

**LOVELAND CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Friday, April 2, 2010**

**Call to Order &
Pledge of Allegiance**

Mayor Weisgerber called the meeting of the Loveland City Council to order at 8:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Roll Call

Council Members Present: Mayor Robert Weisgerber, Vice Mayor David Bednar, Linda Cox, Paul Elliott, Todd Osborne and Brenton Zuch.

**Motion to Excuse a
Council Member**

Mr. Elliott moved to excuse Councilman Mark Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Zuch. Mrs. Cox stated that she spoke with Mr. Fitzgerald and he indicated that he was not notified of the meeting. Mayor Weisgerber stated that he had voice messages with Mr. Fitzgerald about this meeting and the one scheduled for April 6th. Mayor Weisgerber stated that he also checked the email that notified everyone of the meeting and Mr. Fitzgerald was included on the distribution list. Roll Call: Bednar, Yes; Cox, Yes; Elliott, Yes; Osborne, Yes; Weisgerber, Yes; Zuch, Yes. The motion carried.

Also Present: City Manager Thomas Carroll, Solicitor Frank Klaine, Acting Clerk of Council Eva Parker.

Open Forum

William Bays, 1314 W. Main Street, wanted to withhold his questions until Council discussed the ordinance. Mayor Weisgerber stated that he would allow Mr. Bays to ask questions later in the meeting.

Mayor Weisgerber noted that there were two pieces of legislation on the agenda. The first pertained to an amendment of Section 905.14(g), which was introduced at the March 23, 2010, meeting. He stated that he was going to ask Council to vote that piece of legislation down because a new ordinance amending Section 905.14 would be introduced and addresses the concerns raised at the last Council meeting. Mayor Weisgerber added that Council will meet again on Tuesday, April 4th to discuss the ordinance further.

**City Manager's Reports
and Memorandums**

Mayor Weisgerber announced that there were no new City Manager reports or memorandums.

Old Business
Amendment to Section
905.14(g)

Mr. Osborne introduced for second reading an ordinance amending codified ordinance Section 905.14(g) of the Loveland Code of Ordinances governing the City's sidewalk reimbursement program.

Mayor Weisgerber reiterated that this ordinance has undergone many amendments and requested that Council vote this ordinance down. Roll Call: Cox, No; Elliott, No; Osborne, No; Weisgerber, No; Zuch, No; Bednar, No. The motion failed 0-6.

New Business
Resolution 2010-16
Resolution of Necessity for
Sidewalk Reconstruction
and Repairs

Mr. Osborne introduced a resolution of necessity by the City of Loveland as to the reconstruction and repairs of sidewalks within the City of Loveland.

Mrs. Cox asked why the resolution was changed from the last two meetings. Based upon the information she received today aprons will now be included in the assessment. Mayor Weisgerber replied that the previous resolution included driveway aprons, which is not permitted in Section 905 of the Loveland Code of Ordinances or in Section 729 of the Ohio Revised Code (ORC). The ordinance

amending Loveland Code Section 905.14 includes aprons as part of the voluntary assessment but homeowners will not be eligible for a reimbursement for the City for driveway aprons. He noted that dates have changed in the resolution as well.

Mr. Klaine stated that Section 905 of the Loveland Code of Ordinances does not permit the City to pass a resolution of necessity for driveway aprons. Therefore, the revised resolution of necessity deals only with sidewalks. Mr. Klaine stated that Section 729 of the ORC only permits resolutions of necessity for sidewalks, curbs or gutters. Mr. Klaine reiterated that the new ordinance amending Section 905 of the Loveland Code of Ordinances would include the option to include driveway aprons as part of a resolution of necessity.

Mrs. Cox asked why Council was being asked to pass a resolution of necessity before the City knew exactly what Council was going to be assessing. Mr. Klaine replied that residents were cited for driveway apron violations under Section 302 of the City Building Code. The City is now giving residents the opportunity to agree to have that assessed upon their property and it is not pursuant to the resolution of necessity.

