

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF AVON, OHIO, HELD THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2022,
AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING,
LOCATED AT 36080 CHESTER ROAD**

Chairman John Weigman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patricia Ashley, Ward 1; Elizabeth Damstra, Ward 3; Clint Gault, Ward 4; James Gemelas, Ward 1; Joseph Glick, Ward 1; Marcel Mylen, Ward 2; Alternate A Melissa Ramirez, Ward 3; Alternate B Bruce Klingshirn, Ward 4; John Weigman, Ward 1

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mary Berges, Ward 3; William Logan, Ward 4

ALSO PRESENT:

Law Director, John Gasior; Secretary to the Commission, Barbara Brooks

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MARCH 10, 2022, MEETING

A motion was made by Mr. Gault and seconded by Mr. Gemelas to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the meeting of the 2022 Charter Review Commission, held Thursday, March 10, 2022, and to approve said minutes as published.

Mr. Gasior stated that there was a correction to the minutes. In the second paragraph where it states "pertaining to Article IX, Section 7, Salaries and Bonds", that should be "pertaining to Article IV", Section 7, Salaries and Bonds".

The vote to approve the minutes as amended was: Ms. Ashley, "yes"; Ms. Damstra, "yes"; Mr. Gault, "yes"; Mr. Gemelas, "yes"; Mr. Glick, "yes"; Mr. Mylen, "yes"; Ms. Ramirez, "yes"; Mr. Klingshirn, "yes"; Mr. Weigman, "yes".

The vote was 9 in favor and 0 against and the Chairman declared the motion passed.

DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AVON

a. ARTICLE XII – AMENDMENTS TO THE CHARTER

There were no comments on Article XII.

b. ARTICLE XIII- GENERAL PROVISIONS

Mr. Gemelas stated that in regard to Section 9, Detroit Road Preservation, he could not figure out why this was actually put in the Charter. He always thought that roads were supposed to be handled by the State, especially Rt. 254, which is a State route. He really does not know what the necessity was for this to be put in the Charter. There is no other provision in the Charter regarding anything that he can see

as related to zoning, or traffic ordinances or traffic laws. He wanted to find out a little bit more about the history of it and why they chose to put that in the Charter for any particular reason. He just thought it was something that could cause a problem for us in the future in case the City or the State actually decided to come through here and expand the road. As far as making the road larger, he thinks we are choking with traffic in this town when it comes to certain areas of Rt. 254. He has lived here since 1994 and has been in the area since the 80's and he has never seen it this bad and he thinks putting this in the Charter and hamstringing us for whatever reason just seems out of place.

Mr. Gasior stated it was an interesting Charter Review Commission that got together back then in 2003. He believed that several of the members were part of the Avon Historical Society and one of those members spearheaded the drive to get that particular provision passed. He thought that their goal was to somehow try to curtail growth and they thought that by keeping Detroit Road to two lanes or three lanes they could do that. They were primarily looking down Detroit Road probably east of Jaycox where it has a pretty rural sort of flavor to it and they wanted to preserve that. And the same is true if you go west. Once you get past the High School, things changed to more of a rural character of spread-out homes and he thought that they wanted to make sure that we kept that to two or three lanes. Mr. Gasior thought that the question that Mr. Gemelas will be asking is what would we do as a City if the State wanted to widen Detroit Road to four or five lanes? It is a State route and they do control it so if they wanted to spend the money and widen the street, he believed they would be able to do that and what that would do to us is that it would force us into a court situation where we would have to uphold our Charter provision and say we cannot allow the State to do it and then we would end up in this battle between the State and the City in court, spending money and probably losing because he thought that the State would prevail on that.

Mr. Weigman asked if the theoretical widening of Detroit Road would involve both City and State dollars and Mr. Gasior said generally it does. It usually is an 80%/20% function or 90%/10% so the State usually pays the lion's share of the cost but the City is still going to be obligated to pay that 10% and then has to give them permission to come in. There is consent legislation that comes through Council twice a year when the State is going to do work on bridges going over I-90. How does that relate? They have to get permission to come in and do work on Detroit Road and if we do not grant the permission and it is a State route, it just creates a lot of legal issues that Mr. Gasior does not think any community in Ohio has ever dealt with.

