

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MARCH 15, 2011

The second semi-monthly meeting of Mansfield City Council met on Tuesday, March 15, 2011 at 7:30 PM in the Council Chambers of the City Building.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by the audience.

Councilman Mike Hill led the audience in prayer.

ROLL CALL: The following answered present at roll call: Carmichael, Haring, Hazen, Hightower, Hill, Jefferson, Rock and Versaw.

There being no objections, the reading of the Journal and Communications were dispensed with.

JOE MATERN, MATERN METAL WORKS: I have a short letter that my wife and I composed in regards to the Feb. 28 flooding. Three and a half years ago we sustained the worst flooding in the history of Mansfield. They call it the 100 year flood. Nobody expected it. Mansfield was devastated. Two weeks ago, it happened again. Our business was destroyed again along with many others that had been destroyed in 2007 and additional businesses that had not been effected before. This time we never saw a FEMA representative telling us to go to SBA for a loan, we didn't see the Mayor, we didn't see the newspaper or tv reporters, we didn't see anyone who cared. It's old news now, Mansfield floods. Well it's not old news to us. Our small business and those like ours in the effected area are attempting to keep people working through this horrendous recession we're having. We're trying to keep food on their tables, there's no grant money, no stop gap, no help for the businesses, we're trying to give people jobs so they can fix their flooded homes. But while we clean out the mud again, the city worries about making Central Park pretty for those who might visit, they worry about making green space that will be easier to clean up. When will the city worry about fixing the problem? Once was a fluke of nature, twice, the city has a problem. If this happens again, we will be out of friends who want to help clean up the mud. We will be out of business and the city will lose more jobs than it already has. City of Mansfield, fix this flooding problem, people are tired of losing their homes, their businesses and their jobs. If this happens again, it will be on the city and nobody will be around to clean up. When I went there at 5:30 in the morning and it was 12:30 before I got into the shop and there was 5 inches of water then. At 4:00 there was still an inch of mud. Nobody's been around. When you go down Adams St. when it rains, the east side of Adams St. has no drain. You have a drain at the post office side and every time it rains the east side of Adams St. down there is nothing but a mud hole. Every time everybody leaves from Bunting Bearings, they raise so much dust right now, you can see a cloud of dust all the way over to the granary. So, last time I came in here after the flood and I asked City Council if they could get somebody down to help clean up that mess and they sent some people down with the sweeper trucks to help get rid of the mud. This time it's torn up my driveway and parking lot and everything. We got nothing left to give.

PHIL DOLLISH, IAFF PRESIDENT: During the past three years the city administration has attempted to illegally break the contract of IAFF local #266 on more than one occasion. These attempts have been taken to court and found in the firefighter's favor both times. We have twice in 2010 proposed a cost saving package which could have saved the city two and a half million dollars over a three year period but the city rejected this cost savings stating that staffing levels are too high in the daily manning of the department. The daily manning has been referred to by some city officials as a means to pad the fireman's pocket, that the city fireman is a bad employee that won't play ball. We are firefighters with a long strong history of placing our life in situations that most people are moving away from. We are not heroes in our own eyes but to many we are. Now, that the city is willing to abide by our contract even though we did have to pursue legal means to accomplish this and since they are pursuing other means of staff reduction, we should be happy but we are not. How can we stand our ground that staffing levels should well exceed the levels of 21 firefighters a day but allow the city to lay off the proposed 14 police officers. This move would also place the citizens of Mansfield at risk. The Mansfield police union chose larger pay packages over manning clauses that the firefighters had in their past contracts. That was their choice but now it is our decision to try to help maintain a balance of safety for the citizens of Mansfield. We the local #266 propose the following : a daily staffing of 18 firefighters a day to staff three rescue squads four engines and one ladder truck. This proposal along with some others should allow the city to stay within its last proposed budget to the state fiscal emergency committee. By no means do we think that this is a safety level for our city but shorting the police department is also not a safe measure either. I will gladly meet with the Mayor's staff in the next few days to explain this proposal in its entirety. Thank you and may we all continue to work as a team united for the purpose of our safety as well as the safety of our citizens.

