

Finance Committee
Monday, April 8th, 2019
5:30 p.m., Multi-Purpose Room

In attendance: John Coyne-Chairman, Jim Shields, Paul Rose, Bill Lamb, Dennie Simpson, Eric Heffinger, and Bob Starcher

Also present: Mayor Hanwell, Greg Huber, Keith Dirham, Patrick Patton, Nino Piccoli, Jansen Wehrley, Jonathan Mendel, Kimberly Marshall, Dan Gladish, Mike Wright, Laureen Wilson, Chief Painter, Chief Kinney, Sean O'Donnell, Charles Marshall, Bob Finnan, News Channel 5, and Kevin McManus

1. Assignment of Requests for Council Action

2. 19-024-1/28 – Discussion of S. Broadway Reconstruction Project.

Mr. Patton stated we are here to try and decide how this will be funded. Patrick stated he is currently working on the plan and expects to be done in about 3 to 4 weeks, and at that time he will submit a request to council for authorization to bid and award and needs a decision on payment type.

Mr. Coyne recapped the last Council-of-the-Whole meeting and stated they all agreed that the brick should stay but the question came down to the funding of it and if there should be an assessment or not, or a combination of the two to the property owners. The ordinance from 1982 or 1983 that is in place was also discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Huber sent out a memo regarding the ordinance and a solution or non-solution to what we can or can't do with respect to that. Mr. Huber stated basically you can fund the brick road for South Broadway Street without assessment by simply not passing a Resolution of Necessity and asking Patrick to go ahead and bid it. The next issue after that, assuming we want to do that, is whether you want to take up modifying our current ordinance or not. To bind future council's on what to do with our brick roads, we would have to pass a charter amendment. Essentially, you as a Council are limited in terms of binding future councils on that issue. Future Council would and probably should be able to have flexibility to decide what they want to do when the issue comes up at that time. You could simply repeal the current ordinance and simply go forward pursuant to the law provided by the Ohio Revised Code which is what most city's follow including us for assessing streets and sidewalks. Mr. Huber stated you can't force future Councils to agree with you, although your opinion in an ordinance form would be pretty persuasive.

Mr. Coyne stated some of the discussion he has heard a lot of the South Broadway residents talk about was what occurred back in the 80's and how they were assessed 98% of the cost of repairing the brick road and the city had the other 2%. The argument of course is they didn't get what they paid for, they got the brick road and it started to fail a few years later.

Mr. Lamb said he thought Council had majority decision not to access, and doesn't feel the need to rehash the whole thing again. Mr. Lamb stated the referendum was generated in large part not simply about the brick but because of the width of the road. In the 80's S. Broadway wasn't rebuilt it was simply fixed. There was an assessment to fix the brick street. South Broadway has never been rebuilt since it was built around 1917. There is no other street in the city that has sat without being rebuilt for that many years. Bill feels the city owes it to the history of the road and

to what we do here in Medina and we owe it to the people that live there.

Mr. Starcher feels this has some historical significance due to only having two remaining brick streets in the city. The circumstances that occurred back in 1983 guides him in the direction to keep it brick with no assessment to the property owners.

Mr. Shields agrees with Mr. Lamb on the history of this street and how it was not properly done. This is our chance to correct that. Jim wants that historical image and preservation and does not want to assess the property owners.

Mr. Simpson stated he has mixed emotions. He agrees with the historic value and you can't put a dollar figure on that. He wants to move forward with brick but the problem he is dealing with is there are only a few people living on this street. He has been contacted by other residents that are against the city spending the extra money, their tax dollars for the brick and have their own streets needing repaired. He agrees the road was not repaired properly back in the 80's. Mr. Simpson said he doesn't feel the property owners should be assessed for the entire amount of the project, but he would feel comfortable with a nominal fee of \$50 to \$100 per resident to say yes you are committed and showing that to the rest of the residents that don't feel as strongly.

Mr. Rose stated he doesn't know if he can add anymore to what has already been said other than we do know that Medina is a very special place. Paul feels we need to preserve that and does agree with Mr. Simpson that some nominal fee that won't break anybody's budget, per property owner basis as opposed to per foot.

