

**SAFETY COMMITTEE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2020**

The Safety Committee meeting was held on February 18, 2020, at North Royalton City Hall, 14600 State Road. The meeting was called to order at 7:08 p.m.

PRESENT: Committee Members: Chair Dan Langshaw, Vice Chair Mike Vos, Jeremy Dietrich; **Council:** President of Council Paul Marnecheck, Jessica Fenos, Linda Barath, Vincent Weimer; **Administration:** Mayor Larry Antoskiewicz, Law Director Thomas Kelly, Fire Chief Robert Chegan, Police Chief Ken Bilinovich, Finance Director Eric Dean; **Other:** Dawn Carbone-McDonald, Ed Baznik, Gloria Kacik.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Mr. Langshaw, seconded by Mr. Vos to **approve the minutes for the January 21, 2020 Safety Committee meeting**. Yeas: 3. Nays: 0. **Motion carried.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Police Dash & Body Cameras

Police Chief Bilinovich states the implementation of the body cameras is going forward. First payment I think has already been paid, and the company BodyWorn is now in the process of getting the uniforms altered for our officers which have to be done because the actual camera fits inside like a pouch that fits inside the uniform and will be flushed so you don't have a bulky box hanging out. I anticipate that the dash cam installations for the cruisers and all body cams for the 35 officers will probably be in service sometime in April, hopefully.

Councilman Langshaw states you said it is also for the vehicles too?

Police Chief Bilinovich states yes, we have body cams for the individual officers, we purchased 35 of them, we have 36 officers. I am unfortunately at this time won't get one, and the 15 we purchased, fifteen for the cruisers, 15 for police cars. You will have video of vehicles and officers when they get out of the vehicles.

Councilman Dietrich states are we factoring in if we are to add additional officers, are we factoring that in the cost of the intake of that new officer for their body cam, or is that part of that startup cost?

Police Chief Bilinovich states we would have to add that in because we won't have a bunch of spares hanging around.

Councilman Langshaw states they are all issued to the officers, correct. It is not just per shift that they just take one.

Police Chief Bilinovich states right.

Councilman Dietrich states, just a quick question. Do these go home with the officers, do they charge them at their own home or do they stay at the police station?

Police Chief Bilinovich states they can be charged just like a cell phone charges, they can be charged at the home or at the station.

Councilman Dietrich states I am only asking because of the cost of these things.

Police Chief Bilinovich states most people I would assume will charge them at the station and leave them there.

Councilman Dietrich states if not, there has to be some kind of accountability for them.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states is that your preference Chief that they would charge them at the station?

Councilman Langshaw states yes.

Councilman Langshaw states so maybe Chief for practical standpoints that way for accountability when they start their shift there isn't any issue. I am not saying that no one will have their body cam charged, but no one can say or if there is an issue you know right away.

Councilman Langshaw states I understand.

Councilman Langshaw states this is brand new for our community and I see that the union representative is here. Obviously, it has been a collaborative process and there will be other stuff along the way and they will provide feedback and that has been a very positive part of this whole process.

Officer Chris Johnson, FOP Union Rep for the patrolmen of the North Royalton Police Department, states as you mentioned that this has been a collaborative process, I know Councilman Dietrich was asking about the charging of, these are basically a cell phone with the operating system that has been modified to turn it into a body cam. It plugs into a standard mini USB port. During the testing phase most of us were either charging them at the station or even in our cruisers. Often plug them into a cigarette lighter. Policy wise on where we charge them we did not write that into the policy, the policy that we have, I have been part of the policy review as we brought on new policies onboard. You are required to have it, it like having your gun, you are going to be required if you are a patrolman on patrol to have. Generally, I do not see my people taking them home to charge them at home.

Councilman Dietrich states it just strictly for accountability because of the cost so I feel there should be an accountability. Feel free to take them home, but if it is lost or stolen in your possession outside of being in the station or on duty, it is on issue.

FOP Rep. Johnson states it is an issued piece of equipment that you are responsible for.

Councilman Dietrich states that was my only question, thank you for explaining on how they are charged.

FOP Rep Johnson states if my guy loses one there will be questions.

Police Chief Bilinovich states by and large I do not see my guys taking them home to charge them.

Councilman Langshaw states it is a learning process and if there are issues that is why we all work together and we will sort it out.

