

**MINUTES OF A COUNCIL CAUCUS**  
**Mayfield Village Civic Hall - Mayfield Village Reserve Hall**  
**Immediately Following the Special Meeting of Council**  
**Monday, August 1, 2022– 7:00 p.m.**

The Council of Mayfield Village met in Caucus Session on Monday, August 1, 2022 immediately following the Special Meeting of Council. Council President Schutt called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Mr. Arndt, Mrs. Jurcisek, Mr. Marquardt, Mr. Meyers,  
Mr. Murphy, Mr. Schutt and Mr. Williams

Also Present: Mayor Bodnar, Mr. Wynne, Ms. Calta,  
Mr. Cappello, Chief Carcioppolo, Chief Matias,  
Mr. Marquart, Mr. McAviney, Mr. Russell,  
Mr. Sipos, Ms. Wolgamuth and Mrs. Betsa

**PENDING LEGISLATION**

- **Ordinance No. 2022-10**, entitled “An ordinance repealing and replacing Mayfield Village Codified Ordinance Section 1149.02 relating to Conditional Use Permits.” Introduced by Mayor Bodnar. (First Reading - June 20, 2022; Second Reading – July 18, 2022).

Council President Schutt asked, are there any questions or discussion?

There were none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-10 will move to Third Read on August 15, 2022. As noted during the Special Meeting, Ordinance No. 2022-17 regarding parking on Aintree Park Drive cul-de-sac will also move to Third Read.

Mr. Williams asked, can we have discussion on this?

Council President Schutt stated, sure, we can open Ordinance 2022-17 up for discussion.

Mr. Williams stated, I just would like to start with a question to the Service Director. Have you had a chance to read the second letter from Mr. Hughes?

Mr. Sipos replied, yes, I did.

Mr. Williams asked, any feedback or thoughts on reducing the size of that island?

Mr. Sipos replied, it has always been difficult for us to get our plow trucks around it and pushing the snow out without blocking in cars. The weight of the snow in front of the trucks sort of shove the trucks sideways. It has always been a source of contention when we are plowing up there. Secondly, during leaf season, cars park in front of the leaf piles and we can't pick them up.

We tend not to want people to park in the streets during leaf pick-up. We can't give the public their fair share. Coming around the cul-de-sac it's tough as it is because coming around the curve like that, you can't run the curb real tight so we are already kind of driving away from the curb and when there are cars there, we can't get close to the curb. From a Service standpoint, that's why we don't like cars parking in the cul-de-sac. It's hard to get our equipment around there.

Mr. Williams stated, makes sense. I just wanted to make sure we gave this gentleman some consideration since he took the time to write a pretty well-written letter of concern.

Mr. Sipos stated, I understand. It is my understanding too that they are providing parking spaces at the apartments. They do have places to park. I understand the street's a little closer for them but it makes it a lot harder for us.

Mr. Williams stated, okay. That's all I have on that. I just wanted to acknowledge it for the record.

Council President Schutt asked, Mayor Bodnar?

Mayor Bodnar replied, thank you Council President. There's no overnight parking allowed on the cul-de-sac or anywhere else. The residents who are living in the apartments or the condos do need to move their car at night so that they are within the apartment or condo area. They cannot park on the street so at night they have to move to a parking space and in the morning to go to their parking space to get it. The other thing is there was a question brought up about whether eliminating the middle or median part of the cul-de-sac would make the problem go away. I don't know if you can address that Mr. Cappello?

Mr. Cappello replied, I took a fire truck out with the Chief. When we did that, we did an auto turn using the ladder truck. The minimum radius to the ladder truck is roughly 21 feet. The cul-de-sac is 21 feet radius. So, it's not as if that island is necessarily an issue.

Mayor Bodnar stated, okay.

Mr. Cappello stated, the other problem is you can make a turn because you go a little wide, but this depends on where cars are at. If cars are all around the cul-de-sac, the whole perimeter, that makes it harder. If it's half, then the trucks can adjust to miss the parked vehicles.

Mayor Bodnar asked, so basically you need the outer perimeter to make a wide turn, so that eliminating the middle part won't help you out?

Mr. Cappello replied, correct. Because there's a minimum radius you have to have. The truck can't turn tighter. The center island is about the size of that minimum turn. That curb is mountable so if someone did have to in an emergency drive over it, it's not going to cause an issue. They might turf the lawn a little bit. When we did do the cul-de-sac, we did use an auto turn program to simulate a fire truck going around there.

