

**COVENTRY TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**Regular Meeting of October 13, 2011**

The Coventry Township Board of Trustees met in regular session on Thursday, October 13, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. at the Coventry Township Town Hall.

Chairperson Tom Seese called the meeting to order and asked Fiscal Officer Joni Murgatroyd to record the following Trustees present: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. All Trustees were recorded present.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was recited by those present.

**Approval of Minutes**

111013-01 Brenda Patterson made a motion to approve and dispense with the reading of the minutes of the regular meeting of September 8, 2011, and the special meeting of October 6, 2011. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

**Old Business:**

Tom Seese asked if there was any old business to discuss.

Joni Murgatroyd stated there was none that she was aware of.

Joni Murgatroyd read the following Fiscal Officer's Note: Pursuant to O.R.C. Section 9.24 all contractors or vendors to be considered for awards hereafter have been certified to have No Findings for Recovery as determined upon review of the State Auditor's Findings for Recovery Database on or before October 13, 2011.

**New Business:**

**C.U.E. Road Salt Bid**

Tom Seese stated that we have the issue of the road salt bids. Lael, you got the bids for the salt and this is the best bid?

Lael Stouffer stated yes. We get that through the C.U.E. program and he believes we pay \$200.00 to be in that program, and he may have that wrong but they've always been very successful in getting low salt bids compared to what other places pay. This is the standard bid that we got this year. It's actually down almost \$2.00 from last year. In the end we'll have a savings if we use 1,600 tons, 1,600 tons will cost us \$71,000, but will save us \$2,600.00.

Tom Seese stated so this bid is \$2.00 less than what we paid last year.

Dave Bulgrin stated that he would make a motion that we accept the bid of \$44.81 from C.U.E.

Joni Murgatroyd stated that it will read as stated in the agenda.

Tom Seese stated that it comes from Cargill Incorporated. Any questions? There were none.

111013-02 Dave Bulgrin made a motion to approve the salt bid through the C.U.E. program from Cargill Incorporated in the amount of \$44.81 per ton dumped at our site. Brenda Patterson seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

### Leaf Drop-Off Discussion

Tom Seese explained that the next thing on the agenda is discussion on the leaf drop-off program. As many of you know, in the past we've done two different Saturdays at the Cottage Grove field area. We are in the discussion stages right now and have not established any dates. He suggested that we approve, because the cost this year is exactly the same as it was last year, we approve up to two leaf drop-offs. If it comes down to we're only going to do one, at least we are covered. If we have a bad season and the leaves fall late or something and we need a second one we can determine that. He asked for a motion to approve up to two.

111013-15 Brenda Patterson made a motion to approve up to two leaf drop-offs.

Tom Seese asked if there was a second?

Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion.

Joni Murgatroyd clarified, now will this be a motion to approve up to two with Mulch Makers? Is it still with Mulch Makers?

Tom Seese stated, yes.

Lael Stouffer explained that he contacted Mulch Makers. He told them that the Township was looking at ideas to maybe have some cost savings there. They are really generous in working with us and will still allow us to, if we approve the amount, can schedule one leaf drop-off and if we need another one after that, if the Township so desires to do another one, they'll do it last minute notice. We can call them and they'll come out and set another one up if we need it. If we schedule this one leaf drop-off later in November then we might be fine. It's a crap-shoot with leaves, you just never know.

Tom Seese stated that our intent is to try to save money if we can and if we have a bad season with late leaves then we might have to do the same as in the past. We don't want to deprive our residents of anything. There was a motion and a second. He asked Joni Murgatroyd for the roll call please.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0. (Fiscal Officer's note: Last resolution number assigned to this motion since other motions where previously designated.)

### Township Facilities and Grounds Lighting Assessment

Tom Seese stated there is an issue pertaining to Township facilities and grounds lighting assessment. He believed at our last meeting we discussed some savings with a lighting program. He asked the Chief to explain what is going on there.

David Calderone explained that the news isn't as good as it was. We were going to have a rather significant savings. A \$16,000 project was going to cost us approximately \$600, \$586 to be exact. However, First Energy changed the amount of the rebate so now we are looking at the exact same work that was approved before, but the \$16,000.00 project, our part of it will now be \$10,550. That is a significant increase. However, it's a 35% savings, or reduction. So, we are still getting one third the cost. We will benefit from the monthly savings and the projection is that we will recover that money in 25 months. So, the \$10,000 we are spending, we will recover in saved energy and maintenance, by their projections in 25 months. Better quality lighting, the new most energy efficient standards that are available right now. It's not the great deal that it was before, but it's still 35% off and recovery in 25 months is still a good deal.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

111013-03 Tom Seese made a motion to amend motion number 110728-04 for the

Energy Efficient Lighting Upgrade with U.S. Illuminations for all Township Buildings for a revised total cost of \$13,952.43 as outlined in their quotation dated October 6, 2011, with said project costs being offset by participation in the First Energy Lighting Efficiency Rebate Program for a revised estimated energy rebate of \$3,401.95, for an adjusted total estimated cost of \$10,550.48. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

David Calderone explained that the next motion is for \$1,911.00 from the same company, U.S. Illuminations to change, right now our apparatus bays are wired to where all of the lights, and it's a rather large bay, it's 80 x 100, are always on, all the time. What he has asked to do, and is recommending is, that for this amount of money they will break the bays up into zones, including the upper bay. So we will only use the lights where the guys are actually at. Also, one of the chronic problems we have is that because they leave so quickly and they can't get to the switches, is that we leave all the lights on, sometimes for hours on end. So, this will create infrared zones so they won't have to turn the lights on and off, which in the long run will save us money. So, that's what that is for. While we're doing this lighting stuff, it's cheaper to do it right now.

