

Work Session January 20, 2026

**MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL WORKSESSION
SHEFFIELD LAKE, OHIO
January 20, 2026**

The regular meeting of the City Council Work Session was held Tuesday, January 20, 2026. President Rosso called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Present: Rosso, Morrow, Fogel, DeBottis, Petrucci, Gee, Cizl, Mayor Radeff, Law Director Ward.
Excused: Kovach, Service Director Hastings, Finance Director Rummell
Attending: Citizens, Building Official Gudat, Videographer, Dan Givens/Republic Services.

*******COMMITTEES*******

ROADS & DRAINS: None. /**SAFETY:** Excused. /**BUILDINGS, LANDS, VEHICLES & EQUIPMENT:** None. /**ORDINANCE:** None. /**FINANCE:** None. /**PARK BOARD:** Excused.

*******ADMINISTRATIVE*******

MAYOR: Mayor Radeff has no report. /**SERVICE DIRECTOR:** Service Director Hastings is excused. /**FINANCE DIRECTOR:** Finance Director Rummell is excused.

LAW DIRECTOR: Law Director Ward has no report.

PRESENTATIONS: Republic Services-Lengthy presentation with the following key points/questions:

Dan Givens, Municipal Manager for Republic Services states we have before you a renewal or re-up for a multi-year contract to fix the trash in your community. Councilman DeBottis says I had asked a question, and I apologize, Service Director Hastings isn't here. He said if we got some other competitive bids, and his answer to us was that there's a chance we may lose your bid seeking other bids. Mr. Given responds your community has the ability to do what they want with regards to either going out for a formal bid or not. What we try and do when we're in these situations is to put our best foot forward, give you the best discounted rate that I can give you. After numerous discussions, I've met with the service director, I've met with the mayor, we've gone back and forth with pricing. We've whittled it down to basically the best rate that we can. Once a contract goes out for a bid with a community like yours, it has to go through multiple levels of our company. At that point in time, we have less control over the numbers that are

Work Session January 20, 2026

provided. I'll use the city of Bay Village as an example. We did the same thing that we're doing with you right now. We put our best foot forward, we presented our numbers, negotiated back and forth locally on this. They decided to go out for a bid, which is fine, it's within their rights. They went out for a bid, by the time it was done and it went through the multiple levels that we have to go through then for a public bid, their bid cost them an extra million dollars over the life of the contract. You put it out for a bid, at that point in time all the companies come together, they submit their numbers, and it's always the best example of what took place. In this example, we talked to the drivers, we talked to the supervisors, we talked to everybody that was involved, your people as well. Since we didn't have to go through that elongated process, we were able to eliminate the multiple levels that may be reviewing this. We really feel this is the best opportunity that we have. If you look at your previous contract, which we went down a similar path, and take a look at it historically, in our industry, basically there is a portion of CPI, which is run by the federal government, that covers our industry. It's called WST, water, sewer, trash. Water, sewer, trash, over the same period of time that your contract went through the last time, the price variation from start to finish showed a 34.5% difference. Your contract, the last time, based upon the way it was drafted before, only went up 10%. As we are looking and doing more communities and bidding more communities, our company is really focused on what the federal government has documented with regards to raw costs. If we go through that process, that's something they're going to consider again. It's a roll of the dice, is what I'm basically telling you. Locally, we've whittled this down as low as we can get it. I think, based upon your service director at the time, he was talking to the Solid Waste District, and looking at the competitive rates that were out there, we're giving you a good community. Councilman Fogel asks Mr. Mayor are you aware that the senior discount from Republic Services is only \$1 per month? Mayor Radeff replies yeah, that's what we talked about. Councilman Fogel says this was kind of presented as a benefit to seniors. Why that wasn't challenged as misleading. What can you buy with a dollar? Do you have any idea what you can buy with a dollar? Mayor Radeff responds it's still a discount. You're paying less as a senior. It's in there and you are going to vote on a contract. Councilman Fogel says I googles what you can buy with a dollar. Mayor Radeff replies the point is there is a senior discount. That's what the standard is throughout. Is that not what the standard is Mr. Given? Mr. Given replies most communities that win when we're offering a discount, it's a dollar a month. Basically, if you're using \$20, it's a 5% discount. Councilman Fogel says I thought that was presented as kind of a caveat to this contract, but I don't think you can buy anything meaningful for a dollar. Maybe some instant noodles? A postage stamp? Something they could send their bill in with; a postage stamp with their dollar savings. Mr. Given asks would you like us to remove the discount? Councilman Fogel responds that's up to you. I'd like you to give a real discount to help the seniors out. Mr. Given replies the request was to

Work Session January 20, 2026

have senior discount comparable to all of our other contracts that were in place. We mirrored the other contracts for the vast majority of the communities that we have. Councilman Fogel replies well, it's unfortunate that these other communities accepted a dollar discount per senior. Frankly, I think it's an insult to tell you the truth. I mean, you have a senior that uses a much smaller... They're not going to produce as much garbage as a normal family does. So, to give them only a \$1 discount is just, I don't see any benefit to that and you want us to give you a 4% increase over 5 years, which would be a 20% increase after 5 years, but you're going to reduce the service by like 75%, because we are going to go from unlimited bulk to 4 items a week. Mr. Given replies I think if you look at the concept of bulk, there's a misjudgment. The vast majority of the residents do not put out bulk on a regular basis. We went before, there was, I don't recall where your community is, but there was bulk that was collected, you know, once a month, once every two weeks. You know, now it's down to once a week. So, I know for myself, I can't remember the last time I put out bulk at my house. Most of the time people are putting out bulk if there's a major storm, if they're having a graduation party or something, or if they got a new washer and dryer, a new microwave, something that wouldn't fit inside the cart. Having a collection of once a week to add bulk up to 4 items, I would make the recommendation to communities when they're asking what bulk standard you should go with, I recommend people should go with 2, because when you're going with higher, say for example if you wanted to go to 8 or unlimited, now we have to assume that the vast majority of people are going to have multiple levels/quantities of bulk on their front lawn. By that, it means I'm taking a longer amount of time. That means I'm taking that truck and I'm driving it to the landfill a lot more often than what I would normally go with regular trash pickup. Those are all things that we have to consider based upon assumptions of 2 items, 4 items, unlimited. When people are saying that everything should be unlimited, what you're doing is you are benefiting those very minute number of people that may have larger quantities. Then ultimately, the community as a whole is raising their entire rate up to offset those few people that put out a lot. So, whether it's one or two families that have a lot or it's a landlord that's constantly turning over his clientele, filling up the tree line, now the community is paying for that individual's request for service when 99% of the people will never need that level of service. Councilman Fogel says that makes no sense. If you're not concerned about the level of bulk, then why limit it and why raise the price? Why raise the rate if you're going to lower the service? If you're going to decrease the amount of service, but you want us to give you a rate increase, it doesn't make any sense. We should get a decrease. If we agree to the four items a week, we should get a 4% decrease. My suggestion is the city maybe entertain a one-year contract and explore the possibility of carting/hauling our own trash. President Rosso states you mentioned about a lot of bulk when there's after a storm or a major incident, if you will. At those times, is there any process that you identify, hey, there was a major incident