Mayor Bodnar asked, so you need the width, not the middle?

Mr. Cappello replied, correct. It's just when they are all over the entire cul-de-sac, it makes that smaller.

Mayor Bodnar stated, okay.

Council President Schutt stated, it's understandable that it would be very difficult or potentially impossible to make a turn if cars are lined around the whole cul-de-sac.

Mr. Cappello stated, I won't say impossible, but it's very close.

Council President Schutt stated, sure.

Mr. Cappello stated, it all depends on how far away they are parked from the curb, things like that.

Council President Schutt stated, and weather conditions like snow.

Mr. Cappello stated, right.

Chief Carcioppolo stated, right. So, if there's snow and the cars aren't parked close to the curb, the radius does not account for overhangs like a front bumper. It's not just us, it's buses; any big vehicle. That's my two cents.

Council President Schutt stated, sure. Okay. Are there any other questions or discussion?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-10 will move to Third Read at the Regular Meeting of Council on August 15, 2022. As noted during the Special Meeting, Ordinance No. 2022-17 regarding parking on the Aintree Park Drive cul-de-sac will move to Third Read as well.

#### **MAYOR**

Yes, I have a few things tonight. As we all know, Mr. Meyers brought to our attention at the last Council meeting an issue of illegal parking near The Grove especially along SOM Center and some of the grassy fields. We worked on that. Chief Matias and Mr. McAviney knew it was an issue so they already were working on it. They got some quick signage up for last Friday night. There were several announcements made through social media and e-mails. This past Friday night for Fleetwood Gold we had a very very large crowd. Nobody parked illegally. I know the weekend before that we had issued some tickets. It was a good crowd. They all parked legally.

They were all put on notice of where not to park. The signage worked. I want to thank everybody for working together to get that issue resolved. Councilwoman Jurcisek also wrote a very encouraging e-mail last week in response to the explanatory e-mail that I had sent out. Thank you for that also.

I want to compliment Service. I think that our flowers in the hanging baskets in the Gazebo have never looked better. My younger daughter who is rare in giving out compliments noted that driving home from The Grove Friday night. They look wonderful. Thank you so much for making our Village look so good.

These are all positive comments. I had an e-mail from a resident who was very complimentary to Dan Russell and Councilman Arndt for their assistance and their professionalism in helping her to resolve an issue that she was having. That is very much appreciated. Thank you for being so professional. Thank you for just being accessible to a resident in a situation like that. I appreciate that.

Finally, on my way in tonight, I ran into a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission who complimented Mr. John Marquart on being so thorough in his preparation and making sure that the Planning and Zoning Commission were completely briefed on all of the issues that they had to address. Compliments go out to John Marquart as well.

Tomorrow is Voting Day. I hope I didn't steal your thunder, Steve.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you, Mayor Bodnar.

#### **COUNCIL PRESIDENT**

I just wanted to echo some of the comments from Mayor Bodnar. We appreciate everybody's assistance at The Grove this past weekend. Landon had football practice so I was a little bit later getting there on Friday. What I noticed was the same thing. Cars were parked where they were supposed to be. The crowd was very large. Great job by Fire, Police, Service and Parks and Rec Department. Thank you all for that. Saturday as well. I did not see any illegal parking on Saturday night either.

Also, as Mayor Bodnar mentioned, please make sure you vote tomorrow.

It's hard to believe it's already August. Enjoy the summer because unfortunately winter is going to be here before we know it and we will be dealing with the snow and ice removal and the salt as Mr. Sipos has been mentioning the last couple meetings. That's all I have.

**NEW BUSINESS FOR  
DISCUSSION**

**1) Updates to Stormwater Ordinances (Law Dept./Engineer)**

Council President Schutt stated, these Ordinances have been discussed previously. Ms. Calta or Mr. Cappello, do you have any additional information you would like to provide?

Mr. Cappello replied, not at this time. These are just to be in compliance with our new permit.

Ms. Calta replied, I don't have anything to add unless there are any questions. I will just toss them to Tom anyway because they are water related.

Council President Schutt stated, okay, if no questions, we will move along. Thank you, Mr. Cappello and Ms. Calta.

**2) Agreements for Beta Drive Micro-Transit Program (Admin/Law Dept.)**

- **Services Agreement between Regional Transit Authority, Mayfield Village and Highland Heights;**
- **Transportation Services Agreement between Standard Parking Plus and Mayfield Village; and**
- **Agreement between Mayfield Village and Highland Heights addressing payment for the program.**

Council President Schutt asked, Ms. Calta, would you mind walking us through these Agreements?

