

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2019 - 7:30 P.M.  
MAYOR WILLIAM G. KOONS PRESIDING**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Canton, Carroll, Galicki, Nairn, Porter

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Schloss

**OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Fiscal Officer Romanowski, Fiscal Auditor Lechman, Solicitor Matheney, Engineer Haibach

**VISITORS:** Heidi Baumgart, Paw Paw Lake; Michael Brent, Hazelwood Dr.; Matt Brett, Lakeview Lane

Mayor called the Regular Council meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Fiscal Officer read the roll. Carroll made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 8, 2019 Public Hearing on the Zoning Code change for the definition of “streamer”, seconded by Porter. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried. Regarding the April 8, 2019 Regular Council meeting, Canton stated that on page 8, under the Property Committee section, the minutes should be corrected to read that the memorial trees would sell for \$650 and not \$600 as reflected in the minutes. Carroll made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Nairn. Voice vote - ayes, all.

Matt Brett spoke to Council about the Building Department. He stated that six to eight years ago, the continued operation of the Building Department was addressed when Dave Hocevar retired. Brett stated that the Building Department had an expense to it that was offset with revenues associated with permits and contractor registrations. Those statistics changed somewhat with the status of building in the Village. He advised that the delta was about \$50,000 and it would go up and down by approximately \$10,000. It was also determined that the Village would still be required to have a Zoning Department regardless of whether the Building Department remained open or was closed. Brett advised that the Village’s zoning was complex, and it would be important for the Zoning Inspector to be well versed. There was the potential of utilizing the county services and/or outsourcing the work. However, what struck Brett and Council at that time was in taking the perspective of the residents, the Building Department had a value to the residents, as a resource for guidance and protection. He felt that this was difficult to quantify but would not be present if the Village transitioned to county services or an outsourced resource. Brett welcomed questions from Council as the process continued.

**MAYOR’S REPORT:** The Mayor shared an email from a visitor to South Russell who complemented the quality of South Russell Village roads in wintertime. He added that she was also present when the Village allowed the Jaycee’s to utilize the Park for the Circus and provided positive feedback. He also reminded Council that Bryan Kostura would be attending the June 2019 Council meeting. Additionally, the Mayor relayed that the First Energy tour would be Thursday, May 23, and interested Council members should RSVP. The Mayor stated the Velosano bicycle race would take place on July 21-22 and would involve Snyder and Bell Roads.

**FISCAL OFFICER:** The Fiscal Officer distributed her monthly report to Mayor and Council. She called Council's attention to the Auburn Heating and Air Conditioning contract as well as a side door repair estimate and asked whether Council wanted to approve them. Porter stated that the Property Committee would be handling these two requests. He questioned the request for JL's services, and the Fiscal Officer advised she did not know the source other than having received it from the Building Department. Porter did not know anything about it either. He suggested waiting until the Building Committee met.

The Fiscal Officer reported that the Village tried Paychex Time Tracking, and it did not work. The system was too complex with the different pay schedules in the Village and the technical support was lacking. She advised that the Village would go back to using Google Time Sheets. The Fiscal Officer further stated that the Village would be switching to a biweekly payroll in the fall. She wanted employees to have three months' notice of this change so that they could adjust child support, direct deposit, etc.

The Mayor stated that April was a record month for CCA Income Tax at \$132,000.

**FISCAL AUDITOR:** The Fiscal Auditor distributed his report for the month ending March 31, 2019. The fund balances matched the Fiscal Officer's to the penny. The balances increased and were up \$133,000 for the month and up \$410,000 for the year, which he added was not uncommon for the time of year because of the receipt of real estate tax money. The quarterly Cable Franchise Fee was received with three more expected.

The Fiscal Auditor reported that the State Audit was broader in its scope and the questions were significantly more detailed than in the past. As a result, he speculated that the bill would be higher and that the auditors would find some issues. He was aware that the Fiscal Officer was having a similar experience. She concurred that the audit had been intense.

Brett commented that having the State Auditor come in and put the Fiscal Officer and Fiscal Auditor through the paces helped to avoid the incidences of fraud that had occurred in neighboring communities.

**FINANCE COMMITTEE:** Nairn reported that the Finance Committee met April 19, at 8:00 a.m. Regarding the Tax Board of Review, the Fiscal Officer put an ad in the paper and extended the deadline. Two individuals, Vince Massa and former Mayor Brett volunteered. Nairn made a motion to approve Vince Massa and Matt Brett to the Tax Board of Review for the years 2019 and 2020, seconded by Carroll. Voice vote – ayes, all.

Nairn addressed the draft of a letter submitted by Ike Tripp for individuals who had indicated they would be giving donations for benches and trees in the South Russell Village (SRV) Park.

She also reported the Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council (NOPEC) grant for the Fall Festival had been approved and the Village could expect to receive the money in the coming months. The grant for the Service Building generator was also approved, and the Village should receive \$15,217 in the next few days.

Regarding the Paychex system, Nairn stated it was a learning experience and ultimately identified ways to internally track data and address issues in the future.

The 2020 Tax Budget process would begin in May.

Nairn also reported that the rental house was discussed. The March rent was not paid until April 17 and the April rent had not been received.

Nairn addressed tuition cost and reimbursement of Village employees for classes, training, etc. in the amount of \$2,000 per year. Nairn stated that there was a tuition cost of \$2,700 for the Mayor on the Bills List and asked Council how this would be paid. She further questioned whether there was a policy for reimbursing elected officials for training and courses.

The Mayor stated there was nothing in the handbook other than that a full-time employee who registered for classes must inform Council ahead of time for approval. When the class had been completed and providing the employee had achieved a "B" or better, the Village would reimburse the employee. He added that he and the Fiscal Officer previously attended the Cleveland State Leadership Academy, and prior to attending, Council discussed and approved the tuition.

Carroll asked how long the program lasted. The Mayor stated 19 Wednesdays from May through February. Carroll clarified that it ended in 2020. Carroll asked the Mayor what would happen if the Mayor was not reelected. The Mayor stated he was not worried about this. Porter asked what would happen if the Mayor received a "C" in the course, and the Mayor said there were no grades. He would become a Certified Public Manager. Porter asked if the Mayor would be required to reimburse the Village if he did not attend enough classes to receive the certificate. The Fiscal Auditor asked if it was a bonified business expense and if it was appropriate. Carroll suggested that the use of the Mayor's Discretionary Fund would be most appropriate. If he then required more money for his Discretionary Account, he could approach Council and ask for it.

