

**DRAFT**  
**MINUTES OF A COUNCIL CAUCUS**  
**Mayfield Village Civic Center – Reserve Hall**  
**Monday, May 2, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.**

The Council of Mayfield Village met in Caucus Session on Monday, May 2, 2022. Council President Schutt called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

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

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

Absent: Mrs. Betsa

Council President Schutt stated, good evening everyone and welcome to the May Council Caucus meeting for Mayfield Village, Ohio. Today is Mon, May 2, 2022, it is 7:02 p.m.

**PENDING LEGISLATION**

- **Ordinance No. 2022-04**, entitled, “An ordinance amending Mayfield Village Codified Ordinance Chapter 1519 Fireworks.” Introduced by Mayor Bodnar (Fire Department) (First Reading – March 21, 2022; Second Reading – April 18, 2022) (Fire Department)

Council President Schutt stated, Ms. Calta, I understand there’s an amendment to this Ordinance, will you provide an update.

Ms. Calta replied, everyone should have a memo in their packets. I think the Fire Chief and his Lieutenant went to a fire conference and this was the subject. We have something that’s new in the state called “fountain device retailers”. We talked about where these retailers, where these permits would be issued, but they’re not going to issue them until next year, until 2023. The fear is that your local CVS or your other retailers could have this permit and then they could sell these fountain devices. But the state doesn’t check with the local municipalities when they issue these licenses. If someone like CVS were to look at our Fireworks Code, they may not necessarily see that our zoning code prohibits the sale of explosives (fireworks). We decided we should make some clarifications to the Ordinance that we’re in the process of amending to be very clear to say that you cannot sell fireworks in this municipality. Then we also added in an emergency clause. Our 1<sup>st</sup> Reading was in March, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading in April, this would be the 3<sup>rd</sup> Read, but because we’re going to amend it after the 2<sup>nd</sup> Read, it technically has to go on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading again. So we’re on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading in May, 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading in June, but we need it to be in effect before July 1<sup>st</sup>, so we won’t have the 30 day time it needs to go into effect, so we added the emergency clause so that when it does get passed, it will go into effect immediately in June.

Council President Schutt asked, any questions?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-04 as amended will move to 2<sup>rd</sup> Read at the Regular Meeting of Council on Mon, May 16.

- **Ordinance No. 2022-05**, entitled, “An ordinance enacting Mayfield Village Codified Ordinance Section 1383.06 Automatic Fire Detection Systems.” Introduced by Mayor Bodnar (First Reading – March 21, 2022; Second Reading – April 18, 2022) (Fire Department)

Council President Schutt asked, any questions?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, Ordinance No. 2022-05 will move to 3<sup>rd</sup> Read at the Regular Meeting of Council on Mon, May 16.

#### **MAYOR**

Mayor Bodnar stated, my only comment tonight is to encourage everybody to vote tomorrow. If you have friends or constituents or anybody that might not be voting, I would encourage you to send them some e-mails to Mayfield Village residents tonight to encourage them to vote, specifically vote for the Beta Zoning Overlay District. Thank you.

#### **COUNCIL PRESIDENT**

Council President Schutt stated, I echo her comments about getting out and voting tomorrow. The next Regular Meeting of Council is scheduled for Monday, May 16 at 7:00 p.m. here at the Civic Center. We'll be back in Civic Hall for that meeting.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

- **Worton Park Culvert Replacement Project**

Mr. Cappello stated, we're currently out to bid for this project with a scheduled bid opening date on Fri, May 13.

- **License Plate Reader Cameras**

Chief Matias stated, thank you Council President. Everybody should have my memo, it includes a little bit background about the LPR's and what the cost would be. Pretty much since I became Chief, Mayor Bodnar and I had talked about these cameras on and off over the years. We got to

the point where I gave a recommendation to install four of the cameras. As you see in the memo, we're pretty much becoming surrounded by them by the other communities. This is just the direction Law Enforcement is going. With photo enforcement, it's using technology to give us another tool, to add another layer. The best way I could explain this is one of my goals here is to make it as difficult as possible for criminals to come in Mayfield Village, commit crimes and get away with crimes. Using these license plate reader cameras, it'll add another layer to help us do that. Does anybody have any questions about them?

Mrs. Juncisek asked, do you see this as more of a deterrent, do we advertise that we have these?

Chief Matias replied, I wouldn't say as a deterrent because I really don't think criminals pay that much attention. Again, they are already very wide spread, especially around in this area. I don't know if there's been much of a deterrent factor, but it'll give us more tools.

Mrs. Juncisek stated, you mentioned there's one at Worton Pk. Do you know where the other four will be going, at the sections coming into the Village?

Chief Matias replied, yes. The one at Worton Pk, the reason that ended up there is that all started before I became Chief. The County did a program where they received money to have these cameras installed and you applied to get the cameras. Highland Hts actually made the application. But at the time, the only way you could install those cameras was to have them on a mast arm, they couldn't hang them from wires. If you think about Wilson Mills, the whole stretch, that was the only mast arm, the one we put up for the no left turn sign. The County said that's the place we had to put it. We didn't really select that location, it just was how it played out because it was the only place. The four we're looking to doing, we're still working out a strategy, but there will be one at the north end on SOM, the east end of Wilson Mills by Gates Mills, on Highland Rd near the bridge and then on Wilson Mills just past the freeway, in conjunction with the other cameras the surrounding cities already have.

