

URBANA CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES – JANUARY 24, 2012

The Urbana City Council Regular Session Meeting of Tuesday, January 24, 2012, was called to order at 7:00PM by **Council President Marty Hess**, in Court Chambers / The Municipal Building.

Attendance: All of Council Attended.

City Staff in Attendance: Mayor Bill Bean; Mr. Lee Williams, Finance Director and Acting Director of Administration; Mr. Doug Crabill, Assistant to the Director of Administration; Mr. Chad Hall; Mr. Mike Heintz; Police Officer Josh Jacobs; Police Chief Matt Lingrell; Mr. Robert Munch; Attorney Gil Weithman, City Law Director

Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance

Executive Session

Mr. Larry Lokai moved to adjourn to Executive Session at 7:02PM (Council Only); Mr. Robert Thorpe seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Lokai, yes; Mr. Thorpe, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Brugger, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes (6-0)

At 7:06PM, Mr. Lokai moved to reconvene to Regular Session; Mr. Thorpe seconded. Motion carried without objection.

A vote was immediately taken by ballot to select the next Council Member to replace outgoing Mr. Bill Bean. Four votes (the majority needed) were locked in for Mr. Douglas Hoffman. One vote was registered for each of two others who applied. Doug Hoffman was declared the new Councilman to fill the At-Large seat, by Council President Marty Hess. Mr. Al Evans noted ballots may be examined in the Council Office upon request.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Lokai moved to approve the UCC Public Hearing Minutes (January 10, 2012); Mr. Thorpe seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Council President Hess announced the UCC Regular Session Minutes (January 10, 2012), and the UCC Work Session Minutes (January 17, 2012) will appear on the February 14, 2012 Agenda.

Communications

Mr. Evans moved to place the note of appreciation to Champaign County, and others, regarding support during the planning, construction, and opening of the new Springfield Regional Medical Center, on file; Mr. Eugene Fields seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Administrative Reports – Board of Control

1.

Mr. Lokai moved to authorize a purchase order to Hull & Associates in the amount of \$15,000 for ground water sample collections and lab analytical services for 2012 (This will be charged to Landfill Capital, and is in the 2012 Budget); Mr. Thorpe seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Discussion –

Mr. Chad Hall explained:

“We contacted Hull & Associates about giving us a price on the analytical, and the sampling of the Landfill for 2012—they came back with a not-to-exceed \$15,000. Last year, we were with Alloway...and we were just a shade over \$19,000 for the analytical...so about a \$4,000 savings plus a not-to-exceed.

2.

Mr. Kerry Brugger moved to approve the attached Blanket Purchase Orders for 2012 (*See Council Files); Mr. Fields seconded. Motion carried without objection

Discussion –

Mr. Fields questioned whether the City would get a ‘cut rate’ on gasoline.

Mr. Lee Williams said, “We are paying market price for gas.”

Mr. Brugger asked, “Alloway’s on here for lab testing—is that for...other than what we just voted on?”

Mr. Hall replied, “There’s about a...8,500...9,000...being carried over from 2011 that was just invoiced (I believe here) in this month...so that’s...and then at the same time, we did not have the quotes back from Hull & Associates with the not-to-exceed...”

“\$386,000—plus or minus, for the total list?” asked Mr. Brugger.

Mr. Williams said (to some laughter), “If you added it up.”

“I thought the important thing to point out is last year this list was about a page and a half,” Mr. Williams added. That’s the difference between twenty-five hundred, and seventy-five hundred.”

Mr. Lokai stated, “This is just a routine blanket purchase order so we can go ahead with things this year...I recommend passage.”

3.

Mr. Evans moved to authorize the Director of Administration to enter into a lump sum contract for the base bid with Becker Construction, Inc. for the Urbana Municipal Building Chairlift Replacement in the amount of \$74,700. (No alternates will be accepted for this project due to funding. There is \$64,000 in FY10 CDBG funds available to fund this project. In addition, there will be an additional \$5,000 in FY10 CDBG funds available to fund this project. Any additional costs will be funded with Local Capital Improvement Funds. This is not in the 2011 Budget); Mr. Lokai seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Note: This BOC item was added on just prior to the Meeting.