Nairn recalled the concern of Kate Jacob McClain at the previous Council meeting regarding the use of tax payer monies by elected officials for the Elected Officials Conference in Washington D.C. She was concerned with how this expenditure of tax payer funds might be viewed. Canton stated that if Council must approve the expenditure before the classes and there would be a benefit to the Village, he would support it.

Galicki relayed that he had questioned the Mayor about the availability of the educational opportunities for Council, and the Mayor was supportive of taking advantage of courses. Regarding funding, however, he questioned whether Council members would have the same opportunity as the Mayor. He asked what the source of the funds would be. Canton asked whether the Ohio Boot Camp that he, Nairn, Carroll, and the Fiscal Officer attended was funded by a grant. The Fiscal Officer said it was. Galicki stated that he was currently participating in the Leadership Geauga Program, which he self-funded for approximately \$1,000. Canton reiterated that if it were something that would benefit the Village, had a realistic cost, and was approved by Council, it would be a good thing for the Village. Carroll stated that there was not a good policy for elected officials. In the past when an opportunity had become available, it was presented to Council ahead of time to ascertain interest. He stated that absent a good policy, use of the Mayor's Discretionary Fund would be the most appropriate funding source. He added that advance notice to Council of the Mayor's desire to participate in the program would have been helpful. Porter stated that the Elected Official Conference was a budgeted event. He said that if the course work improved his ability to be the Mayor, then he would see it as an appropriate expenditure and Council should approve it. Porter

added that there might be money in the training budget. The Fiscal Officer stated that there was money in the General Fund for education, but it was for tuition reimbursement and for two people to attend the Elected Official's Conference. Carroll suggested determining training opportunities that would be beneficial to Council and then budgeting for them. Carroll reiterated that the Mayor's Discretionary Fund would be the best source for his tuition since it was set aside for the Mayor to use as he saw fit and for Village purposes. Porter stated he supported the use of the funds and asked when the tuition was due. The Mayor stated he did not know because he had just received the email with little notice. The Mayor asked if Council wanted to change the account from which the money would be taken. Carroll asked the Mayor if he would take issue with including a caveat that if he were not reelected, which was possible, that there would be a reimbursement. The Fiscal Auditor questioned whether the Village placed this requirement on employees who utilized tuition reimbursement, and the Fiscal Officer explained that it does. The Fiscal Auditor pointed out that if the Mayor were not reelected, it would not be by choice. He questioned whether Council could then make him pay back the tuition. He further suggested that if the Mayor resigned voluntarily, Council would want reimbursement. Carroll concurred. Canton stated that in other words, the Village had no policy on this, and suggested Council work on one. Carroll made a motion that the Mayor use his Discretionary Fund to pay for the program for which he had applied at Cleveland State. Canton seconded. Voice vote – ayes, all.

The Mayor stated he could not recall approving course work in advance when Jennell was an employee of the Village and asked if Council knew what courses she was taking. The Fiscal Officer stated there was discussion with Council, as there had been with her own course work. Council knew Jennell was working towards her associate degree, and according to the Village policy, she was required to have her classes approved by the committee. These classes had to relate to her Village employment. The Mayor asked if this was in writing and expressed concern about the auditors. He said he did not recall seeing anything about Jennell's coursework. The Fiscal Officer explained that it was a discussion with Council, and that Council approved. Carroll recognized that the Village needed a better policy on this issue moving forward, and Council should collectively identify classes that might be beneficial and focus on these for reimbursement or partial reimbursement.

Nairn asked if information had been received about the Elected Officials Conference. The Fiscal Officer stated it would be June 20-21, but there was no further information on it yet.

Nairn made a motion to approve the fund balances. Porter seconded. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

**SOLICITOR:** The Solicitor said she would address issues concerning the rental house and land swap during New Business. The information to be addressed had been requested by Carroll.

**STREET COMMITTEE:** Galicki stated the Street Committee met on April 19, 2019. The proposed roads list was discussed. The Engineer presented a reordering of the streets. The first proposal listed Ashleigh Dr. followed by Woodside Rd., but upon further evaluation by the Engineer, it was recommended that Ashleigh Dr. remain the first priority at the cost of \$239,000. The second priority would be repair work on West Bel Meadow Ln. costing \$90,000. Alternate proposals included the transition between the concrete pad and the macadam parking lot by Village Hall, the apron on the East Washington St. side of the SRV park, and the potential of widening the driveway leading from Bell Road to the Police Station. At the time of the meeting, the Street Commissioner took exception to the specified funding for the miscellaneous work for the Village. His opinion was

that the Street Fund should strictly fund streets and not miscellaneous resurfacing work on the Village campus. There was a precedent from the previous year where resurfacing of the Police Department parking lot came from the Streets budget. Hypothetically, if the combined alternate projects were not done, it would still not leave enough funds to address another street on the list for this year. Galicki stated that the Street Commissioner's point was helpful for budgeting considerations in the fall. During the committee meeting, Galicki stated that the Street Commissioner argued that the funds should come out of the Properties budget. Galicki recalled that during the budgeting process in fall 2018, a decision was made to fund the miscellaneous projects under the Street Department. The Street Commissioner was concerned, according to Galicki, about the Village's streets falling behind in maintenance. The Engineer addressed his concern, and Galicki categorized the Village's streets as the envy of surrounding municipalities. The Street Committee was prepared to go forward with bids for the proposed work this year, to include the alternate projects. Carroll asked what the total cost would be, and the Engineer replied that Ashleigh Dr. was about \$240,000. He added that the significant repair on West Bel Meadow Ln. would cost approximately \$90,000, which made this street take priority over Woodside Rd. Galicki added that there were no pressing issues with Woodside Rd. The Engineer agreed and said the West Bel Meadow repair was a much more dire need than Woodside. The Engineer said the base bid was \$330,000 for Ashleigh and West Bel Meadow. The first alternate project, the SRV Park driveway on Washington Street, was \$4,000. The widening of the Police Station drive, which was discussed by the Committee, would be necessary because it could only accommodate one vehicle at a time and presented a safety issue. This estimate was \$30,000. The third alternate was the overlaying of the concrete pad in front of Village Hall, which would be \$6,000. The total alternates add up to \$40,000, with the Police Station estimate being very conservative.

