

**VILLAGE OF CUYAHOGA HEIGHTS
COUNCIL WORKSHOP
MINUTES
6:00 PM
JANUARY 28, 2015**

ROLL CALL: BIRO, BLOAM, CONTIPELLI, DUSZYNSKI, HARRIS, HENLEY

Ms. Biro made the motion to excuse Mr. Bloam from the meeting. All in favor, motion passed.

ISSUE 1: VILLAGE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR GRADUATING SENIORS

COMMENTS:

Clerk Unger stated that various Councilmen and the Mayor have stated in previous meetings that they would like to look into changing the amount of money given to graduating high school seniors in our Village. Currently we give a prorated amount to each of the seniors in our community. We appropriate \$1,000.00 and divide it by the amount of students that apply for the scholarship. If only one applies, we give them the \$1,000.00, if five apply; we give them each \$200.00. So the amount will be different every year.

Clerk Unger talked it over with President of Council and the Mayor and is suggesting to Council that we give a flat \$500.00 to each student that applies. In the last five years, we have had as little as one student apply, and as many as five students apply. Clerk Unger said he believes it will not cost us more than \$3,000.00 per year at most, and could be as little as \$500.00 in any given year. He feels that this is a fair compromise.

Mr. Unger explained that none of the rules will be changed; all of the criteria will remain the same. They have to be graduating seniors, they have to be going on to higher education, and they must complete their studies and remain in good standing after the semester is finished, in order to receive the money.

There was some discussion that this was a lot of money. Mr. Unger explained that a full time student at Cuyahoga Community College was approximately \$1,200.00 a semester just for classes; this doesn't include books or any other costs. Mr. Unger explained that he came up with

the amount of \$500.00 because he felt this was a fair number. He said he is just making a suggestion to Council; it is up to them to tell him what they want to do.

Mr. Contipelli believes that Brooklyn Heights and Valley view give around \$500.00 to each student. Ms. Harris stated that they give it to everyone that applies, ours is much stricter. Mr. Contipelli stated that he doesn't know what their criteria are, but ours is a very strict criteria, and that will not change. The Clerk stated the same.

Ms. Duszynski asked if we ever turned anyone down. Clerk Unger said no, but we have had it where students have not passed their classes and we have not given them any money although they received the initial scholarship.

Mr. Contipelli stated that he believes the \$500.00 amount that Clerk Unger is suggesting is fair, and wants to know if Council wants to draw up legislation for the next meeting. Mr. Henley believes it is a fair number, and she would like to change it. Ms. Harris also agrees, she doesn't believe that just because more children were born in that year, everyone should get a lesser amount by dividing it by more people. The Mayor praised Ms. Harris for her intuitiveness. He said that was the best comment made in this discussion. The Mayor does not believe that a student needs to be penalized because of the amount of children graduating in a certain year is more than other years.

Ms. Biro stated that in order for this to be introduced and passed by Council originally, they had to limit it to \$1,000.00. We had to take baby steps, it was hard for the original Council to pass it ten years ago, and it has not changed since then. Mr. Contipelli said that if anyone has any comments or changes concerning this legislation to call the Clerk or myself otherwise we will have the legislation drawn up for the next meeting.

ISSUE 2 & 3: KENNEDY HOUSE USE AND WHEELCHAIR LIFT FOR TRANSPORTS

Ms. Henley would like to withdraw these issues from the Agenda; she realizes that these are not Council decisions. The Mayor told Ms. Henley that he will have answers to the questions she is asking in the near future.

ISSUE 4: SPEED CAMERAS

The Mayor reiterated what he said at the Council Meeting in caucus. We are up to date of the understanding of the efforts by the State to not outlaw the cameras but make it more cumbersome by having to station a full time officer at every camera devise. This is a blatant example of how when someone doesn't like something and cant outlaw it because it is lawful and serves a

purpose, but because it is not popular, so let's find a way to make it not worth the time of the municipality to have them.

Ms. Henley asked if ours were still working. The Mayor said yes, they were given a date of March 15th, and on March 16th, the new law would take effect. After some math by the Mayor and Law Director, they found out that the day the law will take effect is really March 19th, but we are going to stick to the 15th. Ms. Henley asked what are we going to do on the 16th. The Mayor said he had meetings with the police department to see if they would be cost effective or cost neutral if we stationed a full time officer at the devices. With the costs for the officer, we could not even get to cost neutral, so the suggestion he has to Council from myself as the Safety Director and the two Police Chiefs is to abandon the two units that we currently have, and move to a hand held mobile device.

