Nancy Levin: I just, um, before I went out of town, I sent you a memo. Just so in case I fell off [inaudible] [...], that you would have an update. And, um, so this was written on September {...} August 16th. So. But, um, I just said that the, um, the tenants are holding a barbecue on August 18th. Brainstorm ideas. CHUH public library monies continue to be spent on maintenance. Um, beyond what is covered by rent and repair which needs to be made on three of the four Mammoth HVAC units on the roof. One of these three requires a coil which needs to be manufactured because it is not available. This will take months and will be very expensive. One unit has not worked for air conditioning since before we took over the building. Heat is available throughout the building. Um, but the library has been renting portable air conditioning units for at least two months to help cool the building and I don't know what the status is today, so I'm not. I haven't talked to Emily since I got back. Um, we had to do a repair to the front doors because the supporting structure was no longer doing [inaudible]. Um, fire violations have been cited, but I believe they have all been repaired since between August 16th and now. Um. There was a part that was broken by a construction company and a replacement was ordered, and I believe that [inaudible], but I can double check that. Um, Singers' Club requested an amendment to their term. Um, they wanted to go to month to month and People's Choice have not paid rent in four months. So, um [inaudible] that they were taking care of that. They were catching up on their arrears. Um, a number of tenants have availed themselves of the city planning department to learn about information on available spaces to rent [inaudible]. And, um, I asked them for the same list, and they provided me with a list of 29 locations from their website. Um, and that's sort of the general.

*Nancy Levin:* And then, um, so we're still working with three possible options right now. Option one, sell the building to a third party or to the city. Um.

*Nancy Levin:* We received a plan at the September committee meeting from the tenants but it was, um, not very clear to us how the funding of that plan would be forthcoming. I also said see also the cleveland dot com article on August 13th. Um, according to CPC the onus is on the library to convene a meeting to solve the problem and work toward solutions. They talked about NOPEC. Um, but the library has a five year contract for low cost natural gas from one of our government consortia. We are not at liberty to enter into a new contract. There are no other complications [inaudible].

OVERHEAD SPEAKER ANNOUNCEMENT: May we. Have your attention, please. The library will close in 30 minutes and all computers will shut down in 20 minutes. The bridge doors will also be locked in 30 minutes. Please check out your materials now.

*Nancy Levin:* Debbie Debbie can address the issues with NOPEC and borrowing money.

Deborah Herrmann: I went through the information that was presented from NOPEC, and basically you have to be using NOPEC as your electric or gas provider, and we haven't used NOPEC at the building since we took it over. So I don't know that, we would be, if we maintain the building, we wouldn't be able to avail ourselves of any of those financing positions. And if we move it into NOPEC that puts in jeopardy the, um, discount arrangements in the contracts that we've signed with energy for electric and with the [inaudible] discounts for gas.

*Nancy Levin:* While a number of city council members have spoken up for the tenants I have not had any direct inquiries from the city council or the mayor of Cleveland Heights. I have also called the mayor of University Heights. And um, again, he is not interested in, um, putting any skin in the game, although he says he supports the tenants. Um. There have been opportunities to talk. I've spoken to quite a few council members and, um, the ones in University Heights, at least, are not interested in getting involved in this project at all. The city of Cleveland Heights has not offered any money for this project at all. Um, nor have they expressed an actual desire to take over the building. The planning, um, department, I think I already talked to you about that. Some tenants have approached the city planning department about spaces, but the problem is size. A number of them are too small to move into the spaces. So we understand how difficult it may be to move to a new space within the city. Um, and it's unrealistic for any of the tenants to expect [inaudible] that we [inaudible] subsidize building.

Nancy Levin: So as far as funding goes ...

*Nancy Levin:* The city of Cleveland Heights do not have a parks and recreation manager. And we just learned while I was gone that they lost their city manager, Danny Williams, [inaudible] retiring. So the lack of staff in the city is an issue. Um, problems with the swimming pool and other amenities are an issue. I understand there was quite a performance of the City Council meeting this week. Uh, if you haven't watched it, you [inaudible] kick out of that. Um, a city run program would have to be managed and staffed to operate it, and, um, Patty gave us a wonderful sort of bio on a number of different arts organizations run in northeastern Ohio and nearby that were run by cities or other organizations. And all that goes into that [inaudible] pretty daunting when you think of it.

Tyler McTigue: [inaudible]

Tyler McTigue: I might wait until...

Nancy Levin: I'm almost done.

Nancy Levin: And then so option two, sale of the the property to a third party.

