

**NOTES:**

1. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic all upcoming for Regular or Special Council meetings; Governor DeWine's directive for meetings and social distancing will strictly be enforced.
2. The public is encouraged to email comments related to agenda items or general communications to the Clerk of Council, Michelle Blazak, email address [mblazak@cityofbrookpark.com](mailto:mblazak@cityofbrookpark.com) by 4:30 p.m. the day of said meeting. All emails received will be shared with all elected officials and either read at said meeting or attached to the minutes' journal.

**ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED  
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING  
TO BE HELD ON MAY 19, 2020**

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, SCHMUCK, ORCUTT, TROYER, MENCINI, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE**

Also in attendance were Mayor Gammella, Law Director Horvath, Finance Director Cingle and Building Commissioner Hurst.

**Note:** EXECUTIVE SESSION – PER MAYOR GAMMELLA - COLLECTIVE BARGAINING MATTERS:

Mr. Scott stated to Mrs. Horvath that Resolution No. 11-2020 was passed suspending contract negotiations, is Council allowed to go into Executive Session for negotiations since the resolution was passed suspending negotiations?

Mrs. Horvath responded Council directed the Mayor and Administration to continue to recess the impact of health and economic crisis on city operations. Also, in section five (5) of the legislation the Mayor should recommend negotiations with all labor unions resume as soon as practical; or if the parties agree to submit to any statutory impasse procedures. I assume that the Mayor is using the executive session to inform Council of what is happening and don't see any reason why we can't go into Executive session for this topic.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Troyer, for Collective Bargaining Matters.  
**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Troyer, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried at 7:06 p.m.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Scott, to go back to Regular Order of Business.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt, Troyer, Poindexter, Salvatore  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried at 7:54 p.m.

**DISCUSSION:**

## 1. 2020 APPROPRIATIONS AND REVENUE BUDGET (Councilman Troyer)

Mr. Troyer stated on March 17, 2020 Council passed appropriations legislation, I expressed an approval of that action with an understanding that a budget would be brought up for a complete review; the meeting minutes reflect both Mayor Gammella and Mr. Cingle concurring. The city has a lot of issues and the budget goes along with item number two (2) under discussion. As soon as possible I would like to see an accurate budget reflecting reduction in revenue and appropriations. There are some items that can be taken out i.e. Home Days, fireworks, recreation sports, economic transfers and some stuff that can be moved back and kept safe. With both discussion item numbers one and two I would like to see a meeting, possibly Tuesday, May 26<sup>th</sup>, to discuss items; or maybe the June 9<sup>th</sup> Caucus meeting. All these items need to be looked at and the budget needs to reflect reduction in revenue especially as well as reduction in expenditures.

Mr. Vecchio commented with your idea of the meeting in June a thought might be to combine that with the Council Rules.

Mr. Troyer responded would rather keep them separate and okay with putting the Council rules off longer than the June meeting. Would like to get serious about the budget and getting correct numbers and making sure it is right.

Mr. Mencini concurred with Mr. Troyer and stated this is very important, especially at the current stage. We all work for the public and have to run the city like a business and have to be tough right now. There are some decisions that need to be made on this and think Council did good with the budget process but this is a very important time currently and have to look hard at this. I agree that the Council rules can be put off until late summer or fall of this year. My point is this is a very critical time to be looking at this and will give all us time to study to see where the city needs to go.

Mr. Orcutt stated this is the most important topic because we represent the budget along with Mayor and making sure monies are spent properly. This has to be talked about to always be in line with what is happening. The finance director has done an excellent job with the updates, unfortunately, there aren't a lot of updates and won't have them until the extended income taxes to July 15<sup>th</sup>. One point I want to talk about with this budget is this community has had a major issue with flooding for some time possibly four decades. With no finger-pointing or blaming anyone which is usually what happens in this community; we have to get away from that type of attitude. Business must be done a different way in this community and one thing that needs to be done is to act on flooding relief and has to start with appropriations. The reason I'm bringing this up is if anyone was in Ward 3 and know other wards had

**Discussion: cont.**

(flooding) but wasn't able to get to the other wards due to running down sidewalks. If people saw the destruction that occurred on Friday, 15<sup>th</sup> from 4:30 to 5:00 p.m., it was like a war zone. It's pretty basic and was able to trace it to a lot of trenches that hold the water and push north to Lake Erie were completely full. Some of the trenches built to be 15' high were cresting higher to 18' to 20'. There were issues where whole neighborhoods that tie-in to the trenches were dead-heading and the water had to go somewhere. The hydrostatic pressure on the mains and streets on Wengler, Robert, Doris and down Fry Road to Bowfin, Remora, Pike, Muskingum, Harrison, Pike, Ashland and all streets in the Fayette and Sylvia areas. I heard that Wards 4, 2, and 1 were hit hard and we need to and let's be the Council and Administration that starts those appropriations. Because, the price tag being seen now is \$3,500 to clean residents' basements out, it was unbelievable, and don't have the total count, still working on that. The city is probably over 500 homes which is over 25% of homes in Ward 3 that received water damage. This is something that can't go on any longer and if I don't see anything with flooding relief in the budget, in the near future, nothing personal but won't support that budget.

Mayor Gammella challenged the 25% in Ward 3, I was out Saturday, Sunday and Monday and service crews were out to pick up off tree lawns and it wasn't 25%. The area hit Shelby, Robert and Wengler has always been an issue and has been talked about for years. Hope you will join me in putting a retention basin somewhere in that area to help resolve that. The problem was the program we have street sweeping, jetting and cleaning out the mains has been very successful. The problem is there was an enormous amount of rain, almost 3.5", in an hour on top of the 2.5" that fell earlier. I think what we need is a retention and/or detention basin to help in that one particular area.

