

**URBANA CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES – JULY 9, 2013**

Council President Marty Hess called the Urbana City Council Regular Session Meeting of Tuesday, July 9, 2013 to order at 7:01PM in Court Chambers / The Municipal Building.

Attendance: All Council Members were present with the exception of Mr. Robert Thorpe. City Staff – Mayor Bill Bean; Mr. Kerry Brugger, Director of Administration; Mr. Lee Williams, Finance Director; Mr. Doug Crabill, Assistant to the Director of Administration; Mr. Chad Hall, WWTP Superintendent; and Police Chief Matt Lingrell.

Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance

Council Vote for Replacement of Council At-Large Seat

Council President Hess said, “The first thing we’re going to do tonight...we had interviews tonight for the vacant Council seat...Council had interviews since 5 o’clock...we need to vote on that...I talked to the Law Director...we have to do that in an open meeting...there will be secret ballots...I think you all have paper in front of you, so if you would write your selection...please write it legibly, so I can read it and Gail can read it.”

There was a tie between 2 of the 6 applicants that were interviewed. Council President Hess directed another vote be taken—the second vote remained tied. Councilwoman Virginia Smith requested the Council President to announce the two candidate names from the tie. Council President Hess noted the two as: Mr. Patrick Thackery and Ms. Amy White. A third vote was taken, with Ms. Amy White announced as the person to fill the open Council seat. (Votes – 3 Ms. Amy White, to 2 Mr. Patrick Thackery – on file) Council President Hess expressed appreciation to all of the candidates who came to interview; noted he would call Ms. White, and the other applicants.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Eugene Fields moved to approve the UCC Public Hearing Minutes and UCC Regular Session Minutes of June 25, 2013; Mr. Dwight Paul seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Communications

Mr. Paul moved to place the City of Urbana Shade Tree Commission Minutes (April 2013 - #108) on file; Mr. Fields seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Discussion –

Mr. Al Evans stated, “They continue to work on trying to rewrite the Regs...we’ve had a lot of discussions about we are going to address the remainder of Ash Trees that we have in the city, which are going now...so we do have some challenges. Since our last meeting, we had a successful Arbor Day celebration at all the elementary schools...”

Mr. Doug Crabill indicated, “We’re working on the inventory right now.”

“Thank you—you guys do a lot of work that nobody knows about,” said Council President Hess.

Mr. Paul moved to place the Urbana Youth Sports Schedule of Events on file; Mrs. Smith seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Discussion –

Mr. Evans said, “I think we’re moving right ahead—I know that my group’s having a fishing derby—I understand that Dr. Dave Smith (from Freshwater Farms) has stocked

some fish in there...and we have an aerator system in the Park now, so the quality of the water should be improving. Looking forward to a good time!”

Mr. Kerry Brugger added, “I think they’re still looking for a dunking booth...I think we have 1 slot open at 10 o’clock, if anyone’s interested.”

“This is really amazing—this is what the Park needs—tennis, basketball, softball, all kinds of things,” said Mr. Paul. “Go out to urbanayouthsports.com to look at the schedule, and there’s contact names in there if you need it. Hope to see everybody out there!”

“This weekend—that’s when it is!” said Mr. Fields.

“...and don’t come at 3 o’clock and expect to see me in the dunking booth...because I’ll be there in the dunking booth...so...I can’t take that at 10 o’clock,” Council President Hess added.

Administrative Reports – Board of Control

1.

Mr. Doug Hoffman moved to authorize the Director of Administration to enter into a construction contract with Dugan and Meyers Construction Company in the amount of \$17,644,344.88 for the Waste Water Treatment Plant Facility Expansion/Upgrade Project (This bid was the lower of 2 bids received / This project will be financed by a loan that is pending approval by DEFA. Loan repayments are planned to start in Jan. 2016); Mr. Fields seconded . Motion carried without objection.

Discussion –

Mr. Chad Hall said:

“As you remember, we went back out for rebid...the last low bid we received was from Dugan and Meyers, the same company. (He noted the bid of \$17,644,344.88) It’s about a \$2 ½ mil difference.

