

DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE
CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, May 7, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.
Mayfield Village Main Conference Room

Present: Vetus Syracuse
 James Sheridan
 Merv Singer
 Tom Piteo
 Ron DiNardo
 Albert G. Hehr, III
 Paul Fikaris

Also Present: Diane Wolgamuth
 Mary Betsa

Absent: Stivo DiFranco

The Meeting of the Charter Review Commission was held on Thursday, May 7, 2015 in the Main Conference Room at the Mayfield Village Civic Center. Chairman Fikaris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

• **Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting of Wednesday, April 22, 2015**

Mr. DiNardo, seconded by Mr. Hehr, moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Wednesday, April 22, 2015.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion Carried
Minutes of Wednesday, April 22, 2015
Approved as Written

• **Status Update and Discussion**

Reviewing the Status Summary (attached), discussion ensued on the sections not yet preliminarily approved.

Article III – The Council

- Section 1 – Composition and Term

Mr. Hehr stated, I wasn't at the meeting where discussion ensued as to whether we were going to repaginate it or not. It doesn't matter to me, but if you feel it brings clarity and we are making grammatical changes anyway –

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 2

Chairman Fikaris stated, Joe commented: “this language is fairly common in most charters, and in order to cover all legal interpretations appropriately, I don’t see how it can be streamlined or outlined. The detail is needed because of the precision in establishing elected representatives, and who votes for them.

Mr. Hehr agreed. I don’t want to change any of the words. The question was do we want to put extra paragraph marks in.

Mr. Syracuse stated, to me that’s a minor thing.

Mr. Hehr agreed. Superminor. I just have it as a note.

Mr. Syracuse stated, I don’t feel there’s a need to change it.

Mr. DiNardo agreed.

Chairman Fikaris stated, Joe’s interpretation was entirely legal and not grammatical. I don’t know if there’s a difference on hitting the hard return when typing the Charter. I don’t think that requires changing the Charter. In 2020 we can look at it and make that decision.

. **Preliminarily approved 5-7-15**

- Section 4 – Organization

This section was left to end for discussion as to whether or not it is necessary to change “Village Hall” to “Civic Center”.

Chairman Fikaris stated, this was tabled because we were going to see if there were other general language changes that typically the Law Department might put into a single vote category as was done last time to clean up the language to make the Charter gender neutral. I don’t think there’s any major clean-up which needs to be done this time.

Mr. Syracuse stated, it’s not a necessity. I am fine with it as it is. If we do want to put something on there, we can always just say an amendment to the Charter so that reference to “Village Hall” is changed to “Civic Center.”

Chairman Fikaris stated, the Law Department responded to our request as follows: “I think this is a good recommendation in light of the ordinance adopted by Council. It is my opinion that “Village Hall” is the same as “Civic Center”, or town center, or town hall. It still would be efficient to modify the charter accordingly and use its current nomenclature. This would not be a substantive change, since “Village Hall” and “Civic Center” are both referring to where government regularly meets, it would still be cleaner to amend the charter. The proposed amendment would simply say ‘amending the charter to change the words “Village Hall” to “Civic Center” throughout the charter.’”

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 3

Mr. DiNardo asked, why don't we have Council make the decision?

Mr. Hehr stated, why don't we state that we are going to change it?

Chairman Fikaris stated, amend the charter to change the words "Village Hall" to "Civic Center".

Mr. DiNardo added, as recommended by the Law Department.

. **Preliminarily approved with change request submittal to the Law Department**

- Section 5 – Clerk of Council

Mrs. Betsa suggested that the educational requirements be included in the job description and that it be attached to the legislation appointing the Clerk of Council for a two year term.

Mr. Piteo asked, can it be referenced?

Mr. Hehr stated, it certainly could be. The question was, did we as the Commission want to guarantee and legislatively put a directive on the executive to include the minimum qualifications? I agree with your statement that we could also have it other places. The question is, do we think Mary is so important that we want to guarantee that at the minimum her qualities are maintained?

Mrs. Betsa replied, I truly appreciate it. The requirements would be outlined under legislation which would attach the job description. Every other department works very hard. Some have to follow requirements to maintain their certification.

Mr. DiNardo asked, such as the Fire Chief or Police Chief?

Mr. Hehr stated, that's statutorily defined by the State of Ohio where Clerk of Council is not.

Mrs. Betsa stated, there are a number of municipalities in the past year who have had clerks retire. They have expressed concern over who will be taking their place, most especially whether or not they have knowledge through education. Diane, how do you feel about it?

Ms. Wolgamuth stated, I was here when it was discussed initially. I think I am the one who said that a lot of the positions would fall under ordinance, not necessarily in the Charter, but you are right, that's what you are talking about, is this something we want to include?

Mr. Hehr asked, do we think it's that important?

Mr. DiNardo stated, I think that's the question.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 4

Ms. Wolgamuth stated, you guys talked about whether or not there is a phrase that would imply and list the minimum qualifications.

Mrs. Betsa stated, the law department did suggest “the clerk shall have a minimum certification as municipal clerk, as defined by _____, or obtain such certification within. . .of being appointed by Council”.

Chairman Fikaris stated, if that’s what we are adding, but recall with the Finance Director, we looked at those requirements and did not want to get too specific into defining that. We also discussed Service and Building and we concluded they are covered in the ordinances.

Mr. Hehr stated, my concern was that there is not a Revised Code section that a clerk of council will have qualifications. I know there is one that outlines qualifications for the chief of police.

Chairman Fikaris asked, how long does it take to obtain certification for clerk of council?

Mrs. Betsa replied, for standard certification, three years, with the requirement that continuing education is maintained annually.

Chairman Fikaris stated, we would have to add that language for every department.

Mr. DiNardo referred to the last sentence of Section 5, Article III. “Required by this Charter or by ordinance or resolution of Council”. Why don’t we just leave it alone?

Mr. Syracuse agreed. If we were to just allow Council to do it, if there are changes to this position or if the Revised Code did develop a section with requirements, Council could make their own decision. It’s easier to change than amending the Charter again. I don’t like handcuffing ourselves if Council can make those changes by ordinance at any time.