Mr. Heffinger believes our obligation to the city started well before he made Council that we were going to make this a historical look. We have an obligation to the citizens who voted in the 1980's that they wanted to protect these roads then. Eric believes whole heartedly that these two brick roads that lead into our neighborhoods help us keep that vision of the historic Medina. The city should take their part in it too and roads are one of those things that are our responsibility to do.

Mr. Coyne stated he gave a lot of thought to this. What other cities back in the day were all brick? There aren't many communities left that have brick roads and that is why he wants to keep the two we have. To redo the road without brick is \$1.2 million and \$1.4 with brick. It's a little more expensive and that's why our surrounding towns have stopped doing brick because of cost.

He said he understands the failed repairs back in the 80's and how the residents paid for most of it. It appears from everybody here, that it sounds like the city is going to pick up the cost of it because there is not enough votes to say the residents should be assessed. He does feel for the rest of the city residents and understands what Dennie is saying about we are an entire city and some people are going to be on one side of it saying why should they pay for it.

Mr. Shields moved for the approval of the South Broadway Reconstruction Project with the city picking up the cost for the entire road in brick, seconded by Mr. Coyne. Motion passes 6-1. Dennie Simpson cast a nay vote.

Mayor Hanwell stated he respectfully asks Council to get rid of this ordinance that has been kicked down the road for almost 40 years because it has been so problematic he has watched

what his law director had done and watched why the other law directors didn't want to get involved in it, and he doesn't want to pass this on to another mayor or another council.

Mr. Coyne stated they should put some language in that ordinance that kind of indicates our acknowledgment that we do believe that not only North Elmwood but South Broadway should remain brick and we believe they are historic in nature and we would like to see them maintained as a brick road even though we can't force future councils to do this and maintain them as brick roads, at least we give them our impression and observations, our vision.

Mayor Hanwell stated this ordinance deals just with the two brick roads, binds the administration, and pits neighbor against neighbor and he doesn't want to see that happen again.

Mr. Shields moved to repeal Section 903.01 (b)(3), seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

3. 19-066-4/8 – Expenditure Over \$15,000 – Fire Safety Services

Chief Painter stated FireDex gave them special pricing on it. Mr. Shields moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion passes 6-1. Paul Rose abstained.

4. 19-067- 4/8 – Then & Now – Pradco – Fire Department

Mr. Shields moved to remove RCA 19-067 from the Finance agenda, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion passes 7-0

5. 19-068- 4/8 – General Liability Insurance Renewal – USI

Mayor Hanwell stated this expired April 1st and apologizes for the emergency clause but they were not notified of the amount until March 29th. Process was problematic not the number. Sherry checks with all departments on vehicles listed annually. Mr. Shields moved to approve with the emergency Clause, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

6. 19-069-4/8 – Expand Downtown Parking District No. 1

Mr. Mendel requested to postpone this due to additional information was found about a week ago which substantially changes the information he provided with the RCA. Item tabled until further notice.

7. 19-070-4/8 – Bids, Job #1033: Lafayette Road Sidewalks

Mr. Patton stated this is a CDBG project which means most of the funding for this is coming from the grant. This is to install sidewalks on the south side of Lafayette Rd. starting at South Huntington Street and extending to Oak Street. Mr. Shields thanked Mr. Patton, he is really excited to see this happening, and has had residents ask for this on that stretch. Mr. Shields moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

8. 19-071-4/8 – Agreement w/Ohio Edison – Pole Removals & Relocations

Mr. Coyne stated this is to remove 2 poles and relocate 3. Mr. Shields moved to approve with the emergency Clause, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

9. 19-072-4/8 – City Hall Parking Structure – Design Build Contractor

Mr. Patton stated they went through the design build process for the Parking Deck. They had 5 design builders submit statements/qualifications and we narrowed those down to 3 and invited them to submit proposals. It's a two part process – technical proposal and cost proposal.

We reviewed those proposals and this past Thursday, our design review committee met and listened for several hours to oral presentations and an interview of each of the three design teams.

