

**City of Broadview Heights**  
**Work Session Meeting Minutes**  
**March 26, 2018**

Mr. Boldt called the **WORK SESSION** to order at 7:37 p.m.

Mr. Pavlica led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Mr. Robert A. Boldt	(Ward 4 Councilor, President)
	Mr. Thomas Pavlica	(Ward 1 Councilor)
	Mr. Brian Wolf	(Ward 2 Councilor)
	Mr. George Stelmaschuk	(Ward 3 Councilor, President Pro-Tem)
	Ms. Jennifer A. Mahnic	(Councilor At-Large)
	Mr. Joe Price	(Councilor At-Large)
	Mr. Glenn R. Goodwin	(Councilor At-Large)

<b>OFFICER(S) PRESENT:</b>	Mr. Samuel J. Alai	(Mayor)
	Mr. Vince Ruffa	(Law Director)
	Chief Vizer	(Police Chief)
	Chief Jeffrey Hajek	(Fire Chief)
	Mr. Dave Pfaff	(Finance Director)
	Mr. David Schroedel	(Service Director)
	Mr. Gary Yelenosky	(City Engineer)
	Ms. Kristina Sorensen	(Economic Development Director)

<b>OFFICER(S) ABSENT:</b>	Mrs. Paula Horner	(Parks & Recreation Director)
	Mr. Michael Skvasik	(Building Commissioner)
	Mrs. Amy Jo Washabaugh	(Human Service Director)
	Mrs. Helen Dunlap	(Clerk of Council)

1. Discussion from the Police Department. Chief Vizer

a. **Purchase of Police Vehicles**

Chief Vizer stated that this is the purchase of replacement vehicles for the Police Department. This year he would like to buy 3 Chargers and a Jeep Cherokee and they would auction off the same amount of vehicles. These are all on state bid.

Mr. Price asked for an explanation about the Jeep.

Chief Vizer stated that it is replacing a 2006 Chrysler 300 that we obtained through forfeiture he thinks prior to 2010. It is coming up on over 100,000 miles so they are going to use the Jeep as a vehicle for the detective bureau.

Mr. Price stated that he saw then on the state bid that they had that Jeep for \$23,572, is that options that make up the difference.

Chief Vizer stated maybe because it is a 4x4.

Mr. Price stated this said 4x4.

Chief Vizer stated that this is the pricing.

Mr. Price stated item #2AT. The only options that they state is delivery of course and you can get an extra set of keys and seat belt extenders should you need them.

Chief Vizer stated that he does not have the state pricing in front of him. He stated that they have added some other options. He has the \$23,572 number in front of him and that is the base. He is not exactly sure what other options he has added for \$743. He can get him that information.

Mr. Price stated that he just thought that he would ask. Some of it he is sure is going to be delivery.

Chief Vizer stated that it is usually a couple of hundred dollars per car for delivery. He does not know what he would have added. He thinks that he may have added power seats in the vehicle.

#### **b. Jail Agreement with Brecksville**

Chief Vizer stated that this is the contract with the City of Brecksville. It is basically very simple and very similar to what we already do for other cities for our female housing. It simply just lays down the ground rules for when we house their prisoners and who would be responsible for what, it sets the rate for half day and a whole day and there is an exit clause with 30 day notice for either party.

Mr. Stelmaschuk stated that it sounds like a renewal.

Chief Vizer stated that this is brand new. The only one that we provided services for up to this point on a contractual basis was Seven Hills. This is for Brecksville. This is a new venture because they are planning to close their jail so with them consolidating our dispatch; they are looking to consolidate their jail services so we have offered to take the jail services over. Just so council understands, we are entering into this agreement with them because we are going to be their sole jail where they are going to house. Right now we house for a multiple different communities on a day by day basis without a contract. If North Royalton is overflowing and they need a couple beds, if we have them, we will bring their prisoner over and charge them the flat \$85 a day but this more or less spells out what they are going to do if there is a medical problem with the prisoner and things like that since we are anticipating more volume from them. Typically the prisoners that we get from other communities are prisoners that are coming in just to do a jail sentence. They have already been to court, they are self-reporting. The prisoners, just like with Seven Hills could be someone that was just freshly arrested off of the road so that is why we lay out the specific rules for housing them.

