

PROPERTIES COMMITTEE MEETING

May 12, 2021 9:30 A.M.

Members Present: Chairman Dennis Galicki, Councilwoman Nairn, Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Street Commissioner Alder, Chief Rizzo, Mayor

Galicki called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and read the roll.

Galicki addressed the Service Department building roof and property maintenance. Galicki asked the Street Commissioner about how weed control was addressed on Village properties, to include the Village campus, Cemetery, and the Crappe property. He was concerned that the weeds were not being addressed and asked if weed treatment was budgeted. Galicki felt the weeds did not put the Village in a positive light. The Street Commissioner explained that the Village had never done dandelion and broad leaf weed control but do a crab grass preventer. For the Street Department to do the work, it would cost \$7,000 for a ride-on spreader sprayer. It could handle the Village campus, Cemetery, and corner lot. Galicki wanted to see the cost associated with that piece of equipment and the average seasonal cost for weed killer. He also wanted to see a commercial quote. Nairn noted the appearance of the campus with the dandelions, but felt the thistles presented more of a threat. She thought it would cost a lot of money to address. Galicki noted it would probably take a couple of years to successfully address the weeds but suggested the services should be budgeted in the years to come. The Street Commissioner asked specifically which properties should be included in the quote, and Galicki stated the Village campus to include Village Hall, the outbuildings, and the Police Department; the Memorial Flag site across the intersection, the Cemetery, and possibly the Crappe property. It did not include the old location of the rental property, the larger park, and old Cemetery. Nairn spoke of the weeds in the park and the consideration of having a controlled burn.

Galicki addressed the Service Department building roof evaluation report. The Street Commissioner explained that he requested an evaluation of the current status of the roof by the contractors who had previously bid on the project as well as their recommendation of what the contractors would do if the roof were on their own houses. Galicki recalled asking that the Street Commissioner obtain from each of the bidders an evaluation of the roof surface and for apples to apples estimates based on a total roof repair and a partial roof repair. The Street Commissioner said it was hard to get the roofers to come back to do this because they were so busy. Galicki asked if the roofers from whom the Street Commissioner obtained estimates were the only roofers the Street Commissioner had contacted. The Street Commissioner stated yes. Galicki explained that in reviewing the information, there were not three evaluations of the roof nor were there three estimates addressing partial replacement and total replacement. From a committee standpoint, there was no apples to apples comparison or complete evaluation of the Service Department roof from which to make a sound decision. He asked that the Street Commissioner address the issue in more detail. The Street Commissioner said he could ask the contractors to redo their estimates, and Galicki expressed the time constraints presented by the Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council (NOPEC) grant. Galicki added that there is a plethora of roofers in Geauga and Cuyahoga Counties, and the Village was not limited to the individuals whom the Street Commissioner contacted. Galicki explained to the Street Commissioner that based on the

evaluation of the condition of the roof, it was necessary to identify what work was needed, the scope of the work, and value wise, whether it would make sense to replace the entire roof or just part of the roof.

From the information provided by the Street Commissioner, Nairn garnered that there were several years of life left on certain sections of the roof, and the Village would be looking to replace the section that was bad.

The Fiscal Officer provided background about past consideration by Council to replace the Service Department roof, and how it was postponed due to other projects. The Fiscal Officer offered that the consideration would be to replace part of the roof or the whole roof. Nairn stated it could be \$30,000 and was not budgeted. The Fiscal Officer explained it had been budgeted in the past, but Council elected to do the lighting project instead with grant funds. No matter what Council decided to do, it was not budgeted. Galicki offered that with the NOPEC grant, it could potentially cost the Village half the money it might pay in the future.

The Street Commissioner advised that the flat part of the roof was leaking, and the skylights were failing. Galicki reiterated that given the information he had been provided, he could not approach Council to make a recommendation. He reiterated that in his experience that for most commercial applications and businesses, if a roof were being replaced, generally an evaluation was obtained so that a comparison could be made to determine which option was most cost effective. Galicki asked the Street Commissioner to obtain better information. The Fiscal Officer asked the Street Commissioner if it would be possible to get these quotes before the next Council meeting, and he said he could try and would call different contractors to ask for an evaluation and recommendation on the repair and/or replacement of the roof. The Fiscal Officer added that if this could be done, the committee could meet to review the information so that a recommendation could be made to Council.

Other possible contractors were discussed, and the Street Commissioner explained that he had obtained names of the original contractors from the Building Department. The Fiscal Officer reiterated what information should be obtained, and Galicki clarified that he wanted to be cognizant of the most cost-effective solution.

Nairn addressed the due date for the NOPEC grant and urged the committee to have the information sooner rather than later so as not to burden the Fiscal Officer. Galicki explained that it had been his hope that the requested information would have been provided between the last Properties Committee meeting and the current one. He did not want to lose the NOPEC funds, nor did he want to use the funds in a less than effective manner. Galicki urged the Street Commissioner to direct questions he may have to the committee.

The Fiscal Officer asked Galicki if he would provide her with the Street Commissioner's quotes.

Nairn asked what was going on with the tarp on the Service Garage. Galicki did not know and thought perhaps the Street Commissioner had addressed this with the Street Committee. The issue surrounding tarp had not been presented to the Properties Committee.