Canton stated that the Street Commissioner had a good point about which funds were used for the given projects and suggested that projects like the paving of parking lots come out of the Property Fund. The Mayor asked the Fiscal Officer if this had been done, and she said it had. She explained that the funds for the roads came from the General Fund, but with the passing of the Road Levy, \$236,000 a year must be spent on roads. Any difference would come from the General Fund. It would not matter if the funds were put in the Street Fund or the Street Fund was reduced and money was put in the Service Fund to do the properties. Another possibility would be to leave the road program at \$350,000 and add funds to the budget for the alternate projects. Galicki stated that none of the miscellaneous work would come from the earmarked Street Levy funds. Rather they would be funded through the General Fund. He indicated that it was not a case of taking funds away from the dedicated Road Program. The Fiscal Officer concurred and said whatever 'bucket' Council wished to hold and pay from was up to them. She added that this was the topic of the discussion at the fall Budget Session. Carroll said the area in front of Village Hall was an accident waiting to happen and that for \$4,000, it would be nice to have it taken care of and saw this as a high priority.

Porter addressed the idea of Properties getting a line item for projects like repaving parking lots and called Council's attention to the fact that it would not be the Property Committee that ultimately provided the oversight, but the Street Commissioner. He defined a road as anything on which a car could be driven, including a parking lot. Galicki pointed out that by the Village doing the alternate projects, it would not be to the detriment of dedicated streets work. Porter agreed but stated that if the Village had a \$350,000 Road Program, and \$30,000 was put into Properties, then the \$350,000 for roads and the other \$20,000 could come out of Properties, so the effective road program would not be \$350,000 but \$380,000. Carroll was unclear about Porter's explanation.

The Mayor asked the Engineer about the cost of the West Bel Meadow repair relative to the upcoming repaving of it, which he said was estimated at \$188,000. The Engineer stated it would not be wasted money. The Mayor suggested that it was a good idea to do it now and let it sit for a year or two. The Engineer stated that with another winter, there would be a larger failed area by next spring. The Mayor stated it had moved to a resident's yard. The Engineer stated the Village had proactive budgeting with tending to urgent needs. He complimented the Village in keeping the roads "up to snuff."

The Mayor stated that last year he met with the County Auditor, Prosecutor, and Treasurer. He was concerned that they would question the Village having \$2.6 million in the bank at the end of the year, and that with a levy that would bring in \$450,000; they would be asking how the Village intended to spend its money. He was concerned that the Village was getting close to this point. He stated this question would come in 2020. Carroll and Porter agreed funds could be used for stormwater issues. The Mayor asked whether in addition to West Bel Meadow, there was another street in need of repair. The Engineer stated that there were some big streets coming up for repaving, such as Kensington and Sheerbrook. He added that if the Mayor was worried about spending money on roads, he could spend all sorts of money. Porter pointed out that these two roads would cost \$500,000 each.

Galicki made a motion to go forward with the suggested 2019 Road Program for bids. Canton seconded. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

**BUILDING COMMITTEE:** Porter stated that the Building Committee met earlier in April and the minutes were posted to the website for review. The possibility of amending a section of the Codified Ordinances, 1480.02, Maintenance Standards, was discussed. The ordinance pertained to what residents were required to do to maintain their properties in keeping with the Village's zoning and building regulations. Specifically, the committee discussed amending Section E which addressed outdoor storage or parking of motorized vehicles. The language would be changed to include trailers. Carroll clarified that this would affect residents who currently had trailers and were meeting the zoning requirements. They would not be able to have the vehicles parked next to their homes for more than 72 hours. Porter stated he was unsure because he suspected they would be 'grandfathered' under the former ordinance. It would prohibit other trailers from being stored outside. He added that if the Village attempted to change the ordinance, there would be an argument that it was like an ex post facto law that was enacted and targeted a specific individual. The Solicitor drafted language to amend the ordinance with the idea that the Village would avoid future problems by prohibiting the outdoor storage of trailers. If a resident moved an otherwise conforming trailer under the current ordinance, and then brought it back, they would be subject to the new ordinance. Galicki stated that it was necessary to abandon the usage of the vehicle for 30 days. The Solicitor explained that this was a Codified Ordinance and not a Zoning Ordinance, so there was a specific statute that stated a municipality could not create retroactive zoning ordinances. There was no similar statute with respect to changing Codified Ordinances, which she needed to research. The proposed language would take away the prohibition in the front yard. Carroll brought up the issue of the corner lots. She said this was tricky, and Carroll advised that he would like to consider terms like 'concealment' and thought a complete ban could be problematic. Porter said the committee might consider using language to say, 'vehicles more than 72 hours visible from the main thoroughfare.' Porter added that Schloss wanted to let Council know this was being considered. Nairn asked if it had been verified that there were 40 or more trailers, busses, etc. sitting on properties in the Village. The Mayor stated that employees of the Street Department compiled a list of 40 cars, trucks, busses, boats, etc. that were seen on properties in the Village. Not all were illegal. He added that these numbers were

gathered from driving by, and it was unknown what vehicles residents had that were out of view. Porter stated that if the vehicle were operable and could be driven, it would be acceptable according to the Village's ordinances. Carroll offered that he had a camping trailer parked according to the Village's regulations, but would store it during the winter. He understood the issue with having junk vehicles parked at residences, but thought Council should be careful in approaching this topic. The Mayor stated it was a hornet's nest.

**SAFETY COMMITTEE:** Galicki reminded Council that on March 8, a letter of resignation and retirement was received from Police Officer Mike Kramer, who wanted his retirement to take effect on May 3, 2019. Galicki made a motion to accept Police Officer Kramer's resignation/retirement effective May 3. Nairn seconded. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

**HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE:** Galicki stated that there had been a Human Resources (HR) Committee meeting on April 18<sup>th</sup>. During the meeting, the Committee had a conference call with Clemans Nelson to discuss the audit of the Building Department. The final report had been received on April 22, and distributed to Mayor, Council, and Solicitor. He asked Council to review the report for further discussion concerning the Building Department at the May 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

Galicki referenced the Fiscal Officer's report of discontinuing use of the Paychex system and returning to the use of Google Sheets, and a proposal to modify the pay periods.

Galicki also stated that along with the job descriptions, Clemans Nelson would be providing evaluations. Draft evaluations would be received soon to proofread, and then Council could decide whether to implement the evaluations and the timing of the implementation.

An exit interview was still needed for the former Board Clerk, Lorraine Sevich.

