

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Patricia G. Geissman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. with Stephen D. Hambley and Sharon A. Ray present.

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance and a Prayer.

At the beginning of the meeting the oral reading of the minutes of December 5, 7 and 12 was dispensed with. Each Commissioner has read them personally. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the minutes; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE on the December 5 minutes; and, Mr. Hambley and Ms. Ray voting AYE on the December 7 and 12 minutes with Mrs. Geissman abstaining.

Doug King, Administrative Assistant in the County Engineer's office presented resolutions approving the use of Subdivision Drainage Maintenance Fund for repair work in Golden Ridge Farms subdivision, closing a section of Abbeyville Road for a waterline installation, accepting and awarding the bids for aggregate materials, and the annual resolution reducing weight limits on county and township highways. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the 4 resolutions; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Doug stated that they had a 5th resolution to allow advertising for color aerial photography and digital orthophotos; however, the State did a statewide bid this year and the counties can join their contract. The Engineer's Office has elected to go with the state contract.

Commissioners reviewed the weekly permits list.

Chris Jakab, Asst. County Administrator/Finance Director, presented and reviewed resolutions amending the annual appropriations by transferring and increasing appropriations, various fund transfers, approving an agreement with Maximus, Inc. to provide professional consulting services for Medina County, approving agreements & services for mental health, literacy and parenting programs at the Jail, approving a contract for the provision of medical services at the County Home, approving a contract for beautician services at the County Home, purchasing fuel for the Highway Garage from Ice Oil, and the weekly bills in the amount of \$5,651,915.44. The agreement with Maximus is a renewal for 2006 in the amount of \$13,000 for their assistance in preparing the indirect cost allocation plan. The Jail agreements are renewals with Alternative Paths for mental health services in the amount of \$276,323, the Career Center's ABLE educational program in the amount of \$59,678, and the OSU Extension Service for parenting programs in the amount of \$1,065. The contract for medical services at the County Home is a renewal with Dr. Khandewal. The amount on the bills this week is high due to OWDA payments for the Sanitary Engineer. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the 14 resolutions and payment of the weekly bills; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Gary Berkowitz, Human Resources Director, presented and reviewed the personnel resolution. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the personnel changes; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Gary presented a resolution approving rate increases for the Line Maintenance employees of the Sanitary Engineer's Office in accordance with their approved collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the increases; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Gary presented a resolution approving the removal of an Electrical Inspector in the Building Department. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the removal; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

John Stricker, County Administrator, had no resolutions.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Ken Hotz, Sanitary Engineer, presented a resolution authorizing release of the escrow account of G.E. Baker Construction for the SR 42 sewer replacement and SR 162 sewer extension project. The project is complete and has been cleaned up. Mr. Hambley moved to approve release of the escrow account; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Patrice Theken, Department of Planning Services Director, presented a tentative schedule of Zoning Workshops for 2006. The first will be on January 26 on basic zoning, which will be especially good for new trustees and zoning personnel to attend. On January 18 there will be an audio conference by the American Planning Association and she is encouraging all members of the Planning Commission to attend.

Art Verdoorn, Building Official, presented and reviewed their November report, which shows construction is still following the same pattern. Residential housing has been a little slower than the last couple of years. For November they issued 82 new residential permits versus 78 that were issued in 2004. For the year, they have issued 847 new residential permits versus 953 last year. Commercial is still a little high and their receipts are about the same as last year. Total activity for the department has been about the same. He feels they will see a shift to more affordable housing in the near future. He agreed that 3-4 family units are reported as commercial, noting that the State requires commercial permits for residential development of multiple units.

Mrs. Geissman presented and read a resolution commending Frank Ehrman for his years of service with York Township. She noted that on Friday night Commissioners attended a potluck dinner to honor Frank. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the commendation; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Mrs. Geissman presented and read a resolution commending Virginia Mitchell for her years of service with the MRDD Board. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the commendation; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Mrs. Geissman presented and read a resolution commending Ronald Chambers for his years of service with the Sanitary Engineering Department. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the commendation; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Mrs. Geissman presented a resolution appointing Debbie Kiley to the Community Action Wayne/Medina Counties for 2006. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the appointment; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Mrs. Geissman presented a resolution reappointing Dean Harris and Robert Kenderes to the Port Authority with their terms ending December 31, 2009. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the reappointments; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Mrs. Geissman presented a resolution reappointing Dave Hartman to the MRDD Board with his term ending December 31, 2009. Mr. Hambley moved to approve the reappointment; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

The Clerk read the resolution to allow expenses of county officials. Mr. Hambley moved to allow the expenses; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

The meeting was opened for public comment and there was no one present wishing to comment.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Mr. Hambley moved to recess into Executive Session immediately following the discussion session to discuss personnel/ appointment and employment; Seconded by Ms. Ray. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed all Commissioners voting AYE.

Mrs. Geissman noted that there is an annexation hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m.

Commissioners recessed the meeting to move to the conference room for the discussion session at 10:00 a.m.

Skip Sipos, Metropolitan Housing Authority, presented and reviewed information about the Authority, noting that they are their own local political subdivision. They manage a variety of programs and own & manage 315 housing units. They are federally mandated. They serve 1,000 families per month and provide rental assistance to about 500 families that are at or below 50% of the county median income level. They have a family self-sufficiency training program as well as a homebuyer's educational program. They have received impact grant money from United Way, FEMA dollars and worked with JFS for homeless funds or PRC eligibility. He has an employee that has been helping people with applications and with getting their information to the appropriate agencies. They are short approximately \$17,500 for the salary for that coordinator. With the new Housing Council there is a need for centralized coordination of the various agencies that work with these families. A case management team can see anyone that needs housing assistance and help them apply for that assistance. The housing network was awarded \$100,000 coupled with \$10,000 to \$20,000 from the Commissioners. He is not sure what other money will come in but they will have to follow Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reporting requirements. Case management would evaluate all applications coming in, see what programs the clients are eligible for and coordinate any needed services they may need. For more success in bringing housing dollars to the County there needs to be central data collection. Evaluating the applications, having central data collection, and coordinating with all other agencies would help keep people from abusing the system by going to the various agencies independently. He proposed that Commissioners help with the administrative costs associated with this coordinated effort that will benefit many different programs. He also noted that he will be asking the cities for some assistance from their community development dollars.

Mr. Hambley stated that they hope to include this request in the budget hearings, and all Commissioners agreed to review the proposal further at that time.

