SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
November 21, 2005

Members of Safety Committee present: Lane J. Beougher, Ron Stake, Antoinette Newman, Doug Joseph.
Other members of Council present: Mel Clemens, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Beougher: I'll call the Safety Committee to order at 7:30.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the November 7, 2005 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to the minutes as submitted? (No response). Seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. I have a request from the Safety/Service Director to add the re-paving issue. And I also have a speaker slip from Joan Curnutte regarding liquor permits. And I'd like to make a motion to add those two items. Are there any other additions to the agenda tonight? (No response). Seeing none, I'll make that motion. It doesn't need a second. All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any Nays? (No response). Motion carries.

Mrs. Curnutte, you'll be item 3a, and the resurfacing will be 3b. Joan Curnutte, please.

Ms. Curnutte: Thank you Council members. On behalf of the Concerned Citizens, I would like to express the hope that Council will be able to identify some way to keep our streets from being lined with liquor establishments. We realize that that is not going to be an easy task based on the information that we gathered from the state and shared with you last week. And with the Columbus and Gahanna now passing the no smoking bans, we expect we're going to have a lot more applications. So again, we just urge you to do whatever is necessary to prevent that from happening.

Also, concerning the 2006 fiscal year budget, I attended last years public meeting on the '05 budget, and it was very helpful. And I'm hoping that you will again decide to hold a public meeting on the budget. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mrs. Curnutte. Any questions for Mrs. Curnutte on either of those two issues? (No response). Thank you.

Item 3b, Main Street Resurfacing. Director Reichard. And this is a confusing issue, so please simplify it for us if you can. And it might be good to start out with the history. Where we've been, where we've gone, and where we're going back to.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. Let me give this my best shot. ______________ here to back me up. When we began first talking about the overlay for Phase II, it was, in my estimation, it was just from Rosehill Road down to, was within the limits, from Rosehill Road down to the bridge. Since that time, there was some conversations that began in February from ODOT that I finally, or I got documentation on in July. At least that I could find documentation. That they wanted to increase the size of the project area, of the overlay area from Rosehill Road to the corporate limits in Licking County, and 256 from Main Street to the corporate limits in Fairfield County. They were, I think most of you know, we discussed last week, the fact that Larry Ward and I spent some time, or I'm sorry, Travis Eifert and I spent some time with the folks from ODOT this summer looking at that path, seeing how, or earlier this year, looking at that path, seeing what really needed to be done. Could they just put an overlay on it with in-depth repairs need to be made. And they determined that they would. Now, any of those full-depth repairs, requires a 100% from the City of Reynoldsburg to pay for. The only match, the 80/20 match, ODOT 80, City of Reynoldsburg 20, is on the overlay itself, which is a 1 ½" surface. At the time, when we were initially discussing this, it was my understanding, now I'm going to assume that that was wrong, but it was my understanding, that we could either do the piece that we were going to do, or we could do the big piece. ODOT believes that they have a lot invested in the discovery of this at this point, and they will, they say it's all or nothing to get it done. It is obvious that we do not have the money to get this done. Now, this project was delayed, it is my understanding, in the, a few years ago, and it was delayed until, the 2004 project was delayed because they wanted, because we talked about doing it, or the city talked about doing it in the Phase II project. Well, as we get closer and closer, we have more and more declining revenues, and that's not really going to be possible. So what we looked at, we had a Plan B that we came up with, and that was, Plan B says that we just go ahead and put the overlay down. We do the in-depth repairs that we need to do. We have Complete General do it, and we do it as part of the project. Now, that is going, we had $106,000 was earmarked, well $106,000 is what ODOT told us that our portion of this giant project was going to be. Now I know that Dave Parkinson really objected to that and said that that is way too low. But that was what we were given by ODOT. And of course, for us, as far as we're concerned, it was with the thought in mind that we were going to do this enormous project going out to both of the county lines. We can do, we have met, or talked with Complete General this weekend, they're out there, they're working. And in fact, we can do the overlay with the in-depth repairs where it's needed, for $179,365. When we add 106 of that already sort of earmarked within that large bucket of money that we put together through bonding in other areas, we have the money to complete this at the 179,365. Now, that would be from Rosehill Road to the bridge. This does not negate what ODOT wants to do. They're just going to simply shove this entire project back to the year 2008 and start talking with us again in 2007, are you going to do this? So it's, so the project is still there if we have the funds to do it. But it will be minus Rosehill Road to the bridge.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I understood that. Did everybody else understand that? I mean, there's been a lot of discussion. A lot of e-mail floating back and forth over the weekend, and I tried to forward that on to everybody so you could all be prepared tonight. Mr. Baxter, you had a question?

Mr. Baxter: Yes, Chairman Beougher. The question that I have Sharon is, are you saying that the paving of Streetscape II was not included in the cost we received and bidded out?
Mrs. Reichard: Yes, it was.

Mr. Baxter: So where's the $170,000 coming from in addition? Is that additional money?

Mrs. Reichard: The additional cost would be 106,000. We had 106,000. The additional cost would be $73,000. There is money within the bonded money that the city received to pay, to cover that $73,000.

Mr. Baxter: And that is to go into the deep depth repairs?

Mrs. Reichard: It would go, it's in-depth repair where needed. In other words, it's the project that ODOT was going to do between the bridge and Rosehill Road.

Mr. Beougher: There's money for contingency and I think, some of our utility costs have been slightly less than we had anticipated?

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct. That's correct. And we have that pool of money that we couldn't do it with. This would just be done within the project. There's actually no action that's needed by Council.

Mr. Beougher: And the issue with expanding the project is that, and using the bond proceeds, is that the bond sales package had an exhibit outlining the limits of construction, and we cannot go beyond the limits. Is that correct?