Carroll urged Council to read through the Clemans Nelson report. He added that it was impartial and well done.

The Solicitor asked if the HR Committee had received a preliminary report from Clemans Nelson prior to drafting the final report. Galicki explained that the preliminary report along with a power point presentation was provided during the teleconference. Clemans Nelson staff asked for questions from Committee members before submitting the final report. Carroll stated that the financial verbiage used in the initial report was confusing, and Clemans Nelson clarified the information. He added that there were no substantive changes made. He stated that with the questions Council had asked relative to the Building Department, which included the revenue it generated, and whether the Building Department should be full-time or part-time, he thought the report spoke for itself. Regarding the question of keeping it as a full-time Building Department, according to the report, it could not be justified. Carroll stated it might make sense to keep at least a part-time Building Department because of revenue and control. He said having a third party perspective clarified issues. He advised that with the information from the audit, Council would be in a good position to move forward at the May Council meeting.

Regarding the Clemans Nelson report, the Solicitor questioned the portion of the report that reflected hours billed for January, February, and March. She said they were much more for the record of

inspections; they were more than the last three months of 2018. She asked if this was because Heilman was gone and there were not two people. Galicki advised that he was unsure because he had not had the time to digest the report. She thought this would have been something that should have been highlighted. Carroll suggested that if the Village kept a part-time Building Department, and someone with an electrical certification were hired, the Village might not continue to need Dave Hocevar's services. Would it be possible, for example, for the county to do this? Even after reading the report, he said there were questions of how Council would address the issue. If there was not really that much electrical work, was it really necessary for the Village to keep Hocevar on retainer, or could another service be used when the need arose. Council would have to determine this, but Carroll advised that the issues of having a part-time or full-time Building Inspector or strictly zoning, had been addressed through the audit.

The Mayor asked how Schloss would get the Clemans Nelson report. The Fiscal Officer said she would email it to him. The Mayor said that as head of the Building Committee, Schloss needed to have the report right away. He also said he had sent an email to Clemans Nelson in March on a Saturday afternoon asking that the time study management audit be postponed. He expected to get an email back on Monday, but instead received a text from the Solicitor on Saturday that Clemans Nelson contacted her. She wanted to know what the Mayor had asked Clemans Nelson. According to the Mayor, the Solicitor relayed that the time management study could not be postponed. Eventually, he said conversations floated around, but there was not one comment to him. He was disappointed in Clemans Nelson and their lack of response to the person who contacted them. He stated it was a bone he wanted to get off his chest.

**PROPERTY COMMITTEE:** Canton reported that the Park Committee would be meeting on Monday, May 6 at 6:30 p.m. at Village Hall. Two potential dates for the Fall Festival had been determined, and would be decided on May 6. The two dates were September 15, 2019 or September 29, 2019. He reported that these were the only two dates the Tripps were available. The Mayor asked which date Ted Kruse wanted. Canton stated this would be discussed.

On April 17, Canton spoke to the Chagrin Falls Board of Education about the SRV Park playground and informed them about the donation of memorial trees.

Porter stated that the Auburn Heating, Plumbing, and Air Conditioning maintenance agreement renewal was provided to Council. As background, Porter stated the Village went out to bid for the maintenance contract for Village Hall, Police Department, etc. for the heating and air conditioning. Auburn was well below the other provider, P.K. Wadsworth, and was more responsive. Porter made a motion to authorize the Mayor and Fiscal Officer to enter into the contract for the renewal of the maintenance agreement between the Village and Auburn Heating, Plumbing, and Air Conditioning in the amount of \$1,800 as specified in the contract. Canton seconded. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC UTILITIES:** Carroll stated he had not heard back from Lorraine Sevich but would reach out to her regarding her assistance with the single trash hauler issue.

Regarding the United States Geological Survey (USGS) water quality monitoring, Carroll was uncertain what the county was doing with this, but said the contract was not due until November.



**ORDINANCES:** Nairn provided the second reading of a Resolution declaring it necessary to levy a tax in excess of the 10 mil limitation.

**BILLS LIST:** Nairn made a motion to ratify the April 15, 2019 Bills List in the amount of \$75,875.86. Porter seconded. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

**NEW OTHER:** Canton, Carroll, Nairn, Porter had no new business.

Porter stated that he would prefer to have the Property Committee meeting prior to discussing the rental house. He reported that the current tenant was paying \$1,250 per month with a \$50 late fee. The Village had retained about twelve years of revenue from the property. The Fiscal Officer advised that it had been longer than this. Additionally, in 2015, the Village put \$50,000 into the property. Porter stated the total investment from the Village had been about \$250,000, recouping \$60,000. He stated the Village might want the Solicitor to draft a lot split for the property. Carroll stated that at the last Council meeting, the Solicitor was asked to look into this. He asked that she report her findings thus far. Carroll had also asked the Solicitor about the potential for the eviction process. For over a year, there had been an issue with delinquent rent with the tenant with whom the Village had no contract.

The Solicitor stated that since there was no written lease agreement, it was a month to month tenancy, which involved a 30-day notice to terminate. If the tenant still occupied the residence at this point, the Village would post a three day notice to evict and file a forcible entry detainer action in municipal court. She asked how current the tenant was with his rent, and the Fiscal Officer stated he had paid through March. April had not been received. The Solicitor asked if there had been any further clarification about the fraud notification letter received from the tenant's bank. The Fiscal Office had no further information. The Solicitor stated that according to Council's wishes, she could send out a notice.

Carroll said he realized the Property Committee would want to consider this, but he wanted to see the eviction process started. He stated that the Village should not be in the rental property business and needed to take action. Porter stated Council could not do this now because the tenant was not late on his rent. He indicated that the Village took his payment. Porter said the Village could send a notice for 30 days. Carroll stated this was what he said, and that either way, the tenant was chronically late and either a new contract was required or an eviction notice provided. There was clarification that a 30-day notice was not an eviction, and Carroll acknowledged he used the wrong term.

The Mayor stated at the May 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, the notice to the tenant would be discussed, and added that the previous tenant was perfect. He did not know whether Council wanted to discuss lot splits, cemetery, and rental property at the same time. The Mayor stated it was important to focus on one issue and as of now, the Village had not lost a penny with the renter. He acknowledged that the rent was provided a week or two late, but it was not like he had destroyed the property. If the Village got rid of this renter, it might find a good renter. Carroll stated that if the Village got rid of the tenant, he would be in favor of selling the property, and asked the Solicitor to look into the lot split.