I think a lot of the difference is we added a lot more manufacturers for process equipment...maybe some of them that we didn’t really look that strongly at, or we didn’t decide on when we did the design work...because once we do do design, we pick 1 manufacturer (that we really like), and that’s when we start doing...

Dugan and Meyers was the low bid again, and they’ve done a lot of work with the Administration.”

“Can you expand on the explanation of how we went from \$19mil to \$17mil?” asked Mr. Evans.

Mr. Hall replied:

“Yeah—for instance, there’s equipment that potentially was cheaper than the capital cost maybe...but some of the items that we’re looking into (I just spoke with Dugan and Meyers today) to entertain some of the discussion of manufacturers...let’s just use pumps (for instance)...maybe the capital cost on the particular pump that we designed around is a lot more than what was bid...but even though we have that secondary pump company, we give the competition to that original manufacturer that it’s designed around.

Maybe one of the capital costs is a lot more, but in the long run...or availability of parts...we’re faced with that all of the time now...you almost have to shelf a lot of these (some of these) pump parts, or even a whole pump...just because you’ve got a 6-8 week lead time to get a piece of equipment back in! Something that’s that major, can’t sit and wait that long!

We looked at that a lot when we determined some of those manufacturers that we designed around. There's still a lot that's being decided.

Some of the major equipment—I was very satisfied, but these are one of the options.”

“So basically (what you're saying is) is that the reduction in cost from a month ago...is you shopped around for better deals on equipment,” said Mr. Evans.

Mr. Hall responded, “That—but I think that the manufacturers got a little sharper pencils.”

“Okay—maybe, a little deeper discount—maybe?” asked Mr. Evans.

“Yes--possibly,” said Mr. Hall. “We haven't seen any line items on the numbers yet, because it was kind of a lump sum bid (to a certain degree)...we had some indefinites in there, but that's more gravel/blacktop.”

“But we're getting to the same place?” asked Mr. Evans.

“Same place,” Mr. Hall verified.

Mrs. Smith asked, “The repayments will be the same as—before?”

Mr. Lee Williams replied, “We have not completed the repayment schedule at this point—the repayment schedules should be variably lower—but they'll be variably lower in years 2 and 3, not in 1.”

Mr. Doug Hoffman said, “When you put the bids back out you did add any additional equipment...you were comfortable with the equipment that you've added (while it may not have been your first choice) it's going to be suitable for what we're looking at doing.”

Mr. Hall said, “Good possibility—yes...we've got a manufacturer coming in next week to give us some more administration on their model (of their product) compared...the staff has already seen the other one...we've been doing a lot of research on these other manufacturers.”

“But you think it justifies the \$2.3mil savings...?” asked Mr. Hoffman.

“There's a couple items that I have (a) question on,” said Mr. Hall. “But I think across the board it looks pretty good.”

Mr. Hoffman added, “I just want to make sure we get the right plan, because you're spending a lot of money...and then I want to make sure we get the right equipment.”

2.

Mr. Paul moved to authorize the Director of Administration to enter into a unit price contract with Hi-Lite Markings, Inc. in the amount of \$127,196.50 for the pavement crack repair, application of rejuvenating sealant, and repainting of Runway 2-20 at Grimes Field (This bid was the only bid received for this project. The engineer's estimate for this project was \$131,100. The FAA AIP 1812 Grant will fund 90% of the project cost, and the remaining 10% will be funded by the Airport Capital Fund, and is in the 2013 Budget); Mrs. Smith seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Discussion –

Mr. Crabill said:

“This is the project that we had planned this year for the runway at the Airport with our FAA money. If you remember maybe a few months ago, Council approved a design item with RW Armstrong to design this work, and put together the bid packet (and everything) to put this out for bid...so we did that, and we got this 1 bid. We did have other bidders pick up the plans, but they did not end up bidding. The rejuvenating...basically, what they're going to do is go...the whole runway (100' wide and 4,000 some feet long)...and there's joints at the spacing, and all those joints are going to be resealed...and then

they're going to use what they call a 'rejuvenating seal' on the entire surface that's actually an FAA spec...and it preserves the life of the pavement (to get more life out of the runway)...and then after that, we'll repaint all the markings back onto the runway."

Mr. Evans asked, "Regarding funding--is this a competitive type?"