FOP Rep Johnson states I do not see a lot of headaches forth coming with this, I think the way we did it we are definitely ahead of the curve than some of the other departments where they just drop something on their guys and say, here use it now. We work with the City and we work with the Chief.

Councilman Langshaw states we will keep this on the agenda. Thank you, Chief for the update, that is exciting that it will be ready come April and be on the streets.

2. **Deer Hunting**

Councilman Langshaw states also incorporated with new business items as well. There is a resident here that was waiting patiently to speak. State your name for the record, speak for five minutes and thanks for your patience especially with the little one.

Ed Baznik, Ward 1 Resident, Bunker Road

Ed Baznik addressed the committee and states I have been participating in the deer hunting program for the last four years, taken approximately 18 deer as part of the deer hunting program. I have also participated in the City of Hudson's deer hunting program as well as the City of Independence. In the case of Independence, I have been participating since 2007. I am really impressed with the results with the safety, I think everyone here should be proud of the success of the program and how well it has gone. I read the proposed amendments to the ordinance to lower the fee and make the proficiency test once every four years instead of every year. I think those are really good changes that you proposed so there is less burden on the hunter. Personally, coming up with \$150 every year and usually it costs \$8 to \$10 to take the archery test every year, that is expensive, there is also cost to deer processing and whether you do it yourself or you pay someone to do it, it costs money. There is also gear, an ethical hunter makes sure he has quality broad head and arrows and switching that gear out so he is sure of the shots he takes and hunting ethically, and there is cost that comes along with that. I probably spend \$25 bucks a year on archery supplies that I go through every year. I would just like to point out, I have an article here from Cleveland.com posted March 11, 2018 and in the article, I have four copies.

Councilman Langshaw states we can include it in the record.

Ed Baznik states there is a page that they talk about the City of Independence's program and how the Police Chief says that the program, they do not have a fee in Independence and he said that program more than pays for itself. It is kind of a tradeoff, the program, the resources worth, spending on deer hunting program or more than made up by the money that we are not spending on investigating on deer vehicle collisions. That is Chief Kilbane. I think that lowering the fee is probably a good thing, the way it has been proposed, I think it is a good idea, I strongly encourage it. I was trying to get my father to hunt with me in North Royalton, and he was kind of put off by the \$150 fee. He can hunt in Hudson for free, and he can hunt in Independence for free, why would he come and help out in North Royalton. I just commend you for proposing these fee changes, I will leave the articles up here, in case anyone would like them. If there are any questions that anyone has from the deer hunter's perspective or something like that, I would be happy to talk about it.

Councilman Dietrich states you got 18 deer?

Ed Baznik states yes over the last four years, the combination between a nuisance permits, landowner tags and also we have controlled hunt status granted by the State, so between those different tags and tagging systems over the last four years, I have taken approximately 18 deer off the properties that I am permitted to hunt. I have seen a huge reduction in deer damage. My neighbors have seen a reduction in deer damage. My property has a significant amount of woods and I have noticed that the understory is growing much better than it used to, and so I think it has been very successful. I was curious as to what the car collisions, the deer vehicle collisions have looked like.

Councilman Langshaw states we will get to that, I just want to give you an opportunity, I know the Chief will have some stats for us since we requested it at the last meeting.

Ed Baznik states unfortunately, I am probably going to leave.

Councilman Langshaw states thank you, I know you have been coming ever since we started this program. Like anything, we review over time and see where we can make improvements.

Ed Baznik states it has been an enjoyable program. I have enjoyed participating; I am looking for a way to lessen the burden on the hunters. With that we will say good night.

Councilman Langshaw states we will basically take Items No. 2 for unfinished business and new business items 1 and 2 we will just combine them together because they kind of go together. First, we will go with what

Council requested is some stats from the Chief. I will turn it over to the Chief. Obviously, the season is over now, kind of where we are at number wise.

