Mayor Infeld called the regular meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Mrs. Susan Pardee
         Mr. Mark Wiseman
         Mr. John Rach
         Mrs. Pamela Cameron
         Mr. Phillip Ertel
         Mrs. Michele Weiss

Absent: Mr. Steven Sims

Also Present: Law Director Luke F. McConville
               Finance Director Larry Heiser
               Clerk of Council Kelly M. Thomas
               Police Chief Steven Hammett
               Fire Chief Douglas Zook
               Service Director Jeffrey Pokorny
               Building Commissioner Eric Tuck-Macalla
               Community Development Coordinator Patrick Grogan

MOTION BY MR. WISEMAN, SECONDED BY MR. RACH to excuse the absence of Mr. Sims. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes from March 7, 2016

Mr. Wiseman stated that on page 2 and 3 where Council discussed the salary ranges for the Department heads there was quite a bit of robust discussion back and forth that wasn’t reflected at least to his satisfaction in the minutes and asked that the minutes be tabled to allow the Clerk to make those corrections adding that conversation.

Mayor Infeld asked the Clerk to explain how she produces the minutes.

Mrs. Thomas explained that she develops the minutes from her notes joint with listening to the audio recording and acknowledge receiving an email from Councilman Sims regarding the same concern as Councilman Wiseman. Mrs. Thomas stated that she again listened to the recording and directly compared it to the minutes and the minutes fully captured the discussion. Mrs. Thomas offered Vice Mayor Pardee a copy of the recording to see what may have been omitted.

Mrs. Pardee stated that she felt the Clerk did a good job on the minutes and that it was a difficult meeting. But in deference to her fellow colleagues who have expressed concerns she would like to have a copy of the cd and would support Councilman Wiseman’s request to table the approval of the minutes and added that she would listen to the cd over the next two weeks prior to the next Council meeting.

Mayor Infeld stated that her concern with the pattern that is beginning to develop where the Clerk produces summary minutes then after the minutes have been summarized and then gone back over, it is then sketch the minutes tremendously. Mayor Infeld added that in this case she didn’t know what was or wasn’t contained in the minutes but that the minutes looked fairly complete to her. Mayor Infeld commented that it would be most fair to have the minutes recorded by a court reporter rather than to have somebody on Council listen to the tape afterwards and skew the presentation even more by pulling out certain comments and not others. Either it is a summary or it’s verbatim and verbatim minutes aren’t really done here. Having verbatim minutes is something that the Council could choose to consider in terms of legislating.

Mrs. Pardee replied that every now and then Council does have corrections and the addition of additional information to the minutes that Council recalls from the discussion. Mrs. Pardee acknowledged that Council is very serious about having the minutes accurately reflect what they believe they heard or said. Mrs. Pardee stated again in deference to her colleague interest she understood what Mayor Infeld stated but added that she
would be happy to accept the meeting cd and listen to it and if there was a motion on the floor to table the minutes she would seconed it.

Mayor Infeld stated that she still believed that this issue needed further discussion because she believed that if any member of Council listens to the tape and then says that they would like the comment from this person be included in the minutes skews the presentation and it becomes a matter of several people having to listen to it to then review that person’s review. And, there will be a situation like there have been in recent month where sometimes minutes haven’t been passed for 3 or 4 months because of the constant back and forth where somebody’s concerned that they may have said something and it wasn’t attributed with as much emphasis as they wanted. To take summary minutes that gives somebody who was not there a sense of the types of things discussed is the way the City has normally operated. Council should really consider having verbatim minutes if that is the case. Speaking on behalf of the residents, Mayor Infeld stated again that she thought it was skewing the presentation and is also creating more work although she heard what Mrs. Pardee was saying.

MOTION BY MR. WISEMAN, SECONDED BY MR. S. PARDEE to table the approval of Council Minutes from March 7, 2016. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Comments from Audience

There were no audience comments.