Work Session January 20, 2026

and for that week's trash, we'll pick up more? Or you say, hey, there's a lot of extra trash due to a storm and flooding or whatever, so we will provide more dumpsters for residents to bring that off. Mr. Given responds yes, I forget the year, whether it was 2022 or 2023, the entire coast of Lake Erie got hit with that storm. I'll use the city of Lorain as an example. The city of Lorain's bulk requirement is they don't have an item number. They just say the pile can only be 5x5x5. If we would have stuck by the 5x5x5 after that storm, they probably would have had trash on their front lawn for eight or nine months. That's how bad the city of Lorain was. I'm sure your community was affected as well. So, at that point in time, when those situations occur, usually the mayor, the safety service director, they make a phone call to us. They tell us what's going on. We come out and do the investigation and see what we can do. I mean, our guys are committed to their work, if you had a four-unit maximum on your contract and that one resident who never puts anything out, put out five this week, my driver's probably 99% sure he's going to pick it up for the simple fact that if he's going to leave it, first he has to call up his supervisor, then he has to tag it, then he has to take pictures of it and load it into the computer. By the time it's done, it's easier to take. Yes, we do take those things into consideration and work with the communities. Councilwoman Gee says #5 on the contract discusses that and what they will do for us in the event of a storm. Councilman Morrow says I talked with some business owners who are also residents, so they're looking at it from two perspectives. Surprisingly to me, they did not mind the first-year increase. They said, you know, hey, we have a good price on refuse removal, and we shouldn't look a gift horse in the mouth. They did balk at the 20% increase then with the reduction of what we're talking about here of not being able to have unlimited amount. I do think that we should look at all of our options when discussing this, including potentially us looking at doing trash removal. I know other communities that have taken that up. Sometimes that's a benefit, sometimes it's not a benefit. One of the things that I will say is that the decision was, I guess, more or less made in, I don't want to say a vacuum as far as this negotiation on this contract, but I know from hearing from a bunch of our people, they're like, well, if we can't get unlimited, could there be like once a quarter having like a much larger amount just in case that they have it so that they don't get trash that builds up? Things like, oh, we're going to take down an old plastic shed in our backyard. Well, now that would be, you know, maybe more than what's allowed now, and they would have to look at some other way to get rid of it or just end up burning it in their backyard, you know, against our rules and regulations within the city. I didn't know if there is any type of movement there. The 20%, I think that if it was cut down over the same five years to say 15% total, I think that there would be a lot more people that would be happier with that. Nobody is happy with any type of a bill that goes up, but, you know, we have inflation, you have fuel costs, you have labor costs, you got to be able to cover all that. I understand that. Whether or not that's excessive, I'm sure that you guys built in a

Work Session January 20, 2026

little cushion there as all good business people do. I'm just looking at doing that at the same time as reducing services just has a bad perspective among the community, even though they say, hey, we're getting a good deal. We'll get a good deal in another year, but maybe four years down the road, we don't like that deal, because maybe inflation wasn't that high, maybe fuel prices went down. Is there anything that we could look at putting a variable in there? Let's just say diesel costs or natural gas; I'm not sure what your trucks run on or gasoline costs, if that goes down, is there a way that we could get a benefit by a reduction if you have some of your costs go down? Mr. Given replies yes, another contract that I was just involved with, we had the price/percentage locked for I believe the first 3 or 4 years and then after that, we had language in there that we would go off of the rolling consumer price of the water, sewer, trash. That way the community can feel that they're getting a fair deal that should the market go down, they would reap the rewards. I throw the caveat out there, because if the market goes up, then you know, it's not going to be 4%, it's going to be 6%, because you're basing it off of that specific metric. The reason why I put the caveat out there, is we know that within the last X number of years, the world has gone crazy. Pricing is all over the place. Six, seven years ago, before that, the expectation for an annual price increase was usually 3%, 3% was locked everywhere. If you look at what's going on, that's tracked through the federal government with regards to our industry, the pricing for our industry over the last year, I think it was 6.5% and 6% and 5.5%. So, the price has significantly increased and exceeded our expectations. So, we'd be happy to consider after the first few years of having a locked price to put a metric in there, such as that. I just want you to be careful. We have no idea where it's going. Once you go with that for an extended/longer, if high inflation comes through and there's nothing we can control, that annual amount is going to go up. Whereas if it's locked, and we've proven this to other communities, when it's locked, even when the world goes crazy, we don't walk away from that contract. We will continue on with that contract. President Rosso says Mr. Morrow brought up about if someone takes down a shed. You provide x amount of dumpsters a month for the city, right? I believe there's no charge. Councilwoman Gee responds on page 5 it talks about them being supplied to us free of charge. President Rosso replies so, where I was going with this is residents can bring stuff up and put it in a dumpster at no charge. Councilman Fogel asks what do you define as 4 items? Mr. Given responds 4 items, 4 washing machines, 4 big boxes, 4 garbage bags, etc. Councilwoman Gee asks part of BFI's, and correct me if I'm wrong here, they help us with our leaf pickup? That was part of the deal that we had with them when we got our leaf truck and everything else, was that they assisted with that? I'm not saying about doing the pickup. If Pat was here, he could verify and explain in detail what I'm talking about. They were very instrumental in us getting that moving forward and getting the leaf truck. The fact that we get 2 dumpsters every week from them, it's announced constantly, but I do realize a lot of residents don't know. If you need it, you call,

