

MINUTES
WADSWORTH CITY COUNCIL MEETING
June 16, 2020

Meeting held remotely through Videoconferencing per HR 197

The regular meeting of Wadsworth City Council, Tuesday, June 16, 2020, at 5:00 p.m., was held through means of electronic video conferencing, per HR-197. City Hall was not open to the public for this meeting. The meeting was broadcast live on CityLink Channels 17 & 329; live on Spectrum Channel 1024; and streamed live on www.WatchWCTV.com. The recorded meeting could also be viewed at www.WatchWCTV.com.

PRESIDING:

Bob Thurber, *President of Council*

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL PRESENT:

Ralph Copley, Bruce Darlington, Patty Haskins, Jeanne Hines, Tom Stugmyer, David Williams, Jon Yurchiak

OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Robin Laubaugh, Director of Public Service Robert Patrick, Director of Public Safety Matt Hiscock, Director of Law Director Tom Morris, Clerk of Council Tammy Guenther

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

Mr. Thurber called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. Meeting participants joined the Council President in saying the Pledge of Allegiance. The Council President gave the Invocation and the Clerk of Council called the roll.

MINUTES: **Mr. Copley** made a motion, which was seconded by **Ms. Haskins**, to adopt the minutes of the Council meeting of **May 19, 2020**. An all-in-favor vote was taken. **THE MINUTES of May 19, 2020 WERE APPROVED.**

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a) AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE TO ADVERTISE FOR, RECEIVE BIDS AND ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE VALLEY VIEW DRIVE AND BAKER STREET WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT PROJECT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Mr. Patrick said he would present some slides regarding the Valley View / Baker improvement project. It had been discussed for a couple of years and they were dealing with the Baker Street area. They received the engineer's 100 percent, completed drawings along with the engineer's estimate just prior to the last Public Service Committee meeting. The Chair, Mr. Darlington, asked Mr. Patrick to give a presentation at this Council meeting and to discuss it again at the next Public Service meeting.

He mentioned the scope of the project and the shift from a waterline improvement project to an overall improvement project. It was located at the west side on West and going down Valley up to Baker Street, then to the north and south on Baker, then continuing on Valley all the way to SR-94. The waterline was on the schedule to be repaired based on age and the amount of breaks. It was about 65 years old, cast iron and, as they knew, the City did have some waterline lines that were older than that. This one was problematic though.

The total, estimated construction cost for the project was \$1.1M. He would show what made up that amount. Starting on the water side, as Mr. Patrick said, the infrastructure was 65 years old. It was a big project consisting of about 3,000 linear feet for the water line replacement. It called for a ductile iron replacement. He showed a picture of the old cast iron and the growth of deposits. The engineer's estimate from the OHM Group came in at \$913K for the waterline. As they might recall, the budget amount was \$800K for the project. The \$800K was made up of an internal note for \$400K to conserve some of the cash balance, which they talked about at the beginning of the year. They would pull \$300K from the cash balance and that was budgeted. Just over \$100K was to come from OPWC loans (Ohio Public Works Commission).

As they recalled, the City applied every year for the OPWC funding. There were two funding streams. The grant portion, which they'd been fortunate to receive dollars on an annual basis, amounted to almost \$400K now. This year's funding cycle started last year on July 1 and went to June 30 this year. The City had applied with a number of projects and received funding for the Takacs Drive improvements last summer, including resurfacing, broadening of the concrete, doing the bed work and putting the asphalt down. They did it quickly to get it done in the summertime so impacts to the school at Takacs would be minimal.

They had asked for the current project, to borrow money. It was a really good loan because it was 20 years, which was the maximum for OPWC funding amounts. The lifespan of the project would be much longer than that. The interest was zero percent. That was obviously a very good deal. The other project was the Seville Road culvert project, which was in the final stages of engineering. They would want to go out for the construction coming up.

Seville Road and the project under discussion that day had not gotten going yet, so they would apply for an extension of funds before the end of the month. Mr. Patrick did not see any issues and hoped it had not changed due to state funding issues. He noted that with funding in the next round, for next year, which would start July 1 through June 30, 2021, the City had applied for help with the downtown project. They were told that that funding was on hold at that point. They would have to wait and see what came of it in the future.

