



**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING
BRECKSVILLE CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
BRECKSVILLE CITY HALL
JANUARY 28, 2023**

The Charter Review Commission was **CALLED TO ORDER** by Chairperson Skaljac at 10:00am.

Following the **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**, Commission Members answered to **ROLL CALL** as follows:

Present: Bartos, Bender, Berlin, Gawlik, Lesh, Mansfield, Schirch, Skaljac, Vida-Clough

Absent: None

Others: Commission Alternate Holub, Council President Laura Redinger, Council Representative Beth Savage.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 4, 2023 CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Skaljac asked for comments regarding the minutes of the January 4, 2023 meeting. Hearing none, Chairman Skaljac, moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Berlin.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Bartos, Bender, Berlin, Gawlik, Lesh, Mansfield, Schirch, Skaljac, Vida-Clough.

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Skaljac began the meeting by reminding the Commission at the last meeting they whittled down the original list to the following items that will be discussed in a little more depth today. He said the goal for today is to further narrow the list to the items that will be going forward. Chairperson Skaljac prepared a work sheet for everyone that he passed out that he asked the Commission members to rank the eleven topics from most important on down. He said they will then tally those all up and see if there is a consensus on topics. They will then send those to Law Director Matty to begin having them put into legislative form so the Commission can review what the language would potentially look like and then determine if those are items to place on the ballot. He said he is hoping by the end of February to have the final list and to complete a more final vote. He stated after that list is finalized they will begin completing the pamphlet that is required to be sent to the public,

ARTICLE III: MAYOR RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

Chairperson Skaljac reminded the Commission members this discussion was regarding how many years someone would be required to be a resident prior to running for Mayor. He said it is currently two years and the discussion was to remain at two years or increase. He said at the last meeting the Commission seemed pretty much split down the middle. He said he thinks two years is fine and going up to four years would also be fine. He believes it has never really been an issue here, but would like to hear others thoughts.



Mrs. Vida-Clough asked have all the previous Mayors lived in the City for more than two years. Chairperson Skaljac responded that since the 1970's the City has basically had two Mayors that lived here all their lives. He said the reason that he brought up the issue originally is due to the current environment in politics everywhere, which could lead to people coming in for one particular topic, and the Mayor position in a City, he thinks two years is a little light for a requirement. Mrs. Vida-Clough agreed that four seemed reasonable. Mr. Schirch agreed that raising the requirement would be appropriate because they cannot look to the past here as an indicator, they need to look to the future. He told the Commission that Broadview Heights just passed a four year residency requirement with a 71% margin, which he believes shows that residents really want this. Mr. Schirch said he would recommend a minimum of four years and can go from there. He said he thinks that one of the Commission's goals should be to not put anything on the ballot unless they are fairly confident it will pass, so he doesn't think that the requirement should be too long.

Mrs. Mansfield said she agrees, but would not go higher than four years. Mrs. Lesh stated she did not have strong feelings one way or another with this topic, however, she thinks four should be a maximum length for requirements. Mrs. Gawlik said on one hand she does not like any kind of legislation that takes the power of the vote away from the people and she can see circumstances where a highly qualified individual comes to town and would be a wonderful mayor but hasn't been here for two years, but that's a voting philosophy that she has across the board. She also see the benefit of having someone being from the town for a long time and knowing what's going on. She said she would support putting four years on the ballot and letting the community decide if that's appropriate.

Mr. Berlin said this is a topic he feels very strongly about given today's societal changes and what might happen in the future. He said looking back sometimes is a good thing, however, he does not believe it is a predictor of the future. He said his concern is someone would use this as a stepping stone for a quick win. He is concerned someone could move into a condo for a short period of time and with enough money could win on something they don't really believe. He said he strongly believes that the City of Brecksville and the Charter Review Commission need to protect the residents from those situations. He said they have had people recently move into the City and right away say they want to change Brecksville. He said it is a major topic and he would like to suggest six year requirement because it spans through an election cycle, but agrees four is better than two.

