

**COUNCIL AS A WHOLE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES**

**TUESDAY  
FEBRUARY 24, 2026  
7:00 P.M.**

The meeting was called to order by Council President Semick at 7:00 p.m.

All members of Council in attendance.

All members of the Administration in attendance.

**LEGISLATION PROPOSED:**

**1. 02-24-(01): An Ordinance to reappropriate for the expenses of the City of Eastlake, State of Ohio, for the period beginning January 1, 2026 and ending December 31, 2026, and declaring an emergency.**

02-24-(01): Carol Ann says that is the budget that they just reviewed in the Finance Committee Meeting earlier tonight. President Semick says it will be on First Reading tonight.

No questions.

**2. 02-24-(02): An Ordinance amending Section 939.26 (d)(3) "Sewer Service Charges" of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Eastlake, Ohio, and declaring an emergency.**

02-24-(02): Carol Ann says these are the changes Willoughby has made and they have requested that we do the same.

**3. 02-24-(03): A Resolution authorizing and directing the Mayor and Director of Finance to accept a Fire Department Training Grant from the Ohio Division of State Fire Marshal for a total of Six Hundred Dollars (\$600.00), and declaring an emergency.**

02-24-(03): Chief Kovacic says this is a grant that the State Fire Marshal office put out that is reimbursing us for a class our Fire Marshal went to.

No questions.

**LEGISLATION PENDING:**

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

**1. Discussion of Councilwoman Kostelnick's request for legislation authorizing removal of Councilwoman Krajnyak per V-3 of the Charter of the City of Eastlake.**

Mr. Semick states that this is an important issue. We are not conducting any kind of trial or discussing about removing anyone right now. We would like to give each Council member 3 minutes to speak on the topic to keep things focused.

We will start with Ms. Kostelnik as this was her request.

Mr. Klammer says there was a request. His comments were to have a discussion to see how or why to proceed. The process is simple in the Charter, but it becomes complicated at this point. Ms. Kostelnik's request outlined her reasoning in her request. Ms. Krajnyak will go last to make her responses to all comments. The proceedings going forward are that if Council decides to move forward, he then secures special council to draft a complaint

and that goes to Council as legislation. If it moves forward to that point to essentially a trial before Council. He would then sit as the Law Clerk to the Council President who would essentially be the judge in the trial. There would be a full hearing similar to a trial. These things do not happen often. He has had some experience with it with a neighboring community.

Ms. Kostelnik says that she formally requests initiating removal procedures against Councilmember Krajnyak. This request is not political, it is based on documented conduct that undermines public trust, disrupts Council operations, and involves intimidation, misrepresentation of facts, refusal to engage in good-faith governance, and misuse of public platforms. She has screenshots, emails, instant messages, audio files, and official confirmations to support each of her points. She clarifies that she was in the process of resigning from Council prior to these events but decided to bring this matter forward after Councilwoman Krajnyak crossed a clear professional line by involving her full-time employment in a public forum in a threatening and intimidating way. During a discussion on facebook, she clarified her position and stated that she was done engaging in the conversation. She says Councilwoman Krajnyak then said "smart idea especially if you're working". Councilwoman Krajnyak continued to post about her and her employment saying that people are "watching, waiting, and willing particularly when you are working for the tax payer. Consider this a friendly warning". She feels this moved the issue from policy disagreement to personal intimidation involving her livelihood and professional standing. After she disengaged, Councilwoman Krajnyak continued to post about her employment and claimed to know an ex employee personally. This ex employee confirmed they do not know Ms. Krajnyak and they have no connection to the City or Council. They were upset their name was publicly used on social media. She mentions that Ms. Krajnyak sought out public donations from residents and local businesses to purchase police chairs. She made a comment that the Finance Director allegedly denied the PO. Councilwoman Krajnyak publicly stated that "over \$2,000 had been pledged" for the police chairs. To date, it is not verified if those funds were received by the City. Ms. Kostelnik requests that Council verify whether or not these funds were collected and then deposited into any City account. If no funds were received, this was misleading for residents and created a false impression of City inaction. Ms. Kostelnik requests that Ms. Krajnyak verify whether these funds were collected, how they were collected, and where they were deposited. After the Mayor corrected this false statement on the City's official page, a resident demanded that the City issue a public apology to Councilwoman Krajnyak for calling her out. This demonstrates the confusion and public mistrust created by her false statements. Ms. Kostelnik says that after the chair incident, Ms. Krajnyak sent an instant message saying "FYI every collective bargaining year, Carol Ann buries money in different accounts so arbitrator can't find it. That money should stay in the General Fund... last time it was over a million over 4 accounts." Ms. Kostelnik says this is another false statement made by Ms. Krajnyak and considers this to be defamation of character on behalf of the Finance Director.

Ms. Kostelnik ran out of time to speak.

Mr. Meyers says he understands that things have escalated quickly between the two parties. He would like to make the suggestion that perhaps the two individuals sit down with a neutral individual to work out differences rather than drag the City through a messy situation.

Mr. Semick says he jotted a few notes down. When this complaint was first brought to him, he was sad because he thought that we were past this. It is his understanding that it is not solely his place to decide what happens next. He consulted with the Law Director and shared it promptly with Council. He does not have any supervisory role. Unfortunately he feels that public comments have secured the belief that we are not going to be able to resolve this one on one. He says that he has observed interactions involving residents, city staff, business, and members of Council that fall far short of the professional standards we should expect. That includes recent changes over routine administrative matters that escalated unnecessarily. Additionally, posts on the Blockwatch page, which many of it's members believe to be a City sponsored page in which they could trust for accurate and impartial information regarding our City... it is not, he clarifies... have included statements



