City of Cleveland Heights
Charter Review Commission

Collated Responses from the Community Meeting and Online Survey: Form of Government and Charter Issues Discussion

Thursday, April 19, 2018
7:00 – 9:30 pm
Cleveland Heights Community Center

Meeting Overview

The meeting got underway shortly after 7:00 pm. CRC Chair Jack Newman welcomed the 82-plus people in attendance and introduced the members of the Commission. He then went on to review the meeting purposes and presented an overview of the charter review process. CRC Facilitator, Dr. Larry Keller, then spoke about forms of government. Following his presentation, CRC Member Katie Solender facilitated group exercises organized around two discussion questions:

1) What type of government do you prefer for Cleveland Heights and why?

2) What other elements should be added to or changed in the city charter to improve our local government?

For each question, participants at each of the 18 tables wrote their individual responses on answer sheets that were provided. Table re-organized after the first session and so there are fewer tables for question 2. Then each group engaged in a discussion of their ideas, which were summarized by a recorder and then reported out by a spokesperson to all in attendance. The evening concluded with a summary of next steps of the Commission and closing remarks by the Commission Chair Jack Newman.

Information from the Meeting

The data from the answer sheets are organized and summarized, without any analysis, in the following charts. All listings reflect the order in which the forms were reviewed. Data from several tables on Question 1 is in the first chart. Table responses are also numbered in order reviewed. Tables were not numbered at the event. Some tables responses did not include a tally on the question. If any tallies were reported by any table, the numbers are listed with the specific concerns of that table.
Chart 2 lists concerns noted by any individual. The concerns above the line were noted by more than one individual. The concerns are not listed in any order except as they were reviewed as noted in the paragraph above.
Charts 3 and 4 deal with the second question in the same manner as Charts 1 and 2 do for Question 1.
Every form submitted is included in the tallies in these charts. The list of responses is what is important and to the greatest extent possible, the original wording is recorded. Responses above the line in Charts 2 and 4 had more than one response. In those cases, rather than list many closely related responses the most frequent words were listed and/or wording was combined to preserve as many of the original words as possible.
Chart 5 looks at the information submitted online after the Community Meeting. A few days after the meeting the two questions were posed online. In addition, if an online respondent selected a hybrid form of government they were asked to define it. The definitions of hybrid are in Chart 6. Chart 7 lists the reasons a particular

form of government was preferred. The Chart is organized by selected form of government.

Chart 8 lists other issues for charter review in the order they were submitted online. Any issues listed more than once are above the line in the Chart.

Abbreviations for form of government are: – SM – Strong Mayor; SM/CAO – Strong Mayor/Chief Administrative Officer; CM – Council-Manager; CM/EM – Council-Manager with an elected mayor.

Chart 1 Responses by Table to Question 1
Preferred Form of Government

Table 1 (Form 1)

Preferred Form: SM/CAO – 4; CM – 2; SM – 2. Council with both wards and at-large

Concerns: 1. Mayor should be elected. 2. Current system lacks accountability to voters. 3. Disproportionate and non-representative council because of incumbency, party favorites and skewed promotion.

Table 2 (Form 3)

Preferred Form: evenly split between SM/CAO and CM (numbers not listed)

Concerns: 1. Success depends upon council – must have no internal conflicts with give and take on city future. 2. If council dysfunctional, then SM/CAO the answer.

Table 3 (Form 9)

Preferred Form: CM, current system

Concerns: 1. Council elected and accountable to voters. 2. Strong mayor typically a politician not an administrator. 3. Some wanted some wards for council.

Table 4 (Form 26; Envelop 1)

Preferred Form: CM (current system) – 1; SM/CAO) – 1; Abstain - 1

Concerns: 1. Current system too fluid. 2. Need to know to whom to go to when have a problem; 3. No accountability of individual councilmembers or "mayor."

Table 5 (Form 36)

Preferred Form: CM – 5; SM/CAO - 2

Concerns: 1. With SM no guarantee qualified individual. 2. Unlikely to vote on past or future administrative experience or potential. 3. CM guaranteed professional.

Table 6 (Form 43)

Preferred Form: CM – 3; SM/CAO – 2

Concerns: 1. CM professional, highly trained, can deal with complex problems; 2. CM decisions not politically motivated; 3. CM keeps staff out of politics; 4. SM has clear authority with accountability; 5. Chain of command responsibility.

(Chart 1 continued)

Table 7 (Form 62)

Preferred Form: SM – 5; CM – 2

Concerns: 1. SM and strong council. 2. All wanted wards for council. 3. Council would have distinct areas of assignment and responsibility. 4. Elected Law Director.

Table 8 (Envelop 2)

Preferred Form: CM – 4; SM/CAO – 1

Concerns: 1. SM more nimble setting of policy – accountable for solutions if not execution. 2. Accountability; difficult to know what the council-manager is; insulated. 3. Fear of cronyism in the city (about SM/CAO). 4. CM is check against abuse of power in the hiring and firing of staff. 5. Guaranteed professional in role vs. popularity in council. 6. Whatever we choose, need to have a long term vision and strong leadership. 7. Multi-decade plan.

Table 9 (Form 75)

Preferred Form: SM – no tally provided

Concerns: 1. Need strong leadership; mayor represents the city and to regional governments; 2. worried about SM inviting corruption

Table 10 (Envelop 1)

Preferred Form: SM/CAO – 3; CM (current system) – 1; SM – 1; Abstain - 1

No concerns listed

Table 11 (Envelop 2)

Preferred Form: CM – 4; SM/CAO - 1

Concerns: 1. SM more nimble setting of policy-accountable for solutions if not execution; 2. Accountability-difficult to know what the council-manager as insulated; fear of cronyism with SM; 3. CM is a check against abuse of power in the hiring and firing of staff; 4. CM guarantee of professional in role versus popularity in council; 5. Whatever we choose, we need to have a long term vision and strong leadership; multi-decade plan.

(Chart 1 continued)

Table 12 (Envelop 3)

Preferred Form: split between SM/CAO and CM; no tally listed

Concerns: 1. SM elected and answerable to the electorate; 2. Present system working well; 3. SM would put too much power into a single person's hands; 4. Mayor's office would cost too much money.

Table 13 (Envelop 4)

Preferred Form: CM – 3; SM/CAO – 2

Concerns: 1. CM non-political professional management; 2. SM clear authority and decisive.

Table 14 (Envelop 7)

Preferred Form: SM/CAO – 5; Strong CM – 2; Strong elected representative council – 7

No concerns listed

Table 15 (Envelop 9)

Preferred Form: SM/CAO – 5; SM – 3

No Concerns listed

Table 16 (Envelop 10)

Preferred Form: no tally listed.