The committee consisted of himself, Mr. Coyne, Jonathon Mendel, Chip Klinkenberg (local Architect) and Leslie Traves (Chair of Historic Preservation Board). We rated each submittal, the three design teams submitted a total of five proposals, and two of them submitted the base proposal that is required, plus an alternate of their own design. After all that was done, we had two that came in tied by the committee in terms of technical proposal. The following day they opened the cost proposals and I've got that information here for you too, they were very close. Our consultant recommended one of these and now we wanted to present these to you. Mr. Patton showed the committee's displays and explained the different footprints. He showed that Ruhlin submitted an alternate proposal. Our RFQ laid out a footprint that basically the garage would be oriented not north and south, so that the west half of the existing city parking lot and the green space where the Masonic Temple would be was not part of the footprint. Ruhlin, in their alternate, they are proposing to put a two story parking deck that would span from Elmwood all the way across the frontage of City Hall. Patrick stated to the Finance Committee that \$3.8 million was the budget, and they've got to submit something that meets that budget and 4 of the 5 proposals did. The two that he is presenting do meet that budget. He showed a rendering of what Ruhlin's would look like and explained the canopy is not included. That was one of their deductions to get it to \$3.8 million exactly. He explained the orientation of the rendering. The entrance to the parking deck is the entrance to City Hall right now. He then showed the alternate. The Ruhlin footprint gives us 218 parking spaces in the deck and eliminates all surface parking.

The other submittal was from a company called CPS out of Pittsburg. First of all, the orientation is a little different but this is in the footprint that we defined, which is basically starting at the parking lot between Sully's and Porters, coming back I think 90 ft. to allow the future development there but then going all the way up to City Hall on the eastern side of City Hall. It leaves some surface parking in front of City Hall and leaves the Masonic Temple green space. That deck has 200 parking spaces in the parking deck and maintains 16 additional spaces in the existing parking lot of City Hall. Mr. Patton showed the rendering of the proposed deck, stating the view would be if you are standing at the back of Sully's looking towards City Hall. This one was \$3.68 million.

Mr. Coyne stated that as a member of the committee, they are very close as far as the technical design and the parking and the cost and all that, but there are some differences that he wanted to point out. On the CPS proposal, they are at \$3.68 million but notice that the towers are on the east side of the deck, whereas the Ruhlin proposal, there is a tower on the east side and the northwest side. Mr. Coyne also pointed out that this has less brick, because of the cost and no defined entrance, just a drive right in. He said this side keeps the green space of about 10,000 sq. ft. footprint on Elmwood, where the Ruhlin one gets rid of it. He said the CPS proposal goes 90 ft. from Liberty where that one goes about 135 ft. so there is a difference there. This one is a multi-story, you can see where the other deck ends up top here, where that one is a flat, kind of two story with a ramp going up, where this one is a little bit different, a little bit smaller, a little bit higher than the other one. The difference, you have to take into consideration, this one has parking in front of the deck which is shown, you can't really see it but the front little gray spot is parking in front of the deck that is not covered. They are handicapped spots, so you would probably want them covered, in my opinion, because you don't want them parking in the snow.

There is a little walkway that they have covered on the sidewalk that goes into the deck. The biggest thing to look at I guess is to think about what do you really want. That one (Ruhlin) takes a lot of footprint up above City Hall. It creates a whole front of City Hall that is going to be covered but it does create a little bit more (135-140 ft.) if you want the CIC to have somebody build on that, they would have a little bigger area to build. The advantage I see to that is only that they will build a bigger building and pay more taxes and more money will go help pay for the deck. But it eliminates this spot so you ever wanted to do office here, that's gone but you do get it now rather than later, I don't know which is better. If the green space is gone, if you ever had a problem with the court, you can't build a court there anymore because there's nowhere to build it. It's a trade-off, you have to think about what you think will be best for the city now and in the long-run. There are advantages to both of them. If this goes in front of the Historic Preservation Board, my guess is there will probably be some changes to this, of course, the entrance and maybe a cover over the parking so that will add cost to it, you have to take that into consideration and make your mind up which one you like best. I think they are both about equal. I think both parties are great, they are both good to do, one is from Pittsburgh and one is from Sharon Township so, there's that local component. You have to make a determination which direction you want to go.