## **2. Discussion from Council.**

### **a. BBHHS Gymnastics Championship.**

Mr. Boldt stated that this has been on before and they will put it on again this year. They are asking for it to be on for April 23<sup>rd</sup> to come to Council. Mr. Boldt read some of the email which is attached.

Mr. Wolf stated that there are also some other school things that made it past states. Do we want to recognize all of them as well?

Mr. Boldt stated that he thinks that was individuals.

Mr. Wolf stated that it was the robotics team. It was a team event so if we want to stick with teams and not individuals then he will get council the information on the robotics team but they also made it past states and are in nationals.

Mr. Goodwin stated that we are currently scheduled for the second Monday off in April so are we still going to stay with that.

Mr. Boldt stated that April 23<sup>rd</sup> yes.

### 3. Discussion from the Service Department. Mr. Schroedel

#### a. **Service Department Truck Purchase**

Mr. Schroedel stated that this is to purchase 2 new tandem axle salt trucks. We had a thorough discussion last week at Service Committee and it also went through Finance Committee this evening so what he is looking for is council approval next week to purchase these trucks.

Mr. Stelmaschuk stated that it was discussed at Finance Committee.

### 4. Discussion from the Engineering Department. Mr. Yelenosky

#### a. **Soccer Fields Culvert Pipe Lining Bids**

Mr. Yelenosky stated that what he passed out to council before the meeting is an image of what the current conditions of the culvert underneath The Fields as well as inspection report provided by the NEORS from 2016 so as you can see by the photo, this is in dire need of replacement so what we did is we currently have the road shut down and we are not allowing any traffic to go through so we are considering this to be an emergency. What he did is that he sought 4 proposals, 2 kind of alternatives, 1 being a lining technique and the other being a direct barrier open excavation. What you will see in front of you starting with the open excavation, 2 proposals, 1 by Ty, Inc., the other by GeoTech Services, they kind of mirror each other so what we would essentially be doing is excavating the road, taking out the old pipe, taking out all of the material, replacing it with a new 84" pipe and backfilling it properly and installing the road and curb and gutter as well. There are 2 alternatives to the pipe material that we can use, we can go with the corrugated metal pipe that is lined with a plastic polymer or we can go with an HDP pipe that is reinforced with steel. His recommendation to council would be to go with the Duramax pipe which is the steel reinforced plastic pipe. This will provide for the longevity of the pipe material. The 2 other proposals that he received, 1 from T&T Pipe renovations and the other from GeoTech Services is a lining so what they would essentially do is slip line the existing pipe. This would mean that there would be a reduction in the pipe and we would have to reduce it down to a 72" so they would basically slip line a pipe and grout behind it and reinstall the connections so that there would be no open cutting so the 2 quotes that he received, 1 was for \$114,500

and the other was for \$93,000 from GeoTech Services. Ultimately, long term, his recommendation would be to open cut, replace the pipe properly and in doing so what we would do is we would route 2 of the catch basins directly to the creek as opposed to penetrating the new installed pipe. With that being said he would also recommend the Duramax pipe. Again what happened, we get a lot of salt that would flow through this culvert that kind of ate away at this existing pipe so long term his solution would be to go with the open cut and the 84" Duramax pipe. He knows that it is a lot to digest.

Mr. Ruffa asked which one is it.

Mr. Yelenosky replied that it would be the GeoTech Services, the proposal dated 3-23-18, it is a small spreadsheet. So ultimately we want to try to get this rolling as soon as possible with the spring time coming and it is a heavily traveled area and right now it is currently closed to traffic. This material was also uploaded to Dropbox outside of the GeoTech Proposal dated 3-23-18 which was the open cut one which he just received this afternoon.

Mr. Pavlica asked Mr. Yelenosky that his feeling is that the slip line and grout just the outer area between the existing and the new is insufficient as far as the diameter of flow.