The Valley View / Baker project was budgeted and numbers were put together a couple of years ago so it had been in the pipeline for a couple of years.

Mr. Stugmyer asked Mr. Patrick why the 65-year-old Baker Street water main was more problematic in that area than in other ones. Mr. Patrick said he didn't have a good answer. Some of the bolts on it eroded quicker where the breaks had happened. They never knew what batch of metal, the steel, or with what vendor it came from back then. If they remembered, the Broad Street waterline done a couple of years ago was upward of 100 years old. They had some in downtown that were 100 years old and in relatively good shape at this point. There were different sediment conditions and ways that installations were done. There were a number of variables and factors as they could imagine. He did not know of one, exact reason, but it was a good question.

Mr. Patrick returned to the presentation and said they looked at it as a complete project. When they tore up the street, they looked at the other utilities that needed work so they did not have to come back. The worst thing they could do was to install a new street and have to do repairs before it came due to

be replaced again. He pointed to the sanitary sewer area that had need of improvements and showed recent footage of the inside of the pipe. They could see the degradation and cracking forming in the pipe. There was separation in the joint. That section of pipe looked relatively good, said Mr. Patrick, though there was some deforming that had an oval appearance. He pointed to another area that was in poor condition. There were different repairs that they could do, such as lining. They had budgeted to do some lining projects. They had not gotten to those yet. They could repair at certain points and replace sections.

The proposed project looked at a couple of the repair areas and replacement of a couple of sections that needed done. They didn't have budget for lining for this project right now. They would come and do lining in areas that were not as bad of a condition.

Mr. Darlington observed that it looked like clay pipe and Mr. Patrick confirmed that it was. Could they re-line clay pipe when the joints were so rough. Mr. Patrick said they could, if the condition permitted – if it wasn't too bad, they could get through to do the lining. Mr. Darlington asked if they would be digging in the same area as the sanitary sewer line was. Mr. Patrick said no, it would not be in the same location. Mr. Darlington said he was thinking to go ahead and replace it if the ditch was open, but they could not do that.

Mr. Patrick talked about a couple of areas that needed to be done. RedZone had videoed there in 2013. They saw degradation since then when a newer video was evaluated. Conditions were found to be worsened and in need of more repair. They had budgeted about \$30,000 before the new video came in; the engineer's estimate was now \$72,000, more than double for that item. He said to keep in mind that they continued to hope that bids came in under the estimates. They had been pleased recently with that. The low bid for the Watrusa waterline, for example, came in under the estimate and the next bid was around the estimate. The Street Improvement Program came pretty well below estimate and they had a number of bidders on that project.

The storm sewer work involved a number of catch basins needing replacement and some of the areas aligned would need to be replaced. They had budgeted \$15,000 and the estimate was \$22,000.

He talked about street repairs and said the waterline would be on one side of the road. A couple feet would be dug up and the waterline placed in, then they disbanded the old waterline. The capping of the concrete would occur for that section. All of the connections and all of the tie-ins would also occur with the sewer and would also be capped with concrete. But they also evaluated other areas of the streets to see the conditions. Mr. Patrick showed photos at the point after turning right from Baker Street (looking toward SR-94). He pointed to areas where slabs were cracked and needed replacing and on the gutter line as well. They looked at all of the areas that were bad to that point and needed to be done. There was about \$75,000 worth of additional work that could be done to bring the condition up to a reasonable level so they would not have to get back there for a number of years. It could also be removed out of the project. They did not budget any monies for this portion of repairs. They would have to find that money in the street improvement program; they did have some balance there, as they talked about a couple of months ago. Or, it was something they could remove if they decided to come back in next year, or the year after, to do some street resurfacing like they did on Takacs. They could do that as well. Mr. Patrick said.

Mr. Williams asked about the stormwater intrusion in that area. Mr. Patrick appreciated the question

but did not know the answer. It was not one of the areas where they were doing the flow monitoring right now or flagged with the overflow areas. They had intrusion in a lot of different areas, like most communities, but he didn't know that there were any big problems here. He would find out. Mr. Williams thanked him.