111013-04 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the labor and materials to install seven ceiling mounted occupancy sensors to seven lighting zones for the Fire Department bays from U.S. Illuminations in the amount of \$1,911.62 as quoted in their proposal dated August 23, 2011. Brenda Patterson seconded the motion.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

#### Administration/Fire Department Roofing

Tom Seese asked David Calderone to please explain.

David Calderone explained that in July we approved a motion for up to \$3,500.00 for work from Michael's Roofing that included some flashing on the air conditioning, extra insulation at the areas where we are having chronic icing problems, actually severe, chronic icing problems in the front and the back. What he would like to do is amend that. It also included the assistance for Michael's to help with the specs for the re-roof. So, we're going to rescind this, or just modify it?

Joni Murgatroyd stated no, we're going to rescind it because that isn't going to get done now. His cost for that was \$3,200.00.

David Calderone stated well, two-thirds of it, minus the specs will. The flashing is, the insulation is.

Joni Murgatroyd stated well the three items that were included here, it was \$2,915.00. Then there was a separate cost of \$3,200 to do the specs. This is what she had on the information she was given. So, she deleted that since we were going to wait until the spring to see how the insulation held up based on our previous discussion.

David Calderone stated right, the purpose of the \$3,500 was to fix ice damming and flashing problems.

Joni Murgatroyd stated, but see the initial, the specs, the quote that he gave you August 5<sup>th</sup>, the details for the specs were \$3,200.

David Calderone stated we don't need that.

Joni Murgatroyd stated right. We don't need that now, so all we need to do are the repairs. He's not going to be doing the spec's right now. She referred to the requisition and quote she was given and explained, so we need this and the \$1,250 and that comes out to \$2,915.

David Calderone stated that's correct, thank you.

Joni Murgatroyd stated that's why we'll rescind and recalculate.

David Calderone stated we are not going to do the specs right now. What he is going to add, by their recommendation is that we add some gutter flashing to stop the water from coming over the gutters in those areas and they are going to do the temporary repairs of the roof. The reason we are dragging our feet here is that if the insulation and this gutter repair doesn't do the job, we don't want to have the roof just done. It makes sense that we solve the icing problem before we take that on. However, we do have roof problems and it does need patched. So for the amount that Joni said, the \$2,915.00 is going to include, he's going to repair all the spots in the roof that need to be patched and he's going to add the two areas of gutter that had severe icing. We'll further repair by extending the height of the gutter to help with the overflows and he's going to guarantee the leaks. If we have any problems through the rest of the year until next spring, he'll at no charge come and correct the problem. So, we're just not doing the specs.

Joni Murgatroyd stated right, so that's why we should just rescind that because in three or four months, actually closer to six months, it could change and we'll revisit it at that point.

111013-05 Tom Seese made a motion to rescind motion number 110721-06 and to approve up to \$2,915.00 for Michael's construction for the installation of R30 fiberglass attic insulation to alleviate an icing issue, to replace existing material covering three air conditioner unit bases and to make temporary repairs as needed including patches and splash guards. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

### Policing Contract

Tom Seese explained that this is something that we absolutely have to do because our current contract with the Summit County Sheriff is up at the end of this year and this is a renewal. He asked David Calderone to explain.

David Calderone explained that basically it is a re-up of what we have right now, but the pricing is good. The pricing for all three years is less than what we are paying this year. They did that by their cost cutting and locking down their salaries and through their negotiations in the Sheriff's Office. So again, we are going to go three years paying less than what we are paying this year. In each of the three years, in 2012, 2013 and 2014, the highest increase from one year to the next is less than \$300.00.

Tom Seese explained to the audience and the reason they've done a good job of negotiating with the Sheriff's Department is that we stayed within the budget of the levy we have on the ballot for the renewal of the Sheriff's contract. We hope you give us the renewal. He explained that if by chance you give us the additional, if you approve additional protection that's not inclusive in this agreement, then we can add to it.

David Calderone stated yes.

Tom Seese stated is that right. So, at best case scenario as long as we have the levy

renewed that we presently have we are okay. That's only the one Sheriff's deputy and if you want an extra Sheriff's deputy we have an additional levy on to let you make that decision for the community.

111013-06 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the three year Policing Contract from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2014, and to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between the Township of Coventry and the Summit County Sheriff's Office. Brenda Patterson seconded the motion.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

Coventry-Akron JEDD - Fourth Amendatory Agreement

Tom Seese asked Joni Murgatroyd to explain.

Joni Murgatroyd explained that back in May we received a petition from the Akron Auto Auction to be added to the JEDD so they could obtain sewer and water services. This is the second step in that process. That was approved by resolution by the Board at that time. Now we have to actually approve the Fourth Amendatory Agreement to the actual JEDD contract to solidify that. That's what this is for. She requested a motion to approve the Fourth Amendatory Agreement between the City of Akron and Coventry Township for the addition of JFB Diversified Holdings, LLC for their property at 2471 Ley Drive, Akron, Ohio. She added that Irv Sugerman, legal counsel, reviewed this and recommended approval.

Tom Seese asked if there was a chance of receiving any additional taxes because the employees are now in the JEDD area?

Joni Murgatroyd explained that actually because we now share, we get a portion of the quarter-percent, we do get some of that, yes.

111013-07 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the Fourth Amendatory Agreement between the City of Akron and Coventry Township for the addition of JFB Diversified Holdings, LLC for their property at 2471 Ley Drive, Akron, Ohio. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

Report by the Fiscal Officer:

Joni Murgatroyd, Fiscal Officer, asked the Board to approve the following motions:

111013-08 Tom Seese made a motion to pay all bills and salaries, warrant numbers 60704 to 60874, as certified by Fiscal Officer Joni Murgatroyd, and subject to audit. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0. A listing of the warrants will be made a part of these minutes.

