



**SPECIAL CAUCUS MEETING  
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROOK PARK, OHIO  
HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2022**

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:

**MENCINI, ROBERTS, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE, TROYER, SCOTT**

Also in attendance were Mayor Orcutt, Economic Development Commissioner Marnacheck, Recreation Director Gonzales, Service Director Beyer, Law Director Horvath and Finance Director Cingle.

Madam Coyne properly excused.

**DISCUSSION:**

1. ORDINANCE NO. 11250-2022, AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 11143-2020, AUTHORIZING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BROOK PARK HOME MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM (HMAP) AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt.

Mayor Orcutt stated the reason for this special meetings are prices are increasing on certain items on a daily basis. City is bringing back the HMAP that is a \$50,000.00 grant program with a 50/50 split; up to \$5,000.00.

Mr. Scott stated at last meeting voted yes to move this legislation forward and should have voted no due to having an amendment. The 2017 HMAP legislation had a section 3, term no. 8, that read 'once a loan or grant has been awarded to a household. That household is not eligible for another assistance award for seven years'. Would like to amend Section 1, subsection 6, to read once a loan or grant has been awarded to a household that household is not eligible for another assistance award for five years.

Mr. Mencini good with five years.

Mr. Salvatore good with five years.

Mr. Poindexter asked if that would cover the previous five years?

Mr. Scott responded no, this is new legislation; would take place from this point forward, the verbiage wasn't in the 2019 or 2020 program.

Mr. Vecchio asked when the seven-year verbiage was eliminated?

Mr. Scott responded wasn't in the 2019 or 2020 legislation.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Poindexter asked if not in the 2020 program can they apply this year?

Mr. Troyer stated doesn't have to be retroactive if received in five years, can't get assistance.

Mr. Vecchio stated that wasn't in the past legislation so yes because it wasn't in 2019 or 2020 legislation.

Mr. Troyer stated would think it would because this is new legislation and next year would change; so think the wording needs to be in there.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Marnacheck how many people received this assistance last year or year before?

Mayor Orcutt stated in 2020 this had to be extended due to contractors not being able to finish until later; brought back to Council for an amendment.

Mr. Salvatore asked defining household would this be address of home or people living there. If someone moves within that five-year period would they be eligible?

Mr. Roberts stated can't give to a grant to a building; would be given to a homeowner.

Mr. Mencini 'Point of clarification' first 'Whereas' reads home maintenance to Brook Park residents.

Mr. Roberts clarified to homeowners,

Mr. Salvatore asked would the five-years not apply if the home was sold to someone else?

Mr. Roberts stated if someone has the money to buy a home will they be looking for a grant a year later?

Mr. Salvatore stated just trying to clarify if someone sells home during five-years and received a grant. Would the new homeowners be qualified for two or three years left?

**Discussion: cont.**

Mrs. Horvath stated would agree with Mr. Roberts I don't think can attribute this to an address but instead to a resident or a family that lives in that residence. For instance, a husband and wife are on the title and there could be a situation where they don't reside at the same address. Primarily, seniors will apply for this grant with one name. Understand the thinking from the standpoint of putting a lien on the home and how that would act with the residence. This should pertain to residents, not the house, and may want to do something with that specific piece of property, that's a different issue. If going to bar someone from coming back a second time it should be an individual.

Mr. Troyer stated should say homeowners' or homeowner.

Mr. Vecchio stated section four reads Brook Park residents owner-occupied would cover that.

Mr. Troyer stated if a homeowner can't get for five years and have to live there. Can't say a landlord is going to get, just say homeowner.

Mr. Salvatore reiterated if the home is sold.

Mr. Vecchio stated what if there is a quick-claim deed with a daughter having a different name but stays as the homeowner.

Mr. Troyer stated then change grant to loan to protect city monies and when the home is paid off when the house transfers, the next person can apply for another one:

Mr. Vecchio asked for support of Mr. Scott's proposed amendment.

Mr. Mencini will support.

Mr. Troyer suggested an amendment to the amendment to change household to homeowner.

Mr. Vecchio stated amendments will take place on the special Council agenda immediately following, if in agreement to change household to homeowner.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Marnacheck how many people have applied this year?

Mr. Marnacheck replied no one applied to date but have been contacted by about a dozen individuals.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Poindexter asked to have a copy of the application attached to the legislation.

Mr. Marnacheck responded the application is still being worked on, waiting on Council to finalize the legislation.

