



April 22, 2013 at 7:30pm
Notice posted

Minutes

PUBLIC MEETING

**Meeting of the Charter Review Commission
Cuyahoga County
Monday, April 22, 2013 at 7:30 P.M.
Brecksville Community Center
Brecksville, OH**

Required notices were provided and posted and the public meeting was called to order at 7:45 PM by the Chair.

Present: **Akers; Tarter; Riley; Russell; McLaughlin; Dietrich**
Absent: **Headen; Callahan; Albright**
A quorum was present.

Akers introduced himself and addressed the public process that had been undertaken to review Cuyahoga County's charter. **Akers** provided background information on the process that the CRC had utilized and asked Prosecutor McGinty if he had any topics that he wished to discuss as several of the proposals addressed by the HRC involved the operation of his office. McGinty thanked **Akers** for the opportunity to discuss his office. He addressed the working relationship between the Prosecutor and the Director of Law. He noted the steps that had already been undertaken by the interested parties to establish an amicable working relationship. McGinty noted that he was working together as co-counsel on several legal matters.

McGinty next addressed the need for an Annual Justice System Audit. He noted that calling for accountability on all matters of governmental processes was considered a “best practice” by most enterprises. He noted that gathering data would allow other county agencies to interrelate better and more efficiently. Specifically, McGinty noted that reducing the amount of time that criminal defendants spend in custody could potentially save the county millions of dollars while providing faster, more efficient justice outcomes. Additionally, McGinty mentioned that four matters would need to be addressed:

1. Revenue generated (court costs, etc.);
2. Costs incurred per case;
3. The length of time that a case was open; and,
4. The amount of time of local incarceration, pending resolution.

McGinty noted that simply gathering the information pertaining to those four topics would allow the county to determine where improvements could be made.

McGinty next addressed the topic of how the Prosecutor should be chosen. McLaughlin provided background on some of the concepts that had been brought forth during the CRC’s meetings. McGinty noted that no county prosecutor in the State of Ohio was appointed and he reiterated his position that appointing a prosecuting attorney was likely not consistent with Ohio law. He noted that having two county-wide elected officials provided electoral balance.

McLaughlin next asked McGinty to comment on the manner in which the County Sheriff was installed. McGinty noted that he has always felt that the Sheriff should be an elected position. Homer Taft, a member of the public, noted that he felt that having an appointed Sheriff, removable for cause, was preferred. Tim Quinlan, another private citizen, added that having an elected Sheriff could lead to the creation of political fiefdoms, despite progress made in this county. McGinty closed this area of discussion by noting that the public can correct any errors it makes at the next election.

Taft asked the CRC to review the manner in which private citizens were able to utilize the Initiative and Referendum provisions. He felt that having a burdensome signature requirement would serve to stifle public involvement in the debate. He recommended that the signature requirement be reduced from the current 10% of recent voters, to a 5% total of recent voters. Dietrich noted that even 5% may be too high a sum for citizens to reach. She noted that Council would likely hear and debate relevant issues of general concern. Taft agreed, but noted that if Council

did not choose to take any action, there was no mechanism to mandate action without utilizing the provisions of Initiative and/or Referendum.

McLaughlin asked McGinty to comment on the request for a regular Justice System Audit. McGinty stated that an annual audit was preferred and consistent with national best practices. He did note that the definition of “best practices” was evolving and any policy that was implemented would have to constantly be monitored.

There being no further business before the CRC, **McLaughlin** made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by **Dietrich**. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45PM.

Draft_____

Issue_____

App._____

Posted_____