

**REGULAR CAUCUS MEETING  
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO  
HELD ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 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 Service Director Gardner.

Mr. Vecchio asked for a moment of silence for Cleveland police officer Skernivitz who was killed on duty and Cleveland police officer Sabo passed away.

**DISCUSSION:**

1. AMERICAN LEGAL PAYMENT (**622.05**) FOR ELECTRONIC UPDATE TO THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Orcutt, to place on the September 15<sup>th</sup> Council agenda under verbal approval.

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

**FINANCE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, SCOTT:**

1. AN ORDINANCE MAKING A WRITTEN RETURN TO THE FISCAL OFFICER OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO, FOR CHARGES FOR THE SERVICES OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO, FOR CUTTING WEEDS ON CERTAIN PARCELS OF LAND DESCRIBED HEREIN AND AUTHORIZING SAID CHARGES TO BE PLACED UPON THE TAX DUPLICATE AND COLLECTED AS OTHER PURSUANT TO SECTION 731.54 OF THE OHIO REVISED CODE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella. **Deadline date for filing September 17, 2020.**

Mr. Vecchio commented Council can pass this at the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting and the legislation will be sent to the county.

Mr. Cingle concurred with Council President Vecchio the legislation can be passed at next week's meeting. The budget commission asked that the legislation be in their office no later than September 17<sup>th</sup>. This is charges for cutting weeds and grass throughout the community that will be assessed on the tax duplicate.

Mr. Troyer stated don't remember this being done this way and there is an ordinance for foreclosed homes and such. Is this still for the foreclosed homes or

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

for owner-occupied when not keeping up with their property?

Mr. Cingle responded not sure if these are foreclosed homes or not.

Mayor Gammella stated these are homes that are either foreclosed and/or occupied.

Mr. Troyer continued to Mrs. Horvath if these are foreclosed homes or owner-occupied homes and brief the definition or description of written return means.

Mrs. Horvath responded written return is to having notice to the fiscal officer and the city wants to have timely notice to the fiscal officer because this becomes part of the taxes due on the property. Notice is being sent to the fiscal officer for the charges the city incurred for grass cutting. As far as the various parcels I would call them parcels in transition rather than saying owner-occupied or foreclosed upon; usually once a foreclosure begins usually a management company comes into cut the grass and items necessary to maintain the property. These parcels may be owner-occupied or possibly trapped in probate (court) limbo, each one probably has a unique story. This task involves departments of Building, Service, Finance and Law to work together to generate for Council.

Mr. Troyer commented the legislation allowing the city to do this was passed in 2016 or 2017?

Mrs. Horvath responded I think it may have been earlier and can research that, think it was passed prior to my tenure (2016) and think it was being done differently years past and found that to get accurate information all four departments worked together.

Mr. Troyer commented this will be a yearly item?

Mrs. Horvath concurred.

Mr. Mencini clarified this is for grass and am sure weeds are in there too and am surprised there is only six (6) properties. Years ago, the service department had a sheet of parcels that service crews cut and agrees with Mrs. Horvath with the outside companies cutting the grass. In section 5 the legislation states the charges are placed on the tax duplicate as a described lien on said parcels of land. Meaning the lien gets placed on the property so whoever purchases the home will have to pay the tax lien.

Mr. Salvatore stated these six (6) properties are being cut by service department crews in-house, correct?

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

Mrs. Horvath responded the service department crews are cutting these parcels and does the invoicing; building department does the checking and citing and all this information is then transferred to both finance and law departments to begin the process. The best lien to have is a tax lien since they take first in foreclosure proceedings.

Mr. Salvatore continued the fees being assessed reading this legislation are all different; probably due to amount of cuts or size of the area. Are all these charges based on 2020 summer season?

Mrs. Horvath responded I believe this reflects from September, 2019 through September, 2020 as to how these charges accumulated on an annual basis.

Mr. Mencini commented due to very high grass in the backyard at one of these parcels one (1) had to be contracted out.

Mr. Salvatore commented would like to know what property was contracted out.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to place on the September 15<sup>th</sup> Council agenda.

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

2. A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE AMOUNTS AND RATES AS DETERMINED BY THE BUDGET COMMISSION AND AUTHORIZING THE NECESSARY TAX LEVIES AND CERTIFYING THEM TO THE COUNTY FISCAL OFFICER AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mr. Cingle stated this is a housekeeping item, Council approved the 2021 Tax Budget earlier this year and these are rates that Council approved with no changes from years past. This is time-sensitive the County Budget Commission has asked this be passed by end of September.

