

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday September 7, 2010

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Chris Long, Nathan Burd, Fred Deskins, Jr.

Other members of Council present: Leslie Kelly, Doug Joseph, Barth R. Cotner, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I'll call the Safety Committee Meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. First item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Are there any items tonight to be added to the agenda or withdrawn? If not, we'll move to the next item.

Item No. 3a - approval of the minutes of the Safety Committee meeting held July 6, 2010. Are there any additions or deletions to the minutes? If not, they'll stand approved.

Item No. 3b - approval of the minutes of the Special Safety Committee meeting held July 12, 2010. Are there any additions or deletions to the minutes? If not, they'll stand approved.

Item No. 3 - approval of the minutes of the Special Safety Committee held July 19, 2010. Are there any additions or deletions? If not, they'll stand approved.

Item No. 4 - Discussion: General Safety Issues - - - topic added to special Safety Committee meeting on July 12, 2010; held one week; *item discussed 7-19-2010 at Special Safety Committee meeting.* This will be presented by Councilman Long.

Mr. Long: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. The topic this evening is a carryover from what we were discussing in our Special Safety Committee Meetings. Hence then, there have been two pieces of legislation that have been introduced and we will be discussing them tonight. The first one is an ordinance that would prohibit minors from the ages of six to seventeen from being upon the public streets during school days, during the academic year while on suspension or expulsion.

Mr. Clemens: On this ordinance, members of the Safety Committee, are there any questions for Mr. Long on this, to discuss this? I think my only question was, why the emergency section to it at this time?

Mr. Long: Yes Sir, and that was put in place at the request of Chief Suci and the Reynoldsburg Police Department who felt that in order to keep things as smooth as possible within the Reynoldsburg School District, the academic years, that it be implemented as close to the beginning of the school year as possible. Naturally, we've passed that. The interest here is to get it through as quickly as possible.

Mr. Clemens: I think it would have helped a little bit if you'd had done it thirty days ago.

Mr. Long: Yes Sir.

Mr. Clemens: You know.

Mr. Long: It would have helped a lot better if we didn't take August off either.

Mr. Clemens: Then you know, we would have had it in place when school started.

Mr. Long: Yep.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions on this one? Members of Council? Okay, if not, okay. Yes, I'm sorry.

Mrs. Kelly: I have a question.

Mr. Clemens: Go ahead.

Mrs. Kelly: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Councilwoman Kelly.

Mrs. Kelly: Officer Mielke, I see you here tonight. I have a couple questions that maybe you can address or you in the back could address, either one's fine, but Mr. Long brought up the idea of the emergency as requested by the Police Department. Since we've already started school, we've been in school for a couple weeks now, do you still see this as a need to go through as an emergency? What would you see the difference being between doing it as an emergency now versus taking it through three readings?

Lieutenant O'Neill: Well, I guess the easy answer is what Councilman Long said. It's a lot easier for us if we have the students that would be affected by this ordinance, not operate under two sets of rules during this school year. I can't speak specifically with the number of students that are currently under suspension or expulsion. I'm guessing since the school year just started, it's relatively a small number and if we could get this implemented before we have several students that start falling into this category, then we wouldn't have to worry about them, like I said, operate under two separate sets of rules during this year.

Mrs. Kelly: Okay. I have an additional question for you.

Lt. O'Neill: Okay.

Mrs. Kelly: With this ordinance, it directly speaks to suspended or expelled students.

Lt. O'Neill: Yes.

Mrs. Kelly: How do you, and prior, the previous ordinance that was brought forward by the Police Department, they talked about implementation; how they were going to implement this; so with the students who were suspended or expelled, if those students are from outside Reynoldsburg, how do

you, as a Police Department, think you would, what was your plan, and how to enforce that and deal with this with students who are outside of Reynoldsburg?

Lt. O'Neill: I'm not sure exactly if I got the question right.

Mrs. Kelly: If a student comes, that is not a student of Reynoldsburg, and you, and they're walking down the street and you pull them over and they say 'I go to, I'm on virtual school', how will you go about confirming whether they're in virtual school or they're suspended or expelled?

Lt. O'Neill: Well, with the help of Officer Mielke and some of the contacts we would have scattered throughout central Ohio with the other School Resource Officers and such, we would have the ability to track down people. There's a likelihood that some of these students would be facing any kind of criminal charges after the fact. We may not be able to verify on the spot whether or not we're dealing with a virtual student, an expelled student, a home-schooled student.

