

**ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED  
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING  
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 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, ORCUTT, STEMM, MENCINI, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE**

Also in attendance were Mayor Gammella, Law Director Horvath, Finance Director Cingle, Service Director Gardner, Building Commissioner Hurst, Economic Development Commissioner Adams, Engineer Piatak (7:05 p.m.) and Recreation Director Elliott (7:10 p.m.). Councilman Burgio arrived 7:28 p.m.

Mr. Vecchio excused Councilman Stemm from tonight's meeting.  
-----

**DISCUSSION:**

1. DIVISION OF LIQUOR CONTROL -OHIO LIQUOR NETWORK, LLC, 15200 BROOKPARK ROAD, BROOK PARK, OH 44135 **C NEW 6523138** FOR A D5. **At the 11/13/18 Caucus Meeting, City Council by motion asked for a 30-day extension that was granted until December 19, 2018**

Mrs. Horvath stated the law department found no reason to disqualify this license and should go forward.

**Motion** by Mr. Scott, supported by Mr. Mencini, that item number was one discussed.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Orcutt.

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**FINANCE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, SCOTT:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CHANGE ORDER BETWEEN CUSTOMIZED PHONE SYSTEMS AND THE CITY OF BROOK PARK FOR ADDITIONAL RE-ROUTING AND WIRING AT THE NEW BROOK PARK CITY HALL AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mr. Scott stated to Mr. Cingle this work has been completed.

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Poindexter clarified this is re-work of something missed?

**Finance Committee - Chairman, Scott: cont.**

Mayor Gammella responded this is something that was missed during the construction to help the system run more efficient?

Mr. Orcutt stated the invoice is for \$5,455.00 with an increase of \$957.50.

Mr. Cingle responded this was additional work requested for moving City Hall to the new location with the balance reflecting the amount due plus the \$957.50, for a total amount paid of \$5,455.00.

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Salvatore, Mencini, Poindexter, Scott, Orcutt.

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear under M-6 as Ordinance No. 11056-2018.  
-----

**SAFETY COMMITTEE - CO-CHAIRMAN, SCOTT:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 153.241 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES ENTITLED 'MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS FOR POLICE AND FIRE CHIEFS AND CAPTAINS' AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella. **Note: Moved by motion from the 12/11/18 Caucus agenda.**

Mr. Orcutt stated this is through the union and if cancelled the benefits would come back to the city's insurance.

Mayor Gammella concurred.

Mr. Orcutt asked what would cause someone to be terminated for hospitalization coverage.

Mayor Gammella responded this would be from the state pension fund and only affects the captains, chiefs and assistant chiefs when retire. The city, at that point, would have to pay for their health care.

Mr. Poindexter stated once these safety forces members retire and taken off insurance the city would cover them for the rest of their life.

Mayor Gammella responded for police and fire captains, chiefs and assistant chiefs, in essence, the city would be paying health insurance for non-employees and retired.

**Safety Committee - Co-Chairman, Scott: cont.**

Mr. Salvatore asked if there is anybody eligible or in the process that will be affected by this?

Mrs. Horvath stated to my knowledge no one is receiving this benefit and my understanding is that the State of Ohio will cease to pay this type of benefit. This will terminate through these four categories of retired individuals and don't believe that any of them are currently receiving contributions towards hospitalization.

Mr. Cingle commented that is the case, none of the retirees are receiving this benefit. When 65 years of age older on Medicare they would receive \$100.00 a month, \$1200.00 annually, to date, there isn't a retiree on the city's health care plan.

Mr. Salvatore stated that \$100.00 that goes to each retiree towards benefit, will the removal of this clause affect that?

Mr. Cingle replied no, they will still be eligible for the Medicare reimbursement if 65 years of age and on Medicare.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Cingle, with this if nothing was done or voted down could this open up a can of worms for the city?

