

6:30 P.M. – CITY COUNCIL TO TOUR FUTURE CITY HALL – 36600 DETROIT ROAD

Members of Avon City Council met at the future City Hall site to tour the building and gather information related to the facility's layout, operations, and ongoing development. The tour was conducted for informational and future planning purposes as the City prepares for the transition to the new municipal building. Mayor Jensen led the tour.

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AVON, OHIO HELD MONDAY, MAY 18, 2026 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Council Members: Council-at-Large – Mary Berges; 1st Ward – Jennifer Demaline; 2nd Ward – Anne Marie Etienne; 3rd Ward – Anthony Moore; Council-at-Large – Michelle Patton; 4th Ward – Scott Radcliffe; Council-at-Large and Council President – Brian Fischer; Mayor – Bryan Jensen; City Engineer – Ryan Cummins; Planning/Economic Development Coordinator – Pam Fechter; Law Director – John Gasior; Finance Director – Steve Presley; Clerk of Council – Barbara Brooks

ABSENT:

Safety/Public Service Director – Duane Streator

Council President Brian Fischer called the meeting to order.

1. TREE CANOPY PRESENTATION

Collin O'Donnell and Leo Wible

Rick Varga, Arborist and Chair of the Tree Commission residing at 33676 Reserve Way, Avon, offered brief opening remarks on behalf of the Tree Commission. He noted that the presentation was rooted in the City's ongoing tree inventory work and its obligations as a Tree City USA designation holder, and that the student presenters had done a great deal of excellent work in preparing the materials, which had been distributed as handouts.

Collin O'Donnell of 36550 Mills Road and a Student Member of the Avon Tree Commission opened by describing the guiding goal of the project: to find a meaningful way to express how Avon's tree canopy coverage has changed over time and to assess whether the City has been doing an adequate job of protecting its urban forest. He explained the methodology he and Mr. Wible considered before settling on their final approach. The first tool examined was the online platform "i-Tree," which provides canopy coverage data and benefit estimates for a given area, but was found to be limited because it only returns a single, most-recent year of data without clearly identifying which year that is. They next considered USDA Forest Service datasets, which are available for virtually any year, but found them impractical to use because they cover the entire country and would require substantial effort to isolate Avon specifically. This led them to select MultiSpec, a remote sensing program with which Mr. Wible had prior academic experience.

Leo Wible of 3450 Long Road and a consultant to the Avon Tree Commission explained the technical methodology in depth. He described MultiSpec as a remote sensing program that allows a user to create mosaics of different categories of land cover from satellite imagery. He explained that he had been trained in remote sensing at Kent State University and that he sourced his satellite data from the United States Geological Survey's Earth Explorer website, which maintains an expansive temporal archive of Landsat imagery going back at least to the 1980s or 1990s. Using this data, he mapped the distribution of tree canopy cover across Avon from 1995 to 2025 and incorporated data from 2026.

Mr. Wible walked Council through the mechanics of remote sensing analysis. He explained that he employed a near-infrared view of Avon — a combination of near-infrared light, green light, and red light — to transform

vegetation, which appears in dark green in true-color imagery and is difficult to distinguish from grass and standing water, into bright red tones. This approach also had the benefit of making buildings and roads stand out more clearly. He showed Council two side-by-side images of Avon from the prior year — one in true color and one in near-infrared — to illustrate the difference.

Mr. Wible then presented a time-lapse video spanning approximately 30 years of satellite imagery, which visually depicted the gradual loss of canopy coverage across Avon as development expanded. He acknowledged the video was somewhat unsteady and that his video editing skills were not the strongest, but it clearly conveyed the development of Avon Commons and numerous housing developments as major contributors to tree removal. He noted that he had applied a filtering criterion to the imagery, selecting only scenes from between May 1 and September 30 with less than 20 percent cloud cover, to ensure trees would be visible at their peak leaf-out and to minimize distortion from cloud shadows.

