Minutes of a Meeting of

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY & COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

held September 12, 2016

6:00 p.m.

Present: Councilman Paul Vincent, Chair
Councilman Dwight Clark
Councilman Dave Tadych

Also Present: Councilman Tom Henderson, Councilwoman Karen Lieske, Councilman Marty Mace, Law Director Ebert, Councilman David Kos, City of Avon Lake, Ward 4, Deborah Conway, Cuyahoga County Dog Warden, Mindy Natichioni, Cuyahoga County Animal Shelter.

Audience: Tara Wendell, William Levendusky, Sarah Shofstall, Tom and Gail Moran, Linda Mottaz, Beverly Beran, Jan Neal, Jen Huellich, Mary Krauss, Dennis Driscoll, Margaret Mayerhoffer, Jan Keberle, Betsy Langer Kapp, Lysa Kenney, Elaine and Mary Lautzenheizer, Carol Miller, Bob Tuneburg, Carol Cole, Tom and Karen Peterson, Lydia DeGeorge, Susan Murnane.

Mr. Vincent called this meeting of the Environment, Safety and Community Services Committee to order at 6:00 p.m. and thanked everyone for their attendance this evening. Mr. Vincent introduced all of the City officials present.

Chapter 505 – Animal Control

Mr. Vincent stated that the focus of tonight's meeting will be a review of City of Bay Village Codified Ordinance Chapter 505, Animal Control, with input from residents for beneficial and positive possible changes to the ordinance. Hopefully, with the suggestions heard this evening, an amendment to the existing ordinance will be placed on the Council agenda on September 19, 2016.

Councilman Henderson has put together a Green Paper combining all of the many good ideas from residents. That Green Paper will be reviewed this evening. In addition, the Committee will review Chapter 505.01, Animals Running at Large, and the penalties for this section of the code.

Mr. Vincent stated that the incidents that led up to this evening began in April, 2015. The dog of a resident on Pellet Drive was involved in an attack on a neighborhood dog. More than a year later, the same resident had another dog incident with a Pit Bull, and as a result of that Mr. Henderson and Mr. Vincent received calls from residents asking what steps can be taken. Subsequently, a public meeting was held on Monday, August 29, 2016 at the Bradley Road Lodge. Residents were given the opportunity to offer suggestions for improvement at that

meeting, and also offered input through emails and telephone calls. Mr. Henderson took these suggestions and created the Green Paper that will be reviewed this evening.

Mr. Vincent introduced David Kos, Avon Lake City Councilman of Ward 4. Mr. Kos stated that a year ago the City of Avon Lake was going through this same experience. He advised that Bay Village is off to a good start and will use the Avon Lake model. He is present to offer any input and support from the knowledge he gained from this experience in Avon Lake one year ago.

Mr. Vincent advised that Mr. Henderson and he were able to meet with Mr. Kos last Wednesday to review their current ordinance, comparing it to Bay Village's code, and asked about how they arrived at some of their modifications.

Debbie Conway, the Chief Dog Warden of Cuyahoga County was introduced by Mr. Vincent. Ms. Conway stated that she also serves as the Secretary of the Ohio County Dog Wardens' Association, working on legislation throughout the state on a state level with Ohio laws concerning vicious, and dangerous dogs and animals.

Mr. Vincent introduced Mindy Natichioni, the Shelter Director at the Cuyahoga County Animal Shelter. Ms. Natichioni thanked Mr. Vincent for the opportunity to be present this evening and provide input and direction.

Mr. Vincent asked for discussion and what it means to be a victim of dog disobedience. Some of the concerns from residents were about being bitten with consequential medical expenses. One of the things to be discussed this evening is what can be done to obligate dangerous dog owners to have in the way of insurance.

Mr. Vincent introduced Jerry Frebes who represents The Insurance Office for comments on coverage through a homeowner's insurance policy.

Mr. Jerry Frebes stated that he has twenty-eight years' experience in the insurance business. He has worked in claims, litigation, and negotiation, and many were dog bite cases. Homeowners insurance does apply to a family's dog, if it is not classified as a vicious dog and on a vicious dog list. Even if a family chooses to keep a vicious dog, there is insurance available from some firms. He suggested that insurance agents be contacted to determine the coverage owned.