Resolution Accepting The Amounts and Rates as Determined by the Budget Commission and Authorizing the Necessary Tax Levies and Certifying Them to the County Fiscal Officer

Joni Murgatroyd explained that this is a customary motion we have to do every year to certify our levies. She requested approval from the Board for the Resolution Accepting The Amounts and Rates as Determined by the Budget Commission and Authorizing the Necessary

Tax Levies and Certifying Them to the County Fiscal Officer. She noted that the County Budget Commission has received an extension from the Tax Equalization Division of the State of Ohio which extends our filing date by the same period of time.

111013-09 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the Resolution Accepting The Amounts and Rates as Determined by the Budget Commission and Authorizing the Necessary Tax Levies and Certifying Them to the County Fiscal Officer. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

#### Vacation Carryover - Road/Maintenance and Zoning Departments

Joni Murgatroyd explained that we have a couple of vacation carry-over requests. She requested approval of the carryover of 40 hours of vacation pay for Danny Yaros to his new anniversary year effective October 1, 2011. He's our senior road laborer. Also the carryover of 60 hours for George Beckham to his new anniversary year effective October 24, 2011.

111013-10 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the carryover of 40 hours of vacation pay for Danny Yaros to his new anniversary year effective October 1, 2011, and the carryover of 60 hours for George Beckham to his new anniversary year effective October 24, 2011. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

#### Cash Transfers-Out

Joni Murgatroyd explained that what this is for is we planned transfers, we appropriated it, she requested the following:

111013-11 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the following cash transfers from Fund 1000 to the following funds:

1. \$ 25,000 to Fund 2031 - Road and Bridge Fund;
2. \$125,000 to Fund 2191 - Fire 4.65 Mill Levy Fund.

Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

Joni Murgatroyd noted that when she explains where the General Fund subsidizes our other departments, that is what that motion is in that case.

#### Resolution for Advancement of Funds from the County Fiscal Office

Joni Murgatroyd explained that this is another customary motion we have to request. It's a resolution for advancement of funds from the County Fiscal Office. She explained as the Real Estate funds start coming into the office, generally they just have one major settlement, but we need the funds ahead of time to meet payroll and our operating expenses. What this does is it allows them to advance money to us several months before the final settlement date. She requested the following motion:

111013-12 Tom Seese made a motion approving the Resolution for tax year 2011 authorizing advances of local taxes pursuant to ORC 321.34 from the County Fiscal Officer to use for the purposes of 2012 calendar year expenses. Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0. The resolution has been made a part of these minutes.

Amendment to the 2011 Permanent Appropriation Resolution

Joni Murgatroyd requested approval of the amendment to the 2011 Permanent Appropriation Resolution. She explained that this is the time of year where she has to review all of our funds again to verify our revenues against our expenditures, and we have several grant funds that she will have to amend down. We are finalizing those grants and we spent less than what the grant was for. The other situation was for the CDBG grant. We had initially been approved for \$100,000.00 and HUD reduced that to \$83,500.00 so she has to amend that appropriation down for that. Then the next step is that she has to amend our Certificate of Estimated Resources. Then there is also our SAFER grant fund which we are still analyzing, but we are looking at that to amend it down as well.

111013-13 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the amendment to the 2011 Permanent Appropriation Resolution. Brenda Patterson seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0. The resolution has been made a part of these minutes.

Disposition of Obsolete and Unusable Equipment

Joni Murgatroyd explained that we have a couple pieces of old equipment that are broken and unusable. She requested the following motion:

111013-14 Tom Seese made a motion to approve the disposition and removal from inventory of obsolete and unusable, broken Administration office equipment as follows:

1. HP Scanjet G4010;
2. HP Deskjet 6988.

Dave Bulgrin seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

Joni Murgatroyd advised the Board that their period to date financial reports are in their meeting packet. Also today we had our pre-bid meeting for the South Bender/Iris Avenue Culvert project as part of the HUD requirements for the CDBG grant. Any contractor who was interested in bidding on this had to attend the pre-bid meeting. We had two companies that did attend. At first we were concerned that we weren't going to get anyone because it had to be run within 72 hours of the last bid advertisement. Unfortunately, that didn't give them a lot of time to respond. She reported on the levies and explained that we have three important levies this fall on the General Election Ballot on November 8<sup>th</sup>. She explained that all of this information is on our website at coventrytownship.com. It's on the homepage which will link to the Fiscal Officer's web page. She has been updating that as she's been receiving information. The first levy is Issue 7 which is the 2.5 mil Police Levy Renewal. She has gone through it at other meetings, but just wanted to cover it briefly. This levy is what covers the Township's existing police protection. Currently we are collecting \$622,694 annually. In 2012, it is estimated that we will only receive approximately \$583,000 which is being reduced as a result of the property revaluations. The reason why we are going to be able to also meet our contracting requirements for the next five years with the existing contract is because we had a significant carryover. We had to have a contingency reserved for various provisions in the contract should we have had a deputy get injured and we would have had to cover it with a second deputy. So, because some of the provisions have been locked up a little bit in the contract now, we are able to apply those carryover funds to the contract over the next five years which is going to sustain us for the base contract only. The ballot language then for that will be, "A renewal of a tax for the benefit of Coventry Township for the purpose of providing police protection at a rate not exceeding 2.5 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to 25 cents for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2012, first due in calendar year 2013." So this is what you will see when you go to the ballot on the 8<sup>th</sup>. The next levy is Issue 8. That's the additional 1 mill Police Levy that Tom mentioned. This will be a new five year levy, and if passed, the levy would be effective tax year 2011, with its first collection in 2012, which would enable the Township if it's passed to immediately increase our