Mr. Yelenosky replied that he thinks that there are a couple things. You are reducing the diameter of the pipe to 72". This isn't in his opinion a very sensitive area but establishing that connection to the existing pipe that we are going to basically tying into, that could ultimately down the road result in some negative impacts to the steel lining essentially what would happen is that water would find its way behind the lined pipe and eat away at that grout possibly causing an issue down the road if not continually maintained and inspected so ultimately he is a long term kind of, he likes to reduce the amount of maintenance that we would have to do in the future but with doing so we would have to go with the more expensive option.

Mr. Pavlica asked if the contractor did a field inspection himself.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he did meet with all the contractors out on site. They were provided with all the information and they met out on site. The good thing is that it is down in the valley there so that we can close the road, get in and get out as soon as possible. There will be some bypass pumping involved obviously with the spring time we anticipate rain.

Mr. Stelmaschuk stated that he thinks that for the price he would go with the open cut and replace the whole thing.

Mr. Price asked if there is any compensation from NEORS.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he tried very hard to get them to pay for it but however this is not part of their regional sewer system so he did explore that avenue however they did go out and reinspect this year but he didn't provide a report because basically it is the same thing as the initial report from November 2016. That is about as much assistance as we got from them. Now we can use community cost share dollars for that but given the emergency, there is a process involved with submitting for community cost share so he would advise that we use that money later down the road. Ultimately what he would ask council is for a not to exceed in the amount of \$175,000 just given any contingencies that may be involved.

Mr. Price stated that their quote is \$125,000.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that it is \$125,000, what this quote doesn't include is about \$5,000 for rerouting that catch basin, again he thinks that there may be some things that we potentially can run into, he just wants to be sure that we have the money in there to take care of those issues should something occur.

Mr. Price stated that the struggle that he has with that is with ORC, even on a bid project only allows what for an overrun?

Mr. Yelenosky stated that it is usually 10%.

Mr. Price stated no more than 33%. Not to exceed 33% and you are more than exceeding 33% by jumping it up \$50,000.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that the reason that he is mentioning that is that he would personally like to go with the Duramax pipe so it is \$350 per linear foot as opposed to the \$211 linear foot. He does not have the rough numbers off the top of his head. He can do some calculations on the calculator but he knows that is obviously going to be, you are talking roughly about \$140 more dollars per linear foot. That is \$14,000 right there over 100'. So you are looking at \$145,000 right there.

Mr. Price stated that he is looking for another \$30,000 on top of that.

Mr. Yelenosky stated before council would approve, he would clean these up and he apologizes given the expedient nature of this situation, he is bringing it to council kind of unprepared in a way.

Mr. Price stated that he has a right to do it, it is an emergency, he just thinks that jumping at \$50,000 exceeds what a normal bid would be and he thinks that even in an emergency it could be justified but he doesn't just want to automatically just approve it.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he understands.

Mr. Boldt stated that he agrees with Mr. Price. He thinks that we should set it a \$138,000 and pass it and if you need more money you will have to come back.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that that allows for some additional contingencies and he is fine with that.

Mr. Boldt stated that what he did was add \$5,000 plus 10% on top of that.

Mr. Ruffa asked what the number is.

Mr. Boldt stated \$138,000.

Ms. Mahnic asked if we are going to vote on this next Monday so he can't start work until Monday because if this is an emergency and it is sitting there.

Mr. Pavlica stated that he has the road closed right now.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that right now the road is closed to any traffic so he doesn't see it as a we need to get the shovels in the ground tomorrow however it needs to occur within a reasonable amount of time.

Ms. Mahnic stated that this is not going to interfere with recreation schedule for spring activities.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that it will impact them slightly however they said that they would be accommodating and willing to work around. If we are able to get in there and get it done he thinks that they are looking at maybe 2 weeks.

Mr. Pavlica stated that you have 2 entrances coming in off of Broadview Road so they can come in on either side.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that a good portion of that parking lot which is on the west side is going to be closed, pretty much that entire parking lot is going to be closed.