Mr. Orcutt rebutted Mayor Gammella's statements by saying I didn't talk to you until 11:00 a.m. the next morning and did assessments until 1:30 a.m. on Saturday. The two circuits hit the heaviest were the circuit that runs up Fry Road from Snow Road that picks up a third of Bowfin, Remora, Pike, Muskingum and takes a good section of Hummel and goes up to Shelby. Then goes into Wedo Park and takes a 45-degree angle to the cell tower. That is one circuit and those people took water and just because people don't have furniture on the tree lawn doesn't mean they didn't get flooded. Some people live with nothing in their homes which is wrong. Especially with 900 or 1,000 square-foot home and not able to double that square footage for a family room downstairs.

Mr. Troyer – Point of clarification. Mr. Vecchio recognized Mr. Troyer's point.

Mr. Troyer – this is supposed to be about the appropriations, can we add a discussion item number three for flooding.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Orcutt – this is about appropriations.

Mr. Vecchio – Mr. Troyer, Mr. Orcutt is correct because he stated he would not vote on a budget if monies were not appropriated for the flooding issues; continue Mr. Orcutt.

Mr. Orcutt continued the second circuit I wanted to talk about is Wengler, Robert and Doris that all Y-in together south of Hummel and Shelby and make a 45-degree angle across Hummel Road and enter what was told from me is the beginning of Kolleda ditch, north of the railroad tracks north on Hummel Road. From pictures taken years ago estimates approximately 15' deep, that water was well over the ditch and cresting on the railroad tracks. So the three streets over there and Doris all had hydrostatic-pressure issues where the mains could not go into the ditch, every home did see water in the basements and I was in almost over 200 homes over the last four days. The other area in Ward 3 hit extremely hard was between Fayette and Sylvia with Pickway having severe damage, and all streets from Morrow to Greene. In addition, many phone calls taken for all of Smith Road, West 148<sup>th</sup> Street south of Elm Street, half the homes in that area took water. The estimation of 500 (homes) is probably a little conservative and probably more and will share those numbers with your administration, once all counted.

Mr. Mencini concurred with Mr. Orcutt there is a problem and when the city gets that kind rain residents don't look out the window looking at the rain; residents sit in their basements and wait for the water to come up. This isn't once or twice some of these homes it's happened to 20 times. Mayor, I'm not putting this just on you a lot of cities had this problem and you are correct it is a lot of water but we need to take this a lot serious and know there is not one specific answer. Councilman Orcutt said it might be the ditch or this or that but it's hard to explain to the residents on Sheldon and Smith when there is a lake sitting in the middle of their street and coming up driveways and entering their homes. This Council needs to look at this budget more seriously and it's rough sitting in a basement watching the water come up and not being able to enjoy a family and/or kids' playroom, due to smell and possible mold issues. This city's forefathers and foremothers have tried and did a good job and this city must maintain the sewers and mains all the time, very important. It's tough talking to new residents that have been here for four or six years that never experienced water before and lost family heirlooms in their basements.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mayor Gammella living in Ward 3 previously and experienced flooding back in 2011 with the "100-year-rain" and was also in Ward 3 on Friday night to take some video of the amount of water rushing through from the southeast side of Holy Cross Cemetery. Flowing all the way down (Hummel) to

**Discussion: cont.**

Michael Drive with residents in that area having the same colored brown water in their basements. Mr. Orcutt brought up a number of roughly \$3,500 for the cleanups and agree we need to look at appropriating funds to help these residents', whether it would be with backflow preventers or whatever the city can do to stop this. What I've seen in some of these areas is since 2011 this is the third or fourth time flooding has happened to these residents who can't make an insurance claim because of either they have previously or can't due to not having flood insurance. The residents' are taking the hit and the city's responsibility is to make things right for these people. I think we need to look at things like that as a whole Council and administration to do something to help these people, whether a retention basin or backflow preventer.

Mayor Gammella stated to Mr. Vecchio, you and I talked earlier about a retention basin at a certain location and totally agree with you, as well, as Mr. Orcutt. A retention basins are a good way and willing to move in that direction and will sit down with the engineer to go from there.

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mr. Troyer this all relates to the appropriations and something this administration and Council can do. Serving in the Navy as a combat engineer and the experience from that was building retention basins. A lot has to do with hydro-static pressure and when the ditches are filled because of taking in so much water from the south. There were no visions in the 1950's of small towns becoming major cities and taking on their water. If the city can't handle taking on that water it must be relieved and the best way to relieve the water is into a retention basin. The check valves did help a few certain people but, ultimately, when the hydro-static pressure and main in the street is too full and has too much pressure; it doesn't matter if there is a check valve or not. What we witnessed on Friday evening is the ground getting completely saturated on Thursday and Friday and not going into the drain tiles around the house, where it was going into the drain tiles. That drain tile didn't do anything because it couldn't push into the mains. The pressure of water needs to be relieved of the water coming into the city so that the circuitry built 60 years ago can work; that past administrations did do. I know that because I've been working on this for many years and have seen all the containers put in. There has been a lot of work done and we just need to continue and nothing against the Mayor or administration. If there is nothing seen in this budget appropriated towards flooding relief I will be a non-support of that budget.

Mr. Troyer stated want to get back to the topic and understand this all relates in a way and think there should be more discussion on the flooding. It seems that there is a consensus that Council wants to look at this budget again redirect differently from the original capital, directed somewhere else. Don't think there are enough reserves or capital currently and are in good shape, until things start

**Discussion: cont.**

happening, to do any of these big projects. My thoughts on what needs to be done is get grants and the storm water fee that residents' are paying. The city should be getting a big project not just little bits of 25%, need to go after that. What I would like to see is look at the budget, sooner or later, need to get the budget right.

Mr. Vecchio stated nothing will be known until after July 15<sup>th</sup>, until the taxation final numbers come in.

Mr. Salvatore stated would like to see this take place sometime after July 15<sup>th</sup>, some history is needed to what the revenues will look like. That will give a better understanding where the city is and what funds will be moved based on income.

Mr. Troyer commented would prefer earlier but is good with July but thinks there might be an issue with timing on getting anything done at that late time.