Ms. Ray stated that she is still gathering information on the MedAssist Direct program. She would like to ask Commissioner Michael Fox from Butler County to attend a meeting in January to discuss this program. She understands Mr. Fox will also be meeting with Larry Long, CCAO Director. Mead Wilkins, JFS Director, has called the Butler County JFS about the program and the biggest cost involved is mailing the information. She would also like this included in the 2006 budget discussions. Commissioners agreed to have Commissioner Fox attend a meeting in January and to include the proposal in the budget discussions.

John Stricker stated that he has been working on a technical audit for each department under the Commissioners. The request to the departments is for a list of computer models, brand, processing operating system and software. This will give us the ability to analyze the appropriate maintenance of the equipment and to make sure legitimate software is being used by the departments. The departments have been cooperative and many departments do have an IT person. This inventory will help save money in the long run.

Ken Hotz reported that the 20% of the ODNR recycling grant that was not received has been released. The ODNR will have a grant program in 2006, but applications will not be taken until June and they will not be more competitive in nature.

Ken noted that the computer they took to the Hinckley Plant from the computer collection drive did need some cleaning up. Most of the computers from that collection drive still need some additional work done on them.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Ken stated that he took the liberty to respond to the State Representatives' letters regarding HB 304. It looks like this has been backed off, but we need to protect our sewer system because we can't shut that off for non-payments. He is hoping to get an exemption from the bill for the county's sewer billing. He will send a copy of his correspondence to the Commissioners.

Chris Jakab stated that he is looking at January 9-13 to schedule budget hearings, and possibly into the following week. Most of the budget hearings will be scheduled in the mornings. Commissioners are available January 10-12. He will let Commissioners know if any hearings will be needed the following week.

Chris stated that he had sent memos to the Commissioners regarding the life insurance coverage and prescription benefit management. He asked them to contact him if they have any questions. This will be further discussed during the budget process.

Chris reported that Manatron is in today and tomorrow for the Auditor and Treasurer's software.

There was a brief discussion about setting a time to go over office space needs with the Auditor and Treasurer. This was sent for the discussion session next Tuesday.

Commissioners recessed into Executive Session, which was voted on earlier in the day. The meeting recessed at 12:10 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:00 p.m. with Mr. Hambley and Ms. Ray present for the annexation hearing of 81.6673 acres of land from Wadsworth Township to the City of Wadsworth. Mrs. Geissman was unable to attend due to illness.

Mr. Hambley swore in those wishing to testify and noted that the hearing is at the point of accepting additional testimony from the parties involved.

Blake Gerney, Attorney for the Agent for Petitioners, presented an October 17 letter addressed to the Board by Zach Greaton of the Department of Planning Services as Exhibit 3. Through questioning he agreed that it is an addendum to the Department's staff report regarding some erroneous information that was provided by the ODNR relative to Mine #8 that was found to be underneath the property. That has been corrected and Mr. Gerney wanted that noted in the record.

Trina Devanney, Assistant Prosecutor representing Wadsworth Township, submitted the certified election results from the referendum as Exhibit 4.

Mr. Gerney called David H. Lewis for testimony.

Through questioning, Mr. D. Lewis stated that his business address is 8691 Wadsworth Road, Suite 100. He is a civil engineer and is licensed in Ohio. Their office has several licensed surveyors and they are the surveyor of record that prepared the annexation plat for this property.

Mr. Gerney submitted a reduced size copy of the plat as Exhibit 5.

Mr. D. Lewis testified that it is the plat prepared by his office. Their office specializes in land development projects, boundary surveying, residential/commercial projects and any type of project converting raw land into development. This includes utilities, infrastructure, roadways, plats for right of ways, and traffic engineering. He is familiar with the subject territory, adding that he has walked the property. The territory is rectangular in shape and relatively flat. The property is bordered by the city to the east by 2500', to the north by 250', and the total boundary that adjoins the city limits is about 37% of the parameter of the property. The property has direct property frontage on Hinckle Drive, a city street, and approximately 20% of the boundary of the property abuts city dedicated right of ways. Park Centre Drive stubs to the property with about

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

60' of frontage. Smokerise Drive also dead ends into the property and within those street right of ways are city utilities and infrastructure to service this property. He is familiar with Wadsworth Township and in his opinion the overall decrease in township property with this annexation is very minute; approximately less than 1/10 of a percent. He agreed that the property is about 1.2% of the total of the city. Having the city utilities available to the site will make it more easily developed and it can be developed in different ways; not only residential but commercial. Commercial development such as grocery stores, restaurants and dry cleaners would provide the general public with things they can use, not just single family homes.

Mr. Gerney presented an October 12 letter by Mr. Swaggart, which was already marked as Plaintiff Exhibit 1.

Through questioning, Mr. D. Lewis stated that he had reviewed the letter several weeks ago. Everything that Mr. Swaggart says appeared to be correct and his numbers appear to be realistic and correct. In his opinion, Mr. Swaggart estimated the total build out of the property using high factors of development. He picked the higher residentially zoned districts for this. Mr. Swaggart said the property has the potential of creating 600 vehicles per peak hour. He's not disputing that, but he failed to mention that if it's developed commercially that commercial traffic is not generating all new traffic. There are existing commercial businesses in the area and there's around 20% of the traffic that is shared and this property will capture that traffic from those existing businesses. That's decreases the 600 vehicles by 20% and takes that figure down to about 500 cars. An analysis of the distribution of traffic was not done, and not all of the 500 cars will enter this property at the same point. There's Hinckle Drive, Smokerise Drive, Park Centre Drive, Reimer Road and Hartman Road for traffic distribution. The most important thing done by a traffic engineer is doing a traffic study to see how the traffic will be distributed onto the roadway system. 90% of the existing traffic is on High Street because of the interchange with I-76 and the commercial businesses in the area. With this property annexed, about 60% of the traffic will go back out on High Street. This removes 300 more from the 500 vehicles per hour; leaving 200 vehicles that will be distributed along the existing roads. Not all of the traffic will use only one driveway or impact just one street. He agreed there is more work needed. This was a trip generation analysis that says there is this much acreage with so much being developed residentially and so much being developed commercially within city zoning districts and that you can expect this many trips. It's not a complete traffic analysis that says where the vehicles will go or if additional signals or turn lanes are needed. That can't be addressed until there is a plan that shows where the streets and driveways are proposed. He has reviewed the city's comprehensive plan that recommends the connection of Park Centre Drive to Hartman Road. It would be reasonable to make that connection someday. That connection would not occur as part of this annexation. On balance he believes it is important to the city and the community for this property to be annexed. Wadsworth Township can provide central sanitary sewer by means of extending the county sanitary sewer system, but they do not have the ability to provide a central water distribution system. In his opinion this sight could not be developed commercially within the township and about the only development that could occur would be large lot rural residential development. He doesn't feel that is an appropriate use of the land that adjoins so much of the city's dedicated right of way and backs up to Wal-Mart and Home Depot. He personally wouldn't buy a 2 acre lot there.