Ms. Calta replied, sure. John, do you want to start with anything? I don't want to steal your thunder because this is really your project.

Mr. Marquart replied, thank you, Ms. Calta. Just briefly, as we reported on several times over the last 8-9 months, we were recipients of a Connectworks Micro Transit Grant from the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority. In order to make the vehicle appear on our streets and serve our residents and employees, a lot of legwork has to be done contractually with both the operator which is Standard Parking Plus, Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority and also with the City of Highland Heights who is going to split the remainder of the cost with us. Toward that end, Ms. Calta has been working diligently with all those entities to get us protected and able to operate this thing legally and efficiently and effectively. That's all I have. I will turn it over to the Law Director at this time.

Ms. Calta stated, thank you. Just a follow up on that. There are three Agreements that will be for Council's consideration for First Reading and then an additional two readings after that. The program is looking to be in place towards the end of this year. We have an Agreement that is focused with the grant with RTA and that is their standard contract that they require for the grant to facilitate the whole program. That's with RTA, Mayfield Village and Highland Heights. We

worked with RTA to get it into a form that was acceptable to everyone. So, that's pretty much the first Agreement. It outlines the scope of what their requirements are for the program and how much money they will be funding.

Mayfield Village will have an Agreement with Highland Heights to address the funding for the remaining portion of the program. So, there will be monies from RTA and then the remainder will be split equally between Mayfield Village and Highland Heights.

We will be facilitating all of the monies into the Village. Highland Heights will be paying us and we will be paying the providers. Mayfield Village will have an Agreement with Standard Parking Plus for them to service the route and have the transportation.

So, you will have three Agreements and that's pretty much the general overview of what each Agreement will do. I think everyone's familiar with the route and the times and the seasons. There's an extra stop during the summer. Is there anything else we want to say about this yet?

Mr. Marquart replied, I have nothing further except to say that the provider originally quoted us a brand-new vehicle. This was over a year ago. Just to bring everyone up to speed, supplies being what they are, the manufacturer is now telling us that it is 14-18 months out to acquire the vehicle. We are now trying to procure a like-new vehicle. I will keep Council apprised. RTA has indicated that would be acceptable provided it is no more than 5 years old. We are trying to acquire one that is less than one year old. For everyone who jumps on the vehicle, they probably wouldn't even know it is a used vehicle but given the state of manufacturing right now, we are sort of forced into that position.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments or questions?

There were none.

**3) Emergency Ordinance Amending Chapter 501.99 re: Weapons Forfeiture Penalty for Misdemeanor Offenses (Police/Law Dept.)**

Council President Schutt asked, Chief Matias or Ms. Calta, will you give Council some background on this proposed change?

Ms. Calta asked, would you like me to, Chief or do you want to start?

Chief Matias stated, briefly, when they got rid of the concealed carry license requirement in Ohio, one of the things everyone was concerned about is if you are charged with a misdemeanor gun crime, there is no forfeiture requirements in the penalty phase so if you are charged with a gun crime that's a misdemeanor and you go to court, whatever the appropriate penalty is, depending on what kind of misdemeanor it is, it doesn't include the gun forfeiture and we would have to give the person their gun back. So, Prosecutor Mike Cicero is working with the communities he deals with and what we are proposing is it would add the ability for when the

case is disposed of for the court to order the forfeiture of the weapon so the person doesn't get it back. That's the nuts and bolts of what we are looking to do. Are there any questions?

Mr. Meyers asked, it's strictly in the weapons and explosives part of the misdemeanor ordinance, right?

Chief Matias replied, right.

Mr. Meyers asked, no other part?

Chief Matias replied, no, it's just added to the current ordinance, it's not a new ordinance.

Ms. Calta replied, right. We have an existing ordinance. This is added to the penalty provisions in our ordinance. It would be just a firearms violation that it would apply to.

Mr. Williams asked, what is an example of a misdemeanor?

Chief Matias asked, a misdemeanor gun crime?

Mr. Williams replied, gun crime.

Chief Matias replied, well, it would be carrying a concealed weapon, what we call failure to secure dangerous ordnance; let's say you were at Brown's Stadium and you carried a weapon into the bathroom and you left it there and walked out, took it off to use the bathroom, things like that, transporting it improperly. It's usually any kind of handling of a firearm. If you are actually using it, it would be a felony which is jail time and again we would seize the weapon. This is mainly based upon what you are doing with it in handling it.