Concerns: 1. What is economic impact of any of the forms, cost analysis if one is better than others. 2. What do citizens get out of the form? 3. Why have a mayor if office has no power? 3. Would an elected mayor clarify who to go to – buck stops here? 4. Elected mayor may provide more accountability to public. 5. SM/CAO better balance of power between legislative and executive branches.

Table 17 (Envelop 6)

Preferred Form: SM/CAO; no tally listed

Concerns: 1. SM elected by the people and responsible to the voter. 2. Responsibility and accountability in mayor. 3. With CM, could end up with weak leadership.

(Chart 1 continued)

Table 18 (Envelop 8)

Preferred Form: no tally listed

Concerns: 1. Strong argument for a mayor who is a spokesperson for the city, who can communicate the city's vision, and represent the city in the county and the state. Directly elected mayor more likely to do this. 2. Possible to have CM with an elected mayor. 3. CM as operational manager reporting to council and mayor. 4. Either way, put the issue on the ballot.

Chart 2 Individual Responses to Question 1
Preferred Form of Government

Preferred Form of Government

SM - 1　　　CM –31　　　SM/CAO - 52　　　CM/Elected Mayor - 0
No Preference - 4

Arguments/Concerns

CM preferred individual responses

1. No compelling argument for change
2. Fear recalcitrant Strong Mayor and Council which leads to embattled status; built in conflict
3. CM has evidence based professional training in Public Administration
4. System designed to avoid corruption and patronage; progressive government
5. Chief Executive not political, has relevant experience, make hard decisions
6. Policy and visionary goals should be a collaborative process as diverse people
7. Accountability
8. Focuses on city-wide issues, make decisions for whole city
9. Minimizes parties, partisan politics
10. Better city staff, apolitical, and work environment
11. Concern with example of East Cleveland
12. Will best citizens run for mayor?
13. Need wards
----
1. Tax increase if form of government is changed
2. Current system can be improved by changing ordinances
3. Current system but with 4 wards, 3 at-large with Council President as Mayor
4. Higher council salaries
5. Full-time council administrator
6. Cannot afford full-time mayor, Office of Mayor cost $500,000
7. CM has clean enumeration of duties
8. CM cost effective so CM can be paid a just wage
9. Promotes recruitment of talent with relevant experience in similar cities
10. System has served the community well – engaged community, healthy political life and high quality of life
11. If system is slow, council should firm goals and hold CM accountable
12. Services distributed on need not politics
13. Council needs to keep people informed
14. Council quality makes the difference
15. At-large council can address whole city
16. SM risks politicizing decision making
17. Professionalization
18. Moderates extreme views

(Chart 2 continued)

19. No inherent conflict between council, executive
20. Wise and efficient use of tax dollars
21. No certainty change benefits community
22. Council won't put issue on ballot anyway
23. Power corrupts, SM has too much power
24. Handles complex issues
25. Successful cities have CM
26. Changing form does not solve problems
27. University Heights example of mayor and council fighting
28. Need strong council and strong CM then system works
29. Wards don't work for city
30. Need good communication among council and CM
31. Changing form of government will only exacerbate existing problems
32. Prevents two headed monster of SM versus council
33. Council makes policy, CM administers
34. CM works from best practices not political expediency
35. Open minded but don't want additional politics
36. If changed, like SM/CAO
37. If current officials not addressing problems, fire them
38. All systems depend upon the people
39. Minimizes politics to a degree while emphasizing professional
40. Moved to CH and after 20 years understand the system
41. Could adopt charter changes to improve government
42. Put form of government on ballot
43. Need spokesperson but that does not require changing the form of government
44. City needs, "to promote its assets in a more profound way than it has"
45. "I think the extremely careful, and carefully limited official narrative, may come from staff other than the CM as much as elected officials."
46. Mayors make cities political
47. Mayors have personal agendas
48. Mayors invite favoritism
49. System working
50. Like Shaker Heights form of government but CM fine if power checked
51. Question if elected mayor better than a council selected one

(Chart 2 continued)

SM/CAO preferred individual responses

1. Council at-large
2. Provide accountability, accountable to the people
3. Full-time officials/council
4. Promote speedy Leadership with best policies
5. Nearby mayors more bold, especially a mayor who must please council
6. Mayor a risk but CAO reduces the risk
7. Public knows where decisions are made, clear chain of command
8. People know who to contact, where the buck stops
9. Current system not working or addressing problems
10. Government too remote needs more visibility but without politicization
11. Problems not handled well, sluggish system ex. Water
12. City not vibrant any longer, moving forward
13. Need strong, informed, forward, strategic thinking leadership
14. Elected leader for all
15. Professional full-time CAO
16. Checks and balances, separation of powers
17. City manager has too much power, behind the scene
18. SM does vision, face of the city and CAO day to day stuff
19. Voters should decide
20. SM leader externally, to county, state and national
21. Need some wards
22. Like mayor with 4-year term and CAO
23. Recall good idea
24. SM strong leader
25. SM directly elected and responsible to people so more transparency
26. Concern about cost of SM/CAO, if can afford
27. Wards make a SM less critical, all wards
----
1. Council 4 wards, 3 at-large
2. Mayor elected by the people with professional city manager
3. Shaker Heights model with inducements for full-time such as administrative assistants to mayor and city manager
4. Develop Severance
5. Promote Economic Development/Attract businesses
6. Wards focus on specific issues
7. Non-partisan elections
8. Current system confusing and non-responsive diffusing authority
9. Low participation in current system
10. Election of Mayor highlights issues
11. current system too technified
12. Council not strong and CM not elected
13. leadership that can shepherd solutions to current issues
14. Little electoral accountability as difficult to change council

(**Chart 2** continued)

