

SPECIAL SESSION - COUNCIL CHAMBERS - CITY HALL BLDG. - LORAIN, OHIO – JANUARY 11, 2010

President Arredondo called the Special Meeting to order at approximately 6:35 p.m. Chaplain Eddie C. Edwards led Council in Prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT – 11 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Given, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Schuster, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky, Snodgrass.
ABSENT - 0 None.

READING OF SPECIAL CALL LETTER:

January 6, 2010

Honorable Members:

In accordance with ORC Section 731.46, I am calling a Special Council meeting for Monday, January 11, 2010 to begin no earlier than 6:30 p.m. to consider the following items at a Third Reading: the consent order regarding the CRA litigation settlement and ordinances reaffirming parameters for the City's CRA's.

/s/ Tony Krasienko, Mayor

**LEGISLATION –
THIRD READING**

Ordinance No. 9-10 a.) Introduced by Mr. Edwards, an ordinance approving a consent order among the City of Lorain and various other parties to facilitate the settlement of pending litigation related to the City's Community Reinvestment Area Program.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Holcomb, to pass the ordinance.

Messrs. Snodgrass, Schuster and Given requested permission to abstain from voting due to a possible conflict of interest. Without objection, permission was granted.

Moved by Mr. Fallis, supported by Mrs. Molnar, to recess into Executive Session, in accordance with ORC 121.22 G (3) to conference with the public body's attorney concerning disputes involving the public body subject to imminent or pending court action.

AYES – 7 Messrs Molnar, Fallis, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 1 Mr. Holcomb. The motion carried and Council recessed into Executive Session at 6:38 p.m.

President Arredondo called the Special Meeting back to order at 6:45 p.m. All members were present Messrs. Schuster, Given and Snodgrass did not attend the Executive Session.

PRESIDENT ARREDONDO restated the motion on the floor.

Moved by Mr. Fallis, supported by Mr. Holcomb, to pass the ordinance.

AYES – 7 Messrs. Fallis, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky

ABSTAIN - 3 Messrs. Given, Snodgrass, Schuster.

NAYS – 1 Mrs. Molnar. The ordinance passed.

Ordinance No. 10-10 b.) Introduced by Mr. Edwards, an ordinance amending Resolution No. 51-80 as amended by Ord. 29-89 and Resolution No. 19-06, to specify and reaffirm certain parameters for the City of Lorain's Community Reinvestment Areas No. 1 & 2 and declaring an emergency.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, to rescind/delete Section 5, (Page 7) the non-transferability clause and also delete the emergency clause in Section 9, (Page 9) and in the caption.

REMARKS: MR. SNODGRASS: Just prior to the meeting, I had a conversation with Attorney Riley. Although I disagree with his opinion and have had my own discussions with the representatives from the Ohio Ethics Commission, Mr. Riley also had those discussions and has come up with a new ruling as far as my ability to vote on legislation.

LAW DIRECTOR RILEY: Subsequent to the last Council action on these proposed pieces of legislation, issues were brought to the attention of the Law Department regarding the propriety of a vote by certain members of Council. Based upon the issues presented to the Law Department, research was done regarding the right of several Councilmembers to vote on the proposed new legislation. In the context of the reasons why it was raised, included the following; that people may have had homes in the areas that were under or for sale and their vote here may have put them in a conflicting position and people may be working for employers who are supported by real estate tax dollars. Attorney Budway and I spent a good part of the past three days trying to answer the questions raised by those issues. We have come to the following conclusions. The conclusions we reached are based upon our legal research and conversations with the Ohio Ethics Commission, particularly John Rosky of that office who talked to us as late as today about these very issues. He has agreed, in terms of our research and our conclusion that the fact that someone may have a home for sale at this point in time is not a sufficient interest to otherwise give rise to a conflict if in fact that person is voting on legislation that might create tax exemption for people who may or may not build or may or may not remodel in the future. The relationship between selling a home now and persons who may build in tax exempt areas in the future or remodel homes that exist in those areas is to tenuous and speculative as to give rise to a current direct peculiarly interest and therefore there is no conflict as far as the Ohio Ethics Commission generally believes. We agree with them; that concern was raised that someone may be trying to sell a home and in the future, the sale of that home could be affected positively or negatively by the passage of this sort of legislation and we do not feel that is an adequate conflict for recommending someone not vote.

