

**Council for the Village of Yellow Springs
Regular Session Minutes**

Virtual Meeting @ 7:00 P.M.

Monday, October 5, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

President of Council Brian Housh called the virtual meeting to order at 7:00pm.

ROLL CALL

Present via Zoom were President Housh and Council members Marianne MacQueen, Lisa Kreeger, Laura Curliss and Kevin Stokes. Also present via Zoom were Village Manager Josue Salmeron, Public Works Director Johnnie Burns, Zoning Administrator Denise Swinger, Chief Carlson, COS Florence Randolph, Sergeant Naomi Watson and Solicitor Breanne Parcels.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Florence Randolph announced that the Youth Learning Center had its first five students today, and Housh encouraged parents to contact the Youth Education Center if they need such an option. Housh noted that this is being funded through CARES Act money.

Curliss spoke about the recent updated home evaluations sent out from the Greene County Auditor. She stated that the average valuation has increased by about 19.65 percent, and reminded viewers that October 23rd is the end of the informal review process, so urged people to check their property descriptions prior to that date.

Housh stressed that the amount of property tax received by the Village is fixed, and does not increase based upon home valuation.

Salmeron congratulated Johnnie Burns and his crew on receiving the American Municipal Power Innovation Award for “Integration of Technology Services” for using GIS technology to map out infrastructure data and putting this information into the iWorQ’s tool. The Village also received an Honorable Mention for its residential solar program. The Village received the Safety Award, indicating no injuries on the job during the year.

MacQueen acknowledged Indigenous People’s Day on October 12, noting Council’s 2016 resolution to that effect.

MacQueen commented upon the Trump Car Parade which went through town recently, stating that while the parade participants had been entirely appropriate and within their rights, and that most citizens had been equally appropriate. She said that a few bystanders, however, had been highly disrespectful and had thrown frozen meat and hurled obscenities, injuring one participant. MacQueen asked that future events of this sort be referred to the JSCC to create training or a response, and stated that she will be meeting with members of the JSCC about this.

Housh noted that the JSCC has discussed responses to potentially volatile situations and how to manage potential escalation.

MacQueen acknowledged the Chief and PD crew for handling the aforementioned parade situation well.

Housh gave a primer on voting by absentee ballot and where to vote in person on November 3rd.

Housh noted that he will provide a check in on Village 2020 goals at the next meeting, and highlighted the discussion held on September 22 among Council and Staff.

Housh read a quote regarding COVID transmission, stressing that masks are still necessary. He asked that Village officers continue to offer masks and cite persons not wearing masks.

CONSENT AGENDA (7:10)

1. Minutes of September 21, 2020 Regular Session
2. Minutes of September 22, 2020 Work Session

Kreeger MOVED and Curliss SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE. The MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

The 2020 Village Goals check-in item was moved to the next meeting.

PETITIONS/COMMUNICATIONS

The Clerk will receive and file the following:

Amy Wamsley re: Proposed Annexation
Emily Seibel re: Support of CLUP
Greene County Public Health Department re: Early Intervention
Ursa Northstar re: Government Intrusion
Carol Young re: Petition from Elm Street Residents Opposing Future Parking Concept
Parkey Buckley re: Photos of Street
Selwa Whitesell/David Goode re: Opposition to Proposed Development
Marianne MacQueen re: Housing Advisory Board Minutes
Pat Dewees re: End Cash Bail (Three Attachments)
Zo Van Eaton Meister re: Alleging Wrongdoing and Requesting Resignation
Josue Salmeron re: Response to Allegations of Wrongdoing (Includes GC Sheriff Report)

MacQueen reviewed the communications received.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/LEGISLATION

First Reading of Ordinance 2020-23 Adoption of 2020 Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
Stokes MOVED and Housh SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Housh prefaced the discussion by commenting that there were statements made during the last Planning Commission (PC) meeting that mischaracterized the nature of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Housh stressed that this is a high-level document that brings in various concepts for future possibilities, a working document that anticipates possible changes and addresses potential proactive responses.