"No—our FAA funding every year is what they call 'entitlement'—by being a public use airport, we receive \$150,000 a year for the Airport (if we choose to apply and accept funds)," replied Mr. Crabill. "If we don't accept funds, the money rolls forward into the next year."

Mr. Evans asked, "Are there other grants, or other packages—that we can apply for (to do upgrades out there)?"

"We had the grant last year from the Ohio Dept. of Transportation (from their aviation side)—we did rehab of Taxiway B, and one of the aprons, I believe...and that was with ODOT money...so..." answered Mr. Crabill.

Mr. Evans made reference to a conversation he was involved in at the Airport last week (during dinner), regarding how some of the other airports in the area are being upgraded and it was said, 'are better than our Airport.'

"The question that was posed to me was, 'Why can't we get the money that some of the other cities are getting to upgrade their airports?'" said Mr. Evans.

Mr. Crabill said, "The example of the city that was being used was one north of us—I've heard the same argument...but it's a newer airport (it's less than 10 years old), and they don't have anything to spend money on."

"My answer was that we've spent a lot of money there in past years...and we're catching up, and perhaps down the road we may be able to do some upgrading," stated Mr. Evans.

Mr. Crabill indicated, "It's still on our radar, and I'll get to that—we have a Resolution tonight, so I can elaborate on that more...but I think in Bellefontaine's case, it's basically that they have a new airport, and they've been holding money back for several years...and not doing any projects. I heard the same conversation—I was there last week."

3.

Mr. Paul moved to authorize a purchase order to Software Solutions in the amount of \$12,497.25 for the annual software license and maintenance support for the financial systems that process the City's general ledger, accounts receivable, payroll, income tax and utility billings systems (Last year the charge for the software license and maintenance support was \$11,664. This expense will be charged equally to the (3) finance departments, and is in the 2013 Budget); Mr. Hoffman seconded. Motion carried without objection.

Discussion –

"There's 3 elements to this purchase order request...there's the annual license...which is just that, it's the terminology...annual license," stated Mr. Williams. "The 2 more important things are—there's unlimited maintenance, if there is a failure in the software performance...and also—there's upgrades...any software upgrades that are made to the software are included...so...there's no additional fee if the system is upgraded for whatever reason...Software Solutions will cover that in the annual licensing fee."

Mr. Paul asked, "Is this suite of software—is it working (for us)?"

Mr. Williams replied, "It's been working flawlessly for us—for 13 years."

“So no issues? They’re keeping up with everything they need to—to keep up with?” asked Mr. Paul.

Mr. Williams answered, “They are—they’re keeping pace.”

“Have you had good response with issues?” asked Mr. Paul.

“Absolutely!” replied Mr. Williams.

“Thank you,” said Mr. Paul.

Citizen Comments

Mr. Matt Fox, 723 Fountain Cir., addressed Council regarding an update on the Dog Park.

Representing the Dog Park, Mr. Fox said, “Last week we broke ground, and I’d say we’re about 80% (as far as having the fence up)...and we’re looking at about 2-4 weeks (more towards the 4), as far as having the Dog Park up and running for dogs, & their owners.”

Mr. Evans said, “Good luck—and we’re going to have a big announcement...and a ribbon cutting? A ‘bark-in,’ or...?”

“Absolutely,” replied Mr. Fox.

“Looking forward to that,” said Mr. Evans.

Mr. Hoffman said, “Good luck!”

Mr. Fields added, “Thank you!”

“Thanks for all the work you’ve done—appreciate it!” said Council President Hess.

Ordinances and Resolutions

Third Reading –

ORDINANCE NO. 4402 –

Mr. Evans moved to place ORDINANCE NO. 4402 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Paul seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Hoffman, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Paul, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes (5-0)

Discussion –

Mr. Hall explained:

“This is the Sewer Rate Increase for the Plant Project (we discussed this just a little bit ago)—the rate increase is about 15%, January 1st of 2014; 7 ½% January 2015; and an estimated/projected 8%, January 1st 2016. This is all going to be to the Capital side of the fund...”

Mr. Hall referred to a question Mrs. Smith had about the change in total cost of the Project, and whether the lowered rate would affect the percentages per year.