*Nancy Levin:* Um, I recommend that we establish a limited moving expense fund for tenants who wish to depart by December 30th. Those who wish to [inaudible] board [inaudible] fund the additional initial amount in a resolution.

*Nancy Levin:* The board would have to consider a bidding process to welcome competitive offers. Ohio revised code allows government entities such as public schools, city government and public libraries to transfer real estate between them, but not to other entities. But the building is legally a public asset. Um, Debbie and I were talking today. It's insured for \$5 million. And ownership should only be transferred to another government entity.

*Nancy Levin:* Two separate large developers have toured the building. Um, neither one was interested in any kind of relationship because of the condition of the building and its public status. It has been intimated that the city might consider passing on the building to private ownership, which would also be problematic. Cresco Real Estate worked for a year to show the building and found it undesirable to prospective tenants, and ultimately asked the library to pay them a monthly retainer to show the building because it did not generate enough revenue, revenue, revenue and commissions. Um, that [inaudible] research.

Nancy Levin: The other option number three is demolition.

*Nancy Levin:* The only way we will know how much it will cost is if we do a study, and we want to make sure that there is no contamination and that debris would be handled in a sustainable way, and there are greener ways to do demolition than other ways. And if we actually got that far down the line, we should consider those. Um, the cost of demolition could be offset by future maintenance needed by the building if it continues to operate.

*Nancy Levin:* It's not historic, nor, nor is it particularly beautiful. It's location does not lend it to foot traffic, and the parking lot has only 42 open spaces. The survey we conducted show a very small percentage of people who have actually been inside the building, and nostalgia is not a reason to keep it. I would like to remind you all that Northwood School was demolished to create the Walt Park, and it was in better shape than the former Coventry school building is now. And I'm told [inaudible] mayor Enfeld so many years ago.

Nancy Levin: While the community sees Coventry School with great nostalgia, it has

not been a school for nearly ten years, and I included pictures [inaudible] which now is [inaudible].

*Nancy Levin:* Um, the one thing that we have not discussed in any of our current state of the, um, affair is that if we did not have the building there, it would enhance the park. And the park is something that we have been committed to for as long as we've been in this project. And, um, it's not us, it's not, uh, the building with the tenants or nothing, it's choosing the best way for the library to use it's public money for all people. And, um, to offset unknown costs and other issues that might arise. So while I'm not saying that we need [inaudible] still are not preferring demolition, I'm just saying that the conversation was not even... no one's bringing up the park, which is a huge asset we're investing in heavily and which will be fantastic for our community. It will also be a financial driver for, uh, Coventry. And which is, will be, will, we know it will bring people to the neighborhood. It's not even a "if" because people were there before. Um, so that's all I have right now. I don't have anything stellar. Um, and I know that we have, still, yet enough information to make a decision.

Deborah Herrmann: And I can do a pass around. I've got a note from Emily, an email from Emily just today that, uh, they're asking us to pay \$14,437, which includes operating deficits, paying Gardner for repairs, the Playhouse Square, some fire and security. Um, uh, improvements in that. And, uh, it's it's all in here. And we have to pay them pay for Cresco's percentage for the three new tenants that were signed this year. So if we can keep the building until the end of December, I'm still going to have to pay, the library still has to pay 14,437, uh, to cover these deficits before the end of the year.

Deborah Herrmann: And I do have a resolution in here. I talked with Julie Crisone about if it were, the board were to determine to demolition and demolish the building when we went to demolish the church that we purchased for the Noble property, we hired a consultant to do a facility assessment survey, and she recommended that we do the same for the Coventry building to see ... You know, I just can't call somebody and say, how much would it be to demolish it? Because they'll need to do some testing. Uh, Tim Pasbrig told me that when we took over the building and the paperwork we got from the school said that there were no asbestos [inaudible] check. You know, [inaudible], but he said no, the school had gotten rid of all the asbestos, but I think we still need to do that. So I have a resolution that if board chooses to move forward with the demolition, that we hire a consultant to do an assessment, because I think there is some salvageable material in there that [inaudible] in previous positions torn down a school, you know, they said it'll cost X to tear it down, but we can find X amount of copper pipes and fixtures and things like that. So we ended up not having to pay the full amount for the teardown because they were able to get, um, salvaged parts other [inaudible]. So I have a resolution prepared for the future that says we would hire a consultant, and K2M was the name of the company hired for the [inaudible], the Kirkwood Church. And that's who Julie Crisone

suggested we contact for it. So that's the last page of the agenda, that if we move forward, um, discussions with the tear down, that would be the suggestion to come up with a price and find out what needs to be done to mothball it and then demolish it.