Swinger provided an overview of the CLUP update process.

Curliss asked whether the revised Future Land Use map was approved by PC.

Swinger responded that they had not seen the revised version, but that this is acceptable, since Council has the authority to modify.

Curliss commented that she finds recitals four and five unacceptable.

Curliss commented further that “Council is not a rubber stamp to PC.” She stated that public attention is often not focused until the last minute.

Parcels commented that Council is not acting as a “rubber stamp”, but that Council has the right to modify, accept in whole, or reject in whole Planning Commission’s recommendation. She clarified that a substantive change requires that the changes be made available to the public prior to passing the ordinance, while non-substantive changes do not require this availability.

Curliss disagreed with the interpretation of the word “substantive”, commenting that the public had not heard about the map change proposals.

She stated that the Village properties should be added to the future land use map and taken back to PC for their approval prior to Council passage.

Kreeger thanked the CPI team for such a participatory approach. She commented on parking, noting that efficiency within the existing footprint, acknowledging that what is in the plan does not imply tacit approval, but that it could eventually be made public, transitioned and enacted. Things do need to change over time, she pointed out, and indicated her approval for leaving the parking plan in the CLUP document.

Kreeger stated her encouragement for exploring annexation options that might further the Village’s goal of providing more affordable housing.

Kreeger stated her support for annexation of Village-owned properties.

Regarding the Mills Lawn property, Kreeger indicated that while a future plan for the property if it were to change ownership is useful, she does not want to ignore concerns expressed by the School Board regarding any designation of the property at this point.

Kreeger read the fourth recital, and commented that the word “consider” mitigates the statement, and she does not read this as a “rubber stamp”. She commented that even a one-year plan in

these times is significant, and it provides a roadmap and a commitment to explore, rather than a mandate.

Stokes agreed with inclusion of Village-owned properties on the future land use map.

Stokes read through the fourth and fifth recitals objected to by Curliss, stating that he does not see these as problematic, but that he does not see “anything lost” by sending the document back through PC.

MacQueen stated her comfort with the plan overall. She asked that any implications regarding annexation of Village-owned property be brought forth.

Megan Bachman, Yellow Springs News, asked which properties were being discussed with regard to annexation, and what the implications of this would be.

Sorrell stated that he had added language into the CLUP which contemplates annexation of land within the urban service boundary. This, he said, is consistent with the Village’s current annexation policy, which states that property can be annexed for development within the USB. Any other property, outside of the USB, may be considered by Council for annexation for reasons other than development.

Salmeron commented that controlling the destiny of the three properties proposed for addition to the future annexation map is critical: one for wellfield protection, one for control of the property on which Village equipment is stored, and the last for one “dear to the community”, that of Ellis Park. None of these is intended for development, Salmeron said.

Parcels responded to a question from Stokes, stating that the Village cannot annex non-contiguous property.

Parker Buckley, Phillips Street, spoke against the proposal for angle parking along Elm and Phillips Streets contained in the CLUP. He cited hazards to cyclists and potential “influence on future zoning”.

Matt Kirk stated his concern regarding any potential rezoning of the Mills Lawn property and opposed the angled parking proposal. Kirk commented further that he did not see any immediate need for annexation of Village-owned properties.

Terry Smith commented that the plan should be “based upon current need”. He asked what the plan was based upon, because he does not see any need for increased parking availability.

Michael Slaughter agreed with previous speakers, stating that “anything documented” can be “fallen back on and implemented quickly”.

Julie Ford opined that once in the plan the proposal would be “harder to dispute”. She opposed diagonal parking for safety reasons.

Carol Cottom stated her concern that “several large housing developments” are on the table, and asked how the developments would include features desired by the community. She asked for traffic studies for any development.

Housh commented that these are all things that will or would be considered through the hearing process.

Bernadine Parks objected to the angle parking plan.

