

DRAFT
MINUTES OF A COUNCIL CAUCUS
Mayfield Village Civic Hall – Mayfield Village Civic Center
Monday, June 6, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

The Council of Mayfield Village met in Caucus Session on Monday, June 6, 2022. Council President Schutt called the meeting to order at 7:00 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, Chief Carcioppolo,
Chief Matias, Mr. Cappello, Mr. Marquart, Mr. McAviney,
Mr. Russell, Mr. Sipos, Ms. Wolgamuth and Ms. Garbo

Absent: Mrs. Betsa (excused)

Council President Schutt stated, good evening everyone and welcome to the June Council Caucus meeting for Mayfield Village, Ohio. Today is Mon, June 6, 2022, it is 7:00 p.m.

PENDING LEGISLATION

- **Ordinance No. 2022-06**, entitled, “An ordinance adjusting the compensation of the Mayor and submitting same to the electorate for approval by majority vote.” (First Reading May 16, 2022).

Council President Schutt stated, since we’ve had some discussions on all three of these, we’ll go through each one of these individually. Are there any questions or further discussion regarding Ordinance No. 2022-06?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-06 will be moved to second reading at our Council meeting on June 20, 2022. The names of Council Members Williams and Meyers have been added as sponsors of this Ordinance.

- **Ordinance No. 2022-07**, entitled, “An ordinance adjusting the compensation of the President of Council and members of Council and submitting same to the electorate for approval by majority vote.” (First Reading May 16, 2022).

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other questions or discussion on Ordinance No. 2022-07?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-07 will be moved to second reading at our Council meeting on June 20, 2022. The names of Council Members Williams and Meyers have also been added as sponsors of this Ordinance as well.

- **Ordinance No. 2022-08**, entitled, “An ordinance increasing, as of January 1, 2024, the annual compensation of the Mayor, President of Council and members of Council by 2.5% and submitting same to the electorate for approval by majority vote.” (First Reading May 16, 2022).

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other questions or further discussion on Ordinance No. 2022-08?

Mr. Williams stated, I think it would be really important for us as Council to be on one accord when we vote on this next month. I’m not trying to say let’s coordinate or conspire or anything, but I think it would be very important to show a level of unity. For some reason these two Ordinances 07 & 08 at the moment strike me as we’re not united. Since our last conversation, it was evident that we weren’t united. I think we should try to get there if possible, to have consensus on how this is presented to the public in the future. I’m open for possible discussion, and offer as a recommendation to eliminate 2022-07 and get behind 2022-08 as a way to move forward and create compromise.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Councilman Williams. Does anybody have anything to add to Councilman Williams comments?

Mrs. Juncisek asked, are you saying to eliminate 2022-07 completely and it would just be the two Ordinances 2022-06 & 2022-08?

Mr. Williams replied, yes.

Mrs. Juncisek stated, I can understand and get behind that.

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other comments or discussion regarding any of these three Ordinances?

Mr. Murphy stated, based on my discussions and my stance of a couple of meetings ago, I would be okay eliminating 2022-07 as well.

Mr. Arndt stated, I could back that as well.

Mr. Meyers asked, all this is for is to put it on the ballot, right? So why would we want to eliminate it, it’s for the voters to decide, not us, it’s only to put it on the ballot.

Mr. Arndt stated, I actually had a resident reach out to me regarding this through e-mail. They looked through it and it was very confusing to them. I tried to relay as much as I could through e-

mail. I asked them to give me a call so I could get a little more in depth with them to make their mind as ease of how to read it and what to look at. So I could see that having three on there would be confusing for the residents.

Mr. Meyers stated, that's why in the beginning I suggested that it should be done as one Ordinance, the Mayor, Council and if we were going to do the percentage of the raise over time for the cost of living. That's why it was suggested that way by me and I was pretty adamant about it. You split stuff up, it's more to read, more for people to think about. That's my stand on it.

Mr. Williams stated, if I remember correctly, we didn't want to jeopardize 2022-06 by adding complexity to it. I think that was the primary reason for separating them. I agree with Councilman Arndt that this presentation can be confusing. I hear what you're saying Councilman Meyers, but if I'm hearing you correctly we would just condense what we see here down to one and it's confusing enough as separate Ordinances. Again, I opened up with in the spirit of being united when we vote on this next month.