Mr. Williams replied, okay.

Chief Matias stated, normally in most cases for that because they are misdemeanors there's no jail time, just fines. That's why we want to beef it up a little bit. It would be more of a deterrent that you are going to lose your firearm. They get a little bit expensive.

Mr. Williams stated, thank you.

Council President Schutt asked, any other questions or comments?

There were none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you, Ms. Calta. Thank you, Chief Matias.

**4) Lyndhurst Municipal Court Operating Deficit – Mayfield Village's share for January-June 2022 (\$22,829.83) (Finance)**

Mr. Wynne reported, the Finance Directors held their semi-annual meeting with the Court last week to go over the operations. Our portion for the first six months is \$22,829.83. It is allocated the same as it has been in the past based upon total case count for municipalities in 2021. The Court itself has been doing a very good job controlling expenses but the case counts amongst the communities just have not increased to the level it was pre-pandemic to cover the total cost of the Court. So even though we have a portion of the deficit, we still receive our portion of the Court fines and those have been about \$35,500 for the year so far. So, we are not in a deficit position on what we do in supporting the Court in total but that's what their numbers were to the end of June. The Judge has said this before and has said it again that he would be happy to come here at a Council meeting to make a presentation to Council about the operations of the Court, what they are doing and what they are seeing if Council so wishes to do that.

Council President Schutt stated, if anyone's interested, send an e-mail to Mr. Wynne. Any questions or comments for Mr. Wynne?

There were none.

**5) Contract with Cargill for road salt for 2022-23 season (2,300 tons x \$47.24/ton = \$108,652.00) (Service)**

Mr. Sipos reported, we put in for 2,300 tons this year for the 2022-2023 season. The contract was awarded to Cargill, who we used last year. I am happy to report that Cuyahoga County came in one of the lowest in the State. We were beat out by Geauga and Lake by a couple of dollars. Unfortunately comparing from last year, salt has gone up \$10.00 a ton. It is a little more expensive. Last year we ordered 1,800 tons but ordered 2,300 this year because of the winter we had this past year. It comes in at \$108,652.00. Any questions on this?

There were none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you, Mr. Sipos.

**ANY OTHER MATTER BEFORE COUNCIL**

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other matters to come before Council this evening?

Mrs. Jurcisek asked, Councilman Schutt? I just wanted to say a few comments. I am echoing what the Mayor and yourself said. I was also there Friday night at The Grove. It looked like record numbers to me. I just wanted to echo my thanks to our Rec Department, Police Department and Service Department who I am sure had a lot of clean-up after the event. I have heard a lot of good things from residents and non-residents. They were excited to see K-9 Leo there just to help if there was any kind of doubt. Residents were thrilled and sort of proud that it can gather some of the crowds and the non-residents that I have heard from say, it's great, we

don't charge for this event which may lead to future discussions and may be some opportunities that we can have in the future in discussions with the team of maybe what we can do in the future to offset some costs and control numbers. I just wanted to give some feedback there.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Councilwoman Jurcisek. Are there any other matters to come before Council this evening? Yes, Ms. Calta?

Ms. Calta stated, thank you. I wanted to bring up and I believe all of you are aware that there was a denial of a variance at the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting on Tuesday, July 19<sup>th</sup>. That applicant has requested to appeal that decision to Council. I believe everybody got a copy of the letter that was given to the applicant confirming that their variance was denied and that they have the right to appeal. The appeal came in to Mr. Wynne. I just wanted to mention to Council that typically we would put this on for Council's agenda on the 15<sup>th</sup>. Under the current Code, you have the ability to review that. I don't know if you remember back, probably one of the first meetings this year, we had a similar appeal to Council from a denial of a variance. You have the option of reviewing the Minutes and any other information in making a decision at the meeting on that appeal or you can have what would be considered a rehearing. I think what we did back in January is we actually had the applicant speak and anyone who opposed or was in support of it also spoke and you could ask questions and make a decision based on that appeal. You can affirm it or you can reverse it. If you reverse it, it requires an additional vote; a supermajority so to speak.