Mrs. Gawlik asked if a resident grew up in the City, lived here all their life, moved away for a short time and came back, would they need to complete the residency requirement of two years. Chairperson Skaljac said yes, it is a requirement of two years consecutively prior to the election. Mr. Schirch asked if they could recommend it not be just prior to an election. The Committee members all agreed this was brought up before as a suggestion and was agreed that it would be hard to determine which years should be lived here and decided to not recommend that. Mr. Holub asked what determines residency, if it was just owning a home in the City or is it voting and living. He gave the example of a snow bird owning a home in Brecksville but living most of their time in Florida. Chairperson Skaljac said he believes it is based off voting location, where an individual votes from. He said there are examples of people owning homes in other cities, but living somewhere else and voting in that specific city, not everywhere they own a home. Mrs. Mansfield agreed saying going by where an individual votes would cover renters too. Mr. Berlin



suggested asking Law Director Matty if there is a standard definition of residency for requirement or if that is something that needs to be defined or clarified.

Mr. Bender said he would be in favor of increasing the residency time for Mayor. He said six years seems a little high, he feels that it is portraying a person must be a lifer to be considered, so he is in favor of bumping it to four years. Mrs. Bartos said she goes both ways, two years seems enough and they should trust the electorate, but she would not support changing it to anything more than four years. Mr. Holub said he is in the same position. He said if a person comes in and is really engaged, two years seems sufficient to learn about Brecksville. He also said the Mayor explained it really well when he discussed term limits by saying it is an election, if there are residency requirements of two years, it is still an election, let the people decide. Mrs. Bartos said just because an individual has lived in Brecksville for two, four, or six years does not mean they have been an active engaged citizen. She does not believe that the residency requirement is protecting what they want to protect, there is no engagement requirement. Mr. Berlin said they are trying to protect the City from a person coming in changing things, doing what they want to do, then getting bored and leaving. He said he doesn't have to lock his doors at home because people shouldn't want to break into his house, but he still feels a little bit more comfortable when his doors are locked to protect his family and he looks at the City of Brecksville as his family. He said he would love to say that everybody who would run for Mayor would have the best entrance of the city in mind but he does not feel that that is the case any longer. Mr. Schirch said if the person is that highly motivated to run for Mayor, they should be ok to wait the extra two years to meet the requirement. Chairperson Skaljac said that it was also discussed to change the requirement for Council, they also have a two year residency requirement. He said, for the most part, it is really hard for someone to come in without any city experience, be it on a Board or Commission or as a member of Council, and run for Mayor and win. He said it is hard enough for a person to run for Council and win who has never had experience on a Board or Commission or been involved in something else in depth in the City. He said to run for Council is two year residency, then the Council term is a minimum two year term, possibly four, if they have aspiration to go on to Mayor, they would meet a four year requirement. He said he is sitting on the fence for a need to increase it, however, does not see a need to go any more than four years.

Chairperson Skaljac said it seems like the Commission is in agreement to continue discussions to increase the Mayors residency requirement or on the fence, but did not hear any nos other than to six years. He said he will note this topic as a four year suggestion and when they rank them all out they will see everyone's interest. He asked if Council President Redinger or Council Representative Savage had anything to ask or add. They responded no.

ARTICLE V: HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Chairperson Skaljac said to refresh everyone's memories, they have discussed this topic and it was brought up by a few different Department Heads as far as the suggestion to have a dedicated Human Resources Position and or Department created in the Charter. He said it is currently handled within the Finance Department. The discussion is if this should be something City Council creates or the Charter. He asked Council President Redinger or Council Representative Savage if anything has been discussed in Council. Council President Redinger said she appreciates the idea of having a separate person or department, just from the confidentiality side of it, but she does not think it is something for the Charter to handle. Council has just heard about this suggestion and are planning on discussing. She said she is always thinking of the dollars



and putting it the Charter would be committing the dollars and do they want to require a specific expenditure for a person or department or do they want to allow Council to discuss and review. Council Representative Savage agreed with Council President Redinger saying this is the first time this Council is hearing of the recommendation and appreciates the transparent conversation from the Administration. She said in her “day job” if you draw a black and white line, there are payroll compensation functions that are very standardized, they need to happen and they need to be accurate. She said there is a standard set of procedures to process those steps. She said she also thinks that there might need to be a different approach when it comes to the confidentiality, employee relations sort of topics. She said they want to have City Employees who are valued and engaged and feel safe and respected and they can also get their paycheck on time. She said by adding in a director level role via the Charter puts the City in a position for a skill set and a pay scale and job description range that might not be necessary. She said for that reason she thinks it is more of a legislation step rather than a Charter requirement. Council President Redinger said they have had the great fortune of finding really good people, such as the new hire Monica Barkowitz, to help expand the team's capabilities and she thinks because they have had the ability to find the right person versus having to just have a body. She said the City has done a really great job of finding and appointing Department Heads and have had great success and the Mayor has had great success finding the right people. She said there is a need and importance to this position and role and do not want her comments to negate that as well.