Mr. Frebes noted that the owner of a dog that bites a person or another animal is liable for that incident. The coverage will extend, but there may be issues in the future about getting insurance if that particular dog is kept.

For a typical Pit Bull breed, coverage through a homeowner's policy is about $650 per year for maximum coverage of $100,000. The dog must be muzzled when walked. For a dog that is not considered dangerous, most policies will cover $100,000, but it is not recommended to have any insurance for a pet under $300,000 liability coverage. It can always be raised up to $1 million without a great deal of additional expense.

Lysa Kenney, Pellet Drive, asked if an owner is liable for a dog bite that occurs prior to a dog being classified as vicious. Mr. Frebes stated that the coverage goes to the date that the accident occurred.

Dennis Driscoll, Willoway Drive, stated there is a vicious dog classification and a dangerous dog classification in the statutes. He asked if the term vicious dog being used for the insurance policy refers to the classification or would it possibly cover the dangerous dog as well as the vicious dog.

Mr. Frebes read insurance information for animals as follows: "Ineligible risk for homeowners insurance: exotic or non-domesticated animals kept on premises; livestock (no more than three); domesticated animals that have bitten or has exhibited aggressive behavior. The following breeds of dogs are ineligible, Akia, Chow, Doberman, German Shepherd, Pit Bull, Presa, Massive, Rottweilers, Staffordshire Terrier, all Wolf Hybrids." Mr. Frebes noted that some policies allow the homeowner to exclude the dog. Most companies do not even want to take the homeowner's policy at all by breed exclusion.

Chapter 505.01, Dogs, Cats, and Other Animals Running at Large

Mr. Vincent called upon Police Chief Spaetzel to explain the current problems with Chapter 505.01.

Chief Spaetzel stated that the escalating events only apply if the subsequent events are within the first twelve months from the first events. If outside that twelve month parameter, like the latest event, the penalty does not increase. There are language issues as to how it does progress.

The other factor is that no matter what the dog does when it is loose it does not affect the level of fatality. If a dog is accidently let out by a small child and exhibits friendly behavior, that is a Minor Misdemeanor. If a dog runs out of a house and bites someone, it is still a Minor Misdemeanor. There is no differentiation to the level of offense based on the dog's actions. We want to give people an opportunity to correct that behavior, but increase the penalties as we go on without a strict time limit.

Mr. Vincent stated that he will recommend leaving Chapter 505.01 (a) (b) and (c) as is. The most important part of Chapter 505.01 is (d). In its current form whoever violates this section is guilty of a Minor Misdemeanor and subject to incremental increases in Misdemeanor degrees if repeated offenses occur within the first twelve months of the first event. The proposed revision is an escalation with a Minor Misdemeanor of the first offense; no more time limit; and increase the second offense to a Fourth Degree Misdemeanor, and the third offense or subsequent offenses to a Second Degree Misdemeanor. Mr. Vincent displayed the penalties for the Misdemeanor offenses as follows:

First Degree Misdemeanor	A small fine with ability to have the record expunged a year after the offense.

Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	Possibility of Jail Sentencing up to 6 months or Probation and $1,000 fine.

Mr. Tadych noted that there are also court costs involved when these cases are brought to court, which can be up to $250 or more. Mr. Clark asked if jail time can be invoked if the fines are not paid. Law Director stated that the offender would be found to be in Contempt of Court in that instance.

Chief Spaetzel added that the state law allows for three violations before a dog is deemed dangerous. That is another option that is available for repeat offenders. If the dog is continually getting out of the home, it can be deemed dangerous.

Debbie Conway stated that the designation of the dog remains even if the owner of the dog should change. Ms. Conway stated that many times the owner of a dog is neglectful, and that is when the need exists to look at the ordinance to see what can be done about the owner and not necessarily the dog. It is not the dog that needs to be punished; it is the owner that needs to be punished. Sample legislation from South Bend, Indiana will be provided to the committee by Ms. Conway that looks at owner versus dog.

Three Strikes Rule

Ohio Revised Code (ORC) 955.22 says that no person who has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to three or more violations involving the same dog can no longer keep or harbor a dangerous dog and obtain liability insurance with an insurer authorized to write liability insurance in this state providing coverage in each occurrence because of damage or bodily injury to or death of a person caused by the dangerous dog if so ordered by a court and provide proof of that liability insurance upon request to any law enforcement officer, county dog warden, or public health official charged with enforcing this section.