Discussion –

Mr. Doug Crabill stated:

“As you’ll note (from your Agenda - Footnote) the bids were opened today at 1:00...so that’s why you got a more detailed summary this evening...we had 5 bids that were accepted for this project. This is to put a chairlift back in the main stairway of the building. It’s not quite like what we had before—it actually will make more levels of the building accessible—it will actually start by the Finance window/the Income Tax window will be the 1st level you’ll be able to get on the lift...and then up to where the Prosecutor’s Office/Council Clerk’s Office is...and then on up to Engineering...and then on up to Administration...so all those levels will be accessible...it will actually follow the inner stairwell...so this base bid is to construct that chairlift on those levels (with call buttons at each level. The alternates...we had an alternate for the finishes to be a little bit different on the unit itself...it’s a basic institutional beige (like powder coating finish), and the alternate was to upgrade that to a stainless, and a black...but just the way the budget came out on this, it doesn’t look like that’s going to make so much sense to do...so the Alternate 2 was a secondary chairlift...a separate unit that would go from the level that the Clerk and Prosecutor are at, down to So. Main St...so if we only install the

base bid chairlift, the building will be accessible from Market St., instead of Main St...you can still (of course) go in this other Main St. door, but...so that's what the base bid is for...it's for the unit, all the way from Finance up to Administration."

Mr. Thorpe asked, "You're not coming in off Main St. at all?"

"Well—when we looked at trying to make the building accessible (on other levels), this was the best way to lay it out architecturally...so...and the accessibility would be from Market St. unless we would opt to go with this other lift (and fund that somehow)," answered Mr. Crabill.

"In that case, you'd have one from So. Main to the Prosecutor level?" asked Mr. Thorpe.

"Yes," said Mr. Crabill.

"...and then get another car on up?" asked Mr. Thorpe.

"Yes—you'd have 2 different lifts," said Mr. Crabill.

Mr. Fields sought clarification on whether this item would be a chairlift, or a wheelchair lift.

"It's made for a wheelchair—it's not a sit on it, and ride on it..." said Mr. Crabill.

"If we're going to have those folks coming in on that level, we'll need handicapped parking spots out there," stated Mr. Evans.

"That had been discussed—that we might have to look at that," Mr. Crabill replied.

"We will have to look at that—because you've got the handicapped spot out here," said Mr. Evans "...for access to that end of the building."

"We can take a look at that," said Mr. Crabill.

Mr. Lokai pointed to more traffic coming in on Market St., and said 'logically that would be the best layout.'

"\$22,000 (more dollars) for another lift, for 5 steps may not be money well spent right now...as long as the people know they can come in on Market St.," he said.

Mr. Crabill explained the funding:

"Our grant is for \$64,000—we had 2 projects in this grant—1 was the curb ramps on Oakland, and that project came in under the project amount, so we've asked for \$5,000 to be transferred from that project (which is 10% of what that project budget was...which is what's allowable)...so altogether we should have \$69,000 in funding to use, and this amount actually includes an allowance that may not get used at \$5,000...so we may end up where the grant would fund the entire thing...but there's a potential that the City would pick up a little bit of the cost."

"Thank you, Doug—good job!" stated Council President Hess. "When do they start, Doug?"

Mr. Crabill answered, "The contract within the next week, and then...they have to be complete by May 1st...the equipment has like a 6-8 week lead time, that's the biggest delay."

Council President Hess remarked, "This would be a good thing to get in, because the BZA meetings...we had to meet in the hallway, because we couldn't get up...so...glad to get that project going."