Mr. Holub asked if someone could remind them who originally suggested this topic. Chairperson Skaljac said the Council Clerk and Director of Purchasing both brought it up during their interviews. Mr. Holub responded he thinks the position makes sense whether it is by Charter or City action. Mrs. Bartos said she believes this topic is better addressed by City Council, and she thinks that they recognize the need. She also said that by Council action it is more guaranteed to happen as opposed to putting it to a citywide vote. Mr. Bender agrees, he thinks a good next step would be for Council to conduct a needs assessment through some kind of outside firm for a road forward. Mr. Berlin said he has made this statement before that a company the size of Brecksville would have a separate function to protect themselves against bad things that happen. He said small companies, like Brecksville use to be, typically would throw things like this under Finance. He said this is something the City should definitely have, his problem is the City currently has the Director of Public Safety the Director of Public Service, the Law Director and other Directors in the Charter and it becomes confusing when you have Directors in the Charter and Directors by title. He said what if the remaining members of Council do not think this is an important topic or they do not want to spend the money on it. He said for two employees to come in a public forum and on record recommend this as a need, he believes this needs to happen and it needs to happen quickly, not a year or two down the road. Mrs. Gawlik said the City should have a dedicated HR person, and suggested submitting a letter to Council on record that the Commission reviewed this topic and suggests the Council take action, but does not agree it should be in the Charter. Mrs. Lesh said she agrees with Mrs. Gawlik, and it absolutely needs to happen, just not in the Charter, she would like to do a letter to Council. Mrs. Mansfield is on the fence regarding the method of this topic. She said coming from Finance, she thinks a Director of Finance should be able to handle these things, it is common, however, she envisions maybe not a Director role and it could remain under the Finance Department, and those ins and outs lead her to more of a Council recommendation, but she could get on board to adding to the Charter depending on wording and not overextending the City. Mr. Schirch said he believes there needs to be a dedicated person or



department for this. He really liked Law Director Matty’s recommendation regarding a third party. He said in an organization this size, in his experience, HR people are not independent. He said he is on the fence about Charter or Council action. Mrs. Vida-Clough is leaning towards making this a City Council action and the Commission writing a letter. She said the Administration that is here all the time crafting a job description makes more sense than the Commission laying out those rules. She said safety and psychological issues are very important in the work place and thinks everyone is on the same page that something needs to happen.

Chairperson Skaljac said he agrees with everyone and also thinks this is a Council action. He said the positions that are laid out in the Charter are positions that the City absolutely needs to have to function. He said the Economic Development Director is very important but does not need to, nor is it, in the Charter, same as IT Directors. He said in today’s world and the number of employees the City has it is needed, either a third party or a dedicated person, but it should be a Council action. He said it sounds like the Commission agrees, so he said they will draft a letter to Council. Mr. Berlin said he would like to have in the letter that if a third party is hired, they serve at the discretion of Council not the Mayor. Chairperson Skaljac said it would be under Finance which is under Council. Mr. Berlin said it should not be under Finance because it would not break that bridge of concern. He said, like the Law Director sits outside to protect the City, so should the HR Department. Chairperson Skaljac said thank you and the Commission moved on to the next topic.

ARTICLE V: ROLE IN CONTRACTS –FINANCE DIRECTOR

Chairperson Skaljac said this topic is also tied into Article VI: Role in Contracts for Purchasing Department. He said the Commission will discuss those both together because how closely they relate. He read the note from the Purchasing Director. The Charter currently reads “The Director of Purchasing shall have the responsibility to make certain that all terms and conditions imposed in favor of the Municipality or its inhabitants in any contract to which the Municipality is a party are fully and faithfully kept and performed.” He said the Purchasing Director wrote that is not correct because it states “any contract” so she is recommending to modify it to read “The Director of Purchasing shall have the responsibility to make certain that all terms and conditions imposed in favor of the Municipality or its inhabitants in any purchasing agreement and publicly bid contract to which the Municipality is a party are fully and faithfully kept and performed.” He said she was specifying the type of agreements. He said this is more of a clarification of duties. He said it would probably not impact anything if it stayed as is, however, it was suggested because her role. He said circling back is the same with the Finance Director and clarifying the types of contracts the Finance Director deals with. He said these would be things that if the Commission did want to push forward on, that the Law Director would need to get some language together to specify the Director of Finance spot and the Director of Purchasing language. Chairperson Skaljac said he thinks that it makes sense to do that, but it might not be a high priority issue because it is not impacting their day-to-day jobs or duties and it's not necessarily opening up the city to any liabilities. He asked if anyone had any comments.