Mr. Arndt asked, do you receive notification? Let's say somebody comes into the city, do you get notification that they've got a warrant or anything, does that go right into the computers in your cars?

Chief Matias replied, it would go to the cars into the dispatch center. It would give an alert as long as it's entered in the system and you can select what alerts you want to have. Usually it's all through the NCIC Database. It would be for stolen cars, missing persons, be on the look outs, warrants, suspensions. Depending how high you want to set it up is what you could select.

Mr. Meyers asked, would it get a person walking up Highland? It's not video at all, right?

Chief Matias replied, it takes a picture. If you walk right in front of one, it might take your picture, I don't know, I can find out.

Mr. Williams asked, have you had any hits from the one on Worton Pk?

Chief Matias replied, from what I can recall off the top of my head, we had a porch pirate case using the data from the LPR. Last year we had a hit and it came back to a missing endangered adult, the Officers were going east on Wilson Mills and the Officers found the gentleman at the gas station. So anything like Amber Alerts, that's also included in the alerts.

Mr. Meyers asked, are you able to set them up or does the County do that?

Chief Matias replied, the County won't have anything to do with these. We set the alerts up.

Council President Schutt asked, do you anticipate a price increase after the first 12 months for an annual fee?

Chief Matias replied, no. The pricing is what they give us. I don't anticipate an increase.

Council President Schutt asked, would there be a possible reduction in pricing if we agreed to a longer term?

Chief Matias replied, no. I'll double check though. The initial contract they sent us was a 2-year. I asked if we could just do one year at a time, it's the same price. I can ask them if we did a longer term, like a 5-year, but that didn't come up in any of the meetings we had.

Council President Schutt asked, any questions?

There was none.

### **Mayor and Council Salary Increases**

Council President Schutt stated, next up for discussion is Mayor and Council salary increases. As you know, this has been talked about basically over the past couple of years. It's also been discussed at the Citizens Advisory Committee at their most recent meeting as well. There's a lot of support from the Citizen's Advisory Committee to bring this forward and put it on the ballot for the voters in November. For tonight's discussion, I thought it might make sense to break these down a little bit and talk about them one by one.

- **The Mayor's salary to be increased from \$26,000 per year to \$50,000 per year.**

Council President Schutt stated, I'd like to open this up for discussion at this time.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, I was present at the CAC meetings that it was discussed at. The residents that were present asked a lot of good questions in what is involved in the position of Mayor. They looked at where the salary for a Mayor position was in comparison to what Mayfield Village has and all the tasks and responsibilities. Based on that feedback over several meetings, they did come to the conclusion that there was an inequity in the salary compared to other municipalities that were similar in population, similar in footprint, coupled with the fact that there's a larger General Revenue for Mayfield Village. They did suggest that something be put to

the voters to vote on an increase. I personally explained at those meetings, there was a little confusion, this is salary increase, like maybe it was what everyone is familiar with, a merit increase. I said this is more of an equity adjustment is what I'm familiar with and how I would explain it, because the salary right now is not even in a range of other Mayor positions, again, similar footprint as Mayfield Village. Based on the CAC discussion regarding this position, that's why Mr. Williams had brought it to the attention at the last Council meeting for it to be put up to discussion. That's how it came about, the CAC suggested it. Based on the review of the CAC minutes and when I was there, they unanimously agreed that they would like to see something, again, I view it as an equity adjustment versus just what someone would say as a merit increase, to put that position in a range of similar positions.

Ms. Wolgamuth stated, the handouts, handed out earlier, the amounts for Council on those are accurate. What's not accurate is the General Fund Revenue and the General Fund Balances. We have not updated this for Citizen's Advisory with respect to Council because we were kind of focused on the Mayor's discussion. So those salaries are correct. I can tell you what the General Fund Revenues & Balances are if that matters.

Ms. Wolgamuth recites the updated General Fund Annual Revenue and General Fund Balance sections of the handout.

**NOTE:**

**Elected Official Salary/Benefit Comparisons – March 2022 (Updated 5-3-22)  
Corrected version (attached to minutes)**

Council President Schutt thanked Ms. Wolgamuth. I would also like to comment on the Mayor's salary increase. I believe that this should be put on the ballot in November. It's just not what Mayor Bodnar does in her role, it's the position itself and what it involves today. Obviously she's doing a great job, however, it's the Mayor position as a whole in general, so it's not necessarily to our current Mayor, it's actually the position itself. I feel that we should move forward with this. It would align not quite to some of the other municipalities but it would at least move us in the right direction at this point in time. I'm definitely in favor of moving forward with this.

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other comments regarding the Mayor's compensation?

Mr. Murphy stated, I was just looking at the handout Diane had given us. You can tell that our Mayor is definitely underpaid. In looking at the Resident Population, the General Fund Balance, I would agree that the Mayor is underpaid.

Mr. Williams asked, what's involved in moving forward?

Ms. Calta replied, we would have an Ordinance prepared with that information and it would be for Council essentially to move it forward to the ballot. I make that distinction because you would be voting on an Ordinance to place it on the ballot, you're not voting on a raise itself. It will be up to the ballot to determine whether the raise goes into effect. We would put it on a May

Reading, June Reading and a July Reading, if the Ordinance is passed, it would be provided then to the Board of Elections prior to the deadline for the Nov 8, 2022 general election.

