

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

December 20, 2004

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Eric Gilbert, Lane J. Beougher, Antoinette Newman.

Other member of Council present: Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:30.

The first item on the agenda, approval of the minutes of the December 6, 2004 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item is approval of the agenda. I would like to remove item number 7 (Discussion: Engine or exhaust brakes) and have it put back on the agenda the second committee meeting in January. I know Mr. Underwood has been busy and hasn't had a chance to look at it. And I'm sure the Chief's been busy.

Mr. Underwood: I looked at it.

Mr. Clemens: I'm going to hold it anyway then for the second committee in January. Are there any additions or deletions to the agenda? (No response). All in favor of the change, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

The next item on the agenda is a Liquor Permit Request. A new one at the address of 6527 & 6529 E. Livingston Ave., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Chief.

Chief Miller: The La Jalisciense liquor license at the location that you just mentioned on 6527 and 6529 E. Livingston. We've done a background, an investigation into this request, and we can find no reason at this time to appeal the liquor license application.

Mr. Clemens: Fine. Thank you. We'll just let it go at that and not move any further on it. Are there any questions for Chief Miller? (No response).

If not, next item, Discussion: Amend 1339.01(a) and 1339.04(a) and (c). Stephen.

Mr. Moore: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Mr. Beougher and myself have been working on this. This is a change to update the commercial building code. The state has a new code they've put together and it will become effective March 1, 2005. And we need this to be in place so our effective date becomes the same as theirs.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions for Mr. Moore? (No response). On this Stephen, we could move it on for the first reading and then if we have questions relating to it or possibly you'd be able to explain more on it once we go through the process since there's no big hurry on it.

Mr. Moore: Sure. That's fine.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mr. Moore? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion we send this to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, Stephen.

Mr. Moore: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Next item, Discussion: Authorization to accept subgrant, appropriation of funds - for server and related equipment concerning in-car cameras, etc. Who is going to speak on this?

Chief Miller: I will, Mr. Clemens. After we asked for the original grant earlier this year where we, this is the transition from VHS recording to digital recording for the in-car cameras. Our in-car camera system in the cruisers have now reached an age where they're constantly breaking down and this is a new technology. When we asked for your permission to apply for the grant earlier this year, we did not include our network administrator, Bobby Smathers on the process. And as we started, after you approved it and we started to move forward, he came to me and expressed some concerns about how, about the fact that the technology and the program as we had had it originally approved, would not be easy to work out. So I went back to Mrs. Reichard, and we went back to the Office of Criminal Justice Services and asked if they had any additional funds available. They do. The money that they are providing for us will cover what is needed by Mr. Smathers to bring the system up to what he thinks will make it more usable. And so now we are asking for approval to accept the grant and to move forward with the whole package. Now, the additional monies that we're asking for, there was a question about the fact that it's over \$10,000. And just so you know, one of the vendors is Dell, and the items that they have that we are purchasing, and I think they come to approximately \$19,000, are on the state bid list.

Mr. Clemens: On the state bid list?

Chief Miller: Yes. So there's not a need to go out for a bid on this.

Mr. Clemens: On this, and I intend to support this Chief because I know it's needed, I do have a couple of problems. When this was brought up, the in-car cameras and also the in-car computers, and we discussed all this, and I know the amount of money that's being spent on it, there were questions asked. And I asked a question and I don't know anything about computers, but I had talked to people about it and so forth and it was brought up, I brought up the fact that we would need a new server probably. And I was told at that time, 'no there's no need for a new server. This will all be handled and it would be no problem'. And I have no fault with you on this. I have a fault on it's been that length of time and we worked on this for probably a year now that some of this stuff, that's why it's being brought up now, should have been known before. And one reason I'm bringing it up is, it's on there as an emergency again. And I do respect Mr. Stearns' comment as far as the emergencies are concerned. It just seems like on these grants, and I know there's plenty of grants out there and they're good for the city, and they're good for the community, but it seems like we're getting our grants in late and at the last minute we have to do

these things. And my thought would be, on the approval of these grants, my thought would be, and I know there's plenty of grants that you should apply for, that you would come to Council and explain it and get approval before we even apply for grants. Because we apply for grants, if we apply for grants and get it back on approval and we decide we don't want it, don't want to spend the money, then it would be bad. It would make you look bad. And I would hope that in the future when we get into the grants that they would be brought before Council before they're applied for so we would know what we're looking at financially and so forth. That's what my only problem is. The server part was brought up. And now I look and see that that's basically what the main part of it is, is a new server. And I think that's something that our computer specialist should have known a long time ago to be honest with you. Now I could be wrong. Don't get me wrong, because I don't know that much about it. I think it's been a long process and I think that this is something that could have been handled sooner and not had to have been at the last minute and not been an emergency.

Chief Miller: And please accept my apologies, Mr. Clemens. It was not the way any of us would have wanted it to go. One of the issues was that when we did finally sit down with Mr. Smathers and he made this recommendation, we then struggled with where we were going to come up with the extra money. And quite frankly, one of the things I thought about was waiting until after the in-car computer program was finished and made sure, and I thought I might take all of the money, the additional money for the in-car cameras out of Asset Forfeiture. I had a discussion late in the year with Mrs. Reichard about this issue. And that was when she suggested we call the Office of Criminal Justice Services.

Mr. Clemens: And I want to thank Mrs. Reichard for the work she did on this. And I understand the situation. But I think, and there has been comments made and so forth, we are passing a lot of things as an emergency that probably shouldn't be. We should have had one more time on it. That's the only reason I'm bringing it up.

Chief Miller: I would like to be clear that the money that's going for the in-car cameras, the vast majority of it is either grant funding or asset forfeiture. There was some money transferred, I think earlier in the year from our personnel budget to cover a portion of it. But it would be, at this point, maybe 10 or 15 percent of the total cost.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Chief. Are there any other questions for Chief Miller pertaining to this subject? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion that we send this to Council for approval as an emergency. Do I have a second on it? Second by Mrs. Newman. Thank you, Chief.

Chief Miller: Thank you, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE 2005 STREET PROGRAM and APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR (CIP #99) AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

I'm sorry. We should vote on that. (Previous topic)

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, I think also do you want to send that over to Finance for approval?

Mr. Clemens: Alright. We'll send this to Finance for approval and I'd like to take a vote. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Next item, and this will go to Finance Committee. Next item, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE 2005 STREET PROGRAM and APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR (CIP #99) AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. First reading 12-15-04. On this, this basically was not an emergency. It's in the ordinance as an emergency and I don't know whether it has to be or not be. It was not sent to us as an emergency. Is there a reason? Should it be an emergency? Or would you rather have that taken out?

Mrs. Reichard: No. It was not sent as an emergency and I was kind of surprised to see it come out of committee that way, but delightfully surprised, because the earlier we bid it, the better the price. And so if we have an emergency on it, we don't have to wait the extra 30 days to bid.

Mr. Clemens: I think that what Sharon's saying is that the earlier we're able to bid the project out, the much better price we'll get. Because contractors are looking for work at the start of spring and it does benefit us by getting it out early. So, are there any questions for Mrs. Reichard on this. It's being an emergency. Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Are we asking to leave it as an emergency?

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Since it's there.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens. I'd just like to note, the emergency, people don't understand. If it's not an emergency, it's got a 30 day waiting period. Once the decision has been made by Council or the administration, we do need to do a Street Program, and Council says, 'yeah we agree. We need to do a Street Program and here are the streets'. The quicker you can get that bid on the street, the longer time there is. So the decision has been discussed. It's been talked about. I don't see where an emergency, once there's been a full discussion and the opportunity and decisions from administration and verified by Council, I don't think that anyone would have, I don't think Mr. Stearns will have a question on the emergency then. Once it's decided, streets need repaired, we're going to do it. So this one has been around and we know yearly we do a Street Program. So from that benefit, while everybody else is having holiday cheer in some way shape or form, somebody can start bidding on some projects next week.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Stearns: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. You know, I don't want it to be said that...emergency is emergency is the way I see it, and if something has to be done, I don't have a problem with it. If it's something that has to be done and it's going to save the city some money just like Mrs.

Reichard said, go on ahead and do it, but the thing, like you said yourself Mr. Clemens, if it's something that has to be done, don't wait until the last minute to get it before Council. Just go ahead and do it in a timely manner. That's the only problem that I have with the emergencies that are coming before us.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Stearns. Are there any other questions on this subject? (No response). If not, I'd like to send it to Council for its second reading as an emergency. Do I have a second on it? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

That will end the meeting at 7:45.

Safety Committee

--Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

December 20, 2004

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

December 20, 2004

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens, Lane J. Beougher.

Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: I'd like to call the December 20 Finance Committee meeting to order at 7:46.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee

meeting held December 6, 2004. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of agenda. I have a couple of item I'd like to change on the agenda. One is, we need to add as 3a, the request appropriation transferring of funds for the in-car cameras and related equipment. And then also, if there's no objection from Council members, I would like to remove items 1 (Discussion: Amendment of Table 1155 Zoning Code Fees (Plot-Grade-Utility Plan Review)), 2 (Discussion: Change in City of Reynoldsburg Investment Policy (Treasury Investment Board)), and 3 (ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE "CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL" Section 7.05 "Smoking/Tobacco Use") under Other Legislation status. If we have folks that would like to bring those back next year I'd be happy to re-entertain those. Are there any other changes? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: You said 1, 2, and 3?

Mr. Stake: Yes. At the end of the agenda, after 16 under Other Legislation.

Mr. Baxter: I see what you're getting at. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other changes to the agenda? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item 3a is the request, an appropriation of funds by transferring funds and accepting grant monies for in-car camera related equipment. A transfer of \$6,666.67 from account number 290.000.5529. I believe that's a DUI/Education Enforcement Fund. And \$20,000 from the unappropriated General Fund to account number 110.111.5639, Other Equipment. And pass that as an emergency. This was discussed in the Safety Committee and I believe the Finance Committee will just be granting an approval of that. Is there any further questions or comments on that? (No response). Okay. None being heard, then I will make a motion that we approve this request by the Safety Committee. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion?

Mr. Beougher: I do have a question. Are there any restrictions on the DUI/Education Enforcement Fund? Is that a restricted account or do we have the authority to use it for in-car cameras?

Chief Miller: We have the authority to use it for in-car cameras because it will be used in terms of evidence at DUI enforcement cases.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Thank you, Chief. Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay then. Then I'll make a motion that we approve this request by the Safety Committee. Is there a second? Or, Mr. Beougher did second that. All in favor, state aye. (All

voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is Discussion: Addendums for professional services contract(s). This was something that was brought up by Mr. Gilbert at the last committee meeting. I believe the City Attorney drafted us a couple of sample addendums, or addendums for the engineering contracts. And out of respect for Mr. Gilbert, he asked for this to be put on the agenda and discussed tonight. Or asked that this be brought forward. And Mr. Gilbert, I’ll turn this over to you.

Mr. Gilbert: I would just open up to the members comments I’ve read. I’ll thank Mr. Underwood for his write-up. And I think they were concise and simple and I would just say as far as consideration this evening, I agree with your suggestion last week that we add this for discussion this week. And I think my comments were clear and simple at the last committee meeting in terms of why I support this. And just let them stand and open it up to discussion from the other members. There wasn’t a great deal of discussion at that time and we had talked and we thought it would be good to have additional discussion on the items.

Mr. Stake: Okay. First of all I guess, this is something the administration would have to talk with the professional services providers about. I was wondering if they had any comments on this.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Well, first of all, we kind of wanted to see how it went here at City Council before we have any formal negotiations with the engineers. We had briefly touched base with them letting them know that it was on the agenda suggesting that they perhaps contact their legal counsel and get an opinion as to what they would want to do. So that’s pretty much where we’ve left it with them. As far as the administration’s recommendation, this was not a part of our bid. When we put the request for proposals out, we are not in favor of adding this addendum to the contract. We have had an excellent working relationship with EMH&T probably for 40 plus years. We have built a considerable amount of trust in that. And we don’t really see a need for it. As you recall several years ago when there was a perceived conflict with the engineers reviewing their own work, we changed that. So any plat that comes in that’s got EMH&T’s logo or name on it, it automatically goes to review by DLZ. So we have not had any problem whatsoever with any conflict with EMH&T and the private sector. And we’re not really sure that asking an engineering company to divulge their future, or potential clients to the City of Reynoldsburg is even workable. I think anyone that’s been involved in contract negotiations and real estate at any level, realizes there are a lot of things that are done that are done prior to actually bringing it forward to Council, to the administration, or any one. And again, I haven’t received any comments back from the legal counsel of the individual engineering companies. But it is an addendum that we don’t feel is necessary in the administration and would encourage Council to not require this addendum to be added to the contract. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Seeing as how this would be attached to the engineering contract and we do have our City Engineer here, does he have any comments on this?

Mr. Parkinson: We were provided a copy of the proposed addendum. We do have certain reservations in regards to the language that’s presented. We have some questions ourselves more internally on the issues. I have spoken with our owners and they are giving it their full

consideration. I do believe that they intend to engage in their legal staff for opinion as well. At this time we have not, that I'm aware of, come to a decision yet.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Parkinson, do you have, are any of these types of agreements in any other contracts that you have with municipalities?

Mr. Parkinson: I'm not aware that we have anything like this in any of our other contracts. Either public or private sector contracts.

Mr. Stake: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just for clarification, I don't know if Bill wants to address this or not, but just to get it straight in my own mind, an addendum to a contract needs to be negotiated and discussed and everything else. We have right now, we had two members of Council and two members of administration and the City Attorney negotiate, or not negotiate, but review those people who provide professional services in the engineering line. And they were categorized and prioritized. And the negotiations of that have already been concluded. And if I look at these contracts right, each firm providing, EMH&T, Triad, DLZ, all four of those engineering firms, have said, 'okay. We have now negotiated with the Mayor as a representative of the city'. And they have signed off on these contracts. So this would be a re-negotiated item that would be a secondary contract. You can call it an addendum all you want. But the terms of this has to be fully negotiated and talked about. I just am a little confused. I talked to Mr. Gilbert about this. It's kind of, this would have been nice to have done this during the whole negotiating in the professional selection stage so that everybody knew what it was and there was something there. I'm not saying that these things aren't done. I personally feel that when you're providing professional services, I'm not sure you have a duty to disclose all of the people you do your work for. There may be times, I have a law license, and I'm not sure that I want to disclose to everybody I have a legal discussion with. And I know Mr. Underwood wouldn't. I'm a little confused as why in the professional selection process, we're getting into a full disclosure or open disclosure or whatever we want to call it. And as I talked to Mr. Gilbert today, I just think that if this needed to be done, or could be done, it should have been done before for owner's, representatives, or whatever of engineering and architectural firms, signed off on a negotiated line. It should have been discussed at that time before they signed off so we knew where it was. Here we are at the 20th of the month, and I think if anything, it may put some questions of where our contracts stand on 1-1-05. If we're sitting here talking about negotiating a secondary contract to be attached to this. But I think, in my personal opinion, I think we made, if this needed to be in there, we got a late start to get it there. It goes right along with what Mr. Stearns was saying earlier. We spend a lot of time here. Some times with those late starts. It's a hurry up and wait. Then we've got to pass it immediately. I think we need to do as we did, we're going to see later on on the recommendations for placements. We shouldn't be looking for replacing people if we didn't start looking until the third week of the month that their term expires. It takes a little, there should be a little more forethought given on those type of things. With that, I just felt it appropriate to make those comments. I was not here last week. I understand I had more fun where I was than you all did. But I did not get to participate in that but I did want to open my opinions up. Thank you, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. First I'd like to say I respect Eric's views on this. I understand his thoughts. And what I have to say has nothing to do with Mr. Gilbert, his thoughts on this. I have thought about this too. And I've looked it over and I was part of the selection committee. If this is something that's going to be, it should be in the ordinance that we have that lays out how we do our selection and how we do our selection committee and how we advertise. Because if we had had this in our advertisement when it was solicited for bids, or solicited for everybody to send their brochures in and their company profiles and so forth, we had probably not have got half of what we got. We would only maybe have got a third of them. And we had about 25, 30. And it was a hard job going over all of these. And as the Mayor said, we read all of these, went through all the procedures. And believe me, these companies, all of them that were involved, there were companies that did 50, 60 million dollar projects. They could have put Reynoldsburg inside the jobs that they did, that sent in their resumes for our work. But some of them like were in Toledo and some of them were too big. And the way our point system is, the ones that do work for Reynoldsburg got higher grades because that's just the way it's laid out. And so after we went through all of this, then we graded it and turned in the top five to the Mayor and then he negotiates from the top five down. I think that everything was followed correctly. I think if this was to be done and thought about, then it should be for the next time and should have a lot of discussion on this and should be in the ordinance that requires what we do. I also worked with Evans and Mechwart for 30 some odd years. As a matter of fact, I was on Council when we hired them. And that's been a long, long, long time ago. I had my problems on some things. We all do. There were some things I thought should have been done different. But I'm not an engineer. I'm like everybody else. You want your own way I guess. And nothing comes out perfect. But I think over all in all these years, I think they've done a great job as far as the city's concerned. They have all of our records. They have everything we ever did in the past 35 years. Their company's grown. Their company's much, much bigger than the City of Reynoldsburg. They've probably got three times as many employees and probably a budget three times as big. So we're probably just a small little fox in their den. But they have been cooperative. They always want to be our engineers. I think personally, I think doing something like this at the time we're doing it makes it look bad not only for the committee that did the selection, for the administration and the negotiated contract, but for the companies that are involved. I mean, it looks like we're pointing a finger at something we don't know where it goes. Now I know there's problems. Problems can be worked out. But I think it puts the city in the situation that will be known all through the different professions on the situation that we're involved in tonight. I think it's something that we feel is a necessity, then there has to be a reason. When you do something there has to be a reason. It can't be over one item or something we thought just happened. I think it's something we should think about and if it's something we feel should be done, then we should discuss it much more and put it in our ordinance. Because our ordinance has to be changed the way we do it any how I feel. And have it for the next selection that we go around. And that way we put it out front. It's out front. People know what we're requiring when they send in their resumes. And if they send in their resumes, that's fine. But I look at it this way. Then engineers are not different than the architects. The architects are no different than the attorney's. And if we're going to do it for one, and I'm a full believer for this, then we do it for everybody. Because I know how an architectural firm can handle this too being our, if you're our architectural