Mrs. Reichard: That is correct. In speaking with the Auditor, he had concerns about when we were looking for money to do the entire project, he cautioned me on that. That was what we, that was the limits of our project. And so to take money out of that to expand it, may not be acceptable. So we didn't even go down that route. Besides that, we're talking over $900,000. It was a huge chunk of money. And it just, it was not going to work.

Mr. Beougher: So to reiterate, we're back to resurfacing from Rosehill Road to the bridge in front of City Hall, or in front of the school building.

Mrs. Reichard: Advantages.

Mr. Beougher: And we have 106 already earmarked, and we're estimating that the cost of the change order, or of the total package is going to be 179,000, which is 73,000 more than the 106.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mrs. Reichard: And we will also have, and you were absolutely correct when we talked earlier, it will be done a year earlier. So in other words, if Complete General does this, as they have given us this estimate, when they complete what they're doing next year, they'll just go ahead and do the resurface, and we're done and we're out of there.

Mr. Beougher: Right. As I recall, the Phase II is going to be north side 2005, south side 2006, and then resurfacing 2007.

Mrs. Reichard: That is correct.

Mr. Beougher: And what's going to happen now is that we do the north side this year and everything else next year. So we're actually finishing a year ahead.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: Which ought to make a few business people on Main Street happy.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. It would make me happy.

Mr. Beougher: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. When Mr. Beougher referred to the, was it the whole package you referred to? I can't understand for one thing, when the Commercial Corridor Revitalization Phase II was done, did we include a cost in there for deep repairs to the sub-surface of the road?

Mrs. Reichard: Not exactly. What we were looking at was doing a partnership with ODOT. That's where we were at. That was our 20%. And then, that was 20% of the ODOT project. We have to have full depth repairs in the areas needed on Main Street which is part of this $179,000.

Mrs. Newman: But was it included in the original estimate for the Phase II? The in-depth.

Mrs. Reichard: It was, wasn't it Dave?

Mr. Beougher: Our 20% was I believe.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes.

Mrs. Newman: And did we assume that ODOT was going to do the deeper repairs? Or assist us with that?

Mrs. Reichard: No. We found out this summer, when they wanted to take a ride and look at what they were going, sort of update themselves, refresh themselves of what needed to be done. Because when they originally thought about it, it's been a couple of years. It's been a few years since originally the plan was put in place. Let's see what the roadway looks like now. Has it deteriorated? Would that be fair to say?

Mr. Parkinson: Sure.

Mrs. Reichard: So when we came back and looked they said, oh gee, we need in-depth repairs in some of these areas. But you know, that's your cost, the city.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. And then if we do the in-depth repairs on Main Street up to the bridge, are we talking about for the additional 60 some or 70 some thousand dollars paid in clear to the county line then?

Mrs. Reichard: No, ma'am. We're talking from Rosehill Road to the bridge only. Just within the confines of Phase II.

Mrs. Newman: I still don't understand why it's going to cost us more money for that. Can somebody explain that?

Mrs. Reichard: It's not going to cost more money.

Mrs. Newman: I think you said 70 some thousand.

Mr. Parkinson: Because the contract with Complete General does not include the repaving. That money is to be used when, for the ODOT Urban Repaving Program which is another contract that's administered and sold by ODOT whenever they get around to it. Now, that's what we have been discussing up to this point, is how do we partner with ODOT? What percentage are we going to do? What degree or repairs are we going to do? So the contract with Complete General that we have today does not include the repaving portion of the project. We still have $106,000 that we set in our bond sitting in our bucket for use for the, our share, our 20%, our portion of the Urban Repaving Program. So we've got some money set aside to do this work, but the contractor that we have on board today was not hired to do this work. That was to be a future contractor. So what we're going to do now is engage the contractor that we have today and ask him to do it so his contract went up. He's doing work that he didn't plan on doing, and that's why it costs more. Because it's this, it's the ODOT was going to help share with this and now we're going to take it on ourselves in order to get it done and get it out of the way.

Mrs. Newman: And ODOT's not going to pay for any part of that?

Mr. Beougher: That's correct.

Mrs. Reichard: Not the Rosehill to the bridge.

Mr. Beougher: The ODOT project gets pushed a year out into the future and we don't lose it. We still have that out there provided we can find matching funds to get it done.
Mrs. Reichard: That is correct.

Mr. Beougher: Clear as mud, right? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: And I want to make sure it's clear as mud in my mind is, that we have two projects here. One project is the revitalization project, and that did not include the paving. The Urban Renewal Project did include the paving and it could be more. That's what you found out and brought to us last week.

Mrs. Reichard: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: And that could be additional cost. Almost $900,000 you said. Now what you've suggested is, that we're now going to take that project, pull it aside from ODOT and bring it into the revitalization project, and pay the entire amount, the full 100%, which is 170 some thousand dollars.

Mrs. Reichard: Right.

Mr. Parkinson: Only for that portion.

Mr. Baxter: Just for the portion within inside the parameters of Streetscape. I understand that now. So what we've actually, what you're asking us to do is, is it okay for us to go ahead and move forward with 100% of the secondary contract? The ODOT contract, and pay that portion of it so that we can do it a year ahead of time and have Complete General do it.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. I understand it. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Any other questions from members of the committee or from members of Council? Mr. Hills. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: No. Sorry, Mr. Beougher. I was just pointing out to the audience in the back. I think the City Attorney...

Mr. Beougher: Oh. I'm sorry. Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: I just have one question. We still have the cost of the AEP litigation. Are we spending that money?

Mrs. Reichard: No.

Mr. Underwood: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Beougher: Don't touch Mr. Underwood's Special Counsel Account.

Mr. Underwood: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike). It's in the project and we have that yet to determine.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any other questions? (No response). Now, before you go, now that we've got the history and everybody understands the project, what I'm concerned about a little bit is, the cost of the ODOT package which was what, 344? And we're doing that for approximately half the price? What's in the ODOT package that we're not doing? I mean, is there engineering associated with that, and bidding costs and things like that, Dave? If we were going to do a project, and our share was 106 and ODOT's share was 228 and we're now doing that with a change order with Complete General for 179?