Mr. Zuch moved to amend Section 3 of the resolution to read as follows: "That such sidewalks ~~or aprons~~ may be reconstructed or repaired by the owners of the lots or lands abutting thereon or specially benefited thereby in accordance with the specifications on file in the office of the Clerk of City Council," seconded by Mr. Osborne.

Mr. Elliott asked if the resolution of necessity allows the City to assess the property owner on a non-voluntarily basis. Mr. Klaine stated that adopting the resolution starts the process that requires the City to give a specific notice of the terms of the statute to repair the sidewalks. Individuals will have the same rights to pay for the improvements with the 50/50 program. The resolution sets up the mechanism to allow the City to assess the property voluntarily by the homeowner or gives the City the option to assess if a homeowner does not pay for the improvements.

Vice Mayor Bednar asked if assessments placed on property were due in one payment or divided up into several payments. Mr. Carroll stated that a non-voluntary assessment must be paid in a one year period.

Mr. Zuch noted that taxes are collected in arrears. He asked if an assessment is placed upon a property when would the first payment be due. Mr. Klaine stated that if the assessment is submitted in September the assessment would ~~be~~ show up on the second half taxes of 2010. If someone takes advantage of the voluntary three-year assessment the City will receive 6 payments over the term because taxes are due bi-annually.

Mr. Zuch stated that if a person has an escrow account, the mortgage company will notify the homeowner of the assessment and at that time the homeowner can pay the assessment in full or have the mortgage company divide the amount into 12 payments over the next year.

Mrs. Cox felt Council should pass the ordinance prior to passing the resolution of necessity.

Mr. Klaine said the letter for the resolution of necessity would need to be reviewed to make sure it included all of the updated information. Mrs. Cox asked if the certified letter would contain the information that was approved in the ordinance.

Mr. Carroll stated that the resolution of necessity creates the mechanism, which allows the City to go forth and manage sidewalks on behalf of the residents and assess them. The driveway apron assessment option cannot be offered until the ordinance goes into effect, 30 days after passage.

Mrs. Cox asked if the letter would explain the differences between the one percent discount and the resolution of necessity discount. Mr. Carroll stated that the one percent discount would only apply to a resident that was given an order to make repairs and failed to do so. In this case, the City would be required to make the repairs and if the resident didn't pay the City prior to assessment they would be charged one percent. The resolution of necessity is a different authority.

Mrs. Cox suggested the letters not be mailed until the ordinance amending Section 905 is passed. Mr. Carroll stated that he would take that under advisement.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to amend the resolution: Elliott, Yes; Osborne, Yes; Weisgerber, Yes; Zuch, Yes; Bednar, Yes; Cox, Yes. The motion carried with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Elliott asked for the resolution to be explained again. Mayor Weisgerber stated that if Council passes the resolution of necessity residents may opt for a voluntary assessment on their property that would be paid over a three year time period. Repairs must be completed by July 9th. If a person does not comply, the City will use the existing Code procedures for assessment.

Mayor Weisgerber noted that the ordinance detailed the constraints and options that a person may choose to pay for the repairs of their sidewalks and driveway aprons.

Mrs. Cox referenced the letter sent out on March 15th. She stated that the second page of the letter spelled out the options for payments and assessments, which needed to be updated with the new information and dates. Mayor Weisgerber agreed, noting that the letter would be changed. If Mr. Carroll waited to send the letter out until Wednesday of next week, after the passage of the ordinance at the Tuesday meeting, Mr. Carroll can reference the changes. He noted the ordinance will be eligible for referendum throughout the 30-day waiting period before the ordinance becomes effective. Mrs. Cox stated that it would be clearer to pass the ordinance first and the resolution of necessity second.

A roll call was taken on the resolution of necessity: Osborne, Yes; Weisgerber, Yes; Zuch, Yes; Bednar, Yes; Cox, No; Elliott, No. The motion carried with a vote of 4-2 adopting Resolution 2010-16.

Amendment to Code
Section 905.14(a),(b),(c),
(e),(f) and (g)

Mr. Osborne introduced for first reading an ordinance amending codified ordinance sections 905.14 (a), (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g), of the Loveland Code of Ordinances governing the City's sidewalk, carriage walk and driveway apron maintenance. Mayor Weisgerber identified the proposed amendments included in ordinance, which included: additional definitions, notice requirements, methods of notice, options for failure to make repairs, resident options for City managed repairs and reimbursement options.

