

**ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Council President Vecchio at 7:00 p.m., the clerk called the roll and the following Members of Council answered:

SCOTT, BURGIO, ORCUTT, STEMM, MENCINI, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE

Also in attendance were Mayor Gammella, Finance Director Cingle, Law Director Horvath, Service Director Gardner, Building Commissioner Hurst, Engineer Piatak and Recreation Director Elliott.

DISCUSSION:

1. POWER POINT PRESENTATION FROM BOSS PRO-KARTING REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PHASE ONE AT 18301 BROOKPARK ROAD LOCATED IN A U7-A DISTRICT, TO OPERAN AN AIRPORT PARKING FACILITY IN CONJUCTION WITH CURRENT TENANT USE. **Note:** Moved by motion from the Caucus meeting held on November 13, 2018.

Steve Pryatel
General Manager
18301 Brookpark Road

Brad Copley
Owner
18301 Brookpark Road

Mr. Pryatel gave a power point presentation for phase one that is available for review in the Council office.

Mr. Mencini thanked them for coming and expressed concerns with the 10 to 15 parking spaces and who else could come forward, how this will be watched and is the outdoor track going to stay?

Mr. Copley responded the outdoor track runs as part of the existing parking lot and into a new area. When the outdoor track in opened in the summer there is parking for 10 cars and when the track is closed through the winter there will be spaces for 15 cars.

Mr. Mencini asked if this idea came from clients?

Mr. Copley responded across the street in the City of Cleveland, there is a new Airport Express Parking between the RTA (Regional Transit Authority) and Dog Day Care and for the past two years they've been opened the approximate 36 spaces have been full on a daily basis.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Mencini asked if there is a shuttle bus involved for transportation?

Mr. Copley responded there are two tests being done, one with a black Suburban to shuttle people back and forth and also testing the valet of the customer's vehicle for them.

Mr. Poindexter thanked them for a great presentation and asked what if there were 16 customers would Boss Pro-Karting parking lot be used for the excess spaces or turn customers away?

Mr. Copley responded the parking spaces being used today for Boss Pro-Karting would remain for Boss Pro-Karting.

Mr. Poindexter commented in 2015 the city gave a demolition grant for construction of your facility and at that time the anticipation was to employ 20 to 30 persons and those terms have been met.

Mr. Scott stated how will the cars be secured in the back of the building?

Mr. Copley responded the area is already fenced in and padlocked and currently there will be two cameras for 24-hour video surveillance along with the current lights and fences.

Mr. Orcutt thanked them for a great presentation and asked Mayor Gammella if Boss Pro-Karting is within the city's airport parking zone?

Mayor Gammella referred to Building Commissioner Hurst.

Mr. Hurst responded no, they are not zoned for airport parking.

Mr. Orcutt stated in April, 2018 another company came to Planning asking for a Conditional Use Permit and was denied. Mr. Orcutt asked for an explanation of the differential between the two businesses.

Mr. Hurst responded one of the conditions for a Conditional Use Permit is for unique situations; how the business outside of the zone negatively or positively affect the surrounding businesses and neighbors. When there are shuttles coming in and out that becomes a hindrance on surrounding businesses. There was one denied on Smith Road, a few years back, due to the negative impact of a residential area. In this case, there are no neighbors it is only the RTA tracks, Route 237 and the railroad so there is no impact surrounding neighbors or traffic.

Discussion:

Mr. Orcutt asked Law Director Horvath if anyone could sue the city that was denied a Conditional Use Permit for airport parking?

Mrs. Horvath responded there is always the possibility of litigation but the facts presented by Boss Pro-Kart is quite different and would be surprised of any litigation and if there was doesn't think it would be well-founded.

Mr. Hurst commented the company denied in April was in a U7-C zone that is set up as a very restrictive special district and would have negatively impacted neighboring businesses. Boss Pro-Kart is in a U7-A district that allows differences for businesses.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Hurst where the company that asked for a Conditional Use Permit in April is located?

Mr. Hurst responded the company wanted to locate between the Oncology Center and former Ferry Cap & Screw. Although, there is industrial and commercial uses the impact on the neighborhood is how a Conditional Use Permit is established. That is why the Conditional Use Permits were denied due to how the neighbors would be impacted.