Mr. Williams stated:

“Just as a point of clarification—we based the original fifteen (what was it—7 ½ & 8?)—we based those 3 increases on a \$1.4mil annual debt payment. That debt payment’s come in \$33,000...every six months under...what we didn’t want to do was adjust that rate increase at this point...being that it’s that close. His operating expenses are approaching...they will approach...\$3mil a year. 1% of \$3mil is about what we’re talking about in an annual payment, and what we considered was...if there’s any technology costs...costs that he’s going to incur with the new facility (the new upgrade) he wouldn’t be incurring today...that would be covered in that differential...so at this point, we were hesitant to do anything differently...so we thought we’d leave it on the table as is, and then amend it down the road (in years 2 or 3). That’s why earlier I said,

‘In year 1, we were going to leave the rate where it is, and then look at it in year 2 and 3—as the project progresses.’”

Mrs. Smith thanked Mr. Williams for responding to her question.

Mr. Hoffman said, “It’s something we’ve got to do—I’m not a fan of it, but we have to do it. Thanks for the information, Chad.”

Mr. Fields commented, “It’s a long time coming.”

“Well, nobody likes to pay more—but I think it’s definitely worth it—you get what you pay for,” said Mr. Paul.

RESOLUTION NO. 2396 –

Mr. Paul moved to place RESOLUTION NO. 2396 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mrs. Smith seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Paul, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Hoffman, yes (5-0)

Discussion –

There were no questions/comments

Second Reading –

RESOLUTION NO. 2397 (Water Main Replacement – Wooddale/Amherst)

Mr. Crabill (again) explained the particulars of this Resolution, and requested a Suspension of the Rules and passage at this Meeting. He noted applications for this Resolution, and Resolution No. 2398, are due by July 19.

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

Council President Hess asked, “ Any discussion on that?”

At this point—Mr. Paul asked, “So what are we going to do if we don’t do this—this year?”

“If we don’t apply to Ohio Public Works Commission—the project remains part of the Phase 1 application that we put in with DEFA—so if this doesn’t get funded again through this process, it will remain in the other one...and follow through on that process. In that program, we’re 133 out of 230 on the list (which is above the cut off for funding). We’re really only pursuing this because of the interest rate savings—it’s so easy to break off.”

“Okay—it’s got to be done anyway,” said Mr. Paul

“Point of order, point of order, point of order,” said Mr. Evans. “We’re not discussing...we’re trying to decide whether we want to suspend the rules.”

“You’re right,” said Mr. Paul.

“If we were voting to suspend the three reading rules—wouldn’t a person want to have a discussion to decide if they want to (in fact) suspend the rules?” asked Mr. Hoffman.

“You can suspend the rules, and then speak to it (at) on the third reading,” said Council President Hess.

Mr. Evans said, “Yeah, your question could be about whether you want to suspend the rules, but you can’t talk about the issue until it’s brought to the floor!”

Roll call vote to approve suspension: Mr. Paul, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Hoffman, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes (5-0)

Mr. Evans moved to place RESOLUTION NO. 2397 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Paul seconded.

Roll call vote to approve: Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Hoffman, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Paul, yes (5-0)

Discussion –

Mr. Paul rehashed the previous discussion, verifying position on the list (as 133).

Mr. Crabill explained again, and said, “Through the DEFA program which has Court, Church, and Ward plus this project—this is called, ‘Phase 1 Water Main,’ which includes all of those streets...but we are way above the cut off line for that program.”

“So pulling this out isn’t going to adversely affect our rankings to get the other section of this done?” asked Mr. Paul.

“No—no...we actually...when we started going through this process last year (and pulled out of the DEFA Program last year, and reapplied)...basically, we can carve out whatever portion we want to not perform (if you will)...so...that’s what we’re looking at doing,” said Mr. Crabill.

“So what—is there an advantage financially? Obviously yes—we pull this piece out we get zero percent interest, but we wouldn’t get DEFA (basically)?” asked Mr. Paul.

“Yes,” said Mr. Crabill.

“That’s our advantage,” Mr. Paul said.

“...and it’s a project that’s pretty easy to break off from the other one, being that it’s...” said Mr. Crabill.