Mr. Patrick continued, when they talked about projects, they typically talked about timing as well. They talked about the timing of the OPWC funding. That was of the biggest concern at this point, in his estimation. They were pushing hard for the engineering firm to get the estimate done and it came in actually before their deadline. Mr. Patrick wanted to get it started in the summertime if they were going to do the project because of the impacts to the school and the proximity to the Valley View School. They could do a project like that any time of the year. Some schools of thought said the winter was a good time to do a waterline project like that because they weren't doing the paving work. But that could bring challenges as well based on weather with cold snaps and freezing. It usually took longer for a project in that time period. Some of the materials could be more expensive – concrete plans, for instance. But who knew if contractors had more availability. If they wanted to push it back, they could wait until next spring or next summer. These were all options they could discuss.

The biggest consideration was the \$100K in loan funding. Mr. Patrick would try to get some word about whether they could delay that too. That concluded his presentation and he asked for questions.

Mr. Williams said he could not imagine that being so close to Valley View School that it was not on the bus route. He noted traffic and directing it around the school. It could also be a cut through street for parents who were picking up and dropping off kids. He asked if Mr. Patrick had talked with the Superintendent of schools about the issues as far as traffic. Mr. Patrick said they'd talked a while ago, updating as to where they were with projects and what they were doing. They said they would try to do it in the summer if possible. He did not think there was a huge concern about that. They worked well around issues. Ideally, Mr. Patrick thought it would be done outside the school year. It was not right in front of the school on Orchard and would not be the direct impact, but there would be some impact. A lot of people came from Good Street too where the crossings were.

Ms. Haskins thought the biggest concern out of the Service Committee, even though the money was budgeted, was because of the current situation and they were not definite on what revenues would be. Should they enter into a project of that size, at this time, or should they wait until they were a little more certain? However, if it needed to be done and they ended up having to do it, there was the question of the loan money and whether it would be available if the project was postponed for any length of time. Mr. Darlington agreed that it was one of their concerns.

Mr. Patrick agreed and that was why they were discussing it now. The legislation was ready but he did not expect them to take any action on it. They could continue to talk about it. As they moved through the year, on the calendar, they would get more and more data on the revenue side and what the impacts would be. Water revenue had been pretty solid and that was good. They would have updated numbers tomorrow as the billing due date was today. Many people paid their utilities that day and they would know. He would give them additional information at the next meeting to see where they were with the water revenue. Then they would prepare for the tax budget. They were doing projections now, which would be finalized by the next meeting for the water revenue side.

Mr. Stugmyer asked about going out for bids and how long were the bids good for, say if they got them

now for the project. By when would they have to act before going out for another bid? He understood these were different times, but wanted to know what they were looking at. Mr. Patrick said different bids had different time frames, but the typical was about 90 days to enter into the contract. Contractors put significant time in to the bids. They gave them three weeks or so, more or less, depending on the project. This was a substantial project – 3,000 feet with multiple aspects at \$1.1M – so the City would want to give ample time. Contractors did put in a lot of time in so the City wanted to be reading to go with the award process.

Ms. Haskins suggestion was to have a first reading that evening, then they could do as many readings as needed, but it was in place in the event they wanted to take action on it. Except, Mr. Darlington said, the way the ordinance read, it said “bid and award.” He would prefer to find out what the bid price was before they awarded it. He noted the issues associated with financing. They didn’t want to lose the \$100K from the state. Secondly, they had to come up with another \$300K or so in funding. He did not think they knew where it would come from yet. He did not mind going out for bids right now, but he would not want to award it until they had the financing locked down. **Mr. Copley** agreed with Mr. Darlington. Ms. Haskins said they could put the ordinance on the agenda “as-is” for a first reading and amend it. They could go five readings if they wanted, if the money didn’t come in. Mr. Stugmyer noted that it could be amended at any point in the reading process.

Mr. Darlington said he had another big issue related to the materials to put the pipeline in. He asked if anyone had seen what the county was doing on SR-94. It was plastic pipe. He thought it was PVC or it might be CPVC. Rittman used PVC and it was much cheaper. He hoped that they would consider using plastic pipe as well as the ductile cast iron. Mr. Copley observed that many communities had gone to the 5900 piping because of its cost and it was easier to work with. Mr. Darlington understood an issue with plastic pipe was in digging around it. It broke much easier than cast iron. With plastic pipe, tape went on top of it – several inches above – so that when digging they ran into the tape and knew the plastic pipe was below. That took care of the safety issue, he thought. He asked the Service Director if they had considered using plastic pipe.