Motion by Mr. Scott, supported by Mr. Mencini, to place on the Council agenda immediately following.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Scott, Mencini, Stemm, Poindexter, Burgio, Orcutt

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTION: Salvatore. The motion carried 6-0 with one abstention.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear under M-5 as Resolution No. 39-2018.

2. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) CONSULTATION TO ANSWER QUESTIONS REGARDING CITY COUNCIL EMAILS. **In attendance: Mr. Zach Ellis from TCC Technology Solutions.**

Zach Ellis
Network Engineer - City IT Representative
TCC Technology Solutions
901 Canterbury Road
Westlake

Mr. Ellis stated two concerns were brought forward with the city's email accounts. One being can one user access another user's email and, if so, can emails be pulled out of the inbox? The second related to security walls and permissions

Discussion: cont.

based on a per-count basis. To start the only way a message can be pulled out of a user's inbox or out of an email in general is through a process called message recall. This service is provided through Office 365 that the city uses and has very explicit limitations on how it works. In theory, a user can send an email to another and withdraw from their inbox. However, the user is notified with a separate email that the sender would like to recall that message. Mr. Ellis provided documentation to Council that is on file in the Council office for review.

Mr. Orcutt thanked Mr. Ellis for coming and meeting with him this morning. At the October 2nd meeting a request was made to Mr. Vecchio, Council Office Administrator of questions to be answered. 1) What is the city's email security level and 2) who besides the user can access accounts? On what day did you receive notice of these questions?

Mr. Ellis responded not sure but would be safe to assume right after that date.

Mr. Orcutt clarified the meeting this morning that subject was discussed?

Mr. Ellis concurred.

Mr. Orcutt continued on October 16, 2018, City Council voted unanimously your attendance at a Caucus meeting about email security. What day were you notified of that request?

Mr. Ellis responded same instance can't give a correct date but safe to assume it came to my attention right after that.

Mr. Orcutt stated, for the record, on October 16th Council unanimously voted to have Mr. Ellis at a meeting. Council was notified on November 14th of a request for your attendance, for the record being one month later. Also, for the record, from October 2nd to October 16th there was no response from your office or the Council administrator.

Mr. Vecchio interjected you said from October 2nd to October 16th nothing was heard?

Mr. Orcutt concurred.

Mr. Vecchio continued on October 10th, I forwarded a copy of Mr. Ellis' email to you at 3:51 p.m.

Mr. Orcutt commented at that time, I was locked out of my email.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio continued there was communication from Mr. Ellis regarding the October 3rd email received...

Mr. Orcutt interjected for the record, I have not been using that email. I was setup with an email work instruction packet probably from Mr. Ellis' office that included a temporary sign-in password. Within those instructions was how to set up the email using the temporary password and once gaining access the user had to change to a permanent password for sign-in.

Mr. Ellis concurred and stated whenever I create a new account for a user you are required to change that password after the first time of signing in, I don't want to know your password.

Mr. Orcutt continued right and you stated that to me. When I set mine up and created my password the instructions say to immediately sign-on. I was locked out and mentioned to the Council President, before a meeting, there was an issue with signing on and he said there was a little delay or error. It took me one, two or three days to actually sign-on with the user password created. What was the error and/or delay when the emails were first set up?

Mr. Ellis clarified do you mean from the time I created the account to when it was available to you?

Mr. Orcutt responded from the time I set the email account up with my permanent password and was unable to sign in for a day or two; then I was able to get in.

Mr. Ellis stated I don't have an answer for that and am not sure why it wouldn't let you sign in. If your password is correct you should be able to sign in using the simple process of using your email address and password login. Some weeks ago, you and I had a discussion where I reset your password for you while we were on the phone, is this before or after that?

Mr. Orcutt responded this was at the initial time of starting emails.

Mr. Ellis commented I don't have an answer for that if you were using the correct password you should have been able to log in, there is nothing in the system that would time-out unless the wrong password was entered too many times.

