



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Committee of the Whole

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Trenton I. Weaver, Chair
Karen J. Angelou
Merisa K. Bowers
Nancy R. McGregor
Kaylee Padova
Stephen A. Renner
Michael Schnetzer

Jeremy A. VanMeter, Clerk of Council

Monday, October 9, 2023

7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

A. CALL TO ORDER:

Vice President of Council Trenton I. Weaver, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The agenda was published on October 6, 2023. All members were present for the meeting. There were no additions or corrections to the agenda.

Vice President Weaver began the meeting by asking everyone to observe a moment of silence for the people of Israel in response to the recent attacks over the weekend. He invited those present to join him in a prayer or acknowledgment for peace in the Middle East and across the world. The attendees honored this request with a respectful moment of silence.

B. DISCUSSIONS:

1. Public Arts Policy - Status Update and Discussion

Vice President Weaver opened the discussion by addressing the previous meeting's discussion on the Arts policy. He mentioned Councilwoman Bowers' request to have outside counsel join the meeting and asked Mayor Jadwin or City Attorney Mularski to introduce the guest.

Mayor Jadwin introduced Donald Brey from the firm of Isaac Wiles, acknowledging his presence to assist with any questions regarding the Arts policy. She noted that the item was on the agenda due to previous requests but mentioned that there were no specific questions received from Council or community stakeholders. Mayor Jadwin then invited the Council members to ask any questions they might have.

Councilmember Bowers inquired about the status of the panel appointed for the Arts policy. She specifically asked whether the identified members had accepted their appointments and if the first scheduled meeting had taken place if it hadn't occurred the previous week.

Mayor Jadwin responded that due to scheduling conflicts, the meeting scheduled for the previous week had been postponed to the current week. All seven identified members had initially accepted their appointments. However, Sharon Iseringhausen later informed the Mayor that she had family obligations and could not serve on the panel. As a result, the panel would proceed with the six remaining committed members. The meeting was rescheduled for Thursday.

Councilmember Bowers inquired about the process regarding the Ohio Public Records Act in relation to the Arts policy panel. She specifically asked if minutes would be taken during the panel meetings and how the panel planned to comply with the obligations outlined in the executive order.

Mayor Jadwin explained that Mr. Brey would be responsible for addressing the questions regarding the process, emphasizing her limited role, which would involve welcoming and expressing gratitude to the participants during the first meeting. She clarified that Mr. Brey would elaborate on the procedural aspects of the panel's activities.

Mr. Brey clarified that although the Advisory Panel is not technically considered a public body, they would operate as if they were, following public meeting and public records protocols. He explained that the panel would exceed legal requirements to ensure transparency, making meetings accessible to the public and recording minutes. Mr. Brey also noted that while the panel would operate under the default rules of Robert's Rules of Order, they had the freedom to determine their advice based on their judgment and expertise.

Councilmember Bowers inquired about support from the Council Office regarding the recording of minutes for the Advisory Panel meetings.

City Attorney Mularski confirmed that the Clerk of Council had offered to take minutes for the Advisory Panel meetings.

Mayor Jadwin assured Council that they would work around any unavailability of the Clerk of Council for taking minutes, addressing any concerns the Clerk might have had with attending the upcoming meeting.

Councilmember Bowers confirmed the upcoming meeting was scheduled for Thursday at 6:00 PM. She further inquired if Mr. Glasgow or another member of the firm would be able to participate on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Brey expressed willingness for a member of his firm to be available to support the panel if deemed useful.

Mayor Jadwin confirmed that Mr. Glasgow would be actively participating in the panel's conversations, ensuring legal compliance and addressing any questions the panel might have.

Councilmember Bowers noted the administration had indicated the recommended policy would be developed by the end of the month. She asked

if Mr. Brey could speak to the process of how the panel will develop the policy and where it would go after that.

Mr. Brey clarified that he could not provide specific details about the deadline or the panel's plan as he wasn't fully informed. He emphasized that the panel's role was advisory, aimed at advising the executive body and possibly the mayor and director of Parks and Recreation in developing the policy. While the executive had no authority to legislate, there was still a need for cooperation to ensure the policy worked effectively for the government and Gahanna's community. Council would be kept informed, and if any legislation was required, it would fall under the council's purview.