Mayor Hanwell stated originally we were looking at 80 ft. x 130-140 ft. If this is done, although it takes up the green space and it's not available, it does give more depth to about the back of Sully's. If you imagine more narrow businesses, but instead of three, maybe four or five because now you have more depth and narrower, kind of like what we have immediately to the east there. He stated he is a bit apprehensive about giving away the space that could be saved for either a second commercial use that could be TIFed or a court if things don't work out. I'm not expecting that they won't, but I always like to have alternatives. That alternative is gone if we go to this.

John asked what questions Council had to ask either Patrick or himself who were on the committee. It all comes down to what you think is the best option. If you think there is more development potential on East Liberty rather than on Elmwood; that is a consideration. One has more brick of course, one does not; that's a consideration. One has more covered parking than the other one, one is only two stories, one is two and a half stories.

Mr. Lamb stated he liked the one with more brick for sure, and feels the development on East Liberty would be of more value than Elmwood but understands what the Mayor is saying with if the Court project falls through. I don't particularly like the design of that building (CPS), and maybe this would be better use of the space, if we take the court out of the picture, this is better use of the space and maybe you could make narrower and deeper buildings. The CPS proposal's footprint would work if we want to keep the Court in the picture, that footprint would work but I'd like it to look more...

Mr. Coyne stated that Jonathan had a concern of that design about the disruption of City Hall. When that's being built, where are people going to go, where are they going to park? The other point is, we talked a little bit about what's going to happen to the Federal Building because the Federal Building is located where the Federal Judge wants it to be located and there's nothing to say that in the future the Federal Judge will be around here in Medina, so that building may be sold in the future too. We don't know the timing of it because Federal appointments are for life, so the question is, is that 20 years away? I don't know. It could maybe be used for more retail, a city function, we don't know any of those things. It's just something to say, it's not going to be

there forever.

Mr. Starcher said, again looking real long range, we had an unknown like you mentioned of a courthouse. So if a courthouse at some point and time becomes available, then that property along with the open space there, that is a very viable corner there for development.

Mr. Simpson agreed with Mr. Lamb as far as the footage and frontage on Liberty Street at this time, more than Elmwood but that could change 20 years from now. Right now he likes Elmwood. As far as the consideration for the court, after the years of discussion, if the current proposal falls through, we were talking about using the existing site for adding on to the existing site versus building a brand new structure. I don't know if that's off the table again, I thought the last direction we were going, before current proposal came up, was using the existing site. I like the green space being left on that, whether we use it for a court or retail. I agree with Bill though, I like the brick, visually I like that building (Ruhlin) more than this one.

Mayor Hanwell said the existing site over there, we could get the square footage necessary for more courtrooms and things like that, but it didn't eliminate within the old building, the safe movement of in-custody from staff and citizens. He stated he has concerns with not having entrance during construction for handicapped parking if the Ruhlin proposal is chosen. With this (Ruhlin proposal) the parking is totally gone both during the construction and until it is ready to use. We have to find some mechanism to, it's one thing to tell customers and employees you have to park next to the Moose and you have to park down by Elmwood NAPA or over at the County, but handicapped folks, that's not going to work. Could we take the front area there where there's not a curb outside the doors and make a couple handicapped spots? The disadvantage is they have to come to the back of the building because they can't get up the steps, so there are other things we just don't have our heads around yet because this is the first time we've seen all of these as well.

Mr. Coyne stated two other things, the alternate that Ruhlin did, now they didn't follow the rules, right? But we talked to Desman who was the architect leading us and they said, yes sometimes people think outside the box to save money, and that's what Ruhlin did, because they didn't follow the rules. I guess everybody had the opportunity to do something different outside of the rules.

Mr. Shields asked if they followed the rules for their first option. Mr. Coyne said they did but their deck was kind of like this deck, but it had no brick, no stairways, nothing, it was all open. They couldn't do it within the parameters of \$3.8 million, so it was kind of like a 1950's deck, meaning there was nothing, just the ribbon of cable around the deck for the sides.