Through questioning by Ms. Devanney, Mr. D. Lewis stated that if annexed the general services to the area could include grocery stores, dry cleaners, restaurants, and any type of commercial or retail businesses including large box retail or daycare services. The general services include places of employment. He agreed that Smokerise Drive and Park Centre dead end onto this property. He expects that the largest percentage of traffic will come from I-76 onto SR 94 and then enter the project through Park Centre Drive or Smokerise Drive. They would then come back out in the same direction onto SR 94. The extension of Park Centre Drive to Hartman Road will not occur as part of this annexation. It doesn't have to be annexed in order to extend the road; noting that there are several streets in the City of Medina that transition into township roads as they leave the city. He stated that he was not aware that the neighboring property had been annexed and that the referendum was to put that land back into the township, noting that he thought it was to remove the land from the city.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Through questioning by Ms. Devanney, Mr. D. Lewis stated that the 20% of traffic is referred to as pass-by traffic, which is traffic that's already on the roads. Those roads could be SR 94, Reimer Road, Hartman Road or I-76 in which someone driving along stops to get a cheeseburger and then sees the Wal-Mart sign and visits there as well. To travel from Hartman Road to the proposed annexation territory you would go to Reimer Road, which adjoins to the north, and then take Hinckle Drive. He agreed that overall there will be an increase in traffic and that the numbers in the Swaggart trip generation analysis are probably correct. He would expect any traffic engineer to come within 10% of those numbers. He agreed that there would be a significant increase in the area generated from 81 acres of developed land; however, the report didn't say where the traffic would go or review the impact. Developing under the City would give greater flexibility to developers because they have the infrastructure and utilities to work with. The current configuration of the sewer is that it is conveyed by Medina County and is treated by the Wadsworth Municipal Treatment Plant under an agreement. He agreed that the land could be developed under township zoning for residential or any use that would not require significant sources of water. Under heavy commercial development he agreed there would be a significant increase in traffic, but that the streets are designed to handle as many as 30,000 cars a day, which is well under the ultimate design capacity.

Ms. Ray asked if Mr. D. Lewis and Ms. Devanney for their definition of significant and whether they have a number to attach to that definition.

Ms. Devanney stated that she does not, but there had been previous testimony from a number of people in the area that based on the 5 to 20 year history it didn't take them nearly as long as it takes now to go to any store in the area.

Mr. D. Lewis stated that his opinion of significant is anything that generates more than 100 trips per peak hour. This development will generate more than that and typically that requires a traffic impact study, not just a trip generation study. The City requires any development generating over 100 vehicles for any use to have a traffic impact study that identifies the existing capacity level on adjoining roadways within a half mile and how that traffic will impact those streets. If an impact is identified such as a significant delay at a stop light, that could require adding a turn lane; or a significant delay at an intersection with a stop sign could require adding a traffic light. The traffic impact study identifies the deficiencies in the surrounding roadway system and shows the needed improvements to bring the system back to an acceptable level of service. There were significant improvements to SR 94 (High Street) when Wal-Mart was developed. The Wal-Mart developer was responsible for those improvements, which basically widened the road to 4 or 5 lanes.

Mr. Hambley asked, in Mr. D. Lewis's opinion and based on the property going into the City and the type of analysis required that will look into mitigating the traffic that is generated, whether part of that mitigation would likely recommend following the comprehensive plan to extend Smokerise and Park Centre to Hartman?

Mr. D. Lewis stated that he doesn't think so unless an owner of this property also owns that property and it is within the same development proposal. Under that circumstance the City has the ability to require the construction of streets and dictate where they are constructed. He's not aware that any owner of this property owns that contiguous land to the east.

Mr. Hambley asked if other mitigating techniques could be utilized to deal with the traffic without extending Smokerise or Park Centre.

Mr. D. Lewis stated he would expect the City would require Park Centre to be built to the eastern limit in order to give an alternate distribution for the traffic so that it's not piled up and overloading one intersection.

Mr. Gerney called Richard K. Lewis, 981 Reimer Road, to testify.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Mr. R. Lewis stated, through questioning by Mr. Gerney, that his 15 acres is across from the proposed annex area in Wadsworth Township. He has lived there for 35 years and has seen quite a bit of change during those years. Traffic has greatly increased with Wal-Mart and Home Depot and it's tough to get onto Reimer Road. He feels annexation is the property thing to do to finish the "project" completely. By approving the annexation and putting the roads in property there will be a reduction of traffic problems that are even associated with Reimer Road. He uses Hinckle Drive to go around instead of going to the corner of SR 94. Once you start planning to extend the roads and they are done there will be a variety of routes for more access. He is a proponent of doing things correctly and putting in developments properly. The water system is a big issue and this land definitely needs city water and not having wells drilled for 2 acre lots. There is a lack of water and he's not sure how safe it is once a lot of wells start going in. The exit ponds that were put in for Wal-Mart have created a gully through his property. It used to run around 2-3 feet deep and now in some places it's almost 8 feet deep. They could control the amount of run off distribution by releasing the water in 4 days rather than 2 days. It's a matter of judgment on what should be done for the future and for the improvement of Wadsworth. He stated that Wal-Mart is an economical and practical facility but it has generated a lot of traffic in the area. With respect to large big box development, he wouldn't like to see that, but he doesn't believe that is what is being advocated. Having proper service to the property by the City would be beneficial.

Through questioning by Ms. Devaney, Mr. R. Lewis stated that he has 15 acres and that it is "sort of" country. He has lived on Reimer Road for 35 years. He came from Cuyahoga Falls. He has well water and a septic system. He chose the location for the good community and access to good schools, plus just knowing someone that had land to sell. The density for the property behind his is 258 homes on 58 acres. There is green space of 27 acres and the lot sizes are 55 X 125. That property was annexed from Sharon Township. He thinks the City has learned a lesson from that. Things can be done appropriately with the right kind of streets and lot sizes. There will be a need for roads to go through to Hartman Road. He agreed he is not an advocate for office complexes or big box stores, and that he doesn't have a say on the type of development going on within the city. If the traffic distribution is done properly to Hartman Road and also onto Reimer Road there will be different ways to give people more access. He agreed there are 258 homes going in behind him, new apartments on SR 94 and the potential for more homes being built, but he welcomes them. He agreed the Township is correct in expressing itself and that they should have a right to vote. Having the stores along the interstate is an ideal reason for the property's prospective of what should be done with it in the future. The distribution of roads will make a lot of improvements in the area. The reason he is not opposing this is not to improve his property. He feels the traffic situation will improve with the development and that eventually other annexation down to Hartman Road would be proper for the whole project. He trusts the City to do this property as they've learned some of their lessons.