Citizen Comments

Ms. Kay Falkner-McOwen (Board Member, Champaign County Citizens for Canines) addressed Council, and provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the organization's drive to open/establish a 2 acre fenced-in Dog Park at Melvin Miller Park. The presentation outlined: what a Dog Park is, what it will do, what it promotes (responsible

dog ownership), what it provides (an outlet for dog & dog owners to socialize), and why it makes for a better community. Ms. Falkner-McOwen said the group initially looked at locations by the Pool, by the pond, and by the hill (as she showed photographs of those areas). She said the group—with Parks and Recreation Superintendent, Mr. Chris Stokes, selected the area by the Pool, and described reasons why the L-shaped area north of the Bike Path, was best. The level ground was noted as a plus for handicapped/elderly citizens with dogs.

She noted there would be separate areas defined for big dogs, and small dogs (25 lbs, and under).

Ms. Falkner-McOwen showed photos of Springfield's 'Wiggly Field' Dog Park, and described the rules of that dog park. Signatures (2,000) have been obtained by the CCCC in support. Area veterinarians were also noted as being in support of this plan. The group has additionally visited dog parks in Mechanicsburg, Xenia, and Allen Creek Reservoir. An application has been made to the IRS for a not-for-profit status, and the group hopes to obtain the tax-exempt status as a 501(c)3 charity corporation. Soliciting of funds will be conducted following that status.

Total cost of the initial construction, future additions, and improvements to the park will be raised by the Board.

Ms. Falkner-McOwen noted a Dog Park is an amenity that people look for when they're moving to a community—'just as they look at the schools, and other community features.' She cited a figure of 8,451 licensed dogs in the county (2011), and told Council that only licensed/vaccinated dogs would be allowed in the Dog Park.

She said research shows that dogs improve people's health—reducing anxiety/depression, stimulating people to exercise, and they also connect people with others...and help redevelop a sense of purpose.

"Dogs are better than Prozac," Ms. Falkner-McOwen said, while asking Council 'respectfully that you grant us the land for the Dog Park.'

Ms. Falkner-McOwen named other CCCC Board Members: Audra Bean, Dr. Charles Wingfield, Lee Ann Brown, Skipp Weithman, Cindy Stonerock, Kym Buchanan, Perry Wise, and Liela Anderson.

Mr. Evans asked, "Normally when we try to do something in the Park we have contact with the neighbors that are concerned about anything—have you folks met with those neighbors?"

Ms. Falkner-McOwen replied, "We have not met with the neighbors, but we do know that several of the neighbors right in that area do have dogs—we're also looking at the space to the north side of the walking path...so it's further away from the closest house."

Mr. Evans expressed concerns that the L-shape borders houses in the area, and wanted to know 'how those people feel about that.'

Attorney Skipp Weithman defined the area near the Bike Path.

"We're to the north side of the walking path," Ms. Falkner-McOwen stated.

"There is a buffer between where you'd put it and the Bike Path," said Council President Hess.

"Right," Ms. Falkner-McOwen confirmed.

Mr. Brugger said, "Ditto what Al said—I think that would be a question. I just...watching...you did a nice job, and your homework...you had a nice, orderly presentation. Were you having any trouble getting any of your licenses (or whatever

those...I don't remember how to refer to them) without having a land use agreement in your hand?"

"No—no," replied Ms. Falkner-McOwen. "What we're waiting for...for donations...to solicit donations for the Dog Park, to fund it."

"Do you still get your permits, and your other...?" asked Mr. Brugger.

Attorney Weithman said, "The statuses we have, have nothing to do with having them."

Mrs. Virginia Smith said, "I don't have dogs, but I think it's a great idea...and I think Urbana does need one...I see a lot of people out walking their dogs, and sometimes they do go out into the road...even with a leash on, so I think it's a very good idea."

Ms. Falkner-McOwen told of a travelling man who specifically looks for cities with dog parks, to stop at while travelling with his pet.

Mr. Lokai said, "I commend you on doing your homework in advance...as I understand (what's happening) we're looking for a land use agreement...this is self-funded, it's not really going to cost the City budget anything...and it will be somewhat self-managed, because of the rules and regulations...I do appreciate you getting things in a sequential order, and I guess the buzzword is you went through the chain of command."

Mr. Thorpe said, "Mr. Lokai took most of my 11 minutes."

Council President Hess verified that the Dog Park will be restricted to licensed/vaccinated dogs only.