The Solicitor stated that in the Village zoning, there was one acre zoning in the residential district. The rental house lot was 2.15 acres, and the lot to the north was 2 acres. The lot next to that was 5.62 acres, which was the Cemetery. The center lot was the vacant lot, and may have been part of the larger parcel for the Cemetery. The Fiscal Auditor explained that by splitting the property, the

Village could pay park taxes instead of residential taxes. The Solicitor stated that if the Village were to split the rental property, the least that could be done was one acre to keep it buildable and conform to zoning. She explained that the Village would be creating a land locked parcel. For example, if the Village split one acre which included the house, the remaining 1.15 might be landlocked. She speculated whether Council would want to then combine it with the 2.0 acre to the north. This would take a combination that would have to go the Planning Commission in addition to the lot split, which would have to go the Geauga County Planning Commission for approval. The Solicitor questioned whether it would be more beneficial and more attractive to sell 2.15 acres versus one acre, and keep 1.15 which might have to be combined and would be landlocked. If the Village ever wanted to sell it, an easement might be required, and this would be more cumbersome. The Mayor offered that it would be creating a flag lot, which the Solicitor said happened all the time, although not favored. Nairn asked if this meant the county could reject the proposal. The Solicitor explained that the county would look at the Village's zoning and ask for recommendations. She said if a flag lot was not created and there was no easement of access, then the Village would have created a landlocked parcel. If it was for the Village, it could be acceptable. However, to sell it for someone to build on would be a different matter. The county would look at these factors, but would not necessarily deny it.

Porter summarized that the tenant issue was the first issue. The second issue was a question of a lot split. The third issue concerned whether the Village would do a lot split and if that split should be combined to form a flag lot.

Canton stated that the Property Committee would be meeting May 9 at 6:30 p.m. at Village Hall.

The Solicitor also addressed Carroll's question about a land swap. Direct authority existed in the Revised Code for municipalities to swap land that it owns with different organizations like a library, county hospital, etc. There would be no direct authority for the Village to swap the rental house for a piece of property on Chillicothe Road that the Village was considering. She further stated that there were a couple of Ohio Attorney General Opinions on selling or leasing land, which included exchange of land. The Solicitor stated that these land swaps were possible but not as clean as swapping for a hospital or school, for example.

Carroll explained that he asked the Solicitor to look into this because there were two parcels Council might want to consider, one being on Chillicothe Rd. and one adjacent to Village Hall at the corner of Bell and Chillicothe. He wanted Council to consider property that could be beneficial for the Village for projects down the road. He reiterated that the rental property was not benefitting the Village. The other example would be a property on Chillicothe Rd. that could potentially help with stormwater issues. If there were no utility, Carroll stated there would be no value in doing this. If there were utility, it would give the opportunity for the Village to unload a piece of property that had been costly to the Village and gain property that would be helpful instead.

The Mayor addressed the Geauga Soil and Water Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He stated it was four pages of "legalese" and the delay was due to it running through a different group of people and finally through the County Prosecutor. Porter made a motion to approve the Mayor signing the Geauga Soil and Water MOU, seconded by Carroll. Galicki asked the Solicitor for clarification of the "legalese" contained in the agreement. The Solicitor stated the last one she saw was dated 2006 and did not know if it was an annual contract. The Fiscal Officer stated that this was one issue found in the Audit. She noted that the permit/issue number changed for some reason. She

said the duties for Soil and Water district had increased. The Solicitor did not think it was the Village's fault that there was no MOU since 2006. Carroll asked if this was something normally done with each community every year. She did not know if it was annual, but that there was one with each community and it was on a certain time basis. She was uncertain if the contract had a term on it. Porter recalled that the Village was "dinged" during the stormwater review for not having an agreement with the county for public involvement and education and this MOU would solve the problem. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.

Galicki addressed an email sent by the Mayor to Nairn and him on April 19. There were discussion items about the contract for Engineering Services for the Village. The Mayor indicated in the email that he would update Council at the April 22 meeting after the Solicitor's report. Galicki noted that this update was not given and offered that the Mayor could update Council on the process.

The Mayor explained that he did not want to speak about the Engineer's contract earlier while the Engineer was present. For the Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) grant, the Village did a preapplication which was accepted. The Engineer sent the North Coast Study to FEMA indicating there was a water issue. A response was required by FEMA before an application could be submitted. If the application were approved, it must be executed by June 21. Galicki stated that the Mayor indicated that "we" sent in a preapplication to FEMA and asked who the "we" was. The Mayor stated "we" was him. Galicki stated that it would then appear that the Mayor elected to submit it independently without discussion from Council on the application process. The Mayor responded, "yes." Galicki asked what the reasoning was for doing this. The Mayor explained that it was because it was a preapplication and he did not know if the Village had a chance to be allowed to do an application. Galicki said that it appeared in going forward with the preapplication process, there were expenses to the Village that would be incurred which may or may not be reimbursed depending on whether the FEMA grant was ultimately received. The Mayor stated the only expense would be from the Engineer who did a flash drive study to FEMA. Galicki stated that in a separate email, the Mayor indicated that there was an expense involved with the fourth option that was required by FEMA. The Mayor said there was no expense that he was aware of. He had thought there would be. Galicki asked if there was merit in discussing these issues with Council before going forward with grant applications. He further stated that it seemed there was a history of this, whether it was with 319 grants or FEMA grants and that independent action had been taken by the Mayor without entering into discussion with Council. It had become an 'oh, by the way' at the Council meetings. The Mayor stated that the 319 grant process was done in front of Council all the way through with Chagrin River Watershed Partners (CRWP), and he did not know what else there was that was not done. He stated that the only thing he did was a preapplication. Galicki stated that the only thing that had been done with the 319 grant was entering into a contract with the Homeowner's Association (HOA) President of Kensington Green, but this was not the proper time to discuss that matter.

Galicki asked again if there was merit in discussing these issues with Council before going forward with any application or preapplication, or was there a need for Council at all? Galicki asked whether South Russell should be called a "Kingdom" instead of a Village? The Mayor stated he attended the webinar and asked if it was a good idea and was told it was and that "he said yeah it will probably do it." So, he did a preapplication which was two pages. He sent it in to FEMA. Galicki questioned whom the Mayor asked if it was a good idea. The Mayor replied that it was the head of FEMA. Galicki asked the Mayor if there was no reason to engage Council at that stage. The Mayor said that this was correct and that he did not think there was any reason to engage Council on a preapplication.