Differently, what is a potential basis for a conflict is whether or not your employer's interest is advanced by your vote or exercising your vote on legislation of this nature. We have on Council, four councilmembers who work for employers who are supported in some way by capped dollars. We have people who work for the Lorain County Community College and County Auditor. Let me address those first who work for the college. LCCC is the beneficiary of a tax levy which generates dollars based upon the value of real estate within the taxing district. However, the way a tax levy operates, when it is passed the real estate value within the taxing district is determined, the tax levy millage rate is applied and an absolute number of tax dollars is determined. That absolute number of tax dollars does not vary during the term of the tax levy and for that reason; a vote by persons employed by LCCC is not deemed a conflict in my opinion nor in the opinion of the Ohio Ethics Commission. Their vote would not affect the number of tax dollars received by the county and their vote on this legislation would not give rise to a potential conflict.

Conversely, for those who work for the County Auditor, the amount of real estate tax dollar revenue received by the County of Lorain through the County Auditor is directly affected by the passage of tax exemption legislation. Different than a tax levy, the County of Lorain and its County Auditor's revenues go up and down based upon the total value of the real estate within the taxing district. If properties were going to be exempted from taxation and thereby reducing the total value of real estate within the taxing district, for the County, the number of dollars received by Lorain County by the County Auditor will be affected by a vote of those people who are employed by the County Auditor. Differently than those who are employed by the County College which receives money from a tax levy which does not vary based upon this vote. The number of dollars received by the County Commissions essentially, and the County Auditor from the Commissioners, is directly affected by a vote on this tax exemption legislation. For those persons employed by the County Auditor, we recommend that they consider not voting because their vote will affect the number of dollars received by their employer. John Rosky from the Ohio Ethics Commission agreed with that position and recommended that those persons who are employed by the County Auditor move conservatively here and our advice is conservative. We respect the fact that people may disagree with us but acting conservatively and in the best interest of our clients, these two Council people, we recommend that you consider not voting because of the potential conflict.

MR. SNODGRASS: I wish to thank the Law Director for researching this further. Again, I have spoken with Mr. Rosky as well and Mrs. Wilke. Although I do disagree with the opinion at this time, I will comply with your recommendation and err on the conservative side. I want to see this legislation put behind us so we can move forward and do not wish to hinder that in any way. By not voting, that can hopefully be accomplished.

MR. SCHUSTER: You mentioned Mr. Riley, persons with wages paid through the Real Estate Department. I am not paid through the Real Estate Department. I don't know if that would make a difference on the opinion.

LAW DIRECTOR RILEY: The interest that needs to be protected is not your personal interest but that of your employer. The question is whether your employer benefits or suffers a detriment by your vote on this legislation and not whether you personally do so. If you shift your focus and look at the interest of your employer, your appointing authority, if his coffers are either increased or decreased by your vote on this legislation, you would then be in a conflicting position. Based upon our conversations with the Ohio Ethics Commission, it would be our opinion that the conflict would be one which results in you not voting on this legislation.

MR. SCHUSTER: I would also prefer to be on the conservative side and not risk any more error and share in Mr. Snodgrass sentiments that this has gone on too long. I would not wish to jeopardize this by any means and have to drag this on further.

PRESIDENT ARREDONDO announced Messrs. Schuster, Snodgrass and Given would be abstaining from voting on this and the following three items due to a possible conflict of interest. Without objection. The motion carried.

REMARKS: MR. GATES: I support Mr. Edward's motion. While I would still prefer the CRA tax abatements to be non-transferable, it has been brought to our attention from the Legal Department that there is some "questionable legality" as far as making the tax abatements non-transferable. For that reason, I will support rescinding that amendment to allow for transferability. The last thing the City needs is more questions and legal worries over this issue.

MR. FALLIS: I also support Mr. Gates and Mr. Edwards comment based upon the information presented today that the ORC allows for transferability but is silent relative to non-transferability. We do not wish to get into a grey area of our CRA legislation that could or could not be contested in the future.

MR. SILECKY: I also support that thought. The last meeting I did support the non-transferability but as that is silent and not spelled out in the ORC, and wanting to come to a close with this legislation, I will also support to rescind that clause.

MR. HOLCOMB: Please restate the motion.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Gates, to delete Section 5, (Page 7) the non-transferability clause and also delete the emergency clause in Section 9, (Page 9) and in the caption.

REMARKS: MR. HOLCOMB: Will we re-add the emergency clause? I understand we are attempting to rescind motions made last week; however the emergency clause was put in there for a reason.

MAYOR KRASIENKO: Actually, the rescinding of that corrects some misinformation I gave to you during the last meeting. I accidentally read the emergency clause in the legislation that was in the amending legislation and not in the original ordinance (Section 8). The emergency clause is not needed in this legislation. It actually corrects an error on my part and the emergency clause is not part of the consent agreement.