#### **b. Rt. 82 Widening ROW Agreements**

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he provided council with a breakdown of the properties that he would like to enter into agreement with. There are 5 of them. Parcel 16, 39, 51, 56 & 64 which are highlighted in blue on the spreadsheet. Those are the ones that we have been negotiating with for ROW takes on the Route 82 widening project. Some of them are temporary, some of them are permanent takes and the dollar values are also shown on there under the amount column. Again these properties have all been appraised and reappraised and these people signed the offer letter.

Mr. Stelmaschuk asked if these are the last ones.

Mr. Yelenosky stated no. We have quite a few so actually the ones that are highlighted in green which there are 5 of them so there is a total of over 60 parcels so we still have quite a few yet.

Mr. Price stated how much are you taking on this one, it is \$62,450.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he believes that he would have to go back and take a look at it, he thinks that there were some additional things that we are taking from them, he believes that we are taking, we have to purchase the sign and there are a couple of other things and that is why the amount is so high. Off the top of his head he wants to say that might be the Cleveland Clinic/Marymount so they have an illuminated sign which is quite possibly the value, he thinks what eats up a lot of that cost.

Mr. Price asked what the simplistic amount is, \$85,000 so it is still under that, is it still under \$85,000 a simplistic take.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that is \$10,000.

Mr. Price stated that there are 3 different types of value takes, so this would be a step up but it is under \$85,000.

Mr. Yelenosky stated correct. He can provide those details to council, what the exact breakdown of the appraisals show. There is obviously some landscaping involved with that as well, but the majority is the ROW take as well as the sign.

Mr. Price stated so basically the \$62,450 includes the cure, relocating the sign, taking care of the landscaping.

Mr. Yelenosky stated no, so what we would do is we would basically purchase the sign and then they would have the opportunity to buy it back at a salvage cost, but we are not relocating, it would be on the property owner to relocate their own sign.

Mr. Price stated that it provides a cure for them by buying the sign and allowing them to repurchase it.

Mr. Yelenosky stated if you want to think about it that way, that is what is wrapped up in the cost.

Mr. Boldt asked what the value of the sign is and what the value to move it is.

Mr. Yelenosky stated again, he does not know the numbers off the top of his head. He can provide that to council. Again everything has been appraised.

Mr. Price asked if they have agreed to this appraised amount.

Mr. Yelenosky stated yes. That is what those shaded ones are indicating and obviously everyone has the ability to negotiate. Obviously they are not going to negotiate any lower than what we offer them. These people have signed their contracts which again have been appraised by a certified appraisers and review appraised.

Mr. Boldt asked if he could have Mr. Yelenosky get him frontage on this.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he would be more than happy to provide that. There is a lot of information on these spreadsheets and maybe they will consolidate it down and get something easier to read.

Mr. Boldt stated that it is just comparable on frontage.

Mr. Ruffa stated that there is an additional parcel on here that we would like to discuss. It is number 40 WD & T and that particular property owner refuses to negotiate with us so as we expected what happened with one or more of these, they are actually asking us to file an action in probate court, eminent domain action in probate court in order to open negotiations so what you have on the agenda for tonight's special is the first step in doing that which is the Resolution of Necessity and then ultimately next week there will be another piece of legislation that will allow us to go ahead and file the action in probate court and begin those negotiations.

### **c. Cuyahoga County Sewer Rehabilitation Program**

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he would like to ask for council approval to go ahead with a sanitary and storm maintenance program. He is requesting \$300,000 for some sewer rehab over the next 2 years. What they would essentially do is utilize Cuyahoga County, their contract, he believes they just contracted out with someone who was a new contractor that won the award, and he believes that it was United Survey. So what we would do over the next 2 years is grout, clean, camera, jet laterals, do various things to our sewers and he provided council with kind of a breakdown of what services would be at our disposal so obviously as things come up we can go ahead and take care of these issues. We have a backlog of sewer maintenance that we need to take care of pretty urgently. He is just looking to go ahead and start doing so.