15. No enough politics in public life
16. Mayoral primary for top two candidates
17. Same cost as for CM
18. CM should not appoint safety director
19. SM/CAO equivalent to CM
20. Mayor can report problems to council
21. Business need elected leaders to address their concerns
22. Council could select a full-time mayor
23. Took council long time to fire CM
24. Mostly wrong decisions during housing crisis, cutting staff, increase taxes and weakened city response; budget cuts don't keep CH strong
25. During housing crisis surrounding cities created CDC's and creating responses to mitigate damages
26. Takes care of weak leadership from CM system
27. SM reports to people CM does not
28. Council does not provide leadership
29. Elect Law and Service Directors
30. Elect Law Director
31. Feels like city has no leadership
32. CAO can implement SM/council ideas
33. SM paid commensurate to job demands so can do research, articulate and present vision of the city
34. CM and staff don't provide options to council so don't know long term needs
35. Need accountable, visible, elected leadership who embodies and communicates people's values and visions
36. In light of community diversity council should have wards and at-large; all at-large discriminatory
37. Cost of SM/CAO should not dictate decision
38. Quality administrative appointments via CAO
39. Concerned about growing partisanship in SM systems
40. Skill set and depth of mayor can be assured by wise and developing Council
41. Seven bosses untenable system
42. SM gives people a point person
43. CAO council approved to run city operations, experience versus politics
44. If no consensus, CAO should wait till it forms
45. SM should have municipal experience, not elected by peers
46. Knowledgeable councilmembers
47. Well-designed accountability of executive and legislature with administrators accountable to mayor and city council
48, Leadership, direction, vision and effective execution
49. Mayoral requirements – 4-year degree in public administration, business administration, finance or law
50. SM must be a resident
51 At-large council, fears wards for bickering and gerrymandering
52. Looks forward to voting for more than council

(Chart 2 continued)

53. CM not responsive
54. New construction poor quality
55. Need to add pride to the people
56. Be consistent with other Ohio cities
57. SM/CAO significantly superior to ours
58. SM/CAO with all wards more democratic, efficient and better able to set long term direction and sell it to citizens
59. What is benefit of a council without an elected mayor

No Preferred individual responses

1. Learning more about systems, questioning assumptions
----
1. Council has no personal responsibility; wards could remediate.
2. CM has no pro-active perspective
3. Re-election to Council cite previous work rather than policies and ideas
4. Daily service done well
5. No long term vision, direction
6. Charter review commission needs to analyze economic advantages/disadvantages of both forms of government

Chart 3 Responses by Table to Question 2
Other Charter Provisions

Table 1 (Table 1)

Issues: 1. Council Structure. 2. Office of CAO. 3. CM should prepare written and deliver orally State of the City message. 4. Even year elections.

Council: Wards with some at-large – 6
        Ranked Choice Voting – 1
        7 at-large – 1
        Leaning towards wards – 1
        See benefits of both wards and current system – 1
        Restructure council meetings

Office of CAO: Charter mandate mayor appoint CAO with council approval
        Mayoral Appointments: Law, Finance and Development
        Civil Service protection for employees with clear hiring and firing
        protections

Table 2 (Table 2)

Issues: 1. Charter works well. 2. Four wards, three at-large. 3. At-large council but periodically assign councilmembers to areas. 4. Make all council business discussions available.

Table 3 (Table 3)

Issues: 1. Council at-large may not represent diversity and is expensive to campaign. 2. Need wards – 3. 3. Need recall – 3. 4. Televise committee of the whole, make all council meetings visible and transparent – 4. 5.Council report to mayor and voters. 5. Council by precinct. 6. All ward council – 1.

Table 4 (Table 4)

Issues: 1. Council with both wards and at-large – 6. 2. Rank choice voting – 1 3. Council approval of all director appointments – 2. 4. Elect law director – 1. 5. Rank choice voting – 1. 6. Need economic development appointment – 1. 7. Include CDC's in charter, 8. Committee of the whole televised – 1. 9. Eliminate non-governing bodies, such as the Immigration Task Force. 10. Clear charter provision for merger with adjoining municipalities – 7.

 Table 5 (Table 5)

Issues: 1. Mix of wards and at-large - 4. 2. At-large council – 1. 3. Gender neutral. 4. Rank choice voting, at least at-large elections. 5. Council should not make midterm appointments. 6. Council appoint safety director.

Table 6 (Table 6)

Issues: 1. 5 wards with 2 at-large. 2. Freeze city tax. 3. Minutes for council meetings/general sunshine law - 5. 4. Nuisance abatement abuse. 5. Double Jeopardy. 6. Maintain CM but have wards for council. 7. Rank choice voting.

Table 7 (Table 7)

Issues: 1. Gender neutral. 2. Appointment for midterm council replacement. 3. Rank choice voting, at-large elections. 4. Non-civil service appointments for fire and police chief appointments. 5. Eliminate politics from selection of mayor. 6. Council candidates, members, Commission and board appointments need to be tax compliant. 7. Address blighted housing, need for senior housing, enforce noise ordinance and vacant store fronts. 8. Distinguish at-will and unionized employees. 9. Charter levy for road/street improvements. 10. Housing maintenance. 11. Full-time councilmembers. 12. Wards and at-large.

Table 8 (Table 39)

Issues: 1. Council at-large – 1, wards and at-large – 5. 2. Require strategic plan report. 3. Require state of city address.

Chart 4 Individual Responses to Question 2
Other Charter Issues

Issues

1. Prefer at-large council but can accept mix of wards and at-large
2. Mix of at-large and wards
3. Keep at-large council
4. Three or four wards
5. Raise council salary
6. Sunshine law, including committee of the whole
7. Minutes for all council meeting
8. Council three at-large four wards
9. Elect law director
10. Record all council meetings, public and open, committee of the whole
11. 5 wards, 2 at-large
12. Mandatory 10-year charter review
13. Vision, economic development/emphasize economic development
14.

----

1. Residence of Ward for One Year
2. Staggered terms with term limits
3. Election of Law and Finance Directors
4. Emergency ordinance needs unanimous vote and must be a real physical threat - 2
5. Ordinances need two readings, then a third and then vote
6. Ward vacancy if within six months of the election filled with candidate with next highest vote and if not within six months have at-large member serve district
7. Rank choice voting
8. gender neutral
9. Outside candidates not just civil service
10. Public safety director position controlled by charter not by default to fire or police chief
11. Keep CM form but would support election of a ceremonial mayor if CM form of government maintained
12. Improve quality of schools
13. Lower taxes
14. Transparent council, minutes, etc., and record all meetings
15. Strong mayor either part or full-time
16. Prohibit candidates/councilmembers from campaigning for others
17. CM deliver state of the city address
18. Require public debates for mayor/council
19. Full-time council administrator
20. President/Vice President of Council rather than mayor/vice mayor
21. Put form of government issue on ballot
22. Support electing ceremonial mayor if keep CM

(**Chart 4** continued)