Police Chief Bilinovich states 2019 deer hunting season ended February 2, and we had a total of 85 permits issued and I know people complain about the \$150, but we still got 85 people to pay the \$150. The total deer harvested were 128 which is down from 144 in 2018, and 2017 it was 193 deer harvested. So, it has gone down in the last three years. The number of hunters permits - 83 was in 2018, 85 this year and in 2017 there were 91. So, it has been pretty steady as far as the number of hunters, but the total number of deer that have been harvested have gone down the last three years. As far as cost, every deer stand that we have, I have to send an officer, I have two officers that do this because they are both hunters, they go out, walk, park their cruisers and walk and go out, not only do they inspect the stand to make sure it fits regulations, they also talk to the hunters out there and go over the safety and the laws in the City. We spent \$3,500.00 in overtime costs in 2019 to pay those officers to inspect the deer stands. Now with 85 hunters that took in \$12,750.00 so more than match our cost in overtime. You asked last meeting about the deer crashes, in 2018 we had 51 reported cars versus deer crashes that is where we were actually notified and a lot of times people hit a deer, take a look at their car and don't even call the police. 2017 there was 90, so it went down like a 1/3. 2019 we have 57, we had a little bit of an uptick as far as the amount of deer versus car crashes reported. There is one more number that my Animal Control Department for the year 2019, this is all separate from hunting, they picked up 189 dead deer and fawns this year. That is a combination of that got killed in accidents, maybe died later, died of diseases, I guess that would be the two main things. Last year, picked up 189 deer, the animal control. That is their job to go around and pick up the dead deer in the city.

Councilman Langshaw states I will just kind of incorporate Ordinances 20-48 and Ordinance 20-49 which both reduce the fees for hunting in the City, we will include these into the minutes like the little packet I put together just because I know we had some issues with emails and people need to see what the changes in both Ordinances. Let's start off, we had this for over three years and I know a number of us have listened to residents that are hunters and overall, we want to continue to make this a very effective program. Obviously, I think this helps reduce the numbers of deer versus car accidents. Knock on wood, nothing serious. I know at the last committee meeting; I think it was either Mr. Dietrich or Mr. Wos that said it best, this is really a public service, I appreciate the Chief providing the numbers. Yes, I think there is a cost associated with, but also in your packet it includes what other cities charge. Obviously, we charge \$150.00, Independence for example is \$0, Hudson is \$0, our neighboring city of Strongsville is \$35, Broadview Heights is \$100, Seven Hills is \$55 for non-resident and \$20 for resident, Parma Heights is \$150 and Parma is \$150. With the proposed changes, I believe this will make it more affordable, there is an interest by the entire committee. I think hopefully, you guys can chime in. I think it will make is more affordable for our residents The whole model is kind of the Seven Hills kind of model, I guess you can say with our own little spin, so instead of \$150, it would be \$30 for North Royalton residents, \$60 for non-North Royalton residents, and then, it will be a no fee permit for both residents and non-residents of North Royalton who are honorable discharged veterans, National Guard Reservists, active duty of Armed Forces, Public Safety Officers, First Responders, that is an added thing that we thought was important because a lot of those people are very good at safety. They are very proficient, and of course we want to continue this program to be effective, but it would be good to encourage those people and also as a thank you for their service to offer as a no fee permit and certain things like that in the community anyways, this is a good way to do that. Another thing, I think it was Eric that mentioned is with one of the Ordinances, there is a lot of things, on average it is at least over \$300 to take a deer that is if you have a good butcher, and all of that kind of stuff, it is very expensive just before you even get the deer. Or when you do, there is a lot of costs. Another thing that does not make a whole lot of sense is every year requiring someone basically where the podium is here, just shoot the bow and I could be blind and can still hit that. I am very proficient with a firearm, I can still probably hit it, it may not be center mass but I am still going to hit it. Some other communities they have it where it is at least every few years, I think that is reasonable to make sure that they are proficient, I still think there still needs to be a proficiency, but it doesn't need to be every year, we should not be nickeling and diming our residents. We still recoup some of the cost, but again this is more of a public service. I believe with my colleagues that it makes sense to make these changes.

Councilman Dietrich states if I may really quick, just because we didn't have the information. If you base the cost of the proposed new fees, \$30 and \$60, you average that out to 40 and you times that by your 85 people, that still covers the Chiefs costs of overtime, the \$3,500.00. So, it still should pay for itself even allowing some of those veterans no charges, it still should pay for itself.

Councilman Langshaw states it is going to balance itself out. This isn't a money maker; we should break even or recoup our costs. Again, this is a public service. It is a minor change, but I think it is necessary every three years and listening to people and the gentlemen, he has been here every single year advocating this issue. There have been other people in the community as well, they are hunters and I think, again this is a public service, not something that we are trying to make a profit off of.