Mr. Hehr stated, the minimum standards are not defined elsewhere right now. Us putting in minimum standards for things not defined elsewhere, for instance, if the requirements of the Finance Director is defined under the Revised Code, I don’t need to put anything there.

Mr. Syracuse stated, I understand what you are saying. I suggest that you show up at a Council meeting and tell them your input on this and say that they should have an ordinance that defines this. I personally don’t feel it belongs in the Charter. By ordinance that would be a good place to have it. We should make Council aware of it. I agree with you. There should be something in there so we don’t get stuck in a situation like some other communities have where they have someone completely unqualified. I think we should leave it up to Council to include by ordinance.

Mrs. Betsa stated, there is legislation prepared every two years appointing me as Clerk of Council. The next time it will be considered is for 2016. Maybe then we could expand the legislation.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 5

Mr. Syracuse stated, I like that. That way it is being addressed but it does not have to go to the voters and confuse people. I hate for it to get shot down for that reason or have the standards change and then we are handcuffed by what the Charter says. If we could do it by ordinance, it would be a lot better.

Mr. DiNardo asked, who creates those ordinances?

Mrs. Betsa replied, the Law Department.

Mr. DiNardo stated, okay. We will leave it in your hands to ensure that the legislation is modified to include the requirements for continuing education.

Chairman Fikaris stated, I like that idea. We would want the same thing. What we are trying to prevent here is things are great now, but if things would change for some reason, the legislation would be in place.

- . **Preliminarily approved 5/7/15**
- Section 6 – Salaries, Bonds and Compensation

Mr. DiNardo referred to a spreadsheet he asked the Finance Director to create for everyone to see to help establish a base of what the adjustment in the salary should be from 2001 to 2015 based on an index by annual rate of inflation. Everyone should have received it in their packets. This will help us establish it. I think we should talk about the spreadsheet and figure out what we want to do.

Mr. DiNardo continued, what Ron did was create the annual rate of inflation for every year and calculated it out for us based on Mayor, Council President and Council person. If they did get a raise, whatever it may be, see one year it is a negative in 2010. It's a gradual increase over 15 years. It's not a huge increase. The Mayor and Council members do not do this for the money as I stated before. They do it because they want to and want to benefit the community. I think we need to talk about whether or not we are going to present an amount to the voters for the Mayor, Council President and Council person and then have increases to a certain amount and then anything over that has to go to the voters. Joe recommended that we establish what the raise is until the next Charter meets so that the voting citizens know exactly what the Mayor, Council President and Council is going to make.

Mr. Piteo asked, it would be one flat rate for five years?

Mr. DiNardo replied, or a set number based on five years.

Mr. Piteo asked, are you saying the Mayor, Council President and Council's pay would change from the \$7,500, \$8,000, \$19,000?

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 6

Mr. DiNardo replied, \$26,000, 10,500 and 10,000. It could be \$11,000 and 10,500.

Mr. Piteo asked, when would that be effective?

Mr. DiNardo replied, 2016.

Chairman Fikaris stated, this way whatever changes the 2020 Charter Review Commission would make, it would go in effect in 2021 which would be 5 years. The language would be increased salaries –

Mr. DiNardo stated, based on annual rate of inflation?

Chairman Fikaris stated, from/to based on an annual rate of inflation.

Mr. DiNardo stated, of this amount. Anything over that amount has to go over the voters. Or you can be specific and give them the amount. Those are the two options. You don't know what inflation is going to do.

Mr. DiNardo stated, I think we should start at \$26,000, \$11,000 and \$10,500.

Chairman Fikaris asked, what are we doing? Section VI says the Council shall have the power to fix all compensation.

Mr. DiNardo stated, so let's get into the wording here.

Chairman Fikaris stated, we would have to ask the Law Department for some magic language.

Mr. Hehr asked, do we want to put automatic increases in the Charter?

Mr. DiNardo stated, I think that was the discussion that was left on the table.

Chairman Fikaris stated, someone just did that.

Mr. DiNardo replied, Mayfield Heights. Apparently they are looking at the same issue.

Mr. Hehr asked, do we have a lack of people who want to be on Council?

Mr. Piteo stated, I don't think so.

Mr. Hehr asked, why do we want to change the numbers? We are getting people we want.

Mr. Piteo stated, they are obviously not coming for the money. What's the motivation?

Mr. Hehr stated yes, why change this at all?

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 7

Mr. Syracuse replied, to fairly compensate them for what they are doing considering what other Mayors are getting.

Mr. Piteo stated, doing a parallel. Why is the Beachwood Mayor getting paid so much?

Mr. Singer replied, it's a larger community. There's a lot of money in that community.

Mr. Hehr added, and a lot more people.

Mr. Singer agreed. A lot more people. A lot more work for Council people.

Mr. Piteo stated, I do not think Beachwood is 10 times bigger than Mayfield Village.

Chairman Fikaris stated, one of the indicators they used was dollars per citizen. In that rate, Mayfield Village was pretty much average. There was some that were actually lower that got a higher compensation rate because of the 3,300 people which I didn't think was as fair. To Al's point, the Charter does have a mechanism that they can do that. If they choose not to, that's their own doing. We have not really heard from Council to say, we don't really like this because it's kind of sticky. We just haven't done this in so many years. The point being, which is a good point, just to bring it up to say, the mechanism is there. If they express the feeling that the mechanism is not correct, is it our duty to do that? If it is, think about the voters and (a) do nothing; or (b) we are going to raise these salaries to a certain amount based on consumer price index and based on the fact they have not had a raise since 2000 and then just leave it at that; or (c) set a mechanism in place to have an automatic based on CPI or some sort of rate of inflation; or (d) roll around to the next Charter and record the mechanisms by which we did it and say we talked to the Law Department and they had not had inflation rates and we based it on that for the last 5 years and therefore we bumped the salary, but how are we rewriting this thing?

Mr. Syracuse replied, we are adding to it. We are not rewriting anything.

Mr. DiNardo showed the wording of 15 years ago. I think that's what it should read to get them to 2015.