Mr. Lamb asked if the CPS deck could not be designed to look more like this (the Ruhlin deck). Mr. Coyne replied yes, but probably for another \$400,000-\$500,000, something like that – I don't know what the number is. Mr. Coyne stated it's just the design, because that one is only two stories, it's just a lot more flatter concrete, when it's ramped like this, that's where the costs come into play, so that's the difference. This one's bigger, the footprint is bigger, but it doesn't ramp as much so that's why the cost is different, I think that's why they did it. Mr. Lamb asked where do you put people if you eliminate all the parking. If it's a concern about saving that space for the courthouse, then some extra cost might be worthwhile. Mr. Coyne stated the other thing you have to keep in mind is that both of these projects will be done the first of December this year. They said they both can meet the timeline, they said maybe they could push it to the end of

November to get this one done, but I think they said December 19th on this one. Mr. Patton stated the required completion date was December 20th and they both beat that within two weeks of each other.

Ms. Marshall noted that building a courthouse there would not benefit the TIF because they don't pay property tax. Mr. Coyne stated the biggest difference is you get more land now and they will probably build on Liberty now instead of later. Mayor Hanwell stated that with Ruhlin's proposal it's another 55 ft. in depth off of Liberty so that is more land for the CIC, however, on this one the green area between the Federal Building parking lot and our existing parking lot, if the court does not have to go there, that's 10,000 sq. ft. times however many levels – there could be another whole commercial complex. Mr. Coyne stated that if it's not a court built there it will be part of the TIF and it would be money generated. Mr. Coyne stated that right now the footprint that would go to the CIC

Mr. Rose asked Patrick, with the design of this deck here, is it possible to take one of those corners and move it so we have one on each end? I really don't think that is a very appealing look for Elmwood. But if we could take the two towers and put one opposing corners that might dress it up a little bit. Patrick stated they talked with them a little bit in the interview and he feels there are some things they think they can do to enhance the northwest corner. He mentioned Leslie Traves was on the committee and we know we have to go to Historic Preservation, we have to get their approval and she felt that to get there approval, we would have to do something different at the northwest corner and potentially add some more enhancements other places as well. Mr. Coyne said to remember the reason it's over in the northeast corner is because it's a slope of a half a deck, so the people parking up on that top a half of the deck, if you move that tower, they would have to walk all the way from the top of that corner all the way across the deck to get to the tower. That's why they stuck it in the northeast corner.

Mr. Heffinger said if you look at this, there is nothing supposed to be her right now, so most people are either walking down here to City Hall or they're walking on to Sully's direction so that's probably why the stairwell is on that side. Mr. Coyne said the question he had about the stairway on the northeast side is there's a drop-off there, a retaining wall by the Police Station in the corner, so he doesn't know how they are going to get around but they didn't have the design enough to see how that corner would interact.

Mr. Rose said the one thing he likes about this design is the fact that we do have some quick parking places that if someone needs to come in and pay a water bill and leave, they don't have to drive around a parking deck to find a spot. Mr. Shields stated that we could have that in the parking deck too, we could have some spots reserved close. Mayor Hanwell said we could set aside 15 minute spaces, handicapped spaces, all of those, it's just the interim during construction.

Mr. Shields asked if there was any way during construction that we could reconfigure the Police parking lot because you would at least be at the level back behind the garage that you could come and get into City Hall. Mayor Hanwell said the problem would be where we move the Police to because with the volume of cars they have and then we have two public spots in the front, we would run out of spaces there. Mr. Shields said he was thinking Rite Aid or the Historical Society. The Mayor said we have the extra Police cars over there and the detective's cars, and some of the dispatcher's cars. Mr. Coyne said the Historical Society might be a good idea because he never sees any cars there, they are only there one day a week (Tuesday).

Ms. Marshall asked if anyone asked Ruhlin if they could accommodate some parking during construction. Mr. Patton stated they did, and they cannot.

Mr. Lamb said one reason it looks so different is it has a lot of brick, if the CPS deck had more brick it might look different.

Mr. Coyne stated each one has benefits and each one has problems so the question is what you think will be best for the City.

Eric Heffinger stated that right now he is leaning towards the Ruhlin proposal, because of the overall look and the opportunity to make money. He doesn't feel the Elmwood real estate is worth as much to a lot of people as Liberty is. We are banking on a lot of "what if's" if this doesn't go through with the county (the courthouse).

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Patton if the building could be turned 180 degrees. Mr. Patton said they'd have to look at it, there are elevation questions. Mr. Rose stated he's thinking if we turn it; that might be more aesthetically pleasing on Elmwood, preserve some potentially valuable property.