Mayor’s Report to Community

- The survey which is part of the Master Planning process is out to community and the University Heights Library is helping by collecting completed surveys at their branch. The 16 page survey is multiple choice except for the end of the survey for people who want to say something else. The return surveys are due back by April 15. About 25% of the surveys return envelopes were stamped with postage. The stamping was determined by the County Planning Commission to give them a statistical significant sampling survey. Besides just the survey, the County Planning Commission typically do surveys in their work and other Master Plans. There are some questions imbedded in the survey which are somewhat standardized among other cities in the County regarding certain questions so that they are measurable based on the responses received. The 75% of the surveys that didn’t have the stamped return envelope can either put a stamp on it or drop it off at either City Hall or the library.

Mrs. Pardee thanked the Mayor and stated that almost all of the comments that Council requested were in the survey. Mrs. Pardee commented that Mayor Infeld provided Council the opportunity to weigh in on the survey and those items were in the survey.

Mayor Infeld replied that the County Planning Commission really wanted wide feedback on the survey. The ultimate decision was theirs as to the wording of the questions and what would land in the survey.

Mrs. Weiss agreed with Mrs. Pardee about the questions that were included and stated that she thought that Council agreed that every return envelope would be stamped.

Mayor Infeld replied that there was discussion about that. But, there were so many discussions that every time she went back to the Planning Commission she thought that until the Council made an absolute decision that there was going to be a survey. It was somewhat confusing to the Planning Commission as to whether the city was not going to do a survey and whether it would be done as all-inclusive as it could be because she has a pretty limited spending authority. Without Council’s approval they had to look as one type of survey that would be fitting within that and once the Council gave her wider approval she went back to the Planning Commission but they said that this was the way that they really do surveys.

Mrs. Weiss stated that Council specifically said it would be ok to go up to $8,000 or so.

Mayor Infeld stated that the amount was $10,000 and that she understood that but again the City hired the County to do this process and they said they really felt that this was the best way for them to get the data. Mayor Infeld continued to say she was relying on them as the experts that the City hired and Council was in agreement in hiring them.

Mrs. Weiss replied that she would have like to heard back that the mailing wasn’t going to be as
Council wanted and noted her surprise when she received her survey as it didn’t have the stamped return envelope. Mrs. Weiss said she would send hers in but there are plenty of people who would not.

Mayor Infeld stated that so far the Administration feels that the return rate has been pretty good and that the library has had a little steady stream of returns. Mayor Infeld again stated she understood what Mrs. Weiss was saying but that she was relying on the County’s expertise; and she suggested (questioned) them about it being an issue but the Planning Commission said it wouldn’t be an issue and that that was the way the County does surveys.

Mr. Wiseman stated that he was confused because his recollection was the same as Councilwoman Weiss’s and asked Mayor Infeld if she was saying that even though Council authorized and specified the money for return stamps on every envelope and made it known that that was what they (Council) wanted; the County Planning Commission members decided not to do that.

Mayor Infeld answered, exactly. Mayor Infeld stated that she told them that the survey could be sent out with a stamped return envelope to every single household and the Commission said that they had never done that with surveys before and that they were much more comfortable in doing the survey in the same manner that they have done for the other communities. Mayor Infeld added that she saw the value in what the County said and felt that thus far the return rate was good. About 25% of the return envelopes have a stamp. So, yes the discussion was held; the survey went out to every household and the hope is that people will return them. At this point Mayor Infeld continued with her report to the community.

- The Cuyahoga County Job and Family Services in partnership with The Earned Tax Credit Coalition will offer free tax preparation. People can call the County helpline at 211 for information.

- There was a waterline break in the area of Green Road and Churchill. Churchill is one of the streets scheduled to have its waterline replaced this summer. Cleveland Water has been notified so that the break can be repaired.

- The tree trimming project is ongoing in the western central part of the city. At times the tree trimming company may close off part of the streets where they are working for safety reasons.

**Agenda Item:**

**A. Presentation from Paychex Company regarding processing the payroll for the City.**

Mrs. Christy Herns, District Sales Manager for Paychex provided a brief explanation of the history of Paychex and the services they have to offer the City and what services the City has chosen.

Mrs. Pardee asked Mr. Heiser why ADP payroll services didn’t work out for the City.

Mr. Heiser replied that there were issues with the pension reporting and time data. ADP attempted to work out the issues but still hadn’t corrected the time data. Mr. Heiser noted that he originally chose ADP from a cost standpoint, they were the lowest. Paychex wanting the business was able to come back and present the City with a better price than it had quoted originally.

