

**ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2019**

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, Law Director Horvath, Finance Director Cingle, Service Director Gardner, Engineer Piatak, Economic Development Commissioner Adams and Recreation Director Elliott.

DISCUSSION:

1. A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 2019 AS BREAST CANCER AWARENESS IN THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Councilman Salvatore, Council as a Whole and Mayor Gammella.

Mr. Salvatore stated this has been done for several years and are now participating with the Cities of Berea, Middleburg Hts. and Strongsville as well as Southwest General Hospital.

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

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

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear under M-2 as Resolution No. 31-2019.

2. ADDITIONAL MONIES FOR CRACK-SEALING - City Engineer Piatak

Mr. Vecchio prefaced the title read wrong, actually what this is the contractor for the Smith Road project believes there is going to be extra material left over after completion; there are no monies incurred by the city at all.

Mr. Orcutt asked what stretch of Smith Road is the contractor looking at?

Mr. Piatak responded beginning at Sheldon north to Snow Road for the use of material for that roadway.

Mr. Orcutt asked is there only one type of material for crack-filling, or several different options?

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Piatak responded there are a number of different options.

Mr. Orcutt continued phone calls taken over the summer were due to the material peeling up and getting on driveways. Does the county choose what material is laid down?

Mr. Piatak responded we selected the material for this project that the county approved; ODOT (Ohio Department of Transportation) Type 3 material. This is the same material used since I started with good success but this past year I was made aware of some tracking issues. Haven't had that happen before and not sure why that's occurring but would not expect that again with this project.

Mr. Orcutt continued if that is being laid down possibly under a certain outside temperature would that not adhere to existing street material?

Mr. Piatak responded yes, there are temperature limitations when you cannot do it and personal preference is to lay when it's a little cooler; the specifications are either 40 or 45 degrees and rising of surface temperature. I prefer to do this when it's cooler to give the cracks a chance to open up to get more material in them.

Mr. Poindexter to Mr. Piatak how much extra material will there be and will it be enough to complete that stretch of Smith Road.

Mr. Piatak responded not sure, the contractor brought this to my attention of having excess material left over to be used elsewhere. I'm not sure what will be left until the contractor gets there and thought it was pre-empted to come before Council to ask permission to go to another street or location to fulfill the requirements of the county participation of this project. If there is extra material, we have somewhere else to go instead of telling the contractor to pack up.

Mr. Poindexter continued I think the completion date for the crack-sealing program being October 27th, will this extend beyond that date or done before?

Mr. Piatak responded the completion date is established in the contract with the intent of this being done by the initial completion date. Crack-seal is weather sensitive to temperature and moisture so we will be careful when the material is put down. If there are ten days of straight rain then that would warrant a new completion date but don't anticipate a needed extension, at this time.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Salvatore asked if any legislative action is necessary?

Mr. Piatak responded no, discussed this with the county and was told to take full advantage of the program in place, no objections applying the extra material to Smith Road, I'm under the opinion that this would be an internal change-order to the contract.

Mrs. Horvath commented I'm under the same opinion, this is not a situation where the city is changing the amount of money being paid. The city is taking extra material and directing the contractor to use the access a particular street.

Mr. Mencini commented to Mrs. Horvath, all the city is being informed that the contractor will be doing a part of Smith Road with the extra material.

Mrs. Horvath concurred.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Piatak instead of doing a little of Smith Road would you look at the possibility of doing a smaller street?

Mr. Piatak responded I could and the reason this is being brought forward to keep everyone informed of the intent to go is, thinks Smith Road is a good location. The other streets that would qualify is a county road, there are other segments of county roads within the city but this this is the best location to apply any leftover material.

Mr. Stemm clarified the monies were allocated for a county road.

Mr. Vecchio reiterated the additional material will be used on Smith Road, being a county road.

Mr. Orcutt mentioned this is a good bonus for the city and great idea to move ahead with this. Also, make sure the contractor understands that whatever application the city needs to do to make sure the material adheres better than last year, with the issues on Somerdale, Ashland and other areas in the city.

Motion by Mr. Burgio, supported by Mr. Mencini, that item number two was discussed.

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

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

FINANCE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, SCOTT:

- 1. A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE OHIO MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (OML) ON H.B. 49 AND H.B. 5 (CENTRALIZED TAX COLLECTION) AND ASKING THE OML TO INCLUDE BROOK PARK AS A MUNICIPALITY SUPPORTING THE OML AMICUS BRIEF BEFORE THE OHIO SUPREME COURT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mayor Gammella stated the city has their own tax department and what the state is attempting to do take our money to give back in 60 to 90 days; the city is not in favor of that.