*Tyler McTigue:* And then Deb on 117, that's, um, estimates for [inaudible]. Um. Estimates on...

*Deborah Herrmann:* That's the estimates that Cresco came up with that the HVAC is \$1,500,000. But then they've also looked at roofing, facade, brickwork, windows, doors, electrical, plumbing, security.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, we saw this earlier ...

*Deborah Herrmann:* Yeah you've seen all that [inaudible] At City council, it was presented that they only needed to, um, get \$1,250,000 for repairs. But I think that would probably just be the HVAC. And Cresco's analysis shows that other items need to be given there.

*Dana Fluellen:* And remember, she sat, here, right here. Um, and she presented us with the top thing that she would get done. But then I asked her, and there are two additional things, so 3, or 3 altogether that really need to be prioritized. I'm only saying it because we have to deal with whatever facts people professionally present. So there is not one that was present. It was ranked. Remember what she said? Um, the other two...

#### Unidentified Speaker: [inaudible]

*Patti Carlyle:* Um, I guess I was just gonna' ask, there's been some question about how we, or they, came to that number? Can you maybe speak to the expertise of [inaudible]?

Deborah Herrmann: Well, Playhouse Square runs buildings all over. You know, Playhouse Square. They've had experience running as property managers at Shaker Square and other properties around there. So they have on staff, electricians, plumbers. So when things go wrong there, they just don't go to the Yellow Pages and find stuff. They either have someone on staff that's a tradesman, or they have people that they have some relationships with. They've done Gardner because that was our our vendor for our HVAC units here and that. So, they've used their expertise in, um, the expertise of their tradesmen and employees that they've worked with before to come up with all these. There's much, I mean, that report that she gave us back in

May, I think was a good 20 pages with much more detail about it. This is just a summary chart from that.

*Vikas Turakhia:* Um, kind of going into that question, uh. Just looking at the, you know, you're watching the city council meeting where, uh, the P.E.A.C.E. people had brought up the 1.25 was their number? Have we seen any actual formal report from them where they've got the estimate for that?

*Deborah Herrmann:* I think what they, the way they phrased it, is they're still working on getting the engineering estimates. And that was going to be another [inaudible].

*Nancy Levin:* So today we received another proposal, um, from the tenants from CPC. Um. I emailed it to you this afternoon and I haven't really spent any time looking at it [inaudible], but, um, they are suggesting that we provide the building, transferring it to CPC for the cost of a dollar and creating easements so that we can still control the land around the building. [inaudible].

Vikas Turakhia: Yeah. Go ahead.

*Nancy Levin:* Um, and then, uh. Coventry P.E.A.C.E. would assume all responsibilities and liabilities related to ownership and that they would create a community advisory board that would provide input to building operations, programming and long-term planning and for building [inaudible] to serve the community. Um, and then that its intention is to keep the building as a focus on the arts, culture, education and human services. So, um, we'll work in good faith to secure funding that supports this mission. And I, I would say... The only thing I can say about that is we've been trying new things for six years to make this building operational and get enough income to pay for all of the expenses, not just the rent and the utilities, but all the capital expenses and we have applied for grants and we have tried to get state money and we own it and it's still not working. So there's a lot of promises, but not many facts. And I don't find that this report changes anything.

Vikas Turakhia: Um, can we, get... I'm sorry. Go ahead.

*Tyler McTigue:* I was going to say that it's a good segue way for Patti's report. [inaudible].

Vikas Turakhia: No, that's what I was I wanted you [inaudible] talk about.

Patti Carlyle: Um, okay, so I sent this [inaudible]

OVERHEAD SPEAKER ANNOUNCEMENT: May we have your attention, please. The library will close in 15 minutes, and all computers and copiers will shut down in five minutes. Please be aware that all library doors will be locked in 15 minutes. Please check out your materials now. Thank you.

Nancy Levin: Yeah.

*Vikas Turakhia:* And then you guys are allowed to stay since you are witnessing the meeting. Even though the library closes here.