Mr. Berlin asked if anybody mentioned to take it out of the Charter and then let that be handled by Council. Chairperson Skaljac explained those are two different topics.

Mr. Bender asked for an example of a contract that would be excluded if they modified that, like what type of contracts do they not look at. Chairperson Skaljac said the Purchasing Director gave the example of the Director of Finance is responsible for contracts related to Economic



Development and financial related products and services and the Director of Purchasing is dealing with purchase agreements and publicly bid contracts as opposed to the current language of any contract. Mr. Bender said it makes sense, he would want his job description to reflect what he did. Chairperson Skaljac asked Council President Redinger if either of those directors talked about having it changed. Council President Redinger stated they have not had further discussion but thinks it is something to have Law Director Matty write up because there are different people that are responsible for different contracts right so maybe language that says the appropriate department head will handle their appropriate contract. Chairperson Skaljac asked if anybody had comments on either topic. Mr. Schirch said he agrees with Dan, if the Charter is not reflective of what is actually taking place they probably should make it reflective. He said it's a housekeeping issue that you put on the ballot, it passes, and you're done with it. Mrs. Vida-Clough agreed. Mrs. Mansfield said she would be okay with the cleanup if they are doing that for other things. Mrs. Lesh, Mrs. Gawlik, Mr. Berlin, Mr. Bender, Mrs. Bartos, Mr. Holub all agreed. Mrs. Bartos clarified she agrees as long as they are not limiting what they do and they need to talk with the Law Director to make sure clarification and cleanup doesn't limit them in the long run. Chairperson Skaljac agreed and reminded the Commission they are the recommendations of Purchasing Director but have not been run by legal. He said he will note them down and to keep the language broader and they will discuss it with the Law Director

ARTICLE V: REMOVE “ANY CAUSE”

Chairperson Skaljac reminded the Commission this topic is regarding the removal language in sections seven, eight, and nine, which regard Board of Zoning, Planning Commission and Recreation Commission and the term “any cause” which is listed in there that for “any cause” any member of those um particular Boards or Commissions can be removed. He said some of them had thoughts and feelings that it is too broad, punitive, or political, and asked if it should be defined what the potential language and reasons for removal could or should be. He said in the last meeting there was eight people that wanted to discuss this further. He also reminded them that the Law Director said if this is something that they wanted to go on the ballot that it would need to be three separate items because it would have to be one for each of the three sections. He asked if anybody had thoughts or positions one way or the other. Mr. Bender said he is okay with the word any. He said if the Mayor wanted to remove someone and then to get five members of City Council to support the removal, he thinks that there is good checks and balances with that process. Mrs. Vida-Clough asked if the different Boards and Commissions have their own Charter that is more detailed. Chairperson Skaljac answered no. Mrs. Bartos agreed with Mr. Bender that the word any is okay. Mr. Berlin said he does not have an opinion either way. Mrs. Gawlik and Chairperson Skaljac agreed to no issue with the “any cause”. Chairperson Skaljac said it is a resident made up Board, it's not an elected body, and with elected positions you have to have reasons to want to remove and those are specified in the Charter. Council President Redinger said she has not seen anybody get removed just because, or just because we don't like them. She said it is typically someone starts traveling for work more or something changes in their life, or and they've been on for a while and they've decided that it's time to move on. Mrs. Lesh said it was her original question and she is glad they talked through it and is okay with keeping it as is. Mrs. Mansfield, Mr. Schirch, and Mrs. Vida-Clough all said they are okay with as is. They removed this topic from the list.