Galicki offered that one of the points in the Mayor's State of the Village Address at the beginning of the year was an issue of transparency, and he offered that actions such as these were not best indicative of a transparent Mayor. The Mayor responded that it was a preapplication, and Galicki responded that regardless of whether it was pre or post, in the United States form of government it would appear there should be discussion and not independent action by any part of a government. The Mayor said he cannot go over and remember all the times Council had discussed the Red Ranch property. Galicki explained that he was not asking the Mayor to go over when he discussed the Red Ranch, and the Red Ranch had been a non-issue for several months. If the Mayor were to review the Council minutes of previous meetings, there was a statement by the Engineer that indicated the efficacy of purchasing and putting a retention pond in the position of the Red Ranch and that it would have questionable merit in terms of stormwater control. He advised the issue was not the Red Ranch, but independent actions on the part of the Office of the Mayor without engaging Council in the decisions.

Nairn asked if the Mayor attended the FEMA webinar on his own and then discussed the webinar with the Engineer? Nairn believed what she was hearing was that Council had been bypassed in the preapproval process, and she believed it would have been important for Council to have had a discussion about FEMA. She recalled FEMA being scrutinized for misuse of funding for what they repaired and rebuilt on the Eastern Seaboard of the United States. She stated there had been questionable issues in the past with FEMA. Nairn added that she was in agreement with Galicki because it would have been beneficial had the Mayor come to Council and reported his findings from the webinar and shared his thoughts that FEMA could be a resource that the Village should engage to address Village problems. This did not happen, and Nairn stated that it was as if Council was being dismissed on some issues.

Carroll stated that the Mayor mentioned the webinar at the previous Council meeting. Per the minutes, the preapplication was submitted prior to the last Council meeting. Carroll advised that the Mayor was updating Council on the progress. Carroll said Council was made aware of the Mayor's actions at the previous Council meeting. Nairn agreed that this was the case, but wanted to understand the steps taken by the Mayor, which involved attending the webinar and then contacting the Engineer. She advised that there was a step in between where Council should have been included. Carroll asked if the Engineer was included in the preapplication process, and the Mayor stated he was not. Carroll advised that some of the issue was having the Engineer fully aware of the projects pursued by the Village. He recalled that at a previous Council meeting, the Engineer mentioned he was unaware of a grant, possibly with the playground, where he was caught off guard. He felt it was important to keep the Engineer fully informed. Nairn added that Council should be fully informed of what was going on. The Mayor explained that the webinar occurred in February where participants called in. Carroll stated that he thought there was a notice for it to Council, because he made mention of it because of the stormwater issues.

Galicki had no issue with the Mayor attending the webinar. He took issue with the subsequent actions and omission in not informing Council or the Village Engineer as to what he intended to do. Porter asked if there was a time limit or something that had to be done quickly or the Village would lose the possibility of funding. The Mayor said there was not, that the Village would just lose the possibility of getting an application. Porter added that it was then not time sensitive, and the Mayor stated there may have been a week or two. Carroll added that the Village may have lost it for the year, but usually these grants are available every year. The Mayor stated he was not sure but that the preapplication had to be in by a certain time. Porter asked if it was correct that the Village was not

committed to anything at this point because of a preapplication, and the Mayor agreed. Porter stated he thought Galicki was right that Council should have been informed before the preapplication was done so that there would be notice that the Village might be committed down the road. However, in a way it was like the 319 grant in that Council ultimately would decide whether to accept it or not regardless of what the Mayor did. Still, Porter continued, it was a FEMA grant, which involved federal money, and the Red Ranch had been a problem. If for no other reason, Porter explained, it had been a problem for the homeowner and as such it was a good thing to have a preapplication. Porter stated that Galicki was right and Council should have been notified in advance.

The Mayor stated he would find out when the preapplication was due. Galicki said it did not matter. The date the preapplication was due was not the issue, but ancillary data. The fact of the matter was that the Mayor went forward with the preapplication without consent of Council. He suggested the Mayor concentrate on this issue and not try to throw in dates and times and places. Whether he viewed the webinar, put in the application, and the date it was due were all extraneous information. The issue was the independent action by the Office of the Mayor without consulting Council.

The Mayor stated the other issue he did not want to speak about in front of the Engineer was the request for proposals. He stated there was a meeting two weeks ago with the Financial Chair, the Streets Chair, and the Fiscal Officer about sending out requests for proposals. The Mayor stated he sent those out and asked for replies from the Financial and Streets Chairs. He explained that they sent out eight of these to eight local engineering firms. The Mayor said they were in the process of developing criteria for the evaluation of these proposals and he was also looking for three citizens to help when the proposals came in to give their opinion of the proposals.

Nairn stated in March, the Mayor requested that she and Galicki be an investigative team to look at engineering firms. There were no templates, guidelines, or requirements provided to them. Despite this, they took action and met with several engineering firms. Three days ago, she and Galicki received an email from the Mayor stating that he was not on the same page with Galicki and her. The Mayor concurred. Nairn further explained that also in the email, the Mayor made the statement that the Mayor, Galicki, and Nairn were working together, but then stated that a Request for Proposal (RFP) had been sent to eight firms. She wanted to know if this was indicative of working together. Nairn questioned the Mayor as to whether he was working with them when he independently contacted eight engineering firms. The Mayor stated at the meeting two weeks ago, he asked for input from Nairn and Galicki. He added this was the first meeting they had to discuss the matter. The Mayor referred to the minutes and emails, stating the Mayor was in charge of the committee. He said he did not put them into a search committee as they were calling themselves. He said the Mayor was in charge. He called the first meeting on April 8 and asked for their input and was basically told that they did not want an RFP from the Mayor and that they were not going to do that, and they were not going to have criteria and they did not want citizens. The Mayor stated he asked for their help, not to take over.

