

## **CITY COUNCIL MEETING – MONDAY, JULY 12, 2010**

The Council of the City of Zanesville met in regular session at 7:00 p.m., Monday, July 12, 2010 in the City Council Chambers, 401 Market Street, Zanesville, Ohio.

Mrs. Norman led those present in the Lord's Prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The following members of Council answered Roll Call: Mrs. Norman, Mr. Kilpatrick, Mr. Hutcheson, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Tilton, Mr. Zakany, Mr. Baker, Mr. Tarbert, and Mrs. Gentry.

Mr. Tilton moved to excuse Mr. Vincent, seconded by Mr. Baker. Motion carried.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Zakany moved to accept the minutes as printed, seconded by Mr. Tilton. Motion carried.

### **COMMUNICATIONS, REPORTS, AND RESOLUTIONS**

Communication from Michael A. Sims, - Director of Public Service – Re: City Cemeteries 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report.

Mr. Tarbert moved to receive, seconded by Mr. Baker. Motion carried

Communication from Dale Raines – Budget and Finance Director – Subject: Alternative Tax budget Information. Motion carried.

Mr. Zakany moved to receive, seconded by Mr. Tilton. Motion carried.

### **PROPOSED ORDINANCES**

Ordinance No. 10-54 (Amended) – Introduced by Council – An ordinance authorizing the proper City official to settle an action pending in the Fifth Appellate District Court of Appeals and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Hillis: The ordinance does not have a line item number, so before you vote on waiving could someone get a line item number from Mr. Raines and amend the ordinance with the line item number inserted.

Mr. Raines: I do not know what line item you want to use. The only place we have money like that is in the contingency account set up by City Council. The line item number is 101.7951.53434.

Mrs. Norman: How do we do that?

Mr. Hillis: Someone needs to make a motion to amend the ordinance and include that line item number.

Mr. Baker moved to amend the ordinance to include that line item number, seconded by Mr. Tarbert. Motion carried.

Mr. Tilton moved to waive the readings, seconded by Mr. Baker.

R. C. to waive  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays      Motion carried.

Mr. Zakany moved for passage, seconded by Mr. Tarbert.

R. C. for passage  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays      Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-55 – Introduced by Council – Amending appropriation Ordinance No. 10-22 and declaring an emergency.

Petition from Randy Case – 916 Vine Street.

Mr. Case: I am curious as to why you are removing \$2,300 from the Police Department and moving it to the Airport.

Mr. Raines: I will respond to that by saying “Robbing Peter to pay Paul”. That is where we are with the budget this year.

Mr. Case: I just wanted to know if there was a reason why it was taken from the Police Department.

Mr. Tilton moved to waive the three readings, seconded by Mr. Hutcheson.

R. C. to waive  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays      Motion carried

Mr. Zakany moved for passage, seconded by Mrs. Gentry.

R. C. for passage  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays      Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-56 – Introduced by Council – An ordinance authorizing the proper city official to expend Revolving Loan Funds and declaring an emergency.

Mr. Tilton moved to waive the three readings, seconded by Mr. Tarbert.

R. C. to waive  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays      Motion carried

Mr. Zakany moved for passage, seconded by Mr. Hutcheson.

Mr. Baker: Mrs. Clapper this is already budgeted in the Revolving Loan Fund to begin with isn't it?

Mrs. Clapper: Yes it is. There are fund available to us. We did request a waiver from the Department of Development to be able to fund this under our formula program. They would not grant us the waiver for a fourth project, but they suggested we use our Revolving Loan Funds which is program income from our other grants.

Mr. Baker: What is the total we have budgeted for this year?

Mrs. Clapper: For the entire Revolving Loan Fund? Should be anywhere between \$165, 000 to \$175,000 that is available to us.

Mr. Kilpatrick: What is the total cost of this project is for the Salvation Army?

Mrs. Clapper: We estimated the cost to be about \$5,500 and that will include the services of an architect to design the project, to replace the units and any electrical upgrades needed, and to hire a contractor to perform that service.