This was a one-foot variance for a chain link fence. Our Ordinance allows a rear-yard, side-yard chain link fence up to the height of 4 feet. The applicants requested one to be 5 feet. They also had another request that is not part of the appeal. It's a privacy fence along the front of the home. That was approved. That's not part of the appeal. You can read the Minutes and they can also speak to Council on the 15<sup>th</sup>. Their main reason was to address deer in their yard, keeping the deer out with the additional height. If you look in the Minutes or the appeal, I saw some reference to some other communities and what the size of their fences are and things like that. That should not be relevant to your decision on the appeal for Mayfield Village but if anyone's interested, I can verify whether that information is correct. There was a recent amendment in Highland Heights on one of their fences. But every community is allowed to have their own fence ordinance and they might be consistent or they might be different depending on how their community is situated. I don't know if Dan wants to say anything?

Mr. Russell stated, no, I have nothing else to say. It's a pretty simple variance request. They are looking for a one-foot variance over the four feet. You are not going to be able to see it from the right of way. There were only three people on the Board at the meeting. Two approved and one opposed.

Ms. Calta stated, I was not at the meeting. Katie was at the meeting. But my reading of the Minutes was the member against it said it had to do with the idea that everyone has deer. There's really no difference or practical difficulties or unusual circumstances. Everyone has deer and a deer can jump a 5-foot-high fence. I can tell you they can. I have seen it.

Mr. Murphy asked, Steve?

Council President Schutt replied, yes.

Mr. Murphy stated, to give a little bit more background too, I got an e-mail the next morning after this denial happened from the next-door neighbor Ron Clines who is directly to the left. The people wanting this variance are Danuta and Stefan Waradzyn. They bought a brand-new house on Wilson Mills. They are out there almost every night. They do a great job. If anyone remembers the house that used to be there it was a dump. He came in support of Danuta and Stefan saying he is all for this variance of a 5-foot chain link fence rather than a 4-foot chain link fence. I went to his house. His property is right there. If there's anyone who is going to be opposed to it, it's going to be him. He went there. He spoke on their behalf. He's all for it.

So, to give people background on this Code section, you can have a 6-foot board-on-board fence and only a 4-foot chain link fence which doesn't make much sense to me. They are requesting a 5-foot chain link fence to put in the back of the property. You can't see it from the road. They are going to be there. I encourage everyone to approve it and let them put up a 5-foot chain link fence. I think people from the Board of Zoning Appeals even mentioned in the Minutes that this Ordinance has been causing them problems and they have seen a lot of issues with this and it shouldn't even go to them. I will work with Diane to make sure that we get this looked at and changed. Mary Beth, if I hadn't asked for these Minutes and the letter specifically, I don't think I would have gotten them, so I don't know if other members of Council have access to these or if they are on the website, but if you wouldn't mind circulating those, I would-

Ms. Calta stated, we will get them to everyone before the next meeting.

Mr. Murphy stated, that would be great.

Ms. Calta stated, I apologize. I thought everyone did get them. If you haven't seen the letters or the Minutes, I will get them to everyone.

Mayor Bodnar stated, I have a question I would like to direct to Mr. Murphy. Are you saying that it's just a good thing to allow a 5-foot-tall chain link fence or are you saying that there's a practical difficulty? I am reading what Ms. Weber instructed the BZA and she instructed them as to practical difficulty. Are you saying that there is a practical difficulty or that we ignore that standard?

Mr. Murphy stated, I don't know how high a deer can jump but they clearly mentioned that they have had a lot of their shrubs and things that they have planted eaten from there so I think them wanting a 5-foot fence isn't unreasonable in regards when we can have a 6-foot board-on-board fence and only a 4-foot chain link fence I think that if that's going to be helpful and them living in Mayfield Village, I don't think that there's anything wrong with that.

Mayor Bodnar stated, I understand what you are saying but I would ask if Ms. Calta maybe send out an e-mail ahead of the next meeting explaining the practical difficulty standard. Because if

you don't want that standard and are wondering whether we should change our ordinances I am not saying whether that's right or wrong, but as long as we have that standard.

Mr. Murphy stated, I agree and I think that goes back to this ordinance from what I know doesn't make much sense to me so I think it's something that needs to be revisited and revamped in order to do that but I don't think because we have an out-of-date ordinance or one that doesn't make sense to me and maybe others should preclude them from having a 5-foot chain link fence when they could have a 6-foot board-on-board. There's cost differences in a 6-foot board-on-board fence versus a chain link fence. It's in their backyard and things like that.

Ms. Calta stated, I think deer can go over 6 feet.

Mayor Bodnar stated, everybody has an opinion but I think we have to hold ourselves to the legal standard. That's all I was saying. If that's a problem we have to address that problem. If the standard is practical difficulty, then I think we need a better handle even on what that is and then we can apply it.