Through questioning by Mr. Hambley, Mr. R. Lewis stated that in the last 35 years he has not noticed much change to water capacity with his well, but that the well is very susceptible to corrosion. The well had cast iron that got a hole in it after about 15 years and the rest of the well, about 200 feet deep collapsed. Plastic was then put down and they've been working off the plastic since. He has a water treatment facility in his basement with different types of tanks and filters that he has changed about 3 times. He's got about \$10,000 in the system. It is difficult for people with a zoning type that puts in 2 acre lots for homes with wells.

Through questioning by Mr. Gerney, Mr. R. Lewis stated that being developed on 2 acre lots with wells will not affect his well. He doesn't consider living there being in the country, noting that he is building a home on 300 acres in southern Ohio and that home has a cistern.

Through questioning by Ms. Devaney, Mr. R. Lewis stated that he has owned the 300 acres for 30 years. It is a cedar log hunting lodge that is used for weekend getaways. He doesn't plan to move there. As he gets older he may buy one of the condominiums on SR 94 because access to services within the city are extremely important as you get older and Wal-Mart might be the best place to shop because it's within walking distance.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Mr. Hambley asked that testimony be kept to the issues that Commissioners can consider, such as the balance of general good to the property and surrounding township area.

Mr. Gerney called Chris Easton, City Director of Public Services, forward to testify.

Through questioning, Mr. Easton stated that he is familiar with the territory and the process of annexation from the city's prospective. His job duties include being responsible for delivering public service within the city; public service includes sewer, water, electric, communications and streets. Upon presenting Exhibit 6, the city's resolution that states what services the city will provide, his role with the issuance of the resolution was to define the services that would be provided – police, fire, electrical, telecommunications, sanitation, emergency medical services and water. Those services are to be provided upon annexation, except for the electrical, telecommunications and water service that will be provided conditioned on the landowners paying for the extension of those utilities. This resolution passed on September 20th and there have been no changes in the city since its adoption that would affect that resolution. Relative to Exhibit 7, his signed affidavit about services and benefits to the proposed territory, he stated that paragraph 8 means the provision of water will allow flexibility on the development options and that increases the potential for additional tax revenues for the property and surrounding area. Paragraph 10 states the City has the ability and resources to provide the necessary services to the property upon annexation. The affidavit was signed September 28th and he believes those statements are still correct. The only change in the affidavit is that in the fall the city entered an agreement with the township for low cost telecommunication services. Those services cost township residents slightly higher than city residents. Exhibit 8, a 2004 study by Burgess & Niple, was done in response to development along Akron Road (Forest City Development) and other developments. The report was dated June 17, 2004. The report estimated that 2005 development projections. One projection was that in 2005 approximately 465 new home units would be built. In actuality at the end of 2005 approximately 140 homes were built. The report also projected water use in 2004 would be 2.349 million gallons/day (MGD) and at the end of 2004 the actual usage was 2.18 MGD. The actual construction and water usage were significantly lower than the projections. The 2004 water usage was lower than the 2003 usages that were 2.197 MGD. Exhibit 9, a graphic representation of average daily water demand for the city between 1984 and present and projecting to 2015, was prepared by Mr. Easton. This shows the average daily demand and the available well capacity projected. Between 1984 and 2004 there were 1800 dwelling units constructed and the water use went up slightly. The lineal projection is that they will not approach the current well capacity for 10 years due to the city's conservation & water usage for residential lawn sprinkling as well as the commercial and industrial users that conserve water. These are the primary reasons there was continuous growth with minor affects on the average daily water demand. The city authorized entering an agreement to purchase land in the city limits. This well, 7A, will add about 100,000 gallons/day. In addition the city is trying to acquire easement rights for a major water supply from Chippewa Township. Well 7A is expected to be on line in 2006 with the other being available in 2007. This process is being done to ensure the long term safety of water regardless of annexation or development. With maximum density for residential and commercial for this proposed annexation area he has no problem on the part of the city serving the area and he believes the territory would benefit from annexation because of flexibility and having central water & other alternatives for landowners. The city as a whole will benefit from the annexation. In reference to traffic, the city's comprehensive plan requires extension of roadways to Hartman Road as well as connections between Smokerise and Park Centre. He believes with development the city would mandate that construction to occur to relieve traffic on city streets by providing better access to commercial facilities for city and township residents. The property itself will benefit by having access to a water supply. The city has an agreement with the township to provide fire services and the extension of the waterlines and hydrants along Reimer Road in this territory to be annexed will provide those facilities closer to the township residents; therefore, their fire services would be better served and would be an additional benefit to the surrounding area. Page 2 of Exhibit 1, the Swaggart traffic report, states that this development will generate more than 100 trips per hour and that impact will require mitigation and a detailed traffic impact study is recommended to quantify those impacts. A development of this scale will require an impact study if developed in the city. Any traffic

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

study is attributable to the capacity of the existing infrastructure. The city has a transportation analysis requirement in their zoning code and a detailed traffic study would be mandated if the land develops in the city. The detailed study would require the developer to define trip generation as well as the origin and destination of that traffic and to examine the capacity of the roadways and intersections within ½ mile of the development regardless of whether the roads/intersections are within the city or township. That must be provided on an existing basis (no build basis) and must include any known development that has not occurred or some factor of growth over time. A level of service is then established within a city ordinance. If there is a negative impact the city requires the developer to provide measures to bring the level of service back to the existing level. The developer has to provide a plan for mitigation and their proportionate share of the improvements to mitigate. Mr. Swaggart was the traffic engineer when Wal-Mart was going in. The process took 2 years from the time Wal-Mart originally proposed building in Wadsworth. The resulting traffic impact analysis that was accepted by the city required significant on and off site traffic improvements. On site roads, E. Smokerise and Hinckle Drive, were required, the developer was required to deposit \$1 million with the city for traffic improvements to High Street, and financial arrangements for Wal-Mart were required for adding additional lanes to High Street. That development had approximately \$4 million contributed towards traffic improvements in the area. That is the same approach the city would use for any development any where within the city. He is not aware that the township has transportation analysis requirements, but feels they can mandate a study if they feel it is appropriate. Once land is annexed the first step is to apply for a zoning classification through the City Planning Commission. The Planning Commission reviews the comprehensive plan, including the thoroughfare plan, to determine the appropriate zoning classification and whether roadways are to be constructed. They hold a public hearing on their recommendation and once approved that goes to City Council. City Council considers the matter and also holds a public hearing before adopting a zoning classification. He agreed that public hearings are held by the Planning Commission and Council and that those speaking at the hearings do not have to be city residents. The city has certification in planning and the zoning plan is detailed as far as offsite impacts to avoid negative impacts on adjoining properties. He doesn't believe the township zoning includes offsite impact regulations. The city zoning code contains detailed traffic analysis requirements that may or may not exist in the township. Preliminary traffic counts have been done in the area and the capacity of the roadways is at level of service A, which is free flowing traffic. They have a scale from A to F for level of service, with F being full gridlock. Annexation and construction of roadways would probably improve the traffic flow overall by providing more access to the commercial areas for both city and township residents. With annexation the city would mandate construction of roadways for better access, which includes the looping of Smokerise and Hinckle.