R. C. for passage  
9 Ayes – 0 Nays      Motion carried.

#### **ORDINANCES FOR ACTION**

Mr. Tilton moved to replace Ordinance No. 10-36 with Ordinance No. 10-36 as amended, seconded by Mr. Tarbert.

Mr. Zakany: Where is it amended?

Mr. Baker: What were the amendments to the original ordinance?

Mr. Tilton: We changed it so that instead of everyone being charged \$100 registration fee we went with the MERS registration. Tim Smith would you like to come up and explain the changes?

Mr. Smith: If you look at the last sentence of the definition of vacant we added “A property that is being properly maintained and secured or is in the process of being renovated under proper permits shall not be considered vacant”. If an individual was taking care of a property, even if no one is actually living there, we will not consider that vacant. We looked into the MERS System, which is Mortgage Electronic Registration System, and about 65% of the lenders are

involved in that program. I was able to get a free membership and registered with this program and I was able to track down individuals that are responsible for the maintenance of that property. So, if you are a MERS member and your property is registered there you do not have to register it with the City of Zanesville, so we exempted anyone in the MERS program from paying the \$100 registration requirement. We eliminated the sections requiring the posting of signs and having insurance on the property. We added a penalty system at the end. If a property is not registered we can post the code violations on the scene and legally hold them responsible for anything the City has to do. So if we have to board it up or we have to mow the grass based on the posting on the property we can bill them for that work. Those are the things that were changed.

Mr. Zakany: Haven't we already been passing those costs on to the deed of the property?

Mr. Smith: We only assess are demolitions. Because we are required to send everything by registered mail and we were spending more money on mailings, than we were collecting in assessments. This way we can get around the requirement to mail these to owners that are not registering their property and we can do it by posting that requirement on the property when they fail to register. This gives us a way to bill them and assess the property.

Mr. Zakany: I was hoping when the properties were raised that someone would take over and use the empty lot if it is an asset to them.

Mr. Smith: We encourage people to use those properties, when we tear a house down. We tell neighbors they can feel free to use it. We have people that have gardens on vacant lots, that live next door. It is easier for us to tell them to utilize it, the only thing they cannot do is build on it. If we would take advantage of the new land bank laws that brought Muskingum County on board, we might be able to get our hands these properties easier and get them back in the tax base. We need a tool to handle these vacant properties. We have 600 vacant properties in the city and we tore down 34, we may get 10 or 12 more, and we spent nearly \$600,000.

Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-36 Amended – Introduced by Council – An ordinance adding Chapter 1355 to the Codified Ordinances of the City of Zanesville.

Mr. Tilton moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Baker. Motion carried

Petition from Larry Emerson -13290 Pear Orchard Road

Mr. Emerson: I am the president of the Muskingum Area Real Estate Investors Association. I would like some clarification on this ordinance. I did not come to oppose this ordinance. We looked it over and thought it is something we could live with. I will have to hold that judgment until I read the amendments. In Section (d) under definitions Mr. Smith explained that it would not affect me as a landlord when I have a vacant property between tenants that I am trying to rent. Nor will it affect other members of our association that are rehabilitating and planning to sell a property. However, I want to make sure that I had a legal definition that this would leave us in the clear in Section (d). I would like to get a copy of the amendments.

Petition from Randy Case – 916 Vine Street

Mr. Case: It states at the top corner that this ordinance that it is put up by Mr. Brandford and by the Code Committee Members. Did the Code Committee approve the amended version of this ordinance?

Mr. Tilton: No, it has not been yet. But I have looked at it and I have approved it personally. I have not had a meeting with the committee yet.

Mr. Case: Shouldn't it be tabled until the Code Committee approves it?

Mr. Tilton: We can go through second reading then have a meeting and come back with the third reading.

Mr. Case: This ordinance has been put up without approval from the Code Committee?

Mr. Tilton: Yes, I am the chairman of the committee and I have read and approved it. I did not have a committee meeting.

Mr. Case: Then why was the Code Committee Members put on this if they did not approve it? You could have put that it was approved by you.

Mr. Tilton: I did not put that at the top.

Mr. Case: I am just trying to get clarification on it and if the Code Committee has not voted on it, I don't understand how an ordinance can say something like that.