Mr. Gault stated that it is interesting looking at different cities and how they are built and you think about all of these houses that are in Avon that have historical integrity and character and charm and the question you ask is, what type of city do we want to be not today or even 10 years from now but say, 30 or 40 years from now. You look at Lorain Road in N. Olmsted and how kind of crazy it is; N. Olmsted has a lot of great amenities but it is also kind of clustery. He thought that the intent behind preserving Detroit Road was to try to make an effort to make at least a part of the City of Avon less hectic. He thought what they were trying to do back then was to say, we have different parts to the City; let's try to preserve the French Creek District as part of the City that has less speed, less craziness on the roads, where the festivals can be held, etc. He noted that the City has purchased different historical properties such as the Jameson House and the Cahoon House, trying to preserve some of what Avon used to be built upon. The school house across from Avon Commons was going to be torn down and that was preserved. Mr. Gault felt at some point Detroit Road has to go to three lanes all through Avon but when you think about how you widen to three lanes, when you look at the houses down Detroit Road going from Westlake into Avon, the road will be up on the front doors of some people. So it is controversial sometimes because you are taking away a lot of the character of some of these houses and it diminishes the value of the home but when you start widening the road, that is kind of what you get into with some of these places. So from a

historical perspective that was what was happening then; they were trying to preserve some of the character and charm of the older houses in Avon.

Mr. Mylen stated that Mr. Gault was making the assumption that the road is going to be widened. Nobody is talking about widening the road. All we are talking about is taking a burden off from the City. If the road is going to be widened, there is going to be a battle with the State anyway but at least we do not have to take it to court or be taken to court and spend a lot of the taxpayer money to do it because it is not our road; it is the State's road and that is the only thing. It has nothing to do with preservation of anything and if you take a look at Westlake, Westlake is two lanes, just like it is on the east end of Avon and the most they are talking about is going to a left turn lane at certain intersections which we have at both Jaycox and at Lear. Nobody is talking about widening the road; just because you remove this from the Charter does not mean we are going to do it and that was the whole thing.

Mr. Gault said that, for him, it is less of a stance and more of an explanation behind why they were trying to put it in the Charter, which was to make it a hurdle for someone to push it along.

Mr. Klingshirn stated that it is an interesting case and would be lucrative for the attorneys and that is what is going to happen because he thought that the City would have to challenge the State on it and say it is in our Charter and they cannot do it. All we would be doing would be spending a lot of money and lose. Ms. Ramírez added that she thought that the other thing to think about is that putting this on the ballot is going to open a can of worms; even when we have all this reasoning behind it we all know that there will be a legal fight. Mr. Mylen noted that it has been on the ballot twice to remove this Section in the Charter. Mr. Gemelas said, was he understanding that this has actually gone to the voters on two different occasions and Mr. Mylen said, yes.

Ms. Ashley said she believed this was brought to the ballot in 2017 and she was on that Charter Review Commission. There were individuals that came to the meeting when it became known that that was potentially coming to the ballot and everyone that spoke had the same concern. They felt that if we removed this from the Charter, then the next week the construction vehicles were going to show up. She wants to try to get individuals to understand that what she would like to accomplish is to prevent the City from having to get into a legal battle. If the State does say they are going to widen Detroit Road, then the way that this is written, Avon basically has to contest that and say we are going to fight it. She does not think getting this removed from the Charter is going to work but perhaps we could insert some sort of language such as, "unless forced upon by the State" or something to that effect so that way we are not giving the illusion that we are going to widen the street next week.