Mrs. Herns stated that Paychex provides payroll services to several cities and will provide University Heights with on boarding employees thru payroll HR time and attendance and also ACA reporting for the 1094’s and 1095’s at year’s end. Mrs. Herns added that at year end the City will have to provide them with the employer and employee benefits cost.

Mrs. Weiss asked Mrs. Herns to further explain the end of the year reporting that the City would have to provide Paychex.

Mrs. Herns replied that currently Paychex has all of the hours, but only has the employee deductions for medical and it is required that both the employee and employer medical deductions be reported. Paychex will provide a spreadsheet that will have to be filled out with the City’s benefits plan, which could take a good day to complete.
Mr. Wiseman commented that in his mind there are only two reasons to do something like this; save money and save work. Mr. Wiseman asked Mr. Heiser if that was the case here.

Mr. Heiser replied yes, that would be the hope and noted his budget this year was based on not having a full-time assistant.

Mr. Rach asked since it is almost the end of the first quarter if it would create any challenges for Paychex and if Council were to approve this today would they be able to start with the next payroll.

Mrs. Herns replied that they have clients sign on every day. Although it is nice to start with a clean slate.

Mr. Heiser stated that the plan is to end the first quarter and begin second quarter.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MRS. WEISS to allow the Administration to hire Paychex Company to conduct payroll processing for the City. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

B. Proclamation Declaring April as Fair Housing Month

Mayor Infeld stated that annually the City declares April as Fair Housing Month to commemorate the passing of the Fair Housing Act which is title 8 of the Civil Rights Act of 1967. The Act enunciates a national policy of Fair Housing without regard to race, color, religion, sex, familial status, handicap and national origin, and encourages fair housing opportunities for all. The Proclamation will be sent to the Cleveland Akron Board of Realtors.

C. Motion Approving the March 10, 2016 Planning Commission Recommendation from the University Heights Public Library, 13866 Cedar Road for the application of the necessary 9 Variances application for the expansion of the existing library and existing parking to the adjacent lots located at 2175, 2179 and 2183 Fenwick Road

Mr. Rach recused himself from the discussion of agenda items “c” and “d” because of his employment with the architect firm.

Mrs. Pardee also recused herself from the discussion of agenda items “c” and “d” because she is on the Board that supports the library; the Fund for the Future of Heights Library Foundation.

Mr. O’Brien provided a brief overview of the project and stated that the library is going through an expansion project to address some of the poor function needs. A lot of it stems from a lagging infrastructure standpoint; electrical, plumbing needs, ADA requirements, functionality for the community as well as safety issues for the parking lot. The expansion to the south will actually improve the current conditions. The library wants to be respectful to the immediate neighbors to the east and to the south and will try to keep as much of the green space as they can.

1.) Code Section: 1274.02 Area, Yard and Height Regulations

1274.02 (b) (1) Front. The front yard shall be not less than 75 feet in depth or not less in depth than the setback building line designated for the district on the zoning map and shall remain unoccupied except for a driveway for ingress and egress

- The existing building footprint resides on the building setback line which is identified as 35'-0"
- The proposed addition would encroach on the Building setback line 8'-6" producing a 26'-6" Setback from the property line.

2.) Code Section 1274.02 (c) (2) (parking setback)

Accessory off-street parking, loading or driveways shall be permitted no closer than ten feet from a side or rear property line or 30 feet from a U-1, U-2 or U-4 District. This area shall be a landscaped buffer, with screening provided according to Section 1274.03.

- The proposed parking lot is bordered on the east and south side by a U-1 district. A 30ft. buffer on the east and south sides would restrict the ability of the owner

Variance #1
to use the property as parking for the new expansion. Refer to drawing for proposed setbacks. we are proposing the following variances:

1. East Side; proposed 9'-0" buffer (Existing condition 5'-0" buffer)
2. South Side; proposed 12'-0" buffer (Existing Condition is 6'-0" buffer)
3. West Side proposed parking setback; 1'-7" (Existing condition is 7'-0" buffer)

3.) Code Section 1274.02 (b) (2) Side and Rear

Each lot shall have side and rear yards unoccupied by buildings, equal to the height of the main building except adjacent to a U-1, U-2 or U-4 District where such yards of not less than 50 feet shall be required. Rear and side yards may include accessory uses as permitted in division (c)(2) hereof.