ARTICLE V: NUMBER OF COUNCIL VOTES TO REMOVE

Chairperson Skaljac reminded the Commission this topic is in regards to the number of Council votes to remove a Recreation Commission member. BZA and Planning Commission both require five Council votes, Recreation only requires four. He said he does not know what the reasoning was behind that originally other than maybe because the Recreation Commission is a Mayor appointed position, but the suggestion was made to make it consistent and make the Recreation Commission removal require five votes of Council. Mrs. Bartos, Mr. Berlin and Mr. Bender voted to make it five votes. Mr. Holub said he would like to see it consistent, however, it is low priority. Mrs. Gawlik agreed with Mr. Holub, so did Chairperson Skaljac and Mrs. Lesh, Mrs. Mansfield, Mr. Schirch, and Mrs. Vida-Clough. They will keep this topic on the list.

ARTICLE V: ADD ALTERNATES TO ALL BOARDS/COMMISSIONS

Chairperson Skaljac reminded the Commission this topic is regarding adding alternates to all Boards and Commissions. He said this would be something that he believes would have to be separate for Section seven, eight, and nine, and potentially ten if Civil Service Commission was also being discussed. He said this could potentially be four Charter amendments. He said his opinion on this is he does not think having an alternate for those Boards or Commissions is needed, and he doesn't know that anybody would necessarily want to be an alternate on those and just sit through those meetings and not have a vote. He said Planning Commission meets twice a month and those can go for hours on end.

Mr. Holub asked if there is anything to prevent a Commission from naming an alternate if they feel it necessary, or does it need to be in the Charter. Chairperson Skaljac said that is a good question, but he is not sure. He said he assumes that if, for example, the Human Services Advisory Board Commission, that is not a part of the Charter, wanted to have an alternate they could. Mrs. Gawlik asked if they would still have to be approved by Council. Chairperson Skaljac said he would assume. He said they should ask the Law Director if this is something Council could mandate or if the individual Boards and Commissions could. Mrs. Bartos asked if they could get comment from the chairs of the Boards and Commissions and see how they feel about this topic. She said her perspective is this would be a great opportunity to have somebody else sit on a Board, more opportunity for citizens to participate, more opportunity for backups as people phase out, and great way to learn, but said she doesn't know if that would be a benefit or a detriment to these Boards or Commissions. Mr. Berlin said going along with what Mrs. Bartos said earlier, if there's someone in the community who is interested in this I think they have ample opportunity now to watch video, become engaged, and attend meetings, so he wouldn't be in favor of making a charter amendment to mandate it. Mr. Bender said at one point in the process he was interested in this and thought it'd be a great idea for the reasons that Stephanie just articulated, kind of the building of the bench strength getting people involved but in practice he does not think this is a Charter issue. He said he remembers the Law Director making mention of problems that may come, for example Planning or BZA, if someone misses then and that alternate's in then that alternate has to be in on all of the decisions. He said it sounded like there was some things to muddy the water so with that he looks at this as a low priority topic that he is not really that excited about. Mrs. Gawlik said she does not think it is necessary, and Mrs. Lesh said she does not think it's necessary from a perspective of the Charter. Mrs. Mansfield said she is a no and so did Mr. Schirch. Mrs. Vida-Clough said she thinks she was the one who brought this up originally, and after all the discussions



and all of the knowledge sitting in on some of the Facebook live feeds she agrees that it doesn't make sense for it to be in the Charter and there is ample opportunity for residents to get involved. Chairperson Skaljac said after hearing everybody's feedback it was pretty much all nos. He said they will get the information Mrs. Bartos asked for and ask the Law Director to answer Mr. Holub's question regarding if those Boards or Commissions can do it on their own. He said they will not be moving forward with this topic, however, will reconsider if they receive an overwhelming response from the Chairs.

ARTICLE VI: EXPENDITURE LIMITS

Chairperson Skaljac explained to the Commission that on the list it says combining section four and five, however, the Purchasing Director sent over an update to recommend leaving section four and five, leaving the language for section five pertaining to public bids, and updating the expenditure limit that is currently at \$3,000.00, and has been at that level since 2003. He said all the Department Heads recommended this and he knows that Council has also recommended this. He said his opinion is as far as it impacts Council, it was never really a big deal. He said it is not like Council was being bogged down, or at least that wasn't his experience. He knows for the Department side it probably is a little, for example if Service has an issue with a vehicle that needs repairs, most are large amounts that need to be done immediately and \$3,000.00 is not going to cut it, \$10,000.00 probably would. He said he knows some people wrote in suggesting \$25,000.00, but if you jump from 2 to 25, it most likely will not be approved. He said something above \$3,000.00 is warranted, but he would not recommend anything over \$10,000.00.