Mr. Cingle stated speaking with Mr. Troyer last few days regarding the budget and the administration is taking this budget serious. The Mayor and I speak multiple times a week along with Tony D'Amico and Marty Healy to look at the figures. More time is needed to get more data as you all know the property tax filing deadline was extended, so there is another timing difference to be worked through. Currently, the way this is setup is very minimal capital dollars are being spent. The \$2 million-dollars that was supposed to be transferred from the General Fund to Economic Development Fund has not been transferred. Currently, spending is pretty much halted other than salaries, benefits, repair and maintenance items that are necessary, cleaning supplies that we hope to get those monies back through the Cares Act and utilities. As I told Mr. Troyer earlier today as soon as capital dollars are appropriated the departments will be able to spend those dollars. Right now a majority of that money has not been appropriated and if this hole is bigger than normally thought the administration may come back to Council asking for some of those dollars to be transferred to the General Fund. So a little time is needed and understand everyone is anxious and as more data is collected that will be shared with Council; so that everyone is up to speed as to what we're seeing on the administration's end.

Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Cingle when will that information be available, it won't be on July 15<sup>th</sup>, correct?

Mr. Cingle responded no, time will be needed to process the returns, some may go on extension, as soon as the data is available the Mayor can call a special meeting. Information will be shared with Council moving through this.

**Discussion: cont.**

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Poindexter, Mencini, Salvatore, Troyer, Orcutt, Schmuck  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

2. NON-CONTRACTUAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION (Councilman Troyer).  
Mr. Troyer stated this needs to be looked at and changes be made and one recommendation is to do a five-percent (5%), across the board, reduction off current salaries; there are also other ideas of certain positions. There are certain positions listed on the schedule that those jobs don't exist anymore. Adjustments need to be made sooner than later but would have to know the administration's plan with the recreation center and so on.

Mr. Scott asked Mayor Gammella if other cost-cutting measures, other than layoff, i.e. furloughs or things like that?

Mayor Gammella responded yes, and furloughs will be implemented shortly; trying to run as tight a ship as possible.

Mr. Scott stated never in favor of payroll deductions, will never support. There are other avenues to be taken but won't support across the board pay reduction. To Mr. Troyer hopefully Council is included in that discussion.

Mr. Troyer continued Council can only do that to themselves and cannot vote to change an elected officials' pay. A Council person or elected official can donate back their pay or request not to be paid a certain amount. You cannot change the pay of an elected official, please don't grandstand on this.

Mr. Scott - all I'm saying...

Mr. Troyer - if this were to happen...

Mr. Vecchio - Point of Order, it's not about grandstanding and see where both of you are at. Let's just make our points and move forward. Everyone has good ideas and we are in a tough spot as a city let's do what is right, let's work together and figure what the best compromise is going to be.

Mr. Mencini stated when you look at non-contractual employees I would have hoped the administration would have looked at this by now. The Mayor does look and tell Council a lot of them are working very hard. Again, it's very tough to cut people's jobs, very tough to lay people off, furlough days but very tough to cut salary. Hope some of this would have been done by the administration a while back too.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio asked Mr. Troyer in your proposal of the five-percent (5%) is that on current wages, on the high and low, what is your proposal?

Mr. Troyer responded it would be to be determined but it would be on what the current salaries are, the current numbers. The only ones Council can change is the non-contractual.

Mr. Vecchio asked Mr. Troyer did you run any numbers to figure out what a five-percent (5%) reduction would save the city, what the benefit would be?

Mr. Troyer responded no, because I did not receive the current salaries from the finance department; don't have those numbers and unable to figure that out.

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

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

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

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Orcutt, to add flooding to the agenda as item number three (3).

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

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

### 3. RESIDENTIAL FLOODING OVER THIS PAST WEEKEND:

Mr. Troyer stated I've seen flooding before but never like this, mostly talking about ward one didn't get a chance to see Wards 2 and 3. One thing that was brought to my attention is there is a retention ditch in Middleburg Heights on the other side of the railroad tracks; yet all the water comes into Brook Park. First thing I want to make clear to all the residents' is the big sewer that runs down Smith Road into the City of Cleveland is a sanitary sewer, not a storm sewer. That's important because it was a sanitary sewer, not a storm sewer, and are to be kept separate. As far as Ward One, the fixes are simple but not easy to get done, not inexpensive. To elaborate in Ward One, we have water coming from Engle Road (Grosse Drive) parallels Engle Road from Calvin to Sheldon, parallels to the next street back. All the water comes from Engle Road runs through the big backyards and floods the backyards of the homes on Grosse and runs down the driveways, every driveway is a river during one of these rains. Every time it happens Smith Road gets closed down in a section of Brook Park; Sheldon Road gets closed down. So everyone knows I inspect the trash-rack at Abrams Creek going underneath the airport, look at that all the time. On Thursday I inspected and there wasn't even a foot high of trash at the bottom, logs and leaves, with that little rain. On Friday after the big rain and looked at it that trash is four-foot high but not over the rack. It was that bad and got that way because Abrams Creek has not been dredged and/or cleaned out; every time

**Discussion: cont.**

there is a storm it takes all stuff and creates dams. That is one of the reasons why Sheldon Road gets flooded and 20-hours later looking at the bridge on Sheldon Road the water was still up to the bridge on either side, the water had nowhere to go. This is where I think we should be approaching the storm water system of Cleveland to do this as a project or to use the monies coming to the city to do this project or other projects. Also, some ideas are when talking about catch-basins is whether enough monies can be pulled together and a project together instead of making catch-basins or something; to make lakes. For instance, where the old (city) sewer plant used to be on Plant Lane, that works off of Abrams Creek. Put a lake there now we have a part of a lake; Wedo Park or somewhere in that area put a lake, catch-basin, retention basin/lake. Build a park off of it and have a city lake(s). The whole problem with all this flooding is simple with giving the water a place to go. I don't have this problem, per say, in Ward One but believe Ward Two has the problem with all the water coming in from Middleburg Heights. My question is, why isn't Middleburg Heights controlling it? That's the issue that goes right into Ward Three. I've had water in my basement and Tells in my backyard and in basement and know when my ward floods by looking at my backyard and basement. I have been dealing with this for the last eight years, didn't use to happen and then all of a sudden it did. Again, two points the sewer that was put down Smith Road is a sanitary sewer, not a storm sewer and the city has to give the water a place to go.