Mr. Murphy stated, I may be in the minority, but I think combining 06 & 08 would be more confusing. I'm a bullet point kind of guy, so when you start throwing in the Mayor's increase and then the 2.5% increase for Council too, I think it would be more confusing doing it all as one.

Mrs. Jursisek stated, I would have to agree with Councilman Murphy. If you eliminate 2022-07, 2022-06 & 2022-08 is very straight forward, I feel like there's no overlapping of information and it's easier to read. Mark brought up a good point, a resident reached out to me as well from the new development on Highland trying to get the background information. The biggest question was would taxes be increased because of this. I think it'll take a lot of education and information to the residents to assure them that it won't. I feel like it's a little bit more straight forward being separate.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments or discussion?

Mr. Arndt stated, I agree with the separate part as well. At least give the residents an option and making sure the end-all be-all goal being the Mayor getting her raise. That's what I'm interested in seeing.

Council President Schutt stated, I could definitely see it being confusing if you add 06 & 08 together and not 07. If it was all combined, it would have to be all three in my opinion. But then also as Councilman Meyers mentioned, we're really not voting on giving ourselves a raise or the Mayor a raise, it's strictly to put it on the ballot for the voters to decide. By having it in all three, they have their voice to vote however they want. If they feel that the Mayor deserves a raise and Council doesn't, they can vote that way. Or if they feel that 06 & 07 makes sense but 08 doesn't, they can vote that way as well. The way I look at it and the way I feel is, it's our responsibility to put it out for our residents and for them to make the decision. It's really not our decision, we're just putting it on the ballot. The positive is we have another 1 ½ months to kick this around a

little bit before we have to make a decision and vote on it. I also agree with Councilman Williams that it would make sense to try to go forward united and all on the same page in going forward together. Those are my comments.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments or discussion?

Mr. Williams stated, right now we have three Ordinances, to combine them would eliminate these three and create one, are we past that point?

Council President Schutt asked, Ms. Calta would you want to chime in on that?

Ms. Calta replied, I certainly can. We did 1st Reading in May, we're set for 2nd Reading in June, 3rd Reading in July. If you made changes, ultimately you'd have to suspend the rules to not have actually three readings because you've made those changes. You can amend it before the 2nd Reading and then not have to read a second time. But you're still looking at trying to get this to the Board of Elections Aug 10th. You could also call a Special Meeting if you wanted to do that.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments, questions or discussion?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-08 will be moved to second reading at our Council meeting on June 20, 2022. Council Member Meyers has been added as a sponsor of this Ordinance.

Council President Schutt stated, that ends our pending legislation. Next up, Mayor Bodnar, do you have any comments this evening?

MAYOR

Mayor Bodnar stated, thank you Council President, just a couple of things. I just wanted to give a shout out to Mary Singer as well as to Shane McAviney in the Rec Department for putting on a wonderful Memorial Day Service this year. I think we had the best weather we've had in a long time and everything went off very very smoothly. Also thanks to Councilman Mark Arndt who did the Master of Ceremonies, you did us all proud Mark, you did a great job, thank you for that. Also finally thank you to Chief Carcioppolo and the Mayfield Village Fire Dept, I think you must have had 2/3 of the Fire Dept employees there with you that day, at least it looked like that. Everybody was there and the speakers were listed, so we appreciate that, thank you.

One final thing, I know that Council President usually has the honors of calling out birthdays but I was afraid that maybe he would forget his own. Happy Birthday to Steve Schutt who has a birthday coming up the middle of this month. A very happy birthday to you.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Mayor Bodnar and thank you for your comments as well.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Council President Schutt stated, I'd like to welcome back Councilman Al Meyers, glad to see you back in person.

Also, please keep Mrs. Betsa in your thoughts and prayers as she continues to recover from her surgery.

The next Regular Meeting of Council is scheduled for Monday, June 20 at 7:00 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

Administration

- **Permanent Stormwater Easement at 6213 North Woodlane Drive**

Ms. Wolgamuth stated, thank you Council President. The first item is the Permanent Stormwater Easement at 6213 N. Woodlane Dr. As expected now that the house there has been razed, we did that in anticipation of increasing the floodplain in that area as part of the Worton Pk Culvert Project. Now that the house is down, the Sewer District is looking to deed the property to the Village and place a permanent easement there to ensure that it stays as a floodplain. We have a draft of those documents and we'll have them finalized for the next meeting. Thank you.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Ms. Wolgamuth.