- The proposed building is adjacent to a u-1 district (residences) and a u-9 district. (Dunkin Donuts)
  1. East side building varies 16'-3" max to 4'-9" min at U-9 District only
     ➢ Zoning code requirement of 21'-6"
     Area abuts green space and parking lot of Dunkin Donuts
  2. West side requirement of 40'-0" from Centerline of street
     ➢ Building proposed at 31'-2" (Existing condition is 30'-0")
     ➢ (Proposing a 0'-10" setback for canopy and site improvements for new side entrance)

2.) Code Section1 274.03 Landscaping and Screening Requirements

(b) Required Open Space: A minimum of 50% of the site shall be devoted to open space and shall be landscaped according to the requirements of this section.

- The proposed site plan is improving the landscaped area on the site from 23% lot coverage
- The existing building and site configuration currently utilizes 18% devoted to landscaping according to the zoning code.

(e) Landscaping on the Interior of Parking Lots. For any parking area that is designed to accommodate 40 or more vehicles, a minimum of 10% of the parking lot area shall be planted as landscaped island areas, developed and reasonably distributed throughout the parking lot so as to provide visual and climatic relief from broad expanses of pavement.

- The proposed landscaped islands is 6.9%

3.) Code Section 1274.04 Parking Facilities

1274.04 (c) (1) parking facilities: in addition to ingress and egress driveways, parking spaces shall be provided by applying the greater divisions (1), (2), and (3).

- According to the plan submitted, a total of 112 parking spaces would be required.
- The parking lot as proposed would provide 43 parking spots with an additional 4 handicapped spaces, for a total of 47 spaces.
  • Existing Condition is 37 parking spaces
  • On-street parking from Fenwick can produce additional parking capacity of up to 12 parking spaces.
  • Siting subparagraph (4) For exceptional circumstances or in cases of clear hardship, the Planning Commission, may, after consideration of the proposed building or use, recommend a parking variance subject to the approval, modification or rejection of Council, and provided that such variance will not violate the spirit or intent of this chapter and provided further that a more harmonious and beneficial use of the property will result.
  • Site dimensions do not permit the code calculated 112 parking spots, and will only allow the 47 onsite parking spots proposed.
Mr. Wiseman added that he thought the project was fantastic, it will be nice to get a more spacious library that is able to hold more things. Mr. Wiseman noted that the 9 variances sound scarier than they actually are. The variances for the west side of the library fronting Fenwick the setbacks are from an area which is inside the sidewalk of the library so the setbacks are very thin but there then the sidewalk and a tree lawn before you get to the street. Mr. Wiseman added that was something that bared repeating because it sounded like the parking lot would be a foot and half from the street and it’s really not. There will be about 15ft. of space. Mr. Wiseman stated he had no questions.

MOTIONED BY MR. WISEMAN, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON approving the March 10, 2016 Planning Commission Recommendation from the University Heights Public Library, 13866 Cedar Road for the application of the necessary 9 Variances application for the expansion of the existing library and existing parking to the adjacent lots located at 2175, 2179 and 2183 Fenwick Road. On roll call, all voted “aye,” except Mr. Rach who “passed” and Mrs. Pardee who “abstained.” due to their outside associations.

D. Motion Approving the March 10, 2016 Planning Commission Recommendation from the University Heights Public Library’s, 13866 Cedar Road, application for the consolidation of Parcels Numbers 722-09-027, 722-09-028, 722-09-029 and the Parcel for 13866 Cedar Road into one Parcel.

Mr. O’Brien stated that the consolidation is for the three lots immediately adjacent to the library to the south. Without consolidating the lots the opportunity to expand the lot to accommodate the parking lot and code setbacks to operate in the future.

Mr. Wiseman asked if there was a start and end date for the construction and if there is a sunset date in which the funds have to be used by?

Mr. O’Brien replied that the intent is as soon as possible, potentially start as soon as August of 2016 with hopes to finish in 2017. There is no date in which the funds have to be used by.

Mrs. Phillips, University Heights Branch Manager stated that they intend to make the closure of the library as short as possible. The next step is to find a temporary location and vendors.