Mr. Mencini stated under the legislation title it reads 'The Council of the City of Brook Park, Cuyahoga County, Ohio met on the 15<sup>th</sup> of September, 2020 at the Brook Park Council Chambers. Think this may need to be corrected since Council is meeting virtually.

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Poindexter asked if a location is necessary or just strike that out.

Mrs. Horvath commented legislation should read 'via electronic meeting'.

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

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mrs. Schmuck, to delete in the first paragraph 'at the Brook Park Council Chambers and insert 'via electronic meeting'.

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

**Motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Mencini, to place on the September 15<sup>th</sup> Council agenda under first reading.

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

**LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, MENCINI:**

1. AN ORDINANCE ENACTING SECTION 509.16 OF THE BROOK PARK GENERAL OFFENSES CODE OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK ENTITLED 'PEDESTRIAN OR VEHICLE INTERFERENCE; ATM PRIVACY' AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Council President Vecchio.

Mr. Vecchio stated this came about with the panhandling that has been taking which place within the city. Back in February, I was at the local Get Go station and was approached by a gentleman who walked up behind me asking for money. Being an adult male wasn't in fear but thought about females, in general, in our city. Also, seeing since then with what took place with the pandemic and knowing the times we are currently in this is being seen more and more of this throughout the city and a lot happening at the ATM's (Automated Teller Machine) and those types of things. Police officers' hands have been tied with writing citations due to rights of individuals and no grounds and having this legislation this would allow to happen and try to quell some of those issues we're hearing more and more about. This would allow police officers the ability to hopefully prohibit the continuation of this.

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mr. Vecchio this is to basically enhance protection and safety of those driving and those that are panhandling; this gives the city police officers the authority to create a safer environment from the panhandlers.

Mr. Vecchio responded for everybody; the panhandlers and the people that may be approached by them.

Mr. Orcutt continued the city currently has laws not allowing people to go to Get Go or hang out at a privately owned business.

Mr. Poindexter stated to Mr. Vecchio if I'm driving down the street and a resident flags me down and hands me something through my car window. Would that be against the law if this is enacted?

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

Is corridor and areas of that nature to prohibit from taking place.

Mr. Poindexter continued by reading the legislation 'no person shall engage in distribution with driver or occupant of a vehicle in a right-of-way, unless vehicle is lawfully stopped. If I'm on the street ready to drive away and a neighbor stops me asking me to check something out, we would be in violation of section A-1. I understand where you are going with this legislation but believe there are broader implications than just panhandlers on the side of the road. A lot of people have conversations when in the vehicle and don't want to over legislate or overburden laws. The city already has laws on the books impeding the flow of traffic that can be used in any of these situations, at the officer's discretion. Would rather keep it at the officer's discretion instead of saying that people have to abide by these laws and rules.

Mr. Poindexter agreed with Mr. Vecchio that panhandling is a nuisance at every (freeway) exit and is dangerous for both the person asking for money and the person in the vehicle. Just fear that if a broad law is made it's going to be applied in other areas and don't want to see that take place.

Mr. Troyer stated to Mr. Vecchio are the police officers aware of this? Have the officers asked for this? Is the police chief aware of this? Are the officers for or against this? Is there any feedback from the police chief or officers?

Mr. Vecchio responded I haven't spoken with the police chief but have spoken with some of the city's officers and they are all in favor. Because currently the officers have very little recourse and there a lot of the same people doing this over and over.

Mr. Troyer continued I understand the issue and agree with Mr. Poindexter that (letter) A is a little overbearing. Like some other parts of this and think the ATM's should be six-feet instead of three-feet, especially with COVID-19. I have a few issues and haven't found all the scenarios yet. First of all, what (letter) A does is makes good law-abiding citizens that may give something to someone at the corner (of the street) making them a criminal and the city can't have that. Secondly, when the firefighters collect for muscular dystrophy Labor Day weekend at the intersection of Snow and Smith that would make city firefighters criminals, illegal according to this. Think (letter) A needs to be looked at and make a few adjustments in the rest of the legislation, overall like the legislation especially if police officers think it is needed.