Mr. Meyers asked, will it be the same draft that you did already with both?

Ms. Calta replied, depending on the outcome of this discussion, it could be, yes. That would be both Council and Mayor.

Council President Schutt asked, any other discussion regarding the Mayor's compensation?

There was none.

Council President Schutt stated, it appears at this point in time we have a lot of support to move forward with this. For this piece of it, I'll work with Ms. Calta on an Ordinance for that to bring forward for May's Council meeting.

- **Council's salaries to be increased from \$10,000 per year to \$11,000 per year.**
- **The Council President's salary to be increased from \$11,000 to \$12,100 per year as the Charter provides that the Council President's compensation shall be 10% higher.**

Council President Schutt stated, I'd like to open this up for discussion.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, the basis for the discussion on the position as Mayor was the result of discussions that were had at the CAC meetings over the couple months and talking about inequity adjustment like I mentioned before. However, Council salaries were never really part of that discussion during those CAC meetings. Coupled with the fact that Council's salaries are currently within the range that is provided, and towards the higher end of the range that was provided. Again, the reason we're discussing this is because the residents of CAC have voiced their opinion as to wanting to see an equity adjustment made for the Mayor position, but Council was not discussed at all. Because we are within the range, I do not believe Council should be included because there is no equity adjustment needed.

Mr. Arndt stated, I would agree with that. Just looking at this range now, you can see we're well above where everybody else is just with our surrounding cities. Cuyahoga Hts obviously is really high, but if you look at Orange Village, Oakwood Village, with a similar resident population, I think our ranges are right where it should be. I agree with a salary increase for the Mayor yes absolutely, but us I don't see a need for it.

Mr. Williams stated, going back, I've been in compensation discussion as a Councilman some period of time over 8 plus years. Are you saying we should not discuss it just because we're in the range? What's the equity, of course the money but at the same time, the timing since the last compensation. I just wanted to throw that out for consideration.

Mr. Meyers stated, I don't think it should be split. It should go forward as both just the way it's drafted, the Ordinance that we already saw that includes the Mayor and Council at the same time. I think if we try to go back later down the road people are going to be like why didn't we do it now. I think it should be all put forward as one Ordinance, Council and Mayor.

Mr. Williams asked, with Council getting a raise or not?

Mr. Meyers replied yes, with a raise for Council.

Mr. Arndt stated, I think there was no need for discussion in the past because we are within the range. If you look at it, we're well above the average.

Mr. Murphy stated, I think based on the information that Diane provided, I don't think it's warranted for Council to get a raise, I wouldn't be in favor of that if they were tied together. For other reasons, the current economic climate and things like that, I think we owe it to our constituents to be fiscally responsible. I wouldn't like to see a raise for Council.

Council President Schutt stated, just reviewing the numbers here I know Orange Village was mentioned, I just wanted to put on the record that Orange Village is actually at \$12,000 annually and \$13,200 for Council President. So they are a couple thousand higher than we are. Also, just looking through this I do see that there's quite a few municipalities that are lower than us. However, there are a few that are higher and one significantly higher. Based on this being my second term 5<sup>th</sup> year on Council, 3<sup>rd</sup> year to thankfully be your Council President, I see more engagement with this Council. I see people stepping up more, having more conversations with residents, being more engaged. Again, I don't want to make it on a personal level to that regard, however, it seems as if I feel that we've been raising the bar. When you raise the bar in qualifications, compensation comes along with that typically as well. I'm actually in favor of the increase, I know it's a nominal increase. However, I agree with what Councilman Meyers said that if we move forward and propose to put on the ballot for an increase for Mayor, I don't feel that we should go for Council increase in the future, I think we should put it together and go forward as one in unison. Sure, I understand the economic climate that we're in today. However, that economic climate has also made all of our positions more difficult as well. Having difficult conversations, bringing ideas to the table, working with our Economic Development Manager on the Beta Overlay Project and just having those conversations that might not have been had because Progressive was always here and in the buildings. Either A) we're going to see Progressive continue on with this or B) we're going to see that return back into the office, probably not to quite what it was before the pandemic. But again, just making our positions more challenging to where we then work with the Department Heads more in finding ways to be more efficient with funds and things of that nature which then in turn raises the bar and the responsibilities of Council as a whole. I strongly am in favor for it.

Mr. Williams stated, in the same manner, we've got to somehow fix the situation that's occurred over these past few years that we have zero standard or policy or precedent on doing this. This would be a good time for us to set a standard for future Councils to be able to look at and refer to. That's one reason I'm in favor of moving forward with an increase, if we need to present

additional language, so be it. I agree with the Council President that this Council has done an outstanding job over the past few years, it's been a tough environment. One of the questions raised to our Finance Director at the CAC meeting was, the challenge with Progressive, how does that affect the everyday resident's life, to what impact? If I recall correctly, the answer was it has an extremely minimal impact on them. Services haven't been cut, no programs have been eliminated and the Village is thriving and moving forward. That's partly due to the work of our Administration and Council.