Galicki stated the Mayor asked for their opinion, and they gave it to him, which he subsequently ignored. The Mayor stated he did not ignore it. Galicki indicated the Mayor went out to eight unidentified firms. Galicki said he and Nairn did not know which firms they were, that the Mayor was going to do this, or whether the Mayor was going to engage the Solicitor with this. Galicki stated the Mayor was driving the bus in a certain direction. He did not know whether the ultimate decision would be that of the Mayor or Council, but he agreed with the Mayor that they did not appear to be working together. The Mayor stated he could not believe Galicki and Nairn held

interviews without him. Galicki stated that the Mayor was not engaged in the process. Galicki advised that the Mayor had said that he was putting Nairn and Galicki in charge of this process. The Mayor disagreed and told Galicki to read the minutes. Nairn stated that the Mayor said this to Galicki and her in chambers but recalled that people were milling around. She did not think it was during the Council meeting. The Mayor asked what the minutes said. Galicki read from the March 11, 2019 Council minutes which stated, "The Mayor stated Council voted to go out for bids for the engineering contract." Galicki added that he did not believe there was a vote. He asked if this was to be taken as the truth and that there was a vote, or whether this was an interpretation of what was said at Council. The Mayor stated that this was what the minutes said. The Mayor referred to an email from March 29 from one of the Council members that stated, "I thought that Council had directed the Mayor to put together an RFP for an open proposal for an engineer at the last meeting." Galicki asked if this was from Porter, and Porter said it was not. Galicki said it was not clear and he thought Council could refer to the minutes of it. However, Galicki stated that considering the independent actions of the Mayor sending out the RFP, electing to pick the eight organizations to which he sent the RFP without engaging Nairn or him in the decision, in addition to the fact that he independently drafted a contract extension with CT that he tried to get approved at the last Council meeting, it appeared to Galicki that there was no need for a committee to provide legitimacy to the independent actions of the Office of Mayor. It only underscored the continuing lack of transparency in the Office. He stated that he was removing himself from the search committee or whatever the Mayor elected to call it. The Mayor said he did not call it a search committee and that Galicki and Nairn did. Galicki stated regardless of what it was called, he submitted his resignation from the committee.

Carroll said initially, he thought Schloss was on the committee as well, and said it was up to Schloss, Galicki, and Nairn to determine the process. Carroll advised that he was the one who suggested that Council should consider other engineering firms, and the Mayor replied that he did not think they should. Carroll recalled then asking the other members of Council, who collectively agreed to look at this as an RFP, to do it transparently. He advised that the Village might still end up with CT and the Engineer had done a great job, but Council had not looked at this in twenty plus years, and it was agreed that it was a good idea. Carroll further recalled that the Mayor put Nairn, Galicki, and he mistakenly thought Schloss, on a committee to start the process. Nairn advised that she and Galicki did what they were told and started very quickly because they were asked to do this. The Mayor stated he did not mean to ask them; he asked them for their help. He thought it was very clear in the minutes that he asked Nairn and Galicki to assist him. He further stated that the Mayor was in charge of this. Galicki said that he would have to review the minutes to see if the Mayor said he was in charge. Carroll stated he did not remember this being said and Galicki agreed, nor did Nairn. Galicki asked the Mayor to please show Council where this was stated. Carroll viewed it as an ad hoc committee just like other committees where Council put things together and then brought them to Council. He thought it was an ad hoc committee looking to develop the Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/RFP for Council to consider potentially looking at other engineering firms. He did not look at it as the Mayor being in charge, but as a part of the process, as with every member of Council.

The Mayor quoted the March 11 minutes, "The Mayor stated Council voted to go out for bids for the engineering contract. He advised that he, the Finance Committee Chair, and the Street Committee Chair would meet to oversee the process." Galicki advised that it did not sound like the Mayor was in charge in the verbiage just read. Nairn stated that the minutes indicated the Mayor said they "would meet." It did not say the Mayor would be coming to interviews. She never heard the Mayor say he was in charge. For the Mayor to say he could not believe Galicki and Nairn interviewed engineering firms without him, Nairn stated they were not trying to do anything beyond what he

asked of them. She added that she was offended by his email that she received because she did as she was told. The Mayor said he did not feel that he told them to run with this when the Mayor was put in charge. Galicki asked where the verbiage was about “the Mayor was put in charge.” He thought perhaps he was not hearing something. Porter stated that he recalled the Village’s ordinance says that if an ad hoc committee were formed, the Mayor was a member of it and that he was the Chairman. He did not recall the exact language, but he thought this was the way it worked. Galicki stated that the statement that “Council took a vote,” was coming from the Mayor, but there was actually no vote by Council on this. He indicated that the Solicitor was nodding her head in agreement. The Solicitor said she would need to hear the recording, but she did not think there was actually a motion, or at least it was not in the minutes. Galicki added that the Mayor’s statement reflected only his words.

Carroll said he was confused and asked if the Village advertised for bids without Council saying it was going to advertise for bids? The Mayor stated “we asked eight engineering firms to submit a proposal.” Galicki asked who the “we” was. The Mayor stated he did it. Carroll asked if it would not have taken a motion of Council to ask to do this. The Mayor said no. The Solicitor stated that it was actually directed to the Fiscal Officer to go out for bid, and then she and the Fiscal Officer discussed what the criteria was. The Solicitor stated that there had not been a vote but agreement in discussion by Council. She saw this in the printed minutes but wanted to listen to the recording because it was not very clear. She wondered if a motion was really made and whether Council was really going out for bid and what the bid was going to look like. Carroll added that he thought this was what Galicki and Nairn were going to do by putting together some criteria for a formal proposal to go for the RFQ and RFP, which technically the Village did not even have to do, unless he misunderstood that part of the process Nairn and Galicki investigated. The Solicitor stated that with a competitive bid, they did not have to do this. Carroll said it was more an RFQ to indicate what the Village wanted; that it was looking for an engineering firm and this was the criteria it wanted met, which was what Galicki and Nairn were developing.

Porter asked to offer a practical consideration. Since the Village had an Engineer doing the Road Program and there were grants in play, Porter thought if the Village went with another Engineering firm next year that would be fine, but there were a lot of things going on this year and the Village’s Engineering firm did not have a contract. He was concerned that there could be serious problems arising from the major work being done. In terms of the budget, if Council wanted to contract with another engineering firm, it could, but he was concerned that it was the end of April and the Engineer was without a contract. He could just leave in the middle of the Road Program or one of the other projects. Going out for a Request for Proposals would take time to evaluate and decide on an engineer. Then this Engineer would have to step into CT’s shoes during the Road Program and 319 project, which he thought sounded like a recipe for trouble. He understood the idea of saving the Village money, but was worried that the current Engineer had no contract and was a free agent.