Mrs. Reichard: No. But the 106,000 was what they were telling us was part of this large project and not just within the confines of Phase II.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Parkinson: Right. That was the total. And we had cautioned early on that ODOT had underestimated in Phase I what the city's contribution would be for their share of the Urban Resurfacing Program. And we were not therefore, greatly confident in the number they were giving us. But it was the only number we had at the time. And so it was the number that we used. I don't know the answer to your question per se.

Mr. Beougher: Well, what I'm looking at is the October 27 memo from Travis Eifert which talks about reference area 1 being the current project limits. Rosehill Road to the bridge, Blacklick Creek has costs including pavement repair 106,139. The cost we got of 73....

Mr. Parkinson: Okay. I can get most of the way there. Partly because, what we have not shared in an attempt to, I think you said clarify, not that we've got anywhere near there. There are monies that have already been spent on Phase II that we have not thrown in here. They're gone. They've already been spent out there. And so we've been trying to keep them separate from the discussion of the monies yet to be spent in order to make this happen. And so, it isn't that it was 179. It's 179 plus whatever we've already spent. But that was already in the budget. So we kind of left that out of the discussion. So if we were to add that in there, we'd get a lot closer than 334 than the 179 would.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I can assume that there's staking, and engineering costs and inspection and so forth involved in that. Along with all of ODOT's cost for bidding which, it's probably higher than our bidding costs.

Mr. Parkinson: There are some. We might suggest that there's an economy of scale. Since we're already on the job site, the inspector doesn't have to remobilize for just the one overlay. So I think the city would actually benefit. Although, there's generally no staking involved with an overlay. It's just mill and fill and go ________.

Mr. Beougher: Bottom line is though, for 179 we are getting the full pavement, full depth pavement repair wear needed, and 1 ½" milling and resurfacing.

Mr. Parkinson: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Within the project limits of Streetscape Phase II.

Mr. Parkinson: Correct.

Mrs. Reichard: A year early.

Mr. Beougher: A year early. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I think it's also fair to recognize that we are not going to be paving those additional areas which would have with those funds, been paved.

Mr. Parkinson: That's correct. We are not.

Mr. Baxter: So I don't want it to paint this pretty picture here without recognizing there's a second page to this. We're giving up on that paving that would have been done if we'd gone with the full picture which we can't afford.

Mr. Parkinson: We're giving up on it, we're deferring pulling the trigger on that decision for a year. The money, ODOT is going to take that project, what's left of it, and push it out to '08. We still have the same dilemma. We still have the same difficult decisions to make. Are we going to find the money to do the full depth repair? Are we simply going to find the money to do our 80/20 split and live with whatever we can get out of the pavement with that improvement.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions from members of Council? (No response). Alright. As Mrs. Reichard said, there is no action required by Council. So with that, I'd make a motion to postpone this item indefinitely. Or at least until next year. Is there a second on that motion? Mr. Stake with the second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item number 4, Liquor Permit Request, transfer, from Pings Jade Restaurant Inc. dba Jades Restaurant, 1304 Aida Dr., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068 to Chan Juan Inc. dba Jades Restaurant, same address. Mr. Nuesse. I'm not sure whether to call you Lieutenant or...

Lt. Suciu: Suciu.

Mr. Baxter: I'm sorry. Mr. Suciu. I was so concerned about the title.

Lt. Suciu: That's alright. Lieutenant.

Mr. Beougher: Lieutenant for now.

Lt. Suciu: Yes. An investigation was completed in this application for transfer and we find no reason to oppose the application transfer.

Mr. Beougher: Alright. Thank you. This item, with no objection, will be returned to the Clerk with no action.

Item number 5, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO

CONTRACT TO PURCHASE ROAD SALT. This had its first reading on the 14th. Any further discussion on this item? (No response). Any further presentation on this item? (No response). We all know we need salt for the winter. So we're going to enter into contract and purchase some when we need it. With no questions, I would make a motion, Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Just a comment. Someone on Council asked me how many tons of salt we had in storage at this time, and it's approximately 2600 tons. So that's a lot of salt. We have both of our facilities filled.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. In reading the minutes, I did see that question come up twice. So thank you. Any further discussion? (No response). I will make a motion to send this forward to Council for a second reading on the 28th. Is there a second on that motion? Mr. Joseph with the second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And with that, I will adjourn the Safety Committee at 7:54.

Safety Committee
November 21, 2005
- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
November 21, 2005

Members of Service Committee present: Mel Clemens, Antoinette Newman, Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph.
Other members of Council present: Lane J. Beougher, Ron Stake, Brett Baxter, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:55.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the November 7, 2005 Service Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item is approval of agenda. I have four ordinances to put on pertaining to our trash collection. Two for SWACO and two for Rumpke. I'd like to add those to the agenda as item 3a for SWACO and 3b for Rumpke for discussion. Do I have a second? Second by Mr.

Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted “Aye”). Thank you.

Sharon, these are, these are going to need some explanation. I know I’ve discussed this with other members of Council. Let’s start off with, the first one is SWACO. And you can, let’s start off with the one authorizing the Mayor to enter into a contract with SWACO, 6220 Young Rd., Grove City, Ohio, for disposal of residential solid waste, composting of yard waste. What I want you to do is, explain to Council why there’s four and what they’re all about. I want to know what we’re talking about.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. I apologize. They weren’t in my packet that was given to me.

Mr. Clemens: The first thing I want to ask you before we even start, because I’ve talked to, there’s a lot pertaining to this. Is there a possibility that we can get Rumpke to agree for another 30 days on their contract? Yes.