Mr. Murphy stated, we're still waiting out to see what the impact Progressive has had, what Ron has talked about, I think Ron mentioned to us there's \$650,000 a month we're losing out on from people working at home. So I don't think we've seen the full effect of it, I don't think we've had a call to action yet to see, we've got to be proactive about that. I agree this Council is great, we all work great together, no one is doing it for the money up here, at least I don't think so. For myself, \$1,000 doesn't make or break me. I just don't see the reason, based on Progressive, based on the uncertainty, yes Covid's primarily over, but we still have primarily all of Progressive working from home so we're still missing out on hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax revenue and income. I just don't feel the need to put a Council increase in front of the voters.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, I would have to agree with what Denny has said. We're here discussing this based on what the residents have said at the CAC meeting. Council is in range, it would have been in range two years ago and still may be in range two years from now. Even if we are trying to fix this so that we're not having this discussion 3 or 4 years down the line in having to put in front of voters again, then just having a nominal increase is not going to do that because that's going to require a discussion five years down the road again. Where are we at, we're going to have to put it in front of voters. I may be jumping ahead Council President, but we're trying to fix this and account for some inflation that happened because your dollar today is not going to be the same value as it is next year or three years down the line. Then that comes into play of adjusting salaries by inflation rate with it and not just adjusting it by a nominal dollar amount when Council is within range right now. Everyone can argue some months are more difficult than other months in your occupation, your job and your service, it comes with the territory. However, Council is different than the Mayor position because the Mayor position is not even within that range, so there's a definite distinction between the two. I have to agree with Denny, Council's in the range, I don't see it, I don't think we should put it in front of voters, I don't think it should be with the Mayor salary adjustment because there's different reasoning behind that.

Mr. Arndt asked, what's the problem with splitting it up, what's the issue with having the Mayor on and not having the Council on there at all? What's the issue of separating the two? It's probably the same amount of work. If we want to be very transparent with everybody, couldn't we just separate it? I don't understand why it has to be together.

Council President Schutt asked Ms. Calta to address Mr. Arndt's question.

Ms. Calta stated, I don't think there's an issue with separating them or putting them together. I think there are just some efficiencies by putting one ballot issue on that addresses this, that's if



the discussion is and the Ordinance is for salary adjustments for both Council and the Mayor, it does make sense to put them in one ballot issue, but it could be separated. As far as extra work, there's two Ordinances, there's two issues. I don't think it's an appreciable amount of additional work but it would be a separate issue. If you do separate them, the results could be different. I don't think there's an issue one way or another, it would just be an advantage point in how the residents might look at it.

Mr. Williams stated, the fundamental question is still, should there be an increase or not.

Mr. Murphy replied, I'm not in favor of it, I'll be honest with you. The Mayor yes, but not for Council.

Mr. Williams asked, as far as separating them, if we separate them, the same question applies, should there be a Council raise?

Mr. Murphy replied, it sounds like we're having different opinions on Council's. Maybe it does make sense to have different issues so that we don't kill something because there's something riding on the other thing. I would hate for the Mayor not to make it to the ballot because this Council is split on a Council increase of \$1,000 for each person.

Ms. Calta stated, I think I mentioned it before, Council would be placing this on the ballot for the homeowners to vote on. Everyone can have their opinion on whether they think it's valid or not, but I guess also take a more high level look and say is it something that would be appropriate for the voters to vote on. I was just doing some quick numbers here and I think you're split without one opinion in the fold. Maybe look at it from that perspective, that you're really just placing this on the ballot for the voters to weigh in, think of it as putting it out there, because it's really not Council's decision, you're not voting on your own raise, you're voting to place it on the ballot.

- **An annual increase of 2.5% for both the Mayor and Council to be included in the Ordinance and placed on the ballot.**

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, with that in mind, again Council President I don't know if I'm jumping ahead, or if we could maybe jump to talking about inflation rate increase for both positions to account for future dollar change and dollar value. I could see that being a separate issue placed on the ballot for both positions to compensate for inflation at a 2.5% rate, would make sense and help going forward avoid this conversation. Again, as Ms. Calta said, we're not voting on it now, we're putting it out there for the voters but we are still addressing Council's salaries for the future.

Council President Schutt stated, for the time being, we'll jump down to that increase that you mentioned and then circle back to the Council compensation. In discussions in reviewing some of this information and some other conversations that I've had with some of the other Administration within the Village, I'm proposing an annual increase of 2.5% annually for both the Mayor and Council positions. If this was passed, for Council that would be an annual increase without compounding, the first year it would be \$250 and the Mayor position it would

be \$1,250. If we go with the 2.5% annual increase, then the voters know exactly the figure that they're voting on if it were to include wording of this degree in the Ordinance.

Council President Schutt stated, I'd like to open that up for discussion at this time.

Ms. Calta stated, I've worked with some communities that have had the automatic adjustment escalators. It's not going to necessarily avoid an equity adjustment at some point but it will at least keep you moving in a direction. Whatever number it might be, I'd rather it be a number as opposed to having it tied into say other employee raises, because as Council President said, voters aren't going to know what that is.

Mr. Meyers stated, so in 20 years Council will be making \$50,000. When is the end? You've got to put a cap on it. You can't just let it keep going.

Ms. Calta replied, you could but you don't have to.

Mr. Meyers stated, so if we stay here for 30 years, we'll be millionaires, just like everybody that works here, it just keeps going and going.