MRS. MOLNAR: I think we should leave the emergency clauses in.

AYES – 8 Messrs. Molnar, Fallis, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS - 0 None. The motion carried.

PRESIDENT ARREDONDO: Council Rule 31 states it shall be in order to amend an ordinance or resolution at anytime but if amended after the Second Reading it shall be read again at a Second Reading and laid over for further and final action.

CLERK GREER advised Council may suspend Council Rule 31 with an affirmative vote of the majority of members elected.

Moved by Mr. Drwal, supported by Mr. Edwards, to suspend Council Rule 31.

AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 0 None. The motion carried and Council Rule 31 was suspended.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Fallis, to pass the ordinance as amended.

AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 0 None. The ordinance passed.

Ordinance No. 11-10 c.) Introduced by Mr. Edwards, an ordinance amending Ord. No. 179-85, as amended by Ord. No. 127-88 and 52-06 to specify and reaffirm certain parameters for the City of Lorain Community Reinvestment Area #3 and declaring an emergency.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Gates, to rescind and delete both amendments made on January 5, 2010 (the non-transferability clause in Section 5 (Page 7) and the emergency clause in Section 9 (Page 9) and the caption.

AYES – 8 Messrs. Molnar, Fallis, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS - 0 None. The motion carried unanimously.

REMARKS: MR. FALLIS: I wish to make a comment and an amendment. I did some homework on CRA tax abatements relative to cities in Ohio. Many of the key cities offer 15 years 100 percent abatement such as Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo. Painesville is 10 years at 100 percent, Canton, Youngstown, Lucas County, Montgomery County; Lima is 15 years at 50 percent abatement. Our competition basically is offering 15 years 100 percent abatement. I believe it would be wise for our City to have the maximum allowed by Ohio Revised Code, which is 15 years 100 percent. This will attract folks from outside of our community into Lorain as evidenced by the activity that happened thus far. It will increase our average medium income, which will attract businesses and also on the west side we have some areas zoned commercial. That would allow the enticement not only to residences but also an enticement to businesses. That is where the economic activity is occurring in our city. Economic forces are really advancing on the west side and we wish to do whatever we can to increase that.

In addition, by changing it to 15 years 100 percent, all of our CRA's would be consistent thereby making it easier to administrate this particular program. Based upon that foundation, I would make the following amendments which would allow us to offer the maximum tax abatement in terms of percentage and number of years allowable by ORC.

Moved by Mr. Fallis, supported by Mrs. Molnar, to amend the following:

Page 2, Residential Improvements, change 50% in the first sentence to "100%"

Page 3, in b), delete 10 years and insert "12 years"

Page 3, in c), delete 10 years and insert "15 years"

Page 5, Section 3 – Residential Improvement, delete 50% and insert "100 %"

Page 5, b), delete 10 years and insert "12 years"

Page 5, c) delete 10 years and insert "15 years"

REMARKS: MR. HOLCOMB: I would like my colleagues to take into consideration what these changes mean. I would also like to point out some misinformation in the argument that Mr. Fallis stated. He stated that in the various cities, they all offer 15 years 100 percent abatements. So does Lorain. There are two sections of this City that we just passed that receive 15 years 100 percent. Whether these cities offer this throughout their whole city is a different question that I do not have the answer. A second part of that would be to ask yourself how much vacant land is in Cleveland, undeveloped – used to be farm land vacant land. The reason they are offering 15 years 100% is to go into areas like Hough where it has worked tremendously to change old factories and burned down houses and abandoned apartment complexes into half million dollar homes and condos that stretch for blocks down Chester, between Chester and Euclid. That is what 15 years – 100% abatement is meant for. It is not meant to send people out into the middle of farm fields so we can develop more housing to create more infrastructures that the City cannot

