ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2021

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 Law Director Horvath, Finance Director Cingle, Engineer Piatak and Mayor Gammella.

DISCUSSION:

1. ZOOM MEETING AND PROCEDURES (Councilman Mencini) HOW THE PROBLEMS CAN BE RESOLVED WITH MEETINGS NOT LIVESTREAMING TO THE CITY'S WEBSITE FOR PUBLIC VIEWING.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Mencini would like to weigh-in on this and then you can explain what you have.

Mr. Mencini responded feel free.

Mr. Vecchio continued what was found is that when BoxCast was initially setup with Zoom there was only one stream that the clerk setup BoxCast on and that was City Council. Simple setup BoxCast and Zoom itself became clearly simple with one click link via Zoom to BoxCast. Recently with COVID-19 and what has taken place the recreation center having limited capacity asked the technology committee about livestreaming basketball games for the residents viewing. The technology, recreation staff and members of BoxCast to setup streaming of games on three basketball courts. What failed to happen is that when those were setup the clerk and myself that Council had an additional step to setup BoxCast by selecting a channel. There are two basketball courts that have cameras as well as the recreation center having a stream, so there are three streams going into the recreation center. There is one stream for City Council so when BoxCast is setup to livestream it was forgotten to inform us the need to click on an area called channels and select Brook Park City Council. This was found out on Tuesday, February 9th with the issues that were arising of the viewing the stream of the Caucus meeting. I worked on this for approximately 2 ½ hours after that Caucus meeting to find out the problem thanks to Andres Gonzales. Tests were performed through Zoom and everything and found that the problem was resolved.

Mr. Mencini stated brought this forward because of last week and residents not being able to view the meeting but also with the winter storm in January and other instances. Did I think that we thought we were going to be on Zoom this long or maybe how long we want to be on, we don't have that answer? Personally would

Discussion: cont.

go back to the chambers and understand why some others might not. My point is when this all started and started the energy conservation at the recreation center and to this day still feel that a lot of the communication isn't what it should be and am not the one that feels this way; that is with everything telephones, communications and thought by now Council would have laptops, most Councils, school boards have them and thought laptops would be connected just for Council. Appreciate that you and the clerk did after that meeting to get this corrected but can't keep having this. Sometimes people zoom out and understand that happens, not the most tech-savvy person but from what I'm understanding there are a lot of people offering services to get us up to date whether a person or their company. Don't think that at this point is where we should be in 2021. We left a former office few years ago that many people thought was outdated and kind of see where we're at now and not so sure that we're that much further ahead. To move forward we must do our diligence and some of us are moving too fast with their own things and should concentrate right with our ourselves, not pointing the finger at anyone that's probably all of us and by no means am I the only one that feels this way.

Mr. Vecchio stated with some of the technology issues that we all experience everyone knows that internet within the area is not the greatest overall. The biggest cure for it to be more stable here would be having underground utilities that are not subject to the weather that happens above. There are some cities for instance in new developments in the City of Medina everything is run underground, there are very few internet issues there. Some cities that supply internet that have underground cable; above ground wires are susceptible to the weather; there is not a lot that can be done there, unfortunately, in that time we all experienced that. As far as communication we have all said this we have had communication problems throughout the course of time. Not just one area it's been throughout the city and we have all said that communication can be much better from all aspects.

Mr. Mencini continued working on a 2012 I-Pad and have a flip phone and haven't had too many problems, not saying I'm up to date and not a tech-savvy person. The city won't be getting underground wires and won't happen for a long time. All of us have a job to do and are working to move city parks, streets, flooding and walls in the natatorium in the recreation center. We should be working to get the things needed and have been told that sometimes the phone system and computers at City Hall and recreation center are little outdated. We definitely have to get caught up and think it's very important to not have meetings cancelled out with so many items on an agenda. Some items could have waited last week but need to get done but can't have that especially with the upcoming budget and major items coming forward. Can't keep holding off on meetings, people zooming out and freezing up. I know this happens and Mr. Vecchio is correct its time to

Discussion: cont.
start moving ahead.