As Council discussed the ordinance, several amendments were proposed. The amendments agreed upon by the majority of Council are included in the attached red-lined ordinance. All additions are underlined and deletions have been struck through. These amendments will be brought back to Council at the April 6th meeting.

Referencing Section 7 (g)(1)(A) and (B), Mr. Elliott thought that all reimbursements should be 50%, similar to the 50/50 program, even if the City managed the project or if the repairs are assessed. Mayor Weisgerber compared an assessment to the cost of tuition which can be paid monthly but if paid quarterly or annually the tuition cost is discounted. If the City manages a project and assesses the resident they should not be given the same reimbursement that a person who completes the work on their own. Mrs. Cox also favored a 50% reimbursement rather than the 75% reimbursement listed in section (A). She supported capping the price for the 50/50 program reimbursements to prevent contractors from overcharging residents.

Mr. Osborne discussed making sure that the program wasn't abused by residents making unnecessary repairs. Mr. Carroll stated that the City Engineer has implemented practices to ensure that the repairs are needed.

Mr. Carroll stated that typically the City will be able to secure a better price from a contractor than a resident could. If a resident allows the City to manage the work, at a lower price, the resident will receive a larger discount than if they would have participated in the 50/50 program. Unless they do the work on their own and only have to pay for the materials.

Mr. Zuch stated that this was the most legislating that he had done while on Council. Because there are seven Council Members with different opinions, this ordinance will never be 100% supported in every aspect. He didn't see the feasibility in offering someone a 50% reimbursement if they elected to be assessed. This would strain staff resources, be more expensive for the City, and require budgeted items to be cut. Mr. Zuch stated that the longer Council delays this process the more they are confusing the residents. He appreciated administration's efforts to find a compromise that everyone could live with.

Mr. Elliott and Mrs. Cox asked for an explanation of the 90% fee proposed in Section 7 (g)(1)(B). Mr. Osborne stated that based upon input from previous meetings and discussions with other residents, a fair and equitable solution has been offered. He supported the percentages listed in the ordinance and thought the figures were fair and offered several options for the residents.

Motion to Suspend Council Rules

Mrs. Cox moved to suspend the Council Rules to allow Mr. Bays to ask questions, seconded by Mr. Osborne. Roll Call: Weisgerber, Yes; Zuch, Yes; Bednar, Yes; Cox, Yes; Elliott, Yes; Osborne, Yes. The motion carried.

Mr. Bays stated that he attended the open house on March 24th and shared his concerns and hoped his comments were considered. He wanted to know why this project needed to be completed by the end of the summer. Due to the economy, he believed that residents of the Heights needed more time to complete the repairs. He asked Council to reconsider the deadlines for completion of the project which would be a benefit for the property owners.

Mayor Weisgerber noted that Council is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, April 6th at 8 p.m. to discuss this ordinance further. In regard to the timing of the project, if there wasn't an assessment option and everyone managed their own project there would be less issue with timing. For those who fail to complete the work, will result in the City completing the repairs and assess for the cost. The City has to submit all paperwork to the auditor by September to proceed with an assessment.

Mr. Carroll stated that the current standard for the notice of violation in the Code is a reasonable period of time but not less than 15 days. The City gave the Heights

residents 88 days of notice prior to the deadline. Initially, projects needed to be completed by June 11th that has been moved to July 9th, which would provide a total of 116 days of notice. If work isn't completed by July 9th the City will have time to contact the property owners to determine if they intend to complete the work or if the City will be required to complete the work. When the City receives the bill from the contractor, the bill will be forwarded to the property owner giving them the opportunity to pay the bill. If the bill isn't paid by the property owner the City will move toward the assessment phase.

During the Heights neighborhood meeting last August, residents in attendance asked the City to do something about the sidewalks. The City then started inspecting the sidewalks and found approximately 865 sections of sidewalk that need to be repaired, which supported the resident's concerns. Mr. Carroll noted that one appeal was filed with the City but was later withdrawn. The City has spoken with the Loveland Ministerial Association and will put residents who can't afford the project or are unable to complete the work on their own in contact with the Association. The City is obligated to have the sidewalks repaired and are trying to provide an assessment option to the residents.