coverage rather than having to wait another year. So this levy will cost the owner of a \$100,000 home \$30.63 annually. It's estimated that this levy will provide \$233,361 annually. The ballot language for this levy is, *"An additional tax for the benefit of Coventry Township for the purpose of providing the addition of a sergeant and additional deputy coverage to the existing police protection at a rate not exceeding 1 mill for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to 10 cents for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2011, first due in calendar year 2012."* The next issue is for the replacement of 1 mill of an existing road levy and a .50 mill increase. This levy was first put on the ballot in 1992 and has been passed as a renewal since that time. So, it's basically collected at the same rate that it was passed at in 1992. This levy currently expires in tax year 2011, with it's last collection year in 2012. If the replacement and increase is approved by our residents it will enable the Township to continue its current road maintenance programs including chip and seal. The increasing costs for salt, hot mix, fuel and oil used in the chip and seal program have made it increasingly difficult to continue with the current road maintenance program. In addition, the severe weather this winter and spring have caused numerous road and drainage issues. If passed, this levy would be effective tax year 2012, we wouldn't collect on it until 2013. It would still be one year away. The additional cost for a \$100,000 home would be \$31.30 annually. If this levy is passed it is estimated that it will bring in an additional \$215,398 for the general construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and repair of streets and roads in the Township. Currently the levy that we have right now is only bringing in \$134,644 annually. She stated that in a moment, when she completes the ballot language, Lael will explain why this is not very much compared to what we are paying right now. The ballot language is, *"A replacement of 1 mill of an existing levy and an increase of 0.5 mill to constitute a tax for the benefit of Coventry Township for the purpose of general construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and repair of streets, roads, and bridges at a rate not exceeding 1.5 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to 15 cents for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2012, first due in calendar year 2013."*

Lael Stouffer explained that just to provide a little bit of some numbers to put some reality with that, in 2004 we were able to resurface 13.5 miles of road for \$80,000. These numbers, when he is working with the Engineer's Department, are usually figured in units of square yards, so dollars per square yard, we paid 52% a square yard, per dollar. Fast forward to 2009, we went from 13.5 miles to 9.5. For four less miles of road, we paid \$139,000, so we're paying 124% per square yard. That's a big price increase. From 2002 then to 2011, we have 198% increase in our cost per square yard for our chip and seal resurfacing project which is absorbing a lot of money. There was big jump from 2008 to 2009 in the oil market and he thinks we encountered an 85% increase from 2008 to 2009 which was a real shock and a 15% increase on the slag that we use. The 409 chip seal is a preventive maintenance procedure for our roads. It's designed to save us, by applying that we save on bigger costs in other areas by doing that. We don't want to get to where we are, every time we do less and less miles per year, you prolong the cycle. You go from a 5 to 6 to 8 year cycle, the roads are going to get worse and worse and more time goes by before we get to them. To just put a little reality to it, that sums it up.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions.

John Rogers stated that it's probably putting the cart before the horse or whatever, but is it wise to put the 1 mill and the .5 mill together? Aren't we in danger? What if it doesn't pass, would we have zero money?

Joni Murgatroyd stated no, no. Next year we could put it, if it fails, we could put it back on as a renewal and then we would just have to cut back on our road program considerably.

John Rogers stated he understands, he's just saying.

Joni Murgatroyd stated, yes. Well, then we have to go back and we'll have to put it on probably as a renewal, but we are being completely forthright. If we didn't need this, we wouldn't be doing this.

John Rogers stated he understands that.

Joni Murgatroyd stated and yes, people could just say, they're tapped out and yes, well, next year is our last collection, so we have one more collection year next year. So, if necessary we could put it back on in the primary election as a renewal. But, people would have to understand, because people get pretty emotional about the roads you know, if there's a hole. They're going to have to understand that we're going to have to cut way back. If the chip and seal goes down to just several miles of roads, our roads are going to become in very huge disrepair.

John Rogers stated you don't have to convince me, I was just concerned.

Joni Murgatroyd stated that was a great question because she is in the office a lot and in the community a lot. She hears the people and they come up and ask about things. Our maintenance program is bare bones. They ask why we aren't doing the paving like New Franklin and such and well, if you compare the asphalt paving with what we are doing with chip and seal, it costs a lot more. In order for us to do that we would have to have another 2 or 3 mill levy to even begin a program like that. So, when you are talking about just the chip and seal, if we lose this levy then we will have no choice but to cut back because there won't be the money. Then, just with the year we've had in salt, we're in excess of \$60,000 in salt, just this year! We have a few other funds that subsidize the road maintenance, gas tax, motor vehicle license tax, permissive tax. Well, two of those funds only bring in anywhere from \$25-\$40,000 a year. There goes, that's your salt. That's not fuel, that's not hot mix, that's not the chip and seal. Then you have the wages for our people who are covered under the other road and bridge fund we have that his based on inside millage. But, as she's been reporting on in other meetings, all of our levies are going to be affected except, say for instance this one was renewed, because it's so old the property revaluation may not affect it because there is a reduction factor the State may be able to adjust in that case. All of the other levies are losing money regardless of whether they're just renewals because of the revaluations. It's unprecedented for the values to go down. Normally, they've all gone up.

Ed Diebold stated since 1992.