Councilman Dietrich states one more number, I know we just got these numbers, but I know some of the people in the audience love deer and I like them too, they are pretty, but I will tell you the biggest number to look at is the 2017 number of vehicles that were in an accident with a collision with a deer, there were 90 and it has gotten down to the 50s, you have cut it in half. I love deer, I love animals, I am a hunter, but I also have pets, I grew up on a farm. We had two of everything, Noah's Ark. I will tell you that human life is just as important and we are cutting down on injuries and potential death, you cut it in half by eliminating the deer population or at least controlling it.

Councilman Wos states I would say to that point as well, if you want to go back further, as I recall before the hunting program started the collision were in excessive of 200, I don't know if the Chief can confirm that, but with the car deer related car accidents at one point around 200 a year.

Police Chief Bilinovich states years ago they were. These are only ones reported, there is probably twice as many deer car crashes as this, a lot of people especially their insurance don't require a car police report anymore or the people only have minor damage or they only have liability on their vehicle so it doesn't make any sense for them to file a report.

The one thing, if you let me say something is, our overtime rate for an officer to go out and inspect a stand is \$55 an hour, that is the overtime patrolman rate so if you only charge \$30 for a permit, I don't know if we want to subsidize out of the city coffers. At 85, if we only charge \$30 a head and 85 hunters that is only \$2,550.00.

Councilman Dietrich states you are correct, I averaged it at 40, it is our fault we didn't ask for these numbers. I know he mentioned that his father doesn't live in North Royalton but he may come here to hunt, I don't know what the number is out of the city residents that come here and hunt. If that is 50%, I was just balancing it out, if it is 30/60 fee, I averaged it out and I was way above. If half of the hunters are non-Royalton residents then it would balance out actually and then that number would be higher, but I don't know that number and we didn't ask you to bring that with you.

Police Chief Bilinovich states with all these zero veterans, I mean who knows.

Councilman Dietrich states that will be limited too.

Police Chief Bilinovich states my secretary Nancy Maceyko who has to do, she probably spends an hour of follow up on every permit, these new things, well it is going to cost \$30 for this person, nothing for this person, and if this person brings in a DD214 they are okay, it will be a nightmare for her as far as record keeping. When it was a flat \$150, if you are just going to make it \$30, you should exempt no one, as far as I am concerned.

Councilman Dietrich states we considered that. Actually, when we talked, the way we looked at it, it should be a benefit to be here in North Royalton and hunting, you know what I mean, give back if you are a resident, that is the way we looked at it. I don't think it will be too confusing, you show your drivers license that says North Royalton on your drivers' license you are a resident.

Police Chief Bilinovich states I mean all the other things that you are talking about, veterans, reservists, retired safety forces, first responders where do you draw the line.

Councilman Dietrich states military ID, or your retired form of military service, that is it.

Police Chief Bilinovich states what constituents a first responders, is that like a Donald Martin ambulance driver, all these things are going to have to be put so they are not subjective, you know.

Councilman Dietrich states that is a good point.

Police Chief Bilinovich states I just think that deer hunting is such a very hot topic with residents, half the city doesn't want anything to do with deer hunting.

Councilman Dietrich states I understand that, 67% do and I believe that is passed that, that is who voted. I understand that.

Police Chief Bilinovich states I am just saying that it should at least pay for itself.

Councilman Langshaw states you wouldn't be opposed to at least to try to compromise and meet in the middle. Obviously, you don't want to be subsidizing anything.

Councilman Dietrich states or get us better numbers that we didn't ask for. Get us the numbers of the non-residents.

Police Chief Bilinovich states we have home addresses of every hunter. I cannot tell you how many are residents and how many aren't residents.

Councilman Langshaw states or just keep it as a flat rate.

Police Chief Bilinovich states I mean if you are going to keep it at a flat rate of \$35, like Strongsville does or \$30, maybe we should not exempt anybody then. That way it makes it really easy, we don't have to be checking IDs and DD214s.

Councilman Langshaw states so you wouldn't be opposed if it was a straight up \$30.

Police Chief Bilinovich states I would be opposed to it because I do not think \$30 is going to pay for the officers.

Councilman Dietrich states if you balance those two numbers, it will pay. Based on the numbers you gave us, there is 85 permits pulled for 2019 and you said the cost was \$3,500.00, we proposed \$30 and \$60, and I am going on the low end, I am not even in the middle, if you go \$40 times 85 you end up with over \$3500.00 to cover your costs, at least that is what my calculator says.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states what do you do with the remaining \$7500 or so we are losing in revenue?