Mr. Wible then presented a series of pie charts and graphs. He reported that in 1995, approximately 37.5 percent of Avon's land area was covered by trees. By 2000, that figure had dropped to approximately 33.8 percent, and by 2005, it had dropped by roughly a quarter from the 1995 baseline. He cautioned that MultiSpec is not a perfect classification tool — satellite pixels are approximately 15 meters on a side and can represent a mixture of land cover types, a phenomenon known in remote sensing as "mixed pixels" — but stated he was confident the data was sufficiently reliable for planning purposes and that the overall trend was clearly directional. By 2025, the canopy coverage had fallen to approximately 28.9 percent, which Mr. Wible noted may be slightly overestimated by MultiSpec, but nonetheless reflects a clear and sustained decline. The most current data, from 2026, showed canopy coverage had dropped further to approximately 20.4 percent — a decline of approximately 17.1 percent from the 1995 baseline and a loss of roughly 8.5 percent, or over 1,500 acres, from 2025 alone.

Mr. Wible described the seven land cover categories he and Mr. O'Donnell used for classification: urbanized land (encompassing roads, bare ground, construction, and buildings), agricultural land, golf courses, lawns and grassland, open bodies of water such as retention basins, and tree canopy. He noted that the most recent five years of data show Avon trending significantly more urban, while the late 1990s showed a heavier proportion of agricultural and forested land — a shift that mirrors the City's transition from a smaller farming community to a more suburban municipality.

Mr. Wible also presented a z-score correlation chart he had constructed to examine whether there was a statistical relationship between construction activity in Avon and rates of deforestation. He reported finding a high correlation between the two variables, suggesting that construction is indeed a meaningful driver of canopy loss. A companion chart comparing canopy cover against construction volume year over year showed more variability and a somewhat less clear relationship, but the directional trend was consistent.

Turning to economic impacts, Mr. Wible stated that between 1995 and 2025, the loss of tree canopy had resulted in a loss of at least \$135,856 in stormwater remediation value, \$175,000 in air pollution removal value, and nearly half a million dollars in carbon sequestration value. He explained that these figures were derived using data from the i-Tree website that Mr. O'Donnell had collected, which Mr. Wible used as a 2025 baseline. The methodology, which he demonstrated via a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, involved cross-referencing the known amount of carbon sequestered in 2025 with its known dollar value, then applying that ratio to calculate the estimated value for any given prior year.

For 2026 specifically, Mr. Wible reported estimated losses of nearly half a million dollars in carbon sequestration value, over \$150,000 in stormwater mitigation value, and over \$200,000 in air pollution removal value compared to the previous year. He also presented a chart showing that carbon sequestration by Avon's trees had dropped from nearly 13,000 tons per year in 1995 to just over 5,000 tons per year in 2026. He noted that if the current trend of development and tree removal continues, these losses will continue to compound.

Mr. Wible then presented a series of spatial maps he had prepared using the QGIS program, including a Green Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (GNDVI) map, a standard NDVI map, a false-color infrared map, and a true-color map of Avon, all based on recent Landsat imagery. He explained the technical distinctions between the indices — the GNDVI uses short-wave infrared radiation minus green light wavelengths to differentiate trees from buildings, while the standard NDVI uses short-wave infrared radiation minus red light wavelengths. On the maps,

he identified with orange outlines the parcels owned by Lorain County Metro Parks (including the Miller Road Nature Preserve and the wetlands preservation) and with blue outlines the City parks such as Northgate Park, Veterans Memorial Park, Schwartz Road Park, and the Traxler Arboretum. He offered to email copies of all maps to Mr. Varga or Ms. Berges for relay to Council Members.

Mr. Fischer opened the floor to questions and remarked that both presenters had clearly achieved academically at a higher level than he had. His first question was about the methodology used to assign dollar values to ecological benefits such as carbon sequestration and air pollution removal. Mr. O'Donnell explained that these calculations are based on an established practice of assigning a monetary value to a given quantity of carbon absorbed — for example, if 10 tons of carbon is valued at \$70, one can calculate the cost of any proportional canopy loss. Mr. Wible elaborated, noting that he had used a simple cross-multiplication formula in Excel: taking the known annual carbon sequestration and dollar value for 2025 and cross-referencing it with the sequestration figures for each prior year to derive an estimated value. He offered to display the spreadsheet for Council's review.