Vice President Weaver expressed gratitude for Mr. Brey's presence at the meeting and asked for an update on the snowplow project, mentioning President Renner's previous inquiry about dispelling rumors regarding the project's status.

Mayor Jadwin shared that the snowplows had been delivered to the schools and were ready for painting. However, she noted that the schools preferred to wait until an Arts policy was in place before proceeding. She mentioned the possibility of needing to retrieve the shovels due to liability concerns and confirmed that the city would move forward with the project once the schools were ready.

Vice President Weaver inquired about Mr. Brey's involvement with other communities and best practices regarding public Arts policies. He expressed concerns about liability and shared that some research suggested not having a policy might be the best approach. He sought Mr. Brey's insights on this matter.

Mr. Brey delved into the intricate aspects of public forums and the legal intricacies linked to public Arts policies. He underscored the significance of determining the specific forum type being established, outlining distinctions such as traditional public forums (like sidewalks where free speech is generally allowed) and closed forums (like private homes or executive sessions). The critical question, he pointed out, was whether the city wanted a policy to allow artwork and, if so, what kind of artwork and from whom. Limits were necessary, especially concerning illegal, defamatory, or potentially city-liability-inducing content. Additionally, Mr. Brey raised the potential challenge of an "all-comer" situation, where any artist could participate. While it might be suitable in some cases, he suggested that this approach could pose future problems, particularly if controversial or conflicting artwork submissions emerged. He hinted at past positive experiences but hinted at the potential complexities faced by the Council in future scenarios. Overall, he emphasized the importance of clarity and regulation in the Arts policy to avoid legal complications and ensure the community's best interests.

President Renner expressed a strong preference for keeping politics separate from the realm of art. He made it clear that he did not want any member of the council, the mayor, or the city attorney, to be directly involved in matters

related to art. To achieve this objective, he openly voiced his support for establishing an independent body, specifically an Arts commission. This stance, shared in April, highlighted his commitment to creating a separation between the political sphere and artistic endeavors within the community.

Mr. Brey affirmed that the mayor possessed the authority to establish an advisory panel, which he understood had been done. He expressed uncertainty regarding the concept of an art commission, questioning whether it involved the creation of a new public body that would be integrated into the administration of the city.

President Renner responded no. He inquired about the possibility of the advisory panel or task force recommending the establishment of an independent commission. He suggested that if the panel expressed a preference for this approach, it could be considered as an outcome. President Renner said he thought the Mayor would support this.

Mr. Brey clarified that the advisory panel had the authority to advise on any approach they deemed appropriate, including suggesting the establishment of an independent body. However, he mentioned the potential need to review the city's Charter as altering the administrative or executive powers vested in elected officials or their appointees might require legal consideration and adherence to the existing governance structure outlined in the Charter.

President Renner expressed interest at the mention of the city's Charter potentially affecting the establishment of an independent body, indicating that this was the first time in the conversation this has been mentioned.

Mr. Brey clarified that an independent body could exist as long as it doesn't exercise governmental authority. He explained that while an independent commission could operate autonomously, once it becomes part of the sovereign authority of the city, it constitutes a public office. He noted that there might be limitations in creating elected or autonomous public offices within the city's charter.

Councilmember McGregor expressed concerns about the need for clear authority and oversight for the proposed body. She cited the example of the post office, which operates quasi-governmentally with limited oversight, and emphasized the necessity of elected officials having authority over the proposed body to prevent autonomy without accountability.

Mr. Brey acknowledged the complexities involved in establishing autonomous entities within government structures. He highlighted the need for accountability and emphasized that ultimately, decisions about such changes should be made by those who have the authority to do so, respecting the democratic process and the accountability of elected officials to the people they serve.

Councilmember Bowers inquired about the possibility of a model similar to Dublin's and if Mr. Brey was aware of any examples in the region that could provide guidance. She also asked whether Mr. Glasgow would be addressing

this with the panel.

Mr. Brey explained that there are different forms of government, such as mayor government and city manager forms of government. He noted that while Gahanna operates under a specific charter, there are other ways to approach the situation, and Mr. Glasgow could discuss these options with the advisory panel. He emphasized that the existing charter guides the city's approach unless it is changed.