Through questioning by Ms. Devaney, Mr. Easton stated that the services that can be provided by the city includes water, electric, communications, sanitation, engineering, planning and code enforcement, public building and park management, and construction management in the repair of streets, storm drains and sidewalks. Sanitary sewer service in the township can be provided by the county and property owners do have access to that.

Ms. Devaney stated that according to the Burgess & Niple report new significant sources are needed for water or the city will have trouble providing water to their residents.

Mr. Easton disagreed about having trouble supplying their residents. He noted that the report also makes recommendations and one of those recommendations was the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant. The city is in the process of that expansion and the project is about 30% done.

There was a brief discussion about a GeoScience report that questioned the numbers of the Burgess & Niple report. Mr. Easton is not familiar with that report and copies were not available.

Through further questioning, Mr. Easton stated that the city has an agreement for water distribution with Medina County where the city sells raw water to Medina County via a

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

transmission line in SR 94. There has been no problem and he foresees no problems in supplying water under the agreement. Under the agreement Medina County can be supplied with 150,000 gallons/day and their current usage is 70,000 gallons/day. There was a recent inquiry about extension to some property owners in Sharon Township. The agreement allows the city the first right of refusal. The essence of the conversation with the county about the request was that the city is hesitant to extend the lines into the township due to litigation for the expansion of the water supply system. The result of the conversations is that the city agrees it is appropriate to live up to the agreement and that it can be done once the well water system is complete. The litigation concerns the eminent domain proceedings that the city started on properties in Chippewa Township for the construction of a well water transmission line. This is one of the sources of water referred to earlier. That is still in litigation and is not a guaranteed source of water. He agreed that the Burgess & Niple reports states that the city is close to capacity and that litigation is ongoing for the one source of water.

Through questioning by Commissioners, Mr. Easton stated that the city has entered a purchase agreement and received preliminary site approval from the OEPA for Well 7A. That well will add 100,000 gallons/day and will be on line in 2006. This purchase was made after the Burgess & Niple report of 2004. The average daily use for homes is about 165 gallons/day. The city has been involved with projects that included off site improvements on township property. They negotiated with township property owners for improvements to the intersection of Hartman Road and Akron Road, which had a portion still in the township. He agreed that the city includes the impact on roadways whether it is within the city or not. The realignment of Hartman and Akron Roads was mandated with the Forest City project as well as the need for a traffic light being required at the intersection of Akron and Medina Line Roads, which is completely within the township. The city is moving forward to make sure that construction occurs. Relative to the annexation that was a referendum on the ballot, the city had not gone through the process of recommending a zoning classification. The projections in the Burgess & Niple report versus the actual use shows a projection of 460 dwelling units being built in 2005 and the actual number was 140. The report also suggested an average daily water usage of 2.349 MGD and the actual water demand in 2004 was 2.18 MGD, which was also less than the 2003 actual demand of 2.197 MGD. Based on water usage of 20 years the city has projected to have at least a 10 year capacity.

Mr. Gerney called Virgil Mochel, Wadsworth Township Trustee, to testify.

Through questioning, Mr. Mochel stated that the township cannot provide water to this territory, absent individual wells. Other developments in the township have drilled deep enough to find water. The township cannot run waterlines. Having water by annexation is a benefit depending on the property use. This area could get water and they aren't in the coal mining area. The city won't supply water to this area without annexation but they do through Sharon Township via the county. He is familiar with the Mount Eaton and SR 261 annexations and the township was opposed to both. He agreed that the 2 primary reasons for the township being opposed to these annexations was the desire to preserve country living for the surrounding area and that they are the voice for individuals who being annexed that didn't join the annexation petition. As far as he's concerned the area now being considered, 81 acres, is country living as there's no city there.

Mr. Gerney stated that at the October 17 hearing the township had witnesses testify against the annexation; Shawn Bousher talked about the deterioration of the water quality since Wal-Mart went in; Linda Strong talked about increased crime and break-ins since Wal-Mart went in; Jeff Tucker testified that he moved to the area to be in the country but he's now living in the city; Cheri Penwell talked about increased traffic and how she can't walk or bike on Hartman; and, Shari Thompson said it's difficult to get to the country roads because of the traffic, that cars are backed up 4 to 5 deep on Hartman and Reimer Roads, and she can't ride her bike over to Blake Road because of traffic. He doesn't consider the things the people testified about as being country problems.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Mr. Mochel stated that it's country as far as he can see but it is not desirable country living. He agreed, through questioning, that there are no other township residents being asked to annex and that all of the owners of this township land have asked to be annexed. This isn't a situation like Hartman Road or SR 261 where there were an immeasurable number of individuals being drug along.

Through questioning by Ms. Devaney, Mr. Mochel stated the township has asked the city on several occasions for some type of agreement for providing water to township residents or for annexation agreements involving a water exchange and the city has repeatedly has said no. The township has the ability to enter an agreement for water with other governmental entities and they are exploring other options. The township is in the beginning stages of talking with Rittman and Norton to bypass the City of Wadsworth for water. If they can get water from another source they will be able to provide for their residents and ensure the zoning is more country, which is the desire of the majority of people within the township. In a survey about 10 years ago the people said they wanted to maintain the country atmosphere. Exhibit 10, the survey of residents, was submitted. Mr. Mochel noted that the survey says 87% were in favor of preserving the rural small town atmosphere with agricultural activities, open areas and limited areas for large lot zoning. Currently people can develop under the township zoning and they can drill for water. The zoning for this proposed annexation is R2 where they would require 1 ½ acre to build a home with sewer or 2 acres without sewer. He agreed that one unit per 1 ½ acre is significantly different than 6 units per acre and that the 6 per acre would be a detriment to the area. Other detriments would be the traffic from those 6 units per acre. It is not a place he would want to live because he likes the open country. That's why he bought in the country 34 years ago. In his opinion there are no benefits to annexation.