Councilman Dietrich states I don't know where that revenue went to.

Mayor states first of all let me say this, I am sitting here listening to all of this. Number 1, the \$3,500 is just a number we pay the policemen. There are other expenses to it as far as the Chief even said, with Nancy goes in there and she still has to do all the permit work, there is a cost to that. I don't know exactly what that cost is, but there is a cost to that. When you start comparing some of the other cities as well. Number one, I know our program since it has been initiated has been flawless, and I hope, I knock on wood and don't jinx that. A lot of it has to do with the job they do when they go out there, they check those stands, they do everything. I guess

my one question to you, what are you trying to accomplish with what you are doing? Is it you want more hunters? Because again more hunters bring more cost and again, do we have the ability to monitor more hunters. Because the number has always been right around 85/90, it has worked really well, I mean do you guys want hunters, do you want 120 hunters, what is the purpose? When you do legislation there should be a reason and a purpose. If the sole purpose is to say because we had in the last three to four years we had a few people come in here and say it costs too much, I have a hard time seeing the validity to that when we take out more deer and our numbers have been consistent with how many hunters we have in here every single year. Our city takes out more deer probably than all the other cities combined. Part of that is because of our terrain and our demographics. Seven Hills, I believe they do the low fee because they are trying to get people because of their demographics, they even lowered their initial from five acres down to two acres in a lot of cases because they couldn't get anybody. There is a lot of different reasons why cities do whatever. My thing with this has always been it should not cost the city any money to run. It is a lot like what we did a few years ago under the agricultural district before you guys got on Council. The agricultural districts only benefit the people that are getting the agricultural district, the city used to pay for all the advertisement and everything out of that, we changed that so when you have an agricultural district you have to pay for all that because you are the person that is benefiting from it as a resident. This is something that the residents of North Royalton shouldn't pay for, the people that are hunting should burden the cost of that. Now, when everybody said \$150 was too much, maybe I agree with that, but \$30 is unreasonably low, I don't also believe that, and again, you start taking military, I am a lifetime auxiliary member for the veterans for anybody to try to spin any differently as far as safety and everything else, it is not about that. But anytime you segregate a certain group of people for this program, I don't think it is the right thing to do. Again, what is the purpose of it? Just to have more hunters?

Councilman Dietrich states no, not necessarily.

Mayor states there is still a cost to doing business. I think that when you look at all of this, I mean to me, if you guys would have come in and said, lets go from \$150, lets go to \$100 and see how it all works out. Alright, reasonable, I can live with it. I won't live with the \$30 or the \$50. I will tell you right now, Council can do what they want, if you pass this legislation as it is right now, I will probably veto it. I will tell you guys that right now, I think what we need to do if there is a reasonable number to deal with, I am willing to listen to that, but I am not going to look for legislation that is going to cost the city. This is the type of legislation that the people that do it. Dan even though you said it cost \$300 to take a deer and carve it for meat, that is an individual choice, when they chose to hunt deer and to do that and for their meat and everything that should not have any bearing on what it cost them to deer hunt. My other question is and I don't have the answer to at this point, you are talking about a four-year permit. That gentlemen mentioned that he also hunts in Independence and Hudson where it is free, I don't know. Do they have to get a permit every single year to hunt in Independence and Hudson. If he does, these hunters do hunt other places, Southern Ohio they may hunt where they may have to require to have a license every year anyway, what is the purpose of us waiving that if they still have to get the license every year because they hunt other places in Ohio. Again, I think there is a lot of things here, I would prefer this when to committee as we have done in the past where you bring the subject up, you talk about it, we hash it out, figure out what the right solution is and then, you still have the opportunity to make legislation that you support and that you introduce. I think there is a lot of flaws in these pieces of legislation.

Councilman Dietrich states we can table it and come back it to with a different number. I still think \$100 is too high and you asked a question. First of all, you mentioned consistency and the consistency has changed, the consistency for the permits have stayed the same, but the number of deer killed has gone consistently every year. Consistency why are we doing it is just to lower the fee because the fees are too much money, no not necessarily, part of the reason is to keep the amount of deer that are harvested up, it has gone down.

Mayor states you want more hunters?

Councilman Dietrich states if the number of permits stay the same and the number of deer that are killed are less, then yes you have to bring in more hunters.