Mr. Patrick said they had, and it was a good point and question. They had a firm do some analysis on this project to determine if it was a good project to move to PVC or CPVC because of the cost impacts. After looking at it, the recommendation was that it was not a good project for it. Some of the things they talked about – and the City would continue looking at plastic for future projects – were the longevity of it, which was not known at that point because it was relatively newer. As mentioned, there were damage issues if other work was done around the pipe. Also some of the tie-ins were more problematic, having a higher failure rate. He thought density, such as in the townships, might not play into it as much with longer distances there. Mr. Patrick believed the higher density and shorter areas would maybe better for the ductile and ductile had a long lifespan. Looking at those points, the strong recommendation was for ductile iron pipe for this contract.

Mr. Darlington went back to Mr. Patrick’s point about flexibility for the project, perhaps doing it next year or in the winter. When they went for bids, could they ask for bids as to a certain time period? Maybe it would be less in the winter or more costly next year since prices went up every year. Good point and good question, Mr. Patrick said. He didn’t think there would be any price breaks to bid it now and move forward at a particular time period. The contractor would face various exposures as to material costs at a given time. Material costs fluctuated as did the labor workforce. He also did not think there would be a big difference in winter time. There were some pros and also some cons, as with

the summertime. They had talked about giving the contractor a longer time frame to complete the project and whether there would be a break there. He did not think it would necessarily be the case. Contractors typically scheduled the workload over a certain time period in the future. They wanted to get in and get out, which was the same as what the City wanted. He did not think flexibility would move then needle much. He thought the biggest element on the timing when contractors put out bid amounts was the good indication that City planned to move forward. There would be hesitancy from some to move forward with a bid if there was a chance that all the work put in would be for naught. Mr. Patrick would not want to narrow the pool of contractors for that reason. If they did not go through with the award, it might change effects later down the line with other projects, to seem not as serious.

Mr. Darlington said they would have to know where the \$300K would come from. Mr. Thurber stated that he was with Mr. Darlington on this. He thought that the economic emergency committee of Council was looking at these types of issues and in giving it another month or two, they might be able to answer some of these questions. He was comfortable to advertise for and receive bids, as Mr. Darlington said, but was not sure about entering into a contract. He would like to see that changed. Mr. Darlington said the limit for the bids was \$1.1M, plus 10 percent, which brought it to \$1.2M. If they could guarantee the financing for it, he would be more comfortable. But right now, he did not know that they had the money.

Mr. Copley commented that that was exactly what they were doing with the fire truck from Safety Committee. They went out for bids to see what it would cost and then would see if they would move forward with it depending on resources.

Mr. Stugmyer asked how payment on a project of that size with multiple contractors was portioned out: was it one-third with the contract, one third with completion and one-third on 30 days and inspection? Was it split up like that? Mr. Patrick said it varied, but was similar to what Mr. Stugmyer described. There were milestones that were completed at which time payment was received. It could be on a monthly basis, or a percentage – 20 or 30 percent – and the last 30 percent was on final inspection to make sure everything was good. That was important because they wanted to make sure everything was complete to standards and if there were punch list items that the contractors came back to get that work done. Sometimes they had to hold payments. They didn't want to do that. The process was similar to what Mr. Stugmyer described.

Mr. Stugmyer followed up with a question about a ballpark timeframe for the project – how long it would take given all the variables. Mr. Patrick said it would be a couple of months for a project like that with all of the aspects – waterline, sewer, storm sewers. He would get a better idea on the timeframe by the next meeting.

Mr. Williams said he would be in favor of just going out to bid to see what happened. He did know that many projects had been cancelled. There were contractors who needed work to fill their schedules. Mr. Darlington was comfortable with that. Mr. Copley and Ms. Haskins agreed.