Mr. Cingle responded if Council does nothing then the retired (police & fire) chiefs, assistant chiefs and captains could come back on the city's health care plan; that would increase premiums over the years for the city. The city's health care premium was initially 26% increase for 2019 that has been negotiated down to 21.7% and by adding more could impact the increase to be higher.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Cingle has there been anyone in the past using this benefit, if so how many?

Mr. Cingle responded no, because the retirees were covered under their pension system. It is my understanding that the pension plan will no longer offer health plan to the retirees they will only be given a stipend to go into an exchange. The retirees' argument is with the OP&F (Ohio Police & Fire) pension fund since they have paid into it and the city has paid into it and that benefit is being adjusted for them.

**Motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Mencini, to place on the Council agenda immediately following under First Reading.

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

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**Safety Committee - Co-Chairman, Scott: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio stated that will appear under M-7 as Ordinance No. 11057-2018.  
-----

**Miscellaneous:**

Mr. Orcutt - there is some unfinished business with the request to Mr. Ellis, city's IT technician, to perform a further check with his email problem and have not heard anything back. The email hasn't been used due to the possible investigation to see where it was compromised. I do not agree with all of Mr. Ellis' findings when he appeared before Council but it is more with the subject matter of the emails in August. The first email deleted was from Mr. Vecchio dated August 17<sup>th</sup> about a piece of legislation that four Councilmembers' wanted on the agenda; reducing City Council by one person and having the Council President vote. That piece of legislation didn't make the agenda and my question is why wasn't that piece of legislation placed on the agenda?

Mr. Vecchio - it wasn't for me to place on the agenda considering, the fact, that Council voted which removes the Council President from that.

Mr. Orcutt - Council returned from summer session and on August 17<sup>th</sup> there was a piece of legislation to be placed on the August 21<sup>st</sup> agenda. Per your email sent it stated that piece of legislation wasn't going on the agenda because there was similar legislation in committee.

Mr. Vecchio - correct, that's the email that you're talking about, sent to you, Mr. Salvatore and the Council Clerk.

Mr. Orcutt concurred.

Mr. Vecchio - to let everyone know, I felt the piece of legislation that was in committee was very similar and needed to be acted upon before acting on that piece of legislation. I felt that Council needed to take that action to resolve that piece being in committee and then move forward.

Mr. Orcutt - that piece of legislation also had a timeline of 20 days for Council to review, pass and get to the Board of Elections (BOE) for the residents to vote yes or no. On the reduction of City Council and the streamline of city government based on beginning with Council and putting that money in other departments. Mr. Orcutt asked Mr. Vecchio if he went to the law director for an opinion?

Mr. Vecchio - I spoke with the law director saying there was a similar piece and had you communicated with me or anyone else about the 20 days. The

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

further question would be what was the rush? If this was an important item why wasn't it done beforehand? Why a last minute item?

Mr. Orcutt - Council was off for four weeks and coming back from recess, August 17<sup>th</sup> from that time to September 6<sup>th</sup> to pass the legislation and get to the BOE; that was shortened because you didn't put on the agenda. That was the email erased from my inbox completely gone.

Mr. Vecchio - you also requested that email from the Council Clerk?

Mr. Orcutt - yes, I think you and I can both agree that 12 minutes before the deadline for me to request an opinion...that happened at 11:48 a.m. That legislation was sitting in the office for a few days and at 11:48 a.m., 12 minutes before the cutoff time. I think you can agree that I didn't have enough time to call the law director for an opinion and have her write an opinion to send to the Council office for that piece of legislation to appear on the agenda. My question is why didn't you put that piece of legislation on the agenda?

Mr. Vecchio reiterated the piece of legislation that you wanted on the agenda and as I sent an email, of which, you did not respond to me. Was stated clearly that I thought and felt that the piece in committee previously was outlining the same thing, a reduction in Council was very similar and needed to be acted upon. As the Chairman and looking at we can't have like or same legislation in two different places.

Mr. Orcutt - I don't agree with that.

Mr. Vecchio - you have the right to disagree and if you're going to push the issue with this you could have communicated with myself by a phone call.