Mr. Vecchio encouraged both Councilmembers Troyer and Poindexter to take some time with myself to look at this and see what can be changed to A-1, appreciate the feedback; let's open it up to provide safety to not only city residents' but

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

those that are in need along with city police officers.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mr. Vecchio I like this, read this over a few times and first thought was the city firefighters'. There is a lot of good things in this legislation and a lot of this is discretion for the police officers, who do a lot, see a lot and know right from wrong. To Mrs. Horvath the City of Cleveland tried to do this a few years ago and received resistance; when looking at this did you compare with any other cities?

Mrs. Horvath responded this legislation was placed in committee on April 21<sup>st</sup> and need to refresh my recollection as to what other cities were looked at. I would note that (letter) A has frequent references to Ohio Revised Code (ORC) 4511, a section of the traffic code, and would like to go back and refer to that ORC section.

Mr. Mencini asked in the city's codes is there anything that could be a possible companion piece, or similar to this? Did you see anything like that when looking at this?

Mrs. Horvath responded this is somewhat new and would have to go back and revisit that and try to issue something to Council in writing for guidance.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, to place on the October 13, 2020 Caucus agenda.

Mr. Troyer - Point of Order.

Mr. Mencini recognized.

Mr. Troyer - I don't see the law director's stamp as legal form and correctness, there is a signature as Clerk of Council but there is no stamp.

Mr. Vecchio concurred, the law director's signature is on the line for Clerk of Council, by mistake.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mrs. Horvath if this legislation is in correct form, it's been in committee since April 21, 2020. It seems like minor adjustments have to be made in (letter) A-1. Why prolong it why can't we put on the next Caucus agenda bring suggestions to the table and let's get some work done.

Mrs. Horvath responded I would say yes, probably the error is me signing a pile of paperwork and somehow this didn't get stamped with the law department stamp. I ended up signing the last line on the left side. Looking through this I see a lot of work put into it, I do recall quite a bit of things with this issue. Obviously, being

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

submitted back in April that would have been at a time if Council meetings were taking place. I would say yes, this is sufficient form to be able to move to a Caucus agenda and put the law department stamp prior to that meeting.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Councilmembers Troyer and Poindexter do you think your amendments could be ready by the next Caucus meeting?

Mr. Poindexter responded yes, I can jot things down and send over to the Council President for this thoughts by the next Caucus meeting.

Mr. Troyer responded I would eliminate (letter) a would be the simplest thing but if you could rework some words on there. We could take out (letter) A-3 and take out just parts of it which would probably work too, I think, but that doesn't work for the firefighters'. I will look at this and don't see what the rush is on this since it's been since April but would rather see it get done right and let it go to Caucus to come up with some changes. Thank you to Mrs. Horvath for your input on that, I was concerned that it really doesn't look like your signature and concerned that your signature was needed, otherwise there is an issue.

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, to place on the October 13, 2020 Caucus agenda under discussion.

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

Mr. Poindexter commented while I will be looking into amendments for this piece of legislation, will continue to look for ways to make this economy more equitable for people; so that Council doesn't have to make laws like this. There wouldn't be panhandling if society was more equitable for more people i.e. lot more good paying jobs and access to health care and things of that nature.

**RECREATION COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, POINDEXTER:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH GOVDEALS.COM FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUCTIONING VARIOUS FILE CABINETS, EXERCISE EQUIPMENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mayor Gammella stated this is the most legal way to dispose of various office and exercise equipment.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mayor Gammella all the items on the list strictly from recreation or from other city departments?

Mayor Gammella responded mostly recreation.

**Recreation Committee - Chairman, Poindexter: cont.**

Mr. Troyer commended Mayor Gammella on this piece of legislation, have purchased many vehicles from GovDeals and recommend that the city sell their used vehicles in the same manner; know there is a reason why the city doesn't. I have an account with this company and they pay top dollar, most of the time. Also, suggested to Mayor Gammella to do a possible robo-call for this auction so residents' have a good change to bid on the equipment.

Mrs. Schmuck asked Mayor Gammella has the city ever tried this particular auction before?

Mayor Gammella responded no.

Mrs. Schmuck commented looking at the GovDeals site and this looks like a great match for the city equipment; glad to see the city doing this.

Mr. Vecchio commented the city needs to begin purging what the city has.

**Motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Orcutt, to move to the September 15, 2020 Council agenda.

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

2. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO TAKE BIDS TO HIRE A CONSULTING COMPANY TO GIVE THE CITY AN ESTIMATE TO REPAIR THE NATATORIUM WALLS AND ROOF AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.  
Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

**Note:** Due to the Mayor and law director being in the city hall conference area and practicing social distancing and wearing of masks some excerpts of the following discussion were hard to transcribe.