Mr. Zuch stated that he didn't disagree with Mr. Bays' logic. This issue has gone unaddressed for years, so what's the rush. Mr. Zuch stated that the issue has been brought to the City's attention and the sidewalks need to be repaired before someone is injured. He noted that many sidewalks did not comply with the American Disability Act. Mr. Zuch stated that he felt the City needed to press forward with this project.

Mrs. Cox agreed that the project should be slowed down and noted that there would be more discussion on this ordinance at the next meeting. She noted that she voted against the resolution of necessity because many elements of the ordinance were unclear. She thanked Mr. Bays for his patience. Mrs. Cox said that Council can do better than a 75% or 90% reimbursement for the residents and asked them to reconsider those figures.

Mr. Bays asked if the sidewalks in the Heights had been inspected within the last 20 to 25 years. Mayor Weisgerber stated that he was unaware of inspections in the Heights. Sidewalk inspections should be a normal routine and because this has not been done in the past, major sections need to be repaired. The City is now on a 10-year rotation to get through all sections of the City. Mrs. Cox stated that in the past sidewalk repairs have been on a reactive basis rather than a proactive basis. Basically, repairs were only addressed if the City received a complaint.

Mr. Elliott asked if ICRC would be at the next meeting. He asked the City to check into that possibility.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Osborne moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Cox. Roll Call: Zuch, Yes; Bednar, Yes; Cox, Yes; Elliott, Yes; Osborne, Yes; Weisgerber, No. The motion carried 5-1. Mayor Weisgerber declared the meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.


Robert Weisgerber, Mayor


Drafted by Misty Cheshire,
Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE 2010 - _____

ORDINANCE AMENDING CODIFIED ORDINANCE SECTIONS 905.14(a), (e), (f) and (g), OF THE LOVELAND CODE OF ORDINANCES GOVERNING THE CITY'S SIDEWALK, CARRIAGE WALK AND DRIVEWAY APRON MAINTENANCE

WHEREAS, pursuant to Codified Ordinance Section 905.14 (a) the owners of land abutting any sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron shall be responsible for keeping such sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron in repair and free from nuisance; and

WHEREAS, the City of Loveland has provided in Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(g) a 50% reimbursement program to help property owners meet the requirements of Codified Ordinance Section 905.14 since at least 1991; and

WHEREAS, the City is proactively enforcing Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(a) following resident input that residents desired that their sidewalks, carriage walk or driveway apron be repaired and free of nuisance; and

WHEREAS, the City in addressing such concerns is developing a new alternative to benefit residents by allowing residents the option of having the City manage and undertake the repair of the sidewalks, carriage walk or driveway apron on the residents' behalf and bill the residents for the cost of the repair work or place the cost of the repair on the residents' tax bill as a special assessment; and

WHEREAS, City Council of the City of Loveland wishes to clarify the sidewalk reimbursement program as it exists today and provide an alternative to the residents permitting residents the option of having the City manage the sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron repairs on the residents' behalf.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Loveland, Hamilton, Clermont and Warren Counties, Ohio.

Section 1. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(a) is amended in its entirety to read as follows:

(a) The owners of land abutting any sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron shall be responsible for keeping such sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron in repair and free from nuisance.

Section 2. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(b) is hereby amended in its entirety to read as follows:

(b) Definitions.

For purposes of this Chapter, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(1) "Abut" or "abutting" means any land that borders a carriage walk, driveway apron, or sidewalk.

(2) "Carriage walk" means the paved portion of the street right-of-way set aside for pedestrian use lying between the established or presumable curb line and extending to the sidewalk where a sidewalk exists or between the established or presumable curb line and the property line where no sidewalks exist.

(3) "Driveway apron" means the paved portion of the street right-of-way set aside primarily to permit vehicular access to a driveway lying between the established or presumable curb line and the adjacent driveway or between the established or presumable curb line and the property line where no driveway exists.