Mrs. Kelly: So you may have to let the student go and just say 'okay, you're a virtual student' and then check into it later?

Lt. O'Neill: Exactly.

Mrs. Kelly: Okay. Okay. Now do you know if all of the Pickerington, Whitehall, Columbus, all the Columbus High Schools have Resource Officers in them that you guys would be able to have easy contact with?

Lt. O'Neill: I don't think all the Columbus City Schools do. I think the Pickerington Schools do, Whitehall, I think, does.

Mrs. Kelly: What about the Charter Schools around here? Do you know if, do you guys have contacts with those?

Lt. O'Neill: I don't know. Officer Mielke?

Officer Mielke: The Charter Schools do have sometimes a security specialist that works for them. I do not know of a Police Officer that's assigned or a School Resource Officer that's assigned to the schools.

Mrs. Kelly: Okay. My concern is, creating something and putting something out there that enforcement is very difficult. So we put something out there, we are going to do this, and all these kids who are suspended or expelled, we're going to make sure, you know, they're going to be held accountable for this, and for some of those kids, without easy contact, they could be let go. At the moment, we all know for adolescents, the more immediate the consequence, the better the consequence is for them; and so that's my concern, is the Police Officer's ability to implement this

fully and completely, so it's not, it doesn't become just a band-aid on a larger problem?

Lt. O'Neill: Probably the second aspect of this, is this ordinance would not only serve as an enforcement tool, but also a deterrent. If they're likely to be approached by a uniformed Police Officer while they're wandering around the city during the day, they're less likely to move forward with any kind of criminal behavior that they were planning to get themselves into.

Mrs. Kelly: The original ordinance that was put in Other Legislation, that was developed by the City Attorney and the Police Department, can you help me understand the differences between these two, as far as implementation?

Lt. O'Neill: Help you understand the differences between.....

Mrs. Kelly: The differences as far as how you would implement the original versus now, because there wasn't a suspended or expelled language in there.

Lt. O'Neill: I would think that initially our approach towards the student that was out during the school hours, would not significantly be different. We would approach them if we observed what we considered suspicious behavior.

Mrs. Kelly: Right.

Lt. O'Neill: This would be very similar to the way we take enforcement action for the current curfew that takes place between 11:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. in the late hours. You know, our Officers that work during the day are either our Detectives or our Senior Officers who are generally confined to the same patrol areas for the entire year while they're on duty. They do recognize when something's out of place, they do recognize what most people would consider to be suspicious behavior. They're not the kind of people that want to waste their own time tracking down a lot of stuff that doesn't amount to much.

Mrs. Kelly: Right.

Lt. O'Neill: Again, so initially, I don't know that there would be a significant difference between how we would approach someone until we could determine whether or not they're suspended or expelled. The a, as I understand the initial ordinance, anybody, even those who were home-schooled, virtual-schooled, or whatever, would be subject to some kind of criminal proceedings based on their being out during school hours. Now our Officers would approach them if they could determine that they are not covered by this ordinance. I would say they would send them on their way and you know, kind of keep track of who's supposed to be in the area on a day-to-day basis.

Officer Mielke: One of the things that is different between this ordinance and the original ordinance, is the fact that the criminal consequence would only occur to those who are suspended or expelled

from school. So if there is somebody that is skipping school for a short period, a brief period of time, they still are going to be approached by the Police Officer. However, they are not going to have a criminal charge pressed against them. So they can continue to have this type of behavior, because there is no criminal consequence for their behavior out in the street. That's the difference between these. It's still the tool that the Officers can use, similar to the other ordinance, because we were having _____ with people who were suspended or expelled. They were included in the original ordinance as it was written. However, this time what happens, is if we approach a kid that's just skipping school, maybe from another school district or something like that, there is no consequence for them because this ordinance would only effect those who are suspended or expelled.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Lieutenant, thank you Officer Mielke.

Mrs. Kelly: I have one more question.

Mr. Clemens: You have another question?

Mrs. Kelly: I do. This one is for, I'm sorry it's not for you, thank you very much. Mr. Hood, my question is for you. Having looked at the, I'm assuming you've looked at the ordinance regarding wrongful influence of a minor?