Mr. Vincent asked Mr. Frebes if the City can obligate a dog owner to have this liability insurance. Mr. Ebert stated that a person charged in court on a first offense can be required by the court to obtain insurance the first time a dog is deemed dangerous. Chief Spaetzel commented that if the City were to be named added insured the protection would be extended to the City and the City would be notified if there were a cancellation of the insurance by the property owner.

Gail Moran, Pellet Drive, asked if a homeowner has a dog deemed vicious and has homeowner's insurance, and gets rid of the dog and gets another dog, is the homeowner required with that second dog to have homeowner's insurance? Mrs. Moran stated that the person could get rid of the dog, bring in another dog that is potentially vicious again. Mr. Ebert stated that if the person is charged in Rocky River Court they could ask the court for specific requirements for a five-year period of time. If the person did not comply, that would be a separate court action.

Councilman Kos of the City of Avon Lake stated that they put language in the Avon Lake ordinance that the owner or keeper of any designated dog shall provide a copy of the policy of

liability insurance to the Police Chief on a yearly basis and provide proof of that liability insurance upon request to any law enforcement officer, county dog warden, or public health official charged in this section. Penalty for non-compliance is a Misdemeanor.

Chief Spaetzel noted that if a homeowner does not have insurance or has insurance that excludes the breed of dog owned, the victim of a dog bite of that dog has no recourse other than a civil law suit. Mr. Frebes noted that from his experience most dog owners would take care of the dog if there were an incident as a conscientious act to the community.

Mary Krause, Glen Park Dr., stated that she doesn't see a differentiation in the Minor Misdemeanor penalty of a friendly dog off leash versus what happened on Pellet Drive. The penalty should escalate depending on the behavior of the dog. Mr. Vincent stated that this will be discussed under the "One Strike Rule."

Sarah Shofstall, Pellet Drive, asked if the One Strike Rule goes to the dog and not the owner. Mr. Vincent stated that the One Strike Rule goes against the dog and the owner.

Jan Keberle, Pellet Drive, asked if her understanding is correct that the ordinance would state that this dog owner could own dogs for the rest of his life and if the new dog he keeps getting is vicious because the owner is training them to be vicious, the whole story starts all over again.

Debbie Conway stated that is why they are looking at escalating the levels of penalty. One of the stipulations of the probation is that the owner can't own any dogs, or whatever the judge decides as a stipulation, which goes to the person, not necessarily the dog.

Mr. Vincent summarized the Three Strike Rule which requires that the owner of any dog (not just a dangerous dog) to keep the dog confined or restrained at home by a leash, tether, fence, supervision or enclosure, and, when not at home, to keep the dog under reasonable control of some person.

Betsy Kapp, Crestview Drive, stated that Mr. Vincent's language quotation was from the Ohio Revised Code. Section 505.01 also includes cats and other animals. When the language is revised, it should be noted that there are cats on the loose that are not so nice. Ms. Kapp wants to make sure that the revision of the ordinance includes dogs, cats and any animal at large.

One Strike Rule

Item 5) from the Green Paper of 18 items states: "The owner of any dog that kills another dog shall be fined $1,000 on the first offense so that owners of all dogs that are *potentially* dangerous (but have not yet done anything wrong) are more likely to properly restrain and/or muzzle their dog before it attacks."

Mr. Vincent read the Avon Lake legislation as follows:

One Strike Rule

(2) Notwithstanding division (j)(1) of this section, where the animal at large is not a classified dog and the animal aggressively bites a domestic animal without provocation as a result of a violation of this section, then whoever violates this section is guilty of a Misdemeanor of the third degree. Additionally, where a violation of this section involves a dog, the court may order the offender to complete dog obedience training within a specified period of time and provide written proof thereof to the Police Chief.
(3) Notwithstanding division of this section, where the animal at large is not a classified dog and the animal aggressively bites a human without provocation as a result of a violation of this section, then whoever violates this section is guilty of a Misdemeanor of the Second Degree . Additionally, where a violation of this section involves a dog, the court may order the offender to complete dog obedience training within a specified period of time and provide written proof thereof to the Police Chief.
(4) Notwithstanding division (j) (1) of this section, where the animal at large is not a classified dog and the animal aggressively bites a human or domestic animal without provocation and causes serious injury as defined by Ohio R.C. 955.11(A) (5), as a result of a violation of this section, then whoever violates this section is guilty of a Misdemeanor of the first degree. Additionally, where a violation of this section involves a dog, the court may order the offender to complete dog obedience training within a specified period of time and provide written proof thereof to the Police Chief.