MAYOR CULLIVER: One quick comment. Since the News Journal had an editorial about the beautification of our entryway and also the square, I've had a number of calls stating that with our financial situation, the city should not be putting money into those areas. Well, the reality of it is, with both of those issues, the economic group are the ones that spearheaded that and they're using their own money on that issue and then the square is not a administrative initiative. That was a gentleman in town here that decided that they wanted to pursue and see if the square could be changed so any money that comes from that issue is still not a city initiative, so as the gentleman stated on that issue, no there is no city funds and it's not a city issue on either one of those efforts. The city has nothing to do with either one of them except for to listen to all the sides and also see what everybody has to say about making Mansfield safer, making Mansfield more beautiful so that we can attract business. That's the only part, so far, as far as I know, from the administrative side, and also any of the council people that's been out there with any of those groups, they are there just because (inaudible) and also with the economic group, they are part of those sectors, which had nothing to do with the city government in itself.

SSD MESSER: I'd like to take a minute just to thank the fire fighters and their labor organization for stepping forward and helping to resolve some financial issues. It's clear that with the court order from Common Pleas Court that immediately after the judges

order came out that the fire union could have taken us to court and filed a contempt citation to order 21 minimum manning every day. We were able to call back the fire fighters off furlough immediately or within just a few days and the fire union agreed, as long as we did our best to try to maintain state levels, that they would not seek that violation of the court order, and I think it says a lot about the fire dept. leadership, not only the union, but the members of the fire dept. that they would step forward and try to help us move in the right direction to avoid a number of significant cuts in the safety forces and other depts. as well. Union membership's like a brotherhood. I remember growing up, my father was the treasurer of Teamsters since far back as I can remember, both my brothers are members of UAW and I've been a member of the FOP, practically my entire adult life, so I realize how important that brotherhood is but police officer and fire fighters are a little bit stronger. They're like your true siblings that you fight and you say things to often times you regret later but when one of you are threatened, all of your siblings come together for each other and hopefully, I'll meet any time that Phil's available tomorrow or any of his leadership and we'll be able to work on a solution that will make Mansfield as safe as possible in those circumstances.

PWD KLOUSIADIS: I also echo Director Messer's thoughts and words along with the fact that we need to thank the AFSCME union also for what they do. I know it's tough. I know times are tough, but we appreciate them working with us. Mr. Matern, I want you to know that I'm going to talk with Engineering tomorrow regarding that east side of Adams, I'll go down there with our service complex manager and take a look and see the condition of the roads, if there's anything based on mud and things, we will clean that. Unfortunately, when that river comes up, there's some stuff in the works, long run, to look at retention but that's all the Corps of Engineers and other depts. That's large dollars, millions and millions of dollars, but I do want you to know that we do feel, we are concerned about the flooding and appreciate what you have to go through.

MR. MATERN: Behind Schneider's Bakery, they have a big manhole and every time it rains really, really hard you'll see that water flying out of there 5 feet high. Last time we had that flood, I spoke with you and a couple other people on it and I asked you to investigate that drain line that is running from out of there into that creek because I seriously believe that is one of the main problems because it's setting up into the water not down with the water. I would appreciate it if that got looked into.

PWD KLOUSIADIS: We will and if we were down there discussing that I'm sure Engineering would probably be the one that had already checked that but I will check along with that. Thank you.

LAW DIRECTOR REMY: The only comment that I would have is to Bill 11-038. The Law Director's office played English teacher here and cleaned it up a little bit, changed some of the verbiage, however, in substance, it is not been changed. We did some spell checks and I just wanted to let everyone know that. Again, in substance, it reads, if not verbatim, the body of it reads that same as was given to you last night.

WEDNESDAY DEADLINE

MRS. CARMICHAEL: I move that with respect to Bills 11-034 and 11-035 that the rule requiring legislation be submitted by Wednesday noon be suspended and that Bills 11-034 and 11-035 be allowed on the floor tonight, seconded by Mr. Jefferson. Motion was passed by voice vote.

SUSPEND RULES

MRS. CARMICHAEL: I move with respect to all bills that come before Council tonight that the rule requiring reading on three different days be suspended and that each bill be read one time by title only, seconded by Mr. Jefferson. The vote was taken and resulted as follows: Ayes: 8, Nays: 0.

LEGISLATION

DEMOLITION – 165 ARTHUR AVE.