City Attorney Hood: Yes.

Mrs. Kelly: Can you explain to me, what would happen if Bobby gets stopped and he's suspended and he gets picked up? What would the impact then be on his parents?

Mr. Hood: Well, if they took an active step in aiding and abetting the juvenile in violating the ordinance, they could also be punished criminally as well. They could be cited with a misdemeanor.

Mrs. Kelly: And what would determine an active aiding and abetting? How would that be determined?

Mr. Hood: The Officers, you know, in the course of their investigation would have to determine that there's evidence of them doing something, allowing them to run at large, helping them, you know, violate the ordinance in some fashion. Of course there was the exception that they're on a bonafide family emergency or with a parent or guardian or something of that nature.

Mrs. Kelly: Right.

Mr. Hood: To be honest with you, since I've been the Prosecuting Attorney in Reynoldsburg, I haven't seen a violation of this nature. So I've never prosecuted one.

Mrs. Kelly: Okay. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hood: Uh-huh.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Yes, Councilman Burd.

Mr. Burd: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I just want to follow up on the deterrent aspect of this new proposal that's being discussed. I just want to point out, I think you all received in your packet the correspondence from the school district. I asked Tricia the last time she here, the last Special Committee Meeting the process of notifying parents when a student is suspended or expelled and we have received some assurances that they would add language to their notification that it would be against the law for their suspended child or their expelled child to be out in the city. Now, I'm not naive enough to think that every parent and every child's going to pay attention to that, but I have to believe that's a strong deterrent, that it would be against the law for your student during the duration of his suspension or expulsion to be out in public. I do think we heard back in June about 9 of the 15 burglaries that were solved, that some of those were kids who were suspended or expelled. I have to think that if this were in place, some of those would not have happened. Maybe not all, but no matter what ordinance is passed, we're not going to completely wipe out juvenile crime in the city. We're going to, hopefully, make some positive steps, but I just want to point out, I appreciate the district saying that they would educate both the students and the parents that this would be in our rule book if this passes.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Councilman Burd. If I remember reading that correctly, they said anything that we pass, they would greatly work with and notify the parents, things like that. So it's not just this one, but anything that we did, they would cooperate completely with us. So I, do we have another ordinance, do you have another ordinance that you....

Mr. Long: Yes, I do. The second ordinance that's up for discussion this evening also was alluded to in the discussion between Councilwoman Kelly and the City Attorney. It's the ordinance that would hold the parent responsible for a minor or guardian who violates the daytime curfew while suspended or expelled. One commonality that we've heard over the past few months and that I receive emails on, telephone calls on, and so forth, and it didn't matter what side of the issue, whether they were for or against the old one, the new one, or anything of that sort. Everybody was asking 'where are the parents'? Why aren't the parents involved? Why aren't they being held accountable for what their children are doing? And that's why this second piece of legislation is being introduced.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Councilman Long. Are there any questions, members of Committee, President Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could refer back to the first one with a followup question, and I think, just trying to be

sure what the people are saying, because I've heard people tell me, well, this new one, there won't be stops. Our Police Officers are going to stop anyone on the city streets that they have a suspicion of probably not there with the best intent, and we're, this ordinance is only talking about those who are expelled and/or suspended, which can be documented through the system. We've had the connotation of home-schoolers and home-schoolers were all upset; unfortunately, we ought to probably re-categorize everybody. You are either a student in the school system, in the buildings, or you may be receiving education somewhere within the community outside of the building, because E__ students, the ones that used to go to the ____, those are now all called home-schoolers and so I think home-schoolers are offended about thinking that we would do these type things, but the concern I have is this ordinance certainly speaks only to expelled and suspended.

Mr. Long: Uh-hum.

Mr. Hills: What concerns me with what I heard from the Lieutenant, we're going to stop somebody and they could be from Columbus and they could be here for the purpose of selling drugs, shooting somebody, or robbing somebody's house, and we're going to say 'oops, well, we can't show that you're suspended or expelled, so we'll see you later'. Now I think the Officer's probably going to find another way to keep that person in control until all the investigations are done, but I guess, I'm seeing the first ordinance that was proposed, which came with the recommendation at the time it was proposed, the Administration, Schools, Police Department and the City Attorney kind of addressed that issue, and I believe it was sampled after one that has been proven, it did work in Columbus, and now we have altered, or a group of us are trying to alter it. I'm not opposed to altering things, but I'm concerned that the suspension and/or expulsion may eliminate some of the investigation of keeping people off of the streets that should have been off of the streets that aren't expelled or suspended. Like the guy that's been truant for three days. They haven't had a chance to expel him yet or suspend him.

