

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES
Of August 17, 2026

In Attendance: *Vermilion City Council: Jeff Lucas, Council President; Gary Howell, Council at Large. John Gabriel, Ward One; Greg Drew, Ward Two; Drew Werley, Ward Three; Homer Taft, Ward Four; Alec Bonawit, Ward Five; Melanie Wood, Clerk of Council.*

Administration: Russ Owens, Mayor; Tony Valerius, Service Director; Chris Howard, City Engineer; Chad Angney, Finance Director; Tony Pecora, Law Director; Scott Holmes, Police Chief.

Call to Order: Greg Drew, Chairperson, RESOLVED THAT this Legislative Committee comprised of the committee of the whole has now come to order.

TOPIC ONE: Review of Ordinance 2026-46 (Creating Part 13: Emerging Technology)

Councilman Drew opened the first agenda item, the review of Ordinance 2026-46, which concerned the creation of Part 13: Emerging Technology, and turned the floor over to Councilman Drew Werley.

Councilman Drew Werley began by acknowledging some uncertainty about how to phrase the ordinance, noting that he had spent several months drafting it. He explained that he had reached out to the Law Director at some point, and that his position on Automatic License Plate Reader (ALPR) cameras was well known. He stated that the prior police chief had removed a previous proposal, citing the possibility of securing funding for such a system. Werley noted that a significant number of community members — approximately a dozen — had come to speak specifically about the privacy aspect. He said he wanted to "get ahead of that," adding that even if funding were obtained, he still did not want the technology in the city.

Werley described his drafting philosophy: "I wrote it as restrictive as I possibly could so you guys can do this. I kept the terminology as broad as I could." He explained that he deliberately chose not to include exceptions, stating, "If you guys want to put exceptions in there, you can fight for those. I'm not going to negotiate against myself."

He then addressed recent news coverage surrounding Flock Safety and similar systems, noting that several cities had canceled their contracts and that multiple Ohio cities were in the process of passing bans on the technology. He acknowledged he had included an "emerging technology" section because of other surveillance technologies on the horizon, such as systems that can pull Bluetooth signatures from vehicles passing by — though he said he would not dwell on that since the ordinance focused on ALPR. He then invited discussion from Council and the community. Councilman Homer Taft expressed general support for the ordinance. He described the Flock Safety model as "a public-private partnership from hell," explaining that the private company collects, retains, and sells data in ways that are not fully disclosed to the municipalities that license the system. He elaborated: "They acquire all of the data from all of the states for all of the license plates and all of the cars. And they collect that along with all of the distinguishing features of those cars, whether there's any reason to or not. And then they give access to whomever, essentially they please — not who the city police is — and that kind of problem."

Taft cited multiple reports of false identifications leading to aggressive police stops, including gun-drawn felony stops of innocent people due to misread plates. He expressed concern that

private companies controlling this data is something the city "can't have." He also noted that even Flock Safety was beginning to feel public pressure — announcing a seven-day data retention policy — but said such pledges were insufficient: "They don't really necessarily tie themselves to that forever. And that's not good enough."

Taft stated the only scenario under which he might consider accepting the technology would be if the police department itself collected and held the data for seven days and destroyed it unless a specific warrant or hold was in place. He raised a couple of specific provisions in the ordinance that he felt warranted discussion, including the prohibition on mobile license plate readers that police departments sometimes use on patrol vehicles for instant checks. He also raised the broader constitutional question: "I think there's a serious question whether it's constitutional for any government entity to access the information that we've allowed a private company by our license to collect on our citizens — this 24 by seven by 365 surveillance."

Councilman John Gabriel said that overall, he was comfortable with banning the cameras from the city, saying, "I understand the reasons for it. I understand people want their privacy." However, he raised two concerns about the language.

His first concern was the prohibition on accessing data from other communities. He cited two specific examples: a shooting incident in Ward 5 that was solved using ALPR data from neighboring communities who allowed Vermilion PD to access their systems, and a stolen vehicle tracked down in the same manner. Gabriel said, "I just don't see the harm in asking other people who do use it for their ability to check on it." He clarified he was fine with not having the cameras in Vermilion but did not want language that would prevent officers from reaching out to agencies in other communities that do use the technology.