Mr. Coyne stated, he thinks he can tell you from listening to CPS, they really priced that out, they went the extra mile and they know exactly what the cost is going to be because they got the prices now. He thinks some of it has to do with elevation too, because they are taking into consideration trying to minimize the earth work. Mr. Rose stated that aesthetically he does like the Ruhlin one.

Mr. Simpson and Mr. Shields stated they like the Ruhlin design. Mr. Starcher said that he would like to save that space but the Ruhlin design, based on everything, the Ruhlin one.

Mr. Lamb said, could we not take out in front of City Hall, where the front door is, is there a tree lawn where we could temporarily take out that area in front and have a parallel park there? Mayor Hanwell said we could just let them park on the concrete and then we'd have to direct them around the building.

Mr. Coyne stated he likes the Ruhlin design, he likes the fact that you have more economic viability. He does understand the Mayor's argument of the green space for the court but he likes the fact that you can build a bigger building on Liberty now which would give us more money towards the deck immediately. That sounds a little more enticing to me.

Mr. Shields said it would also allow for more second and third floor apartments above. Mr. Coyne said we talked about the configuration, because there could be a hallway going north/south with the apartments instead there could be two sets of apartments.

Mr. Patton stated just to be clear before you vote, our consultant did recommend CPS and the reason was financial, it came down to that. Our budget is \$3.8 million which is what Ruhlin submitted. You will see in the next item, we already have costs above that, we are going to need \$38,000 to move the Ohio Edison poles, we have to hire a testing firm, there is a lot of concrete that needs to be tested that's on us. I estimated \$50,000, I think the last parking deck it costs us like \$33,000. I put \$50,000 but maybe it won't be that much. My point is if we accept the \$3.8 we are already above.

Mr. Shields said that on the CPS deck, Historic Preservation is going to require some additional costs. Mr. Patton stated that is true, they may on the Ruhlin one as well though, who knows.

Mr. Coyne said in the past you have worked with Ruhlin on a deck so you kind of know what they're going to do, you kind of know what they ask for. That's the known quantity; that is something that's worth something that you know so there is a benefit to that. Mr. Patton stated they were very good to work with the first time around.

Mr. Shields moved to approve and accept the proposal Alternative Option #2 from Ruhlin with the emergency clause, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion passed 7-0.

10. 19-073-4/8 – Real Estate Purchase Agreement

Mayor Hanwell stated this is the lot across from the old Napa on S. Elmwood Street that the County owned. Mr. Huber worked with the County on an agreement of \$50,000 there are other fees – closing fees, title work a few of those things that we don't have the numbers on yet but expect it to be less than a \$1,000 so we are asking for \$51,000 to be appropriated. There is a budget amendment coming up as well for the same amount and he expects it will be less than that. This is coming out of the JEDD money. Mr. Shields moved to approve with the emergency Clause, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

11. 19-074-4/8 – Revision to Job Descriptions, Amend S&B Code 31.07

Lauren Wilson stated there is a physical demand section at the end of the job descriptions and they want to move them under the essential job functions because of a legal issue. Mr. Shields moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

12. 19-047-2/25 – Budget Amendment

Mayor Hanwell stated this is the \$51,000 to be appropriated for the land acquisition. Mr. Shields moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

13. 19-076-4/8 – Increase Expenditure – MNJ Technologies, P.O. #19-852 – MCRC

Mr. Wright stated this is to increase the P.O. due to information that was unknown to IT at the time. Mr. Shields moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Simpson. Motion Passes 7-0.

14. Executive Session: (Imminent litigation/land acquisition)

It was moved by Mr. Shields and seconded by Mr. Simpson to enter into Executive Session at 7:18 p.m. to consider the purchase of property for public purposes or the sale of property at competitive bidding because premature disclosure would give an unfair competitive or bargaining advantage to a person who's personal, private interest is adverse to the general public interest, and for conferences with the City's Law Director concerning disputes involving the City which are the subject of pending or imminent court action to include the Mayor and Mr. Huber. The roll was called and approved by the yeas of B. Lamb, P. Rose, J. Shields, D. Simpson, B. Starcher, J. Coyne and E. Heffinger.

There being no further business the Finance Committee meeting adjourned at 7:31p.m.

John M. Coyne, Chairman