Work Session January 20, 2026

they're here. They're always there. They also supply for the community center and that's really an asset, too. I understand a dollar's only a dollar. I'm a senior and \$12, that isn't that much a year, but I know seniors that that does mean something to. Yes, I wish it was more than that, but I'm looking at things that you are offering us that we didn't use to get for free included in the deal. I really believe the good outweighs the bad in this deal. Mr. Given says one additional thing you need to consider, and most people don't, is you're looking at it as, okay, we're only picking up your trash, or we're driving by once a week and picking it up. We have multiple trucks driving by your house once a week to pick up your trash. The other thing is, once we pick it up, I own your trash for 30 years. That trash is going to the landfill. The vast majority of our costs are the landfill, maintaining the landfill, dealing with the methane gases, dealing with the Ohio EPA, dealing with everything else that goes along with it. There's a lot of costs there just for the equipment there, the science there, the engineers that have to be there, and the continued expansion of the landfill. So, these are all the things

that we have to put in play to establish your pricing. For less than a dollar a day, you can put this stuff out on your front lawn and you know it's going to disappear.

Councilman DeBottis asks what is the biggest senior discount that any city has gotten so far? Mr. Given replies I don't have that in front of me, but the vast majority of our contracts have a historical dollar discount. Councilman DeBottis asks your bids when the city has accepted them, is there a website that we can go on to what those bids were and what was accepted? Mr. Given replies you would have to do a public records request at each individual community. Councilman DeBottis says eligible senior citizens, tell me what the word eligible means. Mr. Given replies it's based upon what Lorain County has established as an eligible senior citizen for their homestead discount. Brief back and forth about the homestead discount. Councilman Fogel asks so, I know in other communities that the waste haulers will either put out a smaller can for seniors, and then they can reduce the costs that way, or they won't have a can at all, they'll let them put out like a bag of trash. Do you have that? Is that possible? Mr. Given replies I would suggest that if you, if council wants something totally different, put something in writing to me, and, you know, it can be considered. But, like I said, now I'm taking you back to a whole bunch of other people to review the pricing. Councilman Morrow says normally you let the executive negotiate the deal or the contract.

I mean, that's part of being the executive. Maybe we should have been a little bit more proactive with input as to the details of it. I've seen other communities, like down in Florida, where instead of having a 105-gallon trash container, the elderly have a 50-gallon trash container or a smaller, half-the-size trash container. So, they have a much lower, like \$5 or \$10 less for coming to get that. Now, where you're living in a condominium and you're elderly, that's probably something that may be realistic, but if you're a homeowner and you're elderly, it's probably not realistic. I believe in being able to give choices. The only thing that I would say is that if we

Work Session January 20, 2026

do do this, that we only do it once, so that it's not like giving him one thing and then a day later another thing and then another thing a day later, because that'll make you go bald like me trying to produce a quote for a city to get something that's manageable. I'm just offering that if we do do that, that we may get 1 paper, 1 sheet to him rather than doing it piecemeal. President Rosso says we can share some of these concerns with Pat or Patrick and go from there. Councilman Cizl states I want to thank you for coming and making a presentation to us. I'm sorry that Pat Hastings isn't able to be here, but I've always, being on council, I've always felt that what Mr. Morrow was talking about, it's the executive's responsibility to be negotiating, and we oversee that, and they ask us for that input. I didn't expect that we would be in a position where we would almost negotiate with and interfere with the contract that you are drafting with the administration that we're voting on.

My constituents, and again, with Pat Hastings, he's been here the longest. How many years? 30? I mean, he's been dealing with this, and we've been on here from 2 weeks to, you know, a dozen or so years. So, I don't want to be in a situation to interfere with anything the administration is doing. We have to vote on that when they make a recommendation with our input. I just wanted to clarify that. Like I said, my constituents, when I ask them, hey, what do you think about our garbage pickup? Have you had any problems or whatever else? Up until this morning's email that we got, thanks to Mr. Fogel, thank you, that clarified a lot of my concerns. You have cameras in the trucks, and when people complain, you know, everyone likes to complain to us because that's when people come in and yell at us, and that's their job, and that's our job. When people are unhappy, it isn't necessarily the truth. Your company has the cameras inside the trucks, and they've accommodated us and, like I said, my constituents are pleased. Thank you, Mr. Hastings has been tough on me. We've been talking about this for quite a long time, trying to get the best value for the community. You know, he pushed back a number of times with what I was able to bring forward. We finally got to the point where, okay, we were all in agreement that this was the fairest way to go about it. I understand the concerns about 4-4-4, you know, and I'm pretty sure I'd be able to convince the GM there to go 4-4-4 and then water, sewer, trash for the remaining. But being in your shoes, when it comes to a budgetary position, it's easier to budget for 4%. When you start pushing 6% or 7%, that's when it gets ugly, and that's when the community's in an uproar. Mayor Radeff states Pat and I spent a lot of time speaking with Mr. Given and Chase who is above him and I think and Pat agrees, that this is a good resolution. We considered things such as risk. So, like he said, in three years, we'd be paying 7% and you just locked yourself into 7%, where it can guarantee it's only going to be 4%. Part of the decision-making on some of this is having predictability and knowing where the costs are going to be in the long term. At no point ever did we think that it was financially responsible to do our own garbage pickup. As Pat said, he's been on the board with the county multiple years and talked to Thomas Patrick there, who is literally the expert on trash. His

Work Session January 20, 2026

discussions with him led us to believe that this was a good contract. So, this is what we negotiated. This is what's before you. In two weeks, when it's a third reading, you can vote on it, you don't vote on it, but I think Mr. Givens has made clear, and we've made clear by speaking with other cities as well, we take the risk if we want to go out for a bid. Once we got the bid, he could be the lowest bid, and it's at 7%. We have no idea. Councilwoman Petrucci says I'd like to say that a couple times I've had some residents call me or contact me because their recycling was missed or whatever. I've called, and you guys have been very responsive because I've gone back and driven and checked to see, and yeah, it's been picked up. Mr. Givens responds you make the phone call and tell us there's a problem. When we're in your community that day, I have supervisors in the community. Even if that driver's 6 streets down, if you notify me, I'm going to have the supervisor go back and do the correction or do the pickup.

