MAYOR LICASTRO: I have 5:30, so to our
guests, we are going to go into executive session
for half an hour, then go back into open session
at which time you'll have the floor. So I want
to open the meeting and ask the clerk to call the
meeting of the Committee of the Whole, please.

MS. COOKS: Mr. Benjamin?
MR. BENJAMIN: Here.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Burke-Jones?
MS. BURKE-JONES: Here.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Huffman?
MS. HUFFMAN: Here.
MS. COOKS: Mr. McDonald?
MR. McDONALD: Here.
MS. COOKS: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Here.
MAYOR LICASTRO: I'll ask for a motion
to go into executive session to discuss pending
litigation.

MR. McDONALD: So move.
MR. BENJAMIN: Second.
MAYOR LICASTRO: Roll call on the
motion, please.

MS. COOKS: Mr. Benjamin?
MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
MS. HUFFMAN: Or aye.
MAYOR LICASTRO: Mayor, may I amend that
motion to also include a personnel employment
matter, please.

MAYOR LICASTRO: So amended. Is there a
second as amended?
MR. BENJAMIN: Second as amended.
MAYOR LICASTRO: Roll call as amended,
please.

MS. COOKS: Mr. Benjamin?
MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Burke-Jones?
MS. BURKE-JONES: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Huffman?
MS. HUFFMAN: Aye.
MR. McDONALD: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Mr. McDonald?

MR. McDONALD: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Aye.

(Whereupon, Committee of the Whole moved
into executive session.)

****
MAYOR LICASTRO: It's 6:00. Is there a motion to return to open public session, please.
MS. BURKE-JONES: I so move.
MR. McDONALD: Second.
MAYOR LICASTRO: Roll call on the motion, please.
MS. COOKS: Mr. Benjamin?
MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Burke-Jones?
MS. BURKE-JONES: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Hoffman?
MS. HUFFMAN: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Mr. McDonald?
MR. McDONALD: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
(Whereupon, Committee of the Whole moved back into open public session.)
MAYOR LICASTRO: Thank you for your patience. We are in open public session for this portion of the Committee of the Whole. We have DS Architects in the room, along with Jill Akins. And for the record, introduce yourselves, please.
MR. ALLENBY: Amir Allenby, Project Manager with DS Architecture.

Designer with DS Architecture.
MR. PROS: I’m Eric Pros, Director of Design for DS Architecture.
MR. MEYERS: Jeff Meyers, owner of DS Architecture and also the Studio Director for Public Safety Civic Architecture.
MAYOR LICASTRO: Thank you. We went through a seven-month process with three proposals from three very qualified firms. I’m happy to say that all would suit our needs. I asked Ms. Akins in her role as our on-staff architect if I may, to evaluate the proposals and come up with a recommendation.
As you saw from the e-mail, she has recommended we hire DS Architecture to start the process to do a needs based analysis for new facilities. It doesn’t mean we’re ready to break ground on a new civic center. This is the first step in an arduous process to gather data and fact.
So, Jill, if you would, for the audience, would you reiterate your recommendation and why?
MS. AKINS: Sure. Absolutely. So I recommend DS Architecture. I have worked with them before. They’re very professional. They’ve got the right team for this. They have a dedicated studio that deals in public facilities.
I did evaluate the other two proposals. I feel like DS Architecture got more of a comprehensive plan, which is what we really need here. They are very focused on the architecture of what needs to be done with the needs analysis and a cost estimate. They brought in mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and structural engineers, which is an important part of the process.
They have addressed all three of the facilities that we are looking at. Some of the other proposals either did not address all three facilities or they had a more engineering focus that I didn’t think was appropriate for this venture, for this first go through.
So my recommendation is to go with DS Architecture.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Thank you, Ms. Akins.
Any questions for Jill?
MS. BURKE-JONES: I have a question for actually Dave Matty, because I know we sent out proposals before, a request for proposal, we would not allow anybody to do any projects after proposals before a study. They could do this job. They couldn’t get any job that would come out of the study.
Have we changed that? Because I see in the information that’s presented by this that they refer to other architectural work after the scope of this.
MR. MATTY: No, I haven’t changed it.

As I understand this proposal, the cost of the thirty-one three is for the initial examination of a needs assessment. And the additional items that were marked as additional costs are not part of this --
MS. BURKE-JONES: I understood that.
MR. MATTY: -- as far as I’m concerned.
MS. BURKE-JONES: What my question is --
MR. MATTY: Your question is if they do the initial needs assessment, can they continue forward?
MS. BURKE-JONES: No, that’s not my question. My question is that when we sent out a proposal for whatever is in the next scope of work that we intend to do, that they could submit a response to a request for proposal.
MR. MATTY: No.
MS. BURKE-JONES: They cannot do so?
MR. MATTY: No, you can't have a company recommending that you go forward in a certain direction and then have that company continue on in that direction and receive proceeds for doing the second part of the project.