firm or you're our City Engineer, or you're our City Attorney, or you work for the city, people look at that. They know that if you do work here, then you've got a step up on everybody. Because you know what's going on. You know what our policies are. So therefore, they do look for you to do their work. And I understand that. That's why about 10 years ago, that's what the Mayor says, we went to Council and had the back-up engineers put in. And the way it works and if a company is handling work for a developer and they're doing the plans and all of this for the developer, it all comes through and the back-up engineer does the work for the city as far as the approval and okay and everything like that. And that's worked fine. And the same way with the architectural firm. That's the way it works. And it's worked fine. Personally, I don't see any reason to do it at this time. I think the situation that brought this about was not caused by the City Engineers. It's a situation that, because I discussed it not only with our Service/Safety Director, but with our Street Department Superintendent. And it's a situation our engineers had nothing to do with as far as one portion of this is concerned. I feel that Eric in good faith brought this up and I have no problem looking at it for the future. But I know it takes a lot of discussion. That's my feeling on it. I just wanted to get my feeling out.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Gilbert, member of the committee.

Mr. Gilbert: Well I appreciate the comments. In thinking this through, and talking with Mr. Hills today, in one aspect it's reinforced my feeling that this is necessary. From another standpoint, I appreciate the points that have been made in regards to the timing and the good faith negotiations that were entered upon with potential contractors. Mr. Clemens has a point in terms of being out front, and up front on this, and I guess my thought on that is, in doing that, we do what we suggest we should not ask of our contractors. And, I'd like to keep this simple - it's full disclosure; nothing other than that. There is no indictment, or criticism made of anyone in this process, and how I brought this up _____ how thing's could be misconstrued. My understanding of the triggering mechanism for the backup engineer, is that it's self-enforcement; and that is a luxury that we have, but I guess we have some issues here; I don't deny the fact that the timing is difficult. I just do not acknowledge that seeking full disclosure is an attempt to damage a business' private interests. I just think it's more important, and it's our job to protect the public interest, and full disclosure does that. It is a unique situation when a company represents the public interest, and the private interest, on both sides of the aisle, and I'm willing to consider the suggestions made here tonight that we pursue this further for the next round of discussions, but I think it's important to note that the public interest isn't the enemy here. It's the public interest that we're here to protect, and that's to be above and beyond the consideration of reproach. We're all subjected to full disclosure, with our ethics reports each year, and I think this is a unique situation that as we move forward with this relationship, as I pointed out, the full disclosure mechanism is important to protect the public interests; to protect this table and the decisions that we make, as well as the other point that I made with public records and those that are held by a private contract on our behalf. And, Mr. Clemens, you're right, this was entered into on a good faith on my part, and I think in talking with other members at the table, there are a good number of members here that feel the same as myself, and those are just my comments at this point, Mr. Stake, and I think you were going to ask the other members of Council if they had anything to add.

Mr. Stake: Yes, thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Mr. Baxter?

Mr. Baxter: Thank you Mr. Stake. I have a couple of points here; first off, I agree with Eric and with Councilmen Clemens and with Mr. Hills, as well, that this is a difficult issue. First off, it's not a statement based against any of our contracts that we have out or the companies we deal with. I believe we have good faith with them and continue that. I think, moreover, as Eric mentioned, that this is more towards public interest. As to the comment, Bill, that you made of the selection committee, is the contract a stipulation of selection, and how that contract's written?

Mr. Hills: Is that a question for me?

Mr. Baxter: I think that would be a question for you, Bill; I'm not a part of that committee, so I don't...

Mr. Hills: The selection committee reviewed...there's a document - we need engineers, professional services...you submit if you're interested; then it's reviewed by five different members; they're ranked, rated, and then whoever has the top points, the Administration is to negotiate a contract for those services that you've been asked that you can provide; and that's where the contract has been negotiated, and this was not a term in the contract.

Mr. Baxter: But not a part of the selection criteria; they were already selected through the top four or five, at the time you go look at contracts. I think that's the point I'm trying to make that the contract doesn't stipulate the top companies that you go looking at and then the Mayor goes into a contract on.

Mr. Hills: There's a selection sheet that you have to rank according to different things they can provide - can you do this, this and this - and a point total given to that, and then add it together, and the top point-getter becomes the one that the Administration should negotiate first.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. That's the point I'm trying to make, that the selection criteria to get those top points, the contract at that time is part of the selection choices that you rank...

Mr. Hills: No, it's the ability to provide the services you're asking...

Mr. Baxter: That's what I thought; thank you. In addition to that, another point I wanted to make is that I hear full disclosure; I think what I'm listening to...I want to make sure I understand this, when we talk about full disclosure, it's disclosure about those projects being worked on in Reynoldsburg. I don't think, and maybe I'm wrong, correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Gilbert, that you're not asking the companies that we deal with to tell us about all their business in every part of the state, or in the United States, but only in our part of the world.

Mr. Gilbert: The addendum included the corporate limits, and the sewer boundaries.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that was something that was understood...when I hear 'all company's assets, or all company's work', that we're actually just considering the focus in our little realm here. An idea, even though given late, and I

do know this is what we're talking about; it's one of the issues here, it did come late. Good or bad, I think it does need to discuss, and I'm happy that at least it's being brought to the table and being discussed - good, bad or indifferent. My personal belief on this is that it's a good idea; that it does protect our citizens, and that's why we're here - to protect the public. And how do we protect the public? By ensuring that whoever we do business with is looking at the interest of the public as well and I think this gives us the ability to do so. I did hear the question come out, to ask, has there been any other request of EMHT to do this type of addendum, or this type of contract, to get full disclosure. What I was wondering, is this something that is being done, not just through EMH&T, but other companies. My understanding is, that it is part of contracts that states are now producing; that they are asking companies to give disclosure information; so this isn't just out of the blue that we'd like something, but it's other government entities are asking this of their contract companies.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter, can you tell me some of them?

Mr. Baxter: I will be glad to give you a list of a couple of those that I did some research on; I'll go ahead and get that to Council and have that distributed.

Mr. Stake: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Baxter: I don't think this is an intent to do harm or damage to the public or private entities we're doing business with, but moreover to ensure that there's full disclosure of who they're working with. I think lastly, the points that I was going through here were based upon discussions I've heard here tonight. I think the primary goal here, just to sum up, is to state the interest here is to protect the public, number one; and as we do contracts with the companies that we want to make sure we know what the interest is, and I think the discussion here is based upon; I don't think anybody here is trying to have an agenda specifically to do damage to any one of the companies we work with; moreover, to protect the private interests, or the public interests, excuse me. So that being said, personally I am for any type of contract that makes that happen. I don't know if I'm comfortable with what I've seen from Bill yet or not; I'm not an attorney; I'm going to have to take his recommendation for what's the best way to do that. And that's the end of my comments, thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Are there any other comments? Ms. Newman.

Ms. Newman: Yes, I am in agreement also with Mr. Gilbert. And I understand Mr. Clemens' and Mr. Hills' points of view, but it is a little late in the game to try to stick an addendum on a contract that's already been executed. You know, that isn't very good form. The thing I'm concerned about is that we protect the people in this city and use their money wisely, but we don't, for example, provide infrastructure that we may, or may not need, which is going to benefit some future development, you know, that we don't know of. Now I'm sort of a plain-spoken person, and I feel that this may have been the case in the past; that we were encouraged to develop infrastructure, or make repairs that perhaps weren't really all that necessary. And for that reason, I feel that we do need full disclosure.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Ms. Newman. Ms. Newman, what are you referring to?

Ms. Newman: Okay, well, I'm referring to a proposal for a five lane road from Route 70 and Taylor Road, for example; for the repair of that bridge...

Mr. Stake: The bridge on Taylor Road?

Ms. Newman: No, the Summit bridge. I'm not sure we need to do that.

Mr. Stake: Okay, I'm having trouble seeing the relationship the Taylor Road, what we had talked about and ...