Vice President Weaver sought clarification on the concept of an independent body overseeing public art spaces. He inquired if having such a body to manage public spaces and art installations would still present potential issues, seeking Mr. Brey's perspective on this approach.

Mr. Brey emphasized the importance of specific details in creating an independent body for public art management. He pointed out potential issues with granting one group control over public art, as it might restrict access for other groups. He used the example of a music program at a public space, indicating that decisions about one group could raise concerns among others. He also referenced the St. Patrick's Day Parade situation in New York City, where opening the parade to one group led to legal challenges from others. Mr. Brey highlighted the need for careful consideration and clarity in establishing such a system.

Councilmember Bowers expressed the understanding that there were two potential paths concerning public art. One path involved adopting art as government speech, while the alternative path, currently under exploration through policy creation, aimed to provide an alternative approach. She sought confirmation on the accuracy of this understanding.

Mr. Brey acknowledged that there were at least two potential paths regarding public art, emphasizing that there might be more options to consider. He agreed with the concept that allowing someone else to make the speech could open up various opportunities. However, he emphasized the importance of careful consideration of the details. Mr. Brey explained that discrimination, in some contexts, was necessary and not inherently bad; it depended on the specifics of how differentiation was applied. He urged caution to avoid any form of discrimination that could lead to potential legal issues, highlighting the significance of the implementation details in making these decisions.

Councilmember Padova expressed her curiosity regarding the creation of a new Arts commission, especially considering the existence of the current Arts Council. She questioned the need for a separate entity and wondered if there could be efforts made to integrate or combine the proposed Arts commission with the existing Arts Council. Councilmember Padova sought input from the attendees to address her concerns.

Mr. Brey emphasized the independence and credibility of the existing 501(c)(3) Gahanna Area Arts Council. He acknowledged that council members' involvement in this organization might raise concerns about impartiality, even

if unjustified. Mr. Brey suggested that having an entirely separate and unbiased advisory panel would prevent any potential criticism, ensuring a fair and inclusive process. He stressed the importance of both diverse voices and the perception of fairness in the decision-making process. Mr. Brey highlighted that the aim was to avoid unnecessary arguments and ensure a broad representation of opinions in shaping Gahanna's Arts policy.

Councilmember Bowers pointed out the unique context of smaller communities like Gahanna, where there might be limited options for certain organizations such as convention and visitors bureaus or Arts Councils. She highlighted the contrast with larger neighboring cities, emphasizing the singular nature of such entities in smaller communities like Gahanna.

Mr. Brey acknowledged the criticism would be unjust but emphasized the inevitability of criticism.

Councilmember Bowers agreed and noted members were no strangers to this inevitability.

C. ITEMS FROM THE COUNCIL OFFICE:

[RES-0033-2023](#) A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING OCTOBER 2023 AS PREGNANCY AND INFANT LOSS AWARENESS MONTH IN THE CITY OF GAHANNA

Councilmember Padova expressed her intention behind bringing the resolution forward, stating that it aimed to raise awareness about pregnancy loss, a topic often considered taboo until it's deemed safe. She emphasized that one in four pregnancies ends in loss, and many individuals experiencing this tragedy grieve in solitude due to societal norms. The resolution aimed to inform families that they are not alone in their grief. Councilmember Padova also highlighted the recognition of infant loss as a tragedy, regardless of the support a family receives. She invited questions and proposed placing the resolution on the consent agenda for the next week's session.

Vice President Weaver thanked Councilmember Padova for her efforts on the resolution, acknowledging it as a powerful initiative.

Recommendation: Introduction/Adoption on Consent Agenda on 10/16/2023.

[ORD-0071-2023](#) AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING CHAPTER 737 OF THE GAHANNA CODIFIED ORDINANCES TO ESTABLISH THE TOBACCO PRODUCTS SALES LICENSING PROGRAM

Councilmember Padova recalled presentations from Tobacco 21 and Franklin County Public Health Department over the past year regarding adolescent tobacco use. She mentioned that several cities in central Ohio, including Hilliard, Whitehall, Reynoldsburg, and Grandview, have implemented tobacco retail licensing programs. She collaborated with Chief Spence, Director Becker, Mr. Roth, and Mr. Mularski to review and revise the legislation to fit Gahanna's needs. The purpose of the ordinance is to enhance education for tobacco retailers regarding underage purchases, aiming to reduce underage

consumption and subsequent addiction. She welcomed questions and feedback on the proposed draft.