Mrs. Cameron asked how much space is the library looking for in a temporary location.

Mrs. Phillips replied that the current building is 11,000 sq. ft. and that they would be happy with a temporary space of 3,000 sq. ft. or even 1,500 sq. ft. because they are not expecting to duplicate all services. They want people to be able to: pick up books, have some best seller books and popular items on display, have some computers. The plan is to relocate the story times and other programs in the area.

MOTION BY MRS. CAMERON, SECONDED BY MRS. WEISS approving the March 10, 2016 Planning Commission Recommendation from the University Heights Public Library’s, 13866 Cedar Road, application for the consolidation of Parcels Numbers 722-09-027, 722-09-028, 722-09-029 and the Parcel for 13866 Cedar Road into one Parcel. On roll call, all voted “aye,” except Mr. Rach and Mrs. Pardee who “abstained.” due to their outside employment.

E. Ordinance 2016-08 Amending Chapter 212 of the Codified Ordinances, and Amending Ordinance 88-06: Contracting Procedures (on second reading)

Mayor Infeld stated that the Mayor’s current spending authority in the City of University Heights was established about 30 years ago at $5,000 and in terms of today’s expenses it’s not very practical, citing that she often has to hold off on projects, for example the survey for the master plan and the carpet for Council Chambers. Mayor Infeld added that this was just a request for a modest increase, it doesn’t match what the majority of City Managers and Mayors in Cuyahoga County that she surveyed have in terms of spending authority. This Ordinance would give the City’s administration a bit of relief and flexibility in terms of spending.

MOTION BY MR. ERTEL, SECONDED BY ....... Ordinance 2016-08 Amending Chapter 212 of the Codified Ordinances, and Amending Ordinance 88-06: Contracting Procedures

Motion died due to the lack of a Second.
Mayor Infeld asked Council why there was no second to Mr. Ertel’s motion to allow for discussion.

Mrs. Pardee stated that Council discussed Ordinance 2016-08 at length when it was on first reading and said she didn’t feel a need to discuss it further. Noting she respects what the Administration does, but didn’t believe it was a hardship to bring things at the spending level to Council. It allows Council to have a good understanding of what is occurring, not to run things in any way. Council respects that Administration is in charge of operations but Council then has some understanding of especially fiscally what is occurring in the city. Again this was discussed at length.

Mr. Rach added that he was in favor of increasing the spending authority in general as a concept. The amount of $7,500 could be looked at because it represents a 50% increase from the current $5,000. Mr. Rach noted that he would approve it as a concept because as years go by, the consumer price index increases with inflation so the spending authority should be adjusted accordingly. Mr. Rach added that he looked at the consumer price index for the year 2010 when Mayor Infeld took office so today the spending authority should be increased by $500 (totaling $5,500) to reflect the upward trend of the consumer price index. If the number was looked at he may have been a little more comfortable with it.

Mayor Infeld replied that she would take issue with that because she believed that you (council) would have to look at the spending authority from 1988 because it is nearly 30 years old. The consumer price index in 1988 was substantially lower.

Mr. Rach said he did look at that too and it was nearly double so the spending authority today if it were to match the consumer price index increase should be around $10,000 / $10,400. Mr. Rach said he understands that; but he just believed that a 50% jump in one year may be a little much and he would feel more comfortable if it were a little bit less.

Mayor Infeld stated she would like to hear from everyone on Council because it sounded like Council has spoken but nobody had spoken to her and thanked Mr. Rach and Mrs. Pardee for their input. Mayor Infeld added she would love to hear Mr. Wiseman’s, Mrs. Cameron’s, Mrs. Weiss’s input and Mr. Ertel apparently agrees with the - - (ordinance).

Mr. Ertel commented that he thought that the current number is archaic and that Council needs to give the Mayor the ability to administer and should keep to Council’s business to legislate.

Mayor Infeld pointed out to Council that they get monthly expense and monthly revenue reports. So the thoughts that Council needs to be made aware of these expenses is a little bit inaccurate because they get those reports already to show where the city is with fund balances. If Council wants to see, we can revisit something that happened about three or four years ago with the previous Law Director where she (Mayor Infeld) brought every single invoice to Council if the total dollar figure on that invoice would rise to $5,000 or more. At that time Council was very clear in saying they did not want to see every invoice of the city.