Mr. Baker: When an ordinance is passed do the people who put this up for consideration does that become part of the ordinance?

Mr. Hillis: No.

Mr. Baker: So it is a moot point.

Mr. Hillis: The Codified Ordinances of the City of Zanesville you will not see people's names next to each codified ordinance, just the date it was passed. You don't see who the sponsor was or who voted for it.

Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-43 – Introduced by Council – An ordinance to amend and revise the zoning map and make permanent zoning in the City of Zanesville, Ohio as herein provided. (700 McIntire Avenue)

Mr. Tarbert moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Roberts.

Mrs. Gentry moved to table this for 90 days, seconded by Mr. Zakany.

R. C. to table

3 Ayes – 6 Nays – Mr. Tilton, Mr. Baker, Mr. Tarbert, Mr. Kilpatrick, Mr. Hutcheson,  
Mr. Roberts

Motion defeated.

Mr. Tarbert moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Roberts.

Petition from Tom Sullivan – 643 Locust Avenue

Mr. Sullivan: During the Council meeting on June 28<sup>th</sup> it was brought to your attention that a complaint with the Ohio Elections Commission had been filed against Mr. Dodson, American Pride, and American Pride Power Equipment. The complaint requested an investigation into the campaign advertisement provided on behalf of five Council candidates prior to the 2009 election. It is scheduled for a preliminary hearing by the Election Commission on August 19<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. A separate complaint has been filed and received with the Ohio Elections Commission. This complaint was filed against the five City Council candidates who were the beneficiaries of a paid advertisement by Mr. Dodson for not reporting in-kind television campaign advertising. This is violation of Ohio Revised Code 3517.0116. The information presented at the last Council meeting appears to represent a conflict of interest for the two Council members who introduced the legislation in favor of the rezoning ordinance of McIntire Avenue. All of the above suggest that the ordinance should not go forward until allegations have been dealt with by the Ohio Elections Commission. Therefore we request that City Council table this ordinance for 90 days in fairness to give the Elections Commission time to reach a decision on the alleged law violations.

Petition from Kevin McPeek – 624 Smithfield Avenue

Mr. McPeek: First of all, that property has always been, since I-70 went through there, a prime commercial property. But, the City had an asset; they disposed of that asset and they only gave

two entities the right to purchase those properties. They were both public service organizations. There was no auction, there was nothing brought up to the public that they could have equal rights to purchase that property at that time before the zoning went into effect where they could have commercialized it or done as they pleased. I am sure with the visibility there a traffic study was taken. At that time that property would have been a prime commercial location for maybe the Social Security Administration, at lot of different offices would be more appropriate for that area that would have went there. The preceding Council members decided that wasn't appropriate. They offered it to two public entities, public service organizations to purchase that property. One of them has upheld their end of it all the way through, they have a very eye appealing facility, you come down I-70, and it is beautiful. The other one, whatever reasons never maintained or was never able to adhere to their part of it. The City bent over backwards when they were proprietors of that property forgiving or extending water fees to them and many other things. Why? I hope it was because it was a public service organization because they don't do the same thing for other businesses and other members of the community. It has been prime commercial property for years. The Y put it up for sale decided for their best interest you aren't going to have the zoning changed and market it as a commercial property to see if there is anyone else out there that would want to pay more for three and a half acres of prime commercial property. They went ahead and negotiated a deal with one person to purchase that property at that rate. Could the Y marketed that property better and got more money out of it that would have benefited the YMCA? We don't know. Why it was never offered to the general public when it's a public asset for sale. I think you really need to look at this. Then again, this property has never been handled in the manner that it should have been since it is a public asset. It should have been put out there for anyone to purchase and it should have been rezoned commercial from the beginning. We chose the develop Northpointe for the relocation of businesses. Now we are going to develop one part of the I-70 corridor of one entity, I think it is a big mistake. Under different circumstances I would say go for it but you should have taken care of the zoning issue a long time ago and made it available to other people to purchase. That is my opinion on it and good luck on your decision.

Mr. Zakany: I have one comment – it's called spot zoning. Now we got a new high school and Roosevelt on Blue Ave. Now let's put a business right across the street. Some person wants to start a business there. Now, its not zoned, resident, but why don't we change it to put business there. It's the same concept. It is not good common sense.