So I guess I look at, and I think that's what Councilperson Kelly's trying to add - how is this going to be applied? Is it easier to apply the original ordinance we were talking about than this one, and if so, why aren't we doing that and that's what needs to be thought about. I think it's always good to be able to work through these things and the schools, I do agree, that I think it's good that they're going to put it in a letter. While their letter says if you're suspended or expelled, you can't be on school property, and all they're going to put in their letter is 'oh by the way, you can't be on public property', as long as their Attorney's okay. So I'm glad they listen to their Attorneys, but I think that's good that they put that, they put it in there, but that's a documentation between them, the school system and the student. Whereas, our action is going to be towards the activities of a minor, who is out on the street regardless of whether he is expelled or suspended.

Mr. Long: Okay.

Mr. Hills: I see where we're going, I just, I want to be sure that people understand that I'm hearing there won't be any stops; there still will be stops; there are stops today. There are stops without this,

but the purpose of the stop is to try to avoid, or ask questions about unusual activity as to why it's going on here or there. Thank you, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, President Hills. Are there, yes, Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of points that I'd like to make is that a lot of members have continued to refer back to the original ordinance and I think that issue has been put to bed. It's not going to be considered. The majority of Committee members do not support that ordinance. I'm pretty sure a majority of Council does not support it. So the issue at hand is the legislation that is before us tonight by Councilmen Long and Burd, and the thing I would just add is, we could pass this and it may not work perfect, but this Council can come back and tweak any law or ordinance we pass to make better what we do here. So the hypothetical that may do this or may do that, well let's put it in operation, see what happens, and then we can tweak it from that point. So that's just the only observations I have regarding these two issues tonight.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Councilman Joseph. Are there any other members of Council that would like to speak on this before I open it to the public? All right, I have two speaker slips. The first speaker slip is Mr. Robert Cook. Name and address please, Mr. Cook.

Mr. Cook: Robert Cook, 8170 Priestley Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Mr. Clemens, members of the Safety Committee, members of City Council, Mr. Mayor and in light of your recent remarks with all due consideration, Mr. Joseph. "I dropped off my chair when I got these numbers" - that's what Columbus Police Lieutenant Bob Meader said when he saw that daytime crime had fallen 43%; 43% in his area following the enactment of a Columbus daytime curfew for school-aged children, as it was recently reported in the Columbus Dispatch. I dropped off my chair. Members of the Safety Committee, members of Council, it is not my intent to cause bodily injury to any member of the City Police Force but suppose, suppose, you could create the conditions whereby Reynoldsburg Police Chief Suci would say, "I dropped off my chair when I got these numbers". I submit, if you pass the daytime curfew for school-aged children as written by the City Attorney and first presented to this Committee on the 7th of June, you will risk that our Police Chief may drop off his chair. Why? Why has this law worked in Ohio, in Columbus, Ohio? Why has it worked in Akron, why has it worked in Baltimore, Maryland? Why has it worked in St. Paul, Minnesota? Why indeed! Because, re-focus here from the discussion, because an arrest for a curfew violation begins the process, begins the process of counseling, remediation, family help and if necessary, punishment, that results in preventing truancy for all categories of students, not just taking a few students off the street for today. With all due respect to Councilman Long, his alternative proposal excludes all categories except two, all categories of students who may be absent from school without permission and by so doing, it denies those students the opportunity of all the resources available in the county for remediation, counseling, assistance and help to prevent truants.

It is preventive, not just about an arrest. It starts a process that now cannot be started under current legislation. The difference between these two proposals, I believe, is day and night. The

first one will work, the second one will not. The first one is preventive, the second one perpetuates the problem. If Council's goal is to reduce crime, daytime crime in Reynoldsburg, then pass the original amendment; but if Council's goal is to be sure that no one in Reynoldsburg falls off their chairs, pass the second amendment. I dropped off my chair when I got these numbers. Thank you very much for your time. Do you have any questions pertaining to my remarks?

Mr. Clemens: Councilman Burd.