BY: MRS. HIGHTOWER

ORDINANCE 11-032

Declaring the remains of a designated dwelling (165 Arthur Avenue) to be insecure, unsafe, structurally defective and unsafe to life and other property; directing the demolition thereof by City forces or contract labor, materials and equipment, and declaring an emergency.

Upon motion by Mrs. Hightower that Bill 11-034 be read and placed upon the floor for discussion, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The bill was read and placed upon the floor for final passage, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The vote was taken and resulted as follows: Ayes: 8, Nays: 0. Ayes: Carmichael, Haring, Hazen, Hightower, Hill, Jefferson, Rock and Versaw.

The bill was declared passed, signed by the President, approved by the Mayor and attested by the Clerk.

DEMOLITION – 473 MCPHERSON ST.

BY: MRS. HIGHTOWER

ORDINANCE 11-033

Declaring the remains of a designated dwelling (473 McPherson Street) to be insecure, unsafe, structurally defective and unsafe to life and other property; directing the demolition thereof by City forces or contract labor materials and equipment, and declaring an emergency.

Upon motion by Mrs. Hightower that Bill 11-035 be read and placed upon the floor for discussion, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The bill was read and placed upon the floor for final passage, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The vote was taken and resulted as

follows: Ayes: 8, Nays: 0. Ayes: Carmichael, Haring, Hazen, Hightower, Hill, Jefferson, Rock and Versaw.

The bill was declared passed, signed by the President, approved by the Mayor and attested by the Clerk.

FILE APP. FOR LITTER GRANTS

BY: MR. JEFFERSON

ORDINANCE 11-034

Authorizing the Mayor and Service-Safety Director to file an application with the Richland County Regional solid Waste Management Authority for recycling and litter prevention grant funds, authorizing the execution of a agreement therefore, appropriated the sum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000), and declaring an emergency.

Upon motion by Mr. Jefferson that Bill 11-036 be read and placed upon the floor for discussion, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The bill was read and placed upon the floor for final passage, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The vote was taken and resulted as follows: Ayes: 8, Nays: 0. Ayes: Carmichael, Haring, Hazen, Hightower, Hill, Jefferson, Rock and Versaw.

The bill was declared passed, signed by the President, approved by the Mayor and attested by the Clerk.

ACCEPT 2011 LITTER CLEANUP GRANT

BY: MR. JEFFERSON

ORDINANCE 11-035

Accepting 2011 Litter Cleanup Grant funding from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources in the amount of \$2,000, appropriating same, and declaring an emergency.

Upon motion by Mr. Jefferson that Bill 11-037 be read and placed upon the floor for discussion, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The bill was read and placed upon the floor for final passage, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The vote was taken and resulted as follows: Ayes: 8, Nays: 0. Ayes: Carmichael, Haring, Hazen, Hightower, Hill, Jefferson, Rock and Versaw.

The bill was declared passed, signed by the President, approved by the Mayor and attested by the Clerk.

OBJECTING TO SB5

BY: MR. HAZEN

ORDINANCE 11-036

A non-binding resolution objecting to the content and intent of Amended Substituted Senate Bill 5 and asking for reconsideration on the matters contained in said Amended Bill.

Upon motion by Mr. Hazen that Bill 11-038 be read and placed upon the floor for discussion, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The bill was read and placed upon the floor for final passage, seconded by Mrs. Carmichael. The vote was taken and resulted as follows: Ayes: 7, Nays: 1. Ayes: Carmichael, Haring, Hazen, Hightower, Hill, Jefferson and Rock. Nay: Versaw.

The bill was declared passed, signed by the President, approved by the Mayor and attested by the Clerk.

MRS. HIGHTOWER: I would just like to thank Mr. Hazen for having his drafted up, so in some way we could have a voice. I also want to thank all the people today that, in the rain, they stood there, in unity, and I thought that was a way of saying what this meant to them. I do thank you.

MR. HILL: I would just question Mr. Hazen why there's such a rush on this bill when he stood on this floor of council before and complained when somebody would bring a bill on a Friday or a Monday and they haven't had time to study it or go over it. He's doing the same thing he's complained about and now, the bill that we're even, this resolution that we're talking about, the Senate Bill, is not even done as far as I know. How can you vote on something that isn't complete?