afford. I do agree with the argument that we do need to bring in more people with a higher means of income to raise the medium of this city so businesses can develop. However, we must also encourage those people to try to move them into areas of this city where we already have infrastructure in place, to encourage neighborhoods to be not only recovered, stabilized, but also to redevelop into new neighborhoods, new dynamics to also bring new business into those areas that need it as well. I am not sure if the argument was being made by Mr. Fallis or not but it should be noted that commercial property can receive upwards of 15 % within the ordinance. We have heard the “easier to administrate” argument before. Mr. Prudoff carried that banner quite well and it led us down the path where we are today. Four years of mistrust by many people, arguments all around over this tax abatement issue. I don’t care if it is easier to administrate, it is about what is right to encourage people to move into areas of our city that need the help the most. Finally, it should be noted that the tax dollars that come out of this and I was a little confused as of last week trying to come up with numbers similar to those Mr. Fallis, over the tax savings. I even added an estimated \$2500 of property, which is probably closer to what the mean estimate would be, 15 year 100%, the difference between that and 10 years at 2,000 is nowhere near the \$30M he gave us. Looking at a lot less money, I am looking at upwards of only about \$15M to \$12M depending upon if its \$2500 or \$2000 property. The argument goes that this money will be taken out of the economy and will not be put back into allowing people to go out and spend and create more economic base for these businesses to move in. Yet, the money does not disappear, it is being collected and it is being spent with similar vendors and businesses putting people directly to work and providing the services that the residents demand and need. We have to be able to put those plow trucks on all those new streets in Martin’s Run and in Deerfield. I just ask my fellow colleagues to remember some of this information as we make a decision on this amendment right now. The competitiveness of the South Lorain or Central Lorain to Oak Point Road or Martin’s Run and the 10 years 50% as opposed to 15 years 100%, we really need to pay attention and focus on the areas of the city that need our help the most.

MRS. MOLNAR: I resent the fact that Mr. Holcomb bashed Mr. Prudoff on this floor. I think if he did his homework he would find out where the fault really falls. Secondly, before you entice anyone to South Lorain, let’s clean it up and maybe people will come. I think everyone should get 100% and I will not change my vote. I believe you owe him an apology Mr. Holcomb.

AYES – 7 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 1 Mr. Holcomb. The motion to amend carried.

Moved by Mr. Drwal, supported by Mr. Fallis, to suspend Council Rule 31.

AYES – 7 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 1 Mr. Holcomb. The motion to suspend Council Rule 31 carried.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Fallis, to pass the ordinance as amended.

AYES - 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 0 None. The ordinance passed.

Ordinance No. 12-10 d.) Introduced by Mr. Edwards, an ordinance amending Ord. No. 178-89, as amended by Ord. No. 53-06, to specify and reaffirm certain parameters for the City of Lorain Community Reinvestment Area #4 and declaring an emergency.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Gates, to rescind and delete both amendments made on January 5, 2010 (the non-transferability clause in Section 5 (Page 6) and the emergency clause in Section 8 (Page 8) and the caption.

AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 0 None. The motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Fallis, supported by Mrs. Molnar, to amend as follows:

Page 2, Residential Improvement, delete 50 % and insert “100 %”

Page 2, b) delete 10 years and insert “12 years”

Page 2, c) delete 10 years and insert “15 years”

Page 5, Residential Improvement, delete 50% and insert “100%”

Page 5, b) delete 10 years and insert “12 years”

Page 5, c) delete 10 years and insert “15 years”

AYES – 7 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 1 Mr. Holcomb. The motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Drwal, supported by Mr. Edwards, to suspend Council Rule 31.

AYES – 7 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Silecky.

ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.

NAYS – 1 Mr. Holcomb. The motion to suspend Council Rule 31 carried.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Fallis, to pass the ordinance as amended.

REMARKS: MR. HOLCOMB: I move to divide the question between the perambulatory clauses and the operative clauses. I would ask the Law Director to explain.

(Mr. Snodgrass left the meeting at this point.)

LAW DIRECTOR RILEY: I do not believe the motion to amend addressed any of the preamble sections of this ordinance. Because the ordinance is drafted in a complex way, the body of the ordinance itself lays out the proposed changes and then they are restated in a further section of the ordinance so there is no confusion.

MR. HOLCOMB: My intent is to divide the question between the perambulatory clauses and the operative clause because the perambulatory clauses do not reflect the changes made in the amendment. My intent is to vote in favor of the CRA zones to reinstate them; however, I cannot stand for the amendment made and I do not want to vote in favor of those amendments, which unfortunately in the last vote I had to do otherwise it would look as if I am voting against the whole thing. Therefore, I move to divide the question between perambulatory and operative clauses.

MR. SILECKY: Can I get more explanation, I feel similar to Mr. Holcomb but I don't quite understand the explanation.

MR. HOLCOMB: Under Robert Rules, the division of a motion can be made through stating, “I divide the question” and then state which sections you wish to divide. The division between the perambulatory, which are the WHEREAS clauses as opposed to the operative clauses, which are the Sections located below ... NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY COUNCIL, which actually enacts the ordinance. The perambulatory are the intent and the general feeling of wanting to support this.