Mayor Gammella stated this has been ongoing for the last two years and needs to be done, hope Council will move forward.

Mr. Troyer stated to Mayor Gammella is there a cost for the estimates in Section 4.

Mayor Gammella responded it's authorized in section one for the Mayor to advertise for bids, I have no idea.

Mr. Troyer clarified this is just the cost for advertising? We won't have to pay for the bids?

Mayor Gammella responded this will allow a consulting firm to give the city



**Recreation committee - Chairman, Poindexter: cont.**

estimates for repair of the natatorium walls and roof. Whoever is hired will be the city's consultant to tell us the best way to go and what the cost will be.

Mr. Troyer asked if there is an idea on what that person will be?

Mayor Gammella stated to Mr. Troyer if someone is going to be hired that consultant will not do it for free.

Mr. Troyer asked is there a rough figure for that cost?

Mayor Gammella responded no, not at this time, not until advertised.

Mr. Troyer continued in Section 2 it reads such bids will be for a vapor barrier and without a vapor barrier, which is one of the items asked for. In Section 3 states such bids will also include lowering the current roof. Is the city also going to get a bid without lowering the current roof?

Mayor Gammella responded no, this is a consensus of all of Council with what they wanted to do and we need to proceed with this, this is the direction given and that's what we are going to do if passed.

Mr. Troyer reiterated we will also be looking at not lowering the roof, correct?

Mayor Gammella responded all aspects will be looked at.

Mr. Troyer commented different amounts, different bids. I see no reason whatsoever to lower that roof I think it would hurt the city, decrease cubic feet of air space which is worth money. Also, if the levels were to be split it would also reduce possible square footage in the future, see no reasonable reason to lower the roof. In fact, think it would be very expensive and very hard considering the fact that the bleachers being there and wouldn't get much lowering due to the bleachers. For the record, I am against lowering the roof unless some overwhelming reason exists that it has to be done.

Mr. Mencini stated there have been problems with the pool area since late 1980's and I like this piece of legislation better than what was originally brought forward. This problem should have been taken care of a long time ago and probably should have been looked at a lot harder. That being said I'm looking at all options for that pool area and think we need to be open-minded due to being a very large area that wasn't used very much in its later years. It is a very costly to run a pool or pools is very expensive and would like to see everything come forth, on the table. The important item on this piece of legislation for the residents is estimates, this is not a done deal; the city is getting estimates to see what to do with that area.

**Recreation committee - Chairman, Poindexter: cont.**

Mr. Vecchio stated looking at this I think having this comprehensive review of the area is perfect for the city. If lowering the roof saves the usage space for availability for something else, so be it. If keeping the height, the roof is now does everything so be it. I think looking at it overall and having a company take a comprehensive look and seeing how the city can save it. How to best utilize the area and what the cost is going to be benefits everyone. I, myself, favor this and would like to see this move forward.

Mr. Troyer stated the problem I have with this is it's going to cost more money and I don't know what it is to get the estimate on lowering the roof; can't wait to get the information back to Council.

Mr. Poindexter stated I am in favor of this but not in favor of redoing (the pool area) without a vapor barrier. Even if Council moves forward with the pool or without the pool by doing the vapor barrier, at least, we have that option. If we redo the area without a vapor barrier it takes the pool out of the equation all together. The city would have no water feature there and probably ever have a water feature there again. I'm going into this with doing the vapor barrier whether there is a pool or not we could always use for something else. If we don't have the vapor barrier the city could never use the area for a pool again. There will be a little bit of a cost difference there but I am all for getting as much information as possible, get the estimates with and without the barrier vapor and with lowering the roof and without lowering the roof. Want as much as information possible so we get the right product for the city. This should have been done years ago and that would have been the best time to do it but the next best time is now; so let's move this forward and get moving on this.

**Motion** by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the September 15<sup>th</sup> Council agenda.

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

**Motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Scott, to move to the Addendum.

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

**ADDENDUM****SERVICE COMMITTEE - CHAIRMAN, SALVATORE:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION WITH THE COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA FOR THE RESURFACING OF SHELDON ROAD (COUNTY ID# 1285) AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella.