MR. HAZEN: Absolutely, I think that there's a distinct difference between the budget matter that was brought to council that I objected to. There was a pending question as to whether or not the court would find in favor the fire fighters vs. the city and I believed that waiting on the bill was not only appropriate, but it would be prudent to do such a thing given the consideration that courts were still going to hear the pending layoffs and make a decision and that budget will end up having to be amended in some fashion. I think taking that approach would have saved us the headache of actually losing the fiscal plan and losing the budget and having to redraft both those pieces of legislation, however, while I understand your point, I must say that, this, like many other bills, met the Wednesday deadline and the issue was brought before council last evening. There's a draft that was, basically given, and a non-binding resolution is, as far as I'm concerned, much different than enacting a law without sufficient debate. This simply says that the individuals within our city, who are worried about the content and intent of SB5 should have a voice down in Columbus and I want to support their efforts to do that. I don't see where we necessarily need to hold this and do three readings on a bill like this. We've done this non-binding resolution in the past and we've made several statements in support of various issues by non-binding resolution without lengthy debate and I think merely continues what that long tradition has been which is the council stands up for the employees of the city and wants to back them in their efforts to try and make common sense reforms, so while I appreciate and understand your point, and I do, obviously, want to see more debate on matters that come before council, I guess I'm (inaudible) by the

concept that this is somehow something that is going to take a lengthy debate. You're either for this or against this. In my mind, people that are sitting out here for SB 5 or against SB 5, they simply want to put us on the record and I want to be put on the record. I don't know if that answers your question Mr. Hill, but I hope it does. SB 5 is. It actually passed the Senate and this is simply saying that the content and intent of SB5 is something that the worker here disagree with. Obviously, if it's going (applause). Obviously, if this is going to end up going to House Bill 50, these individuals would like to have the opportunity to sit before the house committees or have their representatives sit before the House committees and make common sense reforms to what the Senate is proposing. I think that's perfectly legitimate. However, Mr. Hill, I would encourage you to vote your conscience, as I hope you do.

MR. HILL: I make a motion that we table this. (Seconded by Mr. Versaw).

MR. HAZEN: I see no reason why we would table this bill when we're in the midst of the fight. If we table the bill, if we put it before a committee, if we wait until the next council session, the House of Representatives may very well be voting on their version of this without these individuals having the right to regress this grievance with their leadership and have the appropriate people speak. These folks want to know that we're back behind them and I'm behind them in their efforts to have their voice heard. That doesn't necessarily mean they want to throw everything out the window with SB5 but it does mean they want to have a voice in what's going on and I think unless we make this strong statement that our working people here in the City of Mansfield, whether they're city employees or whether they're other union employees who are going to be impacted by this, they need to know that their city government stands behind them in their efforts to actually have their voice heard. Maybe it will have absolutely no impact (applause). Maybe it won't have an impact, maybe it won't. Let's face facts. We got people down in Columbus who might or might not agree with this but if we don't do this, what we're saying is, Columbus can do whatever they want without the City of Mansfield having a say. I'd rather have a say. (Applause).

MRS. CARMICHAEL: I will be voting on this tonight because I do not want to delay this. They're down there working on it. Why should we delay it? We have to get our voice out there and be heard, that we do not want this bill. (Applause).

MR. VERSAW: I talked to our State Senator today and yesterday. They agree that the bill went through a little too quickly, they were going to make some amendments to it but it was too late, so now it's in the House and they are making those amendments that they originally wanted to put on there. We don't even know what all those amendments are, they're still talking about this bill, so we don't know what it's going to look like in its final form, so I guess my comment is, well today we got a letter, Director Messer sent a letter down to his state representative and showing displeasure. Some of the things that we maybe need to change, some of the things that have gone too far. This is how we should be talking about and making some changes to an existing bill, talking to our state representatives, talking to our state senators and telling them our displeasures and now's the time for them to listen and make some of those changes. (Someone spoke out from

the audience). No I'm not done, I was interrupted. This is our meeting, by the way, this is a council meeting. This is council's meeting, this is for us up here. (Someone spoke out in audience). No, this is a council meeting and it's for council members only. Read the rules of council. Mr. President, point of order.

MR. HAZEN: Let's give Mr. Versaw fair hearing.

PRESIDENT SCOTT: Let's try to hold our comments down and let council members speak.