Mr. Poindexter continued it was spoken about the income guidelines being listed on the legislation and there is no mention of the low to moderate income listed.

Mr. Roberts asked what is the number for income below the federal income level?

Mayor Orcutt mentioned the application is 90% complete with the federal guidelines listed and can be looked up on the internet.

Mr. Mencini stated if not mistaken, this has always gone by federal guidelines for a single person or married couples.

Mayor Orcutt reiterated those figures are on the application.

Mr. Vecchio stated quick point of information, media outlets have shown this morning across the nation that Cuyahoga County is number one in foreclosures for the last year and setting on fire for the first quarter of 2022.

Mr. Troyer asked what the point of that?

Mr. Vecchio responded a lot of people are in need of assistance so the city may see an influx with this, in the housing portion.

Mr. Troyer stated if people are losing their house does the city really want to give \$5,000.00. To Mr. Marnacheck, I asked for information the other week and you said different things. I asked for a list and was told there wasn't a list and now there is a list of people you are going to contact when this passes. Is there any chance of getting that list to Council prior to the special Council meeting immediately following?

Mayor Orcutt responded can get that for you. We did have conversations on that and I told you there was not an official list but people have called and inquired, think the records request you are asking for would be applicants.

Mr. Troyer stated this is a records request from a Councilmember that wants to make a good decision on this legislation. Generally, a records request has to exist to have a case, sort of speak. I have same many times giving the information to make it possible for this to go the way everyone wants. There is a

**Discussion: cont.**

list out there because the economic development commissioner told me he will be calling people when this (legislation) passes.

Mayor Orcutt continued when we talked to you asked for a formal list of applicants applying for this. No one has applied people have just called to inquire, there is no official list.

Mr. Troyer getting back to the subject at hand, Council as I said the other week a motion will be made to change grant to loan except in Section 1-No. 6, depending on how it's worded. Everywhere the legislation says grant will be changed to loan to try and claw back some of these monies when people sell that home. The purpose of this is to improve the neighborhood and improve the values of the whole neighborhood. If that home goes up in value, that does improve the whole neighborhood somewhat and to let somebody sell that home at an increased value and the city getting nothing back, just isn't right. The word grant should be changed to loan.

Mr. Poindexter agreed with that to an extent. Don't think the loan should be paid back on a monthly basis. When the title changes ownership the lien attached should have a time-limit when transfer of title within a ten-year period or would be dissolved. The city should have a way to get back some of those monies when changing ownership within a certain time.

Mr. Mencini stated would concur on that but don't know about the timeframe. Why this was originated was to help people in need of something specific. Have no problem with putting a lien on the point of sale but this was to help. Most residents, in my ward, that applied have needed and used this in the right form and are currently in that home.

Mr. Poindexter stated that was my point, think most of the people using this program would do that. That was the reason for the time limit if people do the upgrade and live there for five or ten years, down the line, shouldn't have to pay back. By that time that has served its purpose and just want to save residents' tax dollars who may do the upgrade and realize they have increased value of their home and suddenly decide to sell. People's lives change and if there is a situation that someone received that loan the city could claw back that money to give to somebody else in need. Would go as far as suggest money clawed back goes right back into the HMAP program to keep build and build over time.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Cingle if a grant is issued is the applicant taxed on that money?

Mr. Cingle responded yes, a 1099 is issued.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Scott continued to Mr. Cingle if a loan there is no tax collected, correct?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Scott stated to Mr. Marnacheck Scott to Marnacheck if something is perceived as a grant is the applicant notified of that being taxable?

Mr. Marnacheck don't remember specifically, there is a form that must be signed before formally accepted that the the law department has reviewed; don't know if taxable is listed on that.

Mr. Scott continued was contacted by an applicant that received a grant and was not aware it was taxable. Maybe should put something in there that the grant is taxable.

Mr. Marnacheck stated would be happy to work with the law department to make sure it is clearly stated on the documents.

Mr. Vecchio stated to both Councilmembers Troyer and Poindexter agree with the grant portion being changed to a loan over a term but the issue I have is how would this work with the five-year eligibility criteria. Point being somebody is given a \$5,000.00 loan for five-years and year six reapplied received another. How would that work on the return if house is sold in year 11? There would be two areas the city would have to chase to recoup those monies, that most likely, the finance department would be accountable for, little bit of a conundrum.