"You would apply for a Park use agreement through Administration—nothing from us," said Mr. Evans. "It's a great idea."

"...and we don't have to clean it up? All we have to do is say 'You can use it?'" asked Council President Hess.

Ms. Falkner-McOwen verified there will be rules to adhere to.

Ordinances and Resolutions

Third Reading –

ORDINANCE NO. 4380 –

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS ESTABLISHED BY CHAPTER 1127 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF URBANA, OHIO TITLED URBANA CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT

Mr. Lokai moved to place Ordinance No. 4380 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Thorpe seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Thorpe, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Brugger, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Lokai, yes (6-0)

Discussion –

Council President Hess said, "Brad was unable to come to this meeting—he had another meeting out of town—this is the sign, the extra sign on the properties in The Overlay District."

Mr. Evans (to Mr. Crabill) said, "Do I understand correctly that if the place in question currently has a sign that has used all the square footage...that that sign would have to be downsized so the other sign could be used with the remainder of that square footage? Do you understand what I'm saying?"

"I think so—yeah," Mr. Crabill said. "If the square footage is exceeded on the site, then I believe (yeah) then they would have to revise that sign."

"They'd have to either put a different sign in, or amend that sign to make room for the other sign?" asked Mr. Evans.

“Right,” said Mr. Crabill. “Maybe make them multi-tenant, you know--change it so that there’s space for one business, and space for another business.”

“But if they want two free standing signs...one sign has already used up the square footage...that sign’s going to be useless, they’ll have to have two signs,” said Mr. Evans. “...or are those signs going to be grandfathered in?”

“I think this is as you present new signs to the site, so...I wouldn’t say that an existing sign (in my understanding) is not a grandfather necessarily...because you’re creating a change which triggers another change (essentially),” Mr. Crabill explained.

“So...to answer my question—if there’s an existing sign that used up the square footage, that sign would have to be demolished or removed...and two signs that use the square footage should be put in?” asked Mr. Evans.

“Not necessarily two signs—they could still just revise the sign to meet the square footage—would be my guess,” said Mr. Crabill, also elaborating on the definition of square footage.

RESOLUTION NO. 2351 –

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE CITY OF URBANA TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES UNDER THE NATUREWORKS PROGRAM FOR PARK IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Lokai moved to place Resolution No. 2351 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Fields seconded.

The Clerk misread the Roll Call, apologized, and corrected.

Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Brugger, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Lokai, yes; Mr. Thorpe, yes (6-0)

Discussion –

Mr. Crabill introduced City Pool Manager, Ms. Cheryl Wade, to explain the Resolution.

Ms. Wade defined the Natureworks Grant as targeting the Swim Team, and said:

“Right now, we’re currently not set up to host a meet—all of our meets had to be away last Summer—and we’d like to be able to host at least 2 of the 3 home meets, and possibly the League meet this Summer...so we’re looking at using this grant money to buy starting blocks, lane lines, and...basically everything we would need to support our Swim Team of 43 swimmers.”

Mr. Fields asked, “Who sponsors the Swim Team?”

Ms. Wade replied, “The Swim Team is now under Urbana Youth Sports—last Summer it was under the City, but we’ve now joined with Urbana Youth Sports.”

Mr. Evans asked, “Can you give me an idea of a swim meet at another pool? The Amount of people that it draws?”

Ms. Wade indicated there are 43 Swim Team Members, and there could be several hundred people in attendance. She elaborated on the possibility of Swim Camps (a tent area), and discussed the ‘ideal parking set up,’ and monies made from concessions.

“One of the positive things about moving in with Urbana Youth Sports is now the Swim Team can recoup 100% of the funds that they make,” she said.

“Will our facility handle a large Swim Meet?” asked Mr. Evans.

“Perfectly—yes,” said Ms. Wade.

“What would it take to make our Pool accessible?” asked Mr. Thorpe.