MR. VERSAW: I'd like to know what the final content is but we are in fiscal emergency in this community and we can't even balance our budget right now, we're still trying to make changes to balance our budget. That's this year. Next year, I just talked to our state senator and they are going to reduce the local government fund 50% and that's probably the second or third largest income that we get in the City of Mansfield behind income tax and it's going to be significantly cut back. I understand, from talking to Director Messer, that many of these grants that keep the police on the streets are going to go away next year. I understand that the court costs fund that the courts are using to offset some of the increases in the general fund, that fund is going to dry up. From what I understand, and I think the administration probably could back me up on this, next year might be even more critical and more dire than this year and we're still \$1.2 million we're trying to make up. All they're trying to do with the collective bargaining bill is to give the administration some tools to manage employees to do a better job, or to just manage employees. We have staffing and manning, we can't even staff and man at the levels that we want to. I also found out today that there was a state study that 85 out of the 88 counties in the State of Ohio that the public employees make more than their counterparts in the private sector. And this is what the taxpayers are upset about. This, Mr. President, this is our council meeting. We are in session in council right now, please.

PRESIDENT SCOTT: I would ask everybody to hold their comments please.

MR. VERSAW: So, all that we're looking for in this collective bargaining bill, changes in the collective bargaining bill, is just level the playing field. That's all they're looking for. So anyway, I guess next year's going to be dire, maybe more so than this year, so either we're going to have to have layoffs or we're going to have to have tax increases. Now, it's up to the public on whether they want to raise their taxes to pay for all this or we just continue to lay off more employees. This is a very tough issue and very, for Mansfield right now we're in a bad situation. All we want to do is try to find ways to get this budget more in balance, not only this year, but next year and the coming years because we're trying to get out of fiscal emergency. All we're trying to do find ways to keep services out there, keep employees working, provide services that the taxpayers want without raising and increasing their taxes. That's all they want. So anyway, I will be voting against the resolution, I think it really should be pulled because I think the biggest complaint I hear from the other side that opposes SB5 is it was ramroded through. What are we doing tonight? Ramroding through a resolution.

MR. HAZEN: We're not ramroding anything through. I want to take Mr. Versaw's points here, a couple at a time, and since we're debating whether or not to squash this resolution on council floor. Let's talk about specifics here. Mr. Versaw stated that we should write our state representatives or state senators and I agree with that sentiment. I wrote a letter today opposed SB5 to both my state representative and my state senator. I put it on city letterhead and I said, as a ward councilman I want to support the people who work in the city of Mansfield. This non-binding resolution simply says exactly that. That we want to communicate as a city to the state and let them know that there are serious issues that are involved here. We're talking about sending this resolution to them. That's exactly what Mr. Versaw wants. I don't see why he wouldn't vote for it. Second, Mr. Versaw talks about having a debate. Well, exactly, there was no debate on this. This was pushed through and that's one of the reasons why these people are upset. If we don't stand up and say we want a fair and honest debate on the issue and allow people to come to the table and make common sense reforms to this bill, then what we're doing, by proxy, is assuming that those individuals down there know exactly what our will is as a city. I think it's clear, from the turnout here, and from what I've been seeing and hearing out of people, that what they want is to come to the table and discuss the issue in an open, honest, fair debate. Mr. Versaw going down to Columbus and talking to people is nice and everything, but I would be willing to bet there's a whole heck of a lot of people that want to do the same thing and don't have the ability to go down and do that right now because they're voices are being heard. (Applause and gavel). Third, the budget cuts that Mr. Versaw is talking about are proposed and on the table and while I do believe there's going to be significant budget cuts, I think the worse thing you can do is tell a whole group of people that we're going to cut you but you're not going to have a voice. There's a lot of people that came to the table, Mr. Dollish came to the table tonight with a proposal to help this city out. I'd be willing to bet that if the Governor took a few minutes and talked with the union representatives, he's find out that they want to come to the table and make common sense reforms that are going to help the state and they are going to help the cities and they are going to be able to make significant budget cuts. Now I'm not saying that everything in SB5 is horrible, I'm not saying that everything inside SB5 is great, but I know one thing, and the people sitting here tonight know one thing, they had no opportunity. If you don't have the opportunity to speak, then by God it's going to happen to you, so what's wrong with sitting down with your state representative, just like you did Doug, and just like the people that are sitting around this table want and actually doing that. All this says is give our people a chance to talk. (Applause). Now, we've done this before and I'm tired of this, all your ramroding. I'm not ramroding anything. Let's get real. We've done non-binding resolutions in this city before and we've had nights notice and we've passed it 8-0. You just don't like the content of the non-binding resolution, so if that's your point, that's fine, vote against it. Feel free. But let the other people on council have their opportunity to give their say so we can send a message down to Columbus if we agree. If these people don't agree with it, they're going to vote against it. There's nothing wrong with that in my book. Let's vote on it. (Applause). (Mr. Hill removed motion to table).