Mayor states that also adds to the expense.

Councilman Dietrich states true and your point was valid. So, maybe we have to come back to the table with a different number.

Councilman Langshaw states we have our Finance Director here. Obviously if you are talking about the overtime budget. I don't recall any time the police overtime budget exceeding the amount. We will talk in finance; do you recall at least for 2019 the police exceeding it.

Mayor states I can answer that it doesn't. But to me that is not the point, the point is you are putting a program in place where all the residents are paying for but not all are using. The hunters that elect to do this should be the ones that burden the cost not the residents that don't want the cost, that is my point. I don't believe that this is a program that the city should provide for that should allow the residents that don't want to hunt to pay for.

Councilman Dietrich states some of the residents that don't hunt should benefit from it too especially since the accidents that have gone down. You mentioned the other person potentially it is not just the officers going out and checking it at the police station, checking their IDs and all, you said, maybe there is a cost associated with that. If there is a cost associated with that, then there is a cost associated with the officer that has to go to a scene of the accident where the deer was smashed. Because you had in 2017, 90 of those and in 2019 you had 57; 2018 you had 51. We are going back in the wrong direction which is why partially you also asked the main question why are we proposing this, is it just to lower the fee? No, it is because of these numbers as well, that is why we asked for them at the last Safety Committee meeting. Basically, with these numbers the Chief just gave us, it justifies what we are trying to propose, but is also obviously, if you are going to veto it, we don't want to cost the city money, we are trying to balance it out.

Mayor states at this point everything that I heard you say, I don't believe you are.

Councilman Dietrich states again it depends on a number we didn't ask for and that is on us, we don't know how many residents, it is not \$30, it is not \$60, it might be somewhere in-between and if that is the case it does, if you base it on \$40 per permit, and based on what the Chief gave it, this is his number and not mine, the \$3500 in overtime, it does cover itself. In addition to lowering the accidents by 50% that is why it was being proposed, to keep that consistency, it was a great program.

Mayor states Jeremy you cannot hear what you want to hear, those are recorded accidents, he also said that he reiterated by saying that there is a lot more than that but they just never been reported.

Councilman Dietrich states I am not hearing what I want to hear. If these numbers were higher than were reported, I am guessing so are the numbers that weren't. I am listening, I am hearing you and I don't want to go where it costs the City money and the residents are paying, but some residents do benefit from it.

Mayor states yes, the residents that hunt.

Councilman Dietrich states no, not just them. The ones not getting into the accidents, it lowered by half. Numbers are numbers. Then, also the potential cost of the officer going out to the scene of the accident. Again, we can table it and come back with a different number.

Councilman Langshaw states you mentioned a number, I am going to throw out a number there to the committee, but obviously someplace else it is \$55.

Mayor states again you are using Seven Hills. It is a way different community, with a way different demographic, way different...

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states topography.

Councilman Langshaw states I am just going to give you range, so let's say low end of \$55; high ends, let's say \$65. Between that do you have any opposition.

Mayor states yes.

Councilman Langshaw states so not high enough.

Mayor states not high enough. I guess, I say the compromise end, I guess the lowest I would look at is \$75 that is just to try to make it all work, I understand what everybody is trying to do, I don't see me looking at anything lower and I will definitely not be in favor of giving it out as a no fee to anyone.

Councilman Langshaw states that was my other question, so you would just want to keep it simple, keep it a flat fee for \$75, there is no fee and lower it to \$75 and you would be okay with that?

Mayor, I would probably look at that as being okay, just in the motive of compromising.

Councilman Langshaw states yes.

Councilwoman Barath states you also have to remember the people benefiting, I am benefiting from the fact that I don't have a dozen deer in my cul-de-sac eating every single piece of plant that I put out. You are looking at the hunter. My husband has put fences up in front of landscaping now, to salvage what you purchase which you can buy hundreds of dollars of landscaping and watch it get destroyed. I love the deer, don't get me wrong. We come home and have a dozen sitting on our grass and they don't even flinch when they see you.

Councilman Dietrich states I have a neighbor with an electric fence around their flowers which is weird.

Mayor states you have to realize there is still a cost beyond the policemen going out as well. There is a cost administratively. To go from \$150 to \$75, I can live with that.

Councilman Langshaw states flat rate.

Mayor states I think it puts it at least where it is not going to cost the city anything with this program.