Mr. Ruffa asked Mr. Yelenosky that he is looking for legislation for us to enter into an agreement with the Cuyahoga County for sewer rehabilitation program.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that as you remember we already have legislation, a contract with them but it doesn't have a dollar amount, it is more of an open contract so what that contract says is that we can utilize their services but there is no dollar amount as to how much we can spend for doing such work. That is all that he is asking for council approval to go ahead and spend some funds for the various maintenance work that needs to be done utilizing their contract. He thinks that this was an item that he discussed at budget time.

Mr. Ruffa stated then that he doesn't need any legislation from him.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he just needs authorization from council to go ahead and approve spending the funds for sewer rehab.

Mr. Boldt asked if this has been through Service Committee.

Ms. Mahnic stated that like he has said, we have not discussed a dollar amount and this is the first time that she is really seeing like I need \$300,000 over the course of 2 years.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that if council remembers we discussed this extensively as a way to increase our rates so that happened maybe a year and a half, maybe 2 years ago, he doesn't recall off the top of his head but in doing so we were under the assumption that we were going to start maintaining these sewers so providing a rehab, a variety of rehab techniques as opposed to letting them get to a condition where they failed so to Mr. Boldt's point, it wasn't discussed recently, it has been a little while but it was discussed during the budget allocations.

Mayor Alai stated that it wasn't discussed exactly sewer and rehab projects in particular that we are doing because we have a backlog of things, but he would assume we wouldn't need legislation because if we pass the budget tonight they should be able to just go ahead and do sewer rehabilitation and do sewer maintenance as we should.

Mr. Ruffa asked if it is in the budget.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that it is in the budget.

Mayor Alai stated that we already have an agreement with the County so once we pass the budget you should be able to go out and do what you need to do.

Mr. Pfaff stated within the allotment. There is more than just that in the budget so we would have to monitor to make sure that combined all of these projects don't go over the amount appropriated. He will work with Mr. Yelenosky on this.

Ms. Mahnic asked then does the budget say \$300,000 because he said \$300,000 over 2 years so is it \$150,000/\$150,000.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that they discussed this so part of that total that we have allocated for this year was the Tollis sewer relining that has been done, that one is a reimbursement through the County so we will be receiving \$150,000 shortly. However we want to use that money for some other work.

Ms. Mahnic stated that we need to do the work and it is in the budget. It has been discussed; this will be our third reading.



Mr. Price stated that he doesn't want to put words in his mouth but the question kind of was \$150,000/\$150,000 but basically if you are approving it like this you could literally spend nothing this year and \$300,000 next year. Is that correct?

Mr. Yelenosky stated yes. What this would allow us to do is say that there is an emergency situation that we don't know about or something comes up, that is theoretically how that would be spent.

Ms. Mahnic stated that the legislation says \$150,000 right?

Mr. Price stated no.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the legislation doesn't say anything. All you are doing, if you approve the budget.

Mr. Price stated that Mr. Pfaff stated that there is more than \$300,000 in the budget.

Mr. Pfaff stated that he doesn't know what the exact number in the budget is but the number would have as Mr. Yelenosky has said the Tollis project.

Mr. Yelenosky stated then the \$150,000 for a total of \$300,000 which we haven't received reimbursement yet. Those requests have been sent to the County.

Mr. Price stated that he guesses that he would only ask that Mr. Yelenosky does not exceed the balance in the line item for 2018 as budgeted and reported to the state April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Mahnic stated that if it is already in the budget, and she is trying to pull it up and of course her app is not functioning, if it is already in the budget, it has already been discussed and it has now gone to its third reading, she feels like Mr. Yelenosky is just reminding us.

Mr. Yelenosky stated yes. He kind of wanted to bring it so that we can start moving forward so that there were no questions further down the road.

Mr. Price stated that it never hurts to have another piece of paper to back you up.

Mr. Pavlica asked if we are going to notify these residents when we start doing sewer work in front of their homes.

Mr. Yelenosky stated yes, he always tries to make sure that he does notify residents well ahead of time.