Mr. Poindexter stated I don't know if it is so much an internet problem that we had it was just a mix-up between the channels as mentioned. The meeting last week (February 9th) did livestream but didn't have it on the main link. On the Council webpage scroll down and click on more videos the last week's meeting can be viewed. So the meeting was streaming but not on the channel that people normally used to clicking on. We brought the city new technology, more amenity by doing the livestream in the recreation center, anything new will have growing pains. Maybe if Council would have taken a break to see what was going on with the livestream instead of cancelling the meeting may have been the better move. Walking out of the Council and spoke with recreation staff Mr. Lukens had it figured out that it was streaming just not on the block people click on. So think it would have been better to pause the meeting, figure out the problems and then continue would have been the better move. Not going to dwell on that and that meeting will be done next week which is fine. Think technology is good and think the internet in the city for the most part is strong; sure there are weather related issues or there is a storm but overall think the internet in the city is reliable. Never had an issue with the WIFI except at the recreation center and purchased an Ethernet cable that is plugged into the wall and have strong signal. Don't think it's so much an internet issue as it is getting the kinks worked out for the systems the city has now. Having said that don't see any issues with moving forward now that the channel has been figured out and the kinks are being worked out at the recreation center. Think we're moving in the right direction and hopefully won't have to do Zoom meetings too much longer but if we do think we are far more prepared this week than even last week.

Mr. Scott stated to Mr. Poindexter, on the technology committee if I'm not mistaken, not bashing anyone just asking a question. When the technology committee was first brought up and discussed one of the tasks the committee was going to do is evaluate and analyze the city's WIFI, IT systems and communications and then make recommendations as to how to improve the general communications.

Mr. Poindexter responded one of the first tasks brought forward was to do a technology audit of all the technology infrastructure systems within the city. Then COVID-19 hit and put a that on the back burner and the committee has been doing projects and long since desired plans. The committee doesn't have access to all the different departments, employees or everyone needed to get that complete audit done. That is one of the items that remains on the committee's agenda and is something that is very important and needs to get done. We need to have an understanding what capabilities the city has, what systems the city has and what being used that is obsolete; it's just a matter of having the ability to do that. The

Discussion: cont.

Mayor sits on the committee as well and it's a matter of coordinating that through his office with all the departments to get everybody together to see what the city has.

Mr. Scott continued nothing against improving into the 21st century but need to make sure to take care of stuff in 2021, not worrying about stuff in 2025 or 2026.

Mr. Poindexter agreed and stated everything in 2021 is taken care of it there was a missed channel.

Mr. Scott commented communication.

Mr. Poindexter stated it's a work in progress, nobody is perfect.

Mr. Orcutt stated at my day job there have been some technical issues that were small and able to be worked on remotely. To Mr. Vecchio when you had to work on this issue and learned that we weren't on the proper channel due to two other channels added. Did you have to go onsite to work on that with people or able to do from home.

Mr. Vecchio responded able to log in remotely and do a test, ran the test and as mentioned thank you to recreation staff, Andres Gonzalez, work through it. Did the testing of the setup of Zoom to BoxCast and then livestreaming to make sure everything worked and coincided right in time.

Mr. Orcutt continued with the 2 ½ hours spent on doing that, at the end of those 2 ½ hours was everything correct and won't have that issue again.

Mr. Vecchio responded as far as what that issue was yes, 100% unless there is an issue with those channels.

Mr. Orcutt stated don't like bringing the next subject up but do agree with Mr. Mencini about it almost seems like things are getting worse. I know there have been some email issues and believe someone in City Hall had their email compromised last week or week before. As the clerk and Council President know my email had been compromised for a few months and just got corrected a few weeks ago, correct.

Ms. Blazak responded yes, it did.