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Clemens. In order for her to get the packets, it wasn’t in mine either, could we just take a short break and let her go pick the packets up? It’s pretty detailed.

Mr. Clemens: I know it is. I was thinking about it, and Mayor you may know this, if we can, I know the agreement, we can hold them their contract for another year at the same price that we have right now.

Mrs. Reichard: That’s correct.

Mr. Clemens: I wonder if they’d go for 30 days, and that would give us time to really look into this and discuss it. And the reason is, I’ve been out of town. I just got back last night. Then I got them all, and trying to get things together in my mind. So I mean, that’s something to think about. Yeah. Go get your packet. That’s no problem.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. Let me go get it.

Mr. Clemens: But I know we did this before, Bob. I know that we’ve had an agreement with them to stretch their contract when we didn’t get everything completed. And I just wondered if they would agree for another 30 days.

Mayor McPherson: I’d have to ask them.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I know.

Mayor McPherson: Councilman Clemens, I’m not really sure. I can’t imagine they wouldn’t go for another 30 days. They’ve been very agreeable in the past. But all we can do is ask them.

Mr. Hills: Bob, did you say that you haven’t had an opportunity to even look at these? Because SWACO, we’ve never had a contract with before. This is the first time I’ve seen their name come up. Apparently we’re going to pay tipping fees twice or somebody pays them direct. I don’t know. And see, that's where a lot of the questions are. Mel, do you want to stick this at the end of the agenda?

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. That's fine.

Mr. Hills: And then we'll go ahead and, if they have an opportunity to do the research between now and then.

Mr. Clemens: You haven't had the opportunity to see them either?

Mayor McPherson: No.

Mr. Clemens: And that's why I hate to send them to Council as an emergency when none of us has really had the opportunity to really look into that much. But yeah, let's move these down to item 9. We'll go to 9a and 9b.

The next one is the Discussion, Resolution of services available to property proposed for annexation of 79.1+/- acres, Etna Township, Licking County, applicant, Harrison W. Smith, Jr., agent for petitioners, Harvey. Alright. This is something that we do all the time. And all it is is an ordinance that shows that, resolution that shows that we have the facilities as far as fire, water, sewer, street, different ones. Are there any questions pertaining to this resolution from the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this resolution to Council as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). I'm sorry. Mr. Stearns.
Mr. Stearns: Could you explain to us, Mr. Clemens, the purpose of the emergency?

Mr. Clemens: Emergency is because we have to get it to the county so we can get it back for the annexation. And that's all the emergency is.

Mr. Stearns: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: What we have to do is, we have to send this to them. They won't take action until they see that all the services are available.

Mr. Stearns: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: It has to get there. Yes.

Mayor McPherson: I think the gentleman here to address some of the issues before him.

Mr. Hodge: My name is David Hodge. I'm an attorney with Smith and Hale at 37 West Broad Street, Columbus, 43215. At Smith and Hale, we are the agent for the petitioners. The reason for the emergency is, it's an expedited type 2 annexation under the Revised Code. With that, the municipal corporation that you're going to annex to is, we are required to provide this service resolution to the County Commissioners within 20 days of filing the annexation. We filed the annexation this morning. One other thing that's probably worth mentioning. It was an issue that popped up today. The original annexation plat that we provided to the city, there was a slight discrepancy in that plat and legal description with what we provided today, with what we actually filed. It's the same property. It's the same 79.1 acres. There's just a different where we showed the contiguity to the City of Reynoldsburg. It's contiguous to a property that was annexed 6 or 9 months ago.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Are there any other questions? (No response). I have a motion and a second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE APPROVING SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT - (6493 East Main Street, proposed use of land/structure - restaurant, bar, and nightclub); applicant, Frida Njunchop. Is she here? Yes. Do you want to come forward please? I think all of you, I had received a letter from Frida and had each member of Council get it, send it to you. Do you want to give you name, address and so forth?

Ms. Njunchop: My name is Frida Njunchop.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. In this letter she had sent, she had asked for us to approve this if we could immediately because of the problems they've had and the situation that they've went through to get this far. There's only three ways we can do this. And one would be to send it to Council as an emergency, which it would become effective immediately upon the Mayor's signature if we passed it and he signed it. This does not fall under an emergency. Because that's for the safety, health, welfare and financial of the City of Reynoldsburg. So we can't do it that way. The second way would be to send it to Council for a rule suspension. And if Council passed it, it would become effective 30 days after the Mayor's signature. The third way is to send it to Council for a second reading and then it would go back to the committee. So that's how they would operate on that. But first, we want to have some discussion on it. Now, we have thought of the criteria that's set down in Special Exception Use Permits and I think we all know that. So I'll turn this over, members of the committee, do I have any questions for Mrs. Njunchop? (No response). Okay. If not, I do. Maybe not questions, but they do fall under the condition of the situation. As I looked at it, I know that you're leasing it. Am I correct? Or did you buy it?

Ms. Njunchop: I'm leasing the property.

Mr. Clemens: You're leasing the property. I know you're remodeling the inside and you've had the inspections and they've been approved and things like that. Our problem is on a situation like this is, we've put all kinds of money in our Streetscape to beautify the city, and then we have these buildings standing. And everybody wants to take care of the inside but nobody really cares about the outside. And I've looked it over and your place is not in that bad of shape. Other than your canopy that goes over the front entrance, it looks like it's falling apart. I mean, it's mildewed and rusty in the front and so forth. Do you suppose you could get the owner to replace that? I mean, we want things to look good in Reynoldsburg. This is what it's all about.

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. We're in the process of doing that. We're told we can't do anything on the outside until after the approval.

Mr. Clemens: You won't do that, you say?

Ms. Njunchop: Yeah. We're going to do that. We're planning to do that.