Mr. Orcutt thanked Mr. Ellis for coming and commented the timeframe for asking for answers to two questions started on October 2nd and today, November 20th, is quite a bit of time. I appreciate your honesty at our meeting this morning and answering those two questions. That is what I was looking for on October 2nd is

Discussion: cont.

the answers to those two questions because there was more behind it; talking about the subject matter of emails.

Mr. Ellis commented of course, emails are a very intricate tool in the way the city operates and conducts business and understand where if a certain user doesn't have access to that or if there is any hindrance in communication it slows the whole process down.

Mr. Orcutt stated the first email deleted and not in my trash bin was from the Council President regarding legislation being placed on an agenda. We both use Outlook 365 and know with your email dated November 7th stated if there is a recall. If somebody pulls that message back I should have received a message, correct?

Mr. Ellis responded 100%.

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mr. Vecchio is there any chance you recalled that?

Mr. Vecchio responded no, as a matter of fact, I still have it saved in my sent folder to Ed Orcutt, along with that same email, the Council Clerk was carbon-copied (cc'd). Of which had my understanding of that...

Mr. Orcutt interjected I'm aware of all that and have Mr. Salvatore, myself and the clerk since we're on the topic.

Mr. Vecchio interjected you asked me a question so let me answer the question. With that...

Mr. Orcutt interjected I just asked if you recalled it, that is a yes or no answer.

Mr. Vecchio stated my question goes a little further in this case, Mr. Ellis if I would have recalled it would a notice been sent to each of the persons that were copied on?

Mr. Ellis responded yes.

Mr. Orcutt stated on the subject of emails that email was to myself and three other Members of Council trying to put legislation on an agenda. You (Mr. Vecchio) didn't want to put that on the agenda could you answer why?

Mr. Vecchio stated we're speaking with Mr. Ellis so that has nothing to do with?

Mr. Orcutt interjected we're talking about the email.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio stated we have Mr. Ellis regarding the issues with the system of email, not the content of the email. That's a whole different subject if you'd like to bring that forward.

Mr. Orcutt stated if anyone had been paying attention to the issue that we had and brought forth to this Council, it was about the subject matter. So when that request was made and voted on unanimously to bring this subject up to the Caucus meeting and have Mr. Ellis in attendance, it's about the subject matter of the email and have been saying that at every meeting.

Mr. Vecchio stated what we're working on right now and discussing has to do with the issue of your email missing, has nothing to do with the contents of it. This has to do with your missing email.

Mr. Orcutt interjected I've asked Mr. Ellis all the questions that needed asking and this is about the subject matter that I've been talking about and all I'm asking is a simple question. Why would an email in my inbox that went away on a subject matter that was time-sensitive be eliminated and am asking you about that email?

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Ellis as you looked into the email and looked at the server did you see deleted emails? Were there deleted emails from Mr. Orcutt or were there emails that we stopped by myself to Mr. Orcutt?

Mr. Ellis responded I do not have direct access to anybody's inbox.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Ellis, are you able to see on the server if an email has been deleted, does it stay on the server? Or if an email is recalled is there a message that goes to the server?

Mr. Ellis responded no, I can see when messages come in and come out what happens internally I don't have access too.

Mr. Vecchio stated the question is back to the email as you stated was deleted. Mr. Ellis has stated he can't see it but yet you would have received a copy if deleted or pulled back as with anyone else.

Mr. Orcutt commented I'm very well aware of that and asked all those questions earlier.

Mr. Vecchio asked Mr. Orcutt where are you heading with this?

Mr. Orcutt responded it seems to me, pretty ironic, that both of the emails deleted had to deal with putting a piece of legislation that was time-sensitive on an

Discussion: cont.

agenda. Council came out of summer recess and trying to place a piece of legislation on an agenda for August 21st that had been in the office for a few days. At 11:48 a.m., 12 minutes before cut-off time of noon on Friday, I received an email that the legislation isn't going to make the agenda, and have stated over and over that's a red flag. The other deleted email dealt directly with the same piece of legislation that was introduced on August 28th, never made the August 21st agenda. At the August 28th meeting, Council unanimously voted to have a special meeting on August 30th. The meeting that was unanimously voted on at the August 28th meeting for August 30th was not going to happen. Because the clerk reached out to me telling me that I needed to come in and sign for a meeting because you (Mr. Vecchio) wouldn't sign for it. One of my constituents that was paying attention emailed me on September 17th asking for information why Council had to sign for a meeting that was mandated by Council on August 28th. All of a sudden my constituent's email disappeared.