Carol Young objected to angle parking because “the parking will bring in business, and we don’t want to be rezoned.”

Maria Booth spoke against angle parking.

Matt Kirk asked how the parking plans got added to the CLUP.

Housh responded that the Village had reached out to both the School Board and Antioch College to ensure inclusion of possibilities based upon potential upcoming changes.

Salmeron reiterated that there was aggressive outreach and a very public input process. He noted that the Steering Committee identified several key issues, and that downtown parking has been identified as an issue since 1972.

Matt Kirk reminded all that the school levy failed due to lack of transparency of process and an “out of scale” facility and unaddressed traffic issues.

Salmeron assured all that there are no immediate plans for change to that property, so change was not included in the CLUP.

Sorrell stated that the use suggested for Mills Lawn is “Public Use”, and the area is zoned as R-C.

Housh stated that most of the discussion is at the level of a specific project, which is not the purpose of the CLUP—the CLUP is an attempt to be prepared and poised for the need for change and adaptation, he said.

Housh stated that there is no need to vote at this reading, and declined to call the vote.

Housh MOVED TO INCLUDE VILLAGE-OWNED PROPERTIES ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP. STOKES SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Curliss MOVED TO REMOVE THE PARKING STUDIES FROM THE CLUP. Kreeger SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-1 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE, with MacQueen voting against.

Curliss MOVED to DESIGNATE THE “SO CALLED” VILLAGE-OWNED GLASS FARM PROPERTY AS “CONSERVATION” RATHER THAN R-C.

Curliss stated that she calls the area the “Glass Wetland” because this is a more accurate description of the hydric soils and high water table hydrology. Curliss opined that had it not been leased as farmland over the years, the land would have a hydric plant community. Curliss stated her strongly held belief that this property has more value as a preserved wetland and public conservation area. She stated that there are strategies to preserve this area and produce income which could be used, for example, to help fund affordable housing. She cited the high cost of extending infrastructure to this area, and noted that it is a Village Value not to develop greenfield areas, but to prioritize infill.

The MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF SECOND.

Curliss MOVED to REMOVE THE DETAILED GLASS FARM CONCEPT PLAN FROM THE CLUP.

Housh received clarification that Curliss intended the plan to be entirely removed, not moved to an appendix.

Kreeger SECONDED.

MacQueen responded to the motion, stating that the Glass Farm is not a wetland. She stated that the area does have hydric soils in two areas of the property, but lacks wetlands flora and fauna. MacQueen stated that the infill development encouraged in the Village is to save farmland outside the Village and so prevent sprawl. She opined that if it were to prove expensive to develop, then likely no developer would propose to take it on.

MacQueen stated that the 2010 and 2017 studies did not recommend low density development, but recommended development in keeping with the areas around it in Stancliff, Thistle Creek—medium to high density.

MacQueen proposed consideration of conservation development for the area, which contemplates a conserved area with fairly dense housing clustered near it.

Housh asked whether multiple zoning options can be proposed in the CLUP for an area.

Sorrell responded in the affirmative.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE and the MOTION FAILED 4-1 on a ROLL CALL VOTE, with all but Curliss voting against the motion.

Curliss MOVED to CREATE AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR THE GLASS FARM AREA FOR CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT. The MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF SECOND.

Kreeger MOVED to CREATE AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR THE GLASS FARM AREA FOR CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT OR MEDIUM DENSITY TO BE DETERMINED

FOLLOWING FURTHER EVALUATION OF THE SOILS AND VILLAGE NEED. Stokes SECONDED.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 3-2, with MacQueen and Curliss voting against.

Curliss MOVED TO CHANGE THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO SHOW THE WESTERN $\frac{3}{4}$ OF THE CURRENT MILLS LAWN PROPERTY AS “PARKS AND OPEN SPACE” AND THE EASTERN $\frac{1}{4}$ AS CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT. Kreeger SECONDED.