(4) "Sidewalk" means the paved portion of the street right-of-way set aside for pedestrian use lying between the established or presumable curb line and the adjacent property line excluding the carriage walk.

Section 3. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(b) is amended and renumbered as 905.14(c) and subsection 905.14(b) and (b)(1) are renumbered as 905.14(c) and (c)(1) in their entirety to read as follows:

(c) Whenever it comes to the attention of the City Manager and the City Manager finds that any sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron is not in repair or is not free of nuisance, or does not conform to the provisions of the material construction specifications adopted by Ordinance 1969-17, and any subsequent ordinance supplementary thereto or amendatory thereto, the City Manager shall notify the owner of the owner of the abutting property in writing to effect such repairs as are necessary to bring this sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron into conformity with such material and construction specifications. Notice shall be served on the abutting property owner or his agent in the manner provided by law for the service of summons in civil actions Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure.

(1) Contents of Notice. The notice herein provided for shall identify the property and the location of the sidewalk and shall specify the repairs deemed necessary, and shall, in addition, specify a period of time within which the owner is required to effect such repairs. Such period of time shall be reasonable, but shall not be less than 30 days. The notice shall also advise the owner or the owner's agent that if the work is not done within the prescribed period of time that the City shall undertake such work in accordance with Section 905.14(c).

Section 4. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(c) is amended by adding subsection 905.14(c)(2) to read as follows:

(2) Service of the Notice.

The notices required in accordance with this Chapter shall be sufficient if served in accordance with any of the following methods:

(A) To the owner personally in writing or in the case of an emergency, the notice may be served verbally.

(B) To the owner by certified mail return receipt requested which shall be sent to the owner's last known place of residence or place of business with instructions to the delivering postal authority to show to whom delivered, date of delivery and address where delivered and if service is refused or unclaimed, then the procedures set forth in the Ohio Rules for Civil Procedure shall apply.

(C) If the residence or place of business of the owner is unknown, written notice may be ~~personally delivered to any agent of the owner, or in the case of an emergency, the notice may be served verbally~~ delivered to the residence by leaving a copy of the Notice at the usual place of residence of the person to be served with some person of suitable age and discretion residing therein.

(D) If the residence or place of business of the owner is unknown, a written notice may be sent to the last known residence or place of business of the agent of the owner by certified mail. (E) ~~When after a reasonable search reveals that there is no resident owner in Clermont, Hamilton and Warren Counties, Ohio or no agent available for service of a notice, or when the place of residence or place of business of the owner cannot be found, a notice may be published at least twice in a newspaper of general circulation in the City identifying the property and the nature and estimated cost of the repairs, which shall constitute the service of the notice~~ service of notice shall be made by publication in accordance with Civil Rule 4.4 of the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 5. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(b)(2) is renumbered as 905.14(c)(3) and amended in its entirety to read as follows:

(3) Right of Appeal. In the event that the owner of any lot or parcel of land abutting a sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron which is the subject of a notice of repair wishes to object to such notice of repair, such property owner shall state his objections in writing and file such written objections in the office of the City Manager within the time prescribed in the notice of repair for effecting such repairs. On filing such objections, the Council shall appoint an Appeal Board, consisting of three disinterested freeholders of the City, and shall fix the time and place for the hearing by such Appeal Board of such objections. The City Manger shall notify by certified mail the person so objecting of the time and place of such hearing. The notice shall be mailed at least five days before the date of such hearing. On appeal of a notice of repair pursuant to this section the Appeal Board may rescind, modify, or expand the content of the notice, having

due regard to the health, safety, and welfare of pedestrians using the sidewalks, carriage walk or driveway apron.

Section 6. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(e) is hereby renumbered as 905.14(f) and amended in its entirety to read as follows:

(f) Collection of Payment for Repairs from Property Owners Failing to Repair Sidewalks, Carriage Walks or Driveway Aprons. The following shall govern the collection of funds from residents who have been ordered to fix sidewalks, carriage walks or driveway aprons pursuant to 905.14 (c) and who have failed or refused to complete such work in the reasonable time provided.