Mr. Cingle stated the State of Ohio currently collects net profit taxes if a company opts-in to the State of Ohio program; the OML opposes the centralized collection of net profit tax.

Motion by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to place on the next Council agenda.

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

Mr. Vecchio stated that will appear under M-3 as Resolution No. 32-2019.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, MENCINI:

- 1. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 331.38 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES ENTITLED 'STOPPING FOR SCHOOL BUS; DISCHARGING CHILDREN' AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Council President Vecchio.

Mr. Vecchio stated everyone is aware of what is taking place in communities on a daily basis of people passing school buses when dropping or picking up children; (bus) lights are flashing and stop sign is out. Currently, the city ordinances have a fine of up to \$500.00 and an area stating the judge may impose a penalty of license suspension. What is being proposed is changing that to \$1,000 fine and a judge shall impose a class-seven license suspension; going from 90 days to one-year.

Mr. Mencini stated very good legislation and some cities are talking about jail time. With the increase in fines what if there are prior offenses or will this be for this particular offense only, which is a severe offense. If a person has other charges that could be more severe will that be at the discretion of the judge or just limited to this offense of \$1,000.

Mr. Vecchio responded the intent would be at the discretion of the judge and

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

hopefully the judge understands the severity of an issue like this. In my opinion, it's not the monetary aspect but the penalty phase being the fact that a license suspension shall be imposed. That, in my opinion, would hopefully deter somebody from doing this rather than the fine imposed, if a child is killed there is no dollar figure that could be put on that. Council knows what is going on with this and if you want to increase you have that ability.

Mr. Mencini commented the important thing is that this is enforced; talking to school bus drivers they have stories.

Mr. Poindexter asked Mr. Vecchio how many times a year this is reported or cited in the City of Brook Park?

Mr. Vecchio responded a record has not been requested but if it's one time that's one time too many.

Mr. Poindexter requested information from the city's police chief and there was one incident reported in the past five years; on December 11, 2018 with no citation issued.

Mr. Vecchio interjected part of that problem is the school district does not have external front-facing or rear-facing video cameras; so it relies on the driver to be able to grab the necessary information of the vehicle, license plate number and driver description and turn the information in.

Mr. Poindexter continued if nobody is getting cited and there's no record of reporting what will increasing the fine do?

Mr. Vecchio responded in speaking with the Berea City School District bus garage the issue is their inability to grab the information to make that report; the problem is not being able to grab the information; this is more of a deterrent measure.

Mr. Poindexter stated hitting a person with a vehicle has a stiff penalty, so that would be a deterrent also. Stiffening this penalty and taking the judge's discretion away in the case of a new driver who gets their license taken away for a year along with the stiff \$1,000 fine. I think the \$500.00 plus cost is stiff and if there is an accident or incident there is additional charges that go along with that. Since this is not reported or cited in the city don't see the need to change.

Mr. Salvatore stated as far as the change from \$500.00 to \$1,000.00, letter f reads 'whoever violates this section the judge has the authority to fine, not to exceed \$500.00'. So changing from \$500.00 to \$1,000.00 puts more teeth into the offense. There is a maximum that can be charged on every offense and my

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

concern is to make sure that \$1,000.00 falls into the realm of authority to charge that amount. The second concern is with changing the word 'may' to 'shall'; does Council have the authority to direct the judge to make that call of a jail sentence. This is well thought out and something Council should consider as long as Council is in authority.

Mrs. Horvath commented the city can always make a stricter penalty but unable to drop a penalty below the Ohio Revised Code. Mr. Salvatore is 100% correct in the observation with the way it's written; it could be up to \$1,000.00 but not mandatory that it would be \$1,000.00. The \$1,000.00 is a monetary threshold for a first degree misdemeanor and with regard to the language change from 'may' to 'shall' that would impose license suspension but there are many instances in the traffic code where there are administrative and court suspensions. The judge or Mayor's Court Magistrate can adequately deal with this and while it may seem harsh for a license suspension for this type of offense, my argument would be that it isn't. If someone has an automobile accident and no automobile insurance that is an automatic three-month license suspension, due to no insurance coverage.