Mr. Gault asked Mr. Gasior what he thought about that. Mr. Gasior said the original 2003 passage of the Charter amendment was highly controversial and several members of that Charter Review Commission resigned in protest over the fact that they were trying to put that in the Charter. He said, so having lived through that and having lived through the last two attempts to get it out of the Charter, he just thinks it is pretty harmless sitting there; it really does not bother him. He does not see anything happening in the next 20 or 30 years and if something did happen, if the State did come in and say they wanted to widen Detroit Road, there are several ways we could avoid a big legal battle over that by just simply having Council put a Charter amendment on the ballot that year and let people know that we have to amend the Charter so that we can move forward with road construction and let the people decide what they want to do. This is not something that he sees as an urgent need to address. It has been shot down twice with the last two Charter Review Commissions that put it in front of the voters. The voters have spoken; they have not changed their minds. They see it as a preservation issue as Mr. Gault points out

but he thinks they also see it as an anti-growth sort of provision, that if we can keep Detroit Road to three lanes we can eliminate significant development down Detroit Road.

Mr. Glick asked Mr. Gasior, with Detroit Road being a State route, would the City even have a right to widen it on its own? Mr. Gasior answered, yes, every city seeks State money for their road programs every year, and if the State believes that your project is worthwhile they will fund that project to the tune of maybe 80% or 90% and then you advertise for bids and follow all the State procedures and go ahead and do your project.

Mr. Glick stated, so the widening would be something that is pursued by the City with State funding. It is not something that the State would come and say they are going to widen Detroit Road to four lanes from x to y. Mr. Gasior noted that we actually did that two years ago in conjunction with the sanitary sewer project over by Elizabeth, Puth, and Joseph on Detroit Road. It was proposed to widen Detroit Road from Jaycox all the way to Nagel to three lanes and insert that middle left turn lane. He does not know exactly what happened but we did not perform that aspect of the job. We did put in the sewer and we did the side streets which were our local streets and we covered that cost and that was the way that worked out. When we did the three lanes from Healthway Drive west to Stoney Ridge in 2005 or 2006, that was done with State funds and he believed it was a 90% job. It moves traffic through there better than it used to although it still backs up at rush hour. He does not think even five lanes can solve that problem. Mr. Glick said that is a good point; there are a lot of studies that suggest that the wider your road is, it is going to create more demand so that things that are slightly less convenient for people will be underutilized and you will see the same backup we have on Detroit Road.

Mr. Gasior said that he remembered going to ODOT's headquarters in Columbus when we were looking for some funding to improve the intersection of Nagel and Detroit. He said you present your case to a panel of about 20 or 30 ODOT District heads and you have to have everything laid out such as traffic studies, etc. You have to develop what is called your "warrant". And they score you and then based on how you score, they decide how much money you are going to get and whether your project is going to go forward. A lot of it has to do with how much money the City is willing to put into the project because obviously if your City can put half a million dollars into the engineering up front, that makes it a little bit more desirable for the State to go forward with funding because they have a project that is shovel-ready. So we work with the State on these things. With this Charter provision, there is probably not going to be any push by the City to go to five lanes because we are restricted because of the Charter amendment. But he does not see how the State would come through here at some point down the road and just all of a sudden tell us that we have to widen the road. He does not know that they have ever done that in any community where they forced their way into a local community and said a road had to be widened. So he just feels this issue is not harming the pro-widening people right now because there is not going to be a pro-widening group forming. He thought that everybody's focus of attention right now is on Chester Road and seeing that get widened to five lanes and seeing all that commercial/industrial property down there get developed. He does not think there is any focus on Detroit Road primarily east of Nagel because there are no sewers there and development is not really going to happen there until sewers come.