- (1) On completion of any repair work to a sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron done by the City, either in case of an emergency or in a case in which the owner of the abutting property has failed or refused to perform repairs which are the subject of a notice issued by the City, the owner of the abutting property, or the abutting property owner's agent, shall be billed for the costs of the repair work. Such bill shall include all costs of temporary repairs, barricading, and other safety measures in emergency cases; all permit fees and an administrative fee, not in excess of ten percent of the City's actual costs.
- (2) Bills issued by the City under this subsection shall be payable within thirty days of the date of such bill. Bills not paid within thirty days shall be reported to Council for assessment against the abutting property as provided by the Charter, the ordinances of the City, and the statutes of the state, and shall be collected in the manner provided by law for the collection of special assessments.

Section 7. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(f) is hereby renumbered as 905.14(g) and amended in its entirety to read as follows:

(g) Resident Option for City Managed Repair. From time to time City Council may pass a Resolution of Necessity pursuant to law to cause work to be performed on sidewalks, carriage walks or driveway aprons not meeting the City's standards. In this event, the City Manager shall provide residents abutting such sidewalks, carriage walks or driveway aprons the option of having the City oversee, manage and complete the necessary sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron repairs, bill the residents abutting such sidewalks, carriage walks or driveway aprons for such work, and if not paid by the resident abutting such sidewalk, carriage walk or driveway apron assess the cost of the work to such property owner.

- (1) In the event the abutting property owner elects to have the City oversee the repair and replacement of sidewalks. The City upon the completion of such repair shall issue a bill to be paid as follows:

(A) 75% of the City's cost to repair if the resident pays said bill within 30 days from issuaneedate of such bill and no City administrative costs shall be included;

(B) 90% of the City's cost to repair if the resident elects to have the City place an assessment on resident's property and so advises the City within 30 days of issuaneedate of such bill- and no City administrative costs shall be included;

(C) In the event the property owner does not pay the bill nor elect to be assessed, City Council shall place an assessment on the property to collect 100% of the City's cost of repair plus all administrative fees incurred by the City not to exceed ten percent (10%) of the City's actual cost of repair-;

(D) The cost of repair of carriage walks and driveway aprons shall not be subject to a price reduction as set forth in (A) or (B) above and shall be due and payable within 30 days of issuaneedate of such bill and if not paid nor an election made to be assessed are subject to (C) above, but shall not include any City administrative costs.

Section 8. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(g) is hereby renumbered as 905.14(h) and amended in its entirety to read as follows:

(g) Reimbursement by City. The following sidewalk repair and replacement reimbursement provisions are hereby available to residents:

- (1) If the sidewalk repair is accomplished by the abutting property owner without having been ordered by the City Manager pursuant to 905.14(c) the City may reimburse up to fifty percent (50%) of the cost of any sidewalk repair.
- (2) The abutting property owner who is responsible for sidewalk maintenance and repair may apply to the City for such payment in accordance with procedures as established by the City Manager, which procedures shall be kept on file in the Office of the City Manager and made available to residents.
- (3) In the event that an abutting property owner is ordered to repair a sidewalk under 905.14(c) and completes the repair within the timeframe ordered by the City, the property owner shall be entitled to the same reimbursement opportunities as specified in 905.14(g)(1).
- (4) In the event the abutting property owner elects to have the City oversee the repair and replacement of sidewalks pursuant to 905.14(g), the

abutting property owner shall not be eligible for reimbursement under 905.14(g)(1) and 905.14(g)(3).

- (5) The City shall not reimburse a property owner more than 50% of the City's then-current sidewalk repair price as determined by the City Manager or the City Manager's designee. The City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine annually no later than March 31st the then-current sidewalk repair price based on recent construction costs, actual bid pricing, or other generally accepted practice.

Section 9. Codified Ordinance Section 905.14(h) is renumbered as Section 905.14(i).

Section 10. This Ordinance shall take effect from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Mayor

Clerk of Council

Approved as to Form:

Franklin A. Klaine, Jr., City Solicitor

First Reading: _____

Second Reading: _____

Passed: _____

2140570_3-4.DOC