Mr. Clemens: You're going to do it? You're going to replace it?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: And also, it would help if you'd cut the weeds around the side of your building that's right next to your building. Things like this, people look at and so forth. You don't have anything as far as landscaping. We did all the landscaping out front. But I mean, on your property, you have nothing for landscaping. Now that's something that the commission could have asked you but they didn't. I mean, they've asked you many other things. But these are just some things that I'd like to bring up. But if you are going to be there, and I don't know how the vote will go and anything like that, these are things you should look into to make your place acceptable. Because we have put a lot of money in this section of town and we expect the owners to do the same. So those are some small items.

Ms. Njunchop: The owner is planning to do a lot of the back yard. He's supposed to do the blacktop.

Mr. Clemens: Because your back needs blacktop. The back is in bad shape.

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. He's going to do the blacktop. It's just, we were told to wait on it until after the approval of the committee before we can do any work on the outside.

Mr. Clemens: I have stated, I'm not really fond of having two bars right next to each other. Yours was there before as a restaurant and lounge. So it's kind of hard to talk, as far as the Special Exception Use Permit that you don't fall under the criteria since it was there for many, many years. One of the regulations we spoke of that we're going to put in is that you can only have 120 occupancy.

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. I accepted to that.

Mr. Clemens: ________________ 6 months.

Ms. Njunchop: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: The other was mentioned by the BZA was, the permits and all that. And you've taken care of all that. I've seen your plans and I know you've got the inspections. You've got your fire inspections and things like that. That would not have to be put in it. Are there any other questions for Ms. Njunchop from the committee? (No response). From members of Council?

Yes, Mr. Baxter then Mr. Stake.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Ms. Njunchop, I know you came to Council, I did read a request to try to expedite the process, that you have bills and things you're already paying for the property. And I fully understand that. I also understand what Councilman Clemens is saying is, we have put quite a bit of funds and money into that area of town. And so we're looking to try to beautify our city. So we're looking to its residents and its commercial residents to also take on those same exercises. One of the things you said is that those improvements won't happen until after we approve the Special Use Permit. The problem with that is, once we approve it without those exceptions in it for those repairs, then there's nothing we can do to get it done. So this is a tool that we have as a Special Use Permit to insure that the property's maintained, and that there's certain requirements placed on the business to insure that it operates, doesn't create an extra burden on our Police Department, or have over crowding, or issues with your neighbors. Obviously, that's what we're trying to do here. So why would this not be something you'd want to do before the Special Use Permit is given to you?

Ms. Njunchop: That's something I want to do. I can include that in the stipulations. The thing is, I was going to do that but the Zoning Department told me I can't do anything on the outside until after the zoning is approved. I'm willing to do that starting tomorrow, but I just want to have the approval to go ahead and do work on the outside.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Clemens: And I understand if, you know, and I hate to put these little things in the ordinance about a new canopy top, you know. And you are going to blacktop the parking lot. That's correct?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. The landlord plans to do that. It's not, my landlord is going to do that.

Mr. Clemens: But it is going to be done?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. He plans to do that.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens, has the lighting issue been resolved in the back?

Mr. Clemens: I'm sorry?

Mr. Baxter: There was supposed to be a drop down type of lighting that was also discussed in the BZA minutes. Light bulbs are being replaced.

Mr. Clemens: Has the inspection and everything been done by the Building Department as far as your electric and lights and so forth?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. It was done. And even the lighting outside, we've changed the bulbs and we have more lights now.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I just have a question. Does the Design Review Board play a role in this? Can anybody answer that? (No response). I was under the impression that when things like this happen, they go before the Design Review Board for approval.

Mr. Clemens: I'm not sure. I didn't see it sent to the Design Review Board. That's why I questioned. Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: No. This is not a building, this is already a constructed facility. She's just renting it. They're not being built or modified. She's renting a facility that's already built and owned by somebody else. So there's no Design Review for her to do. She's just renting it, or leasing it. So we're kind of beating on the wrong person here to spruce up the outside.

Mr. Stake: Well, I'm not beating on anybody. I just asked a question.

Mr. Underwood: I'm just saying we are kind of beating on the wrong person.

Mr. Clemens: We're not beating on anybody. The object is, I don't really care who owns the building. Before it opens up and gets operated on, it's going to be taken care of. Now, she's paying the lease. If we want to turn you down and you want to go back and talk to the person you're leasing on and tell them these are the things you have to do, that's fine. But, the only way we seem to get anything done in this city is to do it right here. I'm not going to be calling up later and asking to go down there and see if that lot's blacktopped, or if they're going to cut the grass. I have to do that every other day. I'm not going to do it. So, I mean, if we can do it here then we won't have to worry about it. That's that many less phone calls we have to make.

Ms. Njunchop: Can I say something?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Ms. Njunchop: I'm just interested in opening a business and putting the place to use. It looks like it's been vacant for a long time. And we're doing our best to try to fix the inside and paint the building. And it looks a lot, lot more beautiful than what it was when we took over.

Mr. Clemens: I understand that.

Ms. Njunchop: And we're willing to do that because we are really anxious to start.

Mr. Clemens: I understand. I'm not beating on you like he seems to think we are. We get into this problem all the time. People doing this and going in and fixing up the inside and the hell with the outside. The outside's what we have to look at. Maybe we're not going to come to your place but people driving down the street are going to see the outside. They're not going to see the inside. You can put a million dollars on the inside but if I don't like your food, I'm not coming in there. But I like to drive down the street and see a nice looking little place. And that's what it's all about. That's what we're trying to do. I mean, we are spending all this money and, I hope we're spending it, we're going to beat on some people. I hope we're not just spending it just so we can walk down the street and see a few flowers. Flowers and nothing behind it. Who cares? I mean, that's not what it's all about. But any how...