Mr. Mencini stated the only thing I will disagree with my colleague, Mr. Troyer, is it's not simple. If it was simple, this would have been handled in the 1970's, 1980's and 1990's. The point made about the water coming down the driveways with all the flooded basements in Ward Two I would say more than double my calls were water in the backyard. Again, there was rain on Wednesday, Thursday that saturated the ground and then more rain on Friday. I don't believe it's actually that simple but what I do agree with is there has to be more dredging and also believe there should be more retention basins or holding tanks. I do believe a lot of the water is coming from Middleburg Heights, mostly everything runs north, and believe that is one of the first things that should be considered to look at. Monies have to be spent and might have to hire engineers to that just specialize in flooding. I kind of know what's been done before, that's dye tests, and maybe these engineers have to be here when there is a big rain and do the dye tests to see where the water is coming from. Put that dye where that pond or lake on Sheldon and Smith when it rains to see where it runs. Is it running into the basements, down Sheldon Road or down Smith Road, maybe they could start in Middleburg Heights. The engineers may tell us some things we don't want to know i.e. upgrade this or start doing this. If this was simple solution I believe this would have been handled by now and think there is a lot of little moving parts with this, not just one or two things. If we can't solve this, we definitely have to slow it down.

Mr. Orcutt stated in my former career in the military I had the opportunity to be in

**Discussion: cont.**

Iraq and wouldn't think there would be a water problem; their winters are actually an extremely rainy season. Once we build those camps there, that are still there for two decades, those issues had to be addressed in 2003, 2005 and 2007. With retention basins the water is diverted to an area where it can be held until the rain stops. Why is the city getting a lot? There is a lot that Mr. Troyer said that it is coming from the south. I definitely think funds must be appropriated. Looking at some areas where, obviously, it's going to be cost-effective and we all know what the city brings in; currently we don't know what we bring in. One idea I have is in my ward two circuits, that I know of, do run to the ditches over by the railroad tracks and go north alongside Wedo Park. At least with one of the circuitries' the city owns the land at Wedo Park. Have heard some of the residents' say they don't want to lose the baseball fields. In discussions with Mr. Salvatore and traveling to different states he has seen that the baseball field is a retention pond. The city does have areas where we can actually relieve that and if Mr. Troyer is having an issue with backyards. Maybe there is a small area where a retention pond needs to be built back there. I think they need to be dry retention basins, having lakes kind of defeats the purpose of a retention basin. I think this is something that can be looked at and find where the water can be caught when it's coming from the south. We all know they built up developments and don't think they started building in the City of Strongsville until the 1970's; the City of Brunswick is a gigantic city. All those parking lots, plazas and malls that parking lot catches that water and it comes to here. It's nobody's fault they just didn't have the vision in the 1950's that this was going to happen. Let's start looking into it now where it's cost-effective and to the finance director, during this pandemic, the city needs to start putting pennies away and start saving for it.

Mr. Poindexter stated the amount of rain this past weekend the retention basin would have to be a rather large retention basin to catch all that water. I think the city's approach should be more of a multi-facet approach like Mr. Troyer mentioned with the dredging of Abrams Creek. When I was working with the Aviation & Environmental committee last term, the Aviation Design Group, some of this stuff was discussed. There is funding out there if there is someone to go and get the funding to take care of the issues of cleaning up the litter, dredging and some of that stuff and also improving the health of the creek. I think the backflow regulators and stuff needs to be a multi-faceted attack, it can't just be the building of retention basins that is going to solve the problem. The retention basins to catch all the water from this past weekend would have to be the size of Cleveland Browns stadium, that was a lot of water in a short amount of time. It will absolutely help but think that's not going to solve all the issues, think it has to be a multi-faceted, even-keel approach on a lot of different areas.

Mr. Orcutt agrees with Mr. Poindexter the retention basins are football field size, especially, where Mr. Troyer spoke of coming across Sheldon Road. Heard there was

**Discussion: cont.**

a considerable amount of water and they are built the size of football fields. Also, make sure they are empty to hold the water. Once the rain has stopped the circuits are completely low then the basins are opened up to drain the retention basin. Think there are funds available to continue the dredging or start the dredging immediately, those are things that should be done on a regular basis. So people understands what I call check-valves is that stops the water from the main pushing into that home, which does help. What's happening in the homes since being older has a lot of water coming into the foundation because it's not getting released into the main. One of the big things that we do is look into relieving the mains and ditches; talking with the city engineer I was asked to keep taking pictures so the engineer can survey where the city can put relief points.

Mr. Poindexter continued listening to Mr. Orcutt, gave another idea. The retention basins could also be used for power-generation as exiting; possible energy grant, to possibly produce a little energy from the problem.

Mr. Troyer stated with the lake (spoken about earlier) would be kept low but also in addition of a retention. On the one-way valves or stop-valves generally what those are installed on is the waste. What it does is when the storm overflows into the sanitary what happens it backs up in basements, leaving a disgusting mess. That's what the valve does and if you put that on the storm now the drain tiles and gutters won't be able to empty because it empties through the storm, need to be careful with something like that. Also, if there is a cross-connection or a situation where mixed and let's say six houses in a row are getting water in their basements coming up from the drain. Five of those six houses have the stops most likely what will happen is the sixth house will still get the flooding along five houses on the other end will get flooding because the water will go somewhere. As soon as the water is stopped from going one place with those stops it will find another place. That's why they frown on doing that because it's a band aid for that house but then it affects other people. That's why it's not the best thing in the world, the best thing in the world is to control the water.

Mr. Vecchio stated Mr. Troyer you are correct and there were quite a few residents that had sanitary issues. That's part of the idea of a backflow preventer with some of these. A question to the Mayor did the city get the results of the Regional Sewer District smoke-testing that ran some months ago; they were in the areas of Defiance, Van Wert, Champaign and in other parts of the city, also.