Mr. Orcutt stated there are definitely things that must be tightened up when it comes to the technology in our city. Not sure how many people I personally have missed that had issues in the city and not able to get a hold of their Councilman. I

Discussion: cont.

definitely think this is a major issue and do appreciate you putting in that time to get everything correct and finding out what we have to do to get this correct. We definitely have to have better communication between the Council office and the administration to make sure that these technology issues happening. Especially with my email that's something needed for work is taken care of very promptly.

Mr. Salvatore stated everything said here is very important and everyone has some good thoughts. I think the one-piece missing is no matter how much technology there is we have to find a way to communicate that with the residents. That's what this is all about is getting Council meetings to the homes of the residents so they can see what is going on. Council can't technically conduct business without that being available to the residents. Council couldn't have had the February 9th meeting, no matter what, because that backup method being talked about today was not available to the residents. They wouldn't have been able to chime in and catch the meeting 30 minutes later because they wouldn't have known about it. I think the biggest item right now is the communication to the residents and now that we know what's wrong should be able to communicate that into some type of system that will allow for people at home to say there is a problem but there is a backup plan to get into that meeting. I think the dialogue is important and what everyone said is important and the most important thing is that we move forward together and work out these issues and back on the right track. There is no telling when Council will return to the chambers, I'm sure there are some that want to go back tomorrow and it's obvious being live at a Council meeting but there are still a lot of issues still going on with the virus.

Mr. Troyer thanked Mr. Mencini for bringing this forward it's not necessarily city business, I brought somethings forward a few weeks ago and they weren't put on which were important.

Mr. Vecchio interjected Tom, hang on, it is city business because we cannot operate city business in our open forum.

Mr. Troyer - Point of Order, can I continue what I'm saying without you cutting me off.

Mr. Vecchio - I was giving.

Mr. Troyer - proper procedure Robert's rules to continue what I'm saying.

Mr. Vecchio - continue sir, with accuracy.

Mr. Troyer - if you want to go under that all four items again Wedo Retention/Detention basin was city business; aquatic roof and walls was city

Discussion: cont.
business; Council clerk position was city business and Council procedures was included in that.

Mr. Vecchio - Tom, stay within the agenda.

Mr. Troyer - wanted to thank Mr. Mencini for bringing this forward and concur with Councilman Salvatore that the meeting place is important. With the livestreaming if you say it's going to be live on the city's website, that's where the people are going to go. If not available on the city's website that's tandem out to moving meetings from Council chambers to let's say the gym, you can't do that. They have to be in the same place.

Mr. Poindexter - Point of clarification.

Mr. Vecchio recognized.

Mr. Poindexter - point of clarification is the meeting was livestreamed on the city's website, just not in the link people are used clicking on. If you scroll down under the block that says Brook Park Council livestream and click on more videos that goes to the list of all videos. The meeting was still livestreaming on the city website.

Mr. Troyer continued that's tandem out to locking the front doors and opening the back doors and saying there was access, it has to be the same situation. What they're used to going to for viewing the meetings that's where it has to be, also hindsight is 20-20.

Mr. Vecchio stated to Mr. Troyer, you are 100% correct they have to be able to view in real time, as your stating.

Mr. Troyer reiterated agree with Mr. Mencini about getting back and may be sitting six-feet away from Mr. Poindexter in the next couple of weeks.

Motion by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Poindexter, that this was discussed.
ROLL CALL: AYES: Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Troyer, Orcutt, Schmuck, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Mr. Vecchio stated the next two items were originally assigned to the finance committee from the May 29, 2020 Special Council meeting. Had no action on them and Council has already approved contracts. My suggestion is if Council likes assign them back to the finance committee, finance committee chairman can pull them out for legislative action 'read in committee' or move the next regular scheduled Caucus agenda.

Discussion: cont.

2. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT EXTENSION WITH THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE LODGE NO. 15 (PATROL OFFICERS) AND MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella (Councilman Troyer)

3 AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT EXTENSION WITH THE OHIO PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION (CITY OF BROOK PARK POLICE SERGEANTS AND LIEUTENANTS) AND MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Gammella - (Councilman Troyer)

Mr. Troyer stated have a slightly different read on this, the reason I wanted these on here is I thought we would want to take care of them because according to our list. If these did have first reading but turns out they didn't have first reading so my idea to put them on here was to deal with them at tonight's Council meeting to get them off Council's agenda. It turns out they didn't have first reading and then reading the minutes, in my opinion of course, they were never introduced. So my motion would be they were discussed.

Mr. Salvatore stated with the meeting for February 23rd these two items were scheduled to be on that agenda?

Mr. Vecchio responded Council moved everything in mass so there with nothing being done so they could be on this agenda or the 23rd agenda, whichever.

Mr. Salvatore asked if other items were moved to the 23rd?

Mr. Orcutt commented there are ten items.

Mr. Salvatore continued if Council hasn't had a chance to re-read those minutes it would probably be in everyone's best interest to read them again and let these items flow under the original setup for disposal at the next meeting.

Motion by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Orcutt, to move items two and three by following the motion made at the last Council meeting to move to February 23rd.
ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Orcutt, Schmuck, Scott, Poindexter, Mencini
NAYS: Troyer. The motion carried with a vote of 6-1.

Mr. Vecchio stated both items will appear on next Tuesday's Caucus agenda.

Discussion: cont.

4. REAFFIRMATION OF CITY COUNCIL'S VOTE ON ORDINANCE NO. 11186-2021 THAT APPEARED ON THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2021 DUE TO THE MEETING BEING AIRED ON FACEBOOK BUT NOT LIVESTREAMED TO THE CITY'S WEBSITE FOR PUBLIC VIEWING

Mr. Vecchio stated so everybody is aware, everything was passed on this the vote was 6-1 and what needs to happen due to technical glitch preference would be to move this to item K on tonight's Council agenda for Council-matic action for reaffirmation of the vote.

Mr. Troyer – Point of clarification.

Mr. Vecchio recognized.

Mr. Troyer stated my question to get clarified is which 1186-2021 is Council reaffirming, the one actually passed or the one signed by everybody, they are different. There was one amendment made by Mr. Orcutt, that was proper, changing 343-07-001 to 342-07-001. That was proper and the only amendment Council made but on the piece that was signed by Council did not have a section three (3); the piece signed by everybody has a section three (3) and two lines added to it. I remember there was an investigation a few years back about this kind of happening. When Council passes a piece of legislation it should not be changed unless Council made an amendment to it. Council has to have the certainty that when a piece of legislation is passed we are passing what is in front of Council and it will not be changed.

Mr. Vecchio - Point of clarification, where are you seeing this at. It's not in the agenda that I'm looking at.

Mr. Troyer - I asked for a final piece of legislation and have it in front of me and if we were in Council Chambers I could show to everybody, they could be copied.

Mr. Vecchio - if you were on video, we could share your video also.

Mr. Troyer - that's true and will happen soon.

Mr. Vecchio - obviously if we knew this it would have been great to have some communication regarding this ahead of time. Because I'm sitting here like everyone else sort of blind-sighted and you're holding something that we didn't know anything about and we're all trying to look. I'm sitting here scrambling trying to run the meeting and see the clerk scrambling and see everybody else with a blank stare.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Troyer - okay, does everybody have the legislation?

Mr. Vecchio - no, nobody has that piece of legislation in front of them.

Mr. Troyer - so we're doing something with legislation that's not posted.

Mr. Vecchio - we're reaffirming a vote that already took place of passed legislation; we're reaffirming it because of a technology glitch. The vote was six to one with your vote being a no.

Mr. Troyer - correct.

Mr. Vecchio - so all it is the reaffirming of the vote. So you have something totally different that nobody has any idea about.

Mr. Salvatore - it sounds to me that you just explained why we're doing this and answered my question why we have to re-affirm and due to the technology glitch. That being said if we're going to vote on something should have it front of us to vote on it. I think the proper way to approach this would be adding it to the next Council agenda with proper legislation attached and if it wasn't done correctly the first time we're going to have to pass it again, anyway, in its proper form.