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you. The thing that concerns me is, if the parking lot is in a state of disrepair, and the canopy out front needs to be replaced or repaired, why haven't our Zoning Officer's addressed this with the owner? Do we just let things sit there and deteriorate until somebody comes along and wants to rent the property? I mean, it's just as ugly when it's vacant as it is when it's occupied. Should that not have been addressed?

Mr. Clemens: I understand. Why don't we, we have to send this on any how to the second, for the second reading with the possibility....

Mr. Underwood: Mr. Clemens. I would make a suggestion that we invite the owner here with her and let him know the concerns so that she can get them in the lease. And that way, you could really lean on him to get the outside up to par.

Mr. Clemens: I understand. That's what I was going to say.

Mr. Underwood: He's the guy.

Mr. Clemens: That's what I was going to say. We have to send this on for the second reading. If the committee wants to send it on, to move it on, we can do that. Next Monday night, could you come back with an agreement from your person you're renting it from that he is going to repair the parking lot? And you are going to have a new canopy put on?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: And you could bring that to us next Monday, or before next Monday, give it to our Clerk of Council so we'd have it at Council meeting?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. I'll bring it.

Mr. Clemens: Would you? And we could move this on with a rule suspension if the members of the committee so advise. Now this doesn't mean that they, whether they would approve or vote for it next Monday night. But at least we'd get it out of committee so all of Council could vote for it.

Ms. Njunchop: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: So I'd make a motion that we send this to Council for a second reading with a motion for suspension of rules. Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). So if you could get that agreement to our Clerk of Council. You know what we want. We want the blacktop repaired on the parking lot and re-blacktopped and we want a new canopy be put over the front entrance. And clean up the weeds and so forth. Okay?

Ms. Njunchop: Yes. Thank you very much.
Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: I have one question Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Joseph: Yes. You mentioned that your landlord has plans to make these improvements. The blacktop and the canopy. Was that a verbal commitment he made to you or is that something he had in writing?

Ms. Njunchop: No. It's part of our agreement. He's supposed to do the blacktop.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Clemens: This will be put on as a 6 month review.

Ms. Njunchop: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Thank you. The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE APPROVING SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT - (6525 East Main Street), proposed use of land/structure - tavern); applicant, Nick. Is Nick here? I didn't finish your last name. I still haven't pronounced it. Would you come forward please? State your name and address and so forth.

Mr. Vuticeuski: Nick Vuticeuski.

Mr. Clemens: And Nick, you're leasing your place too. Am I correct?

Mr. Vuticeuski: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: Could you tell me, are you leasing the whole building?

Mr. Vuticeuski: No. Just part of it.

Mr. Clemens: Because the other place looks like crap. You know, I was just wondering. This will be the same thing. I'm not here to beat on you if your landlord's here. Your place, the east side of it needs painted. I don't know if somebody's tried to paint it or thought they were painting it, but they didn't paint it, maybe they put one coat of whitewash on it or something like that. But the east side needs painted. The building needs to be made to look better from the exterior. And I know you're working on the inside. This is the same principle that we spoke to on the past one. The east side of the building needs painted. The front, the front of it, the white porcelain brick and the west side, needs power washed. If you'd power wash it, the brick would really look nice. It looks now like somebody might have puked down it or something like that. But if you'd power wash it, it's porcelain white, but it would make it look that much better. These are things we are trying to accomplish. And I'm not getting on you about it. And you can talk to your landlord and tell him these are two things we'd like to have. We'd like to have the east side painted. And we'd like to have the exterior power washed. Not with just a hose and a brush. Power washed. You know what I mean. And that would clean that section up. You don't have any landscaping either on your property other than what we put there. And of course, that's not your problem. Now the restrictions that the committee put on you was that, you have to leave a passageway so that people could use it that live behind you. Now, that will be on the Special Exception Use Permit. And you'll have to put some kind of blocking through there. You know, the concrete paving block so that people won't park there. Maybe erect some signs on that. But that has to be there. That was going to be one of the exceptions. And yours will be a 6 month review too. Now, I know you've asked me for the same thing, to expedite as soon as possible because you're leasing it too. That's something that the rest of the committee can discuss because I (Tape Change). Are there questions for Nick here pertaining to his business from the committee? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens, I feel the same way you do. And you've struck on a very important point is, we're trying to beautify our city. And you obviously, you want to make your business appealing so you bring more business. So we both have the same interest. So I'm certain you have some ideas what you want to do. You're not going to let the weeds grow out. It's your business. You want to take care of it. So even though you're renting the place, I've rented places in the past and I've taken care of the outside as well just because it was a business. Do you have any plans that haven't been suggested here to improve that property in any way? Working with your landlord to do those things?

Mr. Vuticeuski: We knew it needed painted. We were thinking about doing that. We need to talk to the landlord about that.

Mr. Clemens: About the what? I'm sorry?

Mr. Vuticeuski: About painting it.

Mr. Clemens: It needs it. I mean, you're going to have to bring back an agreement that it's going to. Now that building's looked like that for 20 years. It's time that they did something to it. So you're going to have to bring back an agreement that he does do the exterior painting and he does power wash the brick. And I'd like to have it next Monday night, or have the owner come in if he would at our next Monday nights meeting at 7:30. So if you'll come up with a statement from him, an agreement that he will take care of these items on the exterior, I'm sure it would help you some. Now, I don't know how Council feels about moving this on with a rule suspension. I've never spoke to them, and that's to expedite it. But there's really not much reason to keep holding it. I mean, we can have discussion tonight if anybody's got any questions tonight, they could ask you tonight rather than two weeks from now bring it back to committee and ask the same thing. So are there, and I'll be blunt about it, I'm not hyper about having two bars right next to each other. I don't think that does anything for our community. I don't believe that we are getting them because of smoking. I think that has nothing to do with it. It's just that these two properties are there and you decided to move yours. So your bar is the same bar only it's moving so we're not gaining anything. It's just that we don't want, it's a safety issue as far as the community's concerned. And one of the issues on here for a Special Exception Use Permit is the safety of the public. And that's why we're going to put the 6 month renewal on it. Just to see how things operate. How it operates in the neighborhood and as far as how it operates safety as far as people driving out onto the street and so forth. See how it operates in the parking lots. See that we don't have a lot of trouble caused that our policemen have to make a lot of runs in your parking lot. Those are important. And that's why it's going to be a 6 month renewal. Any other questions anybody would like to ask? Yes, Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Mr. Vuticeuski, are you able to operate out of your current location until you open the new establishment?