Mayor Gammella responded certain the city did will get with the engineer.

Mr. Vecchio commented all of Council, including myself, would like to see those results as to how many cross-connections and everything else going on.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mayor Gammella suggested for the next meeting is have the engineer in attendance; or a special meeting for that subject matter only.

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Mencini, that item number three was discussed.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

**FINANCE COMMITTEE – CHAIRMAN, SCOTT:**

1. ORDINANCE NO. 11140-2020, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ADVERTISE FOR REQUESTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) FOR GUARANTEED ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACTORS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A GUARANTEED ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella

Mr. Scott stated this was requested by Mr. Troyer.

Mr. Troyer stated just wanted this for discussion, don't want to move or do anything with it. Basically bringing this up because the (pool) roof and walls aren't getting any better at the recreation center and reminding everyone this need to be done. Also, the Mayor promised Council to get different wording and/or have a legal authority give Council information on this.

Mayor Gammella stated speaking with the law director earlier, information has been received from Squires (law firm) and we need to move forward. Walking through there when raining part of the roof is falling into the old diving platform, water leaks all over and eventually this will affect the rest of the recreation center. The roof and walls have to be addressed, irregardless, of what is done with the rest of it; the roof and walls have to be addressed very soon, or could jeopardize the entire recreation center.

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mayor Gammella what is the plan currently for energy-savings or something to get the funds to repair the roof and walls.

Mayor Gammella responded would like to get something in front of Council for passage, doesn't mean I will implement the entire thing. Would like to see what we can get done for the roof and walls and currently, that's all I'm looking for under the current pandemic situation. I think the city is in a position right now where if it is not taken care of and soon there will be a much bigger problem.

Mr. Orcutt agreed with Mayor Gammella of having a bigger problem and continued. To reword my question where specifically is the city going to get the funds from energy to do that project?

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

Mayor Gammella responded hoping the new roof would not take as much energy, less heat and what would go through the roof. Anyway this can get done, especially, at a low rate where it will not affect the city's indebtedness, that's what I would like to do. The simple way would do that and may affect the city's indebtedness and not sure the city would get the same rate. Would like to explore all avenues before proceeding but need to proceed very soon on this.

Mr. Orcutt asked if the room is currently moth-balled and the temperature above freezing?

Mayor Gammella responded yes, the room is moth-balled definitely but one day when it's raining see Recreation Director Elliot to walk through there, there is a big, big issues. Also, will tell you there is another big issue in the water park that needs to be addressed. That area has been leaking for many, many years and is now at the point it needs to be addressed.

Mrs. Horvath stated late today an email was sent to Council of the language of the ordinance that not only did I look at but also Matthew Sagone who is an attorney with Squire, Patton and Boggs looked at the legislation. The language of the ordinance is fine and Squire, Patton and Boggs is a worldwide law firm with 1,500 attorneys. The first draft of the RFQ is out there and the probably the next issue would be what sort of committee would be making the decisions in the event the city advertises. Some things can be tightened up but would advise that neither add or subtract the ordinance as it is now.

Mr. Troyer continued I can tell you who would make that decision according to (ORC) 717.02 that would be the Council. I have some amendments that could probably fix this because RFQ is not part of (ORC) 717.02.

Mr. Vecchio interjected if we're looking to make amendments on this Mr. Troyer was just bringing out to do so it wasn't forgotten about.

Mr. Troyer concurred.

Mr. Vecchio continued unless Council is going to act on something I don't making the amendments right now would be the time to do so. What I mean is the law director just stated that the Squires group has redid the paperwork as Council asked. Why not take a look at that first prior to moving forward with amendments from Members of Council?

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Schmuck, to place back in committee in order to take a look at that.

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

Mayor Gammella commented if this roof situation gets much worse I'm going to have people look at it and give the city bids because the city needs to act on this outside of this RFQ. It's coming to be an emergency situation.

Mr. Troyer commented it would be great to have more information.

The clerk called the roll on the motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mrs. Schmuck, to place back in committee.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Schmuck, Scott, Salvatore, Poindexter,  
**NAYS:** Orcutt, Mencini. The motion carried with a vote of 5-2.

**LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, MENCINI:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 1313.03 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES ENTITLED COMMERCIAL BUILDING PERMIT FEES AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mayor Gammella deferred to Building Commissioner Hurst.

Mr. Hurst stated for the commercial fees the department has streamlined the ordinance over the course of the last 2½ years. Studying the numbers on the attempt to get everything in line with one-percent evaluation of the work. in an attempt to get everything in line with one-percent evaluation of the work, these are the changes the department is recommending. Using the Classic Mazda (construction) job that is coming up I have fielded approximately 35 calls from contractors doing bid work asking questions what are the permit fees, what is this or what is that. The city's fee schedule didn't allow for calculating fees until drawings were in-hand i.e. square footage, numbers for outlets, sinks and etc. This Ordinance allows the city to take the evaluation of the project and one-percent (1%) of that is the cost of the building permit across the board. The other changes see in bold are all reflected of those numbers of what has been put together for the last 2½ years. For example, the city never had a site development fee so all the earth-work, sewers, sewer lines and catch-basins were all figured by measurements of pipe and how many different catch-basins; this clarifies everything for quick and easy figurations. The contractors have access to know what they bidding on when bidding the job.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Hurst the last point made is that it does away with the measuring but I see in the ordinance there is still additional charges for larger areas.

Mr. Hurst responded most of those charges fall under additions, alterations and repairs under new construction. In other words, the E.L. Mustee project that the Planning Commission heard last month is a project that the site is already there, the size of the building is already there and it's an addition. Those calculations are

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

easier to come up with and with the numbers seen changed based on parking lots, additions done in the city. Those evaluations worked out to the approximate one-percent (1%) number of the evaluation of the job. That is seen with parking lots a la carte, commercial roofs a la carte, those are all projects that are not 100% new construction.

Mr. Poindexter asked Mr. Hurst if these changes had been in place last year would the city's fees have been same, less or higher?