Ms. Newman: That's two separate incidents..of where, you know, I don't know what benefit it would be to the city of Reynoldsburg to, you know, widen that road to that extent, to five lanes.

Mr. Stake: Okay..well I think...Mr. Clemens, go ahead.

Mr. Clemens: To answer that - the proposal was never made to widen Taylor Road to five lanes. The discussion was made on whether we should take additional right-of-way, in case it was ever made to five lanes. That's what the discussion was about. That was between the City of Reynoldsburg, and a discussion of what might happen ten years from now, and whether it's a benefit to get the additional right-of-way; then in time, the state may want to do this. The second item, on the bridge; the bridge was brought up ... 1999...and I was still the Service Director then and we put it on the CIP program to be done. It's been discussed off and on ever since then. As far as being put on Issue II, I discussed that with Mrs. Reichard, and I discussed it with Mr. Ward, and they both said they had no communications with Evans, Mechwart as far as Issue II was concerned; that was something Mrs. Reichard had discussed with people she had worked for before downtown, and the opportunity existed, they brought it up that we might have the opportunity to put it on there, and I take both of them at their word, I have no reason why not - so as far as I'm concerned, that solves the bridge problem, and that's been six years ago. Certainly there's been mistakes made all along; I brought that up...Dave and I used to ____ things were done that I didn't especially agree with, but I was wrong on a lot of them, too. I'm not an engineer. In the years that I've dealt with them, the thirty-some years, I don't know of anything that they've done as far as the city's concerned, to improve their clients. You know, we require their clients to run bigger sewer lines, bigger water lines through the developments, so the next person that hooks on, they have to do the same thing so we continue our water and sewer system. The clients have to build all the roads; they have to do all the paving; they have to do all the lighting; the city don't pay for any of it. Those are all done by their clients, so the city's not putting any money into our developments. I know of nothing, in all those years, that has been done to improve a client...position in the City of Reynoldsburg. Now, don't get me wrong, as far as them being our city engineers, or DLZ, or Asebrook, or anybody that does work with the City of Reynoldsburg - certainly people go to them because they know that...they know everybody here; they know that they know all the rules and regulations and so forth, and I sure know if I was going to do a development, I would get Evans, Mechwart or DLZ to do it because they know what the problems are, but that's why the backup engineer, the backup architect services are there. And I understand Mr. Baxter's position on this, as far as protecting the city. I believe that way too. I've never felt the city was unprotected with the way we had our backup program. These companies are big

companies; they have no reason, we have no reason, I've never had any reason to not believe in their honesty or their welfare towards the City of Reynoldsburg or towards our taxpayers. We're here to protect our taxpayers; I know of nothing over the last thirty-some years that Evans, Mechwart has been called to the table on, or been in court over, or did anything that's not justifiable for the City of Reynoldsburg, justifiable for our citizens, I mean, if I did, I sure would be voting against it, I guarantee you that. They wouldn't have my vote this evening, just like DLZ wouldn't, or Asebrook, or any of them. A lot of this is an administrative matter; it's handled through the Mayor, through the Safety/Service Director, etc. I can see everybody's points that's been brought up. I wanted to clear up about the bridge; that was something that had been brought up years and years ago, and we'd never improved it because we were always trying to get money from Etna Township, from Licking County Commissioners, from Licking County Engineers - I suppose at some time, we'll end up doing it. I just wanted to clear that up.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Stake?

Mr. Stake: Yes, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you. I think Ms. Newman was pointing to the appearance, I know, on the five lane suggestion; there was some question where that evolved from. Whether it was from the Administration, whether it was from the engineer, whether it was a suggestion from the developer; and I'll be right up front with you. The first meeting where that was brought about...I was told by the city engineer, as were the others, that this should not leave the room. Well, that's where I'm going to draw the line; I'm elected by the same people as the Mayor; and I don't get told what to do by the hired help. And if you want to talk about appearance; and I have to be careful because there can be misunderstanding, but I know an awful lot of residents that can follow little Jordan Run and question the appearance of things; and I can go back to the Cobblegate-Windsor Forest Sewer Project where questions weren't raised by Council as to the propriety...(tape change) ...of where we were putting sewer lines, but by our own bond counsel; well, the line went in. And the question, the property in question then was put up for development and our engineers were the engineer for the potential development. Improper? No. Working within the confines of the law; but the question...and that's where full disclosure would come in and be helpful so that our constituents don't come back to us and question us about these things. I just think it's time to start asking these hard questions and we may not get an answer in regards to this contract, but if we want to be specific, and offer up some of these examples, I can do it. I've been asked questions by the residents and I've got to find an answer. Those are some of the reasons I brought this forward; I don't question the quality of the work; I don't question the commitment; they're under contract when they do the work for us. But I'm not going to sit here and make the residents' right to know, the enemy. And **that** is why I thought it was important to have this discussion at this point. It's as simple as that. And with due respect to the suggestions of other members in regards to the timing, I would be open, provided other members would be as well, and this had additional discussion as we move forward; if it's not an actual part of the contract that's subject to a vote next week, but I am sensitive to that...to the concerns of the President in regards to that aspect of this discussion.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Gilbert. And I, for one, don't question your integrity on this. Okay, you've been around a while; I'm sure you're familiar with what's going on. And I also respect

what everybody else has had to say here. Again, I'm a little concerned about the timing aspect of it. I wonder if we went ahead and did something like this, do we jeopardize our contract that's supposed to begin at the first of the year? Do we want to be without professional services at the first of the year? I don't think as a city we'd want to be. But I have no problem discussing this further, so, are there any other questions or comments at this time? Mr. Gilbert, what's your pleasure on this?

Mr. Gilbert: With...depending on the other members and how they feel, I would suggest some additional discussion. If it's moving in a forward direction, separate from the contracts at this point, but it is on our radar screen and this is ultimately a goal that we would want to obtain. I would not have a problem with that as we're constructively working towards it in the near future. Providing the other members would be willing to accept that as well.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: To respond to that comment, Eric, I think it's a value point and a great offering, if anything, a way to move forward with this. I agree with Eric with the content that we should move forward with these conversations, but at the chance of putting the city at risk, I don't think I'd want to do that. I'd want to make sure that the contracts we have in play, are able to move forward and we don't put the city at risk, because again, it's the city we're trying to protect, the citizens of that. So I think that's a great opportunity; if we want to move forward with this and if there's some opportunity in the future, next month, six months, whatever it might take to give us the appropriate time to reflect on what this means and the contract, and I'd be for that, as well.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Like I say, I respect everyone's opinion. I think it should be spelled out in the ordinance; I think the ordinance has to be looked into. I think that there's certain things that when we ask for resumes, if it's in there and they know that they have to honor it, then they won't turn in resumes, it's that simple. If it's there, then they're going to abide by it and I think that's the way it should be. And if we work out, this is what the situation should be, full disclosure...and I've told Eric before, I have no problem with it. I have a problem with the timing, and some of the issues that are involved around it. I don't think it should be a personal issue, and I agree - I think it's something that covers everybody. I'm not one of these people that don't think the architects should do it. I'm not one of these people that don't think the attorneys that we deal with - Porter, Wright or any of them. I mean, I'm one of these guys that think what's right for one, is right for another. And that's something we can discuss as we go along, because that would be my feeling on it. When we start talking about companies, I'm talking about **all** companies making disclosures, and that would give us time to discuss that and to get our legal feelings, and get Mr. Underwood's legal opinion and like I said, I respect Eric for bringing this up; we've discussed it and I know the situation he's speaking of, and I know the problems he's speaking of in the past, and I know how he feels about them, and I do think it's something that the timing is a little bit wrong, I feel, for right now.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could, just a quick statement. And, Eric, as you and I talked today, I know that you've got some strong feelings, and they're very valid. But as we look through it and think, as Mel's statement is, I don't see how you can pick and choose. You don't line ten people up, go with two, but not the other eight.

Mr. Gilbert: And I'm open to that, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: And I think there's a thought process there. There's another one that Mel talked about the size of these companies; I'm not an engineer, but I know that engineering firms, as EMH&T, or DLZ, have different divisions that do different things, and the fact that ABC Company, Limited, Dynalab - should they retain the services of EMH&T to do something in-house, in their building, on an engineering project, I'm not sure that I think it's appropriate that EMH&T would have to list Dynalab or the Limited as one of their clients when they're getting ready to put in water, or sewer, or a road, or design a road for us. Because I mean, it's private vs. the private, and I'm not sure that they _____, maybe they can, but if so, I think we need a document that's a little different than the one.....and I appreciate Mr. Underwood putting this together. But I just think that they are a private firm; we are not; we are public and as far as.....I fully agree with you on full disclosure. We fully disclose because we're elected officials; that's why we're fully disclosing. When you're a selected official, I'm not so sure the full disclosure isn't there; it is available in their records, but there are some privacy rights that we don't have. When you're elected, you lost your privacy rights. It's over, folks. For those people who want to run in an election. Just flat get ready; 'cause it's gone when you're elected. I know you're very sincere in this and I am too; I just think that when it came up all of a sudden, in my mind, there needs to be some more discussion to say if this is going to be done, how do we not doing it to a greater extreme than what we're trying to accomplish to be sure that everybody's comfortable.