Mr. Burd: Yeah I, Mr. Cook, thank you for coming in and speaking about this and I don't want to rehash the whole month's worth of debate we had on this, but I drop off my chair when I hear us compared to Columbus Zone 5.

Mr. Cook: Pardon me?

Mr. Burd: When I hear the City of Reynoldsburg being compared to Columbus Zone 5, which is the portion of Columbus that has the curfew.

Mr. Cook: Pardon me, but just to be sure that I understand what you're talking about. Compared to the 43% reduction or compared to Zone 5?

Mr. Burd: Geographically, we're

Mr. Cook: You're talking about the 43% reduction.

Mr. Burd: Geographically, we're about the same size. They have 187 Officers that patrol that geographic area, we have 53. There were 4,712 burglaries in that Zone in 2009 compared to 195 in Reynoldsburg. I'm not saying that a reduction in crime isn't wonderful, it is; but to say that the exact same thing would happen here is hard for me to believe, because it's a completely different situation, completely different, and I think that if Lieutenant Meader were here, he would admit that tonight. The numbers aren't even close. They're not even close in any category. It bothers me when I hear our city being compared to a situation like that because we're not there. We're just not. We're not even close and they also dedicated full time staff to enforcing that. We're not going to do that here. We can't do that here. Our Police have better things to do here. So it gets on my nerves when I keep hearing us say "well, it happened here, it happened there". We are not the same, it's not even apples and oranges. It's worse than that. It's a completely different situation.

Mr. Cook: If I may.

Mr. Burd: Yes.

Mr. Cook: There is a distinction however, and the distinction is that with a daytime curfew, you do kick in the preventive part, right? That's what we cannot do right now. We cannot trigger routinely

day in and day out those things that are in place and available to residents of Franklin County that would lead to remediation and prevention, and that, I think, is much more important than whether we're counting arrests or whatever, because if we're just picking people up and taking them back to school and the parents pick them up, then we're not reducing the potential population of kids skipping school, not just the truants, not just the expelled, just kids skipping school, which is equally important. They should be in school.

Mr. Burd: I, I just.....

Mr. Cook: I think just too much of the talk has been on just merely arresting rather than understanding what that triggers and what a curfew violation triggers that just simply taking them back to school does not trigger and prevention is what will get you the reduction in crime, not just picking people up.

Mr. Burd: Okay.

Mr. Cook: Thank you, but that was a very, a legitimate point, but I think the distinction needs to also be remembered. Anything else?

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Cook.

Mr. Cook: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Next speaker is Mr. Fuller, Jason Fuller.

Mr. Fuller: Good Evening, Chairman Clemens, members of Council. I want to commend Councilman Long and Councilman Burd on their efforts here. I think it's a step in a good direction. I like the proposal. I do want to reiterate that just for the record and because it will soothe my conscience, that pre-emptive law enforcement is not really ethical and it's not really workable. I don't think any kind of ordinance in this vein is going to be all that good from an ethical standpoint. Two, I want to clarify what President Hills has alluded to, Police do not make stops if they think something, someone's in the wrong place. They make stops if they have probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed or if they have reasonable suspicion that a crime is occurring. So Police don't make stops and they don't have the authority to make stops under the Constitution of the US or the State just because they think someone's in the wrong place at the wrong time. That's one reason I think the proposed ordinance is a good idea because it at least gives some kind of reasonable suspicion, I'm sorry, probable cause to any Officer who would be making a stop. Is the person doing something that is against some kind of regulation or law? Here we would have the answer be yes. The child would be breaking either a suspension or expulsion law and therefore a stop of some kind of detainment is permissible, ethical and good. So I think this is a good progression. The only thing I would like to see is some kind of guarantee, perhaps in the ordinance or wherever else is more appropriate about how this is going to be implemented. We've already had some, some discussion

about that. Councilwoman Kelly brought that up for instance and also, it'd be good to have some kind of guidance about what would happen to kids who are apprehended. I would re-assert my concern and perhaps the concern of many other parents in or near Reynoldsburg who would not like to have Child Protective Services for instance, open up a whole investigation or case file on their kid just because there's an apprehension under this ordinance. It'd be nice if there was some assurances that any apprehension would bring the child to either their school or to a Police Station or some kind of youth facility as opposed to opening the child up and the family up to intrusive investigation that may be more harmful than good and I have nothing further. If there are any questions, I'll take those now. Please.