COMMUNICATIONS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: Councilwoman Gee says I stopped at the police station today to give some pins that my husband had wanted to give them. The short time I was there, I enjoyed seeing the new painting that they're doing. They're painting the walls. Then I realized I was freezing to death. How long has there been no heat over there? Mayor Radeff replies I've not been told there's no heat. Kory has not approached me about it. Councilwoman Gee asks is there anyway we can find out what's going on over there? If someone could look into it, I'd be grateful.

NEW BUSINESS: Mr. Morrow states his intent was not for everything he submitted to be on tonight and agrees to remove some items until next work session.

*President Rosso says business regulation code, does the city need to register business, yes or no? If yes, does it make sense to charge for it? Councilman Morrow says I really do not like this. I look at it as being anti-business. I want us to have more businesses here. I do think that there is a way to generate more funds for our building and zoning, and one of those is simply like what Avon Lake does for contractors that are in the city; The city goes through and has a registration process so that they ensure that they have Bureau Workman's Compensation, that they have the proper insurance and everything. They charge \$75 to register, and then if somebody's your contractor and they're not registered, well then, their building plans don't get approved. If the thing is to make us safer, I think that I've heard lots of people have contractors that they've gotten ripped off from in here. I see it on Facebook, I hear it from constituents as well, and I think that that first and foremost would be a better use of our time and energy rather than doing this as far as bringing money in and protecting our citizens. There's just so many things that I don't like about it. I don't even like it even if it's free to register, but I can't see

Work Session January 20, 2026

having like enforcement and stuff like that for free, because everything costs a certain amount of money, and if we do go forward, I do believe that there would have to be a cost associated with it. I don't really want to move forward with it at this time. President Rosso says kind of blurred a line there with vendors. Vendors do have to get a vendor license and register in the city already. We passed that a couple years ago. That's a different process, but yeah, if you do business in the city, you have to have a vendor license that they pay for. Mayor Radeff says we have a contractor license; there's a fee, they have to show that they're bonded. We did that probably four or five years ago. Councilman Fogel says I agree that we should license businesses. I also agree with what Councilman Cizl had said as far as this turning into a money grab. At the ordinance meeting, you had said that you weren't going to have to hire any more staff to process applications and that the city wouldn't incur any new costs. So, I think that licensing probably helps the fire dept. and everyone else and enables you to identify businesses in the city. I just don't think that we should be charging for it. Councilwoman Petrucci says I agree with going ahead and doing this registration. I think it holds businesses accountable. We need to know who's in doing business. I don't think it's meant to be the gatekeepers in any way, shape, or form. As long as it's a legal business performing legal activities, then I'm all for it. As far as the fee goes, I do kind of have a hard time looking at someplace like Apples paying, and then like a Henrietta Honey, who's really trying to serve, and a couple other smaller businesses. I don't know at this point what would differentiate, be the dividing line to charging 90 vs something else. Maybe that's something that we need to discuss a little bit more. I am definitely in agreement with holding businesses accountable through this method. Councilwoman Gee says I agree with the fact that we do have to regulate them to a degree by keeping track of them, only for the fact that there are health inspections, there's things like that. If someone gets sick, there's at least where the city could go back and say, no, this place, this place, this place. As far as the fee for it, something extremely small. I can't picture on any of these home businesses, any of these small places, having to pay the same as, Apples has more than one store, we all know that. They're a big company. I can't see a small, the cookie shop that everybody buys from. I can't see Avery paying the same as a big store. It should be just something small, just to keep it where they paid their dues, they've got their file, and everything's fine. Councilman DeBottis says I think registration is okay, make sure we know our businesses that are here. I would be for a one-time fee, but not a yearly fee. As far as the home businesses, I don't know how we would ever keep track of that. My fear with the home businesses is that the ones that come forward will pay the fee, and then the bulk that don't want to come forward, because of fears of maybe having to pay income tax, or whatever their fears may be, and then we're gonna turn neighbor against neighbor on that. So, that's something that I don't want to do. Our medium household income here is half of everyone else around us, so I think any

Work Session January 20, 2026

extra money these home businesses are making, if they're not doing anything to bother their neighbor or cause a disruption, I would say God bless them and leave them be. The two other things in the area, 701.02 and 701.06, I think that should come in front of council. My reasoning for that, I have nothing against anything or this administration, but I think to grant someone that kind of power, one person, I don't think we would be doing a business justice. I think we all need to hear about it and make our decision from there. Councilman Cizl says I agree that we have to have some type of licensure. I think all other cities have licenses. I think we're a little deficient/behind in that. We have a building inspector that has experience in that aspect, and he's the one that kind of, with the administration, brought this forward. Like Mr. Fogel said, my original reaction was like, I don't want this to be a way to get money. I appreciate him mentioning it, because I don't believe that is the case at all. We pay dog licenses. Everything is licensed now for a reason. We pay \$35 for our ethics certification, which is like a licensure with the state. I really believe that we need to have some type of licensure. The fees, yes, obviously going from zero to something is going to be something that we need to figure out. The original reaction was home businesses vs storefront businesses. How do you differentiate those? Home businesses, whether they're doing insurance or they have a sign in front of the yard, that's a regulation thing that has to be dealt with. Whether we do that or not, the actual fee, I just think that we need to do this somehow. As long as it's in custom with what all the cities are doing, even if we do something like we're already passed the middle of January, maybe some type of credit this year for who knows how long and whatever the fee is, but that's where I stand. Councilman Morrow says when I was going through here, the 701.06, if we were to go forward, I don't like the language there. I also think that council should do it. I think if anything, maybe mayor's court should be able to make that decision as to whether or not somebody could have their license revoked or suspended. I think that's having some sort of a better due process. The other thing that I look at, is maybe if we do go forward with this, we make it look like it is a benefit and that we advertise all the businesses on the website, so we're sort of like a chamber of commerce or effectively acting like a chamber of commerce and be able to say these are the business hours and this is, you know, who the owner is and their phone number and everything. So, you know, that might be a little bit more palatable, you know, to me personally, if we were going to charge them at least, they would be getting a benefit of some advertising out of it. I went to the back of this packet and there's chapter 747 on the tattoo or body piercing establishments and then there's also massage parlor establishments. Are those new codes that we're looking at or are those present? Mayor Radeff replies that wasn't for this. That's going to be a discussion later, this is just for registration. Councilman Fogel asks would 701.060 be subject to administrative appeal? Building Official Gudat replies I think 701.07 addresses appeals. 701.06, that's obviously if they're in violation and they're doing something illegal, which basically makes them ineligible to run a business,