Councilmember Bowers commended Councilmember Padova for her efforts in addressing the issue of teen tobacco use. She expressed appreciation for Padova's work and highlighted the alarming increase in teen tobacco and vaping incidents within Gahanna schools. Bowers praised the proposed ordinance as a practical solution, emphasizing the importance of education and training over criminalization for clerks who may not be adequately informed. She commended the administrative approach, stating that it encourages business owners to implement proper training and maintain responsible practices. Bowers thanked Padova for her dedication to this cause.

Councilmember Padova clarified a question regarding the date mentioned in the draft legislation (March 1), explaining that she had contacted Franklin County Public Health to determine the appropriate timeframe for implementation. She emphasized that the specific date mentioned in the draft would be adjusted based on the readings and passage of the ordinance.

Mayor Jadwin thanked Councilmember Padova for her efforts on the proposed legislation regarding tobacco retail licensing. She acknowledged the importance of the issue, especially concerning youth tobacco use, and expressed gratitude for Padova's passion and dedication. However, she mentioned that she and her staff had not yet had a chance to thoroughly review the proposed ordinance due to ongoing budget meetings. The Mayor pointed out several questions and concerns that needed clarification, including the logistical and operational impacts on the administration, the expectations and responsibilities of the city, potential additional staff requirements, and the associated costs. She mentioned an upcoming meeting with Joe Mazzola from Franklin County Public Health to discuss these matters and suggested including Councilmember Padova in that conversation. Mayor Jadwin indicated that after the meeting and further review, the city staff would be in a better position to provide informed feedback on the proposed ordinance.

City Attorney Mularski addressed several points in the proposed ordinance. Firstly, he noted two financial provisions: a permit fee and potential civil penalties. Councilmember Padova had investigated these and discovered that the \$400 permit fee would go to the Board of Health for program administration, and the civil penalties would be split 80% to the city and 20% to the Board of Health. Mularski emphasized the importance of accurately determining the number of permits to avoid unintentionally legislating businesses out of operation. There was discussion about appealing decisions made by the Board of Health, with concerns raised about the appeal process being within the same organization. Lastly, Mularski highlighted an issue regarding businesses with the same parent corporations, such as Giant Eagle and GetGo, being within 1,000 feet of each other, potentially causing conflicts that needed further consideration and clarification in the ordinance.

Mayor Jadwin sought clarification on the allocation of fees collected under the

proposed ordinance, specifically whether these fees would go to Franklin County Public Health.

City Attorney Mularski noted it is set as a \$400 permit fee.

Mayor Jadwin inquired about whether Franklin County Public Health needed to review and approve the proposed ordinance, especially since it involved obligations and responsibilities for the health department. She questioned whether the council was voting on an ordinance that Franklin County Public Health had not yet reviewed or approved. This inquiry was made in anticipation of the upcoming meeting with Joe Mazzola, the Franklin County Health Commissioner, to discuss the ordinance's implementation details.

City Attorney Mularski noted that the council had the authority to vote and implement any provisions they deemed necessary. He indicated that whether or not Franklin County Public Health wanted to be part of it would be their decision.

Councilmember Padova stated that her goal was to keep the ordinance similar to those in other communities, following the recommendations provided by Franklin County Public Health. She believed that the proposed provisions aligned with those of other communities and didn't anticipate any significant issues from Franklin County Public Health.

Mayor Jadwin sought clarification on the procedural aspect, questioning whether Franklin County Public Health needed to review and approve the ordinance before it could be presented to the city council.

Councilmember Padova acknowledged the uncertainty regarding the requirement for Franklin County Public Health to review the ordinance but expressed the necessity for their input and review.

City Attorney Mularski clarified that Franklin County Public Health would likely need to review and approve the ordinance as the city cannot impose restrictions on them without their agreement.

Councilmember Padova mentioned that the fees paid by retailers for the license would fund the program, clarifying that her understanding is the cost would not be borne by the city but by the retailers themselves.

Councilmember Schnetzer raised concerns about transferability and potentially creating a situation similar to New York Taxi medallions, where limiting the number of licenses might inflate their value. He sought input or historical context from others regarding this potential unintended consequence.