Finance Dept

- **Update on Photo Enforcement Program Revenue**

Mr. Wynne stated, just a quick update on the Photo Enforcement Program. Last month we received several public records requests regarding the statistics on the program. At the same time, we did our own media release on what those statistics were.

In summary, through April 30, our fines totaling \$303,205 had been collected, and of that amount the Village received \$186,000. Through the end of May, just updated for one month, the fines totaling \$449,875 had been collected, and the Village's portion of that is \$276,083. As a reminder, all of that money goes into the Capital Improvement Fund primarily to help with the Police expenses. To date, Council has approved \$211,000 for the purchase of four squad cars this

year and also \$12,000 for the Automatic License Plate Readers that are being installed. So that's what those funds are being used for.

- **Property/Liability Insurance Renewal**

Mr. Wynne stated, our next item is our renewal for Property & Liability Insurance, it came in from Wichert Ins. The renewal premium for 2022-2023 is \$140,152 which is about a 7% increase over last years. The increase is two sections, a portion that relates to our Property/Auto had about a 4% increase. The largest increase came from our Cyber/Crime Policy at 34% increase, which per our broker says it's actually a very good increase, he said most of what they're seeing is in the 50% - 60% premium increase with companies trying to renew if they don't have the proper controls in place which we did put in place last year. They said this type of increase is kind of hard to accept, it's much better than what the market is currently passing on to this.

One thing I've asked our broker to do is similar to what we have for our health insurance, we have the consortium at BORMA. For Property & Liability Insurance there's a consortium called NORMA (Northern Ohio Risk Management Assoc), and most of the cities in the area are part of that group. We did look at it back in 2018 or 2019 I think and at that time it was still more cost effective to be on our own versus part of the consortium. I did ask them to take a look at that again for us and give us a quote. That will on the agenda for the June meeting to compare the quote. If we decide to move in with them, it's an October 1st entry date. I should have more information about quoting from them in the next month or two.

- **Alternative Tax Budget for 2023**

Mr. Wynne stated, the last item is the Alternative Tax Budget, this is something we have to pass this time every year for County purposes. This is due to the County by July 15. It pretty much lays out the temporary budget for next year. Primarily they want to see how we want our property tax revenue split between our different funds. I'll be working on that, with the July 15 due date to the County and the timing of our July house meeting, I would think we're going to need a special meeting at July Caucus in order to pass this so I could get it into the County in time for the deadline period. That's all I have, are there any questions?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Mr. Wynne.

Law Dept

- **Lease Agreement for 6532 White Road**

Ms. Calta stated, thank you very much Mr. President. I have two items. The first is a lease agreement for 6532 White Rd. This is one of the properties that the Village owns. It's been used by the School District for at least the last 10 years. They are no longer in need of that house and

someone in the Administration is. They've asked to see if it's available for lease on a short term basis this summer. This lease is being put together for that rental. That will start I believe July 1st and last for a couple of months and it's for Mr. Marquart. We had Mr. Wynne consult with the Village's realtor whose handled other properties for us.

Mr. Wynne replied yes, she's a Village resident who is a realtor and we've used her for other houses that we've sold.

Ms. Calta continued, she was able to evaluate the condition of the building to come up with the monthly price of \$1,400 a month. There's a little bit of work that needs to be done between the Service and Building Department that would be required for any tenant for us to rent it out. I'm not sure of the long term plans for the property but this is a short term use. We'll bring that forward, the lease is consistent with previous leases that have been entered into. I think there was one last year or the year before for another property on White Rd, so you'll see that the lease is very similar.

Mr. Meyers asked, how long is the lease?

Ms. Calta replied, it's month to month. John, do you want to jump in?

Mr. Marquart replied, 3 months, possibly 4 depending on progress construction of my next home.

Ms. Calta asked, any questions?

There was none.