Mr. Troyer not following that could be two \$5000.00 loans to \$10,000.00 on the lien of the home in any event when it changes hands, that's the idea. I am aware of a senior resident getting a roof done and the family sold within that five-years. Don't know of any others, per-say, that's why for years have been asking for information that was never provided to me, of who received loans and the addresses. The idea is as the city gets the money back by a mechanic's lien or however it is done; with those monies being put back into this program. Down the line the legacy of this program keeps giving and just talked about taxes the grant promotes paying taxes and the loan having no taxes. This gives the city a chance to recoup those monies when the house sells and Council being good guardians of the residents' money. This is good to do for the residents and the neighborhood and when that house sells city should be able to recoup.

Mr. Salvatore stated to Mr. Cingle if for some reason the city goes with the loan process and that loan is forgiven because the residents' stayed in the home for five-years, or whatever the time-limit is. There will some tax liabilities due to not paying back would be effective as a grant, like the way it worked in the past.

**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Cingle responded don't recommend putting a cost sunset on the loan because the lien is filed with the county who must record the time and administer that five-year period. Also, the city would have to have someone watch over that and can see that falling through the cracks, at some point. If Council is going to make this a loan program put that on the tax duplicate and when the home transfers. Those monies come back to the city and are recorded in the economic development fund. Think that would be the cleanest way to do this rather than someone at the county trying to administer and someone at the city following it during that time period.

Mr. Salvatore continued still like the idea of keeping as a grant and also likes the idea of the five-year period. Think people should stay in the home, if they can, for that five-years and if they leave prior to that. When the house is sold the city recoups that \$5,000.00 grant monies. The only way those monies could come back to this fund to be recycled is the program would have to be continuous.

Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Salvatore are you asking to recoup grant money?

Mr. Salvatore responded with restrictions if sold within five-years the grant has to be paid back.

Mr. Troyer continued reading section 5(d) 'during time of grant applicants must reside in the residence, this was loans in the past. Maybe should make this permanent as long as Council can fund every year. Would be all for that in having a way to claw that money back. Think it should still be a loan but if other members want to forgive the five-years. Just watching out for the residents' money and know it happened with a roof and house was sold in that five-years.

Mr. Poindexter commented think there were some great ideas: Claw back some monies good idea, bringing back year after year as long as Council can fund good idea as well as no HMAP funding for five years. Suggested putting back in committee to make the necessary amendments next week and start with a clean piece of legislation.

Mr. Vecchio stated as a point of information in Section 1, subsection 5, reads the use of these funds shall be limited to gutters, paint exteriors, roofs, windows, furnaces, driveways and not for landscaping or sidewalks of a premise. Most of these are capital improvements and are going to be more than five years or ten-years. May want to think about pro-rating such as five-years being 100% and so forth.



**Discussion: cont.**

Mr. Troyer stated the basics of this was to help people out, preferably a senior, but if someone needed help the city wanted to help them out. On top of that is to help the whole neighborhood and all I'm saying is the city should have a way to claw back, why should someone be able to sell their home at a profit using this program.

**Motion** by Mr. Poindexter, supported by Mr. Roberts, that this was discussed.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Poindexter, Roberts, Mencini, Salvatore, Troyer, Scott

**NAYS:** Unanimous.

**RECREATION COMMITTEE – CHAIRMAN, MENCINI:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF A PRECAST CONCRETE RESTROOM BUILDING FROM CXT, INC., FOR THE BROOK PARK CENTRAL PARK AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt.

Mayor Orcutt stated this will be for a precast building built offsite with the exhibits listing the costs of the building, service department costs for installation of the utilities and also the stone and concrete work. The city was approved for one grant from the county and applied for a second grant to cover the rest of the balance and renovation of the restrooms and central park area. Recreation Director Gonzales did a lot of research and hard work on this and is in attendance to answer any questions.

Mr. Salvatore asked if the photograph is actual to the design?

Mayor Orcutt concurred, with that working with the recreation director looking for an actual color to match existing buildings the city currently has, in the central park area.

Mr. Troyer asked Mayor Orcutt the \$11,000.00 listed for the service department is for supplies, does not include wages?

Mayor Orcutt concurred.

Mr. Troyer commented all in favor this was in the budget, let's move forward.

Mr. Poindexter asked Mayor Orcutt does the cost include installation of the building?

Mayor Orcutt responded yes, the company builds and puts in place by a crane with the utility work being done by the service department.

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

Mr. Poindexter asked will the company self-install and not sub-out?