Councilmember Bowers mentioned liquor licenses, drawing a parallel with the concerns raised by Councilmember Schnetzer.

Councilmember Schnetzer asked if that is how this worked.

City Attorney Mularski said it is like a liquor license.

Councilmember Bowers summarized there is precedent with liquor licensing, suggesting that the concerns raised by Councilmember Schnetzer have been worked out.

City Attorney Mularski pointed out that the number of liquor licenses can be expanded under certain circumstances, clarifying that the mayor and city council have the authority to increase the number if they deem it appropriate.

Councilmember Schnetzer raised concerns about the potential for the legislation to create a situation where the limited number of licenses would increase in market value due to supply constraints. He questioned whether the legislation would allow for private transfers of licenses, leading to inflated prices and making the licenses a profit center.

City Attorney Mularski acknowledged Councilmember Schnetzer's concern and mentioned the possibility of different scenarios occurring due to the legislation. He indicated that the outcome, whether positive or negative, was uncertain.

Councilmember Schnetzer questioned if the council cared about the need to limit the licenses.

President Renner responded that he thought the council did care.

Councilmember Schnetzer again raised the question of the necessity of limiting licenses, suggesting that if businesses followed the required protocols and complied with county checks, there might not be a need for such limitations.

President Renner expressed the importance of determining a clear number of retail licenses for tobacco products. He emphasized the need to establish a definitive limit to safeguard Gahanna, especially in light of the impending implementation of similar legislation in Columbus, which could potentially lead to a surge of businesses in the suburbs.

Councilmember Padova highlighted a specific provision in the legislation that aimed to prevent a rapid increase in licenses due to transfers. If a business, such as a vape store or gas station, was going out of business or undergoing substantial changes, the license transfer would not be automatic. Special approval from the city would be necessary for such transfers, allowing the council to exercise discretion in approving new licenses, especially if the business model significantly differed from the previous one.

City Attorney Mularski clarified that permits from businesses like gas stations, if they close and change their nature, are not automatically grandfathered in. However, the permit still exists, and another entity can use it, provided they meet all the specified qualifications. These conditions include not being within a certain distance of other similar businesses or youth-oriented facilities. The transferability of permits is subject to these strict criteria, ensuring that new

businesses align with the defined regulations.

Councilmember Bowers suggested that, due to the stringent restrictions outlined in the proposal, the concerns regarding market dynamics for these permits might be less significant compared to liquor licenses.

City Attorney Mularski expressed uncertainty about the potential market dynamics and implications, stating that he wouldn't want to make any guesses regarding the matter.

Councilmember Bowers highlighted a key point in the legislation, emphasizing that licenses would only be valid at the original address where they were granted. They cannot be transferred to different businesses or sold across county lines, adding an additional layer of restriction and control over the licenses.

City Attorney Mularski clarified the accurate details about the permit transferability. If a business goes out of operation, the permit can be applied for by someone else, but they must meet all the specified qualifications. However, the original owner cannot transfer the permit to a different business.

President Renner raised an intriguing question about the potential impact of the passage of recreational marijuana laws. He wondered if the outlets for recreational marijuana could coincide with existing retail cigarette locations and how this might affect the current legislation under discussion.

Councilmember Bowers expressed uncertainty about the specifics of what recreational marijuana outlets might entail. She emphasized that it's unclear whether recreational marijuana could be sold in any retail outlet.

City Attorney Mularski clarified that there would likely be restrictions on recreational marijuana outlets, but he indicated that they might not fall under the current regulations being discussed. He acknowledged the uncertainty surrounding the specifics of these regulations in relation to recreational marijuana sales.

Councilmember Schnetzer pointed out the obvious, stating that the title of the chapter in discussion pertains specifically to tobacco products.

Vice President Weaver expressed slight concerns about the overbreadth of the regulations outlined in section 737.07 concerning the denial, suspension, and revocation of a license. He mentioned a scenario where someone may have had an underage purchase attempt at the age of 20 and then, several years later, wanted to apply for a license. He questioned whether this situation might be considered overly broad and whether such concerns were discussed with the City Attorney.

City Attorney Mularski addressed Vice President Weaver's concerns about the overbreadth of the regulations, indicating that the matter had been discussed. He stated that it ultimately depended on the council's perspective, leaving the decision about whether the regulations were overly broad to them.