Patti Carlyle: So when it, when it appeared as if getting the city involved may require, like the city to take over the building and then some sort of model that way, I did some research on on some city run community, like arts and cultural center models, and then I sort of trickled up in some other, some other ways that they're done successfully. Um, I'll start with, um, I heard [inaudible] in Minnesota. There was theater that was going to be demolished, um, and it took \$7.25 million dollars [inaudible] dollars, and then the state of Minnesota, the Twin Cities and [inaudible]. Um, so it was very successful. [inaudible]. So that was a historic building. Um, the other two locally here that aren't City [inaudible]. Um, 78th Street Studios and their partners. Also historic buildings also for tenant parking. Um, they're both, um, open to the public, like open all the time to the public. So I think that that's sort of an important element that we keep hearing from other folks who are weighing in about it [inaudible] be a true community arts and cultural resource what would that mean? Um, the things that I find interesting that I, I actually, um, sort of didn't make note of until later, looking at the Committee of the Whole was if the model of nonprofits is abandoned and instead businesses and retail or other, you know, for profit in there, the property tax load on top of an already gigantic capital improvement and building maintenance program. I don't know if the brewery can solve that. Um, so...

Deborah Herrmann: Yeah they wouldn't be able to get the tax, they wouldn't be a tax exempt property [inaudible] nonprofits. And if it's a 3 to \$5 million building, we all know what Cleveland Heights University Heights [inaudible] property taxes are.

*Vikas Turakhia:* Is that something the city can negotiate with and like decide, or the county, or like, is it always it is just...

Deborah Herrmann: It's who owns the building, but it's also the use of it. Because when I worked for county auditor, there was a church that [inaudible] be for profit daycare in their basement, and the state came in and said, you have to split this into two tax bills, and the for-profit daycare center had to pay property taxes, and then the rest of the church family was not taxed on that. So it can get messy. It's not a nonprofit use, and it's taxing to be tax exempt and you're going to have to pay. So

even if the city owned the building, if it was a for profit business in there, they would have to pay for state taxes.

*Vikas Turakhia:* And the county does. Does the county have really, you know, like cities will be like, oh, we'll give you a 15-year break [inaudible]...

Annette Iwamoto: So [inaudible] for some examples. At Providence House I believe that they created an LLC structure for insurance and liability purposes, and [inaudible] buildings [inaudible] not tax exempt anymore. [inaudible] fighting I think to get that back, I don't know all the details because I [inaudible] and all that, but One South Euclid there was property that was donated to us. And so we, uh, taxes were paid. We had to pay the taxes on that until we can prove to the county that we, uh, we're not using, we were using it as a public gathering space and not for a for profit.

*Vikas Turakhia:* So that tax load seems like it would be a guarantee. Yeah. Thing. Yeah. Should there be enough?

Patti Carlyle: Yeah. Which right now is, its [inaudible] The other. The two that were kind of like my favorite and I say favorite in that researching them I was kind of like. why don't we have this already? Why doesn't 'Home of the Arts' already have something like this? Um, [inaudible] Shore Cultural Center in Euclid [inaudible] that information. I think our demographics is very similar size across all three of our cities. Um, I went into income and bachelor's and employment as well, and everything's kind of comparable. Um, but the thing I think that is most notable about [inaudible] Shore is their old ones are 90 to 95 years old and protected by historic landmark status. So you end up with the maintenance question kind of having to be seen as more of an asset to the community to like the [inaudible] whole area. They both have residential neighborhoods, um, both are tax exempt. Um, and then I think the most important thing though that I found in seeking [inaudible] quotes, um, online, for example, Shore says, um, [inaudible] did a did a renovation in 2020 and Ohio's 25th Senate district, the Ohio Development Services Agency, um, earmarked \$325,000 in Ohio's budget. So this is state level budget dollars that is coming in to the city for, for this, um, this program. And, um, Cuyahoga Falls is my hometown, so that was sort of my first place to look at. I didn't, I didn't remember when the school closed. These are both the schools by the way. Um, I remember when the school closed in the 80s. And then [inaudible] year and then the then it was like, kind of like fledgling community center and like, it comes with, like, [inaudible] yoga and stuff. Um, and right around that time was when the falls did a recreational levy where, like your income tax as a percentage, there's no cap on it's there forever. So both of these organizations have been around for 40 years, which I think was a different economic time. And I think, again, the tax load was never what it is in Cleveland Heights. So I think that while I would love to have the city say, okay [inaudible] and we're going to set aside for recreation. I guarantee you it wouldn't go to an art center first, it would go to, you know [inaudible]. You [inaudible] pools and Cain Park [inaudible] marketing properties. So, um, and again, I guess the last thing I'll say is, while both of these

models are very successful, neither of them, um, but one is sort of seeing increasing, [inaudible] and neither of them are breaking even. So [inaudible] you said [inaudible] it's never going to make money. And, you know, we shouldn't be making money off of it. But... that's just what I wanted to lay out, because, you know, there's a lot of models out there that, I think being in this bubble in Cleveland Heights we just aren't seeing the full potential [inaudible].