Mr. Fischer responded with good humor: "Why didn't you tell me it was that simple?"

Mayor Jensen expressed his admiration for the two presenters, stating that it was the second time he had the opportunity to meet with them and that he remained deeply impressed each time. He remarked that their ability to rattle off statistics was extraordinary, noted his pride that they were Avon residents, and expressed optimism about their futures — specifically mentioning Mr. Wible's aspirations toward NASA. He encouraged both students not to lose their enthusiasm and passion for their work.

Ms. Etienne commended the presentation as "one of the most amazing presentations I've ever seen" and asked a clarifying question: she noted that the canopy loss between 2025 and 2026 appeared to show a larger-than-expected jump, from roughly 8 percent to what she understood to be approximately 12 percent over less than six months. Mr. Wible acknowledged the discrepancy and attributed it to the limitations of MultiSpec's classification capabilities, noting that the tool can produce some variation year to year due to mixed pixel effects, but maintained that the overall trend line was valid and that the general direction of deforestation was the key takeaway. Ms. Etienne thanked him and stated the presentation was wonderful.

Mr. Fischer thanked Mr. Varga, Mr. O'Donnell, and Mr. Wible for attending and for the quality of their work.

2. [ORDINANCE NO. 21-26 – TO ACCEPT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VILLAS AT CHESTER COMMONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION/INSTALLATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES AND APPURTENANCES THERETO](#) Mr. Streator

The third of three readings of Ordinance No. 21-26 will be held on Tuesday, May 26, 2026

Mayor Jensen turned to Mr. Gasior, stating that the matter had been pending for some time and that it was his view that a decision needed to be made as to whether the Ordinance would move forward or be withdrawn.

Mr. Gasior explained that the attorney representing the Villas at Chester Commons developer, John Slater, had requested at previous meetings that Council refrain from acting on the acceptance of improvements. He confirmed that the developer had not yet posted the required deposits — specifically, the maintenance bond and other ancillary deposits — though the City does hold a performance bond, and the as-built drawings have been received. He explained the current practice: each Friday, if the developer's attorney has not confirmed readiness, the Clerk is notified and the item is removed from the Regular Meeting agenda without any affirmative action by Council.

Mr. Gasior described the broader history of the project. He noted that the development was initially stalled because of its lack of access to sanitary sewer service. The City offered the developer temporary access to the Moore Road lift station, which was ultimately rejected. The developer had invested money in the property and, after waiting a period of roughly six to eight months for the City to extend the sewer — which the Mayor had made clear the City would not do — proceeded to install the sewer at his own expense, and did so in full conformance with the City's master sanitary sewer plans. The developer's agreement was subsequently amended to allow additional model units.

The more recent complication, Mr. Gasior explained, arose when the developer sought to structure a repayment arrangement involving a loan from Lorain County — reportedly a five percent loan of approximately \$700,000 — and proposed that the City add a \$30–\$40 monthly surcharge to residents' water and sewer bills, which the developer would pay, with the City then remitting those collected funds to repay the County loan. Mr. Gasior stated that none of the formulas proposed by the developer were acceptable to the City. He noted that a comparable mechanism existed on Jaycox Road, where the City had installed sewer infrastructure and then levied a surcharge against benefited properties, collecting those funds over time to retire the associated debt — but that in this case, because the developer himself built the sewer, it complicated the City's ability to issue bonds or assessments against infrastructure it did not construct.