His second concern was the broad terminology in the ordinance — specifically phrases like "artificial intelligence powered vehicle recognition systems" and "cloud-based" systems — and how those terms might apply to state agencies operating on roads passing through the city, such as the Ohio State Patrol on State Route 6. He said he did not want the city to be put in legal conflict with state-level agencies. He concluded: "If we're saying we don't want flock cameras in our community, I'm okay with that. I just don't want to put language in here that would hamstring our local forces or feel that they are unable to do their job, should something really serious arise." Councilman Gary Howell said he agreed with much of what Councilman Gabriel had said. He acknowledged that the technology "when used right," is a useful tool and that the public's concerns are valid "for the right reasons." He expressed worry about handcuffing the department in serious situations such as a missing child. He also questioned whether the city could even legally prohibit the Sheriff or State Patrol from using the technology while passing through or responding in the city, calling it "a law director question." He said: "I find it hard to believe that Sheriff Sigsworth is going to take them off to pass through the City of Vermilion or to come and respond for a backup call." He concluded that with some language refinement, "we can all kind of hit the nail square and maybe everybody be happy with the legislation."

Councilman Alec Bonawit said he agreed with both Gabriel and Howell to an extent. He raised the Fourth Amendment dimension — that to track someone's vehicle via a warrant, police must apply for that warrant and physically place a device. He suggested that over time, networked ALPR cameras could effectively replace that process without the same legal threshold. He noted that the prior proposal had been pulled when the community came out against it, and remarked that it is now a national issue: "I don't think it's something that we want to even get involved in." Councilman Drew stated he had spoken with the police chief, who had no intention of pursuing a Flock contract. He expressed concern about a specific provision that would make it a first-degree misdemeanor for an officer to access ALPR data, calling it "overly broad": "If someone's child did get kidnapped or something happened and we have officers who are in the task force or

Vermilion PD called up another agency or a state agency and said, 'Hey, we need this data' — is that now a crime? Have they committed a crime?" He said he could fully support a moratorium on entering into any ALPR contract with any vendor, calling that "a good move" while the legal questions are sorted out.

A question was then raised from the floor for Police Chief Scott Holmes about a Pizza Hut armed robbery incident. Chief Holmes confirmed that the case was solved with the assistance of Flock Safety systems from surrounding agencies: "We would not have solved that, I don't believe." He noted the individual was subsequently charged federally for that and numerous other offenses. He was then asked to walk through the specifics of how the investigation worked: Vermilion had surveillance video but could not read the plate. A make, model, and a distinctive window decal were identified, narrowing the suspect vehicle down to one of six similar cars in the area. That vehicle was traced through investigation to the suspect's girlfriend. A national bulletin was issued, and the suspect was stopped in Knoxville with the gun in his waistband.

Chief Holmes then deferred back to Werley, who continued his remarks, saying he had drafted the ordinance as restrictively as possible intentionally: "I wrote it this way. If it is in conflict with other laws and provisions in there, most of ours, it says, 'Hey, if this says unlawful, then it doesn't apply.'" Werley expressed his belief that the technology is a blatant violation of Fourth Amendment rights: "This makes everybody guilty. And then you have to prove your innocence when we come after you."

Werley was highly critical of Flock Safety as a company, accusing them of repeatedly lying to municipalities. He referenced the Evanston, Illinois situation in which the council voted to remove the cameras, Flock subsequently reinstalled them under their own account, and then the city had to issue a cease-and-desist. He also cited data suggesting a high rate of plate-read errors: LAPD reported 31% false positives, and a Business Insider article on Rosalie, California reported 71% incorrect hits. Werley said, "There were 20.1 billion plate scans last month. Even if it wasn't 71% incorrect, if it was 7.1%, that's 1.4 million incorrect scans." He expressed concern about what that means for police officers who may react to false alerts: "I'm not a police officer like some of you are, but if I got a hit — hey, this black Tahoe, here's this license plate, they're a stolen car — when I pull them over, I'm going to read the plate that's right there, not come out with guns drawn on them."

Law Director Anthony Pecora interjected to clarify that Werley had stated twice during the meeting that he had reached out to the Law Director's office on the ordinance. Pecora said he was reviewing his communications and did not have a record of that outreach. Werley clarified he had spoken to an associate at the last meeting. Pecora apologized and offered to ensure his cell phone and email were accessible going forward. Pecora then raised his concern about the criminal elements in the proposed ordinance targeting law enforcement: "I think it's tough enough to be a cop as it is. There are other avenues — other laws regarding behaviors of law enforcement — if they're violating their investigatory techniques or if they're violating people's civil rights." He pointed to existing statutes he said already provides for prosecution in such cases, and suggested the criminal provisions in the ordinance may not be necessary. He also echoed concerns about the broad language potentially preventing the department from accessing outside agencies' information to stop someone who did actually commit a crime.

