



CLEVELAND HEIGHTS

Charter Review Commission

May 15, 2024

6:00 PM

City Hall – Executive Conference Room

1) Call to Order

- a. Chair Linda Striefsky called the meeting to order at 6:02 PM.

2) Roll Call

- a. Members present: Linda Striefsky, Roland Anglin, Stephanie Morris, Jonathan Ciesla, Harriet Applegate, Drew Herzig, Graham Ball, and Guy Thellian.
 - i. Guy Thellian arrived at 6:05 PM.
 - ii. Stephanie Morris arrived at 6:08 PM.
- b. Members absent: Graig Kluge.
- c. Staff present: Assistant Law Director Lee Crumrine.

3) Approval of Minutes of May 14 (pending availability).

4) Review and Confirm or Amend Agenda

- a. The CRC agreed to discuss salaries with the Civil Service Commission before proceeding with the agenda.

5) Public Comments

- a. None.

6) Old Business

- a. Discussion with members of the Civil Service Commission regarding proposed changes to salary provisions for City Council and Mayor (Roland Anglin Draft).
 - i. The Civil Service Commission (CSC) held a joint meeting with the CRC. Present were Judith Miles and Hugh Weinberg. Chair noted the overlapping meetings and stated that the CRC is welcoming comment on the salary proposals from the Civil Service Commission.
 - ii. Judith Miles explained that the CSC would rather not have the duty imposed by the proposed charter amendment requiring them to complete a compensation review for the Mayor and Council, that the CSC is not the

right body to perform a compensation review. She expressed a concern that the process will politicize the CSC.

- iii. Hugh Weinberg stated that it might not be appropriate for the CSC and noted that the CSC is appointed by the Mayor.
- iv. Chair stated that the proposal is just to make recommendation and that Council will have to make the ultimate decision.
- v. Hugh Weinberg stated that the CSC might not be able to perform such a compensation review and that he is not comfortable judging the performance of elected officials.
- vi. Drew Herzog noted that state law prevents mid-term salary increase. He stated that he agrees that it is unfair to saddle the CSC with this responsibility.
- vii. Graham Ball noted that there has not been a salary raise for Council members since 2001, which was effective in 2004. Before that, raises occurred in 1996 and 1983. He also noted that the CSC recommendation is not to be performance based, but rather is based on salaries paid by comparable cities, etc.
- viii. Judith Miles requested that process be reviewed. She asked whether consultants would be involved. She noted that Council raises are very rare.
- ix. Harriet Applegate explained why it is difficult for Council to address salary increases themselves, as evidenced by long period since an adjustment. The new form of government provides for more responsibilities for Council, which requires more time.
- x. Drew Herzog commented that the CSC would need a budget to do this work, especially if a consultant is used. Chair noted that CRC could provide in Charter that Council shall provide by ordinance for support for CSC.
- xi. Guy Thellian stated the important of retaining talent through fair compensation. Using a consultant to assist with evaluating salary adjustments is routine business practice. The consultant would develop the process for making recommendations.
- xii. Judith Miles noted that the CRC is only 3 members. Chair noted that the size of the CSC could be increased.
- xiii. CSC adjourned at 6:37 PM and members of the CSC left the meeting at that time.
- xiv. Harriet Applegate stated that residents may be concerned about cost of consultants doing the work of the city. Chair stated that this is a situation where use of consultants may be warranted. Guy Thellian noted that this compensation review requires expertise.
- xv. The CRC discussed Article 11. Chair suggested language requiring Council to provide budget and support to the compensation review by adding the sentence, “The Council shall adopt such legislation as is necessary to implement this provision, including to ensure the City may enforce these objectives in its award and supervision of contracts and grants”. The CRC agreed to make references in Sections 11.3(d) and 3.4 to compensation to “salary and compensation” rather than just “salary.” Motion to accept the draft as amended by Jonathan Ciesla, seconded by Chair. Graham Ball asked whether Lakewood’s charter provision escapes ethics prohibitions on mid-term salary increases. Motion passed 8-0.

- b. Status Report on plans for the second public input meeting to be held May 21.
- c. Discuss any remaining CRC member questions/comments on revisions to charter draft
 - i. Regarding Section 10.5, Chair asked whether that training topics should be determined by Council instead of specified in the charter. Jonathan Ciesla and Stephanie Morris stated support for a revision. Drew Herzig stated his opposition to that revision. The CRC discussed proposed revisions to this section. Roland Anglin expressed concern about requiring elected officials to complete training and stated that he supports more encouragement than requirements. Stephanie Morris asked if it can be conveyed more as continuing education rather than a requirement that may be insulting to Council members. Motion by Chair to approve section as amended, seconded by Roland Anglin. Motion passed 7-1.
 - ii. CRC discussed whether mayor may veto initiatives. Assistant Law Director Lee Crumrine stated that the mayor cannot veto measures providing for submission of initiatives or charter amendments to voters. Motion by Chair to add to Section “No ordinance or other measure proposed by initiative petition and approved by a majority of the electors voting upon the measure in the City shall be subject to disapproval by the Mayor.” Drew Herzig suggested using “disapproval” instead of “veto” because that is how the power is described in the Charter. Harriet Applegate suggested using “veto” instead of “disapproval” throughout the section. Assistant Law Director Lee Crumrine stated that the use of “disapproval” tracks state law under R.C. 705.75. Motion passed 7-1.
- d. Discuss any remaining CRC member questions/comments on revisions to report draft.
 - i. The CRC discussed the draft of the report.
 - ii. Harriet Applegate provided suggestions for the section on ranked choice voting.
 - iii. The CRC continued its discussion of the land acknowledgment section of the report.
 - iv. Stephanie Morris, Chair, and Guy Thellian agreed to revise the draft report together and present it to the CRC at a future meeting.
- e. Status report on development of charter amendment “Buckets”

7) New Business

- a. Discussion of plans for meeting of CRC with City Council to present charter and report.
- b. CRC decided to add meetings on May 28 and 29. May 28 meeting will be to consider input from public. May 29 meeting will be opportunity for any final comments on charter and report before submission of work product to Council. If time allows on May 28, the May 29 agenda can be covered on May 28 and May 29 meeting can be cancelled.

8) Review of Meeting Action Items

- a. Assistant Law Director Lee Crumrine to inquire with the library about the availability of microphones for the public input meeting.

9) Public Comment

- a. None.

10) Review of Meeting for Lessons Learned

- a. None.

11) Adjourn

- a. Motion to adjourn by Guy Thellian, seconded by Jonathan Ciesla. Approved unanimously. Adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

Next meeting: Public Input Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 6:00 P.M at Lee Road Library.