Mr. Vecchio suggested that if Mr. Ellis cannot pull that this may be in IT Forensics, what your kind of looking at. I think you may have to go deeper if you're not able to find these. To Mr. Ellis, if you cannot find the email on the server in a deleted area or see one was pulled back. Where do we need to go because Mr. Orcutt needs that resolution why he doesn't have the email and needs to understand why I still have the email and/or the Council clerk.

Mr. Ellis responded currently the city utilizes E1 licensing through Office 365 which includes premium support for Microsoft and if you would like to dig deeper, I can reach out to Microsoft for options.

Mr. Vecchio commented in my opinion I think we need to go deeper and implore Mr. Ellis for answers.

Mr. Orcutt commented that I received good information from Mr. Ellis when we met and everything he had shared with me. Everything I researched through Outlook 365 and it seemed pretty cut and dry and to be honest with my emails it's not counter-practice to delete any emails. When I look and see that two have been deleted and happen to be on the same subject matter of keeping legislation off the agenda, I am obligated to bring forward.

Mr. Ellis asked if both emails were sent from internal email addresses, city users?

Mr. Orcutt responded no, one was from Outlook 365 from the Council President and the other one from a resident.

Mr. Ellis stated at that point, where I'm sitting, this wouldn't be an issue with the recalling or wouldn't be a matter of one user of an organization pulling emails out

Discussion: cont.

of another user's inbox. I don't know how I would trace that out without having the sender of the other organization unless to do message tracing from them. We should definitely rule out 100% recalling at this point, it seems the issue goes deeper than that. From where I'm sitting it seems more a top security and we might need to change security, password and some other things. What you're describing sounds like emails getting moved or deleted or a user logging into your account and deleting it; those are the only two options from my standpoint.

Mr. Orcutt concurred. If those two answers were given from October 2nd I could have moved on with the other part of the subject matter and not had to bring you here. But from October 2nd to today, to me, seems like so unnecessary and unsatisfactory. Thanks to Mr. Ellis for coming and answering my questions.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mr. Ellis to summarize the discussion it is possible to have somebody retrieve a message out of somebody else's email. You were unable to pinpoint that because you do not have access to that individual email to be able to prove the fact that someone did do that and if so who did it.

Mr. Ellis responded sort of, going back we're talking about is message recall and it's a service through Microsoft. Essentially what this service is allowing one user that is serving a mail server with another user to recall a message. For example, you send an email to Mr. Vecchio and notice a typo that message can be recalled and replaced with an updated email with correct spelling. When that occurs Mr. Vecchio will a notification saying that you want to recall the message and presented with the option to let the message be recalled and receive a new message. Or keep the original message and receive the new message. There is no way a message can be pulled out of somebody's mailbox especially outside of the organization. Unless a user is part of the city's same mail server it can't happen and with what I've heard the concern is not possible. If I send a message to you from Gmail and you're on Office 365 I couldn't recall the message.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Ellis you couldn't recall but could anyone else?

Mr. Ellis responded if I emailed my boss I could recall it but I can't email you and recall the message because we are not part of the same mail server.

Mr. Salvatore clarified if I sent a message to Mr. Orcutt could I recall that message?

Mr. Ellis responded 100% with him getting notified.

Mr. Salvatore asked what if the original message wasn't opened?

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Ellis responded he would still get notification and the original message would be replaced.

Mr. Salvatore asked if a message can be recalled after it's opened?

Mr. Ellis responded yes, but the user is presented with a notification beforehand in case both messages are to be kept.

Mr. Salvatore asked is there any possibility of a message being retrieved without getting notification?

Mr. Ellis responded no, it's impossible per the examples provided by Microsoft, the user is notified, that is included in one of the documents provided this evening.