Joni Murgatroyd stated that's the thing. Usually when you have levies that are just renewed they're going to yield year over year about the same amount of what they were when they were passed. So usually when the property values are going up and that's why they apply a reduction factor to the levy millage. Say for instance you have a 1 mill levy, but at today's valuations they have to apply say for instance in this road levy's case, it's only like .4 something. In order to keep it collecting at that 1992 rate they had to apply that to keep the yield.

John Rogers stated he does understand that.

Joni Murgatroyd responded, so yes, and she completely agrees with him. That will be a concern, but that is why we always do these as soon as we are able at the first General Election. Then we have the collection year to put it back on if necessary and then we'll just have to bite the bullet and say okay, you didn't want that, we'll put it on as a renewal and hope that they'll pass that. We know everybody is feeling the same pain as we are. We also know how adamant people get about the roads and they still want you out there regardless of whether you have the money or not. We're being as honest as we can and this is modest. This isn't even grandiose in what we're doing. She explained that she sat down and ran the numbers and looked at it. This is just still a basic amount. This isn't even getting, there's no fluff in there.

Tom Seese stated we can't afford to cut back anymore on manpower. We've enjoyed having seven people on the Road Department up until recently. We're down to four people and there is no way they can continue to do what the seven used to do and they do a great job in the winter-time and all that, but we can't afford to reduce that department anymore.

John Rogers stated that he hopes all of our citizens want this. He thanked Joni for explaining.

Joni Murgatroyd stated you're welcome.

#### Reports by Department Heads

Lt. Michael Sanchez from the Summit County Sheriff's Office explained that he would start with the monthly report for September and then he has some other numbers to go over with regard to the levies and deputy staffing, activity levels and such. The September calls for service were at 898 calls. That brings the year to date total to 7,625 calls for service so far for the Township. Traffic totals for September were 116 citations issued, which brings us up to 121 citations for the year. There were 24 arrests made in the Township during September which brings us up to a total of 208 arrests for the year. He went over some numbers about the staffing levels of Deputies. A lot of times, as George brought up to him earlier, when there is a crash or something and people see three sheriffs cars there, they are like, well we have plenty of cars. What they don't understand is that one of those cars is for Coventry, one is probably a supervisor and one might be one that a supervisor calls in from somewhere to help, like the community policing car or something. As soon as the crash is done then those cars have to go about their regular business. During the first three quarters of 2010 and 2011, there has been a 6% increase in CAD activities for the Township, which is Computer Aided Dispatch. That could be anything from a deputy calling out a traffic stop to doing a senior check, to getting a dispatched call. So, don't think that is all calls, it's anything generated by a deputy in the Township. From 2009 to 2010, there has been a 14% increase in larceny related crime in the Township and a 31% burglary related increase. The narcotic related crimes are down 26%. That might sound like hey, that's good, it's down 26%, but the reason it's down is because there are less deputies out looking because they're busy responding to other things. They're being reactive instead of proactive. That's just one kind of deceiving statistic that he wanted to explain to everyone. For arrests in Coventry, in 2009 there were 262, in 2010 we're at 201 which is a decrease of 23%. Again, that is one of those false, misleading numbers where you think it's a good thing, but it's really not because there are less people out on the street looking for stuff. So, we really need to concentrate on getting those numbers back up. Really we want people out there being proactive, not reactive. Not going from call, to call, to call. Traffic citations by patrol district, in 2009 there were 1,410, and in 2010 it was down to 875, which was a decrease of 38%. Less patrol on the roads which in a vicious cycle comes back around in less revenue for the Township. He explained that they did a small comparison of the Township of Coventry with the City of Green. You're close neighbors here with the patrol districts. He explained that Coventry Township has five deputies assigned to it. It encompasses 9.2 square miles. The City of Green has sixteen deputies assigned and it encompasses 34 square miles. In 2010, the five deputies that worked Coventry took a total number of 777 incident reports. In Green they took a total of 1,114. So, for Coventry, per deputy you had them writing 155 reports a piece compared to 69 a piece for the deputies in Green. So, we had less guys doing about the same amount of work. He explained that there were 201 arrests in Coventry in 2010, coming out to about 40 a year per deputy. There were 208 arrests in Green, which came out to about 13 per deputy a year. Citations, there were 875 citations issued in Coventry which comes out to about 175 per deputy and there were 2,013 in Green coming out to 125 per deputy. The reason we are giving these numbers is to show you, the City of Green has a lot larger area to cover with a lot more residents, but you can see how close statistically that the numbers are as to what Coventry has and is requesting, and what Green is requesting as far as activity for the Sheriff's Office. The deputies assigned to Coventry Township handle 75% more events than the deputies assigned to the City of Green. There are 201 events per square mile in Coventry Township compared to only 98 in the City of Green. Coventry is a smaller area that has a lot more people compressed per square mile and things happening. These numbers do not include anything that was handled by a supervisor that went and responded to anything because the Coventry deputy was tied up. Those would be totally different numbers. The reason we are giving you these numbers is because the Coventry deputy is spending far too much time having to be reactive and not out being proactive to help reduce crime levels. The one deputy and sergeant for the levy, we feel could significantly help us get to the proactive level again. We could see more of those narcotic related arrests because the

deputies have time to go out and look for it and other incidents like that. A lot more time to spend on complaints like Ingleside park which is an example that comes to mind. People think that they're not doing anything, and they will, but a lot of times the deputy just doesn't have time to get to those types of complaints because he's going from call, to call, to call. He stated he doesn't know any better way to put it.

David Calderone stated that sums it up.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions.

Ed Diebold stated he could speak to that a little bit. His sister worked out here and a lot of his friends work out here and are sheriff's at night. Just to have one car out here, he stated he wouldn't want to be out here by himself and it's not fair to them that they're out there by themselves. Like she said, she pulls somebody over, or they pull somebody over and it's a DUI and they're arrested, they're back there doing paperwork for four hours and we've got nobody out here. It's a dangerous situation.