Mr. Holub agreed there should be an increase but would like to get away from arbitrary numbers, he had an idea he would like some feedback on. He asked if they could put something in the Charter that calls for an increase based on core CPI, whether it's on an annual basis or four years, so that there's an increase that's going to occur at every set period but it's based on something, it's not just on a basic round number from three to five or ten thousand. Chairperson Skaljac responded they can suggest whatever they want. Mr. Holub said this way they would be tying it to something that makes sense. He said part of the reason is the cost of goods have gone up since 2003, obviously, so they should be higher than \$3,000.00, but thinks it should be based on some thought and not just a nice round number that looks good. Mrs. Bartos said she is pro- increase but is not sure as to what amount, and agrees over \$10,000.00 is too much. Mr. Bender said he likes the CPI idea and he thinks there's a need to increase the amount. He said the number he had in mind was \$6,000.00 from the recommendation of Chief Zamiska and Police Chief Korinek. He recommended starting at \$6,000.00 and then tied to a CPI on a go forward basis so that it's depending on what inflation does that'll go up incrementally. Mr. Berlin said his thought is if it even belong in the Charter. He said someone made a recommendation of removing section four and then giving that to council to review on a regular basis. He said he doesn't know how he feels about it he's just bringing it up. He also mentioned various proposals from the Recreation Director, the Public Safety Director, etcetera, that had a scale, it wasn't one number, it was Department Heads X, Mayor approval Y, and Council approval Z. Chairperson Skaljac responded the lower amounts Council can determine the limits, this topic is trying to figure out what Council's approval limit is, what amount needs to be approved by Council, not just the Mayor or Department Heads. He also said his opinion is to not have a limit in the Charter, however, he does not believe that will ever pass. Mr. Berlin said then he would agree to a \$6,000.00 to \$10,000.00 range.



Mrs. Gawlik stated she would support an increase but is unsure of the amount at this time. Mrs. Lesh said \$10,000.00 popped into her head just because it's been since 2003 and giving a little bit of cushion, she does believe \$6,000.00 makes sense, but would support giving a little extra. Mrs. Mansfield said she would support \$10,000.00, but believes the Commission is nitpicking at really small amounts. She said, for example, the Purchasing Director had said there were 54 purchases between those numbers, and she does not think those are impactful. Mr. Schirch said he also likes the \$6,000.00 to \$10,000.00 range, and it is a matter of how it is brought up to the voters, for example, the sense of urgency in fixing a truck. Chairperson Skaljac agreed, saying to tell the voters this hasn't been increased in 20 years, we all know you know the cost of bread 20 years ago is a lot more today than it was then and we're just trying to keep up with the times. Mrs. Vida-Clough agreed to the \$6,000.00 to \$10,000.00 range.

Mrs. Mansfield said she might change her mind, she said she does not have the perspective of what actually \$10,000.00 is and believes people are more skeptical. Mr. Berlin said \$10,000.00 a lot of money, compared to \$50 million in a budget it's not, but compared to take home, so the perspective of voters he said might be different. Chairperson Skaljac said a vast majority of the public has never been to any Council meeting and have no idea or context of what the cost of running a government really is. Mr. Berlin asked Council Representative Savage and Council President Redinger their input. Council Representative Savage said as a newer member of Council she does not feel as though they are bogged down by requests. She said they do move rather quickly, but the fact that they are moving through them so quickly kind of indicates that perhaps they don't require the approval. She said one comment she thinks is really important though is awareness and that there is transparency to have the ability to understand where the money is going, even when it is smaller, so something like the elevator breaks and we need to fix it doesn't necessarily need to wait. She said she thinks that the number can be higher, but she does not want to lose the awareness. She suggest maybe updates from the \$3,000.00 to \$7,500.00 range in the Council packets. Council President Redinger agreed, Council is not bogged down, but thinks about the need to have a special meeting because something that couldn't wait until the next meeting needs to be approved. She said the price of things are just purely going up and that would be the reason why the Commission should consider raising the limits. She said she thinks it would make the Department Heads jobs a bit easier, their Council meetings are always busy, there's a lot going on, everybody works very hard so if they can simplify a little bit she thinks that it's more about that versus bogging Council down.