Mr. Gilbert: I think we can address that as we move along with it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. We haven't heard from Mr. Stearns yet; I believe he has something to say.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you Mr. Stake. It's been interesting to sit here and listen to a great debate and I just want to say that I think it's something that you don't want to do too hastily and one way I feel like you could solve the problem is that we do have more discussion on it at a later date. I think that we don't want to put the city in jeopardy of not having the engineering company working for us, and it's my belief that we should hold off and have more discussion on it, and move on it after that...when we know exactly what we need to do and what we have to do.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Stearns. Mr. Baxter, do you have one more thing?

Mr. Baxter: One last comment, if I could. I think it'd be a great opportunity for a committee to get together, not just this committee, but a commission of people to research what the opportunities are. I know we've done that in the past with certain things we try to get done, and I think this is big enough of an issue that we would want our President of Council maybe to charge a few people to run with; then come back with recommendations to the Council. It's just a recommendation.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you Mr. Baxter. So I guess what I'm hearing is - the consensus is to hold this for future discussion, is that correct Mr. Gilbert? That okay?

Mr. Gilbert: That's fine.

Mr. Stake: Okay. If there's no other questions or comments then, I'll make a motion that we hold this item for future discussion. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is discussion, amendment of 191.19, Allocation of Funds. This is a suggestion that I had brought to the Mayor. We had a meeting, the Mayor, myself, and the Auditor, and Mike Turner, ten days ago or so, maybe a week ago, in regards to seeing what we could do to change the allocation of funds so that we could provide additional monies for services and equipment that we need for this year, and this has been done in the past, where we've changed the allocation of funds, and basically, what I'm proposing is that we change the percentages a little bit. People should have that in front of them. We would reduce to one-half of one percent, from two percent, what we call our Rainy Day Fund, or the city's contingency reserve. That fund seems to be fairly healthy right now; that's one suggestion that's part of this. The other one is to change from eighty-three percent to eighty-four percent the transfer to the General Fund; and to fourteen percent from seventeen percent - the funds shall be transferred into the General Debt Retirement Fund, so we're increasing the transfer to the General Fund, reducing the transfer to the General Debt Retirement Fund, that also seems to be healthy at this time; and according to our Auditor does not put us in jeopardy of any bond ratings; and that would free up some monies so that we would be able to put two percent - transfer that into the Capital Improvement Fund, which I don't believe we've been funding and would provide approximately about \$165,000 to the Capital Improvement Fund, and into the General Fund would produce a little over \$200,000 to the General Fund. And again, this is something that we've done in the past, and it's up for discussion, and possible legislation. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Well, we certainly need to put some money into the Capital Improvement Fund which has not seen any allocated funds for, I believe, two years. We've been spending out of that and transferring certain monies in, but it'd be nice to have that begin to build up; at two percent, it's not going to be real fast, but two percent is better than nothing.

Mr. Stake: Yes, it is; and it's a start and I appreciate your support on that. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I agree with Mr. Beougher that the Capital Improvement Fund needs financing going into it, and also the General Fund, by putting, by allowing this to go into the General Fund, it'll loosen us up as far as on some things that need to be done, and I believe one of them is our police cruisers, which is an issue supported by everyone sitting here, and enables us to put up \$66,000 and more, and so forth, to do that this year. I think that's a benefit to the city, and a benefit to us, and it's another way to loosen up the till a little bit. I would go along with it.

Mr. Stake: Yes. I listen to what people have to say. I think what I heard the most was, 'we need

those three cruisers'. It's one of the reasons that I brought this forward to the Mayor, to see if we could, if he would be amenable to that. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think that Mr. Gilbert has worked on this, and I know he's contacted me on it and has discussed it with me weeks ago, on a way to finance these cruisers. I know it's been on his mind, and this is one part of it that has been on it; the way to do it, and I think each and every one of us appreciates that and we all want to be able to supply some things that we need to. Now I don't want to put this money in there just to turn around and hire people because that's not on my mind. My mind is to do things that we really need; important things and this will enable us to do it.

Mr. Stake: Right. We'll be discussing those in the budget here in a little bit. But it does free up a little over \$200,000; about sixty-five of that would be the cruisers, then there'll be some left over that we'll discuss here in a little bit. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? Members of Council? (No response) In order to fund these things in our budget, we would need to move this forward with an emergency so that we could have this in place. I, as well as you Mr. Stearns, don't like emergency language, but we're at the eleventh hour here and I'd hope you'd be able to support that.

Mr. Stearns: I've given it a lot of consideration _____

Mr. Stake: I appreciate that. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Are we saying that by taking that two percent we have an intent to put it to the cruisers?

Mr. Stake: Excuse me?

Mr. Baxter: Are we specifically saying that we are going to allocate these funds, the two percent, that we're going to put into the CIP specifically for in-car, or cruisers, or for...

Mr. Stake: No, that would be for Capital Improvements. The \$200,000-plus that we're now going to have available via the General Fund, we'll be able to fund the cruisers.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that was clear.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: They'd first would have to come with the legislative request to the proper committee, discuss it with Council; it would put the money there in case members of Council decide to do it; we would have the funds there.

Mr. Baxter: I was going to recommend that we have a revenue signed on that; to ensure that if the revenue wasn't here _____ that we have some language in there stating that if we're at thirty-three percent expected revenue; if the city would continue to have a downturn, those types of

things, that we're not stating that we're going to buy three cars when we may not have the funds. It's fiscally irresponsible to say that I want to put money into a fund and not know if we have the revenue to support it; I'm just making that comment that we want to make sure that we keep a focus on the revenue side of the books, as well as on the expense side.

Mr. Stake: And I respect that. Our whole budget, or the whole appropriation request, is based on revenue projections; by changing the formula - that's how we're increasing the revenue projections. We're not just making this up. That's how we get the extra two hundred thousand plus in the revenue side.

Mr. Baxter: Thanks for clearing that up; I appreciate it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: For those that haven't been here too long, historically, and this is just, if my memory serves me correct, and Bob and Howard can correct me if I'm wrong, but when we have made changes in these allocations before, we've tried to it at the beginning of the financial year, and the decision has only been talked about within the last ten days or so, well, the decision's been talked about all year about the potential of making the changes, but it's just come to a head within the last couple weeks on the percentages, and the emergency fact would be to try to get this percentage change kicked off at the beginning of the calendar year. And I believe that's how we've done them in the past; I've been here for eleven years and I remember this as being the third or fourth one we've done. If I'm incorrect on that...Howard, that is correct, is it not? Because it's much easier to do your financial, saying this year we did these percentages, rather than this year at four months we did this, and then the last eight months we did something else. For clarity, it helps to start it at the beginning of the calendar year.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Hills. Yes, in order to have this work with our budget, we would want to have this in place by January 1st, so that we'd be able to fund the projects that we have within our budget. Okay. Any other questions or comments from anybody? Then what I'd like to do is make a motion that we send this on to Council for a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye") Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number six is Ordinance Authorizing Mayor to Enter into Contract for Professional Consulting and Structural Engineering Services. This is our primary engineering contract with EMH&T. Mayor, do you have anything to add on this?

Mayor: Pretty well discussed everything over the past couple weeks. This would be the primary engineering contract, and then you'll see coming up will be the backup consulting contract with DLZ.

Mr. Stake: Okay. What we would need to do with this then, would be to add emergency language so this would be in place for January 1st. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response) Members of Council? (No response) Hearing none, I'll make a

motion we send this forward to Council for a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 7 is Ordinance Authorizing Mayor to Enter into Contract for Professional Backup Consulting and Structural Engineering, this is with DLZ. This is our backup engineering contract; as the Mayor stated earlier. Are there any questions or comments on this from the committee; from members of Council? (No response) I'll make a motion that we send this forward with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 8 is Ordinance Authorizing Mayor to Enter into Contract for Professional Architectural and Plan Review Services; this is our primary architect and plan reviewer. This would also need to be an emergency. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: This is the one for Triad?

Mr. Stake: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: I need to disclose that I will have to abstain on this. Triad and my firm were in an interview last Thursday up in Youngstown for a project, and Pete Macrae and I will also be serving next year on the AIA Columbus Board and so I think there is enough reason to abstain from that. I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you Mr. Beougher. Any further questions or comments? Okay, then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye", except Mr. Beougher, who did not vote.) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

And our final professional services contract is Ordinance Authorizing Mayor to Enter into Contract for Professional Backup Architectural Services and Plan Review. And this one is with Asebrook and Company. Are there any comments or questions from members of the committee? (No response) Members of Council? (No response) Okay, then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 10 is Discussion: Appointments to Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals; also need to include for the Design Review Board. We did have some names for Planning Commission - Mr. Brad Wilson wishes to be re-appointed; Mr. Norm Brusk wishes to be re-appointed; and I spoke with Al Smith...Mr. Brad Wilson to the Planning Commission; Mr. Brusk to the Reynoldsburg Board of Zoning and Building Appeals; and Mr.