The same situation as you faced with, I believe -- and I can't remember the name of the company, but we told the other company the same thing.

MS. BURKE-JONES: This is a very -- $31,000 is a very responsive number. And I just want to make sure that they are willing to do this work knowing that they have no opportunity to submit further, for further work on any of the projects that are included in this feasibility study.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Their proposal does include some options we could consider. The 31,000 was for the basic services. There are other options to consider going down the road.

MS. BURKE-JONES: I understand that, but that's not what our consultant is telling us. He's saying that any of the scope of this is -- now, I know it's industry practice usually that if you work on something like this, that you are able to submit proposals. You don't get something automatically, but you're able to submit proposals for, you know, additional scope. And obviously you're competing with a number of other professionals. And frequently even the fees that are given for the initial work are very, very -- are lower possibly than would be expected, because they're hoping that they're going to be building a relationship with us.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Ms. Burke-Jones, the nature of the next proposal will be drafted according to our need. And the manner in which it's phrased and structured will give multiple companies an opportunity to proceed.

MS. BURKE-JONES: I understand that, but that's not --

MAYOR LICASTRO: This is the beginning, the very first step. And when we figure out what the next step should be, we'll draft a proposal, again, according to what we need. At that time, Mr. Matty can rule who can bid and who can't.

MS. BURKE-JONES: I'm wondering if they are going to be willing to provide this scope for $31,000 knowing they have no hope of doing anymore work.

MAYOR LICASTRO: But that's not --

MS. BURKE-JONES: That is what Mr. Matty is telling us.

MAYOR LICASTRO: It matters how the proposal is drafted --

MS. BURKE-JONES: No, it isn't.

MAYOR LICASTRO: -- and what we're looking for.

MS. BURKE-JONES: I'm sorry, what's your experience, Keith?

MR. BENJAMIN: Just as Dave said. I mean, obviously there are limitations to when you hire a consultant to do a study and a plan that, you know, when it goes out to bid, there are some limitations on whether you can bid for the job or not, but that's correct, that's what the law director stated, isn't it?

MR. MATTY: Yes.

MS. HUFFMAN: Do we make those rules?

MR. BENJAMIN: I think you're both saying the same thing.

MS. BURKE-JONES: We're actually not. I just want to make sure. I don't care -- what we had told the people that were bidding a year ago on this same service, they asked us could we work it on any other future work that might be, you know, that might be happening within this scope? And the response was no. And we had a bunch of people drop out of working on this, because it wasn't worth doing.

And I'm wanting to make sure that if they've identified a number, you know, we have to be able to tell them you have the right to submit if we ask for another RFP for work beyond scope of this, that you can submit a proposal along with a bunch of other people, too. They're not going to get it, but you have a right to at least submit for additional work and not just be totally cut out because you did this feasibility study.

MR. MATTY: I have to look at the world of architecture. I think that proposal was for -- was that proposal for a real estate company to come in and do some analysis? And then the question was can the real estate company actually benefit from being our broker in the situation?

MAYOR LICASTRO: That's right.

MS. BURKE-JONES: But they weren't even a broker.

MAYOR LICASTRO: It was a different
MAYOR LICASTRO: This is being discussed for the first time at this meeting. This was not brought up prior. Again, I think it will be the nature of the proposal and how it's drafted will determine who can actually bid on it. So let's determine who can actually bid on it. So let's not lose focus. We're here tonight to discuss this proposal as stated and offered. You've heard Jill’s recommendation. Gentlemen, do you want to comment further on your proposal?

MR. MEYERS: Sure. I would like to address the comment. I've been doing public facility projects for 20 years. I've never come across anything that we're discussing tonight where if we do the initial study, we can't move forward with the project.

MR. MATTY: You may have never worked for a statutory agency before, as Bratenahl is. We do not have a charter. We do not have the right to change state law. We cannot by a charter decide that we want to do A, B and C, if state law doesn't allow A, B and C.

MR. MEYERS: Sure.

MR. MATTY: So if somebody can show me by state law that we can take your statement of qualifications for a feasibility study and then have your company benefit if you are chosen for work over that, I'll take a look at it. But we are very restricted in what we can do. And that is one of the reasons why I attached the statement of qualifications to this legislation, because I'm considering this company as being qualified to do a feasibility study only as of this point in time.

MR. MEYERS: I'm happy to find that state legislation for you. We've actually been hired by the state directly to do this exact process, so I'm happy to find that. Addressing the proposal and further steps, I don't need to go in great detail, but we did prepare a little schedule and a little description of what we're going to be doing. We anticipate the study taking somewhere between 12 and 16 weeks. We understand that there's a goal that this should be ready to go by July-ish to be put on a potential ballot in November is from what we understand for a potential funding of the project, so we align very well with that.