*Deborah Herrmann:* Well, I was surprised when you when you met with the people that they have four full time and two part time custodians. We only have two part, I mean two full time custodians and one part time for all four of our libraries.

Nancy Levin: Well, we have a cleaning company. [inaudible].

Annette Iwamoto: Those aren't custodian only.

Deborah Herrmann: Okay. Yeah.

*Patti Carlyle:* Right. Yeah. I think it was like two part time custodians and then other staff. And Quirk actually they have [inaudible] different signs implemented because programing staff that handle all [inaudible]. So um, and they actually don't, they don't have a tenant process [inaudible] City would be [inaudible] contract with people. So there's nobody [inaudible] leasing the space. But 78th Street does have that, um, but that is owned by private developers who went out with millions of dollars to buy a building and was then able to make it incredibly successful. [inaudible]...

*Vikas Turakhia:* The main thing for me, I mean, the one thing about Quirk is, I mean, their motto is activities for all. When you go to the web page like that, that's what's there. Um, and so, if this is like, anyone can go there and, and can do things right. Um, and when I look at Shore, I mean, the thing that I think keeps Shore going is the fact that they have that full size auditorium. Um, you know, because, you know, it was originally a high school before it became that, [inaudible] like the Euclid Symphony Orchestra used that. I think they they're putting on a show or something. They're doing stuff there. Um, but the thing that I also with, with Shore is, and these numbers are older, like five years old now. Um, but, I mean, as of 2019, they, the city of Euclid was spending \$200,000 to \$250,000 annually subsidizing running Shore and all that. And that was what when it was still being managed by a outside company, but, um, from, uh, what I understand, that number has only gone up, but actually, since they took over the building. It's still not breaking even. Um.

Nancy Levin: People were looking to leave Shore to come to Coventry P.E.A.C.E.

Vikas Turakhia: Well. I mean, if you look at the condition that Shore is in...

Nancy Levin: It's in bad shape.

*Vikas Turakhia:* it's not great, but the bathrooms are kind of like they're just getting by, but they're not, like, fixing toilets, they're blocking them off. They're tearing urinals out of the wall. I don't know what's going on [inaudible]. Yeah, like the guy's bathroom. [inaudible]. You know, I mean, like, it's, they're, you know, beyond the, the window improvements, I, I haven't seen very much improvement to Shore over the last, you know, five, five years.

Patti Carlyle: I can see that being funded because it's curb appeal. [inaudible].

OVERHEAD SPEAKER ANNOUNCEMENT: May we have your attention, please. The library will close in five minutes. Please be aware that all library doors will be locked in five minutes. Please check out your materials now. Thank you.

*Nancy Levin:* So technically, the, um. Thank you, Patti. That was really interesting. And, you know, we care about is a good idea. Um...

*Nancy Levin:* The memo we got today is technically an offer to buy. And I think that we need to discuss that with real estate for an executive session. And I think I agree that we need to get the show on the road as far as making some decisions, because everybody's got lives to lead. Um, so... I guess we could have executive session at the next board meeting. Possibly before the board meeting. I don't know what that does [inaudible].

Vikas Turakhia: Yeah. [inaudible].

*Nancy Levin:* Um, and, um, I also would. I've sent it over to our attorney to look at it, and, um. I don't, I don't really know what else ...

*Deborah Herrmann:* We could do an executive session at 6:30. To buy or sell real estate is a legitimate reason [inaudible] come back out at 6:45 or 7:00 and then start the regular meeting, you know, start regular business then.

*Tyler McTigue:* You guys did hear that, Executive Session at 6:30, Board Meeting right after?

*Unidentified Speaker:* [inaudible] we're trying [inaudible] we're trying to get people to [inaudible].

*Tyler McTigue:* [inaudible] still have the info session at 6:00 and start executive session 6:30?

*Patti Carlyle:* [inaudible] is there anything that, as we're reading this, considering this, thinking about this between now and then that we should know what isn't possible? Because some of this sounds like it's not.

*Vikas Turakhia:* So, one, one of my concerns, kind of, I mean like that is a thing for executive session. We can debate that. But I'm, there are, I feel like we should be talking about more, right? I mean, tonight because, I mean, we've delayed this another two weeks and then, like, and I know it's late, but like, I think, um, I mean, you know, looking at this offer, I mean, I, I have a real problem with the idea of giving the building for a \$1 and, um, because we have put so much money into it and not even, we haven't put it into it for, like, library use, but to kind of...