- **Amendment to Codified Ordinance Section 1149.02 Conditional Use Permits**

Ms. Calta stated, the other item is the conditional use permits, this is section 1149.02. You may remember we thought we were ready to move it forward to Council a few months back, but we pulled it back to take a closer look at it, we attached the draft of it. I think the most interesting thing to me in the new draft versus the existing, it kind of jumps out to see that not only has it been clarified that we don't have Special Uses, Temporary Uses & Conditional Uses, we now have Conditional Uses only. We have a very comprehensive section that addresses the authority to grant the uses, the purposes, who is entitled to them, what's included in the application. We have the request for public hearing, the actions by Planning Commission, the actions by Council, the standards that are all considered for Conditional Uses which used to be guidelines, now they're set forth in this section. It's much more comprehensive, I think it's from soup to nuts. It talks about revocation, modification, the timing has changed also. This did go through Planning Commission, it's almost ready to get to Council. Like I said, we walked it back a little bit to fine tune it, now it's ready to move forward. I believe it has the blessing of everyone after a few rounds, from Economic Development, to Building, to Administration, I think we even ran it by Police and Fire. That's all I have.

Council President Schutt asked, any questions for Ms. Calta?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Ms. Calta.

Engineer Dept

- **Updates to Stormwater Ordinances**

Mr. Cappello stated, as part of our updated five year what we call a SWAMP (Stormwater Management Plan), they require that three of our stormwater ordinances be updated. It includes the Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Ordinance, our Comprehensive Stormwater Management Ordinance, and our Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. There're some minor changes, I'll work with Diane to get those in your packets next week.

Council President Schutt asked, any questions?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you Mr. Cappello.

Recreation Dept

- **2022 Entertainment Series Sound Contract**

Mr. McAviney stated, thank you Council President. You guys might recognize that we had this contract a few months back. Unfortunately and sadly our sound man passed away two weeks ago. So I've been working with options of securing the sound for the Grove. Right now I've been working with Bob Myers who was part of the light portion of the company, securing the right documentation, insurance and stuff like that. I also secured two other quotes from two other contractors, so we do have Plan B & Plan C. Plan B is much more cost effective than Plan C, so hopefully we don't get past Plan B, hopefully we stay with Plan A. We'll be going to Council for approval of the P.O., it's a little bit less because of Memorial Day, we covered the sound in house.

Also, remember that Cruise Night is Saturday from 3 – 7 pm. Hopefully the weather stays nice and we get a lot of attendance.

Council President Schutt asked, any questions?

There was none.

Council President stated, thank you Mr. McAviney.

ANY OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE COUNCIL

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

- **Parkview Pool Project**

Mr. Cappello stated, yes Council President. The Parkview Pool project is completed. During the project they came across some piping that was not showing in the right place on the drawings, plus some of the piping was actually just underneath the concrete. We did go over the award amount, the original contract amount was \$204,540, the final amount is \$211,665. The change order will be for \$7,125. I'll work with Ron and get you all that information, there were other items involved, we had some contingency money in there. At the end of the day, I think the project turned out well. Scott could speak to water loss at this point.

Mr. Sipos stated, we went from the previous year's losing probably a good 1' of water over night to losing 1" now. We rectified the problem in our eyes. There are some other minor leaks, some evaporation with use of the pool as well that we lose water from, but I think we've fixed the majority of the problem.

Council President Schutt asked, any question for Mr. Cappello or Mr. Sipos?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you both for that. I agree that is a huge improvement from losing 12" a day to 1" and can attest to evaporation and kids jumping in the pool. Thank you for that. Are there any other matters that come before Council this evening?

- **Photo Enforcement Program**

Mr. Meyers stated, I have some questions for our Police Chief. On Friday, I got a call about an Officer on Highland Rd. bridge doing the photo enforcement. They wanted to know how that's going to slow people down if they don't know they're getting their picture taken. A question came about that it was supposed to be to slow people down, not for revenue. They couldn't understand how people if they're getting their picture taken and they have no idea, even though they're speeding how that helps slow people down.

Chief Matias replied, the idea of the program is to give the overall mindset that when you come through Mayfield Village, if you speed, you're going to get a ticket. I would say most of the people who receive them no matter where we're at aren't aware that they're getting their picture taken, that's the whole point. The people that pass us on the freeway, I don't think they realize it either because they're not paying attention or whatever. Again, it's to try to give that mindset that we're doing the program and whether you see the Officer or not, you should slow down.

Mr. Meyers asked, have you done any statistics lately as to speed to see if it's working or if it's not working?

Chief Matias replied, I do statistics all the time but there's not enough information to say it for sure.

Mr. Meyers stated, so basically it's about the money.