The Mayor explained to Council that the mobile device is a tablet, a laser, and a camera. It works very similar to the stationary cameras but they are held by an officer. If the vehicle it points at is exceeding our threshold, it will take 2 pictures and logs it into the tablet which is uploaded to the vendor, and then the process is just the same as the stationary camera.

Ms. Harris asked if we own the device. The Mayor explained that we lease it from the same vendor we had the cameras, and the vendor gets a cut just like the other cameras, because they manage the data and own the device. The vendor will train our personnel on how to use them, and it is very similar to how they use the radar guns of today. They won't need a lot of training.

Ms. Duszynski asked if other communities will be using these cameras. The Mayor said that he knows of other communities that are going to use them, and they are communities that have already been using the stationary cameras. If council agrees to let the Police use this camera, it will be supplied by the same vendor that gave us the stationary cameras.

The Mayor said these devices are much safer for our Policemen. If this device is used on the freeway, the officer does not have to get onto the freeway, he does not have to get out of his car in traffic, nor does he have to interact with the public on the freeway. He does not put himself in harm's way, and he doesn't put the motorist in harm's way by pulling them over in traffic. More officers in our area have been injured on freeways than anywhere else. Ms. Henley stated that it is to the motorist's advantage because you don't have to supply a driver's license or proof of insurance. The Mayor agreed. No one has to pay court costs, and no one gets points on their license, it is a better way to get a citation. Mr. Contipelli agreed, he believes it is better for the safety of our employees, and they will slow people down.

The Mayor said that the stand alone cameras are not attractive, but the new devices are hand held and out of sight. The vendor has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars getting these devices

operational and our officers are real comfortable with managing the new hand held cameras and they are completely legal.

Ms. Henley has nothing against the new camera device, but she would like them not to use it where there are the flashing MPH lights we have set up on E. 49th and E. 71st. She believes that those lights alert the driver to slow down and doesn't feel that someone who is slowing down should get a ticket. Mr. Contipelli doesn't believe it is our place to tell the department where to use the camera. The Mayor stated that if you're breaking the law slow down.

Mr. Greenberg told the Council that the new statute echoes what you guys have legislated. Now you have to go to Municipal Courts, so all of our concerns have been validated. We don't know what the future holds, but he wanted to point out that what you voted for in the first Ordinance is now in the State Statute. The Mayor stated that we do lead; we have other communities calling and asking for our advice on this issue.

Mr. Contipelli asked if when we switch technologies, are we going to notify the residents and businesses in our Village. The Mayor said yes, we have a whole packet to send out to our businesses, a notification to the Neighborhood News, and we will notify all of our residents explaining the new cameras. As it gets nearer to the date in March that we switch to the handheld cameras, the Mayor will get Council all of the information regarding the switch. You will see more of these mobile devices in other communities.

Ms. Duszynski asked if it will be the same percentage of costs for the handheld cameras compared to the stand alone cameras from the vendor. The Mayor stated that when we switch, Mr. Greenberg and himself will negotiate with the vendor to change the percentages. Also, the Chiefs and the Mayor have given a message to Mr. Greenberg that every person who has gotten a citation and ignored it will be brought to Garfield Municipal Court for civil prosecution. We will not have our residents, friends, and lawful people who pay the fines while others who threw away their fines and say come and get me I'm not paying, to go unpunished. We will file against them in civil court. Mr. Greenberg said he wants to have legislation ready in February to put this plan in place.

CLERK REPORT

Nothing at this time.

MAYORS REPORT

The Mayor asked if everyone if they are comfortable with the committee they are on currently, and if so, could they stay in place for 2015. Everyone agreed they were ok in their committee and there will be no changes for 2015.

The Mayor asked the Public Works Committee to get together with Mr. Sciano to go over the 14 projects that were scheduled for 2014 and never completed or went forward. Mr. Bloam called a Public Works meeting on the day of Council at 5:30pm, but it will not be enough time to go over everything. Ms. Duszynski asked if these projects were large money projects. The Mayor stated that anything you do in the community is going to be a lot of money.

Mr. Contipelli made the motion to go into Executive Session for personnel, litigation, and economic development, seconded by Ms. Harris. All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. Contipelli made the motion to come out of Executive Session, seconded by Ms. Biro. All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

WHEREFORE, there being no further business before this Council, Ms. Duszynski seconded by Mr. Contipelli that the Work Session be adjourned. All voting aye, none opposed; motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.