Mr. Vuticeuski: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: So even if we don't pass it as a rule suspension, that's not going to impact you?

Mr. Vuticeuski: Our lease expires there December 31.

Mr. Beougher: December 31. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Your lease expires when?

Mr. Vuticeuski: December 31.

Mr. Clemens: December 31. Okay. Are there any other questions pertaining to this subject? (No response). Now I want you to know, that if we do send this on to Council, this is to get it to Council for a vote for all of Council. This does not mean that any of these people that send it on are committed to this vote. This is just moving it on to Council so that everybody at Council has the opportunity to vote. So I will make a motion that we send this to Council for a second reading as a rule suspension. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you Nick.

The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED GENERAL WARRANTY DEED FROM JOHN M. BIRCH AND BONNIE J. BIRCH (.165 ac.; Taylor Road right of way donation). It had its second reading 11-14-05. Do I have any discussion on this?

Any questions? (No response). If not, I'd make a motion we send this to Council for approval for the third reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next ordinance, ORDINANCE ACCEPTING FOUR UNRECORDED DEEDS OF EASEMENT (sanitary sewer, water utility line) (Board of Education of Reynoldsburg City School District). It had its second reading 11-14-05. Do I have any questions from the committee on this subject? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion for passage and move this to Council for approval at the third reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Next item is Mrs. Reichard. First, before we get started, could you go over why we have the four?

Mrs. Reichard: We have the four. We unbundled it to try to get a better price. There's only one invoice that's going to go to the community. And that is the one that the city sends out. All of these are run through Rumpke. Rumpke will still be the carrier under this contract. They did win the bid. But they would be the carrier. The ones that pick up all of the yard waste. They pick up all the solid waste. Yard waste, solid waste, recyclables, etc. The issue became, where do they dispose of those? With the tipping fees going up, we needed to get a better, the best price we could possibly get. Between gas and the tipping fees both going up, we were concerned that the rates would like, go sky high. I think we did very well. The rates are $14.50 with $1.50 for senior citizens $1.50 reduction. Which would take it down to $13.00. But we still need to do, we would need to do a contract with both Rumpke and with SWACO.

Mr. Clemens: Could I ask you a questions? And I knew it, that they had passed this some time ago and I didn't know whether it was still there because I've been gone. But they have to dump so much of the solid waste at SWACO's place period anyway, don't they? In other words, Rumpke could not ___________ out of Franklin County. Out of this district down to theirs. Is that correct? Without paying a tipping fee?

Mrs. Reichard: Without paying one to SWACO?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mrs. Reichard: I'm sorry Mr. Clemens. I cannot answer that. I would have to...

Mr. Clemens: I mean, it would make sense that Rumpke could do it cheaper if they could haul it out. I don't believe they can, can they Bob? Isn't there something that was passed?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. They passed some sort of county wide agreement that if you haul in Franklin County, you have to utilize their facility over at the land fill. And that's the crutch you will, that Rumpke's under right now. And that's why they have to pay what the tipping fees are through SWACO.

Mr. Clemens: Right. And that's basically why we have four of these instead of one.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.
Mr. Clemens: Is that we have to go through SWACO now on this.

Mrs. Reichard: It took me, quite frankly, it took me a while to really get my hands around this. Kim Baker, an attorney has, and it's a service that SWACO provides to communities. And in working with Kim, I did not have to, we didn't have to pay for her services. And she was very, very helpful in helping us understand what all of this means. What I, for example, one of the things I found out in recycling, I thought glass was a really popular thing to recycle. But nobody seems to want it. And the best bid that we got, taking in glass also, was from Rumpke. Rather, there was some problems with one of the other bidders because they thought they had put glass in theirs and they had not. They had given us a very skinny list of what they would accept in terms of recycling. So we believe that this is the best that we can offer for the citizens of Reynoldsburg for the next two years. We have, between SWACO and Rumpke, we can get, I think you also know from SWACO, through SWACO, we received the new recycling containers. The 64 gallon recycling containers that we're doing in select spots as sort of a trial run to see if in fact, our recycling numbers will go up. Now it's to our advantage if they do. Because the less they put into the land fill, the fewer, the lower the tipping fees, and that's to our advantage. That's what keeps our rates low. I happen to be on, somebody else picked this, but I happened to be on one of the streets where we received these bins. Now I'm not going to say everybody thought they were the greatest things in the world, but I think we are adapting. And I'm finding even for myself, not just because I know I don't want to put a lot in the trash if I don't have to, I'd rather put it in recycling, we are really beginning to fill up that bin. That 64 gallon bin that we have. And that brown bin that we have, the 96 gallon is really not as full as it used to be. So we're hoping that we're going to get more people in the City of Reynoldsburg mindful about recycling, and hopefully one of these days, everybody's going to want one of those 64 gallon containers. And then I'll come back to you and suggest how you could use the money that's in the trash fund. They are keeping that bid open so that we can purchase those containers at a really good cost should the city be so inclined to do so.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. Are there any questions from the committee to Mrs. Reichard pertaining to the subject? (No response). Members of Council? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thanks, Chairman Clemens. Mrs. Reichard, I went through this and spent like you, probably hours trying to get my hands around this. And for the life of me, I can't understand why we would want to pay more for SWACO to do this service than Waste Management or Rupke, which are both lesser bidders.