Work Session January 20, 2026

according to our codes. So that's all that is. Councilman Fogel asks it's not an administrative appeal for the purposes of the Ohio Revised Code? Law Director Ward responds the decision of what is referenced as the Board of Appeals in 701.07, the applicant would have the option of appealing that by way of an administrative appeal under the Ohio Revised Code. Councilwoman Petrucci says she likes the idea about advertising businesses that go through the process. President Rosso says I believe we should have the registration. I believe we should have no costs. At the end of the first year, if we say this is costing us money, then we'll address fees then. Let's give it a year to register, a year at no cost. I can't imagine we're gonna lose a lot of money. I think Mr. Morrow's idea of somewhere on the website it says, here's a list of all licensed businesses, so people know. Here's a list of vendors that are licensed in the city. So, hey, my water line broke, who do I call? I go there and I can find it. That would be a great idea too. Decision made to take back to ordinance committee.

*Water failure relief ordinance- President Rosso says this talks about issuing credits for water that went through the meter, which the city paid for. I'm not even sure we can do that, but if it went through the meter, they should be responsible. The sewer credits, my concern with, and I did talk to the service director about this, I think it's the council's ultimate responsibility to manage money in the city and issuing credits should come from council and not a service director. As we will all say here, Pat's the greatest guy, and we probably trust him. Two out of the three before him, I wouldn't have trusted with a \$2 limit on issuing a credit, quite honestly. So, it works great today if we let him, but I think any money decision should come from council. Councilman Morrow states my impetus for putting this out was that we meet twice a month, and maybe these should be addressed quicker than twice a month. I've seen other communities where this is either the service director is given guardrails with which to operate within, that council gives them, and/or it is between the service director and the mayor making those decisions, because the mayor is there to run the day-to-day operations rather than us getting into it and deciding on it. Only in the special cases where it exceeds a certain threshold would we get involved. That was my thought, was that these things could be taken care of much quicker and offering a better service to our constituents, but I see your point as well. Councilman Fogel says I had a long discussion with Pat and John, some other people about this, and I think it's almost impossible to offer credits without encouraging fraud. There are very limited circumstances where the resident is actually going to qualify for a reimbursement. I know in the City of Lorain, and I hate to keep bringing up other cities, but the City of Lorain, their software at the Water Dept. can detect abnormal usage. They will call you and tell you that they see unusual usage, and that gives you an opportunity to fix the problem before it gets out of hand. I know one of the credits went 4 months before they applied for a credit. I think if we could stop that from happening, if we can integrate the water billing software with the new accounting software, then the

Work Session January 20, 2026

Service Dept. could call and let a resident know that they have an abnormal amount of usage, and they could fix the problem before it ends up being \$1,000 or \$2,000. I know Pat said that that is a possibility. I know the Service Dept., Water Dept. has a lot of work to do over there. I don't know if that's cost-effective for us, but I think that might be an alternative to just giving out a blanket rebate. Councilwoman Gee says we thought we might have a leak at our house, because we went from one cubic ft., which is what we normally use to four cubic ft. I called the girl at the Water Dept. and she started watching the meter, and I was turning things off. We were trying to see if it was outside or was it inside. I turned off my main. It stopped. It turned out it was nothing more than the toilet was leaking so slowly in the tank that you couldn't hear it, it didn't look like it was leaking, and they kept filling, but it was enough to raise us that high. She turned it on and watched while I was... She has that ability to double-check. I don't think there's the manpower, the staff, to do it constantly, and I'm not sure they can have that up and viewing it for everybody all the time. Councilman Morrow says I was raised in a small town in Monroeville, Ohio, and their Water Dept. is set up so that a person can log in and see their usage, they can see their real-time usage, and then they can also set up alerts themselves that can either email or text them if it goes beyond a certain amount. I think that they said that they have about 20% participation in that and that was maybe 6 or 7 years ago. So, things are possible, things are doable, but then there is... Are people willing to look at, okay, we need to have new software come in, you have to have all that training, that's for the new software. Is that something that they would even consider? A lot of times your workers don't want to look at having to do a whole new system or something like that, and that's what my fear would be from what I'm being told is that it would be hard to get that type of acceptance. If it was and it was feasible, and again, I don't know how much their system costs, but if it was and it was feasible, well, then you offer a benefit to the citizens and something that could save a lot of water. President Rosso says I know for a fact that our RF units send the information to the Water Dept., to the software, every hour on the hour. They collect the data. My personal opinion, and you guys tell me if you agree with this, I would like to ask Mr. DeBottis under roads and drains to let's start talking with Pat to see, let's investigate the service that we get and can they identify it. Even if it's once a night, once a day, they said, here's a list of houses that had 24 straight hours of usage. You know, we might be a day late, but we're not 4 months late. Is there a way to get a notice sooner, because they got all the data. I don't know why they couldn't do it. Councilman DeBottis replies I asked Pat and his answer was we have that ability, it would just cost more. Councilman Morrow states I've helped some other communities implement AI software that monitors a lot of different things, answers phones, etc. This is something that they would do. Along with the software, they would just integrate it with the software that's already there. Something like that normally costs on order of at least \$25,000 to set it up. Then there's another

Work Session January 20, 2026

training, and then there's a subscription fee, which normally runs another \$10,000 a year. Referred to Roads and Drains Committee.