Mr. Gemelas said that it just seems odd that we would put something like this in the actual Charter. He can see a number of problems with it as far as trying to enforce it or just ignoring it. He would think we would have more of a problem ignoring it because he thought somebody would take that up. As far as picking which street we are not going to widen, it seems more like a spot zoning issue than anything else. And we took a lot of care into updating all of our ordinances and our regulations when it came to zoning in the City and there were a lot of people who were not very happy about what we did and at that time there was a lot of discussion about removing a lot of different things and he thought that some of these

provisions, if they thought they could get it on the Charter, they would have if they thought it would prevent certain growth in this community. But we have been through it. Avon started growing like crazy; we had housing developments going in all over the place. People really wanted to control it and he understands it. But it still seems to him that keeping this provision in the Charter is really just a recipe for disaster later on down the road. And he thinks that somebody could use it to their advantage. Say we decide we are going to increase the size of the roads in other portions of the City; someone is going to look at the Charter and say we chose not to do it on Rt. 254 so why don't they do the same for Chester Road or whatever other road we have here. Mr. Gemelas said, so he thinks it is fraught with issues. He just always thought it was very unusual to have in the Charter; it seemed like a pet project for somebody, and realistically having that in there is a recipe for disaster. He is sure that people probably want to keep it because they do not want to lose their property on the road, but the State has the right to come in, subject to all legal highways, and every deed that is recorded.

Mr. Gasior stated that in 2003, there were a lot of people upset about this being in the Charter. It was expressed a number of times that this is not the type of provision that you would want to have in a City Charter, that it had no place in the City Charter. But the people that were there were headstrong about doing this; they really believed that this was an historic preservation issue. Mr. Gasior said, and then he thought that some of the anti-growth people realized that this might work for them as well to curtail growth and so it was a marriage of those two groups that was able to get this legislation passed.

Mr. Weigman asked if Mr. Gasior recalled how close the vote was in the last two attempts to overturn this and Mr. Gasior said that he thought that in the last one it was a little over 60% against. He said he would get that number for the next meeting. Mr. Klingshirm said that people around town thought Detroit Road was going to be five lanes from the railroad tracks to Westlake.

Mr. Gault noted, so this is something that the City would be bringing up to want to do. The State probably would not bring it up because they have enough real issues of funding other places, and the City does not have any intention of doing it, so it is almost like a provision that does not matter one way or the other. Mr. Gasior stated that the City is not going to be pushing for a five lane road until all the residents are pushing for that and that is why he said we are looking at something that is probably 30 or more years down the road.

Mr. Gemelas said that the only reason he brings it up is because he still thinks someone is going to make the argument of why we have one area of this town limited in the size of the road that we can expand and not others. He still thinks this will pose a problem with an argument to be made by a developer or somebody else that is against the expansion of other roads in the City and arguing, well, why didn't we protect this area? Ms. Damstra asked, is it not because it is the French Creek District? It is like an historical road. Mr. Gault said, yes, he thought Ms. Damstra was right on that. He thought that the Planning Commission wanted to preserve the French Creek District and make it different. Mr. Gasior added that all those provisions are in the Codified Ordinances. Ms. Damstra asked how far the French Creek District goes on Detroit Road and Mr. Gasior said from Middleton west to French Creek Road.

Mr. Glick stated that when this was challenged a decade ago, it lost 2/3 to 1/3. He said that Mr. Gemelas raises a good point. This provision is in the Charter to preserve Detroit Road; do we want to explore other areas and other provisions in this Charter to preserve other parts of Avon?

Mr. Gemelas noted that this does not just say "French Creek District". This is Rt. 254 from Westlake all the way to Sheffield. So this does not have as much to do with one or two little intersections; this is all of it. Again, it just seems strange that we would have it for one main section of road that bisects

the entire City vs every other road that bisects the City as well. He said that he understands it; people think it is going to control the growth. And Article XV, regarding lot requirement sizes, is the type of thing that was taken up in the Supreme Court for purposes of controlling the growth which turned out to be a violation of civil rights because of cities that were talking about requiring five-acre lots and that was really done for one purpose. They did not want people of a certain caliber building and this is where some of this really went south on some of the cities. It just seems like Section 9 is a decent idea but it does not belong in a Charter and now that it is in there, it is a thorn in there and no one is going to pull it out because they think it will open up Pandora's Box.