Chairman Fikaris stated, then the Charter does not really have to technically be changed at all because it says by the Charter.

Mr. DiNardo stated, right. So we are going to put this in here and the people are going to vote. They very well may vote yes, no, I don't know what they are going to vote.

Mr. Syracuse asked, so you don't have to change or add language to this. We would just propose that?

Mr. DiNardo replied, yes. Do we want to present this to the voting people?

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 8

Mr. Hehr stated, do we want the Mayor and Council –

Mr. DiNardo stated, we make a recommendation.

Mr. Piteo stated, I go back to what Al said. It makes perfect sense. Why do we? There's a mechanism already here. Because they are behind times? That's something that we need to do, to bring them up to times?

Mr. DiNardo replied, the only change is whether we give them raises per year or do we not? Everyone is in agreement we need to give them a raise, is that correct?

Mr. Hehr stated, I am not in agreement that we need to do it. I am not saying they shouldn't get it.

Mr. Singer stated, Council does it.

Mr. DiNardo stated, to make a recommendation, do we increase their salary so they can make a decision to move it on to the voting public?

Mr. Syracuse stated, I say we leave it to them. Let the voters decide if they want to increase it or not this election. If they vote no, Council's not going to do anything to increase it.

Mr. Hehr stated, we make the recommendation rather than Council making the recommendation. This says Council is supposed to make the recommendation. We want to take the political acid off the table of asking for my own pay raise.

Mr. DiNardo agreed. We say this Board here convened and discussed this whole Charter and we feel that this should go in front of the voters, is that correct?

Mr. Syracuse replied, I like that.

Chairman Fikaris replied, we are going to have a public hearing on this. If that question comes up, obviously we can answer to that and give the reason why.

Mr. Hehr stated, I would not oppose us making a recommendation that there should be a pay increase. How much I am not sure yet. I need to look more into what those numbers are. What you are saying is this is just consumer price index. I wouldn't oppose putting an automatic CPI address ad infinitum going on forever, every year they get whatever CPI is. I would oppose that. But as far as us making a recommendation to take the civic nature of asking for a pay raise off, I don't.

Mr. Syracuse stated, I think we should do it until the next Charter Review Commission. They can do what they want with it.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 9

Mr. DiNardo asked, do we want to modify the Charter to include any increases? It sounds like the consensus is no? Or yes?

Mr. Hehr replied, no. I don't want to modify the Charter.

Mr. Syracuse replied, not if there is another mechanism for us to recommend the increase.

Mr. DiNardo stated, so basically we are going to ask for an amount as a raise. I think we should give them both options, one being a set amount, whatever we figure out, and the other would be amounts for the next 4 years. If they decide to say, voters, we are going to get an increase of this amount as of January 1st and then the next year it will be 1.5%, whatever we figure out for the next five years.

Mr. Hehr stated, if we are recommending it for the next five years, essentially we are creating a contract for them. Do we want them to receive CPI for the next five years?

Mr. Piteo stated, I thought we just said we weren't going to do that.

Mr. DiNardo stated, not written into the Charter.

Mr. Piteo stated, to make a recommendation.

Mr. Hehr stated, what came in to my head was that I am not making decisions forever. The Charter is hard to change. But if I say for the next five years this is what we are going to do and the Charter people are going to reconvene, I don't object to that because I am not trying to change the Charter.

Mr. DiNardo stated, but that leaves you in a position of there's some people who want to give a raise for the year but maybe not want to give any increases for the next five years. You don't know the mindset out there. I don't want to put ourselves in a position to have voters come to the table and say, I am okay with a raise, but I don't want to give them a raise every year. They have to prove it to me. I don't know what the economy's going to do.

Mr. Piteo stated, it seems like there's a mechanism to give a raise but not a mechanism to give a raise. It's kind of a double negative. They can't say, hey we need a raise, but yet they can't give themselves a raise. They have to bring it to the voters.

Mr. Hehr stated, if they bring it to the voters, it looks bad for them, like they are going to their boss and asking for a raise. I will particularly object to forcing people to go to their boss and ask for a raise, are we doing a good job but they went to the boss and said, I don't think we want to have term limits anymore and the boss said, hey you are doing a good enough job that we don't need term limits anymore. It works. They didn't get rid of the people that asked to get rid of the term limits, so going to the boss and asking for a raise works.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 10

Chairman Fikaris stated, it's kind of a precedent set that the Charter Review Commission is the guardian. I think we are doing nothing but by submitting something submitted in 2000 that just said we would like to raise the salaries of these individuals, we are kind of being the guardian of this without putting it into the Charter. We are filling in the gap. We are proposing it. The people can vote on whether they think Council is doing a good job. The numbers in my opinion look good compared to others. This whole different cities is like apples and oranges kind of thing. With Charter Review being the guardian, it takes the acid out of them asking for themselves.

Mr. Piteo asked, should there be something that says on an annual basis, they are required to bring it up as an agenda topic at the Council meeting?

Chairman Fikaris stated, I don't like that. I like the idea that they haven't done anything in about 5 years because that's not what it's kind of about. As a steward, we bring this up. That's all we are really doing is bringing it up. They are modest and fair. We are lucky we are not dealing with large salaries.

Mr. Hehr stated, which is why I don't have an objection to saying let's propose an increase but not modify the Charter.

Chairman Fikaris agreed. We are just going to put it like that. We will propose a raise from \$19,000-26,000; \$11,000 and \$10,500.

Mr. Hehr stated, we are advocating for our "employees". If we are the Charter, everyone works for the Charter. We are advocating for them. I don't object to that.

Chairman Fikaris stated even though they are not technically full-time, there are mechanisms in place that we compensate our employees. We are the guardians. I don't think it's too terrible for every 15 years to throw something on there.

Mr. Hehr stated, I don't mind setting the precedent that every five years the Charter Review Commission determines what the compensation is and proposes that the people look at it.

Chairman Fikaris stated, I would say nothing more than saying in 2020, someone sends off an e-mail that says you should take a look at this every 5 years.