Smith to Design Review. Are there any questions or comments on these appointments? (No response) Then I will make a motion that we send on to Council a recommendation that we appoint Mr. Brad Wilson to Planning Commission, re-appoint Mr. Brad Wilson; re-appoint Mr. Norm Brusk to Reynoldsburg Board of Zoning and Building Appeals; and re-appoint Al Smith to Design Review. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 11 is Discussion: Amend 160.02 to add one full-time Assistant City Attorney. This is a request by City Attorney, Mr. Underwood. Mr. Underwood, if you'd like to address us at this time?

Mr. Underwood: The...I don't think there's anything new I can say that hasn't already been said. We did the evaluation through Human Resources and it came out to be a level seventeen; the starting position would be a level one; grade one, level seventeen. When they...part of the Treasury Investment Board - when we met, we made the suggestion of the change in the allocations to come up with some more funds which you all adopted; thank you for doing that. And I agreed that some funds could come out of special counsel; we've already...some weeks ago I terminated one prosecutor in Mayor's Court because the numbers have been down, quite substantially, and I don't plan to add anybody back on that until the numbers go back up to where they were a couple years ago. But we've got a lot of civil work going on and we've got a lot of other things going on; the Fairfield County Prosecutor's Office has come to some agreement down there with their county commissioners on funding theirs for next year; however, they have indicated that we'll probably need to take over some of our prosecutions down there. So we're going to have some more out of county work to do. So there's plenty of work to do and we're ready to go and we need this position.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you Mr. Underwood. We do have a speaker request from Mr. Eric Altherr. Mr. Altherr, if you'd come up to the podium and give us your address please.

Mr. Altherr: Thanks Chairman Stake. Members of Committee, Members of Council, my name's Eric Altherr; I'm a resident of the City of Reynoldsburg. I'm here to speak in opposition to this Assistant City Attorney position. I'd like to speak, addressing two matters; it's a matter of fiscal responsibility. You've been talking this evening about money for cruisers, money for different things, and with the reported cushion in your budget of \$29,000, it would appear that this proposed salary expenditure might put that budget into a deficit condition. Second issue I'd like to address is a matter of value. The City of Reynoldsburg contracts their criminal prosecution; there's a significant budget for outside litigation counsel; this position, city attorney position was formerly part time, understanding the City of Reynoldsburg has experienced some growth, I'm not sure that the growth been so significant that an assistant is required to the city attorney's position. We're paying him a certain amount of money to perform a function; we're trying to pay non-union labor an increase; we're trying to buy cruisers, and I would just question the value of adding this position. In the business world, everybody's been _____ with doing more with less. I appreciate all of your efforts in holding the budget line and I would just like to reiterate that I don't think the City of Reynoldsburg requires and assistant to the city attorney. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Altherr. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, I've discussed this many times; and I've discussed it with Mr. Underwood and I can see his position as far as an assistant's concerned; the workload; and everything that's associated with the city. Since we are growing, we have many lawsuits that have to be taken care of, and our court is getting bigger. He's agreed that he would not fill the position that's there now; her pay would be there, it'd be there if she wasn't; if the person wasn't appointed assistant attorney, it would still stay where she's at; there would be the \$22,000 - he's agreed to come up with 20,000 out of his special counsel, which gets it up to 42,000 out of his budget for the fifty-nine; I've been discussing with him to come up with, it's like pulling teeth, to come up with some more money out of his budget and I think that Mr. Gilbert, I know, has met with him, and discussed it with him, and Bill's been good at this discussion; I think that it's a possibility that we can come up with additional money out of his budget; therefore it will not be an additional cost to the city out of our General Fund. We'd be taking it out of his account. On that basis, I would like to move it along for first reading, and give it a little more time to operate on him, do a little pulling and tugging and maybe come up with a few dollars more. But I think we should move it on at least for its first reading; it'd be my opinion, we could have more discussion and maybe come up with that additional fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars that's needed to finish out the budget.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Clemens. I think Mr. Gilbert warmed up Mr. Underwood for you though...

Mr. Clemens: He did...he did; it's still like pulling teeth though; I'm telling you. I'd like to see it moved on.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions, comments from members of committee? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: I would just say, you know, I think we all reacted to it skeptically, initially, that Mr. Underwood has provided us with a good bit of information over the past four weeks; for three weeks I would say justifying the need, and he's shown a willingness to work that differently than what was originally proposed, to work it within the budget that he has proposed for this year, and I think it deserves our support as we move it forward for a first reading; and I guess my question was - I do not see any change, and I don't have the original budget proposal here, but I didn't see a change in the allocation in that line item for the city attorney so, is that reflecting this, or...

Mr. Stake: I don't think the budget at this time is reflecting that.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay, so that would be adjusted once the item is considered?

Mr. Stake: I guess the ..

Mr. Clemens: It would be a new position and it would be adjusted then, because the position's not there now, so it wouldn't be in the budget unless he...

Mr. Stake: It wouldn't be in the budget if we're going to go ahead and get that done by the end of

the year, I don't think, and we're going to give this three readings.

Mr. Clemens: Unless there's a reason.. it'd be another thing as an emergency on a personnel matter, and I don't know whether we'd want to do a ...

Mr. Gilbert: No, I just meant in terms of the allocation within the budget in special counsel where he'd indicated some of the money had come from, there's another line item, will that be, that would just stay in that area as far as the appropriation...

Mayor: Mr. Stake?

Mr. Stake: Yes, Mayor.

Mayor: It would be done just like any other new-hire, when the new-hire comes forward for city council, it would have the various accounts allocated out, and council would adopt it at that time, and then the budget would reflect those numbers, but the budget that's passed would not reflect those numbers. It would be as if it were a new request coming in after the budget was passed.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Underwood, were you aware of that?

Mr. Underwood: No, when the request was first put in, it was put in for a January 4th hire date, and then it got held a couple times; so now if we're going to go three readings, that hire date would have to go back, and we can still work with it, but it puts in a timing problem. I can get with Howard, or Mike, and we can adjust the budget numbers from my account to that, but some of, it can't all come out of my budget because there won't be any left.

Mr. Stake: Well, I...

Mr. Hills: According to what you said, the 22,000 dollar part time positions won't be filled; then you eliminated..you take..

Mr. Underwood: Then you take twenty...you've got some more...

Mr. Hills: another \$9,000 came off on this .. the Mayor's court person you've hired, is that what you just said this evening? That makes thirty-one.

Mr. Underwood: But that's not going to get another fifteen that Mel's talking about. I'll get with Mike and try ...(Several talking at one time)

Mr. Clemens: If it was twenty-two and then twenty out of special...

Mr. Hills: Twenty-two and nine, plus you said twenty coming out of special counsel, you're getting pretty close to covering your cost.

Mr. Clemens: We're in good shape.

Mayor: We need to remember that has to be changed by the ...160 has to be amended; so there's a number put in there for this position even and that's normally the process. So...

Mr. Underwood: Right.

Mr. Hills: Which as you said that would need to be changed..

Mayor: That would also need to be changed.

Mr. Clemens: Like I said that's why I'd like to send it on for first reading; then we can get it all cleared up; if it has to be, we could go rules suspension, second reading, or it doesn't have to go the full three readings.

Mr. Gilbert: So, just dollar-wise, we're within seven thousand dollars, is that correct? Somewhere between seven and nine thousand dollars difference?

Mr. Underwood: Correct.

Mr. Stake: Well I heard forty-two Mr. Underwood was going to allocate from his current budget so that would give us a difference between fifty-nine and forty-two, correct?

Mr. Underwood: Well I don't what the insurance...Mike couldn't tell me what the insurance is going to be next year, so I don't know.

Mr. Hills: Forty-two thousand payroll is going to equate to about \$65,000 in budgetary items.

Mr. Underwood: No, it won't be sixty-five.

Mr. Gilbert: It was indicated at fifty-nine. So we're at seventeen, and that excludes the nine thousand that you were suggesting...

Mr. Clemens: And that's something we can talk about...I mean, I just think we should move it on and then...

Mr. Underwood: The first thing we got to do is get the position authorized - without that, there's nothin'.

Mr. Clemens: We've got to pay for it though.

Mr. Stake: I'll make a motion that we send it on for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion?

Mr. Clemens: Could I say one thing? As Bill said, if the position needs to be created, if legislation can be brought to create the position for 160, that has to be done, whether it's Finance or not. That doesn't mean we have to fill it; the position's there to fill; I think that's what Bill wants done, isn't it?