Mr. Weigman stated that unless somebody else has further comment, we have probably covered the ground on this and probably will decide that we are not going to pursue it in this Commission.

Ms. Brooks asked if they wanted to take a vote. Mr. Gasior stated that they do not have to take a vote on it right now. He said that he would like to come back and let them know what the votes were the first time it passed and then the next two attempts to repeal it.

Mr. Weigman asked Mr. Glick if he had just looked that up and Mr. Glick responded that it lost 2/3 to 1/3 to repeal it back in 2007 and the last attempt lost 60% to 40%. Mr. Gasior stated that in 2003 he thought that it passed in the 55% area. He said that he might also point out that with the accepted intersections and approaches to intersections, you could start from Rt. 83 and go west and could probably widen the entire Detroit Road in the French Creek District to five lanes because you would probably be up against an intersection somewhere. So under the way that the Charter is written, he thought you could actually take the entire French Creek District and turn it into five lanes right now.

Ms. Damstra said that just being in the City at 11 A.M., it is not that busy. She can easily get from one side of Avon to the other during the middle of the day. It is really just rush hour that it is congested.

Mr. Mylen said that he agreed with Mr. Gemelas. The big reason that he wanted to take the provision out has nothing to do with development. He was not looking at it from a legal standpoint like Mr. Gemelas is but he was looking at it as a cost to the City. But Mr. Gemelas brought up some good points that are important. The problem is we can discuss those points and understand them but the electorate does not know why we are doing what we are doing and it is not something that is easily explained.

Mr. Gasior stated that you would probably have to campaign and get the word out but he knows that you would be up against other people campaigning to keep it in. Mr. Klingshirn added that the last time that it came up there was a group that was passing out cards urging people not to vote for it because then Detroit Road would be widened. That was not the intent but that was their perception. Mr. Gasior said it is a tough issue and he would like Mr. Logan to be here at the next meeting for more discussion.

Mr. Weigman said that they would put it on the agenda for the next meeting as a discussion point.

c. ARTICLE XIV – LANDMARK PRESERVATION

Ms. Damstra noted that in Section 2 (a) where it says "The Commission shall issue a demolition permit no later than six months" – that seems like a lengthy period if someone is working on a project. Mr. Gault, who is a member of the Landmark Preservation Commission, explained that the six months was to prevent someone coming in and just tearing down a landmark and also giving the Commission some time to see what could be done to save it. Usually it is a smooth, friendly process; it is very rare that the

Commission ever says it is against the demolition. And if people tear it down without the permit, it is a pretty light fine. Mr. Gasior added that we have never had to charge anybody with the fine but he believes at worst it could be \$500. Ms. Damstra said that her question more is, are you waiting six months to make sure that it is a good fit not to tear it down like you are doing your due diligence to make sure of all of that? Mr. Gault said there was a push with the LPC a couple years ago to get more teeth in the permit to make it more meaningful because the reality is right now if a person wants to demolish something, they can just do it and you cannot do much about it. The six months was just the idea to give the Commission some time to see what else they could do. One of the points that was brought up was if you paid a contractor to come to the LPC meeting, how much would it cost to come to the LPC vs what would it cost just to pay the fine not to wait the six months?

Mr. Weigman asked if there was further discussion on Article XIV and Mr. Gasior said he would just add one thing. This was part of that 2003 group and this was actually written by one of that group. It has some unusual things like four members; usually you go with an odd number on a Board because you could have a tie vote every now and then. Mr. Gasior had nothing to do with it and then it went to the ballot and was passed. Council has never really passed any legislation to put teeth in it.

d. ARTICLE XV – LOT REQUIREMENTS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS

Mr. Gemelas asked where these requirements were pulled from and Mr. Gasior said they are from the Ordinance. Ms. Damstra said, yes, almost word for word. Mr. Gemelas asked if there was any reason that they needed to be in the Charter and Mr. Gasior responded that the thought at the time was that these provisions have been codified in Chapter 1262.04 and let's just put those provisions in the Charter so that no future Council can either reduce or expand on them. Well, they could expand but no one could reduce down to something less than 100 ft. x 150 ft. They had already repealed the cluster law; the cluster law was in Chapter 1266 and that was repealed in 2003. There were no more clusters being built after that Chapter was repealed.