Ms. Calta stated, I think there's kind of two tracks here. There's the appeal but then it sounds like you are also saying maybe we need to review the fence because when you see, and I don't know Dan that you shared this with Katie but I will take a look also. When you start seeing the same variances come forward repeatedly, that typically is the time to say, hey, we should look at this. But it is not necessarily indicative that you should revise the ordinance, but it makes sense to review it to see if there are appropriate revisions to be made. I think you are kind of saying one thing and Mayor you are looking at the appeal from the standpoint of the legal standard and then the other is to see if there is a conversation to be had about looking at it.

Mayor Bodnar stated, if we should allow a 5-foot fence?

Ms. Calta replied, yes.

Mr. Murphy stated, I would hate for it to go to Council and a month or two months later you can have a 5-foot chain link fence. I think it needs to be looked at. It's just my opinion. I am just getting it out there. I want Council to know. Hopefully everybody can review the Minutes when they get them if they have not already.

Mr. Russell stated, the standard for chain link in our community is 4 feet. Usually they put a board-on-board fence versus a 5-foot chain link fence. It's kind of out of the ordinary. This is the first time I have ever had a variance on those in 25 years.

Mr. Williams asked, Mr. Murphy, are you saying the only way to get into this yard by a deer is to jump over the fence? There's no other entry points for a deer? They are jumping the fence to eat his food?

Mr. Murphy replied, not currently. There's no fence back there. They are looking, and Dan, correct me if I'm wrong, they want to box in their backyard.

Mayor Bodnar stated, Mr. Williams, this is something that I personally experienced. I have seen a deer stand next to a 4-foot-tall chain link fence that was blocking its entry into where it wanted to go and if the deer had walked 10 more feet, there was an open gate where the deer can get into the area and the deer just jumps over the fence.

Ms. Calta stated, I will get all of the information out to Council. We will invite the applicant to the next meeting along with anyone else who would like to speak in favor or in opposition. If there are any other questions, just let me know. I will talk to Dan and Katie about the applications they have seen fence-wise and maybe we can make some recommendations also at that next meeting.

Council President Schutt stated, sounds good. Thank you. I look forward to getting the additional information and then discussing it further on August 15<sup>th</sup>. Thank you, Ms. Calta, Mayor Bodnar, Mr. Russell and Councilmen Williams and Murphy, for your comments. Are there any other matters to come before Council this evening?

Mr. Wynne asked, Council President?

Council President Schutt replied, yes.

Mr. Wynne stated, I am not going to be at the Council meeting in a couple of weeks to talk about the Finance Report so I wanted to give you some brief updates on the income tax numbers just for your information. And there's no surprises here. It's everything that we expected but I just wanted to give you some current numbers.

Through today, refunds for a stay-at-home person is at the \$1.1 million mark. So, when you get your July Finance Report which I am working on, the year-to-date numbers for income taxes in that report will reflect \$486,000 of that \$1.1 million. Our August numbers which are the numbers from RITA for their July activity so I know what's going to happen in August already are going to reflect \$353,000 of that \$1.1 million in refunds which will leave about \$200,000-\$250,000 which we will see either in September or subsequent months depending on how quickly they process them. I am starting to see the amount of request activity for refunds starting to taper off. They are starting to wind down.

I knew coming in and I mentioned this to the Mayor that June through September are going to be our toughest months from a financial standpoint. We are our busiest. Everything is going on in the Village. We do a lot more spending with pool operations and seasonal personnel. In June you saw our General Fund decrease by \$455,000. In the July report you are going to get, the decrease is going to be about \$800,000. That's a combination of the income tax situation as well as the fact that July had three pay periods. Two months during the year we have three payrolls, July and December. So, in July we got hit with the three pays and the refund situation. I would estimate the August decrease to the General Fund, and September also depending upon timing, to be anywhere in the \$500,000-\$750,000 range. Once we get out of that time period, refunds should be pretty much wrapped up which will bring us back to a little bit of normalcy but that

will be the impact for the balance of the summer. If anyone has any questions on that, let me know. I just wanted to give you a brief update on that since I will not be here in a couple of weeks.

Council President Schutt asked, any questions for Mr. Wynne?

There were none.

Mr. Murphy stated, thanks Ron.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Mr. Wynne. Hopefully you are doing something fun on your time away.

Mr. Wynne stated, thanks.

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other matters to come before Council this evening?

There were none.

There being no further matters, the meeting concluded at 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Betsa, MMC  
Clerk of Council