Mr. Underwood: Yeah, at least suspend the rule or something so we can get that going. Then we can work on the budget.

Mr. Stake: I'm willing to work with you on that. I don't have a problem with that.

Mr. Gilbert: Suspend the rule on this? Or on the 160?

Mr. Baxter: 160.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay.

Mr. Stake: We have a motion and a second. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 12 is the Ordinance Approving the Enterprise Zone Agreement with the Board of County Commissioners of Licking County, Ohio and Victoria's Secret Direct - - Mr. Brandt? Is he back there somewhere? You're so quiet, I didn't even see you back there. Would you like to address this?

Mr. Brandt: Yes sir. The application is moving forward; it's currently in process with the Licking County officials and all we need to do is send it forward - we don't expect to .. a need for passage until the, I believe, second meeting in January.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So it's had one reading; you'd like to send it forward for its second reading?

Mr. Brandt: That's be fine.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Brandt: Yes sir.

Mr. Stake: Any comments or questions from members of the committee? (No response) Members of Council? (No response) Okay, then I will make a motion that we send this on for it's second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 13 is Ordinance to Amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio: Section 160.03 "Salary Schedule" - - had it's first reading 12-13-04; this is something that Council is charged to look at and reevaluating based on the CPI, reevaluating the salary schedule and this year I believe the adjustment is 2.4%; are there any questions or comments? (No response) I believe, in order to have this in place the first of the year, we would need to have an emergency on this, or add emergency language? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: This is just adjusting the brackets; this is not an increase.

Mr. Stake: Not an increase; not unless somebody falls below the salary schedule; when this happens then they would be brought up to the minimum. I don't believe that will happen with anybody, so this would not effect anybody's pay at all.

Mr. Clemens: Fine. Not that I didn't want that; I just wanted to explain that way so...

Mr. Stake: I'm glad you brought that up 'cause there has been some confusion on that. And I don't want to elaborate on that to add to the confusion.

Mr. Clemens: Right.

Mr. Stake: So I believe we want to have this in place for the first, so I would like to add emergency to this. Any questions or comments on that? (No response) Then I will make a recommendation that we send this on to Council for recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 14 is Ordinance Authorizing Amount of Merit Increase (2.5%) for the Year 2005, for which Employees Covered by Chapter 160 are Eligible - - this is a request by the Mayor to figure in 2.5% and, are there any questions or comments on this? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor: Just a reminder: this is the...according to 160 the 2.5 is called merit, but I have explained to Council that this would be the equivalent of approximately the cost of living was and that barring any unforeseen downturn in the economy, at the end of the first quarter, I've asked Council to please be open-minded, consider my coming back to ask for the additional 1.5%, which would be the equivalent of a four percent raise, but given our present financial condition, we're only requesting a 2.5. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mayor. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: What are we going to call that 1.5% increase if we have the revenue to do that?

Mayor: Additional merit.

Mr. Baxter: It's additional merit?

Mayor: Yes, 160 says you call it merit; it refers to merit, and there's really no ... nothing in that section for cost of living.

Mr. Baxter: Okay, because I think what I heard you say is, your intent is this merit to be for a cost of living and then a 1.5 additional for a merit. So this is really mistitled. I think I'd recommend that we change it to cost of living, not merit increase. Because a merit increase implies a bonus is going to be given up front.

Mr. Stake: Well we don't have anything in our ordinances I think, that says we give a cost of living increase.

Mayor: This is merely my explanation; that's what I am considering it; it is merit; it is called merit by the ordinance and if I come back at the end of the quarter, I will be asking for an additional 1.5% merit increase.

Mr. Baxter: Clear enough; I made my point.

Mr. Stake: I understand what you're saying. If you wanted to do purely a cost of living increase, I guess we could do that at 2.4 because that's the CPI so, but anyways, I didn't want to say cost of living, because that seems to confuse people. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Stake, so this is an actual increase or just a merit bonus?

Mr. Stake: I believe it's a merit increase as provided for .. in Chapter 160.

Mayor:employee will get a merit increase; up to 2.5%.

Mr. Gilbert: It's not a one-time merit award; it will actually impact the scale?

Mayor: Right.

Mr. Stake: And I believe it's up to each appointing authority to decide how much of that...you know, we're doing 2.5...we're allocating a number that you have in your legislation here, but it's up to them, I believe, to award it accordingly. At least that's my understanding. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just for clarification on my point. When you...my understanding is from 160 is that when you are looking to award it, I was under the impression that it was a bonus; when you say award - that could be done either as an increase or as a bonus - either way? Is there any language there? Maybe I should ask the City Attorney if there's a specific way in which those funds are to be allocated from that piece of legislation.

Mr. Underwood: The 2.5?

Mr. Baxter: Yes sir.

Mr. Underwood: You have to read it and it lays it out how to do it. I can't tell you off the top of my head; I've read it, and it tells you how to do it.

Mr. Stake: There's no reference in there to bonus or cost of living; we're calling it a merit increase...

Mr. Hills: In 160, the term is merit, and Council shall determine an amount of money which is a merit increase. And in this case, that merit increase, has been equally spread at the request of the

administration of 2.5 in each of the payment scale. So Council is appropriating a 2.5 increase and it just happens to be broken evenly; and it's true, the administration can determine who is going to get what, but in this case that 2.5, the administration has said we want it evenly spread over all of the people in the non-classified payroll at the 2.5% increase. And that's why it's broken out; for accounting purposes in each section, but it is merit in there and I - your point is well taken. 160 does say merit; if 160 needs modified or tweaked, that may be open to discussion too.

Mr. Clemens: Basically it's 2.5 to the Administration, to the Auditor, and to the City Attorney...

Mr. Stake: ...and City Council.

Mr. Clemens: .. for their employees, and what they do with it, and how they divide it up; that's not a Councilmatic matter; you just had the Mayor make a statement that everybody's going to get the 2.5, but if he'd want to give somebody a 3. and somebody else a 1. - however he wanted to work it, but each of their departments, they can handle it in whatever way they want; that's basically..let's give them 2.5 and that's it.

Mr. Stake: Correct. Okay. Any further questions or comments on this?

Ms. Frazier: Mr. Stake?

Mr. Stake: Yes, Ms. Frazier.

Ms. Frazier: Do you want to amend that one section to make reference to the fact that the 2.5 amounts include PERS and Medicare?

Mr. Stake: Yes, in the numbers you have in front of you, they include the amounts for PERS and Medicare contributions, so we want to add that to the ordinance; do we need an emergency on this?

Mr. Hills: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay, then I'll make a motion to amend this to include the PERS and the Medicare reference, as well as emergency language. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Is that going to increase the expenditures by adding the PERS and Medicare, or is that going to be included in the dollar amount that I saw in ...

Mr. Stake: It's included in the legislation.

Mr. Baxter: Okay, very good. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 15 is Ordinance Setting Forth a Uniform Procedure for the Sale of Personal Property Not Needed for Municipal Purposes- -it had it's second reading on 12-13-04; this is something that was drafted by our City Attorney. Mr. Underwood, do you have anything else to add on this?

Mr. Underwood: No, we did have some discussions on changing a couple things; I met with Mike Turner and we decided to let it stand as written unless somebody else has some comments for discussion.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Does anybody else have any comments for discussion on this? Members of committee; members of Council? (No response) Okay, then, I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for recommendation for adoption at the third reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes.

Item number 16 is Ordinance to Make a Final Appropriation for Current Expenses and Other Expenditures of the City of Reynoldsburg, State of Ohio, during the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2005 and Declaring an Emergency- -was read for the second time on 12-13-04; want to include emergency in there so upon signing by the Mayor, it's in effect.

(Mayor distributes copies that are more legible).

Mr. Stake continues: If I could just summarize for the committee, members of Council, some of the changes that have occurred...

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Stake, could I request that we get a copy of this electronically? I know I asked for it a couple of weeks ago; I know I've never received that; I know this is put on a spreadsheet; I'd like to get a copy of this on a spreadsheet, if I could please.

Mr. Gilbert: I think there's a copy in the Clerk's office that I had requested.

Ms. Frazier: It's not the current one.

Mr. Gilbert: Oh, it's not the current one?

Ms. Frazier: No.

(Tape change)

Mr. Stake: ...in addition to that, with the additional funds being available, the Mayor has asked that each department have one conference funded; that is there as well; and the three cruisers funded, which is also there on the paper that you have before you. Even by funding the conferences and the cruisers, we do have revenue over expenses of about \$157,000 in there as a result of the change in the allocation of funds, and then the additional expenses. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: The additions are for conferences?

Mr. Stake: There are, in my discussions with the Mayor, he asked that he be able to put in, since we have additional funds, that each department, since they took those out, each be allowed to have one conference.