Mr. McPeek: I'm not against small businesses. I am against catering to one entity to make a profit. One if there were assurances given to them that this was going to be rezoned, people have made some promises, and if he or she is an honorable person they will hold up to their promises but if they are upholding their oath to their office, I don't see how they can. They have two choices. Either way good luck because someone stands to make a profit on this whether is it developed or not they have title to that property. If it is sold or rezoned they are going to benefit from it. Now you have to decide are you going to say everyone preceding us was wrong in the way they handled this property. Or are you going to go ahead and let someone else take advantage of it or are you going to stand your ground. It was not bought for the structure because the structure is gone. It was not bought for the trees because they were taken off. You have a vacant bare piece of land and it is a prime location for any commercial business but that is not the thing. The things is it was never intended to that or we as a City would have managed our assets and offered it to the general public so the City could have taken those funds and put it in their general fund. That is just my opinion on it.

Mr. Tarbert: You agree that the property should be commercial.

Mr. McPeek: I agree that it is a prime commercial location and maybe in the past it should have been. It shouldn't be rezoned under these circumstances.

Mr. Tarbert: Are you saying you would have been happier if the Y had a public auction, sold it for a lot more money, and put a car dealership in there?

Mr. McPeek: It was all about getting the most money for the Y. The Y should have come up to Council, done whatever it had to do, then the Council members should have said okay it's a prime commercial property, let's rezone it and let them with restrictions or whatever you have to put on it to accommodate the area.

Mr. Tarbert: We tried that, remember? They tried to do that.

Mr. McPeek: And it did not pass.

Mr. Tarbert: Now you want to put restrictions on a private owner of property as to what he or she, I'm talking about the Y, you are saying that we should delegate who they should be able to sell their property to for what price?

Mr. McPeek: They were given the opportunity to purchase that property under the assumption that they were a public service organization

Mr. Tarbert: When was that?

Mr. McPeek: When did they purchase it?

Mr. Tarbert: I don't know – 60', 70's? I don't know that is anything we can address right now?

Mr. McPeek: You can't continue to go on and when they decide to sell it... Everything has been for the Y. If the Y needed the money, I don't see the way that it was handled was the proper way.

Mr. Tarbert: It may not have been in 1968, but right now the Y owned the property and they have the right to sell that property to whomever they want to sell that property to.

Mr. McPeek: Did you come to the conclusion that they maintained all their agreements with the City even though we didn't enforce them?

Mr. Tarbert: I don't know that they didn't maintain an agreement in 1973 we can't enforce it now.

Mr. McPeek: I know and how can you go out and rezone the property because one person wants you to.

Mr. Tarbert: Because it is prime commercial property.

Mr. McPeek: That's right. Whatever you decide it is up to you. I just think it isn't right.

Mr. Zakany: With property like this, spot zoning, and its been pointed out its spot zoning, then all the zoning we did in blocks, held control of the zoning, then we should say forget it. Go find a piece of property you like and put your business there because you're a small businessman and you want to make a living. I don't care about those people on the second street down all I want is a small business there that I can hire somebody, one or two people. I won't worry about the spot zoning. With it what we are doing, spot zoning.

Mr. Hillis: Mr. Zakany, this is not spot zoning. Whether you are for it or against it I don't care, it is not spot zoning. Look up the definition of zoning. It is not spot zoning. You sit up their meeting after meeting and accuse the City of violating the law by doing spot zoning and I would ask you as a representative of this City of Zanesville to quit saying that the City is spot zoning when it is clearly not. You have an obligation to this City not to make comments that gets it in court for slanderous remarks. It is not spot zoning.

Mr. Zakany: You mean what you are saying is that McIntire is all zoned?

Mr. Hillis: We are saying that the property contiguous to this property is zoned commercial. Look at the zoning map. The property next to it, right across the street, is zoned commercial; therefore it is not spot zoning. If there was no commercial zoning touching it then it would be spot zoning. There is commercial property contiguous to this. It is not spot zoning. You might not want it zoned this way that's fine, that's not my decision, all I would ask you to do is quit saying that the City is violating the zoning code when it is clearly not. It is not spot zoning.