The floor was then opened to public comment. Three members of the audience raised their hands, and each was given five minutes.

Aaron Weaver, 480 Washington Street (noting that he had just purchased a house in the township and would soon be moving) said he was "really pleased with the tone of the conversation." He agreed with Werley's approach of drafting the ordinance as restrictive as

possible and then scaling back only where necessary. He stated that being a "helpful tool for law enforcement isn't the metric that you just abdicate Fourth Amendment rights." He agreed with Taft that the company model is problematic and said if the technology is ever to be used, "it should be strictly done via the state, not with a partnership between the state and the private company." He argued the technology is not merely a license plate reader but "absolutely a pattern of life tracker," referencing an interview with a former Puckett Police Officer named Noel Pichardo, who he said was forced to resign over his dispute with Flock systems and had disclosed information Flock would not willingly share. Weaver concluded with a strong statement on the principle of liberty: "You can err on the side of liberty, or you could unwittingly pave for the rope from which you will one day hang." He added that while the current government and law enforcement are trusted, future administrations cannot be predicted: "If you had told me a decade ago that in 2020 we would lock everything down and designate you as essential, you as non-essential — imagine this tool in that capacity. It would be terrifying."

Sean Jenkins, 576 Highbridge spoke in support of the ordinance primarily on Fourth Amendment grounds, stating it is not merely a felt concern but an established legal one: "It is as evidenced by recent Supreme Court precedent." He referenced a case — which he identified as "Chatrie" or similar — in which the Court found that surveillance producing a two-hour track of someone's activities constitutes a Fourth Amendment search. He applied that directly to Vermilion: "If I drive to my work at Macedonia, if I pass Flock license plate readers on the way there and there's traffic — that's an hour — I pass them on the way back coming home, that's another hour. If Vermilion accesses those without a warrant...technically under that precedent, they are surveilling without a warrant." He warned that this opened the city to civil rights lawsuits: "Our city has some problems with funding our sewer systems and our water and paving all our roads. So, I really don't want to live in a city that's caught paying a seven-figure judgment." He also noted the data accuracy issue, arguing that given how often the technology is wrong, the financial exposure is amplified.

Sue Owens, 3638 Edgewater Drive said she was "terrified of public speaking" but felt compelled to speak in support of Werley's ordinance. She described herself as being of Polish descent and spoke movingly about stories from her grandparents and parents about life under Nazi and then Communist occupation in Poland, describing how her family would communicate in secret using letters written in milk that could only be revealed when ironed. She said: "It scares me greatly to see what they're able to do with the recording of everyone's everything. As long as our government is amicable, that's fine. But when you watch what happens in China...they turn off your bank account, you can't ride a bus, you can't access the internet. It terrifies me to see what I think is coming here for your children, your grandchildren, and my child." She identified herself as a teacher and offered to distribute a printed reference sheet to council members with items she encouraged them to research, including topics such as bio digital surveillance, internet of bodies, nanotechnology, and stratospheric aerosol injection. She concluded: "I appreciate Drew. I'm always thankful to you guys for thinking about things — for not just doing what everybody else is doing — because doing what everybody else is doing can get us onto a path that we won't recognize our country in ten years."

Following public comment, Councilman Werley returned to the criminal provisions in the ordinance. He acknowledged that the misdemeanor clause was drafted intentionally to be as restrictive as possible, and invited council to remove or modify it. He reiterated his belief that the technology will eventually be ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, calling it "a blatant violation of our Fourth Amendment rights." He referred to the Bucyrus Law Director, who he said had been approached by Flock and responded that, "based on recent court rulings, it's the opinion of this office that it's unconstitutional and we have no interest in doing business with you." Werley stated he was in no rush to pass the ordinance since there was no immediate threat of the

cameras being installed: "If they did get thrown up somehow overnight before we do anything on this legislation, I will go cut them down myself."

Councilman Drew then called the discussion on Ordinance 2026-46 closed and announced the item would be revisited at the next Legislative Committee meeting.