Mr. DiNardo asked, so we should add that sentence into this statement in front of the voters that allows the Charter Review to look at that or is that going to be implied?

Mr. Hehr replied, if the Law Department allows us to put, we recommend that the Council and Mayor's compensation be scheduled at _____, whatever it is, Ron you seem to be very heavily invested in it, do you know what those numbers should be? Do you feel that what we ought to do it hit this 2014 number and it ought to just be that?

Mr. DiNardo stated, to be honest with you, it's still not a lot of money. It's way under.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 11

Chairman Fikaris stated, I think we are being prudent. There's no set precedent. As we see in the paper, they are all over the road. I don't think there's any added language in there.

Mr. Hehr stated, my question to Mr. Diemert would be, can we write a proposal that the new salaries for Council and the Mayor be adjusted to the 2014 numbers as are on this sheet? Does anyone object to that? It's not a change to the Charter at all. It's a recommendation for pay raises. We may be beyond that authority. We may not have that authority.

Mr. DiNardo stated, it's a recommendation.

Chairman Fikaris stated, I think the language should be just like that. There will be a public meeting where people will ask. This will be a subject at which someone will have interest in.

Mr. Hehr stated, I don't want to go to round numbers. This shows logic. We didn't randomly select numbers. We applied the consumer price index. If the question is, where did you come up with that number, that's my answer.

Mr. Syracuse asked, where did the \$19,000 flat figures come from? That's what we are starting with. I like to have a round number. Most of the voters are not going to come to the public hearing and know exactly what is going on. They are going to show up to vote and see these figures and ask why they are like this.

Mr. DiNardo asked, is that a good thing or a bad thing?

Mr. Syracuse replied, I think it's a bad thing. It might not pass because of that.

Mr. Singer replied, I don't think voters would pass it.

Mr. Syracuse replied, I don't think they would.

Mr. Hehr asked, unless we use round numbers, do you think they will?

Mr. Singer replied, I don't think they will period.

Mr. DiNardo asked, you don't think the voters will pass an increase?

Mr. Singer replied, no. We have 3500 people.

Mr. DiNardo stated, say 12% come to the voting table.

Mr. Singer stated, I don't think it will pass.

Chairman Fikaris stated, all we are doing is putting this up for a vote.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 12

Mr. Singer stated, I would like to see them get raises, don't get me wrong, but I am not sure it will pass.

Chairman Fikaris stated, if we propose it like this and have our logic behind it as to why we did this.

Mr. Syracuse suggested round numbers.

Mr. DiNardo asked, do we want to go with the \$26,000, \$11,000 and \$10,500?

Chairman Fikaris replied, I would think so.

Mr. DiNardo stated, okay, so we are going to agree to move on. When we vote at the next meeting, we can vote whether to move it to the next level. What's Mary Beth going to prepare? A list for the Commission to vote?

Mrs. Betsa replied, in 2010, around the same time, the Commission completed their review. A status summary was prepared. The Commission reviewed the summary and voted on the Charter Article by Article, Section by Section. Issues to be voted on were transferred to a final list to be forwarded to the Law Department. Sections of concern were outlined. A letter was prepared to the Law Department. Joe Diemert attended the following meeting to discuss the proposed amendments and clarify any questions. The Commission voted on each proposed amendment.

Mr. DiNardo asked, do we want Joe at the next meeting?

Mr. Syracuse replied, probably. To present the items like they did at the last Charter Review Commission. That's a great idea.

Mr. DiNardo stated, it's going to be in a list format. We are really going along well. We are doing a good job.

Chairman Fikaris stated, whereas tonight, Section 4 and 5, we are good. Section 6 is pending.

Mr. DiNardo stated, there is a recommendation on Section 6.

Mr. Hehr stated, we approved the change to "Civic Center" on Section 4. No change on Section 5. Section 6, no change, but with a question to the Law Department of whether or not we can submit a recommendation for a pay increase. Not changing the Charter. Are we beyond our authority?

Mr. DiNardo stated, he will be here when we vote and can say, yes, you can vote or no.

. **Held pending further discussion with Law Department at meeting of May 20, 2015**

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 13

- Section 8 – Vacancies in Council

Chairman Fikaris stated, there was discussion on this as to whether 30 days was enough.

Mr. Singer stated, it hasn't come up as a problem before. Why should it come up?

Mr. Piteo asked, what did Joe say?

Mr. Syracuse stated, it recently came up. Someone brought up that there wasn't enough time. Personally I don't have a problem with this as it is.

Chairman Fikaris stated, Joe is saying this is pretty general standard language.

. **Preliminarily approved 5/7/15**

- Section 12 – Public Notice and Hearing on Certain Ordinances

Chairman Fikaris stated, this had to do with electronic media.

Mr. Syracuse stated, we might be ahead of ourselves. Down the road in 15-20 years, things are probably going to have changed. I think it is fine the way it is. We have a system in place whereby important things are mailed directly. Other things are posted as required. Mary Beth mentioned it was standard in charters of other municipalities. We should wait and see if people take the step to make changes and follow suit or see what works or doesn't work for them and make changes down the road as needed.

Mr. Hehr asked, is the newspaper publication required?

Chairman Fikaris stated, the law department replied as follows: Your discussion on this subject is interesting, insightful, and productive. "Notice" does not have a specific definition in municipal law, other than reasonable attempts at communication to the electors and citizens and businesses in the community. . . . Perhaps you could require notifications to be digital as well as printed, but individual mailings to the homes, and businesses if impacted, would certainly be the best notice. As it is, we rely on council and the administration to make those decisions as to how far notice should be expanded, and to what degree it is to be assured.

Mrs. Betsa added, the meeting must be noticed within a certain period of time.

Mr. Syracuse stated, if you are publishing in newspapers, most of them are going on-line, so leaving the language as it is, it would be published just by being published on their on-line newspaper. I don't think we need to change any of this unless we were going to say, let's have a direct mailing. I am against that. It's expensive to the Village.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 14

Chairman Fikaris asked, so do we think this is good?

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Syracuse stated, it doesn't say it has to be a printed newspaper. If newspapers are on-line, that's an automatic change.