Mr. Orcutt - the first phone call made was to the law director, the email that you gave was 12 minutes before the cutoff time of noon. I disagree with those pieces of legislation being similar, they're not. The one piece reflects was to reduce Council by five members and the new piece was to reduce City Council of one at-large and have the Council President vote. In your email you recommended the legislation be pulled out of committee and place on the August 28<sup>th</sup> agenda to be defeated. Then have the new piece of legislation placed on the September 4<sup>th</sup> agenda for passage and impossible to get to the BOE by September 6<sup>th</sup>. I disagree with the two pieces being similar and received an opinion from the law director and had placed on the August 28<sup>th</sup> meeting and read into the record. From August 17<sup>th</sup> through 28<sup>th</sup> reduced the availability to get that piece of legislation to the BOE by 11 days. At the August 28<sup>th</sup> meeting there was unanimous vote of 7-0 to have a special meeting to get the legislation to the BOE,

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

that vote mandated you to call a meeting for August 30<sup>th</sup>. Why didn't you sign for that meeting?

Mr. Vecchio - because Council asked for the meeting, therefore, Council is requesting a special meeting and Council had the authorization to sign for that meeting, not the Council President. The Council President, the Mayor or three Members of Council can call a special meeting.

Mr. Orcutt - your interpretation to seven Members of Council saying they want a meeting in two days meant that you wouldn't sign for a meeting.

Mr. Vecchio - I didn't have to sign for a special the Charter and Council Rules state a special meeting is called for by the Mayor, Council President or three Members of Council.

Mr. Orcutt - what the Charter says and going back to the piece of legislation you were not in support of the legislation. In fact, you said that the Council President shouldn't have a vote and be unbiased. The Charter states that you vote if you're going to read from the Charter, you have to understand the Charter thoroughly. I'm very suspicious from the beginning point of this issue on August 17<sup>th</sup> to the time of a notice received from the Council clerk that says the Council President won't sign for this meeting. When I asked the Council clerk how many times has this ever happened she responded never.

Mr. Vecchio - I want to ask you a simple question.

Mr. Orcutt - I'm not finished and I'm very suspicious that you were not putting this on the agenda.

Mr. Vecchio - let me ask you a question, are you saying that I deleted your emails? If you are please say so.

Mr. Orcutt - Mr. Council President.

Mr. Vecchio - Mr. Orcutt, I asked you a direct question.

Mr. Orcutt - Mr. Council President.

Mr. Vecchio - You're insinuating that I did; if you feel that please say it.

Mr. Orcutt - Mr. Council President.

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio - Mr. Orcutt, I asked you a simple question. You're making an accusation, a blanket accusation, of which you're now insinuating that I had something to do with your emails that are missing.

Mr. Orcutt - If you go back and watch the livestream...

Mr. Vecchio - Please come out and say it.

Point of Order raised by Mr. Salvatore.

Mr. Orcutt - I can't even answer that question but will defend myself.

Mr. Vecchio - Point of Order, Point of Order, Mr. Salvatore you're point, sir?

Mr. Salvatore - I would respectfully request that whoever has the floor finish talking with no interruptions. Let's get this over with, I'd like to get this over with tonight. This is something that should have been over a long time and as one Councilman and called the 'senior guy'. I am the 'senior guy' and never seen this before and don't want to see it now either. I'd like to get this resolved this evening and move forward, there is a lot of work ahead of us and a new year coming up. We don't want a resident coming up and get into a debate and neither should we up here, we set the example.

Mr. Orcutt- To answer your question, Mr. Chairman, I have never one time, never one time accused you of deleting an email. All I did was bring up the fact that an email had disappeared. The very first time it disappeared I brought it up to our Council clerk and we talked about it and it was maybe there was a glitch and I stated that. You can go back and watch every single livestream, not one time have I accused you of deleting an email. Not one time have I gone out and spoken to a resident and I've taken many phone calls have I ever said that you deleted an email. I think you can understand that it's extremely suspicious that this thing (legislation) didn't make the August 21<sup>st</sup> agenda because of, I will say, a mistake and think it's very suspicious that you wouldn't sign for this (notice) after you had an opinion that you disagreed with this legislation. I will not allow one person to sit up here and dictate what happens to the legislative body of this great city of ours, it's my obligation.