Mrs. Weiss commented that she never received a monthly expense or revenue report and if in the future that actually happens and Council sees not a global expense report, she would love to see just a check register and would be happy to probably reconsider this and raise it just so she could a feel of it. Mrs. Weiss stated again that she did not want to do the administrating, she just wanted to be fiscally responsible to the residents of the city. Mrs. Weiss stated she would love to see it and would happily revisit this.

Mayor Infeld remarked that she did not understand why Mrs. Weiss isn’t getting what the Council has been getting.

Mr. Heiser asked if the other Council members were receiving the emails.

Mrs. Pardee noted she thought everyone was listed on the emails. Mrs. Pardee added that she thought Mrs. Weiss was talking about something a little more in depth.

Mayor Infeld stated she thought Mrs. Weiss wanted to see the invoices.

Mrs. Weiss remarked that she didn’t need to see the invoices, she prefaced this and stated that she knows a City is different than other corporate or non-profit boards but that she was on multiple boards and they all see the expenses. Again not a global account number with a dollar amount but kind of a detail almost like a check register just so Council can get a feel for what is happening.

Mayor Infeld asked Mrs. Weiss to bring in what she receives from other boards because she has served on a number of boards in the last 20 years and has never seen that. Noting that she also chaired the Finance
Committee for almost every single one of those boards and has never seen what Mrs. Weiss was describing and asked her to bring the financials from one or several of her boards in so they could look at it. Mayor Infeld added that she would be happy to revert to what she did a few years back. The previous Law Director thought it was important for the Council to see every single expense of the city and again the Council was very direct in saying that they didn’t want to do that. The Administration will not create additional reports, but if Mrs. Weiss could show her then she would have a good understanding.

Mrs. Weiss responded ok.

F. Ordinance 2016-09 Amending Chapter 230.02 of the Codified Ordinances and Amending Ordinance 89-56: Disposition of Unneeded Personal Property; Sale; Abandon (on second reading)

Mayor Infeld stated that in 1989 Council established a $2,500 limit for the Mayor to be able to dispose of items such as; printer parts, old computers. But anytime something would raise in value to over $2,500 or the way the Ordinance is written anytime the Mayor thinks it might rise to that value the Mayor would have to get the approval of Council. This is becoming difficult because there is very old equipment in particularly the Service Department that the city is getting rid of, there is equipment in the Fire Department that needs to be gotten rid of, it is a little bit hard to determine the value of these things and with Council’s approval have been selling equipment of gov.deals.com and which is an auction method. In order to take advantage of the best price we have to give it our best guess and hope that it is right otherwise we can’t offer it for sale. Mayor Infeld said again to her this seemed to be very impractical because this was a limit set at a time nearly 30 years ago when everything was lower priced, it’s really not practical in today’s world there are often small capital items particularly computer peripherals that are being disposed of.

MOTION BY MR. ERTEL, SECONDED BY MR. RACH approving Ordinance 2016-09 Amending Chapter 230.02 of the Codified Ordinances and Amending Ordinance 89-56: Disposition of Unneeded Personal Property; Sale; Abandon. On roll call, all voted “aye,” except Mr. Wiseman who voted “nay.”

G. Ordinance 2016-10 Approving the Pricing of Activities at Purvis Park (on first reading)

Mrs. Pardee asked if there was an increase in any of the pricing from last summer.

Mr. Heiser replied that the swim team fee increased from $35 to $40.

Mr. Wiseman thought that the auditors wanted a specific price listing of the various items.

Mrs. Cameron replied that the auditors indicated that this would suffice.

Ordinance 2016-10 was placed on first reading.

H. Motion to Authorize the purchase of two (2) 2016 Ford Escapes for use by the Administration and Building Departments.

Mr. Heiser reported that he contacted five (5) dealerships, four of the five responded back to Mr. Heiser and of the four dealership only one submitted a bid. The submitted bid was lower than the State bidding price.

Mr. Rach questioned if the two new vehicles would be serving as replacements.

Mr. Heiser replied that the Administration would now have two vehicles and the older vehicle may go on gov.deals.com.