Mrs. Betsa stated, we are in compliance. We publish with *Plain Dealer*, *News-Herald* and with the *Sun*, newspapers of general circulation to the residents. In addition, all these newspapers provide information on-line.

. **Preliminarily approved 5/7/15**

- Section 13 – Submission to Electorate of Zoning and Land Use Changes

Chairman Fikaris stated, this was one that Joe commented on.

Mr. Syracuse stated, it is under Article V, Section 12. If there is a change to that, we would have to make a change to this as well. I mentioned language that might need to be added in that. This section was held pending further discussion until we got to Article V, Section 12. Originally it was proposed as referendum zoning being taken out and letting Council make changes. I don't think that's still on the table unless I am mistaken. I suggested looking at allowing use variances in non-residential areas as opposed to changing Article III, Section 13.

Chairman Fikaris stated, the law department states: Should the commission act favorably on this recommendation, I may need to make some changes in article III, sections 12 and 13 that might be impacted by this change. Until we get to this part, let's keep on going.

Mr. DiNardo asked, we are going to tie these two together?

Mr. Syracuse replied, yes. There's not going to be any change to this unless Joe feels there needs to be. They should add language that basically states somewhere in here where Council does not have this authority *except as provided for in Article V, Section 12 regarding use variances being presented to the Board of Appeals*. That would be the only thing you would end up adding to Section 13. Joe would be the one to come up with the language and tell us. It could be incorporated into one amendment to allow for use variances in language Joe provides.

. **Held pending review and revision to language by the Law Department of Article V, Section 12.**

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 15

ARTICLE IV – THE MAYOR

- Section 1 – Term

Chairman Fikaris stated this was held pending further discussion. What was the issue?

Mrs. Betsa stated, it was held pending discussion as to why term limits were removed.

Mr. Singer stated, I can help answer that. About 15 years ago, Mayor Rinker was still in office. His term limits were that it was his last year. I personally went to Mayor Rinker with my wife and daughter and we talked to the Mayor. We asked if there's anything that could keep him in office. His response was that his term limits were up. My wife and I went to the attorney and talked to him to find out what we can do to change term limits. He told us we have to get the voters to approve dissolution of term limits. We did that. It was taken to a vote. We formed a committee and got over 300 signatures. The Mayor was doing a terrific job. He still is as far as we are concerned. He made a lot of improvements in the Village. If he would have left at that time, the Village wouldn't be what it is today. He was that dynamic. It went to a vote. We canvassed a lot of people. Term limits were dissolved. I don't feel we should have term limits. If someone else wants to run against the Mayor they can. As long as they are doing good in office, let them stay in office.

Mr. DiNardo stated, okay. Nothing more to talk about on this. Let's move on.

Mr. Singer stated, I feel very strongly that we should not have term limits for the Mayor or Council.

Mr. Hehr stated, I am a big fan of sending it to the voters, whether I like what the voters decide or not, so I am with you.

Mr. Singer stated, if I came back to my wife and told her that they were going to put in term limits again, she would throw me out.

. **Preliminarily approved 5/7/15.**

ARTICLE V – ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

- Section 2 – Architectural Review Board

Chairman Fikaris stated, Joe responded to this: It should be amended so as to allow the Building Commissioner to vote as a member of the Architectural Review board in case of a tie or lack of quorum.

Mr. DiNardo stated, it allows the Building Commissioner the ability to have a vote in the event of lack of a quorum or in case of a tie.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 16

Chairman Fikaris stated, we still have a final vote amongst ourselves. What Joe said was okay. We compared it to other Commissions. ARB should be able to get a quorum.

Mr. DiNardo stated, I chair it. I support it.

Chairman Fikaris stated, it seems to get action done.

Mr. Piteo stated, it will be interesting to see in five years how many times they voted versus how many voted in the past. You have not done a just service if people don't show up because he can vote, right? I hope that doesn't happen.

Chairman Fikaris stated, it's not like the Planning Commission where he is voting on his own recommendations. It's usually an agreement, right?

Mr. DiNardo replied, right.

Mr. Hehr stated, what the Mayor said during the discussion I read in the Minutes was he did not object to the way it is written now. It wasn't particularly broken. I am a big fan of, if it's not broke, don't fix it. I have a little difficulty with adding in use variances and getting the Building Commissioner to vote because I think we are starting to eliminate the citizenry's contribution. Although I may be persuaded on one of those two, I would be unlikely to say we can do both of those. I want to keep as much vested in the responsibility of the citizens and community as I can. I am a big fan of, if we don't have a quorum, there's a reason for Robert's Rules and the approach that it's used and if we don't have a quorum, the Building Commissioner should be upset at the Commission.

Mr. Piteo asked, is there a penalty if someone does not show up?

Mr. DiNardo replied, no. Sometimes circumstances arise.

Mr. Hehr stated, he said it does not happen often enough to be an issue. If it doesn't happen often enough to be an issue –

Chairman Fikaris stated, I can see how it would be interpreted when it came to a vote. I suppose what we can do is to make a recommendation. It's going to be voted upon by us in the final vote.

Mr. DiNardo stated, you can vote on it. If you want to move it forward.

Mr. Piteo asked, do we have the language?

Mr. DiNardo replied, Joe will be here at the next meeting. He has already created the language.

Chairman Fikaris stated, Joe says to add the following language at the end: "The building Commissioner shall attend all meetings of the architectural review board, and shall have no vote

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 17

except in the case of a tie, or in the case of a lack of quorum where only two members of the commission are in attendance. In such instances, the building Commissioner shall count as a third voting participant, allowing a quorum to have been reached, and shall allow him to enter a vote which shall be counted equally as any other board member." He said I do not see how a conflict of interest would be an appearance of impropriety by reason of the appointed official who also reviews all of the plans for compliance with the zoning code.

Mr. Syracuse stated "appearance of a conflict of interest" is where I might have a problem.

Mr. DiNardo stated, it would read as follows: "*Shall Article V, Section 2, be amended so as to allow the Building Commissioner to vote as a member of the Architectural Review Board in case of ties or lack of a quorum.*"

Mr. Syracuse stated, I still have not made up my mind on whether or not I support that. I see the pros and the cons.