*Standardized complaint logging system- Councilman Morrow says I want to look at having a standardized complaint logging system anytime that there's a complaint, whether it's about a fireman, a policeman, a serviceman, a city councilman, the mayor, the council president, that that's logged rather than somebody just saying that somebody complained and yet there's no proof that there was a complaint to start any type of an investigation or something like that. I think that everybody deserves that. We know that there's actually been a verified complaint before something is looked into and drug out. That was what my impetus was behind that, just to make certain that we don't have anybody saying, well, this person said this, and it's nebulous because now you can't prove who the person was, when they said it, and what the actual complaint was about. President Rosso asks what if somebody calls in and they're really just asking a question? Is that considered a complaint and it should be logged? Councilman Morrow responds I'm looking at specific complaints. President Rosso asks why shouldn't it apply to city council? If a city council member is going to come and say, I had residents call me complaining about x, why shouldn't they have to provide this information so that we know that's actually happening? Councilman Morrow replies it could and I'm not opposed to that either. One of the things that I have seen is that's been used politically in times of election year, of making a bunch of false allegations and tying up city resources. President Rosso replies true, but we run into the same situation, where I could come up here and say, I had people call me because they didn't like the color of my neighbor's house, and you don't know if anybody's called me. I agree, you know, hey, if you're going to say residents have called or residents have complained, then if we're going to have a complaint log for city hall, council should adhere. Councilman Morrow says if somebody's complaining to you personally about something, we should say, hey, call and log it into the system or go online and create the report, and then I can address it as a city council person. I don't think that we should have to write down and log stuff ourselves. I think we should direct the people to either the city website or to a phone number where that information would be collected. President Rosso responds and I don't disagree, but what they're going to say is that's why they called you, they didn't want to have to do it. Councilwoman Petrucci states I think that would completely discourage a lot of people who would fear retribution or some type of retaliation, things that should be reported that would go unreported, and is it even legal that we would have to require someone to give all of their information if they want to register a complaint? Law Director Ward says I think I understand the intent behind this, but I would be remiss if I didn't point out that I don't think this is within the scope of council's authority under the Charter or the Ohio Revised Code. It goes beyond what is permissible in terms of councilmanic action. I think this is an administrative determination and an administrative function that's not within the scope of

Work Session January 20, 2026

council's authority. Councilman Fogel asks that would fall under the law dept., right? That would be their responsibility to investigate a complaint? Law Director Ward replies no, I think this falls underneath the mayor's office. Councilman Fogel says I know the mayor had stated in the past that any complaints, the law dept. was obligated to investigate complaints, resident complaints. So, you're saying it's not the law dept.'s responsibility, it's the mayor? Law Director Ward replies when you say complaint, that is a very broad term. Mayor Radeff says I would like to know what you're referring to. Councilman Fogel responds Channel 5 News. You said that when you got complaints from citizens that the law dept. was required by law to investigate those complaints. Mayor Radeff replies if there is a complaint about something that is illegal, yeah, but we're talking about complaints in general. Each dept. has their own policies on how they deal with complaints. Again, that's always been an administrative day to day power of the executive branch. This is not within the purview/power of city council to do and I agree with Mrs. Petrucci that people aren't going to be honest if they have to put their name, address, etc. We have the ability for people to anonymously complain online about a housing code. People are allowed to put in anonymous phone calls to police if they see something illegal. I mean, that's something that every city and it's just part of everybody's everyday life. I don't understand the purview of let's put together pretty much a list of people that complain about anything. Again, not every complaint when it's reviewed is, they're all taken depending on the complaint at different priority level and different issues. I think it's always been the point of, yes, they complain to you, you tell me, and then the administration deals with the issue or complaint. Council's purview is to pass a law, not to try to decide day-to-day how the administrative is going to function on complaints or day-to-day phone calls. Councilman Fogel says I agree with you and Mrs. Petrucci that it would discourage people from making complaints. I understand Jon's intent, but I do have to agree with you guys that that would probably, it wouldn't promote transparency and it would just, I know there's been some issues with people not wanting to speak up at council meetings and I don't think that would help that out. Councilman Morrow says the executive office is not beyond reproach and we need to be able to discern if there is an abuse there or not. I look at what was done to me as being an abuse and so I'm putting that out there as we have a responsibility to ensure that the resources of the city are used wisely, that we don't have any misfeasance, malfeasance, nonfeasance going on. I think that we are a check to the executive branch. I think this is totally appropriate. Now, if we're looking at, well, maybe people won't report things, okay, is it that important then if they don't? It doesn't necessarily mean that the legislation that we have, that it needs to be public. I believe that there is a way to be able to legally make that list private so that we could have our law director say, yes, this is a verified complaint, I looked at the list. This is a real person making the complaint and then we never know who that person is. I'm just saying that you can still say that it's anonymous, but have that person come in there because I think that if there's

Work Session January 20, 2026

accusations made, that you have a right to confront the person that's making the accusation. I believe that you have that right in the court of law and I believe that you should have that right here as well. I think that we are that check to make certain that this is not done willy-nilly and being done for purposes that we find are real and factual. Councilwoman Petrucci I feel that nobody is beyond reproach and I feel like you just said two different things. You know, it would be private and it could be no one has access to it unless it's like the law director. But again, you say you have a right to face your accuser which means then you do have the right to that information. You can't have it both ways. Councilman Morrow withdraws ordinance and will resubmit with different language.

*Substitute Ordinance 109.25, dog ordinance- Councilman Cizl says this came out of ordinance and we have had a reading on it already. Procedurally, I didn't know what this was. What's going on with this new document in regards to what was already submitted to ordinance? President Rosso replies at any point during the process of ordinances and voting on them, council can make a motion to amend the ordinance, which we do occasionally. I think what Mr. Morrow is asking is, I believe he wants to make amendments based on some topics here or information here. Councilman Morrow says the thing that I saw was a couple of things was that it's not just dogs that are vicious. I think having just a vicious dog ordinance should be a vicious animal ordinance. I'm at the point that we are changing this ordinance, maybe we should look at it as a whole. The other one was is that I didn't like the decision-making power of an animal control or the police officer making the decision that they could come and take your dog and deem it as a vicious dog. I wanted that officer, the animal control officer takes it to court and the judge says yes, you have enough evidence here and it's a vicious dog. I didn't like, you know, in case you have a police officer that may not like you and looks at you sideways and says, well, you know, we're going to do this. Not saying that we have a police officer that would do that. I'm just saying that I've seen in other communities where that has happened and that power has been abused. I really believe that that is something that we could look at protecting with this. I thought that there more could be added to that ordinance just to make it a vicious animal ordinance rather than just picking and singling out dogs. I mean if a cat bites you, you can lose a hand or lose a few fingers just from a cat biting you and stuff. Then there are other people that have weasels and ferrets and stuff like that. I thought having a broader topic rather than just singling out dogs would be a good thing. President Rosso says the current legislation does identify a vicious dog as having killed or caused injury to any person or has killed another domestic animal. Decision made that current legislation will stay as is and more discussion can happen about vicious animals if needed.