Councilman Kos stated that Avon Lake is going to be looking at more strict liability language. All of their issues have resulted in convictions, but the Prosecutor and Police Chief would like a simpler path to get to that. "With provocation" and "aggressively" are terms that have to be proven.

Councilman Kos stated that in Avon Lake the incident a year ago involved a Pit Bull being walked on a leash with a harness. Another dog came charging at that dog, and started barking at the Yorkshire Terrier. The Pit Bull wiggled out of its harness, attacked and killed the other dog. Three days later two more dogs escaped and killed another dog. With the first incident, the law in existence at that time was totally inadequate. The owner was fined $150 under a Minor Misdemeanor and that dog was walking down the street the next day. Neighbors were terrified. The language of the law was strengthened to the law read by Mr. Vincent, and in July a German Shepherd broke out of his yard and attacked and killed a smaller dog. In this case the owner of the dog was found guilty of a First Degree Misdemeanor, fined $1,000 and restrictions were placed on the dog including the dangerous designation. There is a sign in front of the house where the dog lives, and the dog's picture is posted on the Avon Lake city website with a map showing where the dangerous, vicious and nuisance dogs in the City live.

Mr. Henderson stated that if this language is adopted by the City of Bay Village, an educational approach to informing residents should be included in the establishment of these new laws.

Margaret Mayerhofer noted that the education component is very important and this is the part that an Animal Control Officer could handle. Ms. Mayerhofer expressed her feeling that the first offense should be a First Degree Misdemeanor. Chief Spaetzel stated that he did not agree

because of the possibility of having to arrest someone who accidently lets a dog out. He noted that the One Strike Rule and escalating penalties takes care of the more aggressive issues.

Law Director Ebert stated that he has already informed Council to consider hiring a part time Animal Control Officer for at least twenty hours per week. An Animal Control Officer is always aware of where a problem animal lives.

Tom Moran, Pellet Drive, discussed the comments made about recommendations to a judge. Law Director Ebert and the Police Chief stated that when the person is charged the Prosecutor will advise and make recommendations for guarantees and safeguards. Police Chief Spaetzel added that public input greatly weighs on the judge as well. When there are instances such as the one that occurred recently in Bay Village, the judge recognizes through impact statements that this is serious in the neighborhood and will take that into consideration. Mr. Ebert noted that with repeat offenses the judge will ask the victim to be in court to speak.

Jim McConnell, Lake Road, stated that he served on the last dog ordinance committee. He asked if we are leaning forward to hiring a Dog Warden. Mr. Ebert stated that he is making that recommendation to City Council.

Carol Cole, Bradley Road, stated that there are cats roaming everyone, and questioned whether people are aware that cats are not permitted to roam freely. Ms. Cole also questioned about dogs defecating on tree lawns. It was noted that Section 505.13 prohibits this on public property or upon private property other than that of the owner of keeper of the animal, but it is difficult to control. Ms. Cole suggested that residents be notified through the letter that comes to each home. Mr. Ebert stated that the letter is due to be published shortly and he would see to the inclusion of that information if the letter has not gone to the printer.

Pam Cottam asked how people expect cats to stay in the owners' yards. By their very nature, it is unrealistic. Police Chief Spaetzel stated that cat complaints are not numerous, but they do get repeat offenders. He noted the difficulty in rounding up a cat. These calls are handled on a complaint driven basis.

Margaret Mayerhofer commented that she is against cats running at large and it is so important to call in and report a complaint so that there is a record of numerous complaints.

Susan Murnane, Willoway Lane, stated that she is a former Federal Prosecutor and we are concerned about serious violence to other people and other animals from neighbors' dogs. We risk not being able to deal with those problems if we get concerned with cats and friendly dogs being loose because somebody left the gate open. We should be really focused on what we really care about which are situations where animals pose a serious risk of harm to people and other animals. If we spread our enforcement resources too thin, we won't have the resources to deal with the serious problems.