Mr. Gilbert: I guess where I have a concern is - we have an aging cruiser fleet; we're trying to update that with three additional cruisers; I know a number of our vehicles in the Street Department are aging, and yet what we don't see, and this is in the context of the resources that have been projected, is any type of assistance to our Mechanics. I think the projected expenditures for this year was \$204,000 and some odd dollars, and they just budgeted once again at 194- or 195- thousand, and in talking with the mechanic, and the Street Department - we lose an engine, that could be four or five thousand dollars. And if we're riding with an older fleet, and we're limited in terms of how many new vehicles we can purchase, I think the only logical thing to do is to beef up your support mechanism to provide the necessary maintenance to our fleet of vehicles. And I just had a concern in trying to locate some resources to assist with that; and that would be in your motor vehicle maintenance accounts, and supplies, I believe, were the two categories where I would like to see at least look at some type of assistance there, because we're already down \$9,000 from what the expenses were this year. And we're looking at another year of age to the fleet.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And I have no problem with what Eric said other than I think it's customary that the Service Director, or the Street Department Superintendent, make presentation to City Council as far as what they need in their budget; and if there is an allocation that they do need, or equipment, or the mechanic needs more equipment, which I don't doubt that they do need; I think it should be brought through the proper channels, and I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Gilbert: Can I comment on that? To protect the employees...I initiated the discussion with those individuals; it wasn't to avoid any channels, because I think the channels were cut off and each department was told just to budget what you budgeted last year. And based on what the Mayor told us over at the...

Mr. Clemens: I didn't mean it that way...I have no problem with the employees; I speak to them all the time too, but if we do need it, I expect it to be brought to us. That's the proper way for it to be done; be brought to the committee; and I have no problem with it.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. And I will say that we're reasonable people; if they come before us with needs for mechanical needs, or parts, or whatever they would need, I don't, at least I don't think I would deny them if we had the funds and we were able to, and we weren't going to have the vehicles on the street, I would certainly be in favor of providing the funds and getting them fixed and getting them out there.

Mr. Gilbert: I would just add that with that being the case, I wouldn't support the conferences; I mean, this is our budget; we try to avoid departments having to come back for additional appropriations. And I think in comparison, there isn't one in terms of the priority between the

conferences and the maintaining of our fleet. Last year we made a significant investment into the Building Department, that regulates business, and somewhat at the expense of the Development Department, which tries to generate business for the city. And I know there's been cuts in terms of the intern, which in light of the revenues, I don't have a problem with that, but there's other avenues where you can pursue that ... revenues to support that; support the department, and one of the cuts in the Development Department was the promotion of our Streetscape Program, which I believe was presented at about \$7900 so I guess when I see the conferences in comparison with other areas where we have major investments, my concern would be to prioritize these things a little differently. It's not my budget, it's the administration's budget; but that would be where some of my concerns lie. And I think Mr. Clemens brought up at one point even - the new truck for the Stormwater Department; was that resolved through the budget, or is that still included?

Mr. Stake: It's included in there. Any other comments or questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just a quick question on the conversation you had about computer systems, and computer systems department budget. I was given the impression that we were going to try to consolidate that. Is that your impression as well? Consolidate the different budget items across the line into a single computer department? I'm looking at a sheet here; it's hard to read what's on the top of it, but..

Mr. Stake: The Mayor gave you, I think, the same sheet that should be legible.

Mr. Baxter: Right, but I think the point I'm making is I still notice that there are items in every one of the budgets for computer supplies and computer maintenance; were those excluded?

Mayor: Yes. Those were recommended by the Computer Department, the IT individual, that those be kept in the individual departments; those would be supplies that every individual department would be utilizing, and not part of what the IT individual said would be under his purview.

Mr. Baxter: I know we discussed the issue of buying cartridges for printers and things like that and we could have some savings by doing bulk buys and those types of things, but again, that's what my question was, and you've answered it; thank you.

Mr. Stake: Yes, it was a recommendation by the Computer Department Director that we keep those within the individual departments; those types of things. Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Gilbert: Is there going to be additional discussion on this? Or this is the budget you'd like to send forward?

Mr. Stake: Well, if we're going to have this in place for January 1st, I think we need to send this forward, or some form of this forward for next week's Council meeting. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think there's a misunderstanding. Just because we're passing this budget, we are looking for a better report the first quarter; this doesn't mean that we're not going to buy anything

new for the city, or we're not going to try to improve different departments and so forth; if financially we can- I would support it. If it financially comes in where we can't then we'll stick with the budget we have. And I'm hoping that everything's up this next quarter; this next couple quarters; plus the change we've made this evening by putting more money in the General Fund and in the CIP that we can talk about these after the first of the year, and add them to our budget as they come in; prioritize different things like Mr. Gilbert has said.

Mr. Stake: And that will be fine with me. As I mentioned to you, Mr. Gilbert, there are some other things that are up for discussion after the first of the year as well. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, thank you Chairman Stake. I have a question concerning the emergency portion of the appropriation for 2005 where this year's budget wasn't completed until April. Why is it necessary for us to have an emergency clause attached to this, as compared to this year's budget?

Mr. Stake: Well, this has been read twice; it would have a third reading as well. So it's been through the three reading process. Pretty much everything I've received in writing or talked to people about; Mr. Gilbert, if we talked about the vehicle maintenance, I apologize; but I tried to bring that up with the Mayor and get those included in the budget. I've worked the best I could with the Mayor and the Auditor, tried to bring the sides together and get a budget we could have in place for the first of the year. I can tell you as Chairman of the Finance Committee, we did an Interim Budget last year because of some things and we dealt with that until April. I think this is a pretty decent budget; I think we've worked things out as best we could so far; and it's not my desire to be talking about the budget until April; I'd like to be talking about other things next year. Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stearns, again, all the emergency is doing in this case, is not making it wait thirty days to go into effect. Because you have an option by 1-1-05; you either have a budget that has been passed; or you have an interim budget that's been passed. What you wouldn't want to do is pass this in it's interim, waiting for, pass it as a regular, but it can't go into effect until February 1; there's no point in having the Interim Budget because you have to pass it as an emergency also. The emergency avoids the thirty day waiting period; that's all it does, and puts it in place effective 1-1-05.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: First off, I'd like to say, "Thank you, Ron Stake, Chairman, for doing such a great job on this thing." Getting this information to us; I've been going through it with a fine-tooth comb and I think you've done a great job. I've been looking at ways as well to try to make improvements, and I see you've been doing it. Same thing with the Mayor. I want to thank him for putting this out; it's nice to see this happen differently than I did last year. Last year I was sitting out there looking up here going, 'wow, why can't we get a budget done'? And I think it went a lot more smooth; and I wanted to say thank you, and thank the administration for the great job they did putting this all together, and working together to try to come up with a good budget. So thanks.

Mr. Stake: Thank you for those comments, Brett. Any other questions or comments? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Ron, I would like to thank you for your work on this; you did let me pull on your ear a little. And I think you've held this together; and in an atmosphere of tight revenues, I guess, with that said, I would just express some concern in regard to the conferences being prioritized over other things, other items, that I think are important to this city; other items that may have already been justified; your budget sets priorities. I know there's fifty, and correct me if I'm wrong with the dollar amount, \$50,000 taken out of the budget in regards to a commitment we had had in regards to civilian security with the schools; and no matter how you look at it, the taxpayers of the city are still paying the \$50,000, whether it's the City of Reynoldsburg, or the school district. You talk to the employees in regard to the fleet; that's an aging fleet, and you put the funding in there up front and you prioritize the maintenance of that fleet; that's not something where you come back and take care of it if you have the resources there in comparison to the conferences so that's where...as well as promoting Streetscape - a major investment with the city; we allow the Visitors Bureau to promote itself with the Heritage Circle, to promote the community; that's another example where I think it's just a matter of different priorities from my standpoint; and those are suggestions that I made, and they weren't incorporated and that happens sometimes, but I don't want to take away from the confidence I have in you, and the great job that you did with the budget. I just wanted to go on the record with my concerns on these most recent additions. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Well thank you. Eric, I appreciate that as well. I don't think there's many perfect things that happen here in the city here up at this table, so this is not perfect, but I do think it's about the best we can get to at this point. So I will make a motion, if there's no further discussion or comments or questions, I will make a motion that we send this forward for it's third reading with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes. Ms. Smith.

Ms. Smith: I believe it has to be amended with the new numbers.

Mr. Stake: Okay; then I will make a motion that, we'll back up a little bit, I will make a motion that we send this forward, we'll amend this with the new numbers that we have, and send this forward for recommendation for adoption as an emergency, amended with the new numbers. Mr. Beougher still seconds. Any further discussion? (No response) All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye".) Opposed? (No response) Motion passes. Thank you. I'd like to wish everybody 'Happy Holidays' and adjourn Finance Committee at 9:26 p.m.

Finance Committee

—Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

—Susie Smith, Ass't. Clerk of Council