PRESIDENT ARREDONDO: You wish to vote separately on all the WHEREAS clauses?

MR. HOLCOMB: Yes, there would be a separate vote on all the WHEREAS clauses and the main motion and then a second vote taken on all operative clauses.

(At this point, President Arredondo, Law Director Riley and Clerk Greer briefly researched Roberts Rules of Order for clarification and recommendation of Mr. Holcomb's motion.)

REMARKS: MR. HOLCOMB: From my understanding from the Law Director, I am will be unable to make the motion or I misunderstood, potentially and am not necessarily clear on this issue so I will just make a statement for the record expressing my disgust with the amendments that were made to change the ordinance especially after we replaced these ordinances last Monday. If the body had this feeling a week ago, not only should the motions not have been made to actually change out the ordinances and keep the ones we had. I still feel this is not in the best interest of the city. Keeping a level playing field for ease of administration is not something that should be a consideration when we are dealing with areas of the city that need serious reinvestment against other parts of the city that do fine on their own based on the marketability of the property itself and the amenities they have to offer. We speak of cleaning up certain parts of the city to attract people, well you can't do that unless we can bring in new residents and new tax dollars and incomes as it has been stated in to those areas as well. If you don't have an incentive to invest in your home and clean up and can just jump ship and move to the other side of the city and buy a

brand new \$200,000 home and pay less in taxes, what is the point in staying. I am going to express my disinterest in the amendments made but the general intent of the ordinance, I will support for the record.

- AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.
ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.
NAYS – 0 None. The ordinance passed.

Ordinance No. 13-10 e.) Introduced by Mr. Edwards, an ordinance amending Ord. No. 122-90, as amended by Ord. No. 54-06, to specify and reaffirm certain parameters for the City of Lorain Community Reinvestment Area #5 and declaring an emergency.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Gates, to amend the ordinance by deleting two amendments made on January 5, 2010, the non-transferability clause in Section 11 (Page 7) and the emergency clause in Section 8 (Page 8).

- AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.
ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.
NAYS - 0 None. The motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Drwal, supported by Mr. Holcomb, to suspend Council Rule 31.

- AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.
ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.
NAYS – 0 None. The motion carried.

Moved by Mr. Edwards, supported by Mr. Drwal, to pass the ordinance as amended.

- AYES – 8 Messrs. Fallis, Molnar, Gates, Drwal, Howard, Edwards, Holcomb, Silecky.
ABSTAIN – 3 Messrs. Given, Schuster, Snodgrass.
NAYS – 0 None. The ordinance passed.

REMARKS: MRS. MOLNAR: May I tell you why I voted no? The reason why I voted no on the pending litigation related to the City's CRA. The former Mayor hired the Vory's legal team in 2005 or 2006, for the litigation involving the CRA program. He had the lawyers prepare briefs that were completed to be sent to the Ohio Court of Appeals. If the Court of Appeals had ruled on the CRA matter in the very beginning, either in favor or not in favor of the city's legal complaint, their decisions may have established a legal basis as to whether Auditor Stewart had legal jurisdiction to challenge the City of Lorain's CRA program. The legal costs could have possibly been much less. Unfortunately, the present Mayor continued to hire the services of the Vory's legal team and had them prepare a stay on all briefs, plus their continuance in representing the city and this entire CRA battle with the County Auditor. Hours spent, money wasted with numerous Council Executive Sessions including the special session with a mediator at the Justice Center. Nothing was resolved nor accomplished. My own personal opinion is that the Vory's legal team did not represent the City of Lorain in its best interest and threw Council under the bus. The only persons who profited were all the lawyers, well over \$800,000, at the City of Lorain's expense. A large amount in thousands which is not revealed by the County Auditor and paid with Real Estate Assessment Fund. This fund, held by the Auditor, has at the present time a total of \$4.7M. I wonder what other uses that money, \$4.7M, can be used for other than paying unnecessary legal fees for lawsuits pertaining to the CRA litigation that should never have occurred in the first place. What puzzles me the most is how Council was told at the end of the sessions that the CRA legislation was flawed, unconstitutional and illegal. Did not the State of Ohio Division of CRA monitor and approve these abatements in the CRA areas? The County Auditor was also responsible to report to the State the abatements approved by the City of Lorain. Was this done by the Auditor? In defense of my colleagues, all rules were followed with approval of legal advice before members of Council passed all legislation. Thank you for giving me this time to explain.

Moved by Mr. Fallis, supported by Mr. Gates, to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Clerk of Council

President of Council