Petition: Brian Addis – 3808 James Court

Mr. Addis: I am the architect on this project and I would like to echo Mr. McPeek's comment that this is prime commercial property. The only point is – Is this to be “R” or is this to be zoned “C” commercial. I show this exhibit to Council last meeting and I want to show it again. On I-70 there are 1.2 million cars a year circulating this property. You see it is encapsulated by the Interstate, on ramps, off ramps, 1.2 million car per year which is an average of 100,000 cars per month with the highest single car count of approximated at 60,000 cars per day. That is the reason why I think this should be commercial. The reason why it shouldn't be residential is the exact same reason.

Mr. Zakany: I understand the use of this property is going to be to sell lawn mowers. In a C-2 he can put a drive thru, a beer dock in that area too.

Mr. Addis: I know it is within your power if you approve the ordinance you can put any restriction on the ordinance that you so desire. Like right of first refusal, it for example American Pride decides to sell or they go “belly up” why can't you put on the ordinance by first refusal that it reverts back. Why not put restrictions on this rezoning?

Mr. Baker: Mr. Hillis, could we put restrictions on the ordinance for right of first refusal on this?

Mr. Hillis: I don't know. I would want to research on that before I gave an opinion on that.

Petition: Ryan Dodson – 1006 Maple Avenue

Mr. Dodson: Just had a few issues I want to address. Since I am holding it, (exhibit Brian Addis referred to) I'll make the first one, property value. There have been a few people that have mentioned the concern about their property value. I can't find anybody that would say that this (showing exhibit) design the way the green space, the landscaping, the way we will keep the property maintained would it actually hurt anybody's property values. This will be far superior to what has been there the past four years. The grounds will be maintained immaculately, in fact, we would request ODOT would allow us to maintain the area outside of the ODOT fence, the on ramp, the off ramp, and the interstate. We would keep it clean, free of debris, and neatly mowed. Everybody says how much better it looks now than it did before. Another item I want to address is traffic. I don't believe that it will increase traffic on McIntire Avenue. Many of our customers and all of our trucks that come to deliver to our store already use McIntire Avenue and like the Y we are a seasonal business and we will have less traffic in our busy season than the Y did in their busy season. There should not be any net increase of traffic on McIntire Avenue. The biggest difference is when those trucks do come they will be going off of the street instead of having to unload on Ball Street, where you have people flying off of Interstate 70 making a hard right turn on to Ball Street where we are trying to unload trucks because we don't have a loading dock at our current location. We will have a loading dock where we drive right into the semi that will be off the road. It will be much safer for our employees, for people traveling the roads. We will be out of the historic district instead of in it where we are now. Better for the neighbors, better for everybody involved. Another issue that shouldn't have to address, but I feel that I do, is free speech. I wouldn't address the issue except one council member gave this as a reason she would oppose the rezoning to one of my customers. I believe it is well within my right as an American under the First Amendment to oppose the government takeover of our healthcare system. The U.S. already has two entitlement programs with Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, which will bankrupt us. The healthcare bill will speed up that process immensely. Not only am I allowed to say this but I have a duty to say it. I wonder what happened to the philosophy that we are suppose to live by as Americans of I disagree with every word you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it. They suppress free speech in communist China. Those of you attempting to do it here in Zanesville, Ohio should be ashamed. If any of you guys want to get a better idea of the general feeling of the community about this issue, please feel free to come to and spend some time in our store. Hang out of a few hours or a few days or the next two weeks in total. Sit in my office so they can't see you, you might not want to hear what they say but listen to what people say to my parts man, all day every day. That poor guy has to listen to “What in the world are they thinking?” over and over again and about the businesses that we run out of town. One of the greater ironies of the whole thing, Brian King mentioned last time about Longaberger giving the pool to Dresden, Longaberger could have given a pool to Zanesville if we didn't run Longaberger out of town. Longaberger along with dozens of other businesses that we have said, “We are all in favor of business, but you don't meet this specific criteria so you can't come here.” So I don't believe we are sending the right message by saying yes we want

business, we want your employees, we need to not transfer \$2,300 from police to the airport, but these tax revenues, these few employees that we will hire are not going to create enough revenue, but \$450,000 in construction budget in labor alone, those tax dollars will come this fall if this is approved. This fall those tax dollars will go to the City budget, obviously the city is in need of it.