Mr. Gemelas stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals only has a certain amount of authority to amend that with a variance. It is pretty strict at a 5%. So you really hamstring your BZA because if they are running afoul of the Charter, then they do not have the ability to go beyond that 5%. Are we going to get into other concerns about that? Again, he likes the intent but it seems like some of the pet projects got a little out of hand; are we going to put in the Charter that we cannot have yard signs because we do not like the size of the signs on Rt. 254? He hopes not; that is why we have a comprehensive plan; we have all of that. It just seems redundant for some reason and he thinks it poses more of a problem to the BZA because he can see someone making the argument that their neighbor got a variance that was larger than 5% and if that is against the Charter, the BZA has no authority to do such thing. That is why he thinks having that in there is probably not a great idea.

Mr. Gasior said that we have dealt with this maybe six to eight times in Board of Zoning, even before it got to Board of Zoning where we calculated the 5% to determine whether or not someone was going to be able to do a lot split. He did not realize they were going to go so far as to restrict the BZA. When it was originally written there was not going to be any authority on the part of the BZA to change anything. He said that they had to give BZA something; they had to give them 5% just in case the legals were off and so they went with the 5%. It has been working and people accept it; they know what their limitations are when they split off the lots and they want to build a home. We see a few flag lots now, a flag lot being a 60 ft. front that opens up into a bigger portion in the back but it has been working. That really has not been a big outcry even with the developers; they seem to accept the fact that they are going to have to build 150 ft. x 100 ft. lots and they do it. Mr. Klingshirm stated that he has been on BZA for

quite awhile and they have had a few flag lots and everybody pretty much knows they have to have 15,000 sq. ft. and the frontage is the big thing, it seems, but people do not try to challenge that. Mr. Gasior pointed out that this provision was not presented to a Charter Review Commission; this went from City Council to the ballot.

Ms. Damstra stated that 15,000 sq. ft. is a little over one third of an acre and she asked who is enforcing that? Has that really been happening since 2011? She just did a quick search because she thought that seemed like a pretty big lot size, and looking at the Lorain County Auditor's website, there are many houses that have been built since this time on a tenth of an acre or a quarter of an acre. Mr. Gasior said that there were already platted cluster subdivisions that were allowed to go forward without having to abide by this and there were lots of record. Any lot of record that exists in the City does not have to abide by this. But any new lot splits that occurred after 11/8/11 had to abide by this. So if the land was already platted, if a subdivision had six phases and they had already been to phase 4 and they were coming in with phases 5 and 6, they were allowed to continue on. Ms. Damstra asked, so if it changes on the ordinance, does it change in the Charter? Mr. Gasior said, no, the fact that it is in the Charter means that Council cannot change it; the voters have to change it. And that is why they put it there, to not allow Council the opportunity to reduce it. It can be cumbersome; if you are an urban planner and you are thinking about how to be creative with land use and you want to try to do some sort of a mixed use development, you are handcuffed by this provision. But we are not in a position where we are at full build-out and there are only a couple pieces of land that we want to try to get creative and develop and are hamstrung by a provision like this. He said so he thinks it is not hurting anybody.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE ORDINANCE LANGUAGE OF AMENDING ARTICLE IV, SECTION 12, POSTING PLACES, AND SEND IT TO CITY COUNCIL FOR PLACEMENT ON THE BALLOT

(Per the Ordinance, the language reads as follows: "All ordinances, resolutions, statements, orders, proclamations and reports required by law or by this Charter or by ordinance to be published or posted, shall be published or posted electronically and at City Hall for a period of not less than fifteen (15) days prior to the taking of effect thereof. An emergency ordinance or resolution shall also be published or posted as aforesaid, but said requirement shall not postpone the immediate taking effect thereof, as provided in Section 14 of this Article. Council may, by appropriate legislative action, designate additional methods or places for publication.")