Tom Seese asked if there were any other questions. There were none. He thanked the Lieutenant very much and he excused him from the rest of the meeting.

Lt. Sanchez advised everyone that he has the complete presentation and if anyone wants it they can give him their emails and he can send it. He explained that he didn't go over the whole thing, he just wanted to touch on a couple of points. It has crime by time of day, days of the week and that kind of thing. If anyone is interested in the full version he can send it.

Tom Seese stated that we would put it online. If anyone wants to see what the deputy just reported we will put it on our Township website.

David Calderone, Fire Chief/Township Services Director, stated that to tail on what Lt. Sanchez said real quick, there are other things that we are doing that we're trying to deal with that loss of revenue and decreased staffing. If you remember a few years ago we were for the first time assessed \$100,000 for dispatch that we never were in the police department. The way we covered that was to reduce deputy coverage, our coverage, and it just wasn't mentioned. He thinks it is noteworthy. This levy will return that, but in the meantime there are other things we have done and the Sheriff has been working with us. For example, we now, for all interstate calls, the primary dispatched law enforcement for that is the State Patrol. So that then our community policing can stay in the community and the State Patrol, of which we all pay tax dollars to, that can handle the interstate. We're also working with our neighboring communities to increase the level of our mutual aid in the way that you see it, it's customary in Fire and E.M.S. If we need one more ambulance in Coventry, we can get one at a moments notice from any of our neighbors. Unfortunately, that is not the way it is in law enforcement. It just never came up that way. They have, and it's one of those things in the M.O. U. that was just signed tonight, is that the Sheriff has agreed to work with us to work with our neighbors so that we can provide and receive mutual aid when we have those instances. Earlier this week we ran an accident with injuries for example, over by Lockwood Corners and the Coventry car was tied up. There were no other cars available, we couldn't get any mutual aid and it was more than an hour before we got a law enforcement representative on the scene. We're going to see more of that as everybody cuts back. Just emphasis added on what he thinks has been a well documented need. He went on to his normal report and stated that there have been 1,228 alarms to date. There were 134 alarms, emergency alarms for the month of September. He explained that he would like to talk about the Ingleside Park parking problem that the Sheriff talked about and that we have had a chronic problem with too many cars, not enough parking spaces. We have been working on that and have made the decision to move the home-run fence for Field #1 in substantially based on the age of the girls. This will create more parking back behind Field #1. We have just gotten the signage to direct everybody over to that field. He and Trustee Seese have met with the league to talk to them and to encourage them to accept this problem as something that concerns them and to help us, the coaches, the parents, so people don't park on the neighborhood streets. Often there is parking available and they just choose not to because it's not as close as the game that they want to go watch. They have been really

good with that. So, we're moving this fence in and it's going on right now and we've got a bid, but as we always do, and he just likes it when a plan comes together, we tried to reduce the fee. Cardinal got the low bid to put the fence in, but we thought well, we can do that cheaper. We were talking and Trustee Seese was able to find a power auger to drill the holes, there are 29 posts out there to dig to move it. He explained that he talked to the Portage Lakes Girls Fastpitch, Joe Swain who is the Commissioner of the fields and he asked them, sent an email, he explained that he's been corresponding with their whole board, and asked if they could help us out. If we provide the machine, can they dig the holes and they jumped all over it. In the rain yesterday Joe Swain, his son and son's friend, for three hours went out there and dug the holes so that we could move to help alleviate this problem. So, we didn't pay for the auger, we didn't pay for the labor to dig the holes and Cardinal is now going to come and put the posts in. We are re-using old posts, we're re-stretching the old fabric, they're going to throw it back up. The league is coming back to put the crown back on it and the Road Department will fill the holes with dirt so we don't pay that extra because we have that in fill. It's a project that it looks like next spring we will have significantly improved parking and our signage. We will be needing, we have, he started it a few years ago, a meeting with the leagues in the wintertime to talk about what is going on with the leagues and what their needs are and what the Township's needs are and if we are having any problems through the season. That has worked really well. We've done that with concessions with football and Portage Lakes JVS and we'll do that again. The next step and he just wants to be real vocal about this. The next step at Ingleside and what they've been talking about is reducing one more field. There are too many cars and the reason there are too many cars, there are too many games and not enough parking. So if we can't get a handle on this parking, then the strategy, and he's shared that with the league and they understand, is that it might get reduced to two fields. We've already reduced it from 4 fields to 3. We took field 4 out so now there are three. If we still have a parking problem, in response to what is right for the neighborhood we will then consider reducing a third field and just have two fields. Thereby not as much of a parking need. Sufficient field space would be made available down at the Logan softball fields. He stated he just wanted to update that. To go back to the good side, we are moving the fence and we didn't spend as much money because some people kicked in and volunteered. Moving on to flooding at Brewster Creek and Killian, he stated that we had attendance and we know we have that chronic problem that he has been tasked to work on. We have been working on this, he explained that he has met with our attorney, Irv Sugerman. We are doing some things to talk to Akron about the plans for the Firestone construction that went on for the west golf course. He stated he has been looking at some diagrams on some other things that might solve some of the flooding on Killian. We've also met with Lael and the County and are going to be opening up some ditches. We're actually going to do some of that this year provided that things go well for us. We are going to open up some ditches to help get that water off of Killian Road and get those five or six homes that keep flooding from, prevent them from flooding, or so frequently. We are working on that. Brewster Creek, he explained that he has met with Summit County Emergency Management and he discovered that our flooding, our chronic flooding issues are not listed on the Summit County Hazard Mitigation Plan. There are only maybe one or two communities in our entire, he believes there are twenty-six entities in this County, that didn't have any risk and we were one of them. We certainly have issues that need addressed. He explained that he has been doing some investigation and has been down in Columbus, he's been talking to the Hazard Mitigation Bureau in Columbus and in order for us to have any shot at getting any grant money to resolve any of these flooding issues, particularly Brewster Creek and Killian which are our worst, the problem and he's simplifying this is in terms, but the problem has to be registered on the County plan. The County submits a comprehensive plan for everybody, submitted to the State. If we want to try to make some grant applications for some help to get some resolution to this, the first thing they are going to look at is if these problems listed on the County Hazard Mitigation Plan. They're not. He's asked that they are. They are going to be submitting and the Township and Trustees will have a chance to see that. All communities will have to reaffirm, it's time for renewal. The plan, either later this year or early next year you will see the Hazard Mitigation Plan come and you will see those two issues now listed and then we'll still have the opportunity to make changes. He has that going. Again, for the people, and it's going to have to be by video, but he keeps getting calls, which he should, from the Penguin, Brewster Creek and Killian people. He explained that he told them that this is going to be a long process, but if there is any