MRS. HARING: Did not have microphone on.

MR. JEFFERSON: I didn't get a chance to say anything. It's not about me being heard, I don't know what this big hurry is here. I want Mr. Hazen to explain to me, I think I understand it, but the collective bargaining, what are they trying to take away from the unions that they don't already have?

MRS. HARING: Alright!

MR. JEFFERSON: I'm not talking to you, I'm talking to Mr. Hazen.

MR. HAZEN: My understanding of SB5 and please, there are probably people in the audience that can speak better to this than I can but my understanding of SB5 is that it eliminates collective bargaining, as a process, and it eliminates the right of workers to negotiate for their health care, for their wages, and for most of their benefits, that the state law eliminates all of those negotiating points for the union personnel. That's what I believe everybody is, is that accurate gentlemen and ladies? So, it sets a whole different standard for the way that individuals are dealt with, treated in the negotiation process that would happen with the individuals.

MR. JEFFERSON: This is for public. This does not touch private unions.

MR. HAZEN: No sir, not to my knowledge.

MR. JEFFERSON: Tomorrow may not come either. So, the point is, tomorrow may not come so don't give me this rhetoric we're next.

SSD MESSER: I want to ask council just to take 2 minutes and read the back of bill 11-038 and in summary, you're asking that the legislature do 3 things. Section 1. Object to the adoption of SB5 in its current form. Which already, House Bill 50, so it's evolving. That you are urged to defeat passage of amended substitute Senate Bill 5 that prohibit the passage of unfunded mandates that impede local community-based decision-making. Now your objecting to unfunded mandates on cities and communities. And lastly, you urge them to amend and modernize the Ohio collective bargaining law based on the finding of facts and to review the proposed changes. So, after you go through all of this on the front, those are the only 3 things you're asking the legislature to do and they're relatively general in nature. And again, I would ask you to do what we discussed last night. Vote your heart, put in writing how you feel about collective bargaining, whether it's the public sector or private sector, send it to Goyal and the other representative and the senator and many other senators that I know in Columbus. Other than that, this isn't an earth shattering piece of legislation. It's asking them to show good faith when dealing with our labor organizations that start with the public sector but surely will move on to the private sector when this is done.

MR. JEFFERSON: I really wish Mr. Hill hadn't of pulled this bill on getting some more dialogue and some more discussion on this cuz I don't have the fear that everybody out there has and I've been a union member for 27 years but I don't have the fear that the

public, because the state is trying to do something with the public union to cut costs, to not be bankrupt, that it's gonna effect the private unions. The solidarity...

PRESIDENT SCOTT: Can I please ask the audience to....

MR. JEFFERSON: If the private unions showed solidarity and backed the public unions, I think they would win and we don't need all this fear and rhetoric that we're saying, somebody's next. I just don't have that fear, but if it makes you happy and you have that fear, I'll support you cuz I am a union member. (Applause and gavel). I really don't have that fear and I have some other things to say but everybody seems to be in a big hurry tonight, that's why I wish we could have discussed it in depth.

MR. HILL: Microphone not on.

MR. JEFFERSON: Well, then you're easy to sway then, Mike. If we have more discussion, I would say more things because I just don't have the fear because one union is being attacked, which is the public, that the private union is going to be next and if they are, when the solidarity comes together, I really feel, as a union member, that they could win. That's all I want to say on it, I just don't understand the fear that people have.

ADJOURN: Upon motion by Mr. Hill and seconded by Mr. Rock and passed by voice vote, the meeting was adjourned.

Amy Walker
Clerk of Council

Phillip Scott
President of Council