Chairperson Skaljac said he thinks that they all need to understand the limit is this really isn't a limit that is a Council benefit this is helping the Department Heads. He said it is not like the Department Heads are just going to be blindly writing out \$5,900.00 checks, those amounts still have to be approved by the Mayor and Finance Director. He said there's a pretty unanimous thought to move forward and figure out some sort of an expenditure limit or index to use so they will keep that one on the list.

ARTICLE VI: COMBINE SECTION 4 AND 5

Chairperson Skaljac said through the previous discussions, this topic has already been decided to be removed.



ARTICLE VI: LANGUAGE UPDATE SALE OF INVENTORY

Chairperson Skaljac informed the Commission this topic is in regards to the language for the sale of Municipal property and to potentially discuss the current \$1,000.00 limit. He said a few things came up when the Director of Purchasing was giving her report and recommendations. The Charter currently says under Section 6, at public sale the Director of Purchasing may sell personal property not needed for municipal purposes having an estimated value of \$1,000.00 or less without prior authorization and approval of Council. He said what the Director of Purchasing had originally recommended was to update the language to reflect the current procedures something along the lines of “at public sale via internet auction the Director of Purchasing and the Director of Public Service may sell personal property not needed for municipal purposes those articles of personal property deemed of no value or as unsafe by the Director of Purchasing or the Director of Public Service shall be discarded either by means of recycling or by the city's Solid Waste Disposal program”. He clarified that in her recommendation she eliminated the \$1,000.00 or less language and also added in the role of the Director of Public Service as somebody who can also make those determinations on the sale of personal property not needed. He said how it is done today is via internet auction but we don't want to have her prohibited from doing it in some other form. Also, having the Director of Public Service was recommended to be an and/or authorization. He said the \$1,000.00 is a pretty low limit. Mr. Schirch asked if she suggested a different limit. Chairperson Skaljac said she did not. He said the items being sold are typically relatively small stuff like chairs, bikes, and tables, not Capital Equipment. They questioned the term of “personal property” and suggested making the heading consistent with the verbiage in the paragraph.

Mr. Berlin also stated that it does not say if an item is over \$1,000.00 Council has to approve it. Chairperson Skaljac said he thinks that's implied though “with the prior authorization”. Council President Redinger said that for example, say the City would like to purchase a new bailer, as part of the purchase we are trading in the old one, Council is therefore authorizing the sale through the legislation and contract. Chairperson Skaljac said as the verbiage is currently written the things that go to auction are items that are less than \$1,000.00, if they want to sell something more than \$1,000.00 on an auction or some other way they have to get Council's approval. Mr. Berlin asked if anything in this section needs to change. Chairperson Skaljac said the one thing he thinks needs to change is adding the Director of Public Service. Mr. Berlin said then he has a bigger concern that the City Employees are not following the Charter because she says the recommended language is the current procedure the current procedure doesn't align with the Charter procedure. He also said if an item is deemed of no value or unsafe why sell it, throw it away. Mrs. Mansfield said she thinks that was her way to reword the section to get rid of the dollar amount. Mr. Skaljac said he thinks they are getting way into the weeds. Mrs. Bartos asked Council representatives if there are a lot of requests for this. Council President Redinger stated she thinks it is just to stream line the process to sell things that are no longer of use and won't harm anyone. Mrs. Bartos said keeping a number on there helps with transparency to see what's being disposed of what's going on.

Mr. Bender said this is a very low priority topic for him. Mr. Berlin agreed, but said he would support adding the Service Director but not the amounts. Mrs. Bartos said that it sounds like adding the and/or is necessary because they are already doing it, which changes the priority level. Chairperson Skaljac said it is low on his priority list, but sounds like the Service Director needs to be added and keep all the other language.



Mrs. Gawlik and Mrs. Lesh both said this is low priority but understand adding the Service Director. Mrs. Mansfield agreed with all of the changes from the Director of Purchasing. Mr. Schirch and Mrs. Vida-Clough agreed with adding the Service Director. They will keep this topic.

ARTICLE VI: ROLE IN CONTRACTS PURCHASING DIRECTOR

Chairperson Skaljac said the discussed this when they discussed the role in Contracts with the Finance Director. This topic will remain on the list and they will talk to legal.