Mr. Yurchiak wanted to know how Mr. Patrick felt about that. Mr. Yurchiak went on to say that he would have a concern going out to bid as Mr. Patrick said. If a contractor caught wind that the City did not have the money to do it, they could weaken the pool of who bid the job. That was a lot of work to put it together. Mr. Yurchiak said he bid for a living and would be dubious if there was not the

budget. He wouldn't bid because there would be other projects. Mr. Thurber indicated that they should perhaps wait until they were more confident, a month or two. Mr. Patrick agreed with Mr. Yurchiak's reasoning. He thought it would be reasonable to wait on some more information. As they talked about in the other committee, with payments that they had and if revenues were delayed – though water not so much. They were collecting the data on a monthly basis and would continue to report to them. He would have more information at the next meeting. That would probably be the most desirable approach at that point.

Mr. Thurber understood that they would table the legislation. Several members voiced agreement.

b) AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE TO ADVERTISE FOR, RECEIVE BIDS AND ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE BROAD ST./SILVERCREEK RD TRAFFIC SIGNAL PROJECT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Mr. Patrick said they had been talking about the proposed project for a while. They went through a process of doing a number of different studies to see when the traffic signal was warranted, which it was. They went through the engineering process and had gotten the final drawings and the engineer's estimates. They wanted to bring it to Council and the Public Ways Chair agreed. Mr. Patrick offered another presentation.

He described the project limits as the Broad Street / Silvercreek Road intersection. It was a new signalization of the three-way intersection, which was four-way to the Dollar General Store, along with future improvements to roadway. The way that Dollar General was lay out, there was land north of the store that could be divided. He point to a stub that traffic would come around. Basically, it acted as a four-way intersection. They could see Hartman Road and the signal there. They were including additional equipment to make sure the two signals were tied together. They would talk about items that would go toward that, which represented an increase in original costs.

The engineer's estimate for the project was \$230K. They would talk about how it was different from the budget. He showed a map with the scope of the project. On the engineer's drawings they could see the red, long triangle-looking shapes, and the positioning of the new signals. Unlike downtown, when signals were placed nowadays, they were placed on the far side of the roadway from where traffic was. Someone coming north on Silvercreek, the signal would be on the other side of Broad Street. It was the same situation coming eastbound on Broad Street; westbound it would be on the far side; and then coming out of the Dollar General's. There would be four signal poles. They could see the striping patterns. There would be stop blocks installed. There would be crosswalks. Currently there were none. The yellow indicated new sidewalks to get pedestrians to Broad Street. There was additional sidewalk and curbing to be done and gotten up to ADA standards. There was more curbing in other areas.

Mr. Patrick recapped there were four signals, four poles, bases, cabinets, striping, sidewalks, and curbing. There would be fiber installed to bring the Hartman signal all the way down. There would be cameras and controllers. They would get everything on the same system and then upgrade to the new system where detection was done by cameras. They could also utilize the cameras for viewing snow and ice. It would modernize and upgrade the system, like SR-94.

In the bidding, the \$230K was the maximum amount by the engineering firm. That was for all of the work by a contractor. They talked in Public Ways Committee about putting an alternate in that the

City would do some of the work. There was certain work that they needed the contractor to perform, such as boring underground, some of the curbs and sidewalks, along with the bases for the poles. Outside of that, they had, as they knew, a traffic signal department that could do the installation of the poles, the signal arms, the signals, controllers and cabinets. That was an alternative. They would like to see where the bids came in because, obviously, there would be time involved in having City people doing it. That meant some other work wouldn't be accomplished. If there was a great cost savings, they could fit that in. The City could also order some of the materials for potential cost savings. Typically, the City was able to purchase items more cheaply than a contractor. They could also move forward a bit quicker to get items under order. Mr. Patrick had heard that a piece of equipment was on a seven month delay with the pandemic. They wanted to get the equipment ordered as soon as possible.

On the financial side, the not to exceed amount was \$230K, which was for the option of having someone come in to do the whole project. The other option would be half or under half that amount. They budgeted \$110K in the 239 fund, which was the permissive tax fund or vehicle license tax that came into the City. That was where the signal and engineering costs came from. The total amount was a couple years old and they had not updated it because they did not know when the project would come about. They continued budgeting money based on whether the warrants came in. They could see the difference was more than double. They did have additional expenses than originally anticipated, based on the cabinets and the fiber. It was probably \$50,000 for some of the other items. They had not known the concrete and the curbing would have to be changed. Therefore, the number was inflated from what they thought before.