We understand, as was discussed, this deals with three different sites and three different potential end users. In our opinion, the Police Department needs a lot of focus. It's the one that hasn't been studied. You guys have a lot of studies that were done in the past. The
1. very first thing we're going to do is take those studies and compile it down into something that we can take forward and validate and then start adding the police into it.

2. So it's a process we do all the time.

3. I'll be happy to answer any questions, but this group, the city administration, parks and rec and the Police Department will all be involved in developing the critical success factors for the future of the Village.

4. MAYOR LICASTRO: Any questions for these gentlemen?

5. MS. BURKE-JONES: May I?

6. MAYOR LICASTRO: Sure.

7. MS. BURKE-JONES: I'm assuming obviously minutes of meetings will be included with this?


9. Ms. BURKE-JONES: So there's an ongoing document of how decisions have been made.

10. MR. MEYERS: That's in the best interest of you and us.

11. MS. BURKE-JONES: Exactly.

12. MAYOR LICASTRO: They'll all be public meetings.

13. MR. BENJAMIN: Okay.
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1. MAYOR LICASTRO: They'll be public meetings.

2. MR. BENJAMIN: That was my question and making sure we also --

3. MAYOR LICASTRO: The facts, as they gather data, that will be done with each department. When it comes time for accumulation of data and decision-making that's, of course, going to be in a public meeting.

4. MS. BURKE-JONES: Yeah, because we haven't had that. That's a new experience. It's not happened in Bratenahl since I've been on Council, so I just wanted to make sure.

5. MR. BENJAMIN: I would like at least one, you know, before this comes to city council, to move forward on anything, I think that we should have a minimum of at least one meeting where DS lays out their findings to the community and we collect input as sort of a public hearing type. At the end of the day, we're asking the residents to pay for whatever improvements that we all decide upon at the end of all of this.

6. MR. MEYERS: If I may address that.

7. You'll see in the layout there's several steps, but there's the initial report. At the end of that initial report, that's exactly what we do.

8. We present our findings, we ask for feedback and we take that feedback and we complete our final report, which is our final professional recommendation.

9. MS. BURKE-JONES: Okay. So you'll be discussing the program and the requirements for that and how you've identified those, so there will be an opportunity for feedback.

10. MR. MEYERS: We want the community involved.

11. MR. PROS: 100 percent. The success of this report really realize on that feedback. We wouldn't be doing a good job if we didn't take all that into account.

12. MS. HUFFMAN: So you've indicated the timeline for that, the initial and then the final. I'm sorry, I didn't catch it.

13. MR. MEYERS: Yeah, so the biggest thing we can't control actually is your response, you know, how often we can set up meetings, so we like to give a window of 12 to 16 weeks to complete our work.

14. MS. HUFFMAN: You said something like July?
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And then we report back what we think we're hearing and then we hear feedback then. So there's probably two or three meetings with the public.

MAYOR LICASTRO: I mean, we can work at this and come up with a consensus ourselves, people in this room. It does no good if we don't have buy-in from the community, because it's going to be their decision at the ballot box that will determine what we do. So public input is critical before, during, after. And that's a very aggressive timeline. Maybe we can't get on the ballot November of this year, but knowing we have a firewall in '23, with the rollover of our note, I think we should try to be aggressive and work to that timeline, understanding maybe it's not doable, but let's give it our shot. Public input is critical and you recognize that.

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

MS. HUFFMAN: I have one more thing. So when you do your sessions, is that something that a representative of our Village, like our Architect can sit in on or how does that happen?

MR. MEYERS: It's whoever you would like to sit in. We'll set up a parameter and an agenda for each of the meetings and you guys can respond who you would like to be there. When we do the interview with the Police Department, we're pretty much going to be focused on the Police Department. That doesn't mean someone else can't come and listen to that. When we go to parks and rec, we're going to be integral with them. And with the administration, we'll be there, and then the community is a fourth piece.

MAYOR LICASTRO: There will be town hall formats where we'll open the meeting. They'll have presentations for review. We'll get input from the public, Q and A. It's going to be an open, transparent, inclusive process.