Galicki said he appreciated Porter’s concerns but offered Porter’s experiences were largely in the legal profession, and not in the business world or manufacturing. Porter said this was nonsense. Galicki explained that people come and go all the time. People who are project managers elect to take other jobs and people who are project managers get fired. He added that someone new comes in and work goes on. Porter stated that he worked for a pharmaceutical company as a production supervisor for tableting and packaging. Galicki said this may be a perfect time because the Village had not started any of the projects and the engineering work was done for any of the projects that were now completed. Basically, it would go out to bid and whoever takes the contract, whether it was CT or another, they would oversee the job that was already engineered. Anyone could really

step in. Galicki further explained that the engineering firms that he and Nairn had contacted would say that most engineering firms were all the same. Sometimes there was no apples to apples comparison, or they fill out a matrix and as long as they have a check in the block on the rubric, then it was ok. The quality of services that were being offered was what should be examined for the decision. It may not be the lowest bidder or the one with all the checks in the blocks but an evaluation. In his view, the process was being circumvented and driven down a certain road, and he did not want to be a party to that. Porter did not think anyone should drive it to a certain outcome, but he was concerned that CT was currently involved. Galicki stated those comments should be addressed to the individual to Porter's right because he believed there was an effort to drive it in a certain direction. Porter stated he would like to have an engineering firm of some kind on board before the Village started to tear up roads, which would happen shortly. Evaluating eight different bidders or more was fine, but he wanted to know when a decision might be made. He suspected it might be after July 4, and Council would only be meeting once, although Council could meet by Special meeting. He further advised that the Road Program would be in progress and he did not agree that just anybody could just step in and manage it. He stated that the Village was comfortable with CT and had known them for years. Porter added that whoever steps in might be wonderful, but Council would not know because it did not know them. Galicki stated that Council might find that Schloss could step in and manage it. Porter suggested the Street Commissioner could do it and an Engineer would not be needed, but he did not want to find out the hard way. Galicki stated it might not be as hard as perceived. Carroll stated that CT was a reputable company and the Engineer did a good job. He did not see CT stepping away from the Village. Porter said he did not either. Carroll said it would take a little time, but that CT and the Engineer had assured the Village that they would continue to operate under their old contract moving forward. The Engineer was very aware of what Council was doing. He could have already left the Village.

Carroll said there had been some challenges with CT and Craig Cawrse and the playground but moving forward the evaluation needed to be done according to Council's wishes, and it needed to continue to move forward. He preferred Galicki would not step down, but understood his frustration and concern that the Mayor had asked for two on Council to look into the matter. The Mayor qualified that he asked them just to help. Carroll said that whatever the sidebar conversation was, there was miscommunication, but Council needed to move forward. To get an RFQ together, there was a subject matter expert in Schloss, who was familiar with doing roads and streets. He added that there was a community member, and perhaps Galicki would come back to finish the process. However, Carroll stated that arbitrarily doing what the Mayor did was not helpful with the process. He said it was going back to just arbitrary decisions and not sharing with Council ahead of time, and just communicating. Carroll said it was simple, and that 90% of the issues with Council over the past year had been with good strong communication, which was lacking.

The Mayor explained that he was trying to drive an objective process to get something done. He did an RFP and sent a letter to eight firms and said, 'give us your bids', that was it. He said it was time to get something done. The Mayor stated that the meeting he had with Nairn and Galicki, and with Carroll and Schloss sitting in seemed like the fix was in and he was trying to be objective. Galicki said, "right back at you, Mayor. It seems like the fix is in." The Mayor asked who he was fixing it for. Galicki said he did not know, that the Mayor was driving the process. The Mayor stated he sent the correspondence to eight firms. Galicki asked who the eight firms were, and where the transparency was that the Mayor talked about. He added that it was lacking, or gone, and that there was no transparency. He was afraid that this had been a hard point to get across from Council to the Mayor. Galicki stated that it had continually been the same story over and over again; independent



action by the Village Executive without engaging Council to drive a certain objective that the Mayor wanted. At the last committee meeting, the Mayor came right out and stated that the committee had determined that CT was out of the question and off the list. At that time, he and Nairn responded that CT was absolutely not off the list.

Galicki stated that the Mayor had tried to demonize Council, whether it was the Building Department or anything with which the Mayor took exception, and he would turn it around on Council. He added that the spin was not going to work in this case. Galicki stated this was the issue where he took a stand and drew a line in the sand to say, 'I'm sorry, I won't buy into the shenanigans.' Carroll added that he saw Galicki's point in this, because even with the Clemans Nelson audit, the Mayor sent an email out saying that he was going to look at Plain City, and conduct other research when Council had decided to have an independent audit by Clemans Nelson, which took any personality on Council out of the process. That was why Council wanted Clemans Nelson despite the cost involved. Council wanted to keep it transparent and neutral so that no one could say, for example, that Councilman Carroll was driving an agenda. Carroll stated he was actually landing on a conclusion held by other members of Council because of the Clemans Nelson report. He said that was the flavor of some of the things that the Mayor had done, and it was just example after example. Galicki added that to the Mayor's earlier exception with Clemans Nelson, the Mayor tried to circumvent the entire process of the audit in the first place by calling them and telling them to stop the audit. The Mayor had a history over and over again, and this was his record. The Mayor stated he called Clemans Nelson and copied everybody he could to say that it was the end of the month and there was a State report due and they were stressed and asked if the auditors could wait. He received no comment back from Clemans Nelson or anybody on Council who was copied. He saw no problem with asking the auditors to wait, just out of regard for the people in the Building Department. He said Council was informed and could have said, 'what are you doing, why are you doing it?'

Carroll stated that what Clemans Nelson was going to do was not going to be disruptive. He added that if the Building Department was that overwhelmed or busy, it would have shown in the results. Carroll recommended reading the report and added that he would be able to identify that no, the Village was pretty good with where it was at. He thought the report was good, and thought the matter could be belabored forever. The Mayor stated he tried to do what was best for the people in the Building Department, and it was like he was trying to delay and submerge, which was not his intention. They were stressed, and he asked Clemans Nelson to give them a little time. Galicki stated that perception is reality, and this was the perception he provided to himself and many members of Council. The Mayor responded that this was fair enough.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Being that there was no further business before Council, Carrol made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Canton. Voice vote – ayes, all. Motion carried.



William G. Koons, Mayor



Danielle Romanowski, Fiscal Officer

Prepared by: Leslie Galicki