23. Some wards but concerned about strength of council
24. Council approval of fire and police chiefs
25. Neighborhood representatives on CAC and Community Relations
26. Like collaboration and consensus which wards don't promote
27. Elect law, finance and service directors as well as judge
28. Ten percent for referendum petition
29. Emergency ordinances subject to referendum and must cite hazards, risks and damages
30. Council member must live in ward
31. Question about all ward council
32. 7 wards, 2 at-large
33. Council cannot fill an at-large vacancy if within six months of election; next highest vote candidate takes the seat
34. Town hall where council members must answer all questions
35. Robert's Rules for all committee meetings including three readings
36. Term limits
37. Council vacancy within six months of election next highest vote candidate
38. Use at-large councilmember to represent vacant ward
39. Define lines of communication
40. Councilmembers need to walk the beat and comment
41. Keep open book and shame (not clear exactly what is meant)
42. All decision meetings public and taped
43. Publicize committee meetings of council
44. Citizen access to council and elected officials
45. Citizen access to CM and staff
46. CM accountable to the people, currently council and CM not accountable
47. All city decisions posted online
48. Crack down on landlords
49. Mix of wards and at-large with majority in wards to increase both representation and accountability
50. Diminish role of committee of the whole
51. Rank choice voting
52. Strategic plan and vision reviewed annually
53. Put teeth into vision and strategic plan
54. More discussion about votes at council meetings
55. No wards! Built in conflict and can't remove an effective ward representative as is "my guy"

Chart 5 Summary of Online Responses to Question 1
Form of Government

CM 16   SM 69   SM/CAO 26   CM/EM 0   Other or No Preference 7

Chart 6 Definitions of Hybrid or Other Form of Government
Responses to Question 1

1. Elected fulltime mayor, with an appointed CEO; combination ward with at-large council representatives
2. Strong Mayor with appointed Administrator.
3. I think a city manager is a good idea but Mayor should be a stronger position and separately elected, rather than chosen by council.
4. I like the form of government in Shaker where there is a popularly elected mayor and a chief administrative officer.
5. An elected mayor with a City Administrator or manager. I believe that we need a paid professional with municipal MANAGEMENT experience running the city, not someone who wins an election due to the best organization of a campaign or name recognition.
6. Prefer elected mayor with a strong COO to run the city on day to day basis with Mayor and Council setting priorities.
7. Citizens elected mayor.
8. A popularly elected mayor with an administrative manager to oversee day-to-day operations
9. An elected mayor with an appointed manager a la Shaker.
10. See description below. I believe a qualified City Manager supported by a Ward-based elected council. [This was classified as a CM preference as all the definitions and reason were based on a CM system]
11. Management professional in support of a policy-setting Mayor and Council.
12. A popularly elected mayor and a professional administrator.
13. A strong, elected, fulltime mayor with a COO that is a professional to carry out the mayor and council's agenda.
14. We should have an elected mayor with all the powers normally associated with mayors but we could convert our city Mgr into a Chief Operating Officer who focuses on the technical aspects of city operations. This would assuage the folks who want to keep the City Mgr. since many of her duties would pass to the COO. But City managers are not trained to be POLICY experts and the voters need to be able to hold anyone making policy accountable and that has to be an elected person.
15. I support a popularly elected mayor paired with an appointed professional chief administrative officer.
16. Elected Strong mayor with hired administrative support.
17. Mayor-Council with CAO to head internal administration by department heads. Mayor elected to serve part-time. Mayor elected for 4-year term with tenure limited to 3 consecutive terms.

(**Chart 6** continued)

18. What Shaker Heights does – their elected strong mayor hires a chief administrative officer to handle day-to-day operations of the city and report to the mayor.
19. An independently elected Mayor that is separate and distinct from City Council. The Mayor would hire a Chief Administrative Officer to act as a defacto [sic] City Manager but the decision making authority would wrest with the elected Mayor thereby making him/her accountable for decisions made.
20. Other: a part time mayor elected at large whose responsibilities are to chair meetings and supervise the city manager/chief of staff. A council of 8 with 5 elected from wards and 3 at large, as they have in Euclid.
21. Other: Mayor with assigned council wards
22. Other: Balanced w/mayor & council. Do not like the sound of "strong" mayor.
23. A strong mayor with a Chief Administrative Officer who would be responsible for the day-to-day operations and would report directly to the Mayor – like Shaker Heights.
24. The hybrid offers a reasonable compromise.
25. Elected mayor and professional manager.
26. City Manager retained, with an elected mayor. I would like to see something modeled after Shaker's system – although you shouldn't pay the mayor as much as they do
27. The Mayor should have more power and should be elected not appointed – City Manager should not have more power than the mayor.
28. City divided into 4 Wards; 7 councilpersons…ALL at large but 4 elected by their wards. Top vote getter. 3 remaining at large. Mayor elected by the people. Mayor works with City Manager/Chief administrator of the city.

Chart 7 List of Online Reasons for Preferring Form of Government

SM Preference

1. Give the mayor and city more accountability to the voters.
2. To have an accountable elected figure and point person.
3. This is the only way to get rid of our totally useless council.
4. Let a SM run the show.
5. I would also be ok with a hybrid form like Shaker has.
6. Cleveland Heights needs someone with VISION. This council has no vision, no backbone and no ethics.
7. [The SM system] is the best way to simultaneously 1) ensure the highest level of citizen voice in local elections, and 2) give clarity to decision-making (currently its [sic] fuzzy and people complain about not knowing who to go to get things done).
8. Better accountability. Currently no one is responsible if things go wrong and everyone takes credit when things go right. With everyone running at large, every councilmember can claim they have a mandate on the platform that they ran on. This means there are seven different visions for the future of Cleveland Heights.
9. I believe the citizens of Cleveland Heights should have more of a say in who is the mayor AND that mayor should be more than a figure head. This still allows for a council and a system of checks and balances. Many CH citizens don't know who the mayor is because they are appointed by council and quite frankly they also don't know who council is. I believe this system will allow for a stronger Cleveland Heights community.
10. An elected mayor can articulate a vision to move a community forward. Her or his election can then be a mandate to achieve this vision. The entire government apparatus can be tuned to expedite the desired future.
11. First, the city manager is not directly responsible to the people they serve and then, given the nature of the position, they inevitably become part of the established bureaucracy. We've been seeing, sadly, the fallout of poor practices enabled by a former city manager with inadequate oversight from (and likely improper direction) from city council. The final element is the lack of obvious benefit to our current system. We're surrounded by strong mayor systems, yet see nothing that makes our system more responsive, efficient, or effective.
12. I believe we need a stronger leadership position to run on an agenda and govern based on that mandate.
13. The current system with a Mayor chosen from the council is just strange. And since Cleveland Heights is a city, not a township, it should have an elected Mayor and Council, who can hire a professional city manager should they deem it desirable.
14. I feel it give [sic] the citizens a DIRECT input as to who actually runs the daily details of the city.
15. Accountability! Something that is seriously lacking in the current form of government.

(**Chart 7** continued)

16. The mayor should be elected by the people and then should be some healthy tension between the mayor and council. Having the council select the city manager is just reinforcing on small group's agenda and further centralizing power.
17. I believe there will be more accountability with a mayor.
18. The citizens of Cleveland Heights should have the power to select their mayor and the mayor
19. I think an elected CEO would be more accountable and thus more responsive than a CEO who is appointed by and answerable only to elected council members. I also think that sometimes "professionalism" can be at odds with residents' values, case in point being the water privatization proposal.
20. Because the current form of government has failed out city. Cleveland Heights has deep rooted problems that need drastic action to reverse.
21. Cleveland Heights lacks accountability. It needs a mayor that speaks for and can be spoken to. A mayor knows the city, visits stores, restaurants, special events. A mayor that questions are [sic] present and future and helps to protect what its' [sic] citizens have dedicated their hearts to preserve and foster. A mayor to answer to fiscal inaccuracies and be able to put back on track.
22. Because an elected official can be made to move forward on issues that we as citizens care about. I have lived in Cleveland [sic] through two city managers and there is never a since [sic] of urgency about getting something done in our community. I have volunteered on boards and even when citizens talk directly with the managers and priorities are agreed upon it may take two years to get a simple task done.
23. I want to choose the mayor, and I believe council has become a self-serving club.
24. Full time position, available for outside entities to meet with during business hours. Would help develop and oversee vision for city. Point person for city residents who need problem solving or direction as to where to go in city system. Easier access into city system. Directly accountable to voters.
25. I would like to see more accountability among CH officials. If we had an elected mayor, candidates would campaign on platforms that the voters could evaluate, using that as a basis for their choice. The current system makes "mayor" - largely a ceremonial position, the choice of fellow city council members (not everyone in the city). In addition, city council members are elected at large, so I'm left with a strong sense of simply not being represented by anybody.
26. I want to be able to elect the mayor.
27. The general population of Cleveland Heights should be electing a Mayor. It shouldn't be the job of city council. There is a blanket assumption that the City Manager, a hired position, should run the city. The concept is archaic. It might have worked well for Rockefeller and his cronies but those days are long gone.
28. Direct accountability, more effective leadership, vision. Given the challenges our community faces, we need a full time leader. Uncomfortable that stewardship of any community reliant on part time council members.
29. Deduction making needs to become more efficient with someone taking responsibility.

(Chart 7 continued)

30. Makes all decision makers elected by the public which should lead to better accountability.
31. If I pay the salary, I want a vote.
32. If someone is going to have the title of Mayor then I believe I should be able to vote for them for Mayor not for city council and then have their friends elect them mayor. Its [sic] a slap in the face of the voters.
33. Accountability to the voters, something our current could feel they don't need to have.
34. I am torn between the Mayor-Council or Hybrid and would be supportive of either these forms, as I understand the merits of having an administrator to help manage the city. However, I cannot remotely understand how the Charter Review Commission seems to be against allowing CH citizens to have a direct vote for our mayor. When even our smaller counterpart of University Heights allows for a popularly elected Mayor, I am baffled that we keep with this antiquated mindset that all is well in Cleveland Heights. I fear Cleveland Heights is stuck in the mindset of the 90s when Coventry was booming and the city was considered a great place for everyone to live, including students, young adults, and families. Times have changed and our city is getting left behind quickly. While an elected executive wouldn't solve all our problems, it would be helpful to have someone to serve as the key leader for businesses to meet with, lobby new job growth in our city, and push for policies to bring our city into the modern era. I love this city and do hope we can join our more successful counterparts in Lakewood, Beachwood and throughout the rest of the county in moving toward a government with a popularly elected Mayor.
35. I want to elect our mayor not have council select the mayor. This person would be accountable.
36. Allows city to have a "real" mayor who has the chance and power to put his/her vision into play.
37. Mayor should not be chosen by Council.
38. The Mayor should be directly accountable to the citizens.
39. Cleve Hts seems to be falling behind the surrounding communities developmentally. You look at Cedar Center, University Circle, etc. and wonder why we late to the game with the Top of the Hill. Severance shopping area is a disaster (and city hall facing it) with no plan for the future. A stronger force of leadership is worth a try.
40. 1 person to lead instead of 7 who only compromise with each other.
41. It is what we deserve.
42. Cleveland Heights voters would be able to ask questions of and get answers to a mayoral candidate's vision and plans to address the city's issues and move the city forward. Personally, I want voters to be the ones who elect the mayor directly. Our city has a lot of challenges that need to have an out front executive articulating a vision for.
    A strong mayor/council form of government provides a clearer distinction between the executive and legislative branches. Right now, our structure it is conflates the two.

(**Chart 7** continued)

43. I need only to convince the mayor of an idea instead of having to convince 4 of 7 council members.
44. It appears that our current form of government is in the distinct minority for a good reason. It is not working for the citizens of Cleveland Hts. I have lived here 40+ years and have witnessed significant decline in the quality of life over the last 20+ years in in [sic] comparison to communities like Shaker Hts, South Euclid or Lakewood. That should be a wakeup call. The fact that Council appears not to want change and chose the very committee that would be making recommendations back to Council should be a wakeup call. The fact that Council members en mass endorse each other at election time and present no vision, housing or economic development plan should be a wakeup call. The current form of government makes it difficult to both access and assess responsibility. We need a full time elected official overseeing City hall and the various departments on a daily basis. Presently is [sic] is difficult to have city council members be responsive to everyday citizen issues or something as basic as ending the gas aggregation program without letting citizens know well in advance.
45. One voice.
46. A mayor should be elected and be accountable to the residents.
47. When a person is elected they may be more likely to work for and address the concerns of the people who elected them. Cleveland Heights is becoming a city of renters because people cannot to live here much like me.
48. More direct accountability when the people elect the mayor rather than council appointing. It's not "favorite" of council, but "favorite" of the people.
49. The current system should be changed because it splits authority from responsibility. The position of mayor should be a full-time job. An administrator (such as in Shaker Hts) is a good idea as long as the chain-of-command is clearly defined and understood: mayor and council establish policy, ordinances, etc, and the administer [sic] implements them.
50. Better for the community.
51. Our current council is weak and we need real leadership in Cleveland Heights.
52. A strong mayor can move the city forward more quickly and more urgently than our current form of government. The city needs strong leadership, rather than just management.
53. Needed in CH.
54. A strong mayor is called for to lead the city into the future.
55. Our current form is broken. Time for a change.
56. I want to elect my representatives.
57. More accountability to tax payers and more representation of population.
58. My 30 years in the Heights has led my [sic] to one conclusion this is the laziest and least effective council I have ever seen. We need a true leader and changing the charter to all a strong mayor is the first step.
59. We need a strong mayor to advocate for us.
60. A mayor elected by the people would be held responsible to the people and it is more democratic.

(**Chart 7** continued)

61. Greater accountability; more efficient; able to vote for specific expertise
62. More accountability, and it doesn't feel like we have as much say in our government when we aren't directly electing a mayor.
63. An elected mayor will get rid of some of the upper level deadwood at city hall, something the city manager won't do because these people are close with council.
64. I think voting for a mayor would allow the voice of the residents to be heard and would also force someone to have a well-articulated vision for the city, which doesn't seem to currently exist.

SM/CAO Preference

1. Combination of wards and at-large
2. More accountability to the residents and shareholders
2. Greater transparency
4. More representative of neighborhoods
5. More accountability – 2
6. The CM is not elected and that is wrong. I want a say in who is the mayor and who runs city hall. Right now I have no say in either.
7. I think a city manager is a good idea but mayor should be a stronger position and separately elected, rather than chosen by council.
8. Current method of choosing mayor seems like too much insider jockeying.
9. I think things move at a snail's pace in CH. If you believe in the phrase, "the buck stops here" - then in CH that buck has to be split into 8 pieces and it's a cumbersome, clumsy system for accountability.
10. I also believe we have lulled this community to sleep with our current form of government as most folks don't even know how it works. The notion that if you want change or response that you have to lobby seven separate council members and hope to find consensus is not healthy for a community facing our current challenges.
11. We are not keeping pace with our peers, our property values are not recovering at the same rate, and our taxes are increasing. This is not a sustainable model and there seems to be no sense of urgency.
12. Our current form of government has created a risk-averse, cautious culture in Cleveland Heights and in 2018 this does not serve us well.
13. The people should directly elect the mayor or we should change the title to President of Council. It's confusing to people. The City Manager or Administrator should be able to manage the city administration and departments from a professionally trained perspective.
14. I am off [sic] mixed views on whether we need to change the form of government in order to get this city moving forward. If the question is leadership, then we should elect council people with leadership and ask them to pick strong administrators. But this has not happened, so having an elected mayor might be a better way.
15. Citizens elected mayor

(Chart 7 continued)

16. I believe a mayor-led government would be more accountable to the residents, and would provide more decisive leadership. Currently, the City Manager seems to have the most power, and she is only accountable to seven Council members. Cleveland Heights needs to change – this isn't the 1960's. Our challenges require elected officials with vision who will implement bold change to move the city forward.
17. Allows for the professionalism of a manager with a mobilizing elected figurehead
18. Management professional in support of a policy-setting Mayor and Council.
19. More like to recognize and take action to address issues of importance to the community. More likely to take innovative action, less concerned about job self-preservation, less likely to maintain outdated but 'safe' ways of doing things, more responsive to new ideas, more flexible.
20. It is time for a change in Cleveland Heights. We have been stagnating for too long. The energy, and innovation are all on the near west side of town.
21. Our current gov is not getting the job done based on the quantifiable metrics of econ development and housing. This form of gov would give the citizens way more accountability and a vision for the city while maintaining a professional staff.
22. Over my 20 yrs. of living in Cleveland Heights, on most of the occasions that I have interacted with councilmembers, the standard answer to issues and problems from councilmembers if that such and such is the responsibility of the City Mgr. I have heard this often enough to conclude that this is a great buck-passing scheme for City Council to abjure responsibility for anything anytime they wish. I want the buck to stop somewhere and it needs to stop with someone who is accountable to the voters.
23. The chief administrative officer would manage the day to day operations of the city allowing the mayor to set a vision and implement a vision and strategic goals and objectives for the city.
24. It provides for Mayoral leadership and accountability to voters directly with capacity to lead in policy making, in execution of policy and in external relationships in matters affecting the city. It provides a single office for interaction with the city by an official who ranks as a peer with other mayors. It relieves council members of constituent liaison services on administrative issues and enables council to be more focused on policy matters.
25. More accountability of the mayor directly to voters.
26. I do not believe in the current system of governance for Cleveland Heights. It is outmoded. A change is warranted, not for the mere sake of change but in order to provide greater accountability and to offer a clearer system of checks and balances to actions taken. The City would gain from having a person who is its chief spokesperson, its "face", rather than the diffuse system we currently have. This hybrid system works well for Shaker Heights and would work well for us as well.

(Chart 7 continued**)**

27. After living in C. H. for 55 years I realize that many things about our current governmental structure does not work as well as it has in the past. I arrived at my conclusion/choice after observing other governmental structures serving other Cuyahoga County communities. A mayor could promote a certain vision and a chief administrator officer would carry things out similar to the way the city manager does now. Ward council persons are sorely needed to best articulate the special needs of our diverse neighborhoods and at-large council persons would provide a city-wide perspective.
28. A directly elected mayor is more responsive to the city residents. Currently, the City Manager is only responsible to a very weak City Council.
29. I feel that in the current form, changes and actions for responses simply take too much time. Our city, like other burbs next to nearby larger and older cities has many complex social and infrastructure needs that require full time attention. In particular, the city manager is not held responsible for getting things done in a timely manner and anecdotal community observations are that there is often unprofessional and undermining regarding efforts of council. Thus another stronger accountability model is needed.
30. The success of a city depends far more on the people in office and the staff than the type of government. A strong mayor in a small city easily can become a dictator, treating the community as his/her fiefdom; this region has plenty of examples. A city manager is not directly accountable to the voters. A hybrid offers the best chance of countering these negatives structurally – but offer no guarantee that good people will be elected or hired.
31. There has been a "hands off" approach towards the citizens for years now and NO focalized leadership. The Democratic Club acts more like a plutocracy here in CH. Our council should also include Republicans, Independents and whoever else wants to run to be far more politically diverse.

CM Preference

1. There is a greater chance for long term planning that extends beyond the normal election cycle
2. It brings a level of professionalism and management to the running of the city instead of whoever wins a popularity contest.
3. It removes politics from most decisions made on behalf of the city. Strong mayor systems dilute the power of the people.
4. I believe it is the correct combination of representation and professional expertise.
5. With a city our size, I think it is beneficial to be able to hire a professional executive administrator to make sure the [sic] we run the city highly in an effective and efficient manner. What we need to focus on a recruit is a better group of council members. Maybe pay them more and hope to draw from the considerable intellect and professional experience our citizens possess. Its [sic] hard to imagine a political process would be better at choosing an effective leader,

(**Chart 7** continued)

    we just need the best people with only the cities [sic] interest in mind to hire the
    city manager and hold them accountable.

6. City Manager position is held by an individual that has a proper education and
   understands (theoretically) how a city operations [sic] and functions. An elected
   official may not possess those same qualities/expertise.
7. This system is a less politicized form of government. While all systems can be
   subject to undue influence, the mayoral system is more likely to be corrupted.
8. I think there should be a strong performance review of the city manager every
   few years but is easier than reversing policies made because of concern for a bloc
   of votes.
9. I also think that management needs to be in the hands of a strong professional.
10. It puts a professional in charge and keeps politics out of the day-to-day
    operation of the city.
11. I support our current form of government because it guarantees a trained
    professional running city operations. It also protects our city from internal and
    partisan politics.
12. It provides strong oversight of management without turf battles pitting on
    neighborhood against another.
13. The council should hire a competent PROFESSIONAL city manager. This is too
    important a role for petty politics.
14. Distribution of power.
15. I have not heard or seen a Problem Statement as required by the commission's
    creating ordinance.
16. The Council-Manager system retains clear lines of accountability between voters
    and their elected representatives. Adding a mayor would create an additional
    veto point, diffusing responsibility for local problems while generating more
    institutional inertia.
17. Someone in charge on full time basis.

Other or No Preference

1. My main objection to an elected Mayor is the cost.
2. However, I realize the Manager is paid a lot, probably far more than she is worth.
3. elected mayor by the voters
4. 1) The map published earlier this year that shows no council member has been
      elected from the NE "panhandle" of CH in 50 years makes us a sitting duck for
      a voting rights act lawsuit.
   2) The higher cost of running a citywide campaign limits candidates to those who
      can find money or support.
   3) Not having a council member of your "own" means there's no one a CH
      resident can turn to with a gripe -- short of hiring a lawyer, which happens
      somewhat too often. Yes, a note to any council member, the mayor or the
      manager will probably get a reply, but only probably. The result is a
      disconnect with the city.

(**Chart 7** continued)

4) "If everyone is responsible, no one is responsible," as the adage goes. I like to think that if there were ward responsibilities, some council member would have raised cain over the state of the westbound curb lane of Cedar Glen after a year of disruption at Cedar & Fairmount while the street was rebuilt. Or voiced the general lack of enthusiasm for the result of the Lee Road project. Or rose to defend young people when the city passed its unenforceable ban on young people in the evening along Lee Road and Coventry. Or raised an alarm at the state Noble Road fell into long before now.

5) Prevent groupthink, when all the members feel beholden to the whole city and support one another in their campaigns, there's a pressure to go along to maintain a consensus. This dynamic is fostered by the city manager, whose job is secured by keeping that consensus going. I believe groupthink led to the aborted plan to privatize the water system and many other questionable decisions. Why do we have two skating rinks and no indoor pool, for example? Instead of difficult things, council members disagree about abstract ones, like "sanctuary cities" things.

A different system would build in closer connections to the public and greater diversity in decisions.

5. I would like to know whom to contact regarding my concerns.
6. Due to the balance.

Chart 8 List of Other Charter Concerns and Issues

1. Wards
2. Mixed ward system for council – 4 members elected by ward, 3 members elected at large.
----
3. Running the city as a business
4. Councilmembers elected by wards, with perhaps 2 elected at-large.
5. The neighborhoods need individual champions, working for constituents
6. It is incredibly frustrating not to have a single elected official to contact.\
7. What Council needs to do is actually DO things. For decades it has run away from its public school system, failed miserably in combating housing decay, cannot do more than one economic development project at a time (often failing), and twice thrown the public schools under the bus in regard to the disposition of vacant buildings (coercing the sale of Millikin to Mosdos and being spineless in regard to Coventry). CH is now wasting the opportunity to attract millennial homebuyers with this useless distraction when ALL resources possible should be used to develop ALL city parcels in the Noble Road corridor as well as Lee and Meadowbrook. This entire charade appears to be a ploy to create a position for someone to run for, instead of doing what is needed, which is for Council to actually do things instead of pointless exercises like this and debating the merits of backyard chicken coops.
8. I strongly oppose doing away with the at-large election of council
9. At least 4 ward council members and 3 at-large councilmembers.
10. Absolute transparency from city council.
11. [Council] should no longer be able to hide from the community in their committee meetings. Full audio and video with word for word minutes.
12. All boards and commissions should also have audio and video with full word for word minutes.
13. Council Committee of the Whole should videotaped.
14. Council should be split into wards with a few at large.
15. [Preferred SM system] Just wondering where that leaves the city manager/need one? Not particularly savvy in politics but wondering what the big differences would be should we change the system.
16. I think there should be a provision that insists on a review of the charter every set number of years, as not looking at this document for more than 35 years, and then leaving the decision to look at it in the hands of those most entrenched in it does not serve our democracy well.
17. The majority of council persons should be elected by ward. Then each resident has one specific person whose primary interest is that particular portion of the city.
18. We should consider adding two seats to council and move to ward/neighborhood based council representation with seven representative and two at-large members.
19. Broadcast Council of Whole [sic] meetings, regular updates to citizens on issues that council is working on, methods to see regular input from citizens.
20. Council by wards like other cities do

(Chart 8 continued)

21. Term limits are damaging to democracy and they should not be a part of our city's form of government.
22. I am mixed in my views of council running in specific wards as opposed to the current at large method. If we had both, I think that would be better than either one by itself.
23. I think there should be council members by district instead of at-large. This will provide better representation for the various neighborhoods so everyone's issues will be properly addressed at the city government level.
24. Make-up of Council should include at-large as well as representatives from specific Districts.
25. City Council members should have responsibility for wards/precincts in Cleveland Heights. At this point we feel their [sic] is little to no accountability to the community.
26. limit time in office-mayor & council members.
27. Ranked choice voting for municipal elections.
28. Council representation should be organized into specific wards with a few members "at-large." Having direct constituents, location-based, will increase accessibility and accountability for elected officials. I also strongly believe this is a more equitable way to govern our city.
29. At least some ward-based council people to increase balanced representation of all city neighborhoods.
30. The use of RITA eliminates one problem that existed in Finance Department covert practices which used to exist but can no longer.
31. While there are small changes such as gender references and the like, the existing Charter has held up well because it was thoughtfully created.
32. Also, some of the members of Council would be elected by ward.
33. The council members should be elected in wards.
34. We should have a designated council person for each neighborhood. I don't know who to call if I have an issue.
35. I like our at-large election system.
36. Please make the charter's language gender neutral.
37. Change current system of voting for council members to ward system so all city residents feel as if they are represented by someone who lives in their neighborhood.
38. I think city council members should be elected by ward. The way things stand, we effectively have no one representing us. While you can theoretically take concerns to any council member, none of them has an incentive to no [sic] any area of the city and its needs/desires particularly well. I understand that this may have made sense when the city was more homogeneous, but that's not the case today. Different areas of the city have different concerns and those concerns need to be heard and addressed.
39. Transparency, transparency, transparency.
40. Nothing else right now. Move to mayor/council first.
41. A real community development department.
42. Wards. Change gender in charter language to neutral.

(**Chart 8** continued)

43. Wards with no at large.
44. I am undecided on moving to a ward based system. I do not think it would lead to "fiefdoms" as some have described, but rather ensure that all parts of the city are equally represented and have a voice on council. Right now, when I have an issue, I don't know which council member to contact and to contact them all at once usually yields no response at all. However, I feel like this is less important to address now than allowing for citizens to have a real vote and voice in deciding the Mayor of our city.
45. Wards.
46. Voters should elect the Mayor directly.
47. Reduce council to 6 members, 2 at-large and 4 from wards. Mayor to preside at council meetings, voting only to break a tie. Appointment of CAO and department heads subject to council confirmation.
48. I think wards will be good for Cleveland Heights. It will also guarantee that several council members will have to actually run against each other.
49. City council representation by ward. This should be blended with city-wide representation to best serve residents locally while being able to keep the entire city's perspective in consideration.
50. Wards, Wards, Wards
51. About four of the council seats should be ward-based. This could serve to strengthen the local neighborhoods and create more neighborhood engagement with City Hall. I envision precinct committees from the neighborhoods interacting with ward-based councilpersons in a relevant and continuing way. Our council could meet people where they are and be more aware of what's important to all parts of the city. Likewise, ward-based councilpersons could deliver initiatives to the neighborhoods more Effectively.
I also envision ward-based councilpersons being able to more effectively engage with the city's institutions, such as the schools, police and business communities. We would be incentivized to nurture future leaders from all parts of the city.
52. The roles and responsibilities of city commissions should be clearly articulated. I have scoured the City's website and while the term of office and the number of members of a commission are provided, there is no definition of what a commission is to do and why.
53. I've said my piece above. [See Entry 4 under Other or No Preference in **Chart 7** above] A strict rule on public meetings and documents should be in the charter. Workshops and private discussions should not be allowed. Documents that aren't privatized in state law should be public without question. This includes timely posting of police reports, though the website is a decent start.
54. I have no comment at this time.
55. Unsure.
56. Increase council members to 8 – 5 ward council members and 3 at large. If we stay the same in form of government then we should remove the term mayor from the charter and have the president of the council be known only as president of council.

(**Chart 8** continued)

57. Make landlords accountable. Time limits on repairs. No renting unless taxes are paid and dwelling is legally suitable to be inhabited. Toughen nuisance laws and make landlords responsible for police calls.

Economic development person to contact requisite developers, government departments, innovators, etc to create a city for the 21st century.

Encourage the arts and artists of Cleveland Hts by creating/converting multi-use space for housing and studios etc.

Finally, council members should not be allowed to endorse each other.

58. I want wards.

59. The mayor should be elected by the citizenry, not merely chosen by city council.

60. Some at large city council members and some elected by ward – some City Council members need to be directly accountable to residents of specific wards. Currently, there is no direct accountability for City Council members, so we have City Council members who do not appear to be concerned about certain areas of the city.

61. I believe that CH is broken up into 5 wards so there should be 5 ward council people and 2 at large council people. It should be written into the charter that council people, or anyone running for council, may not endorse a candidate or interfere in any other ward council election.

62. I prefer a combination of ward-based council people and at-large council people. That way neighborhoods are all represented directly but there's a check and balance through the at-large so the discussions don't get too parochial.

63. Elected officials: mayor + 6 council members. All can vote. 4 council members by ward & 2 at-large members. Terms of office should be staggered.

64. My observation of current council, based on my attendance at Council of the Whole had been disappointing. I observe lackadaisical behaviors…members come in at various times, many do not appear to be listening to one another and leadership does little to command engagement. Decisions appear to be made to satisfy the status quo instead of really critically thinking through issues. It's not a group that appears proactive or thinking out of the box. A few members seem more engaged and thoughtful but it's not rewarded. A hybrid form would promote a stronger more balanced form of govt for current complexities and demands of the community for a stronger community.

65. Wards for better representation.

66. We need to get the current council out and the best way to do it is by instituting wards. 4 wards and 3 at large.

67. Make 4 of the 7 council people ward-based so that residents know who their representatives on council are and so that council members are more responsive to residents.

68. Get rid of at large council and put in wards.

69. Ward or ranked based voting to get better people on council.

70. Full transparency, unlike what has recently passed. Also, no restrictions on 3rd parties, all should be treated as equals.

(**Chart 8** continued)

71. As I previously stated, this is the laziest and least effective council I have ever seen. To combat this we need to establish wards. 4 wards and 3 at large or 5 wards and 2 at large.
72. Common sense. Our current council has none. Lets [sic] add it as a requirement.
73. Council elected from combination of wards and at large.
74. Council approval for appointment/dismissal of Finance Director and Law Director
75. Ward representation – 4 or even 5 wards with 3 or 2 (respectively) at-large members, or broken down differently depending upon whether or not the elected mayor has a vote, or just a tie-breaker if need be
76. Three readings on legislation as opposed to two
77. Change wording of the charter so that City Council "must" record committee of the whole meetings, at least with audio recording and summary minutes
78. Eliminate council's current appointment process for vacant seats, whatever that is …
79. Any agency that operates as a Community Development Corporation (CDC) for the city cannot be eligible to receive federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for itself.
80. Be divided by wards way it was when my parents moved into area. We lived on Meadowbrook so our ward was Scarborough. Wards makes someone responsible for makes someone responsibly.
81. Transparency…Council "MUST" record CoW meetings and any other meeting where city business is conducted, preferably audio with video and in Council chambers.
82. A member of City Council or the Mayor must actively be involved in the business of the CHUH School district. Right now they operate in 2 different worlds and that causes another schism in leadership. At all times the City and the school district must act in the best interest of the city rather than union contractual demands. A City Councilperson must keep the City updated regularly about progress on Grade Reports from the State BOE and action taken to improve them across the board and ultimately get all of our schools off the EdChoice eligibility list…minimal acceptable grade for each school and the district as a whole be a grade of "C".
83. While I strongly urge council to focus time, attention and financial resources on the northern end of Cleveland Heights, I am nonetheless against electing council members by ward. I fear this would pit one neighborhood against another, causing unnecessary division, both on council and out in the community.