Mr. Vecchio - You've not accused directly but you have insinuated, you have insinuated as you've gone back and forth. Now, again, you requested that legislation be put on. I looked at the legislation and looked at the committee assignments and felt that legislation that was in committee was similar, that was my decision. Whether I agreed with your legislation or not had nothing to do with me since I don't vote in this case but your fellow Members of Council did. Which,

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

in turn, voted against putting it forward. So, the bigger issue is where is the problem? Council did not move this forward. The Council President did not put it on the agenda, as you're saying. Because you felt that I was doing something improperly. My simple request via email was that they were similar, a simple phone call to myself would have handled that but there was not a phone call. There was zero communication not even a response email of which you said you read at 11:48 a.m.; the read receipt shows that it was after 12:00 p.m.

Mr. Orcutt - the read receipt.

Mr. Vecchio - the read receipt, the receipt requested shows that you read it after 12:00 p.m., not 11:48 a.m., after 12:00 p.m.

Mr. Orcutt - that's on your end and there could be a delay through the server.

Mr. Vecchio - which would come to me and shows it was after 12:00 p.m. As far as everything with Mr. Ellis and where we're at today. As we all sat here and discussed with him and Council approved for him to be here. I said I'd like to have Microsoft Forensics Team look into this because this as he stated is impossible to have happened between our system.

Mr. Orcutt- that's not what I took from what he said. Mr. Poindexter asked him a very good question about if they could trace an IP address. He said that all the IP addresses were trended through the cityofbrookpark IP addresses. Then he said if he were to go out and trace outside of that once you hit whoever, whatever wireless network you hit a wall. I'm fine about the emails, my question to you, this evening, is based on why you did not sign for that meeting on August 30<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Vecchio - let's backtrack and let me finish because you started this out wanting to know where we were at with Mr. Ellis, that was the email portion.

Mr. Orcutt- I started this out by saying that I was satisfied with him coming here and that I didn't agree with everything he said, that's where I started off.

Mr. Vecchio - which will be the email portion.

Mr. Orcutt - you keep going back to the emails, Council President. My question to you is now about the email content and the operation of the office.

Mr. Vecchio - again, here we are. I answered your question I don't know where you're going with this but all I can say is your fellow Members of Council defeated your proposal. The Council President didn't defeat your proposal he had no vote on it; whether I agreed with it or not. I do still agree that the Council

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

President should not be a voting position? Yes, I do and will stand by that and have stood by that since day one and until the day I die. We can agree to disagree but as far as where or what took place in not putting this forward for you, the buck stops at yourself with no communications.

Mr. Orcutt - I was supposed to call you after that meeting and say even though we (Council) voted 7-0 can you please sign it; Council President this isn't making sense. All I'm saying is this, every time I ask you a simple question why you wouldn't put it on. You've given me the answer, now; the answer is this. You didn't have to and you wouldn't you said it was Council's responsibility.

Mr. Vecchio - Council requested it, Mr. Orcutt, as per the Charter. Council requested it, Council signed for it, it was on, it was defeated. What more do you want?

Mr. Orcutt - I would think that would be common practice of this Council. This Council is a very good Council; we've done a lot of great things in 2018. I'm sorry I have to end this year with this conversation but since it started on August 17<sup>th</sup>, over three months or over 25% of the year. I think I've been patient and have never accused you of deleting any emails. What I've brought up is the fact that we had a timeline and there was no rush. My phone was bombarded by a small group of people so did Councilmen Scott and Stemm; people introducing new legislation. Why are you rushing this? It was all over social media why is this being slammed down our throat? 20 days isn't getting slammed down by anybody's throat, we had plenty of time. By the time it did hit a small amount of residents started talking about that but, you know what, I don't think they had the correct information. There was enough time to look at this and quite frankly you answered the questions that I had and what they were. Is when this Council votes 7-0 to have a meeting we have to go in a different direction by calling the clerk and have three people sign for the notice. Is that correct for 2019 moving forward if a majority of Council votes to have a meeting do we have to have three Members of Council sign.