MOTION BY MR. ERTEL, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON Authorizing the purchase of two (2) 2016 Ford Escapes for use by the Administration and Building Departments from Nick Mayer Ford for a total price of $40,765.84 ($20,382.92 each). On roll call, all voted “aye.”
I. Motion Authorizing the Mayor to enter into a requirements contract with the City of Shaker Heights and American Roadway Logistics as the selected contractor for the 2016 Pavement Marking Program in the amount of $41,517.15.

Mayor Infeld stated that previously the city had a three (3) year contract with a company to paint the lines; i.e. crosswalk, stop bar, street lines. That contract has ended and was joint with Shaker Heights. This will also be joint with Shaker Heights.

Police Chief Hammett reported that the previous company was A & A, but there were issues/problems with the work they provided. Complaints were received from residents about the level of noise heard from their employees talking with one another during the night and early morning hours. Chief Hammett stated to his understanding American Roadway Logistics has a good reputation.

Mr. Wiseman asked if the city could make the request that the contractor inform us of the exact dates and times they will be painting in University Heights so that we can inform the residents.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MRS. WEISS Authorizing the Mayor to enter into a requirements contract with the City of Shaker Heights and American Roadway Logistics as the selected contractor for the 2016 Pavement Marking Program in the amount of $41,517.15. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

J. Motion to Accept as the best and lowest bid for the purchase of one (1) Four Wheel Utility Refuse Collection Vehicle.

Mr. Pokorn reported that bids were opened on Friday, March 18, 2016 and two bids were received. One bid was from ABC Equipment Rental & Sales with a bid of $15,335.00; the other bid was received from Middlefield Farm and Garden with a bid of $15,443.00. Mr. Pokorn recommended the city accepts the bid from ABC Equipment Rental & Sales as the best and lowest bid in the amount $15,335.00. Mr. Pokorn noted that ABC Equipment also provided the city with the Kubota that was purchased last year, this year their bid was $140 less than last year.

Mr. Rach asked if this purchase was in line with the capital budget.

Mrs. Pardee replied it was and asked Mr. Pokorn how long will it take to fabricate the Kubota for service.

Mr. Pokorn said it would take approximately one month.

MOTION BY MR. WISEMAN, SECONDED BY MR. RACH to Accept the bid from ABC Equipment Rental & Sales of Brunswick Hills, Ohio as the best and lowest bid for the purchase of one (1) Four Wheel Utility Refuse Collection Vehicle in the amount of $15,335.00. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

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

There was no need for an Executive Session.

Directors’ Reports

Police Chief, Steven Hammett provided an update about the area coyote sightings. Chief Hammett stated that he contacted the Ohio Department of Wildlife for information. Basically coyote reappeared in Ohio in the 70’s and since that time they have expanded and are currently present in all 88 counties. In this area it is believe that they live behind Legacy in Lyndhurst. The closest den that has been located is in Richmond Heights a few years ago. Chief Hammett added their food source is mostly small animals including small dogs. Coyotes are tough to trap and residents are instructed to contact the police department if there are citing’s and to keep small dogs on a leash and under control.

Community Development Director Patrick Grogan reported the following: there has been positive feedback for the joint pilot senior program with the Cleveland Heights Senior Center; the city has been awarded a grant from the Solid Waste Distract as well as a grant from CDBG for the resurfacing of Cedarbrook.
There were no other Director reports.

**Standing Committee Reports:**

**Building Committee:** Mr. Wiseman stated that the Building Committee will meet on March 22nd at 7pm in the Conference Room to discuss day camps.

**Civic Information Committee:** Mr. Rach reported that the Memorial Day Parade Committee will meet on March 22nd at 7pm in Council Chambers.

**Finance Committee:** Mrs. Pardee reported that there will be a Joint Finance and Finance Advisory Committee meeting in April.

**Governmental Affairs Committee:** Mrs. Weiss reported that there will be a committee meeting in April.

**Recreation Committee:** Mrs. Cameron will be scheduling a meeting is pending.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:51pm.

**MOTION BY MR. RACH, SECONDED BY MR. WISEMAN** to adjourn the meeting. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

Susan K. Infeld, Mayor

Kelly M. Thomas, Clerk of Council