Tyler McTigue: [inaudible]

*Vikas Turakhia:* Right. It's been to sustain and to try to get this nonprofit thing to work. And it hasn't been working. So, um, you know, that that's just a big issue I have and I haven't seen, Nancy you mentioned this, but, you know, it's, it's intention. Its good intentions. Its the greater [inaudible]. Like our problem is that we have seen, or one of the things we've talked about as a board is that we have seen them try and try and they haven't been able to get over the hump of like making it kind of like being able to kind of sustain, right? With maintenance [inaudible], you know, like, like only, like I own an old car and, and, you know, the car payment is not the only, but, you know, most of my costs are in the maintenance of, like of the brakes and the timing belt, like, all the things that are breaking, you know, and I think, you know, if there's a time the building is in a condition where things could go. And I don't, I don't really think it's...

Unidentified Speaker: [inaudible]

Dana Fluellen: Right.

Annette Iwamoto: I want to follow up on what you're saying because that, um. When I think about making an eventual decision on this I think [inaudible] I went through an internal process where I wrote down what would guide me in this decision. And the first one was responsibility of library resources. You said library services. And the second was being a responsible steward of public property. Uh, and then I went to our mission, vision and values. And, you know, first thing in our mission is that is to provide free access to services and facilities, so, I feel like putting more money into

this building or detracting from our mission. It's not just the money, but it's all the kind of thing that you said since 2018 and discussing this and but it did detract us from other things that we could be putting our collective thoughts on. The other, and then, um, talking about responsible stewardship, that's actually one of our values. And I'm someone who's been thinking about this a lot and have been losing sleep looking at old articles and so [inaudible]

OVERHEAD SPEAKER ANNOUNCEMENT: May we have your attention, please. The library is now closed.

OVERHEAD SPEAKER ANNOUNCEMENT: Yeah, I looked back at articles since 2008, after the building, after it ceased to be usable as a school. There was a study committee formed to talk about the future use of the building. One of the first things that came to mind or came to be a recommendation was a nonprofit, cultural arts hub. Um, you know, it's been a community aspiration since 2008 and no one has been able to put a plan together that makes it work. Um, I think that is one thing to consider. But also, you know, when we think about what might be the next step. You know, if we are talking about responsible stewardship, whether we sell it for a dollar, a building that doesn't have a financial, a strong financial plan in place, is that being responsible steward? I just think coming back to this thought that this community has kicked this can down the road. And we can't, we can't keep it up.

Dana Fluellen: [inaudible] going to two weeks from now in the executive meeting will be to kick the can down the road. So, uh, unfortunately, you know, some things put us in a position. It's the engagement in the project or whatever we want to call it, but. Annette you touched on the things that I've previously mentiored, mentioned and where I stand. We we are already vested with our, uh, citizens, our patrons, with, um, substantial resources. Why, based on that, per our obligation to all the people, would we then for a particular group of people can, what I loosely call an asset, but an asset over for a \$1. We're already vested. It is now our responsibility. I keep saying it, this is the Board, even beyond the administration, to now do what is best for these two communities, per we own that building and we have another project surrounding it that we're, you know, working on. So we cannot, we cannot, we cannot based on what we've done. This is everyone in Heights, you know, we are already vested. We already have staked our stewardship. We have to now go out there and do the best we can to make this turn out good for, you know, our citizens. And it's not handing it over even to an organization as great as they are doing wonderful things. Whatever. So per me this offer. No, they can't have it for [inaudible] No. Come on.

*Vikas Turakhia:* I think, too, one, you know, some people have been, you know, one of the arguments, I mean, why just, you know, even, like, let them have the building. Why not let them have the building? And if it's not going to, if it doesn't work, it's, it's on them. Right? [inaudible]. And I think like, you know, going back to our values, like, that's not responsible stewardship, like, we're not, the idea here isn't I want to throw it to them and we'll let it be your problem. I mean, I think, you know, [inaudible] like this

is adjacent to the park and it is, you know, it is adjacent to the Coventry campus or Coventry Branch. I, I don't want to watch a building fall apart on, like, near these other things. Right. Like I, you know, I don't, I don't think that's responsible. So that to me is also, like it's not just, oh, we should give them a chance. I mean, I feel like we have given a chance to see financially how this could work. And it has not worked.