“As far as ADA—is that what you’re talking about?” said Ms. Wade. “Currently our chairlift that we have is not ADA compliant—it’s years old, so we would have to get that replaced. The ADA actually has handed down new guidelines that we are supposed to be compliant with by March—which means we have to have two means of accessible entry into the Pool (other than the ladders, which we do not have at this time)...we have the chairlift (like I said, which is not in code anymore)...and we have the ladders, so we’re looking to purchase steps for the Pool as well with some of that grant money...and the Baby Pool is also supposed to be compliant with the new ADA guidelines by March.” Ms. Wade noted she has been talking with Patterson Pools (which built the City Pool) about methods to aid in compliance, and she touched upon cost. Council President Hess requested ‘the price in mind.’

Mr. Crabill said:

“This grant is \$11,535 (is the ODNR available funding), and then you have to match that at 75% of the cost...you have to match whatever \$11,535 divided by three is...Three or four thousand,” replied Mr. Crabill.

Mr. Brugger said:

“For clarity, Doug—So if we get the \$11,500 grant, and we make improvements (whether it’s some of the ADA items, as well as some of items to accommodate the Swim Team)...if there’s other additional things that have to be done that require funding (just to maintain the operation) that’s still going to come out of the City coffers...not necessarily out of any proceeds of any means...there wouldn’t be any kind of a sharing, and then proceeds for any Swim Meets...is there any entry fee, or something? Would there be a piece of that come back to the City to help reimburse...?”

Ms. Wade refers to the requirement to be on the Swim Team (the purchase of a Pool membership), and then the charge of a program fee.

“The City would get the Pool membership, and the Swim Team/ Urbana Youth Sports would get the program fee,” said Ms. Wade, also explaining the second grant she is applying for that will be used for Pool renovations (ie. the Pool heater, bathroom fixtures/plumbing, lifeguard chairs, platforms, etc.)

Mr. Lokai sought to clarify recouping of costs, and Ms. Wade again defined.

She added, “Meet fees come out of the registration fee.”

Practice equipment was noted as also needed.

Mr. Lokai questioned whether income would come from concessions.

Ms. Wade said concessions are planned to help the Swim Team, and said concessions would ‘be run by whoever’s contracted to run concessions for the City Pool.’

“I think the thing to focus on is not so much the Swim Meet as the grant that’s going to be to purchase stuff at the Pool,” Mr. Crabill said.

Mr. Fields told Ms. Wade that she really turned the Pool around last year, and noted he has ‘heard nothing but good comments.’

“This grant will help (like you said Doug), put things out there that can stay out there...so we can build upon, and not cost the City a lot of money,” he said.

“With the Swim Team joining with Urbana Youth Sports...and being under that 501(c) umbrella...they would be able to accept donations for the Swim Team...those donations could be used to promote the Swim Team...but they couldn’t be used for improvements to the Pool?” asked Mr. Evans.

Mr. Williams answered, "If they're through Urbana Youth Sports, they could be used for Urbana Youth Sports...yes, for their supplies."

Mr. Evans clarified his point regarding donations through Urbana Youth Sports (for purchases to make the Pool ready for Swim Meets).

RESOLUTION NO. 2352 –

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE CITY OF URBANA TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES UNDER THE FEDERALLY FUNDED LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. Fields moved to place Resolution No. 2352 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Lokai seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Brugger, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Lokai, yes; Mr. Thorpe, yes; Mr. Fields, yes (6-0)

Discussion –

"This is more the Pool building itself—the water heater, the plumbing..." said Mr. Crabill.

"Mainly Pool renovation—yeah," added Ms. Wade. "It's a 50/50 grant up to \$70,000...I have spoken with Lee briefly, and he said that he could potentially come up with maybe \$25,000 right now...the State would match another twenty-five, to give me fifty to do some Pool renovations with."

Mr. Crabill stated:

"It also sounded like this one...you wouldn't get the grant agreement until late in the year, and so some of this (with the match component involved) would be budgeted just for the work to take place after the first of 2013...so if it wasn't necessary to come up with the money this year, we would have to budget for it next year."

Mr. Lokai said, "This is just basically an application to apply for funds, right?"

"Yes," Mr. Crabill said.