Mayor Jensen pressed Mr. Gasior on the practical implications of the Ordinance's status, asking whether failing to vote on it at the third reading would be more harmful than simply leaving it in its current posture. Mr. Gasior responded that the current approach of removing it from the agenda when the developer is not ready creates no harm to the City. He noted that the only party harmed by the delay is the developer, who cannot rent apartments without sewer and water service, and who cannot obtain those services without the City accepting the improvements. Mr. Gasior added: "Once we accept the sewer...any agreement to be repaid money would not work because now the City owns the sewer line. He's got nothing to leverage."

Mr. Radcliffe asked what would occur if Council chose to conduct the third reading and voted the Ordinance down. Mr. Gasior confirmed that this would require starting the process from scratch, necessitating a new Ordinance with a new number, though the substance would be identical to the current Ordinance. He also confirmed that tabling the Ordinance indefinitely via a motion would effectively "kill it" under Robert's Rules of Order. Mr. Gasior also noted that the three-year maintenance bond period would not be backdated — it would run from the date of Council's eventual vote to accept the improvements, regardless of when construction was completed.

Mr. Radcliffe also asked whether the developer's financing difficulties were attributable to anything on the City's side, and Mr. Gasior confirmed they were not — the complexity was entirely of the developer's own making in seeking an unusual County loan arrangement.

Mr. Gasior summarized the consensus view, suggesting Council should sit back, allow the summer construction season to run its course, and see whether the developer moves to satisfy the deposit requirements as economic pressure mounts. Council appeared to concur with this approach, and no motion was made. The item will remain off the agenda for the May 26, 2026, Regular Meeting unless the developer's attorney confirms readiness and the required deposits are made by the preceding Friday.

3. [ORDINANCE NO. 42-26 – TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 413-68, PASSED JANUARY 15, 1969 COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF AVON, OHIO, AS AMENDED, REZONING THE 17.7 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF NAGEL ROAD BETWEEN MIDDLETON & DETROIT ROADS, PERMANENT PARCEL NOS. 04-00-022-102-044, 04-00-022-102-043, 04-00-022-102-039, 04-00-022-102-041, 04-00-022-102-042, 04-00-022-102-047 & 04-00-022-102-048 FROM R-1 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO C-4 GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT](#)

Planning Referral

A Public Hearing for Ordinance No. 42-26 will be held on Tuesday, May 26, 2026, at 7:25 P.M.

The third of three readings of Ordinance No. 42-26 will be held on Tuesday, May 26, 2026

Ms. Fechter indicated she had no additional information to offer at this time unless Council had questions.

Ms. Patton raised a question about the enforceability of developer renderings in a simple rezoning context. She asked whether an applicant who submits architectural renderings as part of a rezoning request can later be held to those renderings if the rezoning is approved. Ms. Fechter explained that in a straightforward rezoning, the applicant is not bound by any illustrative renderings provided. She noted that the City has, in prior cases, entered into separate agreements when a developer proposed to build something that varied from the standard Code — for example, in the case of the Villas at Nagel Farms, where the developer was building at a lower intensity than permitted, resulting in a separate agreement to memorialize those commitments. In a standard rezoning such as this one, however, the renderings are illustrative only; the applicant is simply trying to obtain a C-4 designation

so that the property can be marketed with that entitlement, and any permitted use within the C-4 district could ultimately be developed.

Ms. Patton acknowledged the explanation and stated plainly, "I don't think we should vote for it," though she characterized her question as one of procedural curiosity rather than a formal objection at this stage.

No further questions were raised by Council.

4. [ORDINANCE NO. 61-26](#) – TO AWARD THE PUBLIC BID FOR THE 2026 AVON PAVEMENT MARKING PROGRAM Mr. Cummins

Mr. Cummins reported that bids for the 2026 Pavement Marking Program were opened on April 30, and that a single bid was received from Aero-Mark Company LLC. He noted that the lone bid came in one percent below the engineer's estimate. Mr. Cummins stated that Aero-Mark had performed this program for the City in prior years, has consistently done quality work, and that the bid documents were reviewed and found to be complete. He recommended that Aero-Mark be considered the lowest and best bidder for the 2026 program.