There was some money available from Citco, a small amount. They were looking at the Dollar General to see if there was money there. Many times when development occurred, money was set aside in escrow for improvements that might be needed for the roadway and for the signals.

They would come to Council for a supplemental if they moved forward with bidding and awarding the project to bridge gaps depending on what option they chose. That concluded Mr. Patrick's presentation. He asked for any questions.

Mr. Williams said the intersection project had been enhanced by adding fiber and more controlling devices. By the time engineers were done, they added sidewalks. He asked Mr. Patrick about the cost of the enhancements. The amount of \$50,000 had been mentioned. Mr. Williams asked if the amounts were broken down in the cost estimate. Mr. Patrick thought it was between \$50-60,000 for the additional items. He concluded that the sidewalks weren't really that much.

Mr. Williams went back before the Circle K to when Holland Oil was going to develop but sold to Citco. They were going to pay for the whole development of the turn lane and the traffic device. That was substantial but he did not know what the money was back then. Since then, Circle K had been added and there was some money to contribute. Mr. Williams asked about Dollar General. He said that the traffic coming out of there was causing most of the accidents at that intersection. Did they get something from them when it was approved at the Planning Commission? Did Mr. Patrick know the amount, if any? Mr. Patrick was looking in to it. He did not know that. Mr. Williams went on to say that Dollar General was one, but there was the backlot. He remembered when it was improved, they allowed, instead of another egress, for traffic to go from that sidewalk through the Dollar General parking. With future development, it was substantial, for what they added to the intersection, especially in the future. Mr. Williams thought they bore a pretty good share of this, since it was private

and they would get the benefit of their own traffic signal.

Mrs. Hines agreed with Mr. Williams that there was a lot of traffic coming out of Dollar General and that they should pay toward it. There should be some funding from them. Mr. Patrick said he did not know what the amount was and if there was at that time. He did not know what the traffic counts at that point of development showed. Mr. Williams said it was eight vehicles per hour and it far exceeded that, double and maybe triple. Mrs. Hines added that she used the intersection a lot. Many did not follow any traffic rules. She had seen so many close calls and some accidents. It was the topic for which she received the most questions from the public. She was asked, “When is that light going in?”

Mr. Patrick understood. There were other questions at that point. Mr. Thurber commented that he did not think anyone doubted the need for the last half decade. It was certainly necessary. They had to try and find the money.

Mr. Copley asked if it was reasonable to think that they could assess Dollar General, as they had assessed property owners for a parking lot or anything else that was a public improvement. Mr. Patrick did not believe they could be assessed at this point, after the fact. Many times, as Mr. Williams said, there was, during the planning process, traffic studies were done or future lookout on improvements that could be made. Those could be part of approvals. Some business owners on the north end wanted some of the improvements too. When they did acquisitions too, there could be items and money put in escrow. For instance, on State Road, with Blooming Acres, the traffic counts did not warrant an additional lane at this point. Knowing that traffic could increase in the future, based on how the development worked out and what the counts actually were, there was some money set aside if there was a need. Typically, it was done at the point of the development agreement or in the approval process. Mr. Copley thanked him.

Mr. Williams stated that it had been on the agenda for the last six years, from the start. They added a turn lane there and it didn't do a lot. The traffic signal was now warranted. Not knowing how long it would take to get the mast for the signal or the signaling devices, he would recommend that they suspend the three reading rule and get it passed so they could move the project forward.

Mr. Darlington asked if they had the financing arranged. Mr. Patrick said they would come in with a supplemental to award the project based on what the dollar amount was and based on what option that they chose. They could pull from different funds based on the option. If they purchased the equipment in-house, there would be savings with that. If they wanted the contractor to do it, they would have to appropriate some additional monies. Mr. Darlington asked how close to budget they would be if they did as much work internally as they could. Mr. Patrick thought they could pay the contracted amount with the amount that was budgeted for the project. The other amounts for the equipment and labor time would come out of the operating areas.