Mr. DiNardo stated, I think you let it in front of the voters. Let the voters decide whether that's something they want. Why not? They can come back and say yes, or they can come back and say no.

Chairman Fikaris stated, that's up to our vote. We will vote on it during our final vote based on language supplied by Joe. The language is good. You vote either way.

. **Held pending vote on May 20, 2015**

- Section 6 – Civil Service Commission

Chairman Fikaris stated, we talked about this with the Chiefs. Joe recommended adding a new first paragraph under E: "The position of chief of police and chief of fire, when a vacancy occurs, shall be filled by promotion from among persons holding positions in the rank below, providing that there are two or more persons in such next lower rank who are willing to take the examination and are qualified pursuant to national standards as determined by the Civil Service Commission. In the event two persons are unwilling to compete for such examination from the next lower rank, then the commission has the authority to permit competition for such appointment from the next lower rank, as well as to include competition from qualified individuals outside the department as determined by the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. DiNardo stated, we are all in agreement that we agree with the Chiefs.

Chairman Fikaris stated, the current first paragraph becomes the second and then the third existing paragraph gets removed.

Mr. Hehr stated, I am pretty comfortable with the language he wrote. I would preliminarily approve the changes he is recommending.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 18

Chairman Fikaris referred to a second e-mail from Joe Diemert. Subsection (B) should add the Clerk of Council, all department heads and commissioners, except as set forth in subsection B (1) and (2) above.”

Ms. Wolgamuth replied, the Clerk of Council is already there. He is just adding all department heads.

Chairman Fikaris asked, are we all good with this?

The Commission agreed.

. **Recommended for ballot language.**

- Section 7 – Department of Public Service

Chairman Fikaris stated, the status summary says, held pending determination following receipt of e-mail from Doug Metzung which stated: While the charter under the Civil Service provision does not call out Directors directly (except for police and fire chiefs) it is understood that they are considered Unclassified and not subject to Civil Service. I do appreciate their concerns but the history of the village in regard to stability speak for itself. This section was never preliminarily approved.

. **Preliminarily approved 5/7/15**

- Section 12 – Board of Appeals

Chairman Fikaris stated, the law department notes: Perhaps the motion the commission should entertain on this subject would be something like the following: **"a motion to recommend to council and the voters the amendment of article V, section 12 (A), and any related subsections throughout the charter, so as to allow the board of zoning appeals to grant "use" variances in all nonresidential districts, provided that council approves such variance by legislation that does not include the emergency clause."**

Mr. Syracuse asked, there is a reference to not having the burden be an unreasonable or unnecessary hardship for the use variance. I think we should change it to practical difficulties. Is that something that would go into an ordinance or is that something that would go in this Charter amendment? I am not sure what he meant by that. I think he was implying that would be something that would be done by ordinance but it does not specifically state that. I just want to have a mechanism personally for use variances to be granted.

Mr. DiNardo stated, based on a specific hardship, not the hardship we normally are accustomed to.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 19

Mr. Syracuse stated, it would be difficult on Beta or anywhere like that, but at least the option is out there. We would be changing the standards of practical difficulties. That's by case law. That's not by statute. Is that something that needs to be a charter amendment or is that something that needs to be done by ordinance? That's my question back to the law department. Again, it was my suggestion we make this change.

Mr. DiNardo asked, is the Charter allowing the BZA to make that decision, the ability to make it, is that what we are asking the voters to vote on? The BZA has the ability to make a land use change on non-residential property to change it to, for example, mixed use, and still go through the process? That's what we are asking the voters to do.

Mr. Syracuse replied, yes. Any commercial or non-residential, someone comes in, I don't know about the burden being shifted before we vote on it. That might be something Council should discuss and decide. I like having the mechanism in place rather than doing away with referendum zoning and rather than having referendum zoning because you really are going to prevent businesses from coming here where there is this mechanism in other communities nearby whereby they can get the use they want. We are fortunate with what we have, but again they are on a two-year conditional use permit. They might not come in. If they leave, will someone else come in and do that and will they want to request a use variance that runs with the land to allow them to have hotel and banquet there? That should be done, but not by referendum voting.

Mr. DiNardo stated, it still gives them the option.

Mr. Syracuse agreed. What I am saying is instead of saying that's all they can do. The last Charter Review Commission said we will leave it up to Council. I don't like that. I feel the use variance being permitted gives a good mechanism to allow businesses to come in. It can always get shot down by the Board of Appeals or by Council. If it's automatically approved by Council, I don't think I like that. It should be approved again by Council after the Board of Appeals.

Mr. DiNardo stated, that's the way we normally would do.

Mr. Syracuse stated, without someone filing an appeal, it automatically is voted on by Council. They will have to approve any of the use variances. That's the correct way to do it.

Chairman Fikaris asked, Council would review it and approve it whether or not it is appealed?

Mr. Syracuse replied, absolutely.

Mr. DiNardo agreed 100%.

Chairman Fikaris asked, he would add "shall have no power or authority to grant any change of or variance and any land use" and add the term "in any residential district"? And then add another sentence, while the BZA shall have the authority to grant variances in non-residential

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 20

districts, providing that same is approved by a majority of Council. Should we make this motion that he recommends?

Mr. Piteo asked, have we had any occurrences where businesses have shied away from Mayfield Village because we did not have this mechanism in place?

Mr. Syracuse replied, in Planning and Zoning it was brought to our attention by certain people.

Mr. DiNardo stated, but you don't know who reads our zoning code or charter on-line and says I'm not doing this.