Through questioning by Mr. Gerney, Mr. Mochel stated that they do not have a timetable for providing water to the property in question and that no one in the survey wanted to live next to a Wal-Mart because it's country living.

Through questioning by Ms. Ray, Mr. Mochel presumes the water in the area that is not over coal mines is good for wells. The township has had no complaints about the water table or anything like that. In every development in the township they have drilled wells and haven't run into any problems.

There was a 5 minute recess at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Gerney called Dennis Kreider, Wadsworth Township Trustee, to testify.

Through questioning, Mr. Kreider stated that annexation of this property for city water could be a benefit depending on how the city zones the property and what they put in. After a couple of questions, Mr. Kreider concurred that it would be a benefit to the property owners if they could get city water as opposed to drilling a well. If the property is not annexed and the land was residentially developed they would get their water by drilling wells.

Mr. Gerney stated that Mr. Mochel said he's not aware of any problems with water and that if anyone needs to drill a well within the township they go ahead and do that, and there are no issues with respect to that. He asked if people having problems with their water are one of the primary reasons the township changed their zoning requirements to make 2 ½ acre requirements for single family homes.

Mr. Kreider stated that if this particular territory developed under their zoning, which is 1 ½ acre lots, having 25-30 new wells dropped wouldn't cause a problem. He recalls his testimony during the Mount Eaton Road annexation when he said that since the survey was done the township increased the acreage from 1 ½ acres to 2 acres. The reasons for the increased lot size were the density issue and since everyone has a water issue they felt having less wells in the ground would be good. When the city enforces it's sprinkling ban and tells their residents when they can water their yards, its conservation, but it's different when the township tries to reduce the amount of water being used. He didn't say there was a problem with their water. He made

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

the statement because the water issue comes up every time there's any development in the township. As far as the township people with wells there isn't a water problem.

Through questioning by Ms. Devanney, Mr. Kreider stated that he has not heard of any problems with water or digging of wells in this particular area of the township. He is not aware of any drilled well that has been low or had problems. Changing the zoning ensures the rural nature of the township. The survey they did said people want a more rural atmosphere and to maintain that atmosphere. He did shopping over the weekend and had to go through the city at the north end. It was about noon on Saturday when he entered the city on Route 94 heading south. The northbound traffic was bumper to bumper in every lane, whether it was 1, 2 or 3 lanes, from SR 261 (Akron Road) to Smokerise Drive. He disagreed with Mr. Easton's statement that they have class A traffic on the roads in the area. He's not sure where another car could have gone to make it more gridlocked than it was. He's lived in the area 55 years and never seen traffic backed up like that. It's gotten worse over time as the area has been built up. He doesn't believe the traffic situation will get any better if this property is annexed and developed in the city. There's more commercial traffic there and even if they say 20% is already there, the other 80% is new traffic. The only benefit to the particular property owner is having city water. The township already has every other utility and service available to their residents. Relative to the agreement with Wadsworth Cable, that is not new service. The township already had an agreement with Warner Cable. Wadsworth Cable will now be available in parts of the township. He originally lived in the city and moved to the township in 1975 to get out of the city. Upon review of Exhibit B, the 139 acre annexation on Hartman Road, he stated that it was annexed and the city residents petition for a referendum for the November ballot. The city residents voted not to accept the annexation and the land was turned back over to the township. The vote was only within the city limits and no township resident voted on this, although many township residents felt they should be able to. Upon review of the certificate of election results on the referendum, he noted that it was to accept that land. It failed and that failure means the property remains in the township. That land can be developed under township zoning. That property is contiguous to this proposed annexation on the east side. The vote was a pretty good indication of what the city residents want. They had a chance to vote on it and said no. Growth isn't the issue. The issue is the amount and speed at which growth is going. He feels the city residents are saying to take a time out and correct some of the problems caused by the growth, which has been uncontrolled. Township trustees are responsible for putting in and maintaining roads, which used to be one of their biggest issues. Road maintenance includes culverts and drainage issues. He does not have a lot of confidence in the city extending roads to Hartman Road from past experience. The city needs to fix the problems they have before they add to it and he believes that is the opinion of the city residents as well. One issue that needs to be addressed is the bridge over I-76. There are issues with extending roads and dumping traffic onto 2-lane county roads, Hartman and Reimer Roads. He noted that Hartman used to be a township road but the county took it over years ago after doing traffic counts on the road that showed the traffic was too high for a township road. He stated that the first time he saw the WW GeoScience report was during the SR 261 annexation. GeoScience is a PA firm that did studies on the well tests the city did in Chippewa Township, and concluded that the results showed the wells would not produce like the city was saying they would. It reputed the Burgess & Niple report as not being accurate.

There was a brief discussion about no one having a copy of the GeoScience report, which was dated June 5, 2004. This was taken out for copies to be made.

Through questioning by Ms. Devanney, Mr. Kreider stated that during testimony on the Mount Eaton Road annexation (General Clay), there were a couple of people that had shallow wells that had gone dry. That is not an issue for this area. He agreed that the township is looking at bringing in water for their residents and they have talked with Rittman and Norton. They are in preliminary discussions now. He doesn't see any benefits with annexing this property. A detriment to the ½ mil surrounding area is the loss of rural atmosphere, noting that 1 ½ acres is rural and apartments & commercial businesses aren't. Once this land is taken in and developed, a developer will want to move on to the next contiguous property. The area is still rural and will remain rural if it is developed under township zoning.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Ms. Devanney presented the GeoScience report as an exhibit, noting that she thought it was already in the record.

Through questioning by Mr. Hambley, Ms. Devanney stated that the survey results are the only part of the township development plan submitted. Mr. Mochel thought a copy had been presented before.

Mr. Kreider responded that this property is currently R2 and would likely remain R2 if it were developed under their zoning. R2 zoning with water and sewer allows for $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lots instead of $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres. The only commercial area left in the township is the Marathon station at I-76 and SR 57. Their development plans do address commercial and industrial development, although there is not much in the plan. They do have a little industrial land left.

Ms. Devanney stated that a copy of their development plan would be sent later today.

Mr. Gerney asked for clarification that it was a 1996 survey that asked the residents whether they would like a more rural atmosphere.

Ms. Devanney stated that is correct and the trustees approved their comprehensive plan based on that.