Mr. Stemm stated this has been discussed over the last five years or so about driving infractions is getting more difficult, with communications and texting while driving. Council passed legislation last year about texting and driving and think this is an update on the legislation. The law director can attest that ten years ago for a felony theft was \$500.00 and with more valuable items the fine went up to \$1,000.00.

Mr. Burgio stated this is good legislation to keep the children safe and with the \$1,000.00 leeway should be left up to the judge's determination, as to the severity of the fine based on the driver's record. Is this legislation in place in other communities?

Mr. Vecchio responded written this way is not everyone has different variances and some are now imposing jail time and stiffer sentences. The City of Parma, North Ridgeville and other multiple cities that have adopted their own legislation for changes to stiffen penalties.

Mr. Burgio commented there have been stories of children getting off the school bus and motorists driving by, thankful this hasn't happened in Brook Park. Reiterated that this is good legislation and stated ignorance is no excuse for breaking the law and when taking the driving test people should know the rules for passing a school bus.

Mr. Orcutt stated this is a great piece of legislation and the option should be left up to the judge to give a higher dollar amount. Mr. Orcutt asked Mrs. Horvath for an

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

explanation of a class-seven suspension. Can a judge still give work privileges?

Mrs. Horvath stated the judge would not only be able to provide work privileges as well as picking up or dropping off children at daycare and so forth. Usually various courts will have a letter typed up for the offender to carry with them that designates whatever necessities are needed.

Mr. Scott stated having two young grandchildren to ride a school bus and it infuriates me when see videos of automobiles not stopping. With this penalty of \$1,000, me personally, there is no price to put on a life. The class-seven suspension the judge still has the ability to grant items allowing the offender driving privileges, total support of legislation.

Mr. Poindexter stated all points are well taken on the \$1,000 penalty and giving the judge or Magistrate the leeway to impost a fine of that much. I don't understand how Council is going to give the judge the leeway in F1 and then take that leeway away in F2, of the legislation. I would support this if the leeway was left in both sections giving the Magistrate or Judge the discretion based on circumstances. In some instances, there may be an emergency of a child falling out of a tree and the parent rushing their child to the hospital, nothing is going to stop that parent from getting to the hospital; taking the fine and suspension.

Mr. Mencini stated one thing that is being missed is the discretion of the police officer. A senior citizen, with a clean driving record, might be pulled over for passing a school bus and hopes the police officer would use good discretion. If a motorist has three tickets in the past two months and a cell phone in their face there has to be a lesson learned.

Mr. Stemm stated the one reported incident in five years keeps being mentioned and numbers are the numbers, however, that's one reported. There are unreported incidents out there too that is not known about, there could be more or none.

Mr. Poindexter commented this change would not affect any unreported incident, unreported means unreported. Wouldn't have a fine or suspension attached it's just unreported. These are the statistics in Brook Park with one reported incident in the past five years with no citation issued.

Mr. Salvatore stated when looking at the class-seven suspension it doesn't specify the length of the suspension. Would the judge still have the latitude even though it reads 'shall' instead of 'may'. Could the judge make it a five-day suspension, 60-day suspension or one-year suspension. What is the criteria the judge is allowed to follow based on this change?

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

Mrs. Horvath responded the judge has a great deal of discretion and also remind Council of such a thing of prosecutorial discretion, also. Where in certain circumstances the prosecutor may decide that perhaps the particular charge should be written under the Ohio Revised Code, which is different. Or the prosecutor could write a lesser penalty that is agreed to. This legislation would be stricter with the amount of the fine, stricter with the suspension and could be a tool that could be used by the police department and/or the prosecutor. To make sure if someone is careless and has a bad (driving) record this legislation could be used. In this particular case the word 'shall' means must and the judge or magistrate would have to impose that particular penalty but there are other options that could be looked at to determine what is best under the circumstances.

Mr. Salvatore asked what would be the minimum-maximum suspension and would the judge have the authority based on this legislation to impose a suspension?

Mrs. Horvath responded if Council wants no suspension imposed then would have to go back to the word 'may'. Will provide Council with a chart showing the various suspensions to see the relation to the offense and how they increase in severity.

Mr. Stemm stated to Mrs. Horvath with the provided chart also include some type of plea deal options.

Mrs. Horvath clarified other options that someone could be charged with.