Mr. Syracuse stated, there have been businesses that have shied away because of that. A lot of the property owners on Beta have said they have trouble because of that. They are asking for conditional use permits that have to be renewed every two years. As an attorney who handles real estate law as well, if I were representing a business that might come in and you think this is a perfect location for this, there are certain things I would say yes, a conditional use permit would be better, but a permit like Hilton Garden should be a use variance. The market then would dictate what businesses are applying for both use variances or conditional use permits where we are going to allow them to come in and apply. None of it is guaranteed to be granted. The Board of Appeals can always deny it even on a practical difficulty standard. Council can always overturn anything the Board of Appeals approves. There are a lot of ways that people who would oppose this can come in and present objections to it. It's not going to be affecting anyone in any residential area. All you are doing is giving the Village the ability to permanently change the zoning for a specific purpose but only that purpose. It runs with the land. If the economy then changes and let's say it's zoned now for a restaurant to go in; they get a use variance for that, they have burdens they have to meet, the Board of Appeals grants it, people are not objecting, Council approves Board of Appeals. Let's say it turns out it is a terrible idea and in 5 years no one wants any restaurants on Beta and no one is coming in to put anything there, then someone else can come in for a use variance to change that to something else.

Mr. Hehr asked, what if you get a Crazy Horse that decides to park itself in there? That's something I don't want there. Specifically, if it's got a use variance for a restaurant and they decide they want to be a restaurant.

Mr. Syracuse stated, that would be how it's classified as. That's different zoning.

Mr. Hehr stated, but if it is a bad restaurant?

Mr. Syracuse stated, there's specific language in the zoning code of what it is zoned for and what they are asking it be zoned for. We narrow it down.

Mr. Piteo asked, is there a chance by allowing this that someone can come in and do that and then sue the city to get it?

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 21

Mr. Syracuse stated, they can appeal to do that. They have burdens to meet. I want a little clarification on the change from a standard for a use variance being reduced to practical difficulties, whether or not that's something that goes in the Charter or something that goes into ordinance. I would still like that clarification. These are all good points.

Mr. Hehr stated, that's why I think that allowing the Building Commissioner to vote and this are tied together. We have now passed our way through going to the people twice. What we are doing is saying we don't need the full vote of a real quorum of a Commission.

Mr. Syracuse stated, those are different.

Mr. Hehr stated, I know.

Mr. Piteo stated, it goes through the Architectural Review Board first before they go to zoning. To Al's point, if they go to the Architectural Review Board and don't have a quorum, they get the Commissioner to vote and he is the tie breaker and then he goes to Council and then we are by-passing the people again.

Mr. DiNardo stated, that's not a good choice of words. You are not by-passing.

Mr. Hehr stated, all I am doing is raising a possibility.

Mr. Syracuse stated, I don't think that's something John would do. You are talking about if that change is current in our Charter, who comes after him as the Building Commissioner? I am still not decided on that issue. This one I feel strongly about.

Chairman Fikaris stated, say there's a guy on the corner of Beta who decides to buy the land, tears the thing down and proposes mixed-use and residential. Does that therefore become a residential district?

Mr. Syracuse stated, that's something they plan so much in advance for. That's a question for the law department. I think that's something they would have to go to referendum voting.

Mr. Hehr stated, I am good with a use variance. I am within that commercial area. I got very up in arms when we were trying to put wells in the backyards of people's houses. I wasn't there. I said we don't need oil that much to have my little girl running in the backyard and looking at oil wells. When we are talking about commercial use land and varying the use commercially and staying within the commercial auspice, I am pretty open to that. I think our Building Commissioner and Council, that's enough safety net. Changing from restaurant to warehouse is such a nominal change overall that I don't have a particular issue with having that and then having the ability to change it. I am a little more flexible with the approach of this use variance and although I am just learning about it, that one seems to make sense to me. It seems to say listen, we are going to have to move some of that stuff around. We have enough people in place.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 22

Chairman Fikaris stated, the inevitability doesn't technically change. Something can still happen like we are doing now with conditional use permits. It's just not best for our code that says, this hotel exists with conditional use permits, they come back every two years. We argued that could be a good or bad thing. The inevitability that someone can still go through our present mechanism if they so choose, not push it through, but work, and see if we can get something like that but it would be based on conditional or special but we are saying if it would be easier just to grant that use would either it make it more attractive or give us more options.

Mr. Syracuse stated, that's exactly it. A conditional use permit does not run with the land. It is temporary. It's for two years. It's specific to whoever applied for it. It just came in front of our Planning and Zoning Commission for a cheerleading program. That's something where they would not want to change the zoning on a permanent basis. Most of the businesses coming in or that will come in want that. All a use variance would allow us to do is have the option as a Village to not have to go to referendum zoning to change something but if they get shot down by the Board of Appeals for a use variance, they could very well ask that it be put on the ballot. It could be something they want to rezone. But I like the idea of use variances for areas like Beta because as tenants leave and you don't have so many warehouses and places like that in there, the development of Beta could become crucial to the Village and a lot of people would like a lot of say of what goes in there. Something like Hilton Garden Inn, that's the kind of thing where if they want a use variance, they should be able to take the conditional use permit and now ask for a use variance and not have to come back every two years.

Mr. Hehr asked, if you put a use variance in, can you take it out?

Mr. Syracuse replied, no. It runs with the land as permanent. You are letting the market dictate what is applied for to go in there. It's not saying the market is going to dictate what does go in. The Village still has say through the mechanisms it has for Board of Appeals, Council and so forth. It's the standard I am concerned about. It know it would be difficult to meet, but do we want to make it easy? I don't know. Is that for us to decide or is it for Council to decide? I don't know the answer.

Mr. DiNardo stated, I am going to give you a scenario. You guys tell me what you think. I am a landowner on Beta. I own a commercial building, 25000 square feet. Half the building is empty. I have a tenant who wants to come in and open a restaurant. The other half is office. They are not allowed to come in. Now we go in front of the BZA and I want to present this new restaurant. How do we do it? What is the mechanism that allows what we were just talking about when you have an actual scenario just like that?

Mr. Syracuse replied, file an application with the Building Department for a use variance.

Mr. DiNardo stated, but it's mixed use. You have to separate it somehow. Now are you changing the use to a restaurant, an assembly use, or are you changing it to office which is business?

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 23

Mr. Syracuse replied, that's what they have to present. It would be for a specific purpose that they are asking for it.

Mr. DiNardo asked, that would be considered mixed use? They would come in and ask for a zoning variance for mixed use on my building?

Mr. Syracuse replied, yes.