Mr. Zakany: I have a property on Brighton Blvd, there are a lot of trucks go up and down that street. I have a 50 X 70 empty lot. It has water and gas. My I put up a business in that area next to my house?

Mr. Hillis: I think you would have to check the zoning to see if you can. I don't know what that has to do with whether or not this is spot zoning, Mr. Zakany. I am not saying one way or another whether this business is a good idea for this business to go there. I am simply saying it is not spot zoning.

Mr. Zakany: I understand.

Petition from Martha Sullivan – 643 Locust Avenue

Mrs. Sullivan: I came up last week and you all remember what I said. There are two complaints pending with the Ohio Elections Commission, against people who will be making a decision on this ordinance. What I am asking Council is if you will please wait and make your decision after the Ohio Elections Commission comes to an agreement after they have their hearing so there is no cloud of doubt of the decisions of the Council on this ordinance. No matter which way you vote, you don't want it to be an issue where there is doubt in the minds of the citizens of Zanesville that things were not done properly in introducing this ordinance. So take this very seriously, the integrity of our Zanesville City Council as a whole is at stake here. So please think about this. There was a motion tonight to table this there are people in this room that got an opinion from the Attorney General's office today on this issue. The Attorney General's office advised that you wait to hear the decision from the Ohio Elections Commission and then go forward with the decision that the Elections Commission come up with. That is all I ask. Just wait and to it properly.

Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-51 – Introduced by Council – An ordinance to amend and revise the zoning map and make permanent zoning in the City of Zanesville, Ohio as herein provided. (495 Wayne Avenue)

Mr. Tarbert moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Tilton. Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-53 – Introduced by Council – An ordinance authorizing the proper City official to advertise for bids for materials to overlay various alleys in the City and to enter into a professional contract with the lowest and best bidder and the Transportation Improvement District.

Mr. Roberts moved for second reading, seconded by Mr. Baker. Mr. Tarbert abstained. Motion carried.

Ordinance No. 10-45 – Introduced by Council – An ordinance allowing a moral claim.

Mr. Tilton moved for third reading, seconded by Mr. Tarbert.

R. C. for passage

0 Ayes – 9 Nays – Mr. Tilton, Mr. Zakany, Mr. Baker, Mr. Tarbert, Mrs. Gentry,  
Mrs. Norman, Mr. Kilpatrick, Mr. Hutcheson, Mr. Roberts.

Motion defeated.

#### **PRIVATE PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Mayor Zwelling: I welcomed 350 campers from the Good Sam Camper at the Fair Grounds the other night. They come to this City three or four years in a row and they are very nice people that came as far away as California and several people from Canada. The opening ceremonies were very touching. They played the National Anthem, God Bless America, and the National Anthem of Canada. They honored the veterans in the room. There must have been about 100 of them. With lapel pins of the American Flag. I welcomed them and felt compelled to tell them about the Lima Company Art Exhibit in the basement of Secrest Auditorium. If any of you have not seen it yet, Secrest will be opened the night of the Taste of Zanesville which is this Wednesday. John Kunkel told me that about fifty of the campers came to see the exhibit. They were inspired by it. Soon the artist is doing Mr. Bradley that gave his life in Iraq and he was somewhat associated with the Lima Company. That will be unveiled soon and we will announce when that will happen. It is magnificent and it will be here six or seven weeks. In addition Secrest is basically closed for five or six weeks at this time in accordance with John Kunkel's plan to save on utilities.

Mr. Baker: Mike, is there some water or gas line repairs being made on Gallagher Street area?

Mr. Sims: There was a water repair done. We received a call from a neighbor and we made the repairs today.

Mr. Baker: The gentleman I talked to said something about holes being left in his yard.

Mr. Sims: They were the result of the stabilizers from the backhoe left some depressions. It was taken care of today.

Mr. Tilton moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Zakany.

Motion carried

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.