Mr. Fischer asked whether there was any explanation for the low volume of bids as only one of two firms that pulled plans ultimately submitted a bid. Mr. Cummins indicated he did not have a specific explanation, though he suggested generally that contractors are finding it a busy season as construction activity returns.

No further questions were raised by Council.

5. [ORDINANCE NO. 62-26](#) – TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 156-06 TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE TAX INCREMENT FINANCING FOR TIF#3 FOR AN ADDITIONAL 30 YEARS PURSUANT TO OHIO REVISED CODE SECTION 5709.51; AUTHORIZING OTHER RELATED ACTIONS PURSUANT TO OHIO REVISED CODE SECTIONS 5709.40(B), 5709.42, 5709.43, AND RELATED LAWS Mr. Presley

Mr. Presley presented this item, explaining that the City has followed this practice before with other TIF districts. TIF #3 has reached its dollar collection threshold, and State law allows for an extension in such circumstances. Mr. Presley indicated that he had discussed the matter with Mr. Beachler of Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP and that the goal is to extend the TIF to the maximum term allowable under current law — an additional 30 years — while noting that applicable statutes are always subject to future legislative change.

In response to a question from Mr. Fischer about the geographic location of TIF #3, Mr. Presley indicated it covers parcels in the Chester Road area. Mr. Gasior confirmed that the relevant parcel map is included as an attachment to the originating Ordinance, Ordinance No. 156-06, and that it encompasses properties in the vicinity of State Route 611 and Chester Road.

6. [RESOLUTION NO. R-10-26](#) – TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS FOR THE FRENCH CREEK GREENWAY TRAIL PHASE I PROJECT Mr. Cummins

Mr. Cummins reported that, as of that morning, the final required property easement had been signed by the last needed property owner, clearing the way for the project to proceed to the construction phase. He presented Resolution No. R-10-26 as a request for authorization to publicly advertise for construction bids, with the intent to bring the resulting bids back to City Council for consideration and potential award of a construction contract.

Mrs. Demaline thanked Mr. Cummins for securing the final easement and asked about the anticipated timeline. Mr. Cummins explained that, given that rules suspension would not be available at the May 26 meeting, the earliest the Resolution could be acted upon would be the first Regular Council Meeting on June 8. From there, the City would advertise the following week, receive bids through approximately the end of June, and bring results back to Council in early July for potential award.

Mrs. Demaline asked whether this timeline still allowed for meaningful construction to begin in 2026. Mr. Cummins confirmed that there was indeed enough time to begin the project this year, pointing to a substantial amount of culvert extensions and drainage work that could proceed even if the full trail path was not paved in 2026. He acknowledged it would ultimately be up to the contractor, in coordination with himself and the City Administration, to sequence the work appropriately.

Mayor Jensen suggested that Council might consider holding a Special Meeting on Monday, June 1, which would allow the bid advertisement process to begin one week earlier than if the City waited for the Regular Meeting on June 8. He reasoned that earlier advertisement in the season tends to attract more competitive bids, as contractors are less committed later in the summer.

Mr. Gasior seconded this approach, noting that June has five Mondays and that if the bid award were to slip to a Special Meeting on July 6 or the Regular Meeting on July 13, it would cost the project another full month. He recommended scheduling a Special Meeting on June 1 to at minimum advertise for bids, thereby preserving the best possible window for an early July award.

Mr. Cummins noted a material constraint: the project is funded through a grant that does not permit a construction contract to be formally awarded until after July 1. Accordingly, even with the accelerated timeline, the formal contract award cannot occur before that date — but the earlier the bidding process is initiated, the better-positioned the City will be to award promptly after July 1.

After brief discussion, it was agreed that a Special Meeting on June 1 was the preferred path forward. No objection was raised by any Council Members.

7. REPORTS AND COMMENTS

MAYOR JENSEN provided two updates. First, he offered supplemental context on Ordinance No. 62-26, reiterating that TIF #3 is already generating over \$1,000,000 annually and that extending the term ensures full revenue capture as additional parcels develop. Second, he reminded Council that the following day at 2:30 P.M., the City would be assisting local schools in distributing commemorative placards to students. He was careful to note that this was a school-initiated event, not a City event, and that Council Members present would be there in a supportive capacity only.