Mrs. Horvath - the law department has looked into this and had some discussions interoffice and also some discussions with the attorney general's office about this. Obviously, it's a technical glitch no one did this on purpose it just turns out there was certain portions of our that if they went to the website they wouldn't be able to see the entire meeting. My understanding of the intention of Council's action regarding this is by motion. In other words, they are not re-voting on a piece of legislation you're Council-matic action is centered around voting to re-affirm what you already passed. I assume when I looked at this legislation on the Council website this is what was passed. Obviously, Council can do whatever its pleasure is but this was setup as a housekeeping item just to make sure, being prudent, that everyone that Council has voted on this on February 4th and passed it. Because we did have a period of time where all our residents or others were able to view that evening. Don't want to make it more complicated than what it is and if this is something that all acknowledge that this particular ordinance was passed and whatever signed by the appropriate parties then, again, I think it's fine to deal with it now. I don't know that you necessarily need to attach a piece of legislation because you're not passing it instead all you're doing by motion saying yes; we acknowledge and affirm that we did pass this on February 4th.

Mr. Poindexter - I don't have the new legislation in front of me with section 3 and wanted to ask if Mr. Troyer could read what Section 3 says. Is that the emergency

Discussion: cont.

clause that was missing, I have the original piece of legislation here. It was my understanding, at the time, that we didn't need the emergency clause because we were just changing numbers on the Mylar, simple fix and was under the understanding that we didn't need that emergency clause.

Mr. Troyer - correct to Mr. Poindexter the heading section three was not there in the first two lines of the emergency clause were not there. The rest of the emergency clause is meld into section 2. Obviously, I had some other issues with it and to be clear I have no problem with the re-affirmation, I want to make something clear. To Mrs. Horvath if I vote yes on reaffirming my vote is still no?

Mrs. Horvath - yes, that is essentially correct, your vote was no. You would be reaffirming that there was a vote taken 6-1 that passed this piece.

Mr. Troyer - I have no problem with that, per-say, but it still begs the question which piece am I reaffirming? Or, I guess, you could say I'm just reaffirming the vote but what piece was the vote on?

Mrs. Horvath - which piece is posted on the Council website. I'm sure that Council President and the Mayor signed a piece of legislation, correct? Doesn't that appear on the Council website as passed legislation.

Mr. Troyer - yes, the piece I have says passed the 4th signed on the 5th and has all the proper signatures. But the piece that's signed is different than the piece that we passed.

Mrs. Horvath - is that a result of the amendments made that evening?

Mr. Troyer - in one case yes, but in the other case no.

Mrs. Horvath- what other case are you talking about?

Mr. Troyer - well, in the top I didn't look at the other numbers.

Mr. Vecchio - the original one was 11104-2019.

Mrs. Horvath - correct, there was another ordinance number assigned to the piece.

Mr. Vecchio - correct, the first time it was passed was in 2019.

Mr. Troyer - right, I'm talking from the what we passed 11186-2021 and in that there was no section three listed.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio - for clarification that was made note of to be added to it as was the change to the parcel number that Mr. Orcutt brought forward, those items were changed.

Mr. Troyer - no it was not, it absolutely that's untrue.

Mr. Vecchio - what is untrue, sir. You just

Mr. Troyer - the only amendment made was to change 343-07-001 to 342-07-001 throughout the ordinance, that was the only thing that was amended. There was no other motion to amend.

Mr. Vecchio - I didn't say there was a motion I said it was added as brought forward as Mr. Poindexter just got done explained.

Mr. Poindexter - I didn't say that anything was changed or anything like that.

Mr. Vecchio - no, that would be the correct section, the section itself is what was corrected because it was just missing from however it was sent over; that's what I remember from two weeks ago.