Mr. Murphy asked, are cars ever going to stop increasing, no. I would be for having an annual increase tied to the Producer Price Index or the Consumer Price Index, that's based on the Governor publishes. I get what Diane's trying to say, that could be convoluted for someone going to the polls and saying, look, the CPI, or the PPI, give me a number. So, 2.5% sounds reasonable to me. I would be for tying an annual increase for the Mayor and the Council each year. If you don't increase your salary at all, you're making less this year than you did last year just with inflation. I can explain that better to people why we're doing a 2.5% increase based on inflation. I can't really explain \$1,000 increase when we're in line with other communities of our same statue. Al, you said we're going to be millionaires, well, cars are going to be a million bucks by that time too. Prices for objects are never going to stop increasing either.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, I would agree with Denny, I can get behind that. Again, looking at inflation, just the 10 year break even inflation rate according to the U.S. Federal Reserve is 2.8% as of April this past year. So, 2.5% seems in line. I know there's a lot of indexes out there. I'm comfortable with that percentage.

Mr. Williams asked, how does that relate to the earlier conversation about the Mayor's position increase, does that go away?

Mrs. Jurcisek replied, I think that this would be a separate issue. The Mayor position increase is the equity adjustment to bring it in line into an appropriate range for the position. This helps deal with it going forward and with some sort of inflation and adjustment for both positions.

Mr. Williams stated, I'm having a hard time figuring out how that will work. One Ordinance? Two Ordinances?

Mrs. Jurcisek replied, I would see it as two; 1) The Mayor position with the equity adjustment and 2) The percentage increase for both positions.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments on the annual percentage increase?

Mr. Meyers stated, I think it should be one, I think the percentage should be in with the raise on the same Ordinance so they know what they're voting for.

Mr. Marquardt stated, you're going to confuse everybody on this whole issue, you've got too many things thrown out here. You're escalating the salaries and doing an increase, it's not going to get through. People are going to say, what the heck are they doing down there? You've got to just make it one this time around. Maybe in 5 years you can put Council's on, but not now.

Mayor Bodnar stated, if you put on a raise for the Mayor and you put in an escalator, how do you make the raise start next year with the escalator not starting until the following year? Because I think you don't want it to be both at the same time.

Ms. Calta replied, I think we can clarify that in the language that it doesn't go into effect until the following year.

Mayor Bodnar stated, I thought the language in our Charter says raises don't go into effect until the year following the election.

Ms. Calta replied, right, that's what the Charter says. So the equity adjustment would go into effect according to that language, then it would say plus an escalator to begin 12 months after, it's not going to all go into effect at the same time.

Mr. Williams stated, I see two sides of the debate, is this something we vote on?

Ms. Calta replied, you would all vote on the Ordinance to place it on the ballot.

Mr. Murphy stated, which is why I think there's two, maybe three separate issues here. Like I said, I would hate for the Mayor's to be turned down by the voters because Council's riding on it.

Mr. Williams stated, if it's voted down, it's voted down, it doesn't go anywhere.

Mr. Arndt asked, the main issue is the Mayor, right? If it's voted down, the Mayor won't be able to get what she rightfully deserves. The main issue here is the Mayor, not Council. We're spending more time on Council than we are with the Mayor. We're all in agreement with the Mayor in being that she needs to increase her salary. The only thing we're debating is on Council. Why try to kill one just for something we don't all agree on?

Mr. Meyers replied, because one will kill two.

Mr. Arndt replied no, one won't kill two, I don't see how one will kill two. Our main goal here is what the CAC brought up and we're all in agreement with that. Obviously we're split with Council. So how do you think that votes really going to go if we had it now? It would kill it, wouldn't it? It would kill the main goal, the main focus, this entire thing is for the Mayor.

Council President Schutt stated, if it was on one Ordinance, yes, potentially. With us being split at this time, I'll ask Ms. Calta for some more guidance at this point in time, if you wouldn't mind, I don't mean to put you on the spot.

Ms. Calta replied, not at all. I think these are always hard discussions to have. I think that's why they're not had and that's why you often see salaries not being adjusted. It's 8, 10 or could be 15 years and everybody says hey, we really need to have this discussion. They're not easy discussions to have. It says a lot about this Council that you're having this discussion. One of the reasons for the escalator is so that you don't have to have these discussions. Another alternative would be if you don't look at the escalator that you do plan on having these discussions on a more regular basis, because it's only fair. We're all public servants here, but there is a salary tied to these positions, and we want to make sure that we continue to retain and attract talent that you have. At one point in time there were adjustments for, if you remember there were minimum salary requirements, maybe ten years ago, they adjusted that. You saw some of these salaries adjust themselves so that everyone can get at least the minimum contributions to qualify for . . . OPERS, you're not looking at any of that right now. I don't think that's going to change but it could and that could create another discussion. What we could do is bring forward all the things that have been discussed tonight and have Council look at all of them and then hope to continue to place them on the ballot or not. I think that Council's looking at three different Ordinances.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, I would see it as three different Ordinances, yes.