*Charter Amendment and Bond Ordinance- Councilman Fogel says it's basically a package. It's a package to get it to the Board of Elections in time for the May 5th primary election. Both issues will be voted on separately. So, it's the up to \$3.5 million bond for the Fieldhouse construction and also a Charter Amendment that

Work Session January 20, 2026

would make appointed employees work at the will of Council. President Rosso states charter amendments are very serious amendments; very important I should say. I would be hesitant to have the charter amendment portion come to council on Tuesday and have a suspended rules and vote to add it on the ballot. I think it needs a lot more discussion. Councilman Fogel says this is just a time issue. I know the Fieldhouse has been discussed. We've spent, what, \$100,000 already? Do you agree with that, Mr. Mayor? Mayor Radeff responds I can't speak to the number, but I'll say this is still premature, because Pat doesn't have all the numbers and figures. Yeah, he used that number in his presentation, but he hasn't had the concrete number yet. So, until he does have that, it would be a moot point until he comes back with the exact figure and number, I think we're just getting ahead of ourselves. Councilman Fogel says the only reason I brought this up now is because it won't be able to go on the ballot until November, which means construction won't be able to start until at least mid-2027. Mayor Radeff replies yeah and he wants to do it in phases anyhow, so that's okay. Councilman Morrow says I would really like to see the \$3.2 million, not 3.5, being put on the ballot. I want to say in my ward that there is a small group, but they're very passionate about wanting a fieldhouse. I myself am not for a fieldhouse, but I don't want to deprive citizens. When I talk to citizens, even the ones that don't want the field house, they're like, yeah, put it on the ballot, let's vote on it. That's the most fair thing to do. If the language would need to be changed, that you could say that the initial \$3.2 million, and then you could put a variable amount, not to exceed another amount, because let's be real, whenever you have a construction project, there's always overruns anyhow. It's very rarely does anything come in under budget, and so you would have to, more than likely, even if it was like \$3.6 million, if it ran to \$3.65 or \$3.68, you would still be coming back to council for more money. I think that a lot of citizens would really like to see this happen on both sides of it, whether or not you're for the fieldhouse or whether or not you're against the fieldhouse. President Rosso says I agree that when we get to that point, we should go to the ballot, let them decide. I think what the mayor said, if I heard it correctly, was right now they haven't done their due diligence yet, so they're not quite sure, and I think he just said they're comfortable with if they can get their due diligence done by the end of July, I think this is the 90 days before the issue has to go on the ballot. So, there's no rush to say we gotta do this by Tuesday. At the end of July, if they haven't had time to finish their due diligence, then it'll go until the following May. I guess what I heard was there's no hurry, they're not ready to start doing anything yet, they're still doing their due diligence. Councilman Fogel replies I just assumed because I thought they were ready to try and vote on this before the end of the year. Mayor Radeff says vote on part one. Councilman Fogel replies I thought there was an agreement, and I don't remember exactly how that went, but that that was gonna go to the voters all at once. The whole package, I think I raised that during public comments before I was sworn in. Mayor Radeff responds well, there wasn't an agreement on anything. President Rosso states I

Work Session January 20, 2026

think if it was anything for the phase one, if you will, which was the \$600,000 council already accepted and said we were gonna use it to do the groundwork, the foundation work. The infrastructure on that land, which is including repairing all the sewer and water issues over there. That part has been through council and has been approved. No new monies were going to be committed to this project until, you know, going forward. But we've already approved what I think is being called phase one, the infrastructure part, which, again, is gonna fix all the water lines and sewer on that property. Mayor Radeff says it hasn't been approved yet. We didn't even vote on it. Councilwoman Gee says we accepted the money. President Rosso replies we accepted the money and confirmed our commitment to, I don't know the language, but if you look it says we already approved that, accepted the money and it could be spent. I'll pull the legislation, maybe I'm wrong. Councilman Fogel asks what if we sever the fieldhouse bond issue from the charter amendment? President Rosso responds I'm still uncomfortable with trying to put a charter amendment through in a week. Law Director Ward says I have reviewed it and my only comment is that what is required under the charter in terms of amending the charter is a 2/3 vote of council to submit the matter/proposed amendment to the charter to the electors. Councilman Fogel states or I think it's 10% of the voters in the last general election, so it would be like 150 signatures. Councilman Morrow says I just want some clarification on something. I've worked with other cities that do projects and even if they do them in phases, it's all approved at once because the thought is that if you don't approve all of the phases at one point, then you might get phase one done, phase two done, but then council may back out on phase three and so now you're left with something that is half or a quarter completed. So, I guess, you know, have we... How is this with the field house going to be approved? President Rosso replies the infrastructure part is needed regardless if there is a fieldhouse. Councilman Morrow asks so what's the part with the playground? President Rosso replies this was just to fix the infrastructure, water lines, sewer lines. Mayor Radeff states it sets it up to be a buildable lot. It doesn't mean you have to build a lot. President Rosso says it doesn't approve the building of a rec center. It doesn't approve anything further. Councilman Morrow asks as a whole when we do projects, we typically approve all phases of it before they move forward? President Rosso replies yes, this was a one-time fund that was available that we had to move quickly on. We won't get stuck in a position that you're concerned about that we have 3 walls and nothing else. The only thing that I believe we're committed to is the infrastructure, which has its benefits to that whole neighborhood that we've been trying to get done for years, but now we can use this \$600,000 to do it. There's no other money out of the general fund. It's just the \$600,000 we got in the grant, correct? Mayor Radeff responds correct. His proposal was to use some general fund, but again, we are getting ahead of ourselves. Brief back and forth about what to do with amendments. Decision made to leave on the agenda.

Work Session January 20, 2026

*Council Rule Law Director Seating- Councilman Fogel says it would basically change the seating arrangements. That would bring the law director back up here. I think I could even compromise if you switch seats with the finance director, where the former law director used to sit. Mayor Radeff says I don't think you can force someone to sit anywhere. He has to be here at council, but you can't tell him where to sit at council. Law Director Ward states I think the only reason I was sitting here is because at the beginning of the meeting, I was sitting here originally and the finance director needed to sit there so I moved over a seat. I'm going to do my job regardless of where I'm sitting, but I'm happy to sit there. Councilman Fogel replies I think that would prevent some issues. Mayor Radeff asks what issues?