Mr. Pavlica asked if we know who the contractor is going to be that is going to be doing the work.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that the contractor will be United Survey. They did win the award and they are finalizing their paperwork for 2018-2019.

Mr. Pavlica stated then they won the County and this is the County pricing.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that is correct and that is the County prices that you see on the spreadsheet. And they bid these out every 2 years.

Mr. Stelmaschuk asked if this would be the Sewer Maintenance line item in the budget.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he believes so. He believes that it is under the sanitary sewer. He thinks that there was like \$400,000.

Mr. Stelmaschuk stated that Sewer Maintenance say \$400,000.

Mr. Yelenosky stated correct. So \$150,000 of that was for Tollis which we are receiving a full \$150,000 reimbursement and again he does not anticipate spending more than \$150,000 this year unless there is some outside circumstance which he will bring forth to council but just in case something does overrun we have a little bit of flexibility.

Mr. Yelenosky stated if he may, he has a couple of quick notifications to council. He handed out their detour plan for East Mill Road. We anticipate beginning this construction the second week of April weather depending. The main detour will be Lacey Lane to West Mill. It will only be southbound traffic. There will be no northbound traffic on East Mill. He anticipates this work occurring over 2-3 weeks obviously depending on the weather.

Mr. Boldt asked when does this start.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that this will start, we are slated for the second week of April and there will be a notification out in the Mayor's Message as well as social media.

Mr. Wolf asked again, April 7<sup>th</sup> and also asked if he has alerted the schools.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he has been in discussion with Mr. Fillmore who is the transportation director so he is the man and he knows what is going on and he told him that he would be kept up to date as we move forward.

Mr. Pavlica stated that if he understands this correctly the northbound exit is only going to be able to go south on East Mill Road.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that is correct. So your detour will be south to Lacey Lane to West Mill. If we have to adjust this plan accordingly depending on how the flow of traffic does occur but for right now this is what they anticipate doing and what you don't see on this is there is a lot of signage that is going to occur so those will be posted the first week of April.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that he also passed out a Public Notice; we are starting Wright Road construction this week. These have been passed out to all of the residents on Wright Road and Overlook and there is another letter that is coming out which will be handed out tomorrow just notifying them of what exactly we are doing this week but he just wanted to make council aware that they have begun this project and that road is still open to traffic but it will be closed to traffic very shortly. He will try to do the best that he can and email council once it is fully shut down to local traffic only and the schools have been notified.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that the last item that he has is just a map of the 2017-2018 road program if council didn't happen to remember what they discussed as their plan of attack was. Just real quick a couple of things that have changed is we are taking care of East Mill this year which is a county project and the city is participating in that as well as we are going to do a segment of Rt. 82 where the Brecksville line stops and Broadview Heights line starts to South Hills Boulevard. Those are the 2 things that we have kind of revised from the plan.

Mr. Stelmaschuk asked what we are doing with Oakes Road. It is really in bad shape.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that Oakes Road, they have had some discussions on what we are doing. They are still kind of evaluating those alternatives. What he will say is that they are going to try and do some improvements this

year if the funds allow for it. Whether that is a minor fix to hold us over until we can fully do it the right way. So those are some of the things that they are still evaluating. Obviously there are some concerns with the potential future school so Short Avery has been under discussion, so there are a lot of moving pieces so to directly answer your question, he does not have a plan as of yet but they are evaluating all of the alternatives.

5. Discussion from the Economic Development Department. Ms. Sorensen

**a. Apply for the 2018 Community Planning Grant through the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission for the 2018 Community Master Plan Update Program.**

Ms. Sorensen stated that she is just looking for authority to apply for the 2018 Community Planning Grant through the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission to take a look at the Master Plan Update. This is something that we are eligible for for a comprehensive update. No funds would need to be spent by us. The County Planning Commission indicated that we are eligible for a full review so looking for the authority to apply and look at things like northern Broadview Heights.