Ms. Calta stated, the escalators are confusing, but I could see how that might be a little conducive. That's not something that's been done in the past in the Village but it really is something to think about because it'll at least have the salaries trend a little bit in the right direction and not have you having this conversation in ten years and looking for adjustments. We can have these Ordinances drafted, we can look at them and then move forward on as many as you feel comfortable moving forward on. You could have one for the Mayor, one for Council and then a separate one for the escalators, if that makes sense. The salaries with the escalators might cause some confusion as we're talking here. I think you want to put on the ballot something that's very clear and people know what they're voting on. If there's any question on what they're voting on, that's probably more detrimental to having a favorable passage on anything.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, I agree. Our Charter's reviewed every five years, right? If there comes a time where salaries are out of scope or out of range, that comes the time after review of that committee to propose something to things that got hung up because of the pandemic and everything this past year. I think there's enough checks and balances in place that if outside of the inflation, if Council seats ever became out of range or an equity adjustment was needed, it could be dealt with at that time.

Mr. Williams stated, to Councilwoman Jurcisek's point, the CAC endorsed raises for both. While we didn't go into detail about Council, they didn't say Council shouldn't get a raise. While we spent more time with the Mayor position, I believe the community was looking at it collectively.

Mrs. Jurcisek stated, in the minutes of the CAC, it says that it suggested two separate Ordinances, one to catch up on the salary for Mayor and one for the annual percentage increase, or CPI.

Mr. Williams stated, I'd like to propose we have two separate Ordinances, one for the Mayor and one for Council.

Council President Schutt asked, if we move forward with that, did we still want to move forward with the annual increase or would that be tabled for now?

Mr. Murphy replied, I'd be for putting the annual increase on the ballot. I think what's coming out of this, all of our heads are clearly in different spots, but based on what I hear, I think there's three different Ordinances that are coming out of this.

Mr. Williams stated, I'm starting to see that too.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments on breaking these up into three Ordinances?

Mr. Williams stated, looking ahead, that's what we would be voting on to put on the ballot.

Ms. Calta replied, correct. We have some time, just like with the Fire Code. If this is going to go on three Readings, we can have some further discussions. As it starts to get out into the public, if you're hearing and thinking some other things, we can certainly continue the discussions. We don't want to change things too much again to confuse anyone but if there are discussions that come about, we can certainly make some adjustments.

Mr. Murphy asked, when do we have to get it to the Board of Elections?

Ms. Calta replied, you'll have three Readings, May, June & July. It is limited but if we get it to June and someone says the 2.5% escalator seems really confusing and we don't want to move it forward, you don't have to.

Council President Schutt stated, since we're split at this time, I'm proposing that I'll work with the Law Director Ms. Calta on drafting an Ordinance that would include all three of these points and then work on three separate Ordinances splitting them so we can kind of see it both ways. All as one and then as three separate ones. We would then see how that looks as the two separate ones and then at that point in time, Ms. Calta would you recommend that we then have a meeting on how we would want to bring it forward to our Council meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>, or would we do something in between?

Ms. Calta replied, I think you would probably want to do that. It's kind of like two directions, you're either going to put all of your eggs in one basket or you're going to separate out into three, it's whatever Council's interested in doing. Putting those on paper and looking at them, could start another conversation.

Mr. Murphy stated, I think we need to leave here with a consensus of how we want to see it on the ballot.

Mrs. Jurcisek agreed. I would say do three separate Ordinances for discussion.

Mayor Bodnar asked, what is the vote required for Council to put something on the ballot, is it the same, a majority or is it different?

Ms. Calta replied, off the top of my head I think it's just a majority. I'll double check that.

Council President Schutt asked, any other comments on having one or three Ordinances?

Mr. Williams replied, three.

Mr. Meyers replied, one.

Mr. Arndt replied, three.

Mr. Marquardt replied, one for the Mayor and nothing for Council.

Mr. Arndt stated, I agree with Councilman Marquardt.

Council President Schutt stated, if we were to break them into three, then we could have just that one that was just mentioned. At this point in time since we are split, I recommend that we break them into three, I'll work with Ms. Calta on the Ordinances to bring forward to our Council meeting; First Reading 5/16, Second Reading 6/20, Third Reading 7/18. This schedule will provide sufficient time for the Ordinances if passed by Council to then be provided to the Board of Elections for the Nov 8, 2022 General Election. If passed by the voters, the increases would then take effect Jan 1, 2023 as provided by our Charter. However, we will make sure that there's verbiage in there that the annual increase of 2.5% if approved by the voters would not take effect until 2024. That is my recommendation at this time. Thank you for all your help Ms. Calta.

Ms. Calta stated, I think I have everything I need unless anyone has any other questions. It's a hard discussion to have.

Mr. Williams stated, this has been a long overdue discussion. Thank you everyone.

### **ANY OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE COUNCIL**

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

- **Chief Carcioppolo - Fire Department**

Chief Carcioppolo stated, I just wanted to thank Al for bringing a car up to the High School last week for Police & Fire talks to the students about accidents and safe driving around Prom.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you for having your departments involved and thank you Councilman Meyers for bringing that vehicle up there and taking it back.

Council President Schutt asked, any other matters?

- **ConnectWorks Micro Transit Program - Economic Development Department**

Mr. Marquart stated, thank you Council President. A bit of a late add to the agenda, so thank you for having me. You'll remember back in October of last year, Council passed Resolution 2021-39 in support of our joint application with the City of Highland Hts through RTA for Micro Transit funding.