Mr. Salvatore stated in the world of electronics and computerization is there anything impossible?

Mr. Ellis stated nothing is impossible if you have the right name and password.

Mr. Mencini thanked Mr. Ellis for coming and when opening my email for the first time there were six messages waiting for me. Until that password was put in would somebody have access to those emails?

Mr. Ellis responded I'm going to say no, you used the temporary password given to log in or did I reset your password for you.

Mr. Mencini commented I think you reset the password for me, on the spot.

Mr. Ellis continued somebody could have seen those messages if before you logged in they used your email address and temporary password they could get into it that way. But, again if you're using a new password that can't happen and those messages were shown as unread, so nobody had been in your account.

Mr. Mencini stated if I decided to leave Council how would my contents be accessed; somebody has to have some type of access. Aren't we all on the same network and set up on the same system?

Mr. Ellis responded everyone is on the same email server, however, I'm the only user that has admin (administrative) access and can go in. As I stated I don't have direct access to your inboxes so the easiest way me to access your email would be to reset your password and log in.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Ellis who oversees the system?

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Ellis responded the system isn't designed that way and I'm the only administrator. Every Councilmember has only user rights and access to your inboxes. A Yahoo account would be the same concept with Office 365 being a remote server accessed through the web and there's an administrator somewhere to verify your information to make sure it's you to reset your password. Any user here has basic user access if the password needs to be reset or something changed they have to go to the administrator, being myself, to make that happen. If it were easy for hackers to get into a mail server to steal emails or create accounts Microsoft would be out of business.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Ellis the only way this could happen is if somebody logged in and deleted an email.

Mr. Ellis concurred.

Mr. Poindexter continued is there a way to see which device logged into by location that could be traced.

Mr. Ellis responded that's where this get challenging, the system only logs the public IP address device used to connect to the mail account. I can go in and check logs to see what public IP address was used, however, I can't trace the IP's back to their source and it's usually a general IP. For example, you belong to Verizon they have a said block of public IP's they allow their devices to connect to. I can trace it back to Verizon but once I hit Verizon can't see any further than that. Unless an address stood out showing a location of UK or Russia it's hard to find the malicious logins.

Mr. Poindexter stated if Mr. Orcutt logged into his account from his computer or phone on a consistent basis we would be able to see the few oddball times where he logged in at a different location or IP address. Raising the question that somebody else logged in on his account?

Mr. Ellis responded that definitely could but that user would have to Mr. Orcutt's password which comes back as long as the users are accounts password secured there isn't really a way in.

Mr. Stemm stated to Mr. Ellis if an administrator was able to get in unless they knew the password they would have to change it, correct?

Mr. Ellis concurred and responded as stated before the easiest way for me to get into somebody's inbox is to log in with my admin account and reset that password.

Mr. Stemm stated the next time I went to log in it I wouldn't be allowed?

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Ellis concurred.

Mr. Stemm asked if emails are secured now?

Mr. Ellis responded I believe so and am more than happy to reset all your passwords before leaving.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Ellis at least in my case, I didn't recall or delete any emails but as you said Microsoft could dig a little further. I would like to implore you to please do so and what I would like to get from my that is retrieval from my account of anything that may have been recalled. Or if I logged into somewhere else and also from Mr. Orcutt's account of any deleted items that may be in there that may retract that one back.

Mr. Ellis responded I can do that.

Mr. Orcutt thanked Mr. Ellis for his time and reiterated this started with two questions on October 2nd, it's not November 20th, and I didn't mean to waste your time and city's time. I understand you'll have to look into this and am curious as well and wanted two questions answered relative to the subject matter.

Mr. Vecchio thanked Mr. Ellis for coming.