Mr. Kreider stated that the plan was reviewed in 2000 and they are in the process of redoing that now. They received money from the Commissioners and sent out RFP's for assistance with preparing the plan. The Medina County Planning Department did the last plan, and they may do this update; however, the township wanted to see what private agencies had to offer.

Ms. Devanney presented copies of the GeoScience report.

Through questioning, Mr. Kreider stated that is the report that questions the Chippewa well fields. The big issues involved recovery time and whether those wells could produce like the city claimed they would. That was presented at the Akron Road annexation.

Through questioning by Mr. Hambley, Mr. Kreider stated that he is not aware of pump tests being done since the original ones that were reviewed by GeoScience.

Mr. Hambley stated that he is aware the city had additional tests done because of an increased standard by the State. The testing information was not available.

Through questioning by Mr. Gerney, Mr. Kreider stated that he was not stuck in traffic when he was out Christmas shopping. He was heading south on 94 and from Smokerise to SR 261 traffic was bumper to bumper heading northbound. Every lane going north was full.

Mr. Gerney stated that Mr. Easton clarified that he was talking about Class A traffic regarding Hartman and Reimer Roads.

Through further questioning, Mr. Kreider stated that he does not live near this annexation area but was elected by those people. He lives on SR 94 south of the city. Relative to getting water into the township, they have not proceeded very far along. There are no documented prepared and no idea at this time when that would happen. He would think that the referendum for the property adjacent to this would be a consideration by the Commissioners regarding this annexation because they are to consider anything within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile radius of the area; however, he was not certain they have to consider those in the city. He further stated that without knowing the law and what Commissioners actually have to consider, he would feel they should consider the rapid growth of the city.

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

Through questioning by Ms. Devanney, Mr. Kreider stated that he considers it a detriment to this property proposed for annexation as well as the surrounding area. Those detriments include increased traffic, inability to provide services, and going against the desire of the overall population, both within the city and township. He believes the referendum was a statement by city residents that are concerned about the growth, noting that township residents were unable to vote on that. He feels the detriments to the ½ mile surround property outweigh the benefits that could be perceived for the annexing property.

Ms. Devanney called Shari Thompson to testify. Mr. Hambley swore in Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Thompson stated that she had not planned on speaking but decided to speak because she was either misunderstood or was just misquoted and taken out of context. She still lives in the country – but barely because the city keeps moving over. It's only been a little over a year since Wal-Mart moved in and it was country then. The roads are country roads. They used to be able to bike ride over to State Road to get to Hinckle and other places because traffic wasn't an issue. Now traffic is an issue. Now she has to cut across other areas to get to country roads or ride back & forth half mile on Reimer Road. Wal-Mart and Home Depot is bad planning, zoning and development by the city. Now on 261/Akron Road there is a big commercial development and they've created a mess because they throw the traffic between those 2 areas onto country roads. The proposed annexation does impact her by leaving only 200 feet of frontage from her property line. Through questioning, she stated that her water is fine and there are no corrosion problems. She doesn't understand why the gentleman that has lived there 35 years does maintenance on his. The well is going to cost some money because you have to re-drop it occasionally. What others are paying to the city for water, people with wells put into maintaining their wells. The first hearing on this annexation was postponed until the results of the vote on the Hartman Road annexation. The city residents said to slow down the growth and to stop the sprawl.

Through questioning by Mr. Gerney, Ms. Thompson stated that she lives in the country and on a country road. The heavy traffic is not typical of a country road, but the city has created that problem.

There were no further witnesses to be called and the hearing was opened for closing statements.

Mr. Gerney stated that there has been volumes of information that, in his opinion, are not in the purview of the Commissioners to consider such as the referendum issue that was a reaction to city council's decision to accept property, or whether a city is growing too quickly. According to his information, things to be considered include whether all procedural requirements were met, whether there are challenges to signatures, and whether the appropriate city service ordinance has been submitted. Mr. Easton announced that the city is willing and ready to provide services upon acceptance by the city. Mr. Easton's affidavit says there are no streets or highways being segmented and no road problems created by annexation. The territory is not unreasonably large under State tests. Case law shows that an increase of a city or decrease of a township by 3-4% is a general range of acceptance. There has been no testimony on losing tax revenue as a result of the annexation that would keep the township from providing services to their other residents. In fact, depending on the type of development, the tax revenue for the township in the next 12 years will be significantly higher. As a matter of public record, this combined 81 acres brought in less than \$5,000 in real estate tax revenue. The Galaxy Restaurant development, which is on less than 2 acres, brings in close to \$35,000/year in real property taxes. Under current law over the next 12 years the township will receive tax revenue for the property. The revenue will be at 80% for the first 3 years and then on a declining basis. The property is not unreasonably large and it's rectangular in shape. It will not be difficult to delineate where township services should or should not be provided. The "on balance" test is broken down in 2 parts. The first part is on balance will the general good of the territory be served if annexation is granted. This reference is to the annexation property. There has been no evidence to suggest that's not true, even just by providing water which is a benefit in and of itself. The second part of the test is on balance will the benefits to this territory and the surrounding territory outweigh

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

the detriments. That ½ mile radius considers the territory within the township, not the city. There was testimony from city residents at the October 17 hearing that he doesn't believe should be given much credence because the test focuses on residents within the area. Several residents didn't believe annexation would be a benefit. Mr. Lewis said he believed the general character of the area is changing and this annexation is property use of the property. There were statements and testimony from the township that this is country living and their job is to preserve country living. This is not country living in this area. Relative to the traffic issue, Mr. Swaggart's report only tells us that if the property is developed there's probably going to be more traffic. The report failed to do what the city will do in the event the property is annexed and development is proposed. The city will review a criterion that needs to be satisfied. The city won't just look at this area but also at the surrounding area. They will make the developers pay for improvements. Wal-Mart paid \$4 million to upgrade roads. There have been people that have said this will help traffic by giving more options. They have to figure out where the traffic is coming from first, and you don't just come from your home. There is a detailed analysis that will be done. You have 100% of the owners wanting the property to be annexed and Ohio law is clear on this topic – that is to be given great weight in the decision.