Terry Peterson, Pellet Drive, asked if a person had died as a result of the injuries from the attack that occurred recently in Bay Village, what would the contrast be in what happens from a

criminal or policing action in contrast to the dog being killed. Mr. Vincent stated that it would be a First Degree Misdemeanor. Mr. Ebert noted that the Prosecutor did file on Friday, September 9, 2016, the motion to have the dogs destroyed. That will be a separate hearing.

An audience member stated that a year ago in Shaker Heights a dog killed a 71 year-old woman and the owner was found guilty of Involuntarily Manslaughter under Ohio law.

Carol Miller, Olmsted Township, a board member of dogsbite.org, stated that they are seeing Manslaughter charges, and people going to jail. In addition to the gentleman in Shaker Heights who will go to prison for two years, there is a gentleman in Oklahoma on trial for Manslaughter, Second Degree , facing two years in jail. A woman in Dayton will go to jail for three years, and a man in California is in jail for Murder for 15 years. The courts are taking this very seriously.

Chapter 505 Green Paper

Councilman Henderson stated that he would like to see a response to the incident in a two-phase approach. The first phase is changes to the penalties associated with our existing laws. Following that he would recommend a more comprehensive and deep dive into our ordinances related to dogs. After the incident, Mr. Henderson received input from many different people and what he endeavored to do was compile those into a list of ideas with a bit of information around them. That list is called a Green Paper. That is a term in the legislative process referring to a document that contains ideas pertaining potential legislative change, but not taking a position on any given idea.

The Green Paper is a list of 18 ideas that have come from other cities, Councilmen, dog experts, and members of the public. This will take a longer time to get through. It is important that we give every single one of these ideas due consideration. Whether they are included ultimately or not, is a decision for all the community to make and Council ultimately to vote upon. Each one of them is worthy of the respect of consideration.

State law contains laws that the police can use for charges. It should not have any effect whatsoever on this ordinance.

The potential of having an Animal Control Officer

Mr. Vincent stated that an Animal Control Officer (ACO) can keep track of dogs and potential problems which is difficult for the Police Department to do. Bay Village should also consider following Avon Lake's action in some cases, and pursue educational opportunities in the state and county.

Debbie Conway commented that all dogs have to be licensed, regardless of age, size, breed or temperament.

An ACO can also address the deer issue in the City and manage other forms of wildlife. The county representatives present commented on the many training opportunities available to

Animal Control Officers through the county and state. There is no County website that lists the individual municipalities and their animal related issues. The County does endeavor to work with the municipalities whenever possible.

Nuisance Dog: Topic No. 1 in Green Paper

Police Chief Spaetzel stated that currently Bay Village has a dangerous dog classification and a vicious dog classification, depending on the seriousness of an issue or another pet that was injured. The nuisance dog has a lower level of recognition based upon criteria established.

Mr. Henderson stated that this is an idea from Avon Lake and the Ohio Revised Code. Item No. 2 "Potential Nuisance Dog", aka "Pre-Bite Law," is an Avon Lake specific concept.

Debbie Conway commented that if a dog that is classified as dangerous or vicious under a City ordinance moves out of the City it no longer carries that label with them. If the dog is labeled under the Ohio Revised Code and moves to another city in Ohio the designation stays with it. The dangerous dog designation under state ordinance is a civil hearing, not a criminal proceeding. Agencies must work together to insure safety throughout the state, not just locally. Owners will move to a different city, or keep the dog with a rescue group or family in a different city.

Nuisance designations are handled mostly on a local level with the county getting involved with the dangerous and vicious designations. Nuisance dogs are also covered on the state level and can be designated without a hearing unless one is requested within ten days.

Mr. Vincent asked Chief Spaetzel to describe the process when an incident occurs. Chief Spaetzel stated that he will obtain all the information, look at the circumstances, and review the City ordinance to examine the criteria. In this instance, it was determined that the particular dog caused serious injury to one of the victims. Based on that, the dog was determined to be vicious. The owner gets served with a letter advising them of the vicious dog designation. The owner has thirty days to comply with the regulations. There are certain parts that can be taken care of immediately, such as a sign. The thirty day time frame could be shortened.

Mr. Henderson recommended adding a similar concept for local ordinances similar to the Ohio Revised Code which requires any dog that has been subject to three or more violations of ORC 955.22 to be deemed a "Dangerous Dog." Ms. Conway noted that when a dog is deemed dangerous they do have a dangerous dog tag worn on the collar which is consistent throughout the state. Ohio Law requires microchipping, and any dog contained in the County Kennel is microchipped. Microchipping is recommended over tattooing for safety purposes.