TOPIC TWO: Review of Ordinance 2026-48 (Board of Zoning Appeals)

Councilman Homer Taft introduced Ordinance 2026-48, explaining that as Council's representative to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), he had observed throughout the year many instances where neighboring property owners appeared unaware of pending variance applications. He noted that in other communities where he practices — including Rocky River and Bay Village — it is standard procedure to send first-class mail notices to property owners within a certain distance of the affected parcel. The proposed ordinance would require the building department to identify all properties within 100 feet of the boundary of any parcel seeking a variance and mail them a first-class (not certified) notice of the pending application and the hearing date.

Taft described specific incidents he had witnessed at BZA meetings: a contractor claiming all neighbors were aware and supportive, only for the adjacent neighbor to appear and formally object; cases where applicants listed no neighbors at all on their applications; and instances where required signage either was not posted, was not visible from the street, or in one case was placed inside a building window rather than in a yard. He said: "If you get a piece of mail in the mail that tells you that the neighbor is applying, at least you get to go and take a look. And that's what this proposal is about."

He also distributed a two-sided informational sheet to council members, one side showing the charter provision on the BZA and their required findings — specifically that they must find "unusual circumstance or hardship beyond a reasonable doubt" and the other showing the ordinance standards that Taft expressed concern are not being carefully followed.

Councilman Werley said he supported the idea, particularly recalling the incident where the sign was placed inside a building in a window, noting that the applicants in that case were seeking to erect a sign as close to Vermilion Road as possible for maximum public visibility — yet their own variance notice was invisible. He asked that any costs associated with the mailing be absorbed by permit fees rather than paid out of pocket by the city.

Councilman Gabriel suggested placing the burden on the applicant rather than the city, proposing that applicants be required to have neighboring property owners sign a document acknowledging awareness of the application. He argued this would eliminate the need for city clerks to track down landlords, out-of-town property owners, or property management companies. He noted the city has only two staff members in the relevant office: "I feel that cleans it up and it saves us a lot of paperwork."

Councilman Bonawit noted that his own neighbor had done something similar a few years ago — bringing him a paper from the city about a zoning change he was requesting and asking for a signature — suggesting such a practice was already informally in place in some cases.

Councilman Drew confirmed, based on his four years of service on the BZA, that the application itself does include a space for applicants to list neighbors and their contact information, but that completion was left to the applicant's discretion. He recalled that when signage was not properly posted, hearings were continued to the next month. He agreed with Taft's point about signs on the front of a property not reaching neighbors who live behind the parcel and never travel that street.

Council President Jeff Lucas raised a practical concern about the signature approach, questioning what happens when a neighboring property owner lives out of state — citing an example of an owner based in Las Vegas or California — and how their signature could realistically be obtained. He also raised the concern that some neighbors might simply refuse to sign regardless of the content: "If I'm in a situation that was controversial, I might not sign that, period." He suggested that the intent should be notification, not acceptance or consent.

Service Director Tony Valerius clarified the current process: a sign is posted on the property two weeks prior, the application is advertised in the newspaper, and it is posted on the city's website. A member of the public, Jerry Monroe, 5067 Elm Street (noting he spends most of the year in another community), spoke in favor of mailed notices. He said from personal experience, receiving a first-class postcard from a local government about a pending action near his property had been very effective: "In this day and age, the amount of paper mail we're getting is going down, and especially on a first-class piece — so I think people are more likely to pay attention to it." He cautioned against requiring signatures, saying: "You will never be able to convince some of them. Some people will just naturally be reluctant to ever sign — 'I'm aware of it, but no, I'm not signing anything.' And that puts the applicant out really. That's a pretty steep burden." He suggested pulling parcel numbers from county records and mailing a postcard to the tax address, noting the cost would be approximately 85 cents per postcard.

Councilman Taft responded to the discussion by reiterating that a mailed notice is the standard in many communities and is not particularly time-consuming to implement. He explained that he chose first-class mail rather than certified mail specifically because certified mail would require waiting for return receipts, potentially delaying hearings significantly. He said he was open to other methodologies but believed there needed to be "some method of assuring that people are given that notice," including possibly posting directly on the doors of adjoining properties.