Mr. Hurst if these fees were in place last year, the city's fees would have probably been very similar to what they will be after the changes go into effect.

Mr. Poindexter continued to Mr. Hurst, in your opinion, if these changes were implemented would this help the city attract new development; since this makes the process a little easier?

Mr. Hurst responded I clearly thinks the process is much easier especially for the contractors bidding big work and new projects; there is no guessing. If the electrical contractor's portion of a job is valued at \$500,000 they know that electrical permit is going to cost one-percent (1%) of that.

Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Hurst if there is any hurry on moving this or can this go to a second reading?

Mr. Hurst responded I will say this, I would like it to be done as quickly as can be, I don't think it will impact the city. As stated before this is not changing income or revenue by very little if anything, so it won't hindrance the city. However, it is streamlining so the department is not fielding multiple phone calls on projects to get permit fees portions and have to calculate those fees based on assumption.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Hurst what model was used to design this fee schedule and wants to make sure it is inline so there isn't a similar situation like the billboard legislation. Definitely in favor of any department being able to streamline anything to make run easier.

Mr. Hurst commented there not a lot of changes in the fees, it's more how the fees are calculated. There are some minor changes where the base fee was changed and lowered the square footage fee the same based on a la carte work. This won't change the evaluations very much the department is still one of the lowest communities around in for permit fees, for the simple reason of using as an attraction. This was based on what the State of Ohio does and that is a one-percent (1%) evaluation fee. Every time there was a commercial roof permit we looked at what the evaluation was, what the city's permit fee was originally. Was it more than

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

one-percent (1%), less than one-percent (1%), was it at one-percent (1%) and tried to modify the numbers. So that based on the size of the roofs that one-percent number (1%) works. Are there going to be situations where the department make them a little less on a roof permit than others; possibly, but 99% of them will come in at that one-percent (1%) evaluation and streamlines everything.

Mr. Orcutt thanked Mr. Hurst for time given to him and thinks this is something that will help operations and like the fact of being attractive to the builders.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Hurst this is good with state guidelines and nobody will challenge this.

Mr. Hurst responded to the best of my knowledge the answer is no. What the city ran into with the other ordinance was a language problem in the original ordinance. The language in that ordinance put the city into a situation that the city was called on, it's been taken care of. Looking at this fee schedule specifically under number 9B the city's billboard fees are \$62.00 for aesthetic and \$113.00 for digital billboards, annual maintenance fee.

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Scott, Troyer, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Schmuck, Orcutt  
**NAYS:** None. The motion carried.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as M-2 as Ordinance No. 11152-2020.

2. AN ORDINANCE REPEALING SECTION 1313.08 OF THE BROOK PARK CODIFIED ORDINANCES 'HOME IMPROVEMENT MONTHS; WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEES' AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.  
Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mayor Gammella referred to Building Commissioner Hurst.

Mr. Hurst stated this gives free permits during the months of June, July and August passed in 2000. With the tightening of the belts, the building department gives approximately \$35,000 to \$40,000 annually in free permits and still stand on the fact that at least 80% of those are given to contractors with the residents' not seeing the benefits. The department and General Fund could certainly use an extra \$35,000 this year.

Mr. Salvatore stated being one of the original sponsors in 2000 would not like for this to disappear completely. This has served a tremendous purpose with people wanting to improve their homes and right now people are home more and in the

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini:**

position of improving their homes. I can understand why this is being brought forward to put a little more monies in the city's coffers. Think the residents' do reap the benefit on a fee that has been waived because the builder can't charge for a permit that was not paid for. Would like Council to consider keeping, at least, one month during the summer.

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mr. Hurst all contractors must register in the city, correct?

Mr. Hurst responded yes.

Mr. Orcutt continued it has been talked about the fact that possibly 20% of the people applying for the applications are the residents', correct?

Mr. Hurst responded yes.

Mr. Orcutt continued if the resident does a project by building a shed the building department still has to inspect, correct.

Mr. Hurst responded correct.

Mr. Orcutt stated one thing I'd like to do is protect the residents' and be able to provide this bonus; would entertain the fact that something is still needed in there for the residents'. Not sure if that something can be done legally with the operation of the contractor versus the homeowner.

Mr. Hurst stated let me answer this way, for example, Mr. Orcutt pulls a permit for a driveway and as a homeowner he gets a free permit. Doesn't matter who shows up to bust up the driveway or pour the concrete because Mr. Orcutt pulled that permit. Unless I visit every single job and watch roofs being put on, concrete, hot water tank installation, of furnace. I have no way of tracking and monitoring who is doing the work. So, yes, while contractors have to register in the city to work as a contractor if your cousin's company from Willoughby comes over to help with the driveway. Your cousin doesn't have to register because he's not working as a company, he's working as a relative. We ran into this numerous year's back where residents were pulling the permits for contractors because they thought they were saving money. An \$8,000 driveway in the City of Brook Park costs \$50.50 for the permit. We were talking about all the water and floods a backwater valve to be installed, most of you know, there are companies are charging \$1,200.00 to dig up a front sewer line and replaced; the permit fee for a backwater valve on the exterior of the home is \$50.50. The residents aren't reaping the benefits of this because when a contractor tells the resident I'll do your driveway for \$8,000.00, the resident pays that \$8,000.00. When that contractor comes to the building department to fill out the permit application and told there is not fee of \$50.50 he doesn't drive back to Mr. Orcutt's

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

house to give the \$50.50 back that wasn't paid for a permit fee. This is what the department has experienced and what we've seen; it doesn't help every once in a great while. Somebody may get a free permit and it saves them \$50.00, \$25.00 or something to that effect but it doesn't save the average person. The majority of the people having work done it doesn't save them very much money at all.

Mr. Orcutt agrees that any of those savings are passing on even the way it is now. I would just like for smaller projects and would hope there's not people putting in driveways without proper procedures or having proper people doing it. I think the city should have a little bonus for residents for do-it-yourself projects.