With no other thoughts or questions, Mr. Thurber said they would move on. They would circle back when it came to reading the legislation.

c) AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 154.473, 154.475, 154.484 AND SECTION 154.486 Tables B, C AND D, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Regarding the legislation, which were changes to the sign code, Mr. Patrick said that their Planning Director, Mr. Kaiser, went through the sign codes, with regard to signs in the downtown area recently, as more development had occurred, and with the Architectural Design Committee as to what signs were appropriate. As they knew, Main Street Wadsworth had created historic Main Street guidelines a couple of years ago. There were some discrepancies between what the guidelines showed and what the code was. This was cleaning them up with what the ADC and the Planning Commission thought appropriate for signage. There were some other corrections. The redlined copy with changes was sent out to them. The bulk of it was to identify some of the feather signs that they'd seen out and around the community. Those were not allowed per the Wadsworth Code, so the language on that was cleaned up. On the signs, it was moving away from the internal, illuminated block type signs typically seen in more modern commercial areas like on the north side or out at the Wadsworth Crossings. For downtown, it moved toward the store-type look and feel of a flat panel sign with the external illumination on them. As more businesses developed, it was time to make that change if they all agreed it was needed. At this point, everybody seemed to be in agreement with it.

Mr. Stugmyer commented from the Main Street standpoint, they had Emily Little, who was an architect on their board, take a look at the regulations. They were also able to have Heritage Ohio architect to look at the revisions, as well. Some were actually loosened up a bit to make it easier. They were in line with the secretary of the interior and things like that. They could also qualify for grants. His point was there had been other sets of eyes that had taken a look at them for the downtown area.

Mr. Copley noted that he'd had two calls that summer about the abandoned signs at the commercial interchange on the north end. The signs had been there for years and years. Would the changes clean up that situation so the signs could be taken down? Mr. Patrick responded no, the current code addressed those. Mr. Stugmyer clarified that the changes pertained to the downtown. Mr. Thurber surmised Mr. Copley was talking about the old Dutch Pantry sign. Ms. Haskins noted that they had been discussing that sign since before Mr. Copley's tenure. He knew! That was one of Ms. Haskins issues too, she said. Mr. Copley understood they wanted to update the downtown code, but what about the north end? Two calls had come about those signs in the last month or so, he said. Mr. Patrick said orders needed to be issued to remove the signs. It was quite costly for them to do that, but was something that needed to move forward. Mr. Thurber recalled that early on he was told the signs were grandfathered. He did not know if that was legitimate or not.

Mr. Patrick said that the current signs downtown of the nature deemed not appropriate were allowed to remain. People would not have to replace signs now, but changes in use or upgrades would require them to be brought in line with the proposed codes.

Mr. Williams indicated that he'd not yet had time to read the ordinance, though he would of course, but he thought they ought to address temporary signs. Businesses had come in and put up a temporary sign, sometimes for 12 months – or even two years, added Mr. Thurber. Mr. Williams said there should be some language to address that. Mr. Thurber and Mr. Stugmyer said the language was already in there. Mr. Patrick believed it was in the Code already. They tried to be as friendly to the businesses as possible, to work with them and their circumstances. There was a place for the temporary signage and a time for the permanent. A couple of them were outstanding right now, but the City was working with those people to get permanent signs in, he said. If they had any signs in particular that needed addressing, Mr. Patrick asked that they be sent to him.

Mr. Thurber offered a couple of thoughts. First of all, he was never in favor of more onerous legislation, but strangely, this (change) was the less. It was less expensive for businesses to do these types of signs. He knew that Mr. Titus, who was setting up a business across from city hall, had first thought he needed to do one of the backlit signs with the letters, which would have been several thousand dollars more than the one he ultimately would end up with, following these regulations. Mr. Thurber thought it was a good thing and would really help downtown with a cohesive look. He was all in favor of it and thought it would be a great thing. Having said that, he thought it should be presented for first reading so they could set a public hearing. Mr. Patrick added that they would need a 30-day rule for the public hearing. If Council set it today, it could take place at the second meeting in July, which was July 21.

Mr. Stugmyer noted that Economic Development and Planning Committee would receive a detailed overview of the changes in the regulations at their next meeting in early July. Mr. Patrick also noted that the Planning Commission had approved with minor changes so the version they had was approved. If there were other changes, they could discuss those over the next month after they'd had time to look at it.

Mr. Thurber indicated that they would go forward with the legislation at that point. Ms. Guenther said the ordinance for the traffic signal at Broad and Silvercreek would be numbered 20-031 and the sign ordinance would be numbered 20-032.