chance for us to do this, this is the first step. The next step will be a multi-month, perhaps as much as a year effort to put together a Hazard Mitigation Grant Application that has very specific information on what the resolutions are and how much money it would take and who is going to pay for it. It won't be Coventry. We don't have the money to do that. But, through Federal monies and from other local monies, the Muskingham Watershed District for example, there may be some funding available there. We'll work on that next. Right now we are just getting our problems listed in the County's plan. Once that has been approved we will then immediately begin a process of working through our Hazard Mitigation Grant Application to solve the problems. He stated it's going to take a while, but we've been dealing with Brewster Creek for thirty years and hopefully this will get resolved in a couple of years or less. He thanked everyone for allowing him to report on that. While he is handing out thanks, he wasn't at the last meeting, because the Board allowed him to go as a part of a State Incident Management Team response to New York. He thanked the Board for allowing him to do that. He explained that he spent fourteen days in New York. The first five days were in Long Island and the rest of the time he was in the northern Catskills in a relatively small community, about the size of Lakemore, approximately 2,000 population with a weekend population of 15-20,000. These people were decimated. They had nothing and we did a lot of good help for them and worked really hard. He stated that he logged 192 hours in those thirteen days. The Township paid him his normal salary and he has submitted all expenses that were incurred including the expenses of his benefits. All of that paperwork has been submitted and there are still expectations that complete restitution will come back to the Township. The way this works is, the Township pays him, the State pays the Township and then New York pays our State. So, it's all working, but we sent eight people to New York and we helped people who really needed it. He explained that they wanted him to say 'thank you.' He explained that he didn't know this about New York, he always thinks about New York City, but New York is a lot like Ohio. Rural towns and townships are the same, counties, and it was really, really rewarding and he thinks they did good and he appreciates the opportunity he had to make a difference. They did say, if you ever need help from New York, just call. That's one of the reasons we do it because you get what you give. The final thing he wanted to talk about, it's that time of year, leaves. Burning leaves. It is absolutely illegal to burn leaves. He asked residents, please do not burn leaves. It is illegal all the time, but it is also an extreme health threat if you do it in the evening or let it smolder through the night. He explained that he is not condoning the burning of leaves at all, in fact is telling everyone that it is illegal, but if you decide that you are going to be a criminal in a sense, then please try to be a good neighbor and don't do it in the evening or over the night. He explained that he took heat when he did this last year because it was like he was condoning the burning of leaves. He stated that he wants to be perfectly clear. Please bag your leaves. Do not burn them, it's illegal, it's not neighborly and he does not condone it. Please think about it when you pull out that match.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions for the Fire Chief/Services Director. There were none.

Lael Stouffer, Road/Maintenance Superintendent, reported that the Road Department is very busy. They have a lot of work to do and a window of opportunity before winter that is closing every day. We have obligations in the Township with some drainage repairs and we are going to get to those. One is the Killian thing and we have another obligation in Cottage Grove and a few others that he won't mention. Residents are waiting patiently and they will be getting there. They have to finish their hot mix and road repairs before it gets too cold. They will be wrapping that up, they've been diligent with it, trying to get things done. It's been a long year. He believed that he reported in August that they put more culvert pipes in than they had in the previous three years combined and that was eight months in. He stated he hasn't kept those charts up, he's been too busy, but he thinks at the end of the year he'll do another one just to show how busy we've been. It's been unbelievable with the storms we have had this year. We're trying to play catch up, trying to get things done. We're being diligent with it and being safe at the same time. We've had the Engineer's Office do some safety studies for us in some areas in the Township. Not because we felt they were dangerous, just because we felt there were some improvements that could be made. Those are going to be looked at and scrutinized over the course of this winter. Right now we don't have the time to spend on it so it's just temporarily on the back burner. We still have all of the information and we'll get to

it in due time. They're not dangerous situations. We have not come to a decision on our leaf drop off date yet, but we typically always did it the first and third Saturday in November. We're not saying we're going to do it on the third Saturday, but we will probably come to that conclusion. He asked residents to please bag their leaves. Do not rake the leaves into your ditches. When the leaves are raked into the ditches, you really don't create a problem for yourself, but you end up creating a problem for the guy three doors down. They all wash down there and clog up and end up in his basement. You would be surprised, every time he gets a call, it's the third person down, the guy up the street rakes his leaves into the ditch. There really isn't a way to address that, we can't be out there to catch everyone doing it all the time. He asked that everyone be good neighbors and keep the leaves out of the ditches. You're not hurting yourself, but you are hurting the people downstream and it happens a lot.