Councilmember Bowers sought clarification on the language in section 737.07(A)(2) regarding convictions related to tobacco products. She wanted to confirm whether the provision referred specifically to violations of laws related to tobacco products, rather than any conviction of any law.

City Attorney Mularski clarified that the provision (737.07(A)(2)) pertained specifically to convictions related to tobacco products. For instance, someone might have been convicted of purchasing tobacco under the age of 21, and if that conviction occurred within the past 5 years, they could be denied a permit. However, it had to be a violation related to tobacco products to be applicable.

Councilmember Bowers suggested clarifying the language in the ordinance (737.07(A)(2)) by placing the modifier earlier in the sentence, explicitly specifying that it referred to violations of tobacco-related federal, state, or local laws. This clarification aimed to prevent any misinterpretation and address concerns about the ordinance being overly broad.

City Attorney Mularski sought clarification from Councilmember Bowers regarding the suggestion to modify the language. He repeated the current language "federal, state, or local laws" related to tobacco products, seeking clarity on the proposed change.

Councilmember Bowers proposed a modification to the language, suggesting that it should specify that the violation pertains to a "tobacco-related federal, state, or local law, ordinance, provision, or other regulation."

City Attorney Mularski agreed to review the suggestion and consider moving the phrase "relating to tobacco products" closer to the word "violation" for clarity in the ordinance language.

Councilmember Bowers clarified that the application for the license would be granted to the business owner, not necessarily to an employee of the business. She suggested that if someone is 25 years old and now owns a business, the issue of previous violations might not arise in that context.

Councilmember Padova expressed her concerns, mentioning that while she could understand the context of a child taking over their parents' business, she still found it unlikely. She questioned the necessity of a five-year restriction and suggested it might not be a crucial point to contest.

Councilmember Bowers inquired if the five-year restriction aligned with the regulations observed in other communities, seeking confirmation on the consistency of the rule across various places.

Councilmember Padova confirmed this to be correct.

Vice President Weaver raised concerns about the definition of "substantiated evidence" in the context of license suspension and revocation. He questioned whether it required a proven violation or if an accusation alone would suffice,

seeking clarity on the criteria for substantiated evidence.

City Attorney Mularski clarified that the language regarding "substantiated evidence" was provided by the Department of Health, the entity responsible for administering the ordinance. He emphasized the usage of their terminology, although acknowledging potential room for clarification.

Councilmember McGregor pointed out a potential typo, suggesting that the phrase "distributed" might be more appropriate than "distribute" in the context of the ordinance.

Vice President Weaver noted sections 737.07(C)(2) and (D)(2) under the revocation of license had the typo that Councilmember McGregor referenced.

City Attorney Mularski acknowledged that the presented ordinance was the first draft.

Vice President Weaver expressed that there were outstanding questions that required further examination. He inquired about the council's decision regarding the ordinance, suggesting that it should come back for further discussion and review.

President Renner and Councilmember Padova expressed desire to have it come back for further discussion.

Councilmember Bowers asked Councilmember Padova whether the ongoing conversations with Franklin County Public Health would allow for adequate time for the return of the ordinance for further discussion.

Councilmember Padova suggested that the scheduled meeting for the next week would provide an opportunity to address concerns before the next Committee of the Whole, indicating a willingness to potentially push the discussion back further if needed.

Councilmember Schnetzer emphasized the importance of crafting clean legislation to avoid multiple amendments and potential complications. He suggested obtaining feedback from the administration and the City Attorney's office before introducing the ordinance for first reading, indicating a preference to bring it back for the next committee session.

City Attorney Mularski acknowledged that the presented draft was the initial version, emphasizing that it was the first draft and not yet refined. He pointed out minor issues like misspellings that needed correction, indicating that further revisions and refinements were necessary before finalizing the ordinance.

Councilmember Bowers asked when Columbus's legislation would be in effect.

Councilmember Padova said she believed it was in February.

Recommendation: Held in Committee for further discussion scheduled for

10/23/2023.

D. ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business before the Committee of the Whole, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Jeremy A. VanMeter
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Committee of the Whole, this
day of 2023.*

Trenton I. Weaver
Chair