Mr. Clemens: Councilwoman Kelly.

Mrs. Kelly: Hi, are you aware that currently if, it's my understanding, so Mr. Hood or either of the Officers correct me if I'm wrong, but if a young person is seen out on the street during school hours, the Police now can stop them and ask them why they're out on the street because it's a law that you have to be in school?

Mr. Fuller: I'm not aware of an ordinance or a.....

Mrs. Kelly: It's not an ordinance, it's a law that children have to be in school. Whether, they can be home-schooled, but.....

Mr. Fuller: Sure.

Mrs. Kelly:but they have to be, you have to go to school.

Mr. Fuller: I haven't studied it. I can't speak with any expertise on that issue.

Mrs. Kelly: Officer Mielke.

Officer Mielke: Yes, there is a State law that says that children under the age of 18 have to attend school of some sort or be on a work release program work permit or have a GED and that has to be approved by the local school district.

Mrs. Kelly: So right now, if they see students on the street, Officers can pull them, can stop and say 'hey, where are you..'

Officer Mielke: Yes, if we see a child that looks to be under the age of 18, looks to be of school age, we have the right to stop and ask them where they're going, what their whereabouts are and how come they're not in school.

Mr. Fuller: In my research of this curfew issue, I don't think that issue has ever been litigated.

Maybe it's a practice, I'm not sure whether it's a good one or a legal one. My understanding is that stops of this nature have not really been litigated at all. So we don't have much guidance on it. We do have a 1970 case that indicates that the process of a daytime curfew was allowable but there was expressly no comment about whether it was constitutional in that case.

Mrs. Kelly: It's not a daytime curfew. It's a State law you have to be in school.

Mr. Fuller: Right.

Mrs. Kelly: So if the Police are seeing a child out, they can, there is reasonable suspicion that they're not in school.

Mr. Fuller: Well, if that's the position that there can already be stops made then I would ask what's the point of any of these ordinances if it's not going to accomplish anything different, then what are we doing here? Why have we been arguing over the past couple of months? We've been arguing because this is going to do something different because it's going to give greater authority or.....

Mrs. Kelly: Correct.

Mr. Fuller:power to do things that we're not comfortable with as a city, a neighborhood.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Thank you Councilman Kelly and the good old State law. Thank you Mr. Fuller. All right, are there any other questions to be brought forward to the Committee pertaining to either of these ordinances? Is there anyone in Chambers that would like to speak on this? If not, I'd like to have a motion to amend Section 537.14 of Chapter 537, the ordinance would prohibit minors from 6 to 17 from being upon the public streets during school days during the academic year while on suspension or expelled. Mr. Long motioned to amend. Seconded by Councilman Burd.

(All voted "Aye" except for Mr. Clemens, who voted "Nay".) Motion passes. Okay, this will be sent to Council.

The next ordinance, I'd like to have a motion to amend Section 537.15 of Chapter 537, the ordinance will hold the parent or guardian responsible for a minor who violates the daytime curfew while suspended or expelled. Mr. Long motioned to amend. Seconded by Mr. Burd. (All voted "Aye" except for Mr. Clemens, who voted "Nay".) Motion passes. Okay, this will be sent to Council also.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Clemens, are those for first reading, please?

Mr. Clemens: I'm sorry.

Mrs. Frazier: Did you send those for first reading, or are those for passage?

Mr. Clemens: Well, they're for passage. I got Rules Suspension on it, so I'll send them for passage.

Mrs. Frazier: Each one?

Mr. Clemens: Right.

Mrs. Frazier: All right.

Mr. Long: Councilman Clemens, I can count to four.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah.

Mr. Long: We're into a position here that it's not going to pass as an emergency. Shall we just go ahead and send it for first reading?

Mr. Clemens: That's, that's up to you if you want to remove.....

Mr. Long: We will just go ahead and send it as first reading.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Long: I'll remove the emergency language.

Mr. Clemens: And we'll send it to Council, both ordinances, as first readings. Thank you, thank you. With nothing else to be added to the agenda, we'll call the Safety Committee over at 8:05 p.m.

Safety Committee-- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

September 7, 2010 (Transcribed - S. Cochran, Ass't. Clk. of Council)