Mr. Vecchio - the clerk can automatically assign.

Mr. Orcutt - no further questions.

Mr. Vecchio - I want to respond to Mr. Orcutt's timeline. Today, is December 18<sup>th</sup> and this started on August 23<sup>rd</sup>, five days' shy of four months and on December 18<sup>th</sup> this is the first time you asked me these question regarding the body of your legislation. Which now circles back to what your argument is? Instead of, at some point, picking up the phone or seeing me here or there it's not been questioned but we're doing it today. Is a political motivation, what is it? I don't

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

understand now do I really care because I have nothing to hide. Along with all the emails that are there I have the emails. You're the only one that seems to not have the emails which is ironic to me. Everyone else included on the email doesn't have a complaint about emails, you're the only one. Is the issue on your end very well could be? As I said, I still have the original sent email and have everything there and as far as I'm concerned this is a done issue.

Mr. Orcutt - the issue is on my end, I had a piece of legislation that I was introducing with Councilmembers Scott, Stemm and Salvatore. We went through the proper process to get it on the agenda and you did not put it on the agenda, that issue is on me and now I have to take care of it; I can't respond to an email that vanished. I never accused you and now you're accusing me of having problems being the only person and saying political motivation. This is about the residents of Brook Park; this is about 50% of their government. There is an Executive branch and Legislative branch and I won't sit back and allow somebody not to put one thing on the agenda. That's okay you just admitted there was a mistake because the law director did write an opinion on the August 17<sup>th</sup> decision but when you didn't put it on for August 30<sup>th</sup>. I've got a problem with that and that is a true issue that I do have and will own that issue. So you're correct I'm going to sit here and bring this up because I have to say this isn't right. I shouldn't have to have the Council clerk calling me all worried that you won't place that meeting for August 30<sup>th</sup>, that shouldn't happen to our clerk and will own that too.

Mr. Poindexter - I don't know very much about the issue with the email but will agree with Mr. Orcutt that when Council votes 7-0 to have a meeting, that meeting should be held. I think as the Administrator of the Council office basically our vote directed you to call for that meeting. Interpret as you may, I think it's going to be troubling in the future that we don't even honor our own 7-0 vote, it's going to be hard-pressed for other departments and other items down the line to honor our 7-0 vote too. That's the way I see it and if a meeting is called that meeting should be had. I didn't agree with the legislation either but did vote for the meeting because out of professional courtesies they're legislation should have been presented and discussed in a proper manner and don't feel that it was.

Mr. Vecchio - For clarification and will have the clerk weigh in on this. The meeting that Council called for with a 7-0 vote was correctly called by the clerk. The meeting that Council had to come in and sign for was the additional special meeting.

Clerk concurred.

**Miscellaneous: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio - so it was correctly called the meeting there is confusion on is apparently was the additional special meeting, for three Councilmembers to sign for.

Mr. Orcutt - you stand corrected, the notice I received on Wednesday, August 29, 2018 to Councilmembers Stemm, Salvatore and Orcutt. Mr. Vecchio is not calling for any special meetings, therefore, due to time constraints for Thursday's meeting. I will accept Verbal approval given over the phone from you and call the meeting accordingly. For Friday's special meeting notice I am not comfortable with verbal approval, therefore, the notice for Friday's meeting will be in a file folder on the desk where mailboxes are located. When you have some time today please stop in and sign the notice. If this occurs after business hours, please leave the notification in the folder on the desk for me. Thank you, the clerk.

Mr. Vecchio - that Friday meeting was the original meeting of which the 7-0 vote was, the Thursday meeting was the one where you wanted to have an additional special meeting. I said I wasn't calling it, if Council wanted to call the meeting it would take three Members of Council to call; it wasn't for me to call

Mr. Orcutt - August 28<sup>th</sup> we met and took a vote to have a special meeting on August 30<sup>th</sup>.