Nancy Levin: [inaudible]

Vikas Turakhia: Sorry.

Nancy Levin: So many different ways. With [inaudible].

*Vikas Turakhia:* You know. We, we, I think we have done that and, and it's, it's not working.

*Nancy Levin:* [inaudible] is what's different this time? You know, if it was to be, if it was to be viable. You know, [inaudible] would presented, um, very different kind of, loose plans, I guess. You know, plans that, you know, don't, don't really answer the questions, but, but, you know, I understand that there's, there's effort and passion there, and so I'm looking at I'm trying to find it, find the answers. But I don't see anything indicating why this time is different from the other number of times that we have tried to make an arrangement in different ways, work. Um, and at the end of the day, for me, it comes back to that responsible stewardship, that idea that like, if the idea, if the thought is, well, what what do you have to lose? Just give it to us. That's so irresponsible of us. That's that's not what we're supposed to be doing here. We have a bigger and a higher duty than that of, to, whatever assets we hold that are supposed to be for the entirety of the community. Um, and so yes, I keep, I keep looking. [inaudible] Show me why it's different? Show me why you succeed this time. And I can't see it.

*Melissa Soto-Schwartz:* All other. No, go ahead. [inaudible] I'll think about this. We'll discuss it in the executive session. But what really came to mind was two and a half, three weeks ago that facade collapsed on Fairmount. I thought. Yeah, that roof, all that liability. I don't care who the tenants are.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

*Melissa Soto-Schwartz:* That's what I'm responsible for. That's what most people fail to recognize. Where I put my vote, why I put my vote. I can't say that I haven't fully made my decision completely just yet. But it's always about liability.

Annette Iwamoto: Um, I guess questions to be answered in executive session. I just, I still don't understand exactly what can be done in a sale of library property. Um, I know that there's talk about, like, purchase agreements and contingencies within purchase agreements, but I just thinking about this [inaudible] with One South Euclid, but in the Committee of the Whole meeting, um, I think it was Lee Chilcote that said [inaudible] that they wanted the land, um, and I can't, now I can't find the term, but basically means they want the land through the minerals that are underneath. Um, so one thing I've learned recently is that just because you own property, doesn't mean you own the water, the oil, or, or those minerals that are underneath.

Nancy Levin: Right.

Annette Iwamoto: You know we had previously talked about land leases. But this would be different than that, as I understand it. So I just want to kind of put that out there. I just don't understandable [inaudible] the implication of what we are really able to do. And you know, that is a deep research. So I feel like there's a lot of elements of sale to this or anyone else that you don't know, or I don't know...

*Nancy Levin:* We can certainly have our attorney there. If you like. Or ask him questions and [inaudible] whatever they want to [inaudible].

Deborah Herrmann: Well, we've already discussed that the Ohio Revised Code does not require libraries to auction or have bids on a property like a school or city would. However, one of the second to last pages, our policy says that anything that's worth more than \$300 we have to sell through a public auction or sale. So, if we wanted to sell it, we would have to have a resolution to change our policy to change that in order to sell the building. So we have to do two things if we want to sell it. I am concerned about, you know, the land underneath it, because if we spent money consolidating that into one parcel when we took over the property and all that, and to try to do the lot split, to have the building separate from the playground and the mini forest and our parking lot, you know.

#### Unidentified Speaker: [inaudible]

*Dana Fluellen:* And so, you know, even piggybacking on Annette and Deb's comments. We can [inaudible] we can take that off the table. We don't have to further engage. We can say, yeah, we decided we're not going to sell. We're only considering these two options now. I mean, I just want us to move more deliberate and more, of course we want to stay informed, but I don't want to mislead people either, you know, and so much misinformation out there. But one of, you know, the thing, the additional tenant that doesn't work good for us. We need to get down to the work, get it done, and we can definitely remove some options. What is the likelihood

with this big project we have, that bringing in some, we are already in a noncongenial relationship. We would then make those people further, have further interaction. I mean I'm not trying to, you know, disrespect anyone, but what is the likelihood that we could continue in some relationship with someone that we have such an adversarial relationship right now? We can take it off the table.

Deborah Herrmann: If you have executive session and have a frank discussion about...

Dana Fluellen: Why? I'm just saying.

Deborah Herrmann: selling property or not we could prepare resolutions that's, so when you come in to public session to say you wish to sell the property, and we wish to change policy, or, we wish to proceed with seeking to demolish the building, and then based on what you, your discussion and your thoughts are in executive session, you could then move to, you know, reject and vote down the resolution to sell the property, you could vote down the resolution to demolish the property [inaudible] prepare that, because you can't really decide tonight what you want to do. You can have executive session to decide yay or nay.