Tom Seese asked if there were any questions for Lael. There were none.

George Beckham, Zoning Inspector stated that he really had nothing to report.

Tom Seese asked if he was feeling alright.

George Beckham stated oh, yeah. He's just saving it for next month when he has a better shot at the newspaper.

#### Reports by Trustees:

Dave Bulgrin stated that he's in about the same position George is, everybody else is a whole lot busier than he's been. He really appreciates the fact that we have worked over the past year with all of our groups in taking care of the problems. For instance, he had a niece that plays over at Ingleside and different areas that he goes. He has been down in Cottage Grove there and they have done an excellent job of keeping the field. He gave the road department a big hand for the work that they do. They pick up the slack whenever there is. You guys are doing a great job, keep doing it.

Tom Seese reported that we've had, as you heard from both Service Director Calderone and Road Superintendent Stouffer, that we are having ongoing discussions regarding Cosmos, Buttercup, Killian Road as well as the Penguin allotment and all of that. Some things are going to be done and then we'll try to finish it right later. We're going to get started on something to make sure we alleviate some of the problem. Trash aggregation, at our October 6<sup>th</sup> special meeting we discussed with our Township Attorney what we wanted in the bid-specs. He is putting together for us a bid packet. So, we will be going out hopefully by the end of the year maybe for bids on that. One of our problems is whether it be exclusive and everybody has to pay or whether we can allow some people who wish to choose their own trash hauler to choose their own trash hauler. Lael discussed the leaf pick-up. By our next meeting we will have a date established for the one pick-up we are going to do, or more. You all remember the discussion about all of these little internet cafe's and the debate that Summit County went through along with the litigation and all of that. That's all been settled and he is proud to tell you that Coventry Township's first net from the County and the permits is \$54,375.00. He was advised by the County that this may be our last one because the State Legislature has already passed a new law that allows them to tap into those funds instead of the communities that are supposed to benefit by it. He is working with the State on an open waterway that runs from Portage Lakes Drive through the Coventry Schools property and then heads under Cormany Road and into Long Lake. The day before yesterday, behind Bittner's and Larry's house and the custard stand, when he drove by it was all the way up and over the top. That's not happened for twenty years and all of a sudden we find that there are beaver dams being built back by the track at the High School. The State has gotten permission from the School Board to bring some equipment in there in about two weeks to clean that all out along with the debris. That might solve that problem. He stated that he also wanted to thank Joe Swain because he could say that when he stopped over to his house last night he had been out over at Ingleside Field in the rain for three hours and he dropped that auger off. He had one of his boys and a buddy with him, but Joe did all the work. He thanked him for that, it was a nice

gesture. He reminded everyone that November 8<sup>th</sup> is the election and we have three issues on the ballot. Joni has explained why there is a need out there for that and to remind you also that this Board of Trustees has gone on record asking the Coventry residents to vote no on Issue 2, which is to repeal Senate Bill 5. That is an issue that protects jobs, including even our fire fighters, our road department people, our secretarial staff and all that. He asked everyone to please get out and vote. Lastly, he wished all of the candidates running for Trustee the best of luck. He announced that the next meeting will be November 10, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. here at the Coventry Town Hall.

**Comments from the Public:**

Bill Breitenbach from the Coventry School Board announced that Saturday, October 29<sup>th</sup> will be the Halloween 5k - Fun Run put on by the Win, Pin or Die wrestling group. That will be closing down Portage Lakes Drive for about an hour and a half at around 8:00, from 8-9:00. He wanted the residents to be aware that will be happening. Also, he believes that beginning around 7:30-8:00 over at what is now the Middle School, on Cormany Road the Band Parents will be having a pancake breakfast. He stated that usually the Township has a particular day set aside for beggars night, and maybe he missed it, but will the Township be doing that again this year?

Joni Murgatroyd stated yes. It's already.

Tom Seese stated that the Trustees have not, but he has read that there is a memo out that it will be on the 30<sup>th</sup>.

Joni Murgatroyd explained that there was a resolution passed several years ago that it would be the last Sunday in October, which would be the 30<sup>th</sup>.

Tom Seese stated he will say that he's had some people call him because that last year caused some controversy because we had a night other than the other communities had. We had a whole lot of outsiders coming into our neighborhoods. There are some allotments and that's not set in stone by this Board, but there are some allotments that do their own thing. The Township suggests that it be on the 30<sup>th</sup> so we can notify the Sheriff's Department that is what it will be.

Bill Breitenbach asked about the time for trick or treat.

Joni Murgatroyd stated that all of the information is on the Township website and we've also sent notices to the schools. Every child will get a notice to go home with them in their bag. So, that's already been taken over there. They've got all the notices, they were taken over this week.

Tom Seese asked if there was anyone else.

Geordie Kissos from the Summit County Engineer's Office stated that the Summit County Engineer's 2011 Annual Township Report was sent to the Trustees by transmittal letter. He stated he could answer any questions regarding the report. Within the next few weeks the Engineer's website will post the whole Township's Annual Report for anyone interested in those reports.

Tom Seese asked Geordie if he would, on behalf of himself and the rest of the Board, thank the Engineer for the work that was done on Portage Lakes Dr. It looks pretty good, hope it holds up, but it's pretty good. It was pretty quick.

**Motion to Adjourn the Meeting:**

Dave Bulgrin made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Brenda Patterson seconded the motion. Roll call: Dave Bulgrin, yes; Brenda Patterson, yes; and Tom Seese, yes. Motion carried 3-0.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

*Thomas Seese*  
Chairperson

*Eric Mergel*  
Fiscal Officer