Mr. Hurst commented if there was a way to keep track of that it would be but there is no way to control, track, monitor or regulate it. My biggest fight currently is with pool companies selling nice pools and then tell residents they must get the permit; because they've subcontracted out to a pool installer. Every resident decides to pull their own pool permit even though a contractor is doing the work, the contractor doesn't have to register due to not working as a contractor but a resident's relative. I'm not advocating and see advantages and have seen advantages of this throughout the years and agree with Mr. Salvatore not asking to eliminate this legislation, for the history of time. But, recently have 1½ employees working in the building department due to lack of funds, one is laid off indefinitely and the other who is on the three-month layoff. The city is handing out \$35,000 to \$40,000 annually that the residents don't reap the benefits of.

Mr. Orcutt asked Mr. Hurst, the department itself are you saying you don't go to every roof installation, fence installation and driveway installation.

Mr. Hurst responded department personnel goes to every driveway, fence, hot water tank and furnace installation where there is a permit is pulled, an inspection is done. That doesn't help when showing up for the inspection and there are ten guys on the roof and the homeowner stated they're all family members.

Mr. Poindexter stated I've been in favor of this since moving to Brook Park and thought it was a great perk when I found out the home maintenance months; tell residents to save rehab-projects until summer months to get free permits. This is a great amenity for the city and understand the city is a little bit of a crisis currently and see the reason this was brought forward. Agree with Mr. Salvatore of not wanting this to go away permanently and suggest possibly doing this like the tax-rebate legislation where it comes in front of Council on a year to year basis. Understand the need to put this on hold this year and possibly next year but have this on a year to year basis to determine if the funding is there. \$35,000 to \$40,000 a year is a good money but don't think it's going to make or break the city one way or the other.

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

Mr. Troyer stated have been a strong supporter of having these three months with free permits, my last term I fought against repealing this legislation at that time. In light of the city's finances have had a change of heart, although still don't want to repeal the legislation. Would like to place a moratorium on the legislation until May of 2021; at that time Council can revisit this. Suggested amendment is to delete the word repeal and have it read something like 'An Ordinance placing a moratorium until May, 2021 on Section 1313.08 and continue from there; section three would have to be changed the same way. In a year this is needed the city can reap the money and think right now the city is short (on money) and the fact is. Not all but some residents have received a (stimulus) check or will be receiving a check. This year okay with placing a moratorium for 2020 and revisit in May, 2021 to see if the city can afford it, in a sense the city can't afford to do this for 2020.

Mr. Hurst stated if there is going to be a moratorium on this legislation, I respectfully, ask that the legislation be revisited in February or March, (2021); so the residents are prepared when the spring (months) come. One of the things the department found is and Mr. Poindexter is correct people do encourage residents to wait until June, July or August for free permits. Residents like to start fixing up their homes in April or May, when the weather starts getting nice, and will wait until June not knowing if the city will have free permits or not. If revisited in February or March and it is reinstated residents will know to wait until June; or when reinstated Council could make the months of May and June, little earlier in the year so residents can get started on home repairs. When waiting until July residents are enjoying their yards and Home Days and lose interest in improving their homes.

Mr. Scott stated he had first-hand experience on a contractor applying and getting free permit and turning around and charging the resident a \$250.00 permit fee; seen that happen. To Mr. Hurst if a resident pulls a permit and there is faulty work done who is the responsible for the repairs?

Mr. Hurst responded the permit holder is responsible for anything that happens. Not just faulty work but if somebody knocks down the neighbor's house the permit holder responsible. If somebody takes out a permit and the city doesn't allow homeowners' permits typically for these things but, for example, to replace an electric panel. If someone gets electrocuted or the house burns down the permit holder is the responsible party.

Mr. Scott continued agrees with Mr. Salvatore that Council should get rid of all three months and possibly have, at least this year, one month that residents can apply for a free permit.

Mr. Vecchio stated in agreement with everyone and sees it from all aspects;

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

especially the moratorium that Mr. Troyer brought forward. To Mr. Hurst there have been residents pulling permits that, in turn, get charged by some of the contractors. Is there any way to limit the permits to residents living in the house and the work is performed by that resident for a free permit? For a fence, door or what have you and limit the free permits just for that eliminating the possibility of having contractors doing it.

Mr. Hurst responded what was done a few years back, that the department thought would curtail some of this. Was to actually have on the permit application that if pulling a homeowner's permit you are signing an affidavit saying you are performing the work. Then what happens is they sign and is putting the driveway in.

Mr. Vecchio asked there is no way to penalize the person taking out the permit?

Mr. Hurst responded would have to prove those people are actually as the contractor, there's no way to prove that. The other thing, from my standpoint and have seen in the building department is if this is reduced to one month. Instead of giving \$35,000 to \$40,000 in three months that amount will be given away in one month. On the last day of August, the department get inundated with 60 to 70 permits but the work won't be done until November or December, but why not get the free permit.

Mr. Poindexter during the discussion I came up with a kind of possible outside the box solution with this issue. What if Council kept the three months but changed them to December, January and February? A lot of people won't do home improvements on the exterior during those months so the city wouldn't be losing that revenue. Then if the furnace breaks during those months the humane thing would be to give a free permit for the furnace replacement, just an outside the box thinking not really a solution. Best solution is looking at this on an annual basis and if the monies are there, then do it. Mr. Hurst's point is well taken review this in February when ready to discuss the budget and see where the city is with finances; do three months or only one month.

Mr. Salvatore commented personally I have not heard anything that will change my position on this, really believe that keeping this on the books for doing this only one month would get my support. As far as contractors charging a permit fee when there is no fee involved. To me, that is wrong and should find out who those people are and they shouldn't be allowed to do work in the city; if they're willing to cheat a resident over \$50.00 who knows what they're doing with the rest of the monies. This legislation has been around for a long time, looking at the names, and haven't heard anything that this is as bad program but willing to compromise and offer for one month this year and the reevaluate in December, as Councilman Poindexter mentioned.