Councilwoman Barath states I am not a fan of the levels of tier. I would just go flat and go from there.

Councilman Weimer states respectfully I don't think you are completely off base at all with your comments. I guess as a councilmember, obviously, I am not part of the committee. If this were to come to Council, what I will tell my fellow colleagues is that I would not be in support of this at the moment. I think this type of legislation is crying out for more collaboration and it seems like the Mayor, the Chief and the Safety Committee need to spend some time discussing this legislation and coming to terms with what the real costs are to the city, what the potential impact is financially for us as a city to lower that cost. And then to come back to Council with a piece of legislation that everybody can be happy with and at this point in time just from hearing you guys all talk; I would not be comfortable as a council member putting my name in support of this legislation at this moment. That is the piece that I would share with everybody.

Councilman Dietrich states it is \$75 and I appreciate that. At \$75 times 85 is \$6,375.00 so that more than covers the cost of what we were at already. The hunters increase then we will get more fees and that number will coincide with what we were at already. I am comfortable with moving forward Mr. Chair.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states I would like to hear a little bit more about the thought process on lessening the testing requirement. I don't – four years is a long time especially and as we age, I would like to hear a little bit more of a conversation about the four years because you can have somebody who really benefits from an annual test, I am not saying which way I am on it but I don't think that is something that has been talked about yet so I would like to have a conversation about the four years. Why four years? Why change it? Flesh out your thought a little bit here, please.

Councilman Langshaw states it is like this close, if you cannot hit that, we are talking a distance most of, some deer may be pretty close to you, other instances it is not always measuring to the wall here that does not accurately show that I am a good hunter, but also too that I am a reckless hunter too. A lot of times, I know the Chief has been good, the previous chiefs have been very good to stop anyone that isn't safe or if they have been trespassing or putting stands up, I think that is a better way of how it is going right now. Yes, I think you need to qualify but it is not necessary every year, if anything it is making sure they are doing the right thing. Follow what the orders are of the Police Department which they are doing. I am confident in trusting the Chief and the officers that we have ensuring that safety wise.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states I guess my question tell me how you came to four?

Councilman Langshaw states it is like a driver's license every four years or so you are up for renewal, more comprehensive kind of thing. Just going with that kind of standard kind of thing, standardized kind of process.

Mayor states, I guess the problem I have with that is, unlike the driver's license, you drive anywhere, four years is good. I think a lot of hunters go to other places, if I go to Hudson for instance, I have to renew my license every year than for me to waive it and not have it every four, it is not a factor. If I go down south a lot of times, a state license I assume you have to renew every year. You have to renew the same license every year to hunt in Ohio so what would be the purpose of waiving it here.

Councilman Dietrich states there is no test for renewing your license every year in Ohio. You really just go and buy it. You don't have to take a test. There is no test at all. Once you have completed the test with the State of Ohio, you have it for life.

Mayor states what about other cities requiring this test in cities to do the hunting?

Councilman Langshaw states some do it 3 or 4 years.

Mayor states if you go to Hudson what are the fees?

Councilman Dietrich states there are some cities that we researched that do it every 4, I know you said that you didn't care what other cities did, but that is what some other cities did since you are asking. Other cities do it every four years, some of them.

Mayor states some do and some don't.

Councilman Langshaw states that is where we split the difference, we are trying to maintain safety.

Police Chief Bilinovich states can I just add something. First of all, this ordinance was drafted by prior Council, I assumed they all understood why they were doing what they were doing. As Chief of Police looking at this, with people with crossbows which could kill people, the more steps I can put someone through to get that permit the better. The more I can make someone work for that permit, and cross all the T's and dot all the I's, the better, then that means they are a serious hunter and they are not just someone that says hey let's open their trunk and pull out the crossbow and go out shooting.

Councilman Dietrich states do you feel like that is necessary every single year?

Police Chief Bilinovich states I am not a hunter; we shoot our weapons to qualify by state standards at least once a year. To make someone shoot a crossbow which is a deadly weapon, I don't see a problem with that.

Councilman Dietrich states you want to keep that once a year, is that what you are saying?

Police Chief Bilinovich states I would say keeping it once a year is fine. It takes someone an hour to go to Fin, Feather and Fur in Middleburg Heights and take the test, and boom, and it will cost them \$8 to \$10.