Motion by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Orcutt, that item number two was discussed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Poindexter, Orcutt, Burgio, Scott, Salvatore, Mencini, Stemm
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

3. RESOLUTION NO. 19-2018, TO EXTEND THE BUILDING PERMITS OR CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY FOR ANY BUILDING, STRUCTURE, USE OR CHANGE OF USE THAT WOULD ENABLE THE CULTIVATION, PROCESSING, OR RETAIL SALE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA FOR A PERIOD NOT TO EXCEED SIX MONTHS FROM THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS RESOLUTION, IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE CITY ADMINISTRATION, COUNCIL AND THE BROOK PARK PLANNING COMMISSION TO REVIEW APPLICABLE OHIO STATUTES, CRIMINAL CODES AND THE BROOK PARK ZONING CODE RELATIVE TO SUCH USE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Councilman Scott. **Note: Six-month moratorium adopted by City Council on June 5, 2018 will expire on December 5, 2018.**

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Salvatore stated there is legislation that would be on a more permanent basis and would like to see this going to 12 months; to allow time by city personnel to look at this and come to a conclusion of moving forward or not doing anything at all.

Mr. Poindexter stated support in the 12-month extension and would like to see the Administration, Planning and Zoning do research to see if the city is in agreement or disagreement. Medical marijuana is positively received by members of the medical community and Brook Park is always looking for new and creative ways to increase revenue and help people suffering with various ailments. Not for or against, at this point, until research is done to see how this fits in with the city.

Mr. Vecchio commented that Council is on the right track to extend this longer because Cleveland Clinic has now prohibited all doctors from prescribing medical marijuana due to some issues, extending this out for research is a great idea.

Mr. Mencini stated there is a lot to be looked at this and one year would give the city due process to do that. Bringing in revenue is true but wouldn't want that to be the city's main source of revenue. Until this is correct and city personnel are on the same page agrees with the 12-month moratorium.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Burgio, to amend Section 1, fifth line, remove six and replace with 12 months and Section 6, fifth line, remove six and replace with 12 months.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Burgio, Orcutt, Scott, Poindexter, Mencini

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTION: Stemm. The amendments carried with a vote of 6 with one abstention.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Mencini, to amend the title, fifth line by removing six and replace with 12 months.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Mencini, Poindexter, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTION: Stemm. The motion carried with a vote of 6 with one abstention.

Motion by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Mencini, to place on the Council agenda immediately following as amended.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Poindexter, Mencini, Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTION: Stemm. The motion carried with a vote of 6 with one abstention.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear under N-1 as Resolution No. 19-2018, as amended.

4. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE SALE OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6363 LOCKHAVEN DRIVE, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 343-27-018 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mr. Mencini stated this property is in Ward 2 and is ready to move forward.

Mr. Scott commented Section 1, first line, reads 'The Mayor is hereby authorized to negotiate and enter into a contract. Is that verbiage necessary since the city already has a contract? Would that leave this open for the person to renegotiate?

Mayor Gammella responded no, the agreement is made and will stay the same as prepared by the law department.

Mr. Salvatore asked that the contract be attached to the legislation, if possible.

Mayor Gammella responded this can be placed under Discussion at the next meeting with the contract attached.

Mr. Salvatore expressed concerns with the fourth Whereas, second line, 'purchase this property from Angelo Castelli', that that sounds like the gentleman already owns the property. The gentleman is purchasing the property from the city to build a house.

Mr. Mencini asked Law Director Horvath if the fourth 'Whereas' need to be amended?

Mrs. Horvath responded Mr. Salvatore's point is well taken and should be amended so the legislation is clear. The amendment could be replacing the word and with who or some reference to Mr. Castelli.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, to place on the December 4th Caucus Prior to under Discussion.

Mr. Poindexter recommended placing a comma (,) after offer and comma (,) after property would isolate the two subjects.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio concurred and commented to make it more clear it could read the Economic Development Commissioner has received an offer from Albert Castelli.

The clerk called the roll on the motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, to place on the December 4th Caucus Prior to agenda.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt, Stemm, Mencini, Poindexter
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

There being no further business to come before this meeting a **motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Stemm, to adjourn.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Poindexter, Stemm, Mencini, Salvatore, Scott, Burgio, Orcutt
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED


Michelle Blazak
Clerk of Council

APPROVED



THESE MEETING MINUTES APPROVED BY BROOK PARK CITY COUNCIL ARE A SYNOPSIS, NOT TRANSCRIBED IN THEIR ENTIRETY, ALTHOUGH ACCURATE.

5,306 words