Galicki asked the Chief about his recommendation of the sanitization of the park and playground. The Chief explained that initially, the requirements for sanitization were excessive, and with the current relaxing of restrictions he wanted to contact the Health Director to determine if the sanitization could be reduced or discontinued. He would report back to the committee. Galicki said that the committee would present to Council the recommendation that the Chief gets from Geauga County Department of Health.

Regarding the Village website, the Fiscal Officer reported that she received a quote from Business Marketing Engine, which is the current provider. The Fiscal Officer added in 2020, she and the Chief also had a Zoom meeting with Dynamics Online, which is the contractor used by Chagrin Valley Dispatch (CVD). Geauga County contracts with Company 119, which could do the Village's website at a reduced cost of approximately \$4,600 which would include design and 12 months of web posting. There would be a \$600 annual fee for hosting it. The service had been offered to cities and townships and was recently extended to Villages. With enough members, it would help reduce costs. The Village would have all control over the website and have access to different features which are shared by participants at a savings. The hope is that it will be continuously updated which would alleviate the need to address this matter every five to seven years. Galicki felt this model provided the potential for so much more information to be available to the citizens with the updated website. The Fiscal Officer and the Chief also noted the map feature available through this site.

The Fiscal Officer provided the committee with a list of municipalities that use the County website.

Regarding Dynamics Online, the Fiscal Officer was provided with two pricing options. The first option was \$4,500 which would get the website to the point where it was functioning and then charge monthly as the company gradually prepared the website. The second option was \$9,000 which would be to do the website in its entirety. Any changes or additions would be \$125 per hour for big modifications.

The Fiscal Officer advised that she had spoken to Bainbridge Township and reported they are happy with the County services with Company 119. She added that it would be nice to have a system that continuously upgrades.

Nairn wanted a very detailed street map with the next website. The Chief explained with the Bainbridge site, it links to Google maps. He further explained that the current features of Vacation Watch and the pet registration are simply a link to another website, for which the Police Department pays a yearly fee. The Google map link could be used with any of the potential providers.

Galicki asked the Chief for his opinion on the potential providers, and he said Dynamics was very impressive. However, the details provided by Dynamics were easily duplicated by Company 119. He felt going with the county would be less expensive and the Village would get the same service. The Chief did not see any reason why the Village would go with a more expensive quote. He added that Company 119 controls the county site and is one of the best providers around. The Fiscal Officer explained that when the county controlled the site, the

county had to make the changes requested by the municipalities. With it being controlled by Company 119, the Village could make its own changes. Galicki noted that the price with Dynamics was almost double. Nairn asked if COVID funding could be used, and the Fiscal Officer said no.

Galicki asked the Fiscal Officer for her thoughts and she said she would not go with the Village's current provider, but either of the other two would be fine. She added that the Village's email could also be backed up by the county. The Fiscal Officer said this was beneficial because the county understood the requirements in terms of public records. The Mayor asked if they take credit cards through the website, and the Fiscal Officer said she could ask. She thought they could because property taxes could be paid online.

Nairn thought it was important for the website to be easily and inexpensively updated. She asked if there were any complaints with Company 119. The Fiscal Officer explained the difficulties the county had managing the website on its own until contracting with Company 119. She added that the Fiscal Auditor's Office went with the county website as are many other county offices.

Galicki thought this would be the committee's recommendation to Council. He asked the Fiscal Officer to provide some of her information to Council as a brief background.

Regarding the Inventory Management Policy, Galicki relayed that a draft proposal had been provided to Council for review at the May 10, 2021 Council meeting. Galicki had received no feedback and advised he would propose to Council that the Village try to implement the proposed inventory control system. Nairn verified the threshold would stay at \$300. She felt going lower than this would present tedium. Galicki thought \$300 would cover major power tools, but not every hammer and screwdriver, for example. He did not believe there was a theft problem with the Village and that a \$300 threshold, at least as a starting point, would suffice. Nairn suggested that it be specified that completion of the inventory should be this year. Galicki asked for input on a timeline for implementation.

The Fiscal Officer suggested that the first time around, it should be January, which would be when it was filed. The Mayor thought there should be a meeting with the Department Heads. The Chief asked if there were specifics in how to report because he already had an inventory completed of everything except office furniture on an Excel spreadsheet. The Fiscal Officer explained there would be an Excel spreadsheet and property stickers. The Chief asked if the stickers would be for everything or items without serial numbers. The Fiscal Officer explained it would just be necessary to be able to track an item but felt they should go on everything. Galicki explained it was a work in progress and would be conducted with a reasonable approach. He viewed the Chief's system as transferrable to the new system. The Fiscal Officer added that the Chief already had a sign-out system, which would also be part of the new system.

The Mayor asked that a copy of the policy be given to the Street Commissioner, and the Fiscal Officer advised that once it was passed, it would be provided to everyone to fill out by January. The Mayor said that the Street Commissioner should look at it before it is passed. He thought this would be time consuming for the Street Commissioner and the committee agreed.

The Chief stated that this sheet would be continuously evolving with acquiring and disposing of equipment. The committee did not think it would be so daunting if maintained. Galicki recommended including the draft in the Council packets again.

There was no new business. Nairn made a motion to adjourn at 10:41. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dennis M. Galicki". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Dennis Galicki, Chairman
Properties Committee

Prepared by Leslie Galicki