Mrs. Reichard: You have to be careful. Because some of...

Mr. Baxter: What am I missing?

Mrs. Reichard: A lot of this is done in tonage. So be careful what you look at. How you decipher what it's meaning is. For example, the one on the recycling, it looks like someone else is lower where in fact they will not pick up the glass. And they were just incomplete bids. When we asked for, Rumpke gave us two bids. They gave us one with glass and one without glass. So that's the reason you see. But a lot of this is done on a tonage basis and not a rate. If you would like, Kim Baker has offered to come and speak to Council about this. I could have her here next Monday night. If you would be so inclined to send this on to Council, at least for its first reading. And if you get an emergency and pass it, if you get all your questions answered. We could have Kim here and she would be very, very helpful.

Mr. Baxter: Personally, I think that's a great idea. Because I'm seeing apples, and oranges, and grapes, and pears. And I can't see how I can figure out which one's the best deal when I'm not looking at the same pieces....

Mrs. Reichard: I can tell you, these are the lowest and best, lowest bids. These are the lowest bids. And they are the best. But they're the lowest.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. One other question. If we extend our existing contract, is that a better deal than going with this this year?

Mrs. Reichard: Actually, we're supposed to give them 6 months or 3 month notice to extend the contract. They could do it just because they would do it. But you know, if this is an acceptable bid, I think it's, hopefully it's one that we can move forward with.

Mr. Baxter: But would it be cheaper for us to extend the existing contract than what we have in front of us?

Mrs. Reichard: Cheaper?

Mr. Baxter: That's another apple, so I can't tell you that answer. I don't know.

Mrs. Reichard: I'll go back and compare.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Bill.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Reichard, with a whole lot of pages here, is the bottom line, it will cost the customer in Reynoldsburg $14.50 a month?

Mrs. Reichard: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: And that's the total cost to pick up everything at the street and moving it out?

Mrs. Reichard: Total. That is correct.

Mr. Hills: And that's a quarterly cost of 43.50.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. Except for senior citizens.

Mr. Hills: Which would be less.

Mrs. Reichard: Which would be $13.00 per month.

Mr. Hills: What are we paying today for that same service?

Mrs. Reichard: We are paying 11.25. Unfortunately, when I went upstairs, not all the documents were in this packet. But I believe it was 11.25.

Mr. Hills: Because we talked about this being less. One of things it was going to be, that...

Mrs. Reichard: It's how much?

Mr. Hills: Well, I'll wait until you're finished.

Mrs. Reichard: Excuse me. Mark Kipp, Mark do you know how much it is?

Mr. Kipp: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Hills: And we knew whatever the figure was last year had a 10% billing number in that figure. So the actual cost of collection since we were doing the billing in this one, we should be looking at 90% of whatever the number was last year. Because we asked that it be bid without the collection fee on top. And I don't like playing the numbers that you just pull this one and pull that one. But I gather we're saying 37 versus 43, so $6 a month, or $6 a quarter, $2 a month increase. And out of the 37, what, we got another dollar off of that in the billing, 75 cents.

Mrs. Reichard: No. What we were collecting was a pass through.

Mr. Hills: We charged the customer for it.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. A dollar.

Mr. Hills: And they wrote the check.

Mrs. Reichard: A dollar. That's correct.

Mr. Hills: They absolutely wrote the check that was the 10% administrative cost. And we have decided that this year and history has shown Council, it didn't need to be that. In fact, let's don't put any in the next two year contract because we can use the residual on the account for all customers to benefit off the administrative fees being covered for billing through our account balance.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: So we're talking about an increase here of what, $3 a month at least? I mean, is that where we are? I'm sure you'll have the good firm numbers by next week. I mean, the bids were open a month ago and we just saw them Friday. So I'd hope by one week, we could see what the real comparison numbers are if we could.

Mrs. Reichard: As you can well imagine, a lot goes into this and it took a lot of ____________. I apologize.

Mr. Hills: A lot's gone into it since last Friday for us to try and figure out. I'm not sure where it was the month before. Thank you, Mr. Clemens.

Mrs. Reichard: Alright. But I do think Kim could be helpful. Let me explain one thing. Based on our contract, I hope I say this right, that Rumpke, when the tipping fees went up, they had the right to recover some of that money. And so there's an additional cost that we pay. Not the consumer, but the city pays, since July 1 of this year. It's approximately, I think it's approximately $1500 a month that we pay in our Rumpke bill to cover the cost of the increase of the tipping fees.

Mr. Hills: If we were doing that, that's the first time I've ever heard of that. If we were doing it, were we paying it out of the residual account we had from the administrative cost?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: Good. At least we're keeping it affiliated.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. That's the only thing that comes out of that account, right?

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Mrs. Reichard, in your September 23 memo in the second paragraph, last sentence, you say the contractor will now be required to perform the billing. I thought we were going to continue to do the billing.

Mrs. Reichard: That was one of the options. And we did not choose that option.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Sure that's in the bid documents and everything.
Mrs. Reichard: In the contract. Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Because it's also reflected in Kimberly Baker's memo of September 22.

Mrs. Reichard: Right. But it was...

Mr. Stake: The bid documents require the hauler to assume responsibility for all billing to the residents.

Mrs. Reichard: But we had a dual bid with and without. And that was at your request. At Councils request.

Mr. Clemens: Their bid was $1 a home or something like that?

Mrs. Reichard: Yeah. Something like that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from the committee or Council for Mrs. Reichard?

Mr. Baxter: Just one question.

Mr. Clemens: Yes Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: The questions I have, if we need to get an extension for at least 30 days, do we have an opportunity to at least review this a little bit further and have further updates next week on this, or the week after?

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I'll send this to Council for a first reading but, would you inquire with Rumpke if they would give us an extension to 30 days or 45 days, whatever? I mean, they're the only ones that's bid on