MS. HUFFMAN: I get that, Mayor. I'm just saying while the firm is in a brainstorm session, if there's a person like our architect who can sit in and listen to those things, she knows intimately how we generally feel about what we want. So if she is there, she certainly can provide some input to help bring this project into fruition that will be acceptable.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Let's not lose focus. This is a needs-based analysis. When they meet with the Police Department, the Police Department...
1 helped me.
2 When I was not able to be in a space
3 where we talked about this whole plan, that is a
4 person I listen to, my partner. They could
5 explain it and interpret it to me so I would know
6 and I was satisfied with what's being done. He
7 knew me and he knew what I would like. So I just
8 apply that same thing to here's the firm that's
9 going to be working on a big project for us, we
10 all want to be happy.
11 Certainly we don't know them as well as
12 we know her. She knows us. She knows if she
13 hears something coming up, she's going to say
14 that may not be something that they are open to.
15 Here's something that may be better suited. So
16 that's the reason for my question.
17 MR. BENJAMIN: I support that. It's not
18 unusual in cities that have engineers or
19 architects on staff that they are part of the
20 process and attend and provide feedback and are
21 there, so I have no issue with that.
22 MAYOR LICASTRO: Jill, are you willing
23 to help?
24 MS. AKINS: Absolutely. It might not be
25 me, but someone from my firm will be there.

26 MR. MATTY: My suggestion is if that's
27 going to be the case, that Council will authorize
28 that participation in advance of it happening so
29 that you have a fee arrangement. We have a basic
30 retainer arrangement with our architect. And I
31 don't mean to cut anybody out of work, but if
32 there's going to be a project like this that Jill
33 or her firm are going to work on, at your next
34 meeting you should have authorization for
35 whatever those fees would be in advance so that
36 you understand that that's an additional fee.
37 MR. BENJAMIN: Jill, if you can put a
38 proposal together for us to consider.
39 MS. AKINS: I'll put one together.
40 MR. BENJAMIN: As everyone has said
41 here, we have one shot at doing this right. So
42 it's worth the time and the funds and the effort.
43 I do have one question about will the feasibility
44 study give options for and comparisons on future
45 use of each property?
46 So for example, if the best use of --
47 what is the best use of the Barbara Byrd-Bennett
48 Center land in terms of an economic analysis
49 versus if an addition is made to Village Hall or
50 an addition is made or renovations are made to

27 the Community Center, is that kind of analysis
2 the part of this proposal?
3 MR. MEYERS: We don't do valuation of
4 properties, but we will do a matrix talking about
5 the positives and the risk of each option that we
6 come up with. And we don't have a preconceived
7 option of what those options are, but you'll see
8 a direct comparison between all three sites. Is
9 it combined? Are they separate? You'll have a
10 path forward with that.
11 At the end of this, there are four
12 pillars I say that are part of feasibility
13 studies. We want to know how much it costs. We
14 want to know how long it's going to take. We
15 want to know what's going to be in it. And we
16 want to know the quality of the materials in the
17 studies. Those are the things we have to answer
18 for all three sites if that answer your
19 questions.
20 MR. BENJAMIN: It does.
21 MR. MATTY: Will you be recommending one
22 site over the other?
23 MR. MEYERS: We'll make a professional
24 recommendation based upon what we hear on what we
25 think is the best path forward. So I won't say

28 it's going to be one site, because there's a
2 potential we might use two of the sites.
3 MAYOR LICASTRO: Anyone else?
4 MS. BURKE-JONES: But you will identify
5 what the options were that you will consider,
6 that you considered?
7 MR. MEYERS: Yes.
8 MS. BURKE-JONES: Because obviously it's
9 up to the Village itself to determine what they
10 are. So you're just not going to lead us down a
11 path of a single thing. There are going to be
12 development of that. So on a future project, who
13 knows what that future project or RFP might be
14 for.
15 MR. MEYERS: It might be helpful, I'm
16 happy to leave them here, we have several
17 examples of other feasibility studies that we've
18 done so you can see examples of what you're going
19 to receive at the end. We just did Euclid's
20 Police and Fire Station study where we studied,
21 Eric, how many fire station sites?
22 MR. PROS: Quite a few. We took all the
23 information that you're describing and really
24 figured out what's the best need and the highest
25 and best use of that land. Sometimes what seemed
like a great idea at the beginning actually was
to better on the private market or give that back to
commercial use and let the city find another
location for their fire station.

MS. BURKE-JONES: Right. That's
something that we will be doing outside of this,
but that's why you may not be able to make a
single proposal anyway, but you'll at least
provide us a professional opinion.

MR. MEYERS: We'll provide what we think
is the best path forward and hopefully Jill will
agree.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Anyone else? Okay. So
let's ask for adjournment of Committee of the
Whole, please.

MR. McDONALD: So move.
MR. TAYLOR: Second.
MAYOR LICASTRO: Roll call on
adjournment, please.

MS. COOKS: Mr. Benjamin?
MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Burke-Jones?
MS. BURKE-JONES: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Ms. Huffman?
MS. HUFFMAN: Aye.
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MS. COOKS: Mr. McDonald?
MR. McDONALD: Aye.
MS. COOKS: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Aye.
(Meeting adjourned at 6:31 p.m.)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~