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

Mr. Troyer stated this can be looked at another time but right now Council has this piece repealing. If Council tries to do one month and change it then an amendment is needed to the original legislation, meaning nothing can be done with this. The way I'm looking at this is the only thing Council can do tonight is change this legislation to delete 'repeal' and insert moratorium until February, 2021 and use the same piece of legislation. Otherwise, we would need a new piece of legislation and have an amendment to that legislation.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Salvatore when you and your colleagues brought this forward the reason was to give residents an incentive to improve their home, during the summer months. When asked about this the question is the months designated and think that inspires them to improve their homes during June or July. This year, I understand where our building commissioner about losing employees in his department as well as other departments in the city. Agree with Mr. Salvatore that if someone is getting the permit for free charging residents \$50.00 that seems to be a small crime. Absolutely, times are tight and the city could use the funds and think to take this away some residents might take offense to this, they like this. Sometimes, when saying we'll go back to something it isn't done the way it originally was.

Mr. Hurst commented make no mistake the building department, nobody in the building department nor the Mayor wants to take this step. As everyone said nobody wants to make these decisions and nobody wants to take these steps. The building department will not operate any differently if this doesn't pass, then in the past; nor will the department operate differently if this does pass. This is Council's decision that I brought forth through the Mayor as a suggestion on the finances of the city and will move forward with whatever decision Council makes.

Mr. Orcutt asked Mr. Hurst if a resident is getting a new driveway and the concrete company pulls the permit does the homeowner get a copy of any paperwork or application?

Mr. Hurst responded they get a copy of the permit that is supposed to be posted in the window.

Mr. Orcutt continued is there anything stated on there that for those months' residents shouldn't be charged for permit.

Mr. Hurst responded right on the permit is the permit fee, if there is no fee there is a zero (\$0).

Mr. Orcutt asked if there is any way to change that to have residents check the itemized bill to make sure no fee was charged for permits

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

Mr. Hurst responded I have talked to people about that and have actually put that in the newsletters. Most contracts are simple and have no line items that state x-amount of money for a permit fee. Contractors tell the residents your roof job will be \$8,000.00 with \$4,000.00 down and the rest at completion. So people understand it's easy to assume that the consumers get an itemized of what everything is going to cost but that typically not the way construction projects work.

Mr. Orcutt stated this is a nice incentive that pushes people to improve their homes; this is a tough one and would not like see this taken away from the residents.

Mr. Hurst commented that is Council's decision and will respect any decision made but Brook Park is the only community, that I am aware, in the State of Ohio and possibly United States that has this program, this is a cost-saving measure.

Mr. Troyer stated being through this before and always have been in support of this, against repealing three of four years ago and it's a different situation currently. The current situation the city is in now is within a week and a half this will take effect. Don't think there is time to come up with a brand new piece of legislation and basically Council needs to do something. All the issues talked about can be fixed with the homeowner getting the free permit and believe there is way to do all of this, that can be done next February and bring back stronger than ever. I don't think there is anyone that wants to repeal this but if something isn't done it will take effect and Council will not look good or doing something in the middle with residents taking advantage of the program. This legislation could be amended with the moratorium for this year, simple wording, then fix and do it right in February. Not that it was wrong from the beginning because it's worked for many years, think it's great legislation. If Council does nothing the legislation takes effect and the city loses \$35,000.00 when the city really needs the money.

Mr. Salvatore recommended a new piece of legislation drafted eliminating the months of July and August. Continue the program through June for 30 days and revisit in December. Reiterated the month of June only, July and August would be suspended until next year.

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to amend the title to remove the word 'repealing' and insert placing a moratorium until February 2021 on; to read an Ordinance placing a moratorium until February, 2021 on Section 313.08 of the Brook Park Codified Ordinances 'Home Improvement Months; Waiver of Building Permit Fees and declaring an emergency.

Mrs. Horvath commented the law department will make every effort to have a new piece of legislation drafted. Hearing two versions one is for a moratorium and the other is having the program for the month of June, eliminating July and August.

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

Mr. Salvatore thinks the right thing to do is have the month of June, residents were probably planning pulling a permit in the month of June. Council can make adjustments for the months of July and August with the new piece. That will also provide some history to find out what economic impact by offering three months as opposed consolidating into one month. By the end of the year the building commissioner can provide figures to say okay the month of June wasn't \$35,000 maybe less. Council can't automatically assume that just because there are not free permits the city will still have \$40,000 with the permits being taken out. This incentive might be what is costing the improvement in the first place for residents. Council should take a hard look at this to see if it's a good or bad idea and saving money. That would be my motion.

Mr. Troyer - Point of Order.

Mr. Mencini - recognized the Point of Order.

Mr. Troyer - there is a motion on the floor with a second.

Mr. Mencini - who made the second.

Mr. Poindexter - I did.

Mr. Salvatore - I was just trying to make a point. A motion has been made and thank Mr. Poindexter for seconding the motion. If the motion is there, then let's move forward. Call the question.

Mr. Poindexter - Point of clarification. Mr. Salvatore said he wasn't making a motion and then Mr. Troyer made a motion and seconded that motion.

Mr. Mencini - he said it was a suggestion. Then Mr. Troyer made his motion and I didn't hear your second, with everyone talking over everybody.

Mr. Poindexter - I said I second the motion.

Mr. Vecchio - so everyone is aware sitting here and listening. The motion was made by Mr. Troyer, seconded by Mr. Poindexter, changing the verbiage to read 'An Ordinance placing a moratorium until February, 2021.

The clerk called the roll on the motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to amend.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Poindexter, Schmuck

**NAYS:** Mencini, Salvatore, Scott, Orcutt. The amendment **failed** with a vote of 4-3.

**Legislative Committee - Chairman, Mencini: cont.**

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Orcutt, to have new legislation drafted having the month of June 2020.

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

**NAYS:** Schmuck, Troyer. The amendment carried with a vote of 5-2.

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Orcutt, that legislation was read in committee.

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

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

Mr. Vecchio commented after adjournment there will be a ten-minute recess.

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

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

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

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED   
Michelle Blazak  
Clerk of Council

APPROVED September 1, 2020

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