ARTICLE XI: CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION NUMBER OF YEARS BETWEEN MEETINGS

Chairperson Skaljac reminded the Commission this topic was in regards to the number of years required between Charter Review Commissions, and that it is currently ten years. He said most members did not see any need to change, however, they wanted to discuss it again. Mr. Schirch said he brought up the issue because the issue of ten years was brought up every meeting, he also said other cities are shorter, and an argument against just having Council put it on the ballot would be an argument against having a Charter Review in the first place. He said he does not think ten years is acceptable due to the fast pace of society, and the first Brecksville Charter review was completed after seven years.

Mrs. Vida Clough when she thinks of the hours spent getting the Commission together and all of their time here and the Charter hasn't changed that much, she is pretty confident ten years is acceptable. She said their time can be spent in the community making other changes.

Mr. Schirch said another point is the vast majority of things proposed to the voters passes and sometimes by a very large margin, these are things that Council never came up with, these are items that citizens' initiative never came up, so he would recommend every eight years. Mrs. Gawlik said she would argue that that's a reflection of the passage of the 10 years and if you have the Charter Review more frequent the number of issues will actually go down. Mr. Schirch said they are actually talking about limiting issues to bring to the voters because we don't want to present too many of them at one time.

Mrs. Mansfield and Mrs. Lesh said they are comfortable with ten years, but understand a small change to eight years could be okay. Mrs. Gawlick said she is comfortable with every ten years. Mr. Berlin, Mr. Bender, Mrs. Bartos and Mr. Holub all said they are comfortable with ten but understand Mr. Schirch's points.

Council President Redinger stated she appreciates Mr. Schirch's comments but does not think they are being hindered by the Commission only getting together every ten years. Chairperson Skaljac agreed and they removed this topic from the list.

ARTICLE XII: GENDER NEUTRAL/TYPO CORRECTIONS FOR ENTIRE CHARTER

Chairperson Skaljac reminded the Commission this topic was regarding the overall gender neutral language improvements, typos, numbering mistakes. He said the Law Director provided them some other examples that have been passed in other Charters and that have been held up in court that basically can apply to the entire Charter where both Council and Law Director change the language of the Charter or structure for typos, gender neutral verbiage, numbering issues, etcetera. The Brecksville Charter has a few of these and this would cover the entire Charter, edited by the Law Director and approved by Council. He explained they approved previously a



gender neutral issue on a “going forward” bases. This would be for throughout the Charter, then and now.

The entire Commission except Mrs. Mansfield. Mr. Berlin said they will need to make sure they message that to the public correctly. Mrs. Gawlik said Broadview Heights just passed something similar. Mrs. Mansfield said she thinks it is a lot of rework for not a lot of benefit and it does not bother her or effect how we govern.

Mr. Schirch said he does not think it will cost a lot of money and the City should do it. Mrs. Mansfield said she thinks it will cost the city a lot of money to have a legal review and believes it would be the most detailed oriented topic they have so far.

Chairperson Skaljac said they will keep this topic on as well.

CHAIRPERSONS COMMENTS

Chairperson Skaljac said he had the following for the Commission to discuss further or with legal:

Article III: Mayor Residency requirements

Article V: Finance Director Role in Contracts

Article V: Number of Council Votes to Remove a Recreation Commission Member

Article VI: Expenditure Limits

Article VI: Language to update Sale of Inventory to Include Service Director

Article VI: Purchasing Director Role in Contracts

Article XII: Gender Neutral, Typo Corrections for entire Charter

He told the Commission he will have everyone tally up in a ranking system, with one being the top priority and seven being the least, then pass them down, and he will tally them up for the next meeting.

Council President Redinger informed the Commission that the State of the City is being held on February 22nd and the Commission had a scheduled meeting on that day. Chairperson Skaljac said the next meeting will be February 6th at 6:30, and they should look for a different date than the 22nd. Wednesday, February 15th at 6:30 worked for most people. He said he will get the information discussed today to the Law Department and they could also start working on a suggestion letter to City Council for the HR Department.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS:

Hearing no other requests for PUBLIC DISCUSSION & COMMENT, motion by Skaljac, seconded by Schirch to close the meeting at 12:00p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Bartos, Bender, Berlin, Gawlik, Lesh, Mansfield, Schirch, Skaljac, Vida-Clough.

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting recorded by Eric Schirch