To refresh your memory, our project would provide first/last mile vehicle service to connect local employers to the RTA system. As you know, we have one bus line that runs hourly along Wilson Mills. It would connect that route to Beta Dr., both Progressive campuses as well as Alpha Dr. in Highland Hts and that of course connects to the larger RTA network. Our employers could pretty easily be connected to virtually anywhere in the city.

Now more than ever we all know that good employees are hard to find and any barriers we could remove to employment is a good thing. This service we hope to get up and running by the end of the year. It would also be available for residents if they needed to jump on that as well, it would be a fare free system, in case our resident wanted to go to the Library or Parkview. We're also planning to stop at the Grove during the summer.

With all of that said, I'm happy to report that last Tuesday RTA's Board of Trustees unanimously approved our funding, we are one of only two proposers to be approved. RTA approved \$119,197.00 which is 50% of the overall project cost. This would get us a brand new 12 seat ADA Accessible vehicle and 18 months worth of service. It would also include real-time ridership app so folks could see exactly where the vehicle is and not have to wait out in the cold. Pretty cool cutting edge stuff as well.

We've now begun negotiations to resolve the remaining 50% of that cost. And of course we'll be coming back to Council in the coming weeks and months for legislation to receive the grant funding from RTA, approve a contract with the bus operator themselves, and that's Standard Parking Plus a national leader in the industry. Locally they run vehicles for Case Western, University Hospitals, Cleveland Clinic and University Circle, Inc. If you've ever jumped on that little museum circulator at University Circle, those are the folks that will be driving around our vehicle. Lastly, we would come to you for legislation to enter into a municipality partnership with Highland Hts to operate this service.

So, lots to come, even though we got the grant part, hard work is ahead of us, not behind us. I'd be happy to answer any questions as best I can at this point.

Mrs. Juncisek asked, is the grant for Mayfield Village only or is it for the entire project?

Mr. Marquart replied, it's for the entire project. What was approved going back six months or so when the requests for proposals came out, the gist of the program was to connect closer to transit dependent job hubs and those job hubs are defined I think by Greater Cleveland Partnership, Team NEO and NOACA and Mayfield is a job hub because we have roughly 12,000 employees who live within 3 or 4 square miles here. That's why we got together with Highland Hts, it made sense to sort of connect both of our industrial parks. It is for a joint application, half the service here and half in Highland Hts.

Mrs. Juncisek asked, if I remember correctly, this was talked about based on what Progressive had expressed a while ago?

Mr. Marquart replied, that's correct.

Mrs. Juncisek asked, with Progressive employees not being back in office, has the need for this changed? Do we really need this at this point in time knowing that Progressive isn't in their buildings and it's the biggest employer?

Mr. Marquart replied, excellent question. We actually touched on this at the meeting today with Progressive and the city of Highland Hts. I think if we were maybe to start this service today it would have very few riders because Progressive I think is between 6% and 10% of the folks are back on campus. However, given the fact that there's so much legislation we have to bear and enact, we're looking at probably a Nov/Dec start. They don't have a rigid return to work policy in place just yet, but they've indicated that there's an excellent chance there'll be quite a few more folks back on campus by the end of the year.

Mrs. Juncisek asked, do we have to use the grant by a certain amount of time?

Mr. Marquart replied, we just need to start service by the end of this calendar year.

Mrs. Juncisek asked, are we able to re-apply for the grant if needed in the future? I'm looking at we have the grant for some of the cost but not all of the cost, so Mayfield Village is still going to be expected to pay some of the cost out there and if we're looking to reduce some of the CapEx spending right now because we don't know when and what Progressive is being impacted at \$600,000 / month. Is this a project that we should table and reapply for the grant in the future or are we not able to do that?

Mr. Marquart replied, it depends on RTA receiving funding. If I could back up just a bit, the grant that we received was a 50% matching grant, so there was always going to be a 50% local match coming from somewhere. To answer your question, RTA themselves are actually applying



for another round of this funding from the State DOT. If we were to decline it at this point we would have to reapply just like everyone else. I don't know if declining it would weigh against this in the future, probably not, I think in the interest of fairness they need to judge proposals fairly. They are actually pursuing money for next year, no guarantee that's coming.

Mrs. Jurcisek thanked Mr. Marquart.

Mr. Williams stated, I see a dual purpose, for Progressive employees to get around the campuses and to attend to the rest of the community. I thought that was one of the, if not the primary driver.

Mr. Marquart replied, Councilman, it certainly is a driver. RTA actually had a more wide spread service here in the Village 5, 6 years ago, now we're left with one street every hour. The route is adjustable, we don't have a rigid route that will service only employers A, B & C. The vehicle definitely could be used by residents as well to get virtually anywhere in the Village.

Mr. Williams stated, and not just residents, people looking to work in the Village coming from wherever.

Mr. Marquart replied, for sure. Like I said in the beginning, finding employees is harder than ever. If our employers can sort of cast a wider net, I think that's a benefit.

Mr. Williams stated, congratulations.

Mr. Marquart replied, thank you.