Dennis Driscoll, Willoway Drive, pointed out that part of the problem is trying to take the last ordinance we have in place and layer on it the requirements of Avon Lake. Mr. Driscoll stated that the existing ordinance has very nice language, for example "menacing fashion" and "serious injury" is in the City of Bay Village definition. Some minor changes would fit in very nicely with our current ordinance.

Mr. Henderson noted that Avon Lake attempted to make the definitions of the Avon Lake code and the Ohio Revised Code to mirror each other. In addition, they created a definition for a "Potential Nuisance Dog." That does not have a corollary on the state level, so they can define that how they please, and establish penalties as they please. Mr. Henderson suggested that the Bay Village definitions of Dangerous, Vicious and Nuisance Dogs to mirror the state so there is not any confusion or conflict between local and state.

Mr. Ebert stated that a quick-fix right now might only be the penalty clause until this is vetted completely by everyone.

Susan Murnane, Willoway Lane, stated that the ordinance states to confine the dog in a yard with 6-foot fence. Mrs. Murnane suggested changing the zoning ordinances to allow 6-foot fences in back yards, if our priorities are to confine animals. Mr. Tadych stated that he thinks of the solution more as a 6-foot pen. Mrs. Murnane noted that animals need exercise.

Mr. Vincent read the requirements for restraining animals under the Nuisance Dog category.

2) Potential Nuisance Dog (aka "Pre-Bite Law")

Mr. Vincent reviewed the requirements of Avon Lake Ordinance 618.21 defining two levels of "Potential Nuisance Dog." ("PND"). He noted that this is another way to identify dogs in the process of keeping neighborhoods safe.

Chief Spaetzel stated that using this as a harassing technique against people in the neighborhood must be avoided. Mr. Henderson explained the levels of designating dogs outlined on Page 2 of the Green Paper, and the Declassification Process for Potential Nuisance Dogs, Nuisance Dogs, and Dangerous Dogs, also outlined on Page 2 of the Green Paper. The Green Paper is attached to these minutes as if fully rewritten herein. Ms. Conway noted that there is no declassification process under state law for "Dangerous Dogs."

An audience member stated that her neighbor has a cat that occasionally wanders in her yard. If her dog goes after that cat on the dog owner's property, he could be perceived as threatening that cat. The owner does not want the dog to be classified as a nuisance dog because the person who is looking at him feels he is threatening the cat. The audience member feels that great care must be given in establishing the definitions so as to protect the dog owners as well, noting that at times her dog is frightened by children running at the dog or other inappropriate behavior.

Mindy Natichioni stated that having anti-tethering language in the ordinance is going to make the ordinance enforceable, noting that tethered dogs display aggressive behavior that can be modified or changed when not living on the end of a chain and tied to an object.

Carol Cole asked if there is a law in Bay Village about how many dogs and cats are permitted. There is no restriction on the number of pets. Mr. Tadych stated that when he was on the committee in 2012 to review the animal ordinance, the committee voted to not restrict the number of pets as long as the pets were cared for properly.

Margaret Mayerhofer stated that it was taken out due to neighbors using the restriction to complain about other neighbors.

4) "Repeat Offender Law"

Mr. Vincent reviewed the stipulations imposed if a dog owner has had two or more dangerous or vicious dogs within a five year period. After discussion with Debbie Conway, it was not recommended that the five year period not be shortened.

The Police Department is notified by Debbie Conway if a dog is registered as dangerous. They are required to be registered every year and there are certain requirements that are contained in the Ohio Revised Code.

Avon Lake Website Posting

Mr. Vincent stated that the City of Avon Lake's posting of dangerous, vicious, and nuisance dogs is very helpful to residents. Mr. Vincent is in favor of a similar posting in Bay Village, and proposes that the posting be done on the Bay Village website.

Chief Spaetzel commented that there are no dogs designated as vicious or dangerous in the City at this time. The dogs with those designations have been removed from the City.

Mr. Ebert stated that from the input this evening an amendment to the penalty close of Chapter 501 will be prepared, with a study of the full ordinance for amendments to occur at a later date.

Mr. Vincent thanked everyone for their attendance. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

_____ _____

Paul Vincent, Chair Joan Kemper, Secretary