LEGISLATION:

The following legislation was read for the first time and acted upon as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 20-031 (1st RDG.): AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE TO ADVERTISE FOR, RECEIVE BIDS AND ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE BROAD ST./SILVERCREEK RD TRAFFIC SIGNAL PROJECT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

- Sponsored by Council Member David Williams

Mr. Williams made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Stugmyer, to suspend the three reading rule on Ordinance No. 20-031. A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: Haskins, Yurchiak, Copley, Stugmyer, Williams, Hines, Darlington. Nays: none. Mr. Williams called the question. Mr. Thurber called for a vote. A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: Yurchiak, Copley, Stugmyer, Williams, Hines, Darlington, Haskins. Nays: none. **Ordinance No. 20-031 declared to have been adopted June 16, 2020.**

ORDINANCE NO. 20-032 (1st RDG.): AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 154.473, 154.475, 154.484 AND SECTION 154.486 Tables B, C AND D, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Council public hearing set for July 21, 2020, at 5:00 p.m. by video conference

- Sponsored by Council Member Thomas Stugmyer

Mr. Stugmyer made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Haskins, to place Ordinance No. 20-032 on second reading. An all in favor vote was taken and all Council members present voted in favor of the motion. **Ordinance No. 20-032 advanced to second reading for the rescheduled Council meeting of June 30, 2020.**

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Thurber wanted to go over some meeting dates before they closed that evening. He asked if they could move the next Council meeting to June 29, which was a Monday instead of a Tuesday, it would be helpful for the Safety Director's schedule, he thought. Ms. Haskins questioned the rescheduling and asked if it was a special meeting. Mr. Thurber thought not. It would be instead of the first meeting in July. Importantly, they would consider the tax budget a little earlier. Administration was working on it now. Mr. Darlington understood they would have another Council meeting in June instead of the Council meeting on July 7. Ms. Haskins asked Mr. Hiscock his thoughts and Mr. Hiscock indicated that he had no problems with any upcoming meetings and was not sure why his name was mentioned. Mr. Thurber apologized to him and asked whether June 29 would work for Council. Mr. Darlington wanted to know why late June and not July 7 for the next Council meeting.

Mr. Patrick responded that he had talked with Mr. Thurber about moving the July 7 meeting to a week prior. They had talked about the tax budget two months ago. They were doing the tax budget a little differently, as requested. They would do a light version of the tax budget, to it through in June, and spend more time on the appropriations budget. Administration felt they would be ready for the tax budget in two weeks. If it was okay with everyone, they could move the meeting up a week prior to get the tax budget passed.

Mr. Darlington had no objection to moving it up. Mr. Copley asked if they would be able to see the tax budget prior to the next meeting. Mr. Patrick said yes, they would get it to them before the meeting. As they recalled, the tax budget focused primarily on revenues. They typically did a more thorough job with tax budget to use it as a starting point for the appropriations budget. The tax budget did not obligate any expenditures of any funds. Therefore, with the unknowns, mostly on the revenue side at that point with understanding the impacts of the pandemic, they discussed doing the tax budget a bit differently, to focus mostly on revenues. Once the tax budget was done, they would move forward and spend more time on the appropriations budget, to pin down expenses when they found out more this summer. They could do the full review and continue with the regular schedule this fall where the appropriations budget was presented to Council in October / November and went through the committees for thorough and deep dives in the specific areas, with passage requested in December.

Mr. Thurber said he favored good information as early as they could get it so he thought June 29 would be better than July 7. Mr. Copley wondered why they wouldn't have the rescheduled meeting on Tuesday, June 30. Mr. Darlington agreed, saying Tuesday meetings were his mindset. Mr. Copley asked if they would have a meeting on July 7 after all, but Mr. Thurber thought not. The summer schedule for meetings was one meeting in July and August. Mr. Copley was okay with that.

Mr. Thurber confirmed with Council that meetings would be scheduled as follows, if they had no objections: June 30, July 21 and August 18 at 5:00. That meant the Council meeting for August 4 was cancelled, observed Mr. Stugmyer. That was correct. Mr. Thurber asked members to contact him with any questions or thoughts.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Copley made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Darlington. All were in favor. **The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:07 p.m.**

Clerk of Council

President of Council