Chief Matias replied, I'm sorry you feel that way Mr. Meyers, again I've been very clear that if it was about the money we'd operate it a lot differently. I don't think it's okay for people to be speeding at the rate they're doing up there. Our choice is to ignore it which I don't think is acceptable or to try to do something about it. If anybody has any other suggestions, I'm more than open to them. Also, I don't think it's a good idea to risk our Officers being hurt up on the freeway trying to do enforcement during rush hour. They just did a story that so far this year, almost 90 ODOT crews have been hit on the side of the road, I'm trying to avoid that. I don't know what we're doing wrong, we're just enforcing our Ordinances but using technology to do it differently. And all of our fines, or all of our deterrents are based on revenue. So if we write somebody a regular ticket, that's okay? But if we do a photo enforcement somehow they're a victim? I don't understand the difference, it's all revenue based, that's the deterrent.

Mr. Meyers asked, is that an accountable ticket, do they get points? A photo ticket is about the money, they don't get any points.

Chief Matias replied, I'm sorry you feel that way, but I disagree with you. I'm not going to argue with you.

Mr. Meyers asked, you disagree with me?

Chief Matias replied, I disagree that this isn't all about the revenue. What else should we do?

Mr. Meyers stated, the first thing you brought to our attention was this is to help slow people down on 1-271 because they're going over 100 mph, you brought us statistics but you never brought us anything else after that to show us that this will slow people down.

Chief Matias replied, the program's only been going for 6 months.

Mr. Meyers asked, you can't do statistics from the state cameras like you did in the beginning to show that this is definitely working?

Chief Matias replied, the state cameras aren't providing speed data right now, there's nothing I can do about that.

Mr. Meyers stated, it was supposed to slow people down, that was the object of these cameras. I haven't seen anything that shows people are slowing down with the amount of money that's

coming in. Am I wrong in saying that? If it was \$20,000, not \$300,000, it'd be a different story. I'm just asking.

Chief Matias replied, I don't understand what you're asking, but I think we've been pretty clear about why we're doing the program and what it's goals are.

Mr. Murphy stated, I thought when we first talked about this it was to make sure that people can see the Officer to say hey, they're taking radar here so that it gives people the chance to slow down in Mayfield Village. I thought it was a Cleveland.com article that said there were a lot of break lights. So Chief to your point saying they might not see you when they're in between the express lanes and the regular lanes, I think they do see the Officer and I think they are slowing down. I just learned tonight that they're on top of the bridge which I think is a bit deceiving in my opinion. I've heard from multiple people, it's just a money grab, it's just a money grab. Being on top of the bridge, I claim to agree that it is turning into more of a money grab than the safety.

Mr. Arndt asked, are you looking at this kind of like the Linndale affect?

Chief Matias replied, just so this doesn't turn into a whole discussion, we just started trying it from the bridge very recently. 90% of the enforcement we've done has been on the roadway. I have no problem, I'll have the Officers stop doing it from the bridge. But it hasn't made any difference, we still are generating the same amount of citations when the people drive right past the Officers. I went up there myself personally I think the Friday before Memorial Day, I sat up there for an hour in the morning, I was in one of our marked SUV's at Highland Rd just sitting right out in the open so everyone could see me. I still got 16 tickets after people blew by. The fact that they see us, that's been my whole point, they don't care. We're trying to use a deterrent of the fines which is used for every type of citation we write whether it's a photo or not to try to get that mindset so people slow down when they're coming through town. I have no problem, I'll stop doing it from the bridge. What I'm saying is, it won't matter.

Mr. Murphy stated, I feel better about a ticket being written if a guy blows by you and he sees you right on the side of the road rather than us hiding up on a bridge and no one even has a chance to slow down.

Chief Matias stated, I don't know if it matters or not, but we've done bridge enforcement way before we did the photo enforcement. That's not that uncommon for municipalities to have somebody with a laser in a fixed position and then a radio down in the car and do traffic stops. Like I said, if Council would feel more comfortable if we did it from the roadway, we'll do it from the roadway.