Council President Schutt stated, to that point, I think Progressive essential employees are required to come to the office 4 – 5 days a week. This could definitely benefit quite a few of our essential employees even though you mentioned the 6% - 10%, our essential employees are more 80% - 100%. So this could certainly help them. I know you mentioned RTA is paying half of that, not that you have a breakdown or you could maybe provide now, but I'm assuming Highland Hts would pay a portion of that other half? So we're not on for that whole \$119,000, it's going to be however we split that with Highland Hts?

Mr. Marquart replied, correct. We're just at the very infancy. Keep in mind too that Progressive does have I want to say six facilities on Alpha that'll be served as well, so there is some fairness in that.

Mayor Bodnar stated, if I could just add on to what John has said. We met with Progressive today, the representative was very positive about the project, Progressive is excited and they're behind this project. They'll be recruiting for new jobs along the #7 bus route which is the line that will connect to this one. So that's all very good news, we're happy to hear that. We talked about other companies who are in Mayfield Village who could probably benefit from that, the hotels and other places that could bring in employees who might not have great access without this loop we're going to be putting in. John, I want to congratulate you and thank you for your

skills, your experience, your professionalism all brought this home for us. I think it's a positive, it's a good way to get people to their offices or buildings in Mayfield Village. At the end of the day that's a very positive thing for us. Also, I want to say that I called Mayor Weiss from Shaker Hts who moved to accept our grant, he's on the RTA Board and also Mayor Koomar of Bay Village who seconded that motion. I had a chat with Mayor Weiss. I expressed our appreciation for RTA's and his personal support of our project and he was very gracious. There were 2 of I think 8 communities that applied for this grant?

Mr. Marquart replied, I think it was 8 applicants and only 2 were approved.

Mayor Bodnar stated, and we were 1 of the 2. It's an 18 month commitment and we're going to divide the pie with the \$119,000. I think it's a win situation.

Mr. Marquart said, thank you Mayor. This afternoon's meeting with Highland Hts and Progressive, I think the last five minutes of that meeting were probably the most exciting for me because we all started brainstorming about how we could market this thing, how could we promote it, how could we get butts in seats, pardon my French. I think we're starting to generate some really good ideas about how to really make this thing successful. That was exciting to me and like I said, the hard work begins now.

Council President Schutt stated, thank you for your work to this point, I know you have a lot more work ahead of you, we really appreciate it Mr. Marquart.

Council President Schutt asked, any other questions or comments for Mr. Marquart?

There was none.

Council President Schutt asked, are there any other matters to bring before Council tonight?

There was none.

There being no further matters, the meeting concluded at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Garbo  
Acting Clerk of Council

Enclosure: Elected Official Salary/Benefit Comparisons (updated 5-3-22)

*Council Minutes  
Minutes 5/2/22  
Attachment*

**Elected Official Salary/Benefit Comparisons - March 2022 (updated 5-3-22)**

MUNICIPALITY	RESIDENT POPULATION	MAYOR SALARY		RECEIVE BENEFITS?	COUNCIL SALARY	COUNCIL PRES SALARY	GENERAL FUND ANNUAL REVENUE	GENERAL FUND BALANCE
		(W/ANY SAFETY DIR STIPEND)						
Cuyahoga Hts	650	\$ 100,138		YES	\$ 15,059	\$ 16,564	\$13.3 M (2019)	\$2.6 M (2019)
Gates Mills Village	2,175	\$ -		NO	\$ -	\$ -	\$5.1 M (2019)	\$4.3 M (2019)
Highland Heights	8,390	\$ 40,000		NO	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,000	\$13.7 M (2019)	\$10.9 M (2019)
Hunting Valley	706	\$ -		NO	\$ -	\$ -	\$3.3 M (2019)	\$56.6 M (2019)
Mayfield Village	3,460	\$ 26,000		NO	\$ 10,000	\$ 11,000	\$24.8 M (2020)	\$38 M (2020)
Moreland Hills	3,500	\$ 46,758		NO	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$6.4 M (2020)	\$7.3 M (2020)
Newburgh Hts	2,080	\$ 71,379		YES	\$ 7,200	\$ 9,000	\$7.2M (2020)	\$1.6 M (2020)
Northfield (Summit Cty)	3,677	\$ 40,000		YES	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,600	\$5.4 M (2019)	\$4 M (2019)
Oakwood Village	3,800	\$ 96,408		YES	\$ 9,454	\$ 11,401	\$9.7 M (2019)	\$345,000 (2019)
Orange Village	3,287	\$ 55,000		YES	\$ 12,000	\$ 13,200	\$8.6 M (2019)	\$3.9 M (2019)
Pepper Pike	5,979	\$ 77,500		YES	\$ 8,200	N/A	\$11.3 M (2020)	\$13.5 M (2020)
Richfield (Summit Cty)	3,286	\$ 83,291		YES	\$ 8,727	\$ 9,309	\$13.2 M (2019)	\$2 M (2019)
Walton Hills Village	2,281	\$ 55,252		YES	\$ 12,047	\$ 13,268	\$4.6 M (2017)	\$276,000 (2017)

\*Information obtained from various public information services, including govsalaries.com and staff members from listed municipalities. General Fund Annual Revenues and Balances were obtained from the most recently completed financial audit report on file with the Ohio Auditor of State's Office; year of report indicated. General Fund revenues exclude revenue sources from Special Revenue Funds, Debt Retirement and TIF Funds, and Capital Project Funds.