Mr. Fields thanked Ms. Wade (and Mr. Crabill) for their work on this grant.

Second Reading –

ORDINANCE NO. 4381 and RESOLUTION NO. 2354 were pulled from the Agenda at this Meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 2355 –

A RESOLUTION ENACTED BY THE CITY OF URBANA, CHAMPAIGN COUNTY, OHIO, TO IMPLEMENT A COMPLIANCE PLAN FOR MINIMUM REFLECTIVITY OF TRAFFIC SIGNS

Mr. Lokai moved to suspend the rules on three readings; Mr. Evans seconded.

Roll call vote to approve suspension: Mr. Brugger, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Lokai, yes; Mr. Thorpe, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes (6-0)

Mr. Lokai moved to place Resolution No. 2355 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Evans seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Lokai, yes; Mr. Thorpe, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Brugger, yes (6-0)

Discussion –

Mr. Lokai asked, "Is there a timeline on this?"

Mr. Mike Heintz said, "Yes, there is a timeline."

He requested passage of this Resolution at this Meeting, and noted the timeline of the signs was emailed to Council.

First Reading –

There were no First Readings at this Meeting.

Miscellaneous Business

Mr. Brugger - Nothing at this time

Mrs. Smith - Reported 671 Hagenbuch St., she has received complaints about a large fiberglass bathroom outside (w/ blue tubs that roll out in the rd); Said the items have been out there about a month
Reported 608 Hagenbuch St., a car w/o tags – Said the resident has received a letter (30 days is up); Wants to know the status

Mr. Lokai - Thanked the Street Dept., for a recent repair near Community Drive by the YMCA entrance on the unnamed city street (still St. Rt. 36 E.)

Mr. Thorpe - Nothing at this time

Council President Hess inadvertently skipped to Administration remarks.

To the laughter of several, Mr. Evans said, “What am I—chopped liver?!”

“The Chief has something he wants to talk to you about—I’ll get back to you,” said Council President Hess.

“Oh—never mind—I don’t have anything,” said Mr. Evans.

Mr. Fields looked perplexed as well.

Police Chief Matt Lingrell explained the *Citizen Survey of Police Services* to Council, noting that it is a tool to help Police Division provide exemplary services to citizens. He said the survey will run the gamut of citizens, will be conducted randomly, and will cover questions regarding overall agency performance, overall competency of agency employees, an officer’s demeanor with citizen(s), and community recommendations/suggestions for improvements.

Chief Lingrell said in November 2011 the Police Staff was approached about the evaluations, and he noted that in a recent Division Meeting the Police Staff reacted favorably about the evaluation. He said citizens should not feel stressed when being contacted regarding the 7 questions on the survey.

Mr. Heintz - Noted he emailed Council with information from EPA on illicit discharge and construction activity (a couple months ago) “That hasn’t died—it’s in Skipp’s office, he’s reviewing it...once he gets updates back to me, we’ll get back with you,” said Mr. Heintz. “...but we will need an Ordinance to look at those two Items, and upgrade our existing Ordinances.”

Mr. Crabill - Noted he emailed Council regarding the Recycling Report/2011 “Our current contract is through May 30 or 31st,” he said, also requesting feedback from Council preferably through an upcoming Work Session.

Mr. Robert Munch - Nothing at this time

Mr. Chad Hall - Nothing at this time

Mr. Lee Williams - Nothing at this time

Mayor Bill Bean - Announced the ‘Empty Bowls’ activity that will be at the Urbana Student Center on Thursday, January 26, 2012 (5:00-7:30PM); This was noted as a soup & bread fundraiser (\$15.) to assist

Second Harvest Food Bank

Noted the Park Board has lost a Council Member; Asked the current Council Members to think about getting involved

Mr. Evans - Nothing at this time

Mr. Fields - Nothing at this time

Council President Hess –

Expressed appreciation to the Champaign County Citizens for Canines for their presentation at this Meeting

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Thorpe moved to adjourn this UCC Meeting at 8:10PM; Mr. Fields seconded. All were in favor of adjournment.

Council Clerk

Council President