Mayor Gammella stated this is a 60%-40% split with the county paying 60% and the city paying 40%. Part of the city's resurfacing share will be \$63,000.00 with the reason that the City of Brook Park is sharing with the City of Middleburg Heights. This resurfacing will cover Sheldon Road from Smith to Engle Roads. The cost will be \$63,000.00 for the resurfacing the problem is the waterline needs to be replaced with an estimation replacement of \$500,000.00. This project will not start until 2023 and the legislation can be passed but I will need to talk to the Mr. Cingle where the city will come up with the \$500,000.00 for the waterline between Harrow Drive and Engle Road.

Mr. Mencini stated to Mayor Gammella on that \$500,000.00 is that the sewer problem on the Brook Park side?

Mayor Gammella responded the waterline yes, it is on Brook Park side.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Cingle for any idea where the \$500,000.00 could possibly come from.

Mr. Cingle responded the monies would either come out of the 2023 Capital Fund budget or the city could enter into an agreement with the City of Cleveland the Economic Development agreement and ask the City of Cleveland if they would pay for that waterline through the waterline program.

Mayor Gammella continued the bad part about that is even if the city entered into an agreement with the City of Cleveland Water Department that doesn't mean they will fix this; they have other projects. The City of Brook Park would have to know that up front and the City of Brook Park has never entered into a water agreement because this would be an issue with the city's economic development. However, Engineer Piatak recommends that the city does go with the Cleveland Water service agreement that is being looked at closely that was brought forward by former Mayor Elliott. This is on the table but the issue I have is even if we decide to go with the Cleveland Water agreement they may not do this project for the city, there would have to be some understanding.

Mr. Mencini commented the city still has issues that needs to be attended to i.e. roads and this could go both ways. \$500,000.00 isn't bad for a road that long plus

**Addendum: cont.**

with the sewer it's not a bad price but is big for everything the city needs and obviously the engineer sees the need to have that done.

Mr. Vecchio asked Mayor Gammella before this project commences if approved will the sewer lines be evaluated over there?

Mayor Gammella responded we are waiting for the sewer district meeting to be held on September 23<sup>rd</sup> and certain that will be looked at.

Mr. Vecchio continued I would like to make it a point moving forward with any road projects that the sewers be looked at, with some of the recent issues being seen.

Mr. Poindexter stated is the waterline repair an emergency situation or can that wait until 2023?

Mayor Gammella responded not sure, it could break tonight but it is an issue that needs to be addressed. The last thing the city wants to do is redo the street and then have to tear it up for the waterline.

Mr. Poindexter stated agree 100% and it waits until 2023 and do the resurfacing all at the same time the city could potentially take \$100,000.00 out of the 2021 and 2022 budget to be set aside and then in 2023 make up the difference. Not sure how urgent it is to fix the waterline and wouldn't want to do the resurfacing and then tear it back up, the \$63,000.00 for resurfacing that distance is a great deal.

Mr. Troyer stated this is in Ward 1 and there are a lot of issues over there with the waterline having multiple, multiple patches on the roadway. Councilman Poindexter started to elude to something if this waterline holds up and generally don't know of any municipality that the water departments was forced to replace a line because, I think, if there was such an item the (department) would have done to the City of Brook Park already for that length of line. The fact is the frequency is a little less now because so much of the waterline has been replaced that there is not much old stuff left. I think there might be a savings if done at the same time and don't know if they could coordinate together but if the city planned on doing the waterline the same time as the roadway and generally the water department does get the contractor to dig and replace the waterline then have the road redone at the same time, there may be some savings. It is important to replace that waterline and like the idea of preparing for it ahead of time. Just want to point out to the law director even though it can't be changed in Section C - Funding, number four (4) reads 40% and the county shall contribute eighty-percent (60%).

Mr. Orcutt stated to Mayor Gammella has the City of Middleburg Heights passed this legislation for their end?

**Addendum: cont.**

Mayor Gammella replied not certain but doesn't think the City of Middleburg Heights will have an issue with this. For the price the cities are getting for that stretch between Engle to Smith their city is probably getting the same price of \$63,000.00.

Mr. Salvatore commented with answers to some of the questions asked. As far as Middleburg Heights has passed this legislation probably a little longer than a month ago.

**Motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the September 15<sup>th</sup> Council agenda.

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

**Motion** by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Scott, to go back to the regular order of business.

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

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

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

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED   
Michelle Blazak  
Clerk of Council

APPROVED October 13, 2020

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

5.042 words