Chairman Fikaris stated, in the recent past, there's been like a Sign A Rama that put a storefront application into Beta with a conditional use permit. We accepted the cheerleading thing. We turned down a trampoline place.

Mr. Syracuse replied, they withdrew. It was Playground World. They wanted both a warehouse and demonstrations and have parties go on there. It would be for amusement as well as retail. They came to make it permanent and asked for a variance. One of the main concerns was the danger it could have caused for the Village with kids getting hurt there.

Mr. DiNardo asked, if we had this mechanism in place, would you have granted that?

Mr. Syracuse replied, that got turned down on conditional use permit. That's a different Commission that would be deciding use variances. That was the Planning and Zoning Commission. Again, if I were representing these parties, I would say that should be conditional use because you are more likely to get it granted on a temporary basis and see how it goes. A lot of times you will get direction from legal counsel. If there's going to be a major change, you are going to now have this mechanism that allows them to permanently have that there without having the voters say, yes, we are rezoning this or as was proposed last time by the Charter Review Commission, let's just let Council decide how they want to zone this as they feel it should be zoned. It's a mechanism to allow these businesses to do that. You could have a building owner like you said with mostly vacant space that wants to put a restaurant in. They want to maybe do that on a conditional use permit to start with and then ask for a use variance to keep it permanent. Maybe they want to do it as a use variance from the get go. That's a decision they have to make as an advocate. This mechanism should be in place so we are not turning away as you mentioned, Ron, how many people we don't know didn't even ask about the space because they knew they could only get two years when they wanted a five or ten year lease from the owner. That's another thing. These leases they might be signing for five years if I were in charge of it I would ask that a lease be only two years in case your conditional use permit gets pulled. But if you are representing the landlord you are going to want them in for a longer period of time. There would be a lot of people who just don't come here to put things in. We don't necessarily need the changes right now. I am not saying we need to start changing Beta and put a bunch of restaurants or anything else in. If that becomes something the market dictates is more feasible and benefits the community, we should have a mechanism in place rather than saying let's wait until the next election and have everyone vote on this one change for that property owner. Otherwise, they are going to go somewhere else. Nothing will ever change.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 24

Chairman Fikaris stated, it always seems to me kind of unusual, Hilton Garden Inn has to come back every two years. One of my first experiences was some of the issues we had and we took these guys to task and said listen, someone votes and they say no, your conditional use is gone, you are gone. Why these guys invested so much money on a conditional use permit.

Mr. DiNardo stated, these banks won't finance something on a two-year conditional use.

Chairman Fikaris stated, that's another reason why. But the mechanism protecting the Village that you have in Planning and Zoning is still in place. In my experience, it's quite good at weeding out these things. Another applicant was an indoor bouncy house where on the surface the applicant thought it was cool, but it was like, you don't realize how many issues. They withdrew but it wasn't looking good because there were a lot of factors that go into that.

Mr. DiNardo stated, so we are going to move that along for more discussion with Joe for the next meeting.

Mr. Syracuse stated, I would request that he address the change in the standard.

Mr. DiNardo stated, that's a big one. I agree.

Mr. Syracuse stated, from unreasonable or unnecessary hardship to practical difficulties. I don't know if that's something that should be in the Charter or done by ordinance?

Chairman Fikaris asked, is Joe saying to bounce it off Council first?

Mr. Syracuse stated, I don't know if he is saying do it now or when we do actually present it that is how we would vote on it.

Mr. DiNardo stated, all this stuff is going to be bounced off Council. Everything we present to them. They are going to talk amongst themselves, either in Caucus or individually.

Mr. Syracuse asked, are we going to ask him to be at the next meeting to make the motions on whether or not? He has basically written how it would read.

Mr. DiNardo stated, we have to give him direction on what the items are.

Mrs. Betsa stated, Joe came in for the last Charter Review Commission with documentation and also ready to answer any questions. He had suggested language for recommendations the Commission wanted to make. He explained each one and answered any questions.

Mr. Syracuse stated, this is the motion made on this issue by the Commission and voted on by the Commission for submission to Council.

. **Held pending discussion with Law Department at meeting of 5/20/15**

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 25

ARTICLE XII – MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Section 9.1 – Distribution of Revised Charter Copies

Chairman Fikaris suggested that language be inserted that says, or other delivery mechanism as we see fit so that there is an option.

Mr. DiNardo stated, we should push that through. I don't think it's prudent to spend that kind of money. If someone wants it, we would be glad to make a copy and give it to them. It's also on-line.

Mr. DiNardo asked, did we go through all these?

Mr. Syracuse asked, when there's an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, do they mail a new copy to every resident in the United States?

Mr. Hehr stated, the Constitution of the United States is shorter than the Charter.

.Preliminarily approved 5-7-15

ANY OTHER MATTERS

Chairman Fikaris asked, does anyone have any other questions? Let's determine a date for our next meeting.

Mrs. Betsa stated, May 20th was the proposed next date if everyone's schedule is open.

Chairman Fikaris stated, during that meeting, we should have a representative of the Law Department. Do we anticipate at the next meeting to final vote?

Mr. DiNardo replied, yes.

Mrs. Betsa stated, June 15th is the final day for all recommendations to be provided to the Law Department for drafting.

Chairman Fikaris asked, what date are we looking for in June?

Mrs. Betsa replied, June 3rd? If you are following the every other Wednesday schedule.

Mr. DiNardo asked Mrs. Betsa to send out an e-mail to confirm the June 3rd date.

DRAFT

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Page 26

Mr. DiNardo asked the Commission to recap the items we are going to talk about.

- . **Article III, Section 4 – Organization**
 - o “Village Hall” to “Civic Center” throughout
- . **Article III, Section 6**
- . **Article V, Section 2, 6 and 12**
- . **Article XII, Section 9.1**

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Fikaris asked, any other questions or comments? There were none. If there is no further business, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Syracuse made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. DiNardo seconded. There was no opposition.

The meeting concluded at 7:46 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 20, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the Main Conference Room at Mayfield Village Civic Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Betsa, Secretary
Charter Review Commission