Mrs. Horvath - the number you are reciting is the permanent parcel number so that changed from 342-343 just indicates the number of the map book for going down to the recorder's office. Instead of it being in map book 342 it's in map book 343. The second two numbers are the page number and the third series of numbers is the line on the map book where everything is recorded.

Mr. Troyer - okay, there's no problems with the numbers.

Mr. Mencini - the reaffirmation with the amendments if we can get that and maybe put on the Caucus meeting can't do it next week but maybe the second.

Mr. Vecchio - Point of clarification will have to be done at a Council meeting, no matter what.

Mr. Mencini - the second of March let's get that in front of us as Mr. Salvatore said and can go from there, if it can wait that two weeks. I'm assuming it can kind of came at us pretty quick with the amendments Mr. Troyer is talking about.

Mrs. Horvath - looking online at the piece and it looks like it incorporates Council's amendment to changing the numbers and there is fully and completely a section three there which I assume was added by amendment. Obviously, if you amend something the piece will differ as to how it first appeared on the agenda. Looks to

Discussion: cont.

me it incorporated everything Council wanted and would also say we've spent a lot of time here tonight talking about communication and how it important it is and how vital to our city it is. It would be nice if these issues were brought forward before the meeting. I had sent an email to all of Council asking if anybody had any questions to please contact the law department prior to the meeting. I think this is an example of how sometimes we fail to be on the same page because whatever questions there are aren't timely raised. I just wanted to kind of note that, I mean if we would have this discussion three hours ago we would probably have the issued resolved and be able to move forward. It's Council's pleasure it needs to be reaffirmed you can do it however you wish but I really don't think there's any problem with the legislation that was posted by the clerk as approved.

Mr. Vecchio - Mrs. Horvath, in this case we don't need to even reiterate the emergency clause because it mentions the public peace, safety and welfare, correct. It doesn't need to be reiterated does it?

Mrs. Horvath - I don't think so because what you're doing is amending a Mylar at the county's request. They had a number of things that they wanted changed and you're just reaffirming your prior Council-matic action by motion. Since you don't have a Resolution or Ordinance you're passing it's fine to do it verbally. Again, Council can do whatever it pleases the important thing being it is reaffirmed to me it's a housekeeping event. It's something being done because of the technical glitch that we had with the livestreaming. I guess my point is I think it's a fairly simple matter and it would be best if everybody would have communicated beforehand so we would all have the same materials and all be on the same page.

Mr. Vecchio - I believe also that with the Mayor's signature it's automatically enforced, is it not?

Mrs. Horvath - yes it would be, there's a timing mechanism once a piece of legislation is signed depending on what's included in it as to when it goes into effect, that's the purpose of the emergency. Now this was passed on the 4th.

Mr. Vecchio - signed on the 5th.

Mrs. Horvath - so we are beyond ten days.

Mr. Mencini - do agree with Mrs. Horvath that things should be brought forward and stated that at meetings not too long ago. I didn't receive an email and haven't used the city email address for about six months. Tried working with that for six months and it's not my I-pad I have others look at it. Don't know when that email came out but do agree that some of this should be handled prior to and as stated before. Let's get this right and its Council's choice you are right on that also.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Vecchio - literally if Council wants to reaffirm tonight or reaffirm in two weeks. It needs to go to a Council agenda your votes have to be reaffirmed that's all this is. Whatever your votes were you're reaffirming that you made a yes vote on February 4th or that you made a no vote, that's the only thing you're doing.

Mayor Gammella - I totally concur with your assessment and the law director's. All your doing is reaffirming the vote so people know that it happened; it's already been passed. Mr. Troyer's correct if he votes yes for the affirmation he is in fact that he was a no voted on it, all you're doing is reaffirming the action you took. I do believe the proper place is item K just by verbal approval.

Mr. Poindexter - I basically was going to say the same thing, was able to find the old piece that was posted and signed. To me it wouldn't change my vote either way so I'm okay with just reaffirming the vote. Saying that will make a motion.

Mr. Troyer - Point of clarification.

Mr. Vecchio - your point.