*Dana Fluellen:* No matter what we're going to spend \$14,400 on this building through the end of the year.

Deborah Herrmann: Correct.

Nancy Levin: We already are.

Dana Fluellen: I know right. I'm just pointing it out.

*Nancy Levin:* And if we... it's not a... sell to the tenants or demolish the building and have nothing. It's... go all in on the park. Use that public land for public good. We can, there's a million things that people want to have happen in that park. Many, many people come to us and say, it should be this, it should be that [inaudible] we could, I think we need to change the story and talk about the good we're doing. We just did Noble. We just did Coventry. We're doing the park. These are good things for everyone. So if we go that route, let's, let's start standing up for ourselves and say, look at what the good things we do. And that it's unfortunate that it has to be an either or, but we are at that place. And, um, that park is going to be fantastic, and it's going to be all year round fantastic. And I was just in Anchorage and they had a park and they had nothing but the boards on the ground and that was [inaudible].

Annette Iwamoto: And, and it increases the opportunities for library programing.

*Nancy Levin:* Yes. I mean, it's totally within our mission. It's totally sustainable, which, I mean, it will cost much, much less to maintain that park than the building.

Dana Fluellen: And and we also run into some bad things because, I mean, I just know the history for even someone who had [inaudible], it's my school, I went to the school in the 70s when the school was first built, and the history, and I would have sent my last children, and they immediately closed it in middle of the school year and moved the kids to the other school. So we don't know, even if we did choose, I'm not saying definitely we're there, if we did choose to demolish it, that it would be an immediate 'we want to, you know, what a nice park project'. But we have, we do only and we have to be responsible in our ownership of it and see where this is going, you know, and I mean, I just want to lay that out. It may not be, we may not be able to immediately [inaudible].

Nancy Levin: There's nothing wrong with...

*Dana Fluellen:* But Nancy with the ravine. With some of the other things that kind of have showed their head over the years. This is way back some reference in 2008, etc.. You know, we don't know what might happen when we, you know, demolish that building, you know, but if we want that...

Nancy Levin: Well, it has to be safe.

*Dana Fluellen:* And that's what I'm just saying, it may not be readily available to move on as an addition to the park, yet, it may require some further investments to get there - remediation. That's what [inaudible]...

Annette Iwamoto: Is there any study the school district did on that, because in the, and not scientific, not exhaustive review of like 2018 to now there was talks of it being \$500,000 to demolish [inaudible] closer [inaudible] closer to 2017, I think it was like \$300,000 that the schoolboard mentioned. But I...

*Nancy Levin:* I have the report that they did in like, in 2008. Um, I, I can look, I don't know.

Tyler McTigue: I think Emily estimated more recently [inaudible].

Nancy Levin: But other, we've heard people throw out...

Unidentified Speaker: [inaudible]

Deborah Herrmann: She just estimated it.

Vikas Turakhia: But that's what, what the thing that you put on there, right?

*Deborah Herrmann:* Facility condition assessment would help us determine, um, salvage value and demolition cost.

Nancy Levin: [inaudible] happened.

Nancy Levin: Okay. [inaudible]

Vikas Turakhia: I think so. And he would join us at 6:30 on the 23rd?

Nancy Levin: Yes.

Vikas Turakhia: For executive session?

Nancy Levin: Yes.

*Vikas Turakhia:* Uh, Debbie will prepare multiple resolutions and this way we're going to move forward with September [inaudible].

*Patti Carlyle:* And I guess I just wanted to like, spiritual, not in like, religious, but just for [inaudible] we all just need to get used to the fact that people are going to be upset either way. It doesn't matter what we choose. We're in this situation that, one way or the other, [inaudible] and you are going to get yelled at for the last four years.

Nancy Levin: Yah, like, why not?

Patti Carlyle: Yeah. So I was.

Nancy Levin: [inaudible] do the right thing. Yeah.

*Dana Fluellen:* You don't need to say that to me. Um, I don't concern myself with people hating me. What I concern myself with is what I came here and sat here for, which is to serve the people of Cleveland Heights, University Heights, as a good representative, doing good library type things. We've moved away from that. We're going to try and return to that. That's what I concern myself with.

Nancy Levin: Okay. Is there any other business?

*Deborah Herrmann:* Anyone else [inaudible]? And the meeting on the 23rd is at Coventry.