Ms. Devaney stated that the question comes down to the weighing test – do the benefits to this property and the surrounding ½ mile outweigh the detriments to the properties. It does not. There has been testimony about increased congestion and that the road for the proposed annexation providing commercial districts within the area will dead-end at the boundaries, thus feeding traffic back onto SR 94. Mr. Kreider testified that this past weekend he saw bumper to bumper traffic on SR 94. Putting additional commercial density in the area will not help the traffic situation. If you take the contention that 20% of the traffic study is ancillary traffic you still have an 80% increase in that area. There was testimony about not being able to ride bikes on the country roads any more due to the increased traffic. There was testimony on October 17 about increased road congestion, increased crime and high density all around the territory. None of this was deemed to be a benefit by any of the people testifying on the part of the township. It was deemed a detriment. City residents put to a vote the annexation issue of a neighboring property and through that vote they said they don't want that annexed property to be part of the city. It was a statement to slow down growth. Increased growth and sprawl in this area without controls is not a benefit to the area. It is a detriment to the surrounding areas. These residents are the ones that have to deal with the increased crime, traffic, and potential water issues because of growth in the area. One of the main factors the city proposed during the hearing was bringing Smokerise and Park Centre through to Hartman Road. One of the main benefits touted at the October 17 hearing was that those roads going through to Hartman would be achievable in the near future to take care of the road congestion. That's not going to happen now. There were conflicting statements from the city as to whether or not water could be provided. Mr. Easton testified today. On October 17 the city witness didn't know if they could even provide water to the area. The Burgess & Niple report says that water is an issue and that if the city doesn't take some steps they'll be at capacity. Mr. Easton testified refuting that. However, the GeoScience report says that even the Burgess & Niple report was not a correct statement on water usage. The city is very good at saving water – they've been putting bans in affect for a few years. Are they going to lower sprinkling to once a month or tell people they can't have gardens? How will they preserve water for everyone within the city? Based on the testimony at both hearings the detriments to the surrounding area far outweigh any benefits that could be achieved by this territory being annexed to the city.

Ms. Ray moved to close the annexation hearing; Seconded by Mr. Hambley. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed both Commissioners voting AYE.

Ms. Ray moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:09 p.m.; Seconded by Mr. Hambley. There was no discussion. Roll Call showed both Commissioners voting AYE.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED:

05-1162

RESOLUTION TO ALLOW CLAIMS AND AUTHORIZE ISSUANCE UPON THE TREASURER
IN SETTLEMENT OF SUCH LIST OF CLAIMS

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

- 05-1163 RESOLUTION COMMENDING FRANK EHRMAN FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE WITH YORK TOWNSHIP, MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

- 05-1164 RESOLUTION COMMENDING VIRGINIA MITCHELL FOR HER YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE MEDINA COUNTY BOARD OF MENTAL RETARDATION AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES (MRDD)

- 05-1165 RESOLUTION COMMENDING RONALD H. CHAMBERS FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE MEDINA COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

- 05-1166 RESOLUTION APPROVING USE OF SUBDIVISION DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE FUND FOR REPAIR WORK IN GOLDEN RIDGE FARMS SUBDIVISION IN WADSWORTH TOWNSHIP, MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

- 05-1167 RESOLUTION DETERMINING THE NECESSITY TO CLOSE ABBEYVILLE ROAD (C.H. 47) BETWEEN WOLFF ROAD NORTH (T.H. 94) AND WOLFF ROAD SOUTH (T.H. 94)

- 05-1168 RESOLUTION ACCEPTING AND AWARDDING THE BIDS FOR AGGREGATE MATERIALS FOR USE BY THE MEDINA COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

- 05-1169 RESOLUTION TO REDUCE WEIGHT LIMITS ON IMPROVED COUNTY AND TOWNSHIP HIGHWAYS AS AUTHORIZED BY THE OHIO REVISED CODE, SECTION 5577.07

- 05-1171 RESOLUTION AMENDING THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

- 05-1172 AUTHORIZING CASH TRANSFER FOR THE COUNTY HOME LEVY FUND

- 05-1173 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE CHILDREN SERVICES IV-E FUND (0050) TO THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FUND (0120) FOR CHILDREN SERVICES (IVE) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES

- 05-1174 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE CHILDREN SERVICES SCPA FUND (0050) TO THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FUND (0120) FOR SCPA ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES

- 05-1175 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE CHILDREN SERVICES FUND (0050) TO THE JFS-PROTECT OHIO FUND (0055) FOR THE PROTECT OHIO MATCH

- 05-1176 CASH TRANSFER TO THE CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S HEALTH FUND

- 05-1177 CASH TRANSFER OF INTEREST INCOME FOR VARIOUS SANITARY ENGINEER FUNDS

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

- 05-1178 CASH TRANSFER OF INTEREST INCOME FOR VARIOUS FUNDS

- 05-1179 RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AGREEMENT WITH MAXIMUS, INC. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR MEDINA COUNTY

- 05-1180 APPROVING AGREEMENTS AND SERVICES FOR MENTAL HEALTH, LITERACY, AND PARENTING PROGRAMS AT THE MEDINA COUNTY JAIL

- 05-1181 APPROVING A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF MEDICAL SERVICES FOR THE MEDINA COUNTY HOME

- 05-1182 AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT FOR THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES OF A BEAUTICIAN FOR THE MEDINA COUNTY HOME

- 05-1183 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF 5,500 GALLONS OF DIESEL AND 1,500 GALLONS OF REGULAR UNLEADED GASOLINE FOR THE MEDNIA COUNTY HIGHWAY GARAGE

- 05-1184 RESOLUTION APPROVING PERSONNEL CHANGES FOR THE EMPLOYEES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE MEDINA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

- 05-1185 RESOLUTION APPROVING PERSONNEL CHANGES (SALARY INCREASES) FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE SANITARY ENGINEERS DEPARTMENT

- 05-1186 RESOLUTION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZIGN THE REMOVAL OF VICTOR RUSSELL, ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR, BUILDING DEPARTMENT

- 05-1187 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SANITARY ENGINEER TO RELEASE THE ESCROW ACCOUNT OF G.E. BAKER CONSTRUCTION INC. FOR THE SR 42 SEWER REPLACEMENT & SR 162 SEWER EXTENSION MCSE #500/200-48.3.1

- 05-1188 RESOLUTION APPOINTING A MEMBER TO THE COMMUNITY ACTION WAYNE/MEDINA COUNTIES

- 05-1189 RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE MEDINA COUNTY PORT AUTHORITY

- 05-1190 RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING A MEMBER TO THE MEDINA COUNTY MENTAL RETARDATION & DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES (MRDD) BOARD

- 05-1191 RESOLUTION TO ALLOW EXPENSES OF COUNTY OFFICIALS

COMMISSIONERS MEETING – MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2005

MEDINA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:

Patricia G. Geissman

Stephen D. Hambley

Sharon A. Ray

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela J. Terrill, Clerk