“So this is 560K (I’m sorry I forgot what the total number was)—if we put them all together what was the...?” asked Mr. Paul.

“Roughly—I’m thinking \$2 1/2mil on the water side (something in that range),” answered Mr. Crabill.

“Okay—and so, if we get the application on the 19th, and everything gets approved by...” Mr. Paul began.

“This program (OPWC) you apply in the Summer to your county, and then in the Fall to your district...and then you get a grant agreement in July of next year (or loan agreement—whichever),” stated Mr. Crabill. “July of next year.”

“So the earliest we’re looking at actually getting it started is...” said Mr. Paul.

“Next Fall on this portion—right—now if we go through the DEFA process for the whole thing, that could be next Spring at the earliest,” said Mr. Crabill. “Because we’ve already applied...but we’ll know this Fall whether or not we got this money...we just wouldn’t get an agreement until July of next year.”

“Okay—thanks Doug,” said Mr. Paul.

“The confusion of public funds,” Mr. Crabill added.

“What does that (roughly) equate—that 2.3% on \$560,000?” asked Mr. Hoffman. “Is it quite a bit of money?”

“Well, it’s a declining scale, because obviously the loan value changes...but it’s in the neighborhood...it starts out at about \$15,000 a year in savings, and would end up at zero obviously in the last year so...it’s a 20 year...so in 20 years, you’re looking at probably somewhere in the neighborhood of \$250,000 in savings...I mean, in interest,” Mr. Williams explained.

“So if we had to bump the project back a few months, and save a couple hundred thousand dollars it’s a no-brainer,” said Mr. Hoffman.

“Yeah—you’re not really bumping it back, because DEFA would actually be earlier...” Mr. Crabill explained the particulars.

“It makes sense—I appreciate it—good job,” said Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Evans asked, "Providing we are on board with this—when will the construction begin?"

Mr. Crabill replied, "Next Fall—we would get an agreement this week next year (so it would come out right after the 4th of July)—we'd return an agreement...we'd put it out for bid. We could potentially bid before we get the agreement...we can't go into a construction contract until we have the agreement...so realistically, August or September of next year to start construction."

"...and this project would take?" asked Mr. Evans.

"Probably would be through the Winter of that year, and then finish up in the Spring...I guess," replied Mr. Crabill.

"...and this project, once the water main is replaced will we have paving?" asked Mr. Evans.

Mr. Crabill answered, "I believe that's correct—I believe that's part of it—it's been awhile since I've looked at those numbers, but I'm pretty sure."

Mr. Evans reviewed the timeline once again, and projected the process could be finished by Summer.

"It depends upon how the DEFA project gets phased, because that's going to drag on for months...and I don't know how we're going to phase it so that the paving gets done behind it," Mr. Crabill responded. "I don't know if they'll do a section, and then pave it...and then move onto another section, and then pave it...that I don't know."

Mr. Evans stated, "The reason I'm bringing this up is—the residents in that area have been suffering under these conditions for quite sometime, and I would like to expedite any program over there that would get us a better road to ride on...so...which is the best of those two options to get that done?"

"I can't answer it, because it depends on the paving of the...the larger project," stated Mr. Crabill. "It could be later (actually) with the other one...it could be earlier depending on how it's..."

"So with this proposal you're talking...construction in the Fall, streets tore up over the Winter...and then not being paved back until Spring?" asked Mr. Evans.

"Right, and that could happen with the other...it all depends on how it's phased," said Mr. Kerry Brugger. "This is (again) just an application. We're going to come back again to make sure that we've still got the funding in moving forward."

Mr. Evans interjected, "I understand that."

"I don't want to get too far down into the minutia, at this point," Mr. Brugger emphasized.

RESOLUTION NO. 2398 – (Muzzy Rd. Bridge Widening)

Mr. Evans (following an Administrative request) moved to suspend the rules on three readings; Mr. Paul seconded.

Roll call vote to approve suspension: Mr. Hoffman, yes; Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Paul, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes (5-0)

Mr. Paul moved to place RESOLUTION NO. 2398 on the business floor for discussion and passage; Mr. Evans seconded.