Councilman Werley then raised a secondary concern: while the Service Director had mentioned that variance applications are posted on the city's website, Werley said that searching the site for this information was not intuitive. He demonstrated by searching in real time and finding that a pending variance sign he had seen along Route 60 was not immediately findable except by navigating to the Board of Zoning meetings section and pulling the agenda. He stated: "For someone to see a variance, they have to go to the city website, go to this specific section. I thought there'd be a big pop-up — 'hey, this guy wants to erect a 50-foot statue.'"

The discussion on Ordinance 2026-48 was concluded with Taft indicating he was open to varying methodologies, and the item was advanced for further development.

TOPIC THREE: Review of Ordinance 2025-53 (Mobile Food Service)

Councilman Drew noted that while his name appeared on the agenda for this item, he would defer to Councilman Taft, who had drafted proposed revisions to the existing mobile food service ordinance. Taft clarified that the ordinance had not yet been formally introduced or assigned a number.

Councilman Taft explained the intent of his proposed revisions: to eliminate what he described as overly restrictive limitations on where food trucks may operate. He said the current ordinance effectively restricts food trucks to certain business zones and favors specific communities — such as Linwood — without extending the same privilege to other private communities. His draft, focused on Section 872.08 (Regulations), would reduce restrictions significantly and would allow food truck operation on any property where there is an occupied structure — business or residential — if that property is at least an acre in size and the operation is fully contained within

the property. He acknowledged this was intentionally broad, inviting council to negotiate from there.

Councilman Drew then addressed a separate but related concern that had been brought to his attention: food trucks that operate at the Fish Festival and the Woolly Bear Festival are not currently registered with the city, despite an ordinance requiring all food truck operators to register and pay a \$75 fee and pass a fire marshal inspection. He stated that other vendors had approached him asking why trucks at the festivals don't have to register, creating a fairness issue. He said, "I don't want to do anything that would make it a heartache for the chamber or anybody to not have food trucks at either one of these events," but felt some resolution was needed.

Councilman Gabriel said he was aware that food trucks at the Fish Festival are inspected and licensed by the health department. He then raised his broader concern about the fairness of the competitive landscape: "My ward has the majority of restaurants. These food trucks — most of them are out-of-town businesses. They're not paying sewer rates, storm water, EPA fees, building codes, required parking." He said he was "looking for a level playing field" and did not want to open the ordinance so broadly that it significantly disadvantaged brick-and-mortar restaurants already under financial pressure. He stated he was not opposed to food trucks participating in the local economy but wanted to find a way for them to contribute proportionally to the same infrastructure costs as permanent businesses.

Councilman Bonawit said he agreed with much of Gabriel's position and suggested a tiered fee structure — with food trucks participating in the Fish Festival and Woolly Bear Festival paying a fee included in their event agreement with the Chamber, while food trucks wishing to operate more broadly throughout the city on a seasonal basis should pay a substantially higher fee and reapply annually. He raised the example of the Lions Club at the Fish Festival as a local nonprofit that participates and asked whether a nonprofit exemption should be considered. He concluded that any food truck operating ten to fifteen or more times in a year should not be paying only \$75. Councilman Werley said he supports opening up the ordinance as broadly as possible: "I'm a big fan of the free market. I don't think the government should restrict businesses." He addressed Gabriel's point about rising costs by noting that food trucks typically rent commissary kitchens, and when costs go up for property owners, those are passed to the next party. He also argued that food trucks bring people into town who then patronize other shops and businesses, using the example of a lobster truck that drew visitors from a wide area.

Councilman Taft returned to the specific question about festival exemptions, noting that he had reviewed Section 572.02, which contains a provision allowing the mayor to waive fees for festivals and special events. He said that while one specific festival is named, there is a general provision for other festivals or special events to receive a waiver.

Councilman Drew then located the relevant section: Section 872.04(6) states that "the mayor shall be vested with the power to waive fees." He also found Section 872.04(3), which specifies a \$75 annual permit fee or a \$25 one-time permit for a single event, with fees subject to waiver for "certain events including festivals, city sponsored events, fairs, fundraisers," and similar occasions. Drew confirmed this resolved the fairness concern that had been brought to his attention. Councilman Taft noted for the record that since the ordinance had not been formally introduced and did not carry an emergency designation, even if introduced at the current meeting it would not take effect until after three readings — meaning it would not impact the current year's events. He said he intended the discussion as a starting point and invited all council members to submit suggested edits prior to formal introduction.

TOPIC FOUR: Review of Remaining Charter Amendment Ordinances

Councilman Drew indicated he would move through items 4 through 9 together, as they were related, and invited Councilman Taft to address them collectively.