Stokes pointed out that it was just argued that the CLUP ties the Village to a specific plan, and asked whether there is a real effort here to rezone, or just an addition to the narrative.

Curliss responded that “this is a proposal to recolor the map”.

Kreeger stated her understanding that the motion proposes to signal Council’s intent that the bulk of that area remain green space rather than become developed, and that the eastern $\frac{1}{4}$ is envisioned as potentially CBD. This, she stated, is in keeping with our values.

Housh asked whether there may be an alternative to changing the map.

Sorrell stated that from a planning perspective, designating an area as Park or Open Space tends to set up public expectation of that area. He stated that the school district was not decided at the point that he was eliciting information, and that the intent was to let them lead that decision at present.

Parcels noted that the school has eminent domain, and that the Village could run into problems if the school remains and then requires another use.

Curliss registered her disagreement with Parcels’s comment.

Housh reiterated that the CLUP is a living document.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION FAILED 3-2, with MacQueen, Stokes and Housh voting against the motion.

Housh stated that the document will come back to Council with the moved amendments for a final vote on October 19th.

First Reading of Ordinance 2020-24 Repealing Section 1268.03 “Exemptions” of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Section 1268.03 “Exemptions”. Curliss MOVED and Stokes SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Swinger explained that this ordinance adds the requirement of a stormwater mitigation plan and adds specific requirements regarding the distance of a structure to power lines.

Swinger stated that when residents wish to add structures, these are sometimes located directly under power lines.

Burns stated that there are specific requirements for distance a structure should be from a power line, and he will bring specifics to a subsequent meeting.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

First Reading of Ordinance 2020-25 Repealing Section 1268.06 “Review Standards” of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Section 1268.06 “Review Standards”. Stokes MOVED and Curliss SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Swinger explained that this ordinance adds the requirement of stormwater management as specified in Section 1226.06(a)(7) or Appendix: *Stormwater Guidelines for Low Impact Development*.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

First Reading of Ordinance 2020-26 Repealing Chapter 1260 “General Provisions” of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Chapter 1226 “General Provisions”. Stokes MOVED and Curliss SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Swinger read through the additions to Chapter 1260 as follows:

- Requiring uncommon lot configurations go before the Planning Commission for approval.

- Allowing for a minimum width of 12 feet for driveways.
- Clarifying how an accessory structure is measured when considering the setback requirements, and specific requirements regarding the distance of a structure to power lines.
- Adding the requirement in Accessory Structures of stormwater management as specified in Appendix: Stormwater Guidelines for Low Impact Development.
- Adding under “ Stormwater” the requirement of stormwater management as specified in Section 1226.06(a)(7) or Appendix: *Stormwater Guidelines for Low Impact Development*.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

First Reading of Ordinance 2020-27 Repealing Chapter 1226 “Subdivision Regulations” of the Codified Ordinances of the Village Of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Chapter 1226 “Subdivision Regulations”. Stokes MOVED and Curliss SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Swinger made note of all added text falling under Ordinance 2020-27 as follows:

- **Section 1226.01 Definitions** – Added a definition for “Uncommon Lot.”
- **Section 1226.04 Submission of and action on preliminary plats** – Added a designee for the Village Manager to accept final plat drawings. Increased the number of days to receive final plats to allow for staff notification and reporting to Planning Commission.
- **Section 1226.06 Design Standards** – For undeveloped land, kept the pavement of streets and construction of water and sanitary sewer systems under Greene County’s specifications and the construction of curbs, gutters, storm sewers and driveway aprons under Village of Yellow Springs specifications.
- Added a section on guidelines for low impact development, including LID designs in lieu of a conventional stormwater system that filters stormwater from impervious surfaces and slows infiltration. In lieu of a traditional system, these LID designs may be accepted as an alternative if calculations can prove its capabilities for controlling runoff and if it will not burden the Village with long-term maintenance issues.
- Sidewalks/pedestrian walkways must be included in all new subdivisions following ADA standards. The estate street language was removed. The estate street design, an appendix to the planning code will be replaced with the *Stormwater Guidelines for Low Impact Development*.
- Alleys will be constructed according to Village of Yellow Springs standards.
- Uncommon lot configurations will require approval by the Planning Commission.
- Storm sewer design standards were added to protect from flood damage and stormwater runoff to dwellings. This included:
 - 1) hydrologic design
 - 2) hydraulic design
 - 3) structural design
 - 4) stormwater runoff criteria for retention/detention basins
 - 5) critical year storm calculations
 - 6) post construction runoff control
 - 7) a development drainage plan including hydrologic and hydraulic calculations and final construction plans
 - 8) a stormwater runoff policy
 - 9) planning guidelines for detention and retention basins
 - 10) as-built drawings
 - 11) plan approval requirements
- Maintenance of street trees by the developer increased from one to three years
- Clarification of tree lawn widths
- Referenced the managed natural landscaping in the Weeds ordinance
- Removed the additional tree plantings for Pocket Neighborhood Developments as it was determined it was excessive

Section 1226.07 Park land dedication – the previous language was written for subdivisions of fifty acres or more. The new language is based on a ratio of 1,000 persons per five acres and will be calculated by the total number of dwelling units x 3 persons per unit. The acreage will be based on the appraised value of the land at the time the developer submits an application. A part land/part fee in lieu may be accepted by the Planning Commission. Residential subdivisions of less than five units to pay a park and recreation fee in lieu of dedication established by Council. Staff is suggesting a fee in lieu of \$500 per unit for a subdivision with less than five units.

Section 1226.08 Construction of public improvements – Public improvements, including materials and installation procedures, will be in accordance with Village regulations and applicable Greene County regulations, whichever is more stringent as determined by the Village.

Section 1226.11 Minor Subdivisions – Requiring electric lines to be underground; requiring stormwater guidelines.

Section 1226.12 Replats – Requiring buildable lots be provided with utility laterals and lines; requiring stormwater guidelines.

Section 1226.13 Subdivision fees

- Adding language from the Zoning Code’s fee schedule requiring additional fees collected in cases where recovery of incurred costs is necessary.
- Park land dedication fee - for any new subdivisions of less than five units, the subdivider would pay a flat fee in lieu which will be transferred to a Park & Recreation Fund to be used towards the maintenance or equipment upgrades for the nearest dedicated park from the property. Staff is suggesting a flat fee in lieu of \$500 per unit. The fee in lieu of dedication is based on the average per acre cost of \$35,000 for undeveloped residential land.

Housh asked that the following information be provided for the final reading:

- Information as to why there is a minimum driveway width
- Information as to why Estate Streets are being eliminated
- Why are sidewalks required in new subdivisions
- Tree Lawn: does this reflect information included in the proposed tree ordinance

MacQueen asked how underground electric could be required if undergrounding is not possible in some areas of the village.

First Reading Of Ordinance 2020-28 Repealing Appendix “Estate Street Section” from Part Twelve Title Two – Planning, of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Appendix “Appendix: Stormwater Guidelines for Low Impact Development”. Curliss MOVED and MacQueen SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Swinger stated that this sets the requirement of a stormwater management plan when building any new structure that increases the impervious surface area of a property. This regulation affects any construction taking place on less than one acre. The document contains a calculation sheet for determining potential runoff and offers alternatives for mitigation.

MacQueen thanked those involved, calling the measure “huge”.

Housh CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

CITIZEN CONCERNS

The Clerk read in a letter from Ursa Northstar protesting pandemic restrictions.

SPECIAL REPORTS

Presentation of Storm Water Study. Matt Hoying, P.E. and Ryan Lefeld, P.E. from Choice One Engineering presented their analysis of the drainage issues within the village. The aim of the study is to provide the information which will enable staff to prioritize storm water system work.

The study found many deficiencies, but was meant as a high level overview.

Lefeld spoke to the value of stormwater regulations as a means to decrease impact on the system.