Mr. Poindexter stated the class suspensions are as follows: Class 1 is a definite period for the life of the person subject to the suspension. Class 2 is a definite period of three years to life. Class 3 is a definite period of two to ten years. Class 4 is a definite period of one to five years. Class 5 is a definite period of six months to three years. Class 6 is a definite period of three months to two years and a Class 7 is a definite period not to exceed one year. If leaving this to the leeway of the judge or magistrate the word 'may' should be kept in to give all the leeway that Council wants. If a repeat offender, then the one-year suspension can be imposed. There are a lot of unforeseen circumstances and would hate for someone to lose their license for an entire year and \$1,000 fine.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, to place on the October 15th Council agenda.

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

Mr. Poindexter commented will be voting to move this forward but asking colleagues to consider leaving the word 'may' in the legislation.

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

2. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 933.04 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES ENTITLED 'CONTAINER PLACEMENT FOR COLLECTION; REMOVAL AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Councilman Scott and Council as a Whole.

Mr. Scott stated driving through the ward with rubbish pickup on Fridays and rubbish cans are still on tree lawn until Sunday or later. Speaking with the law director and asking what is promptly depends on the person. In this day we need to be more specific and this legislation speaks to 24-hours after rubbish pickup.

Mr. Stemm stated this is a great piece and get the same complaints about rubbish cans; promptly is timely manner and now will have an actual timeframe.

Mr. Burgio stated in support of legislation and get the same complaints about rubbish cans; windy days the cans blow down the street. This legislation clarifies and as stated in support.

Mr. Mencini stated being a previous rubbish person, windstorms blow the cans but there could be instances where people may be in the hospital and so forth, with no one knowing. Most of the time when cans are left out it is habitual.

Mr. Scott commented it would be 24-hours from the time of rubbish pickup.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Burgio, to place on the next Council agenda.

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

3. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 933.99 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES ENTITLED 'PENALTY' AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Councilman Scott.

Mr. Scott stated speaking with city personnel, there are issues of who could give out citations and/or warnings. Due to the police officers being busy it was recommended that this fall under the building department. First offense would be

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

a warning and then proceeding with a stiffer penalty. In other cities if rubbish containers are not put back 24-hours after pickup citations are issued. This legislation defines what department would be giving out the warnings and/or citations. The felony is whoever violates Section 933.04 of the codified ordinances shall receive a warning letter for the first offense and the second offense will be a misdemeanor of the first degree punishable under Chapter 501 of the codified ordinances.

Mr. Poindexter understands the need to change the penalty for 933.04 to allow for the warning from the building commissioner. It seems that leaving rubbish cans out resulting in a misdemeanor of the first degree seems excessive; understands the other penalties listed, for example, dumping cans in the street. Would be in more support the legislation if it read whoever violates Section 933.04 shall receive a warning letter on the first offense and shall be guilty of a minor misdemeanor for a second offense.

Mr. Scott interjected this would be up to the discretion of the judge.

Mr. Stemm stated to Mrs. Horvath is the Brook Park Police able to issue a citation of a minor misdemeanor for this offense. Thought there were certain categories that qualify for minor misdemeanors.

Mrs. Horvath responded this would be issued through the building department, rather than police department, there are several building code violations that carry the first-degree misdemeanor penalty.

Mr. Stemm commented not sure if the minor misdemeanor can be in citation form, may have to look into that.

Mrs. Horvath clarified if this were changed to a minor misdemeanor would the building department have the ability to write that citation, will check on that.

Mr. Mencini commented with the mention of a warning letter, that letter goes a long way, there may be new residents not familiar how the system works.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mrs. Horvath if the building department wouldn't be able to write a citation for a minor misdemeanor; could a citation be written for a first-degree misdemeanor?

Mrs. Horvath responded building department personnel has the authority to write citations and some of those citations have different levels of penalties, depending on the severity.

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

Mr. Poindexter stated on the list of classes for misdemeanors and a minor misdemeanor is a fine of not more than \$150.00.

Mrs. Horvath interjected and carries no jail time.

Mr. Poindexter continued in support of the legislation and having a penalty just doesn't want to be too extreme. If classified as a minor misdemeanor and kept at \$150.00 there is a leeway between zero to \$150.00

Mr. Mencini commented there is that one person that will test this by keeping the cans out to see what will be done.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Orcutt, to place back in committee.

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

NAYS: None. The motion carried.

4. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 11066-2019, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT ADDITIONAL FUNDS UP TO \$500,000.00 IN ENVIRONMENTAL GRANT FUNDS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AGENCY, OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND/OR THE STATE OF OHIO BUREAU OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK REMOVAL (BUSTR) TO PERFORM AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY AND/OR TO FACILITATE AND ADMINISTER THE ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION OF THE PROPERTY KNOWN AS 6286 ENGLE ROAD, PPN 342-09-011, AND TO TAKE ALL FURTHER NECESSARY ACTION TO REMEDIATE THE PROPERTY AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mayor Gammella stated more work is needed at the former gas station on Engle and Holland Roads.

Scott Adams

Economic Development Commissioner

City of Brook Park

Mr. Adams stated this is for the ongoing grant-project of a former gas station on Engle and Holland Roads. A new grant is being applied for to raise the amount from \$240,000 to \$500,000 that comes from the federal government gas tax to the State of Ohio Department of Development.

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

**Jason Greco
Vice President
BJAAM Environmental
472 Elm Ridge Ave.
Canal Fulton, OH**

Mr. Greco stated the previous grant funds excavated 550-tons of contaminated soils that was removed and taken to a recycling facility. Post-water sampling was done to see if the soil removal addressed all the groundwater concentrations; there are some groundwater concentrations that are still above action levels. BUSTR (Bureau of Underground Storage Water Regulations) requested a plan to address the groundwater concentrations. A remedial action has been put together and approved by BUSTR and the grant-funding has been approved by ODSA (Ohio Development Services Agency) and this is a pass-through meaning there are no funds needed by the city. The work looking to be done is injecting the areas that were not excavated with a product called PetroFix, an injection technology, that adds carbon and other oxidants to the groundwater to oxidize the chemicals that are left. There was a 98% reduction in groundwater concentrations so the removal of the soil definitely affected the remediation on the site; and need to get the other 2% to make the state happy.

Mr. Orcutt asked the area that was excavated will not be tampered with, this will be going to penetrating PetroFix. How far down will that be installed?

Mr. Grecco responded looking at doing approximately 84 borings down to a depth of 12 feet; the injection will be performed at an elevation of six-feet below grade to about 12 ½ below grade. Those chemicals will be very targeted to target the groundwater which is around ten-feet.

Mr. Orcutt asked how long will it take to perform that work?

Mr. Grecco responded the work onsite will be approximately 12 to 15 days with groundwater sampling performed over two quarters approximately three months apart; approximately 30 days after treatment and another 90 days following. There will be six-month span prior to see what the results are.

Mr. Orcutt asked if this legislation is for an additional \$252,000 and do not anticipate having to go over that amount. Up to \$600,000 can be spent on a site and not anticipating going above the \$500,000.

Mr. Orcutt continued any additional funds that need to be used at that property going forward will be on the property owner, correct?

Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.

Mr. Grecco concurred, the ODSA only reimburses for activity that's performed and some instances the municipality may get funding ahead of the work to divvy out the money as work is completed. In this case, when the work is completed invoices will be submitted through a progress report with approval from the city to ODSA. The funding then comes in and paid out to the contractor as the work is completed.

Mr. Orcutt stated if that entire \$252,000 is utilized the city can apply for an additional \$100,000.

Mr. Grecco concurred.

Mr. Orcutt stated if the city gets through this project by putting this PetroFix into the ground to help with the issues. If there is, for example, \$150,000 left over from the \$252,000 can that grant money be utilized and moved over to another area of the city? There is a vacant gas station on the corner of Smith and Snow Roads and two gas stations in the last month that have closed.

Mr. Grecco stated ODSA is only going to allow to have those funds approved on the property on a site-by-site basis. What can be done is if that other property qualifies for a grant; one can be written and submitted with ODSA asking for \$250,000 to start the tank removal and initial cleanup of the property.

Mr. Orcutt asked Mayor Gammella to look into that for the former gas station at Snow and Smith Roads.

Mr. Mencini thanked Mr. Grecco for coming and stated that is a key area for the city. Will that be fenced off for the 12 - 15 days?

Mr. Grecco responded the work site area will be fenced in but there won't be as much. The fencing will be to put equipment in and avoid interference with foot traffic; the treatment process is not as evasive as the excavation.

Mr. Mencini stated once this is completed the area can be sold?

Mr. Grecco responded yes, the area will be cleaned up to drinking water standards and essentially the highest level of cleanup that can be done on a property.

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

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

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear under M-4 as Ordinance No. 11119-2019.

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

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

Mr. Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED *Michelle Blazak*
Michelle Blazak
Clerk of Council

APPROVED *October 15, 2019*

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

4,983 words