Before Taft could begin, Councilman Gabriel intervened. He argued that the council had effectively already voted on these matters previously — noting that while the prior vote was technically procedural (a vote to suspend rules), it represented a clear statement of council's position. He expressed frustration with revisiting the items: "We have talked on these subjects — over 30,000 words. As much as I enjoy just rambling on until the cows come home, I can't do it anymore, man." He made a motion to permanently table items 2026-37 through 2026-43 and remove them from the agenda, stating that if the motion failed, he would know council was prepared to re-engage on all of them.

Motion to permanently table Ordinances 2026-37 through 2026-43 and remove them from the agenda was made by Councilman John Gabriel and seconded by Councilman Alec Bonawit.

Councilman Taft raised a parliamentary inquiry, noting that council had been operating under incorrect information: they had previously been advised by the Board of Elections that the submission deadline was August 5th, but Taft had since discovered — through a published article in the Chronicle-Telegram dated August 6th — that the Ohio Constitution provides for a 60-day window before the election, placing the actual deadline of September 4th. Council President Lucas confirmed this, noting that the Board of Elections had subsequently confirmed the later deadline.

Councilman Drew raised a procedural question about whether the motion should be handled in the committee setting or deferred to the regular council meeting.

Gabriel maintained his motion, pressing the point about the extended time already spent on these items.

Councilman Werley said he was inclined to vote no on the tabling motion, particularly because of one ordinance — 2026-41, relating to initiative and referendum — for which he said he had never heard any articulated reason for opposition. He expressed disbelief that the body had voted it down without discussion: "I was shocked that this body voted it down."

Councilman Bonawit acknowledged Gabriel's point but noted a distinction from the prior Lorain County special meeting, where council had less than two days' notice. He said he would not speak for other members but suggested that opinions may have evolved and that some items were worth reconsidering, particularly given the newly confirmed deadline.

Councilman Taft then spoke at length on the reasons he had requested the items be revisited. He stated that the council had been given incorrect information and had voted under a false assumption about the deadline. More importantly, he argued that one of the ordinances — 2026-41, relating to initiative and referendum — addressed what he characterized as an "utterly undemocratic" action by the state legislature, which had raised the petition signature threshold for referendum from 10% in 30 days to 35% in 30 days of those who voted for governor at the last election. He called this change essentially impossible to meet: "As far as I'm concerned, it's kind of violative of the Constitution of Ohio that says you can." He said he had "greater regard perhaps for what the Charter Commission tried to do than some members" and believed these items were "entitled to full consideration." He noted that technically the ordinances were on their third reading, not second, as they had been introduced previously.

Gabriel then amended his motion, withdrawing it and substituting a motion to permanently table and remove from the agenda all items except 2026-41 (Initiative and Referendum), which he said

he had previously voted in support of. He listed the specific ordinances to be tabled as: 2026-37, 2026-38, 2026-40, 2026-42, and 2026-43.

Councilman Taft offered a technical clarification: the current version of Ordinance 2026-38 had been revised to address removal of members of municipal boards and commissions — combining the prior removal-of-mayor and removal-of-council provisions into Ordinance 2026-37 — so 2026-38 as currently drafted was different from what was described on the agenda.

J. Gabriel MOVED; A. Bonawit seconded to permanently table and remove from the agenda Ordinances 2026-37, 2026-38, 2026-40 and 2026-43. Roll Call Vote 5 YEAS; 2 NAYS (Werley, Taft). MOTION CARRIED.

The sole remaining item from this section — Ordinance 2026-41 (IX-1 Initiative and Referendum) was retained for consideration and deferred to the regular council meeting. Councilman Taft noted several technical drafting issues in the ordinance that would need to be cleaned up, including inconsistent use of the phrases "next general election," "next regular municipal election," and "next regularly scheduled election" in different places within the same provision. He indicated he had provided council with a list of the specific items requiring correction and said he believed "regularly scheduled election" was the correct and consistent term throughout. Councilman Bonawit suggested moving discussion of 2026-41 to the regular meeting, and the committee agreed to proceed.

Councilman Drew adjourned the meeting upon no further discussion.

Next Legislative Meeting: Monday, September 21, 2026 – 6:00 p.m. @ Vermilion Municipal Complex, 687 Decatur Street, Vermilion, Ohio.