A motion was made by Mr. Gault and seconded by Mr. Glick to approve the Ordinance language of amending Article IV, Section 12, Posting Places, and send it to City Council for placement on the ballot, and the discussion was:

Mr. Gemelas stated that it is a little vague in regard to posting electronically. Are we talking about posting on the City's website or what are we planning to use electronically? Mr. Gasior said he thought that was the point, to be vague and call it electronic. It was originally stated that we would post it on the website and someone on the Commission said that term may be something obsolete in 20 years so if we just use the general term "electronically" chances are we will be communicating electronically for the next 50 years and that would give flexibility to Council on how they do it. It may be that someday, someone will hit one button and every citizen in the community gets an email or a text, but it will be electronic. So it will be posted electronically and also at City Hall. If Council chooses to post it in more than those places they can continue to do that and that is the way that he left it.

The vote was: Ms. Ashley, "yes"; Ms. Damstra, "yes"; Mr. Gault, "yes"; Mr. Gemelas, "yes"; Mr. Glick, "yes"; Mr. Mylen, "yes"; Ms. Ramirez, "yes"; Mr. Klingshirn, "yes"; Mr. Weigman, "yes".

The vote was 9 in favor and 0 against and the Chairman declared the motion passed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

a.) MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Glick said to Mr. Weigman that he had emailed him about adding to the agenda the point that he had raised in the last meeting about the oversight on Council pay. Mr. Weigman said that we are going to put that on the next agenda.

Ms. Damstra asked what they will be discussing at the next meeting and Mr. Weigman said he was figuring on Articles VII, IX, X, and XI. Mr. Gasior stated that we wanted to have Mr. Logan present for some of those financial issues that come up and he will see Mr. Logan on Monday. He added that for the next meeting, the Commission can go over the titles that they have not covered and then we may add a few more things.

Mr. Weigman said they would make this the plan: he thought that VII, IX, X, and XI were not covered and we will verify that before Ms. Brooks puts out the agenda. And then the point that Mr. Glick had raised on Council pay will be an agenda item and then the final piece is the Ward verbiage and Mr. Gasior will have the verbiage for that ready for the next meeting. Mr. Gasior said, yes, and he was trying to keep that very simple because all we really want to do is just make sure that every 10 years Council reviews the Wards.

Mr. Weigman asked if they had finalized the discussion on the bidding process and Mr. Gasior said, no, they did not and he thought that Mr. Logan may still want to talk about that. He said that the Commission had talked about personal services and professional services, etc. and he was going to talk to Mr. Logan and maybe we will re-address that and see if there is something we can do about that in the Charter to flesh out that phrase, "personal services", and make it a little bit more detailed. Mr. Weigman then stated that we will put discussion about bidding and property disposal on the agenda as well. Ms. Brooks asked if they wanted to continue the discussion on Detroit Road and Mr. Weigman said, yes, put that on the agenda and we will see if Ms. Berges and Mr. Logan have anything to add or if anybody has any further thoughts on that between now and then.

b.) MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There were no comments from the General Public.

ADJOURN

A motion was made by Mr. Gemelas and seconded by Mr. Gault to adjourn the meeting of the Charter Review Commission and the vote was: Ms. Ashley, "yes"; Ms. Damstra, "yes"; Mr. Gault, "yes"; Mr. Gemelas, "yes"; Mr. Glick, "yes"; Mr. Mylen, "yes"; Ms. Ramirez, "yes"; Mr. Klingshirn, "yes"; Mr. Weigman, "yes".

The vote was 9 in favor and 0 against and the Chairman declared the motion passed.

Respectfully submitted by:
Gail Hayden, Assistant Clerk of Council