Clerk - Council met on August 28<sup>th</sup> and then there was going to be a meeting called for August 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> for legislation.

Mr. Orcutt - correct.

Clerk - if the legislation was there it would have been on August 28<sup>th</sup> for first reading, and special meetings called for second and third reading, if need be, that's my recollection but will check my computer and/or meeting books.

Mr. Orcutt - I've studied this pretty close.

Mr. Vecchio - there is a little bit of confusion on the dates but the initial 7-0 meeting was called correctly.

Mr. Orcutt - the meeting for 7-0 was not called correctly. I would not be sitting here for the last 20 minutes asking this question and trying to get this taken care of by the end of the year.

Mr. Vecchio - Mr. Orcutt, we can't confirm the date because the clerk doesn't have the information here and nobody has that because this wasn't an item set to be discussed, it's a spare of the moment item.

**Miscellaneous:**

Mr. Orcutt - Mr. Chairman, you just stated a few things, I'm not going to go around and around with this anymore. You stated that I've never asked those questions to you in private meetings. When I have and it's been diverted off to where emails go to and all other stuff. My question isn't now what dates are what. What I want to set forth for 2019 so this doesn't happen again, that's the only thing I'm trying to do right now. I want some answers because I suspected that something wasn't right and there were too many things that were happening to keep that piece of legislation off of an agenda that had time. I'm not even throwing in the information that happened outside of here with phone calls and Facebook that seems to be splitting and dividing this city apart.

Mr. Mencini - I wasn't for this piece of legislation either, I stated my opinions and why and think, so far, this year this Council has done good. I've heard the word confused up here and Mr. Orcutt seems very interested in this and don't get the opinion he's confused. The one thing checked when this originally came up is showing me the timeframe of days and so forth; I'm sure he's pretty accurate on his dates. Personally, I'd like to finish this after the Council meeting and feel that we're going pretty good heading into 2019. Mr. Orcutt is asking for an answer and we've tried giving him an answer. My question is we're a good Council and where are we going with this and where is it going to end.

Mr. Orcutt- Mr. Mencini, where I'm going with this is I've followed city politics my since living in the city, been here my whole adult life. I've never seen anything like with the prior Council and that type of activity, that's probably why I'm up here. I disliked all the stuff I did see but we cannot pick and choose what laws we're going to abide by and how we're going to operate Council. We certainly can't pick and choose which individuals were going to chastise and allow to not follow the rules and who can't. We have to do that the right way and to the residents I am not doing this for a political, motivational reason. You deserve the best and deserve both bodies of government to operate efficient. When you don't have that you don't have a promising future, this is nothing personal between the Council President and I and I just want to make sure that it never happens again. Moving into 2019 I want to see exactly what we did in 2018. This Council worked extremely hard on a roads program to improve this city. We've done good things with the budget, things are tough, and in the near future there will be great things happening in this city. That's why I'm doing this it's not a political motivation, I know there are rumors out there that Councilman Orcutt is doing this for x, y and z; he's doing this for the residents and that is it. With that said Mr. Council President at no time did I ever accuse you or think that you deleted my emails. What is was is that I'm fighting for the legislation that I thought was best for this community and when I didn't have the opportunity to get that on the agenda twice, a red flag was raised.

-----

**Miscellaneous:**

Mr. Salvatore - to summarize and get this to a conclusion, everybody put their heads together and figure out how we're going to make sure this doesn't happen again. If there is a need to put this on the agenda again to come up with a procedure or policy, then do that. If both of you are satisfied with the dialogue back and forth then let's move forward with a motion this was discussed.

Mr. Vecchio - the motion that this was discussed isn't needed, the item wasn't on the agenda.

-----


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

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

**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

  
Michelle Blazak  
Clerk of Council

APPROVED



THESE MEETING MINUTES ARE A SYNOPSIS, NOT TRANSCRIBED IN THEIR ENTIRETY, ALTHOUGH ACCURATE.

5,263 WORDS