Roll call vote to approve:

Mr. Fields, yes; Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Paul, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Hoffman, yes (5-0)

Discussion –

Mr. Crabill explained:

“This one is the Muzzy Rd. Bridge—basically it would be a widening project to add more feet to each side...hopefully, it would address the issues that we’ve had with trucks going across that bridge (and damaging the guardrails, and all of that—which has been a problem)...this would be about a \$100,000 project, and we’re proposing to allocate 50% of it, or \$50,000, in the 2014 Capital plan as a local match...and try to get \$50,000 in grant funding to pay the rest.”

“Well, this is an initiative that would certainly solve some problems for the people up in that area—when that thing gets shut down, it’s a problem!” stated Mr. Evans. “I would encourage my fellow Council Members to support this.”

Mr. Hoffman asked, “Is there ever a possibility that we could get a higher percentage match, or is this pretty much the best we’re looking at on a project like this?”

Mr. Crabill answered, “I think this one actually took on a higher percentage than we usually do...because it’s a lower/smaller project...usually if it’s something that we’ve done in the past, we’ve done 89% grant / 11% local...but this one we’ve actually had \$50,000 or \$60,000 in our Capital plan for a couple of years...if we could just seal it by trying to get the balance of grant funding, and make this happen (and off the list)...that’s what we’re trying for...but yeah, you can work with the grant or the matches, and that affects your point scoring...so...”

ORDINANCE NO. 4403 –

(*Read and declared a Second Reading)

Discussion –

Mr. Fields commented, “Maybe this will be a start of getting rid of other surplus homes.”

First Reading –

ORDINANCE NO. 4404 –

AN ORDINANCE ACCEPTING THE ANNEXATION OF A TRACT OF 18.484 ACRES, MORE OR LESS, TO THE CITY OF URBANA, OHIO

Legal Description – Exhibit A Included

(*Read and declared a First Reading)

Discussion –

Mr. Crabill explained:

“This is the Ordinance to accept that annexation petition—what you passed previously (earlier this year) was an Ordinance to provide services to that territory—if it were to be annexed. Since that time, the County Commissioners have voted on the annexation...allowed certain time periods to pass, we’ve allowed certain time periods to pass, and now this is the next step...basically 3 readings of an Ordinance to accept that territory. If Council votes to accept it, then it’s filed to the Secretary of State, and a few other government offices...and then it becomes official after so many days after passage...so this is just continuing the process.”

Mr. Evans asked, “Are we—I know that the County had Public Hearings at that level—are we going to have any opportunity for those people affected to come in, and express their pleasure (or displeasure) to Council about accepting this? Is that part of the process?”

Mr. Crabill replied, “I’m not familiar with it being part of the process...I think the Commissioners’ process (I think) is a little bit different, and I think it actually calls for it (the Public Hearing)...I don’t believe ours does, if I’m not mistaken.”

“So if we accept this—does it automatically come in? Is there someone else that has to make an additional decision?” asked Mr. Evans.

“No—if Council votes to accept it, it becomes official,” Mr. Crabill responded.

Mr. Evans verified, “I guess at this level—no more public input?”

Assistant Municipal Prosecutor/Staff Attorney Breanne Parcels (present in the audience) explained that the required time (waiting) periods have passed to allow for appeal.

“The City is not required to have an additional Public Hearing,” she stated.

Mr. Fields asked, “Were people made aware of that though—when they had their Public Hearing?”

Attorney Parcels replied, “Yes—at the County.”

“Okay,” said Mr. Fields.

“The Ohio Revised Code has a very specific process—if you read through it, it’s like line-by-line with the number of days, and the notifications...it’s very well spelled out,” stated Mr. Crabill.

Council President Hess said, “It used to be fairly simple to annex land, but it’s gotten quite difficult—right?”

RESOLUTION NO. 2399 –

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE CITY OF URBANA, TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS AS REQUIRED (*Read and declared a First Reading)

Mr. Crabill explained:

“This is (as I explained earlier)—basically we receive entitlement money every year--\$150,000 a year for the Airport, if we choose to apply for the money. In talking with the Airport Consultant today (and met with Kerry)...we may not apply for the FY’13, and allow our money to roll over...the reason being, we’re looking (long term) at the terminal project, and before the FAA will fund all of the architectural work on that...we have to have an architect selected to start that process. At this point we don’t, so one thing we are looking at (potentially) if we did decide to apply for this money (and not let it roll over to next year)...we may look at doing some design work on some of the pavements on the south end of the Airport (which is Hangar #9, around the paint shop...and the T-Hangars that are at the south end...looking at maybe some...rehab some of those pavements).