Mayor Bodnar stated, for what it's worth, if I can chime in for just a minute. This was more than 35 years ago I was coming home from Downtown Cleveland, I was late for an appointment and I got a speeding ticket on Route 2 in Cleveland. I think I may have been the only person to ever have gotten a speeding ticket from Cleveland Police. I had no idea I was clocked on radar until I saw flashing lights behind me. There was no warning for me, I didn't see the Police car, he was

in traffic behind me. The point of it is I had to pay a hefty fine for that speeding ticket. Once I got that fine, it had a very strong deterrent affect on me. I was much more careful driving after I got that ticket. So even though I didn't see the Police car, I didn't know I was going to get the ticket until I was pulled over. The fact that I got the ticket and I had to pay that fine had a deterrent affect for what's it's worth going forward. I think if you have to pay a fine because you were speeding, you're going to think twice about speeding the next time.

Chief Matias stated, one more thing in case everybody doesn't know, I asked ODOT if we could install signs on the freeway to let people know as they approach Mayfield Village that we're doing photo enforcement, they have the signs, it's in the Uniform Traffic Control Manual. ODOT replied to me, I have a letter saying because the ORC doesn't require it, we're not going to allow you to do it. I tried to make it so that it would be more visible, but I'm not able to. You can't put anything on the freeway without ODOT's permission.

Mr. Meyers stated, but if it's a stationary camera.

Chief Matias replied, which you can't put on a freeway.

Mr. Meyers asked, no stationary cameras on a freeway?

Chief Matias replied, no. If we put them out here on SOM, yes you could put signs up.

Mr. Murphy stated, from what I've heard, I've heard it's working. I work with a couple guys that come in from Lake County everyday to Cuyahoga County and they can tell the difference when you're going through Mayfield Village that people have slowed down.

Mr. Arndt stated, it's building a reputation to slow down, that's why I brought the Linndale thing up. Everybody knows if you're driving through a stretch of freeway in Linndale, you know to slow down. That's what's going to take time, that reputation. I think it's worth it.

Council President Schutt asked, did you have something to add Chief Carcioppolo?

Chief Carcioppolo stated, I just wanted to dovetail onto a lot of the different comments that I've heard. I would agree that if you do get a ticket, no matter what it is and you're fined, that is a deterrent to keep you from doing it again. As far as on or off the bridge, the point is people shouldn't be speeding because it's hazardous, the speed limits are set for certain reasons. If they're only given tickets at 16 mph over the posted speed limit, that's considerably faster than what the safety recommendations are for that stretch of road. Onto what Paul says, the biggest issue with being on the freeway is how dangerous it is. Whether it's Police, Fire, ODOT personnel, that's the most dangerous thing we do consistently here, is go up on the freeway. I get people don't like the fact that they're getting a picture taken or whatever. There're no points that go along with it, maybe there should be a push to put points behind it. It's your car, you can argue that you weren't driving it, but someone was operating your vehicle at this hazardous pace, 100 mph over is really detrimental to everyone's safety, everyone on the road and then all the people that have to go up and deal with the fallout from that. I think protecting our own is

something that we should be considering as a more positive. We had two cruisers get hit this year, thank God no one was hurt. If you have one guy hurt very badly, how much is that going to cost the Village in terms of trying to make up his position or God forbid if he was killed, now you have a widow, a family. It's just people should try to follow the rules. I had one speeding ticket in my life and it was from a camera in East Cleveland. I was doing 26 mph in a 20 mph. I wasn't happy about it, I paid it and I moved on. I didn't even realize I was in a school zone. I try to follow the speed limits all the time, I'm not saying that I never speed, but when you're looking at it from a safety perspective trying to keep our guys safe and not engage in a traffic stop or even just being parked up on the freeway is dangerous. I think looking at everything from a safety perspective, seems to be a better way instead of as a punitive thing. I think if you frame it differently, it might not be such a negative thing.

Mr. Williams stated Chief, I don't think Council as a whole is saying stop taking pictures from the bridge.

Chief Matias replied, thank you Mr. Williams, I appreciate that.

Mr. Williams stated, I got stuck in a parade in Downtown Cleveland Saturday, traffic was stopped going certain ways, so I had to make a U-Turn. In making my U-Turn I made a right turn on red at the same time, next thing I know they were right behind me. They were watching, he let me off the hook, but he made a point of saying "follow the signs" which I didn't do because I was frustrated being stuck in this traffic. But he was right, follow the signs, follow the law.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments or questions for Chief Matias?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you everyone for the comments and discussion. Are there any other matters that come before Council this evening?

There was none.

There being no further matters, the meeting concluded at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Garbo
Acting Clerk of Council