Mr. Gonzales responded included in the price if for the crane and for a company to come out and drop the building in place.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Gonzales on the grants of \$100,000.00 and other one totaling \$90,000.00. I assume the extra is for added costs and will go to the one (restroom) at Hufsey-Forbes and one (restroom) at Kennedy Park?

Mr. Gonzales responded no, would also go to (restrooms) at American Legion, Plant Lane, McGovern Park and Kennedy Park. Will start in the central park area and see how far those monies go.

Mr. Mencini continued the plan is to have done by mid-summer?

Mr. Gonzales responded at this point on how materials are going can't give a time line. Going to order the materials and see how long it takes for them to get in and city crews to install.

Mayor Orcutt stated the other restrooms mentioned will mirror what was done, a few years ago, at Hufsey-Forbes with having the scorekeepers' tower with the metal wrap and roof.

Mr. Mencini clarified to the other four restrooms?

Mayor Orcutt concurred, as much material that can be handed out for the rest of the parks.

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Roberts, to move to the special Council agenda immediately following.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Roberts, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott  
**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as Ordinance No. 11251-2022.

**SERVICE COMMITTEE – CHAIRMAN, POINDEXTER:**

1. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS FOR TREE INVENTORY SERVICES AND TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE LOWEST AND/OR BEST BIDDER TO PROVIDE THE TREE INVENTORY SERVICES AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt.

Mayor Orcutt stated this was a grant the city applied for and was awarded.

Mr. Marnacheck stated the city applied for an Urban Tree grant and was successful with the team effort of the finance department, service department, city's tree arborist as well as County Councilman Miller and Cuyahoga County Library system submitting letters of support. The goal is to plant trees on the campus to be enjoyed by the residents.

Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Cingle in section two the fund 100 is correct?

Mr. Cingle concurred.

Mr. Mencini stated the grant received is \$46,000.00, correct?

Mr. Marnacheck concurred.

Mr. Mencini continued to Mayor Orcutt most of the trees are now being delivered, correct?

Mayor Orcutt responded the trees being delivered now are from the 2021 grant, awarded in possibly October, 2021. At that time, the Ordinance read to have the trees planted along I-71. With this tree grant the Central Park committee will need to discuss the layout and also go in front of the Planning commission for placement of the trees.

Mr. Mencini asked with this grant can these trees be taken from public property and placed on tree lawns, if there are too many trees?

Mayor Orcutt responded the rules have to be followed and once the trees are installed the city has to report back. The plan for tree lawn trees is to apply for the 2023 grant and also there possibly may be more monies in 2022 for tree lawn trees.

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

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Roberts, Poindexter, Salvatore, Troyer, Scott  
**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as Ordinance No. 11252-2022.

2. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO TRADE-IN THE CITY'S 2013 HUSTLER HYPERDRIVE 72-INCH MOWER AND PURCHASE A NEW 72-INCH HUSTLER SUPER Z MOWER AND FLEX FORKS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt.

Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Beyer how long does this equipment last and how much is it used?

Mr. Beyer responded this unit is nine-years-old with the motor being replaced once. Getting \$2,800.00 after nine or ten years is the maximum, and the mechanics have been helping them last a little longer.

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Roberts, to move to the special Council agenda immediately following.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Roberts, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott  
**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as Ordinance No. 11253-2022.

3. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH STOOPS WESTERN STAR OF OHIO (ODOT CO-OP PURCHASING 023-22) FOR THE PURCHASE OF A WESTERN STAR TRUCK CHASSIS TO BE PACKAGED WITH A HENDERSON DUMP BODY AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt. (Companion piece with Ordinance No. 11255-2022).

Mayor Orcutt stated this is the first of two pieces of legislation for the purchase of a chassis under a four-year lease. Also, the price has increased, within the last week, from \$108,577.00 to \$114,377.00; a differential of \$5,800.00.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Beyer these are the big dump trucks.

Mr. Beyer concurred and stated they have a dual use with the inserts coming out to be used as dump trucks and the big snow plows.

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

Mr. Mencini commented these do get a lot of use and were rusted out when I worked there.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Beyer if there is a date of how long that price will be held?

Mr. Beyer responded the contract states that the price will not be held due to the way the market is currently.

Mr. Salvatore stated time is of the essence?

Mr. Beyer concurred.

Mr. Poindexter stated in the contract it states a surcharge of May 30, 2022 so that price should be good until May 30, 2022?

Mr. Beyer responded not necessarily, what that does is allotted the city to get the vehicle and once committee the city is locked into receiving the vehicle; once allotted does not mean the price cannot change.