Those are kind of the last set of pavement that needs some attention now...so we’re kind of toying with that right now. We’re not adding, we’re just rehabbing what we have...”

Mr. Crabill indicated a distance of ‘several years from anything building-wise with the terminal (by the time we go through the architectural process, and historic coordination... and all that kind of stuff).’

He said this Resolution should be passed at the next meeting (Second Reading).

Miscellaneous Business

Mr. Fields - Nothing at this time

Mr. Hoffman - Expressed appreciation to all of the candidates who applied for the open Council seat; Noted there were a lot of good candidates / and a ‘tough decision to make’

Thanked Police Chief Matt Lingrell for the report included in the Council packets

- Mrs. Smith - Nothing at this time
- Mr. Paul - Moved to excuse Councilman Robert Thorpe from this Meeting; Mr. Fields seconded. All were in favor of excusing Mr. Thorpe.
Mentioned the decision to select a new Council Member was not easy;
Said, “Everyone was very impressive!”
Noted some good ideas were shared during the interviews, and said he is looking forward to working with the newly selected, Ms. Amy White
- Mr. Evans - Said, “Well, in our discussions about how we select or replace a Councilman—I think you all know how I feel about it, and I think that we did exactly the opposite of what our citizens want us to do (when replacing Council)! So—with that said—congratulations to Amy. I look forward to working with her, and I appreciate all the people that came out...and interviewed...and showed interest...and stepped up.
One thing (that Doug mentioned in our interviews with the folks) is that, if you were the one that didn’t get chosen—I wish that you would go ahead, and pull a petition...and run for the seat...because each of you that interviewed could do as good a job as anybody sitting right here! I would encourage you to get involved...get a petition, get your name on the ballot...and let the citizens decide who’s going to represent them.”
- Police Chief Matt Lingrell –
Nothing at this time
- Mr. Crabill - Nothing at this time
- Mr. Hall - Nothing at this time
- Mr. Williams - Nothing at this time
- Mr. Brugger - Said, “We have moved the Codified Ordinances and the Charter to the web, and now you go to our homepage urbanaohio.com ...click on Ordinances and Charter across the top bar, and that will take you to the link for Walter Drane...and then you can click on our Urbana folder...and that opens up...you can search...you can go to any Ordinance...you can go to the Charter...you can go to any section you’re looking for without having to fumble through the book...I think this is a good opportunity for us to step into the 21st Century, and make it a little bit more user friendly for people to find things...”
- Attorney Breanne Parcels then requested a brief Executive Session for “Personnel.”
- Mayor Bill Bean –
Said, “If you remember last Fall—Chief Lingrell came to us in a Work Session to talk about his idea about drug enforcement, and the direction that he would like to go...well, I have some statistics here, and I’m proud of what Chief Lingrell’s done and his Division has done in attacking our particular drug problem! In 2012—in 120 days (Jan.-Apr) there was 31 drug cases—in 2013, this year so far (Jan.-Apr) there was 75 drug cases. Drug arrests in those periods of time was 43 in 2012, and 99 in 2013...so you’ve read it in the paper, you’ve seen what they are doing...and I just want to thank Chief Lingrell (and his staff) on what they’re doing in trying to curb our drug issue here in Urbana...so...thank you, Chief!”

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Paul moved to adjourn to Executive Session (7:59PM) to discuss “Personnel”;
Mr. Fields seconded.
Roll call vote to approve: Mr. Evans, yes; Mr. Paul, yes; Mrs. Smith, yes; Mr. Hoffman,
yes; Mr. Fields, yes (5-0)

ADJOURNMENT

Following the Executive Session, Mr. Paul moved to reconvene to Regular Session and
adjourn; Mr. Fields seconded. All were in favor of adjournment.

Council Clerk

Council President

CONFIDENTIAL