Master Plan process, at a cost not to exceed $8,400 with the revision of item “c” of the MOU to indicate that the mailing will be to all 4,900 University Heights households. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

I. Motion Accepting the new hourly rates for engineering services provided by City Engineer Joseph Ciuni and the GPD Group (tabled from December 21, 2015)

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS to take agenda item “I” Accepting the new
hourly rates for engineering services provided by City Engineer Joseph Ciuni and the GPD Group off the table. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Mrs. Pardee commented that she motioned at the last meeting that this be tabled because at that time Council had just receive the background paperwork regarding this item and did not have enough time to review it. Mrs. Pardee stated she had enough time to review the information and has no problem with increase the fees by the certain percentage.

Mr. Rach asked if the rates were the same rates charged to the other communities Mr. Ciuni serves and if Mr. Ciuni charges higher or lower rates for private clients.

Mr. Ciuni replied yes, all the cities that GPD Group represents are charged the same fees. The rates for private clients are at a higher rate.

Mr. Rach pointed out that he sees engineering fees daily with his professional position and these rates are lower than his firm uses. Mr. Rach noted that he also crossed checked the fees with the Office of Financial Management, that has a guide for Architecture and Engineering fees and GPD rates were on par or below.

MOTION BY MR. RACH, SECONDED BY MR. WISEMAN to accept the new hourly rates for engineering services provided by City Engineer Joseph Ciuni and the GPD Group. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

J. Motion to hold an executive session immediately following this regular meeting for the purpose of discussing legal, personnel, real estate matters

Mayor Infeld stated there was a need to hold executive session for the purpose of a personnel and legal matter.

MOTION BY MRS. CAMERON, SECONDED BY MR. RACH to hold executive session for the purpose of a personnel and legal matter. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Directors’ Reports

There were no Director reports.

Mr. Sims asked if there were any laws or Ordinances regarding the discharge of firearms in the air.

Police Chief Hammett stated that there’s State as well as City Ordinances that governs the discharging weapons within the city limits. Chief Hammett noted that it is hard to locate the source, even though they can be heard.

Mr. Sims noted he had been approached by residents regarding this occurring on New Year’s Eve and stated that there is a need to communicate something to the residents in some matter in short order so hopefully this will not be the case next year.

Standing Committee Reports:

Finance Committee: Mrs. Pardee stated that there will be a Joint Finance and Finance Advisory Committee meeting in February.

There were no other standing committee reports.

Council entered into executive session at 9:37pm.

MOTION BY MR. RACH, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS to exit executive session and to resume regular Council session. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Council resumed its regular council session at 9:48pm.

MOTION BY MR. RACH, SECONDED BY SIMS to adjourn the meeting. On roll call, all voted “aye.”
There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:51pm.

Susan K. Infeld, Mayor

Kelly M. Thomas, Clerk of Council