Mr. Troyer - again, I'm okay with the basic process of reaffirming, that's not an issue here. The problem is and maybe it's for a later date and maybe we can schedule this tonight. The piece that's posted and signed is not the piece of legislation that we passed, you can't deny that. It's not the legislation that Council passed and I voted no on.

Mr. Poindexter - I agree and as I said I looked at the piece that was posted and it looks like section two and three were melded together and section three the heading was off in the first line; in the completed legislation it's there. Don't know if something in the font when it was reprinted corrected itself or if somebody hit backspace erasing something. To me that's a little consequence, I voted yes because I felt the legislation that it should be passed.

Mr. Orcutt- sitting back and listening to everything sounds like we're talking about two different things. I do believe that the law director has provided some good clarification, I believe that Mr. Troyer has provided some very good clarification for a separate issue. I think we have two different issues going on here and think we move forward with what's on our agenda for tonight and then definitely we have to handle the second issue that Mr. Troyer has.

Mr. Salvatore - my question is, did this legislation already go down to the county?

Mayor Gammella - yes it did, a representative from Ford land came down from Detroit and took it down to the county.

Discussion: cont.

Mr. Salvatore - what version went down.

Mayor Gammella - the version you passed.

Mr. Salvatore - then dealing with this tonight it's really a moot point.

Mr. Scott - moot point.

Mr. Salvatore - we're going to reaffirm that we voted in the positive for passage of this legislation that was amended and how we're going to stay.

Mr. Scott- right.

Mayor Gammella - right.

Mr. Salvatore - nothing can change.

Mr. Troyer - Point of clarification.

Mr. Vecchio - what is your point.

Mr. Troyer - again, what the Mayor is saying that we sent down a piece of legislation that was not passed, wasn't signed by him, Council President and the clerk.

Mayor Gammella - stop right there Tom, Point of information.

Mr. Vecchio - point.

Mayor Gammella - what I signed is exactly what you passed, period.

Mr. Troyer - that's not true.

Mayor Gammella - well Tom, I take issue with you there. By the way the secretary of the Planning commission also signed that because it passed Planning unanimously. Let's move ahead, I think affirmation is the way to go.

Mrs. Horvath - I just want to point out that the county doesn't file the ordinance, it's the Mylar is what is filed in the county. The map containing the plot with the other additional information, that is in fact what was filed with the county. They don't file our ordinances.

Mr. Vecchio - going to end discussion on this there is a motion by Mr. Poindexter to

Discussion: cont.
place under letter K of tonight's Council agenda.

Mr. Scott - support.

Motion by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Scott, to place on tonight's Council agenda for Council-matic action during this regular Council meeting to reaffirm the vote.
ROLL CALL: AYES: Poindexter, Scott, Schmuck, Orcutt, Troyer, Mencini, Salvatore
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

During roll call Mr. Scott mentioned to reaffirm; Mr. Troyer to reaffirm the original version that we actually voted for.

Mr. Vecchio stated that will appear under letter K on the Council agenda immediately following.

Mr. Orcutt stated February 2nd the Mayor, Engineer and I had discussion about the feasibility study at that Council meeting. At that meeting there was discussion about them putting together a slide-show to provide the information to the residents. Would like to make a motion that on March 9th have the feasibility study placed on that agenda for the engineer to explain the feasibility study.

Motion by Mr. Orcutt, supported by Mr. Mencini, for the feasibility study discussion on March 9th Caucus only agenda including Mr. Piatak with a slideshow presentation.
ROLL CALL: AYES: Orcutt, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Troyer, Schmuck, Scott
NAYS: None. The motion carried.

Mr. Vecchio requested a five-minute recess between meetings, Council meeting to begin at 8:00 p.m.

There being no further business to come before this meeting a **motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Orcutt, to adjourn with the Council meeting beginning at 8:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED Michelle Blazak
Michelle Blazak
Clerk of Council

APPROVED March 16, 2021

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

6,202 words