Councilman Fogel responds Open Meeting Act violations. Mayor Radeff asks what violation? We aren't involved in Open Meeting Act. Open Meeting Act has to do with people on council and a quorum. We're not part of a quorum in Open Meetings Act. That's Open Meetings Act 101. Brief back and forth about seating/council rules. Law Director states he will move his seat.

*Council YouTube and AV System- President Rosso says here is what I would like to do, I'd like to take this on myself. I'll probably talk to Jon, Aden and Mark, talk to whoever and get as much facts as I can and report back. Council agrees to this.

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:

COUNCIL #102- TABLED- AN ORDINANCE BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHEFFIELD LAKE AMENDING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF LOTS KNOWN AS PERMANENT PARCEL NUMBERS 03-00-040-101-015 AND 03-00-040-101-008 LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF EAST LAKE ROAD FROM A B-1 ZONING DISTRICT TO AN R-2 ZONING DISTRICT.

COUNCIL #109- THIRD READING- AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 505.18 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF SHEFFIELD LAKE REGARDING OWNING, HARBORING AND CARING FOR VICIOUS DOGS AND THE DECLARING OF AN EMERGENCY.

COUNCIL #111- THIRD READING- AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 935.15(e) OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SHEFFIELD LAKE REGARDING WATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT CHARGE, AND THE DECLARING OF AN EMERGENCY.

Councilman Morrow says I've talked to my constituents and they are dead set against this. My thing would be to ask, I know in other communities that they will say, hey, you're going to get an extra charge if you don't pay your bill online, because now we have to mail something out to you and everything like that. I didn't know if there was an alternative potential for that. President Rosso replies this is the matching funds to do our capital improvements in the water dept., and we've expended the money we collect now. So, if we don't raise it 50 cents at the beginning of next year, we will impact where we're probably not going to have matching funds to do any water projects. So, replacing old water lines, etc. It's 50 cents a month for every year it increases. All that money is committed to the current projects we've done. We can't do more without getting anymore money.

COUNCIL #002- SECOND READING- AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES OF OHIO, INC., AND THE DECLARING OF AN EMERGENCY.

Councilman Fogel states I think there's a better deal to be had there with a little bit of effort.

Work Session January 20, 2026

I don't think it's unreasonable to try and, you know, we have a lot of seniors that are living hand to mouth. I think a dollar a month is an insult. You know, I've only been here for two weeks, but, this is something that probably should have been dealt with 12 years ago. They're making hundreds of thousands of dollars. Councilman DeBottis says I think that we knew this was coming up long ago, and I think it would be fair to the citizens that we should always get 3 competitive bids. We had the time. Now we're in a situation where you take this, or it could go up by a million dollars. This is the part that I disagree with. Maybe they are the best bid, we don't know this and our citizens aren't going to know that. They're going to take our word for it and we say, yes, this is the best that we were able to get you. Any time there's an increase, people are going to start complaining. They're going to ask, who approved this? Councilwoman Petrucci says I think I've heard Pat say what we pay vs what other communities are paying, and that we're significantly lower. I don't know that we've gotten bids, but I think Pat has done a lot of looking into what we pay vs what other communities are paying. I think he has stated numerous times that we pay an amount that is significantly less than what other communities are paying. Mayor Radeff says we have plenty of time to get bids. That's not the issue. This is the renegotiated contract we already have. Council is more than happy if they want to approve this contract, which we feel is a good contract. We did our due diligence. Vote no and we can go out for bid. That was never not an option. This is our last chance to negotiate with who is already on the table to save time, energy and money. If not, then we go out to bid and what happens, happens, but they're not going to give us the same price. Don't misconstrue this as if we're not willing to go out to bid. Councilman Morrow says my family was in the trash hauling industry, primarily scrap tires, and one of the things that we do know from working with BFI, Waste Management and these other large companies is that they really do look at the size of the community and the ability to pay. It is very often that you've got 2 or 3 communities where very low profit to no profit, but then the more wealthier communities is where they make their big bucks and so I wouldn't think that... We got to look at another community economically that's similar to ours as to what they're paying, and again, I haven't went out there and done my due diligence at this point. I have had some members of the business community that are also residents of Sheffield Lake, that say, hey, it looks like a good deal. I do have other residential members because they're just like, hey, look, it's going to cost more, and we're getting less service. Nobody likes that, but if they're saying, hey, our economics are dictating that moving forward, and you're not going to be able to get that, well, then I think we have to have the due diligence to go out and get three competitive bids. Councilman Fogel says I don't like the idea of going out and getting competitive bids because it's going to end up costing us more, but we have plenty of time to renegotiate this contract. These people are making millions of dollars off of this over a five-year period. They want to keep this contract just as bad as we want to keep the contract. Okay, they stand to lose more than we do. So, there's some concessions that could be made if you go back and renegotiate it. You have plenty of time to call Dan Givens and talk to him and tell him, you know, look, this is what we would like to see happen. Mayor Radeff replies this is what we negotiated.

President Rosso states all this discussion has been great. I'm reinstating my comment at the end of the year; You know, my motto/mantra for this year is show a little grace. We're doing that. I'd like to throw a shout out to the one person in the first 2 weeks of the year that really showed it. That's Mr. DeBottis and his wife, who I saw helped an elderly citizen of the village out with their driveway. That's exactly the type of thing I'd like to see, not only because he's a council person, but it's just a nice thing to do. So, I just want to recognize it and throw it out there that thank you for shining a light on our city for a little bit.

Work Session January 20, 2026

MEETING ADJOURNED: With no further business before this council, Motion by DeBottis /Second by Morrow to adjourn at 9:17pm. Yeas All.

CLERK OF COUNCIL AFFIRMATION: This Meeting Of The City Council Of The City Of Sheffield Lake, Ohio Was Held And Conducted Under All Rules And Regulations Governing The Sunshine Laws Of The State Of Ohio As They May Apply. All meetings are recorded and available in council offices.

CLERK OF COUNCIL/COMMITTEES
Brandy Randolph

MAYOR
Rocky Radeff

I, Brandy Randolph, duly appointed Clerk of Council of Sheffield Lake DO HEREBY CERTIFY that this is a true and exact copy of the Minutes of WORKSESSION of January 20, 2026.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT
Rick Rosso