Lefeld did recommend developing revenue resources, whether private/public partnerships, or a stormwater utility, or both.

Hoying spoke to the value of a stormwater utility, and offered Choice One’s services in a plan to address the infrastructure upgrade best.

Hoying responded to a question from Housh, stating that he had started the study with some areas identified as problematic by Burns and his crew.

Burns noted that Choice One has assisted the Village regularly over the last several years in addressing stormwater problem areas.

OLD BUSINESS

Update on Meaningful Action re: Anti-Racism and Justice. Housh noted that Angela Allen is continuing work on the Community Sit-Downs and this should soon be ready to roll out. Housh noted Dewees’s letter regarding ending Cash Bail, and stated his intent to put this topic on the agenda for the upcoming JSCC meeting.

Housh noted a SharePoint site now available to those interested where persons can access materials.

Housh noted that Stokes is continuing his work on Implicit Bias training, and looking at how the training is tracked.

Kreeger reported on Migiwa Orimo's banner project, noting that the hardware store owners and the Baldwin family are working with the artists to facilitate the project.

CARES Act Funds Update. This information was shared during the Manager's Report.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Salmeron reported the following:

- VYS was awarded \$12k from the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services for COVID-19 related services.
- VYS was award \$ \$195,326.33 in COVID19 relief funds from the CARES Act.
 - Initial award of \$130,217.54 , supplemental award of \$65,108.79.
 - Expect a third distribution of \$135K, bring total to \$330K

Salmeron asked for Council suggestions regarding projects, stating that he will bring a final list of CARES Act projects on the 19th.

- Continue to design Public WIFI service for Downtown:
 - Changed design to Fixed Wireless Model, which will improve quality, coverage and speed of services.
 - Expanding fiber run down Corry St to waste water treatment facility.

Regarding the Vernay site cleanup, Salmeron stated that the Ohio EPA has scheduled the delineation project for VYS. Expect completion around Summer of 2021.

Timeline for the project has been adjusted: Statement of Basis is expected late 2020 with Community Engagement meeting possibly in Early 2021. Salmeron stated that he is scheduling a follow-up meeting for late October.

Salmeron stated that an offer has been made for the position of Finance Director.

Salmeron indicated that he is prepared to begin the budget review process and will bring a schedule to the following meeting.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS*

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2020-23 Adoption of 2020 Comprehensive Land Use Plan

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2020-24 Repealing Section 1268.03 "Exemptions" of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Section 1268.03 "Exemptions"

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2020-25 Repealing Section 1268.06 "Review Standards" of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Section 1268.06 "Review Standards"

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2020-26 Repealing Chapter 1260 "General Provisions" of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Chapter 1226 "General Provisions"

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2020-27 Repealing Chapter 1226 "Subdivision Regulations" of the Codified Ordinances of the Village Of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Chapter 1226 "Subdivision Regulations"

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2020-28 Repealing Appendix "Estate Street Section" from Part Twelve Title Two – Planning, of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio and Enacting New Appendix "Appendix: Stormwater Guidelines for Low Impact Development"

Emergency Reading of Ordinance 2020-29 Emergency Reading of Second Third Quarter Supplemental

Reading of Resolution 2020-44 Acknowledging the Village's Prior Vacation of the Alley Located North of Dayton Street, South of Union Street Between Stafford Street and Winter Street as Well as South Park Place Between Dayton Street and Union Street

Third Quarter Financials/Treasurer's Report
Greene County Auditor re: Home Valuations
Electric System Study
Update on Meaningful Action re: Anti-Racism and Justice
CARES Act Funds Update
Budget Process

*Future Agenda items are noted for planning purposes only and are subject to change.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:58pm, Curliss MOVED and Stokes SECONDED a MOTION TO ADJOURN. The MOTION PASSED 5-0 on a voice vote.

Brian Housh, Council President

Passed:

Attest: Judy Kintner, Clerk of Council