Councilman Dietrich states I am not opposed to what the Chief just mentioned because honestly, and what Paul brought up and I get why we brought that out there, based on other cities, and it is an easy target. I can tell you as a hunter you have to site on your bow anyway, you may as well do it and get certified.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states, I am sorry and that means what for those of us that grew up in the City – to site your bow.

Councilman Dietrich states basically you have to make sure, even if you hang your bow on a rack, you can throw it in the car on your way home, it can throw off, you recalibrate it, you can throw it off. No hunter should hunt without siting his bow again. Every year they have to do that in their backyard. Obviously not in our backyard here, in Hinckley or at a range. If you have to do that anyways and to the Chiefs point, if he feels that is better for safety, I am not opposed to doing it every year and keeping it at that.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states I defer to the law.

Law Director Kelly states when this program was initiated the former Mayor and largely the former Council recognized that the problem was an area wide problem. The deer don't know the difference between Strongsville and Royalton, and Middleburg and all the other suburbs. There was a collaborative effort that was made, we had multiple meetings here, we hosted them I think for the most part with representatives from Broadview Heights, Strongsville, Seven Hills and I cannot remember all the communities that were there. We passed more or less a uniform ordinance, now there was a disagreement among the communities about what should be charged, which shows in your research. You saw the difference is pricing. But initially, I want to say except for the pricing the ordinances were all uniform, now that has been tweaked a little bit, I know by Seven Hills because they reduced the area that was necessary to form a hunting zone for their community. I guess I want to encourage you to make as few changes as you need to make so we can attempt to at least stay in uniform step with these other communities whose ordinances were all drawn the same. I think for the sake of the hunters, it may actually be helpful in a sense that they all know what the rules are because they are the same city to city. Obviously, there will have to be more discussion about the charge and the fee. But to the extent that you can retain the uniformity of the ordinance that was created for this purpose, I would personally recommend that you do that. That is my thought.

Councilman Dietrich states I am okay with what Tom is proposing and the Chief and didn't keep it every year, if we can agree to the \$75, I am also okay, I am just throwing that out.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states are you planning on voting on this tonight, it sounds like amendments that are in pen and not in print.

Councilman Langshaw states that is okay.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states not for amendments.

Councilman Langshaw states I guess for the committee lets go on Ordinance 20-49 if I hear the consensus of council and the administration, \$75 flat rate was amendable, we strike out the other stuff and make it a \$75.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states process question, when does hunting season begin?

Councilman Dietrich states September.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states so we have time?

Police Chief Bilinovich states we have time.

Councilman Dietrich states but you did say you had to pull the permits from the City by March or April?

Police Chief Bilinovich states by August.

President of Council Paul Marnecheck states so we have a little time.

Councilman Langshaw states just to the committee would everyone be amendable for this ordinance just changing it to \$75.

Mayor states may I say something real quick, I will just go over this, just as a recommendation because there are some changes, I think if you go over the changes, it is still a lot, my recommendation would be because again, I heard what Vince had to say, and Vince said, I don't feel comfortable voting on this right now until, basically what I think he is saying is see a clean copy of all, what the changes are and just so you know if you wanted to vote on it tonight, it is on first reading, and one person that says that they don't waive the rules, you don't vote on it. I would just recommend that you table it, get a couple clean copies, you have time, you can do it next month very easily. Actually, you get the clean copies before the next Council meeting and get them distributed for everybody to vote on, I am just saying that only because if he doesn't waive the rules you are not going to get it voted on anyway.

Councilman Langshaw states we anticipated that it would go on second reading anyways. I think we really hashed this out, we can agree to disagree, not everyone has to agree on stuff, and that is fine, but to the committee I made a motion, I don't know if I heard a second.

I will make a motion to recommend Ordinance 20-49 as amended for \$75 deer damage control permits to Council for approval. Councilman Dietrich seconded the motion. Yeas: 3. Nays: 0. **Motion carried.**

NEW BUSINESS

Councilman Langshaw states we already addressed the items 1 and 2 under new business.

MISCELLANEOUS

Councilman Langshaw states I want to add one thing, just want to say good job to our safety force, they were just recently recognized as the top 20 safest cities in Ohio by Home Security Advisor and that is a testament to the great people that we have on safety forces and the administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Mr. Langshaw, seconded by Mr. Dietrich **to adjourn the February 18, 2020 meeting.** Yeas: 3
Nays: 0. **Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.