Mr. Mencini commented there is not guarantee that the purchase orders or products will be ordered?

Mr. Poindexter stated it reads adjustments made to your order we will make the city aware of any surcharge.

Mr. Beyer continued they will contact the city, as they did, when already allotted the spot.

Mr. Poindexter asked when was the original estimate for this, I believe the end of last year. Looking at the top of the Daimler truck page it states December 31, 2021 that includes those surcharges and believe those surcharges were good until April 1st, is that where the price increase came from?

Mayor Orcutt stated there won't be any price increases until April 1st.

Mr. Poindexter continued looking at the date at the top of the page is December 31st with a list of the surcharges. Then the next page states the surcharge as of January 1st and believe in the email received that surcharge was good until April 1st.

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

Mayor Orcutt continued what happened is the budget was passed at the end of March and we worked diligently on legislation for introduction and that didn't happen until after April 1st. There was is a price of 108,577.00 and as the (service) director mentioned the city was contacted that the price increased.

Mr. Poindexter stated looking at the page there is a total surcharge with a date of May 30th; so does that mean the pricing is good until May 30th?

Mr. Mencini stated that Mr. Pensis wrote that this goes to the Board of Control with a note that surcharges will apply to the final pricing; not to exceed allocated monies from capital. Two things that stood out for me is number one Mr. Pensis sits high with me and number two may possibly be applied to the final purchase. Didn't know the city was losing trucks and the ones at the garage is from 10 or 20 years ago.

Mr. Troyer stated I believe, in the budget, this is replacing a 1986 truck?

Mr. Beyer concurred

Mr. Troyer continued I see the urgency in the truck and less urgency with the equipment. Looking at Capital Fund 432-\$60,000.00 was appropriated and this will be a lease. Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Cingle how will this be financed?

Mr. Cingle responded about a month prior to delivery I will be calling financial institutions and take the lowest interest rate available.

Mr. Poindexter asked how long from time of ordering to receiving?

Beyer takes about a year to build talking about a build-date of May 30th when starting.

Mr. Troyer stated was told it depends when truck comes in and with the next piece once they get a serial number from the truck the building starts.

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

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

**Motion** by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Mencini, to amend the amount in section two from \$108,577.00 to \$114,377.00.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Mencini, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott, Roberts

**NAYS:** Unanimous.

The clerk called the roll on the **motion** by Mr. Mencini, supported by Mr. Troyer, to place on the next special Council agenda.

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Troyer, Scott, Salvatore, Poindexter, Roberts

**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as Ordinance No. 11254-2022.

4. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH HENDERSON PRODUCTS (SOURCEWELL CONTRACT #080818-HPI)/SOURCEWELL #39065) FOR THE PURCHASE OF A 2022 SINGLE AXLE SNOW AND ICE CONTROL TRUCK EQUIPMENT PACKAGE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt. (Companion piece to Ordinance No. 11254-2022).

Mr. Beyer stated the first piece of legislation is the chassis and body and this piece is for the dump body, hydraulics and salt spreader.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Cingle where are the monies coming from for this?

Mr. Cingle responded this is part of the \$60,000.00 allocated in the capital budget snow removal fund 432.

Mr. Mencini asked Mr. Beyer which truck is this replacing?

Mr. Beyer responded probably one of the trucks you were trained on, this replaces a 1986 do-all truck.

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Mencini, Roberts, Poindexter, Salvatore, Troyer, Scott

**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as Ordinance No. 11255-2022.

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

- 5. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH BUCKEYE PUMPS, INC., TO PURCHASE FOUR LIFT STATION PUMPS TWO CONTROL PANELS AND TWO PRIMEX PRESSURE TRANSDUCERS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt and C/W.

Mayor Orcutt stated this will upgrade two more lift stations in the city, the city has 14 total, that have been upgraded over the years. This will be the same style and controls as the upgrades and can be remotely accessed by phone by service department personnel.

Mr. Troyer stated this is in the budget and pre-determined.

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Mencini, Poindexter, Roberts, Salvatore, Scott  
**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio stated this will appear as Ordinance No. 11256-2022.

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

**ROLL CALL: AYES:** Troyer, Mencini, Roberts, Poindexter, Salvatore, Scott  
**NAYS:** Unanimous.

Mr. Vecchio adjourned this meeting at 8:19 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED Carol Johnson  
Carol Johnson  
Clerk of Council

APPROVED June 7, 2022

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