COUNCIL OPEN TO THE RESIDENTS

None this evening.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Mr. Boldt stated that Charter met last week and the next meeting for Charter will be on April 3<sup>rd</sup> and the final meeting for Charter will be on May 1st. What happened is that they did not hit the Broadview Journal so he made sure that they had another meeting and they will post it in the Broadview Journal this month and give everybody about a week and a half to submit any Charter Review changes and then they would vote on it the first Tuesday of May.

Mr. Stelmaschuk asked if they were going to discuss the April schedule. Did we talk about that? He just wanted to wish everyone a Happy Easter and enjoy the time with your families and be safe.

Mr. Price stated that he just wanted to let everybody to know that the BZA will be meeting on Wednesday, April 4<sup>th</sup> and likewise he would like to wish everyone a Happy Easter.

Ms. Mahnic stated that she has mentioned this to Mr. Yelenosky but she wasn't sure if all of council had heard about the McClaren, last year they put, a few years ago we patched some of the road and then last year we sealed it. It was a few years gap but the sealant that went on is almost completely gone in she doesn't know how many months so she thinks that Mr. Yelenosky is still looking into it and working with the company that did the work.

Mr. Yelenosky stated that is still covered under our maintenance warranty period so as the weather improves we will handle it.

Ms. Mahnic stated in case anyone complains because the infamous yellow line is also emerging from there in case your guys get calls.

Mr. Boldt stated that April 9<sup>th</sup> we will be off. Also he forgot to mention that the Planning Commission will meet Wednesday at 7:00 p.m. and there are 3 items on the agenda.

ADJOURN

Mr. Boldt stated that with no further business to come before council, this meeting is adjourned.

The time was 8:18 p.m.



HELEN DUNLAP, CLERK OF COUNCIL



ROBERT BOLDT, PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL

## Helen Dunlap

---

**From:** Dan Huffman <dghdah@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2018 10:12 AM  
**To:** Helen Dunlap  
**Cc:** Joan Ganim; Maria Schneider  
**Subject:** Re: City Council Agenda: State Championships

APRIL 23

Helen,

Tentatively, April 23rd is the better date. There are 14 girls on the team.

We just moved into Broadview Heights 3 years ago. Just so I know what to expect, what would a Broadview Heights Resolution of Commendation consist of? Is the commendation done solely on a team basis, or would all the individual gymnasts receive some sort of proclamation or commendation? These girls have worked very hard.

Just to throw something else out for consideration... Broadview Heights is in a unique position to do something interesting because it bridges across two school systems. Both the Brecksville Broadview Heights and North Royalton high school teams went to states. The NRHS team is on the ascent (thanks to GymWorld) and took 6th place at states (I am not sure, but have heard that this is the first time NRHS has gone to states and/or this is their highest finish to date. I will confirm this if things proceed). One thing that has been enjoyable to watch is the way the BBHHS and NRHS teams interact. These teams are not rivals, and although rivalries can often be fun, what these teams have is even better. These two high school teams cheer together at the meets, support each other during the events, and congratulate one another when the competition is over. You couldn't ask for a nicer example of sportsmanship. There are many friendships between the two teams (again, thanks to GymWorld), but then the other commonality is Broadview Heights. Perhaps, a joint recognition consisting of Resolution of Commendations for both teams would be fitting. It would capture the Sportsmanship exhibited by these two successful "sister" teams and would inclusively span across the two school districts of our city.

It is interesting because it is somewhat unique. How many communities are involved with two separate school districts that have both teams of the same sport qualify for the state tournament? And then have both teams do well, while showing such a high level of sportsmanship?. Certainly recognizing one team would be easiest, but doing two teams opens up some real possibilities, if there is time to properly recognize each team and gymnast, and if there is enough meeting hall space.

If there is any interest in looking into a joint commendation, I would be glad to reach out to the NRHS team, I think they would be interested. Otherwise, I will just look forward to learning if recognition of the BBHHS gymnastics team will fit into a council meeting agenda.

Thanks,

Dan

On Mon, Mar 19, 2018 at 3:32 PM, Helen Dunlap <[HDunlap@broadview-heights.org](mailto:HDunlap@broadview-heights.org)> wrote: