



Village of Reminderville  
Charter Review Commission Meeting  
May 12, 2021

**Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order by Mr. Salapski at 7:01pm

**Roll Call**

Ms. Ritu Chakkarwar, present  
Mr. Vincent Montague, present  
Ms. Beth Pajemola, present  
Mr. Michael Roney, present  
Mr. Mark Salapski, present

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Montague moved to approve the minutes from April 28, 2021. Mr. Roney seconded. All in favor.

**Comments from the Public:** Thirty minutes' maximum time, five minutes per person. Raise your hand, state your name and address. Please remember residents have the opportunity to raise their hands and be recognized by the chair at any time during public meetings.

There were no comments from the public.

Councilwoman Becki Kovach, and Councilman Tom DiCarlo were also in attendance.

Discussion was had regarding reinstating the Councilmanic districts. Ms. Task stated if the three districts are reinstated, there would be three district Council members and three Council members at-large. If no one runs in a district, there would then be a request for letters of interest from residents in that district to be sent to the mayor for consideration of appointment and then confirmation from Council. If one person submits a letter of interest, that person would be appointed; if more than one person submits a letter of interest there would be an interview process before a decision was made. Ms. Pajemola feels that the population has increased and it is more likely now that residents would run. She added that she would like to see representation for districts rather than the majority of Council members all from the same area. Mr. Montague agreed. Mr. Salapski commented there haven't been many Council elections where there

were more candidates than open seats. Ms. Chakkarwar agrees it should be placed in front of Council for discussion.

Mr. Montague moved to have a ballot proposal written up by Ms. Lohan pertaining to Article IV. to reinstate the Councilmanic districts. Ms. Pajemola seconded. All in favor.

Ms. Task began the discussion regarding adding wording to allow lateral hiring without testing for classified full-time employees to Article X, Section 10.04. Classified full-time employees include the police department and service department. Ms. Task read a statement from the Civil Service Commission (attached). The statement is in favor of not adding lateral hiring without testing. The Civil Service members feel the current testing procedure is fair in ranking applicants and feel lateral hiring could lead to discrimination. Mr. Montague stated he spoke with Police Chief Marco Berquist and Chief Berquist is in favor of lateral hiring. Mr. Montague added most cities are doing it because of the decreased number of applicants and to be able to hire someone with more experience in the field. He also commented the Civil Service Commission does not do testing for part-time applicants under the unclassified service and he would like lateral hiring to be added to that. Testing for part-time applicants was repealed by the electors in 2015. He said Chief Berquist would like the ability to pull from a larger pool of experienced candidates without a Civil Service test, then interview and administer background checks before getting final approval from Council to hire. Ms. Pajemola commented if the Charter already gives the authority of hiring practices to Civil Service Commission, it is not necessary to add wording for lateral hiring without testing. Mr. Montague would like it added to the Charter that the hiring authority be given to the police chief rather than Civil Service. There were questions about how applicants are chosen from the test results list to continue in the hiring process. Ms. Task will clarify the current Charter wording with Ms. Lohan and ask Chief Berquist to attend the next meeting.

Ms. Task moved to the discussion on adding the Architecture Board of Review to the Charter. She reported the following communities do not have ABR in their Charter: Aurora, Twinsburg, Solon, Stow, Kent, and Glenwillow. The following communities do have the ABR in their Charter: Chagrin Falls, Hudson, and Orange. Those three have *composition and terms* and *duties in general* listed in their Charters but do not have wording for meeting schedules or application procedures. The ABR for Reminderville is covered in the Codified Ordinances and any requested changes to the application process or meeting schedule can be handled there. Mr. Montague stated the application timeline does not work for residents and is not convenient for some of the residents and should be regulated by the residents. Ms. Task commented the ABR is made up of residents and a discussion can be had with them pertaining to the permit process rather than adding it to the Charter. Ms. Pajemola commented putting it in the Charter takes away the flexibility of the board members and process. Mr. Salapski said the board members are volunteers and if there are too many

meetings it may be difficult to find residents to serve. Ms. Chakkarwar asked why the ABR was not added to the Charter when it was written, even if just for composition and duties. Ms. Task replied it is covered in the Codified Ordinances. Ms. Pajemola stated anything in the Charter is more restrictive so she would like to hear a clear reason to put it in the Charter. Mr. Salapski added what is the benefit to adding it to the Charter. Ms. Chakkarwar said it could be added for definition purposes but she feels it is adequately covered in the Ordinances. Further discussion will be held at the next meeting.

The next meeting will be May 19 via Zoom.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Montague moved to adjourn. Ms. Pajemole seconded. All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:03pm

Respectfully submitted,

Stacey Task, Clerk of Council  
Village of Reminderville