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

MS. BERGES, AT LARGE expressed that the Tree Commission had been greatly enriched by its student members, specifically citing Collin O'Donnell and Olivia Pajak, who was graduating this year, as examples of students who had contributed meaningfully to the Tree Commission's work.

Ms. Berges then raised a question about the Memorial Day parade route, given ongoing construction on Detroit Road. Mayor Jensen responded that arrangements had been made and that while the south side of Detroit Road would present some navigational challenges for a brief stretch, everything was in place and the event would proceed as planned.

MRS. DEMALINE, WARD 1, noted that Mayor Jensen had previously indicated that outstanding sidewalk installations from prior year's programs should be completed by the end of May. She asked whether that timeline remained on track. Mayor Jensen explained that the primary complication involved a property on Detroit Road where the current owner is seeking to sell and a prospective buyer is pursuing a three-lot split. The prospective buyer had requested a delay, but the City has pushed back and is requiring that the sidewalks be installed regardless. He indicated that clearing of brush along the relevant stretch near the McWilliams property should begin that week, and that no formal pushback against installation had been received. He also noted that a separate parcel on Colorado Avenue was supposed to have been under contract for sidewalk installation, and that the City would verify whether a contract exists or whether the City would need to step in directly. Mrs. Demaline thanked the Mayor, noting that the situation on Colorado Avenue had been "promised for years."

MS. ETIENNE, WARD 2, reminded Council and the public that Avon Vendor Night at the Heart of Avon Marketplace was taking place that Wednesday, May 20, 2026, from 4:30 to 8:30 P.M., and that “The Hope for B.E.S.T.” would be the featured charity of the evening. The event location is 2536 Stoney Ridge Road.

MR. MOORE, WARD 3, reiterated the sidewalk concern, specifically directing attention to three parcels on Jaycox Road. He stated that it was frustrating to observe Brightspeed trucks operating extensively throughout the City for their infrastructure work while the company had still not installed the sidewalks required of them — particularly when residential property owners had already completed their required sidewalk installations. He asked that pressure be maintained on those parcels.

MS. PATTON, AT LARGE, expressed her admiration for the tree canopy presentation stating she was impressed with both young men. She also announced she would be attending the Avon Vendor Night, emphasizing that “The Hope for B.E.S.T.” is a nonprofit dedicated to mental health awareness, and she invited the public to attend.

MR. RADCLIFFE, WARD 4 echoed the sentiment that he greatly enjoyed the presentation. He wished everyone a Happy Memorial Day.

MR. FISCHER, AT LARGE, echoed the positive comments about the Tree Commission and the student presenters. He expressed that he was "blown away," though he acknowledged that much of the technical content had "gone right over his head" noting that it was very impressive.

Mr. Fischer also noted that his wife would be at Avon Vendor Night with foster puppies available for adoption.

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATION:

MR. CUMMINS, CITY ENGINEER, had no additional comments.

MS. FECHTER, PLANNING/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR, noted that she had attended the ribbon cutting at the recently remodeled Petco on Saturday morning, described the interior as very nice, and informed Council that as of that day, the last storage container had been removed from the property. She wished everyone a Happy Memorial Day.

MR. GASIOR, LAW DIRECTOR, had no additional comments.

MR. PRESLEY, FINANCE DIRECTOR, had no additional comments.

MR. STREATOR, SAFETY DIRECTOR/PUBLIC SERVICE DIRECTOR, was absent.

AUDIENCE:

No members of the audience came forward to address Council.

8. ADJOURN: 8:23 P.M.

There being no further business, the Work Session of Council was adjourned.

PASSED: _____

SIGNED BY: _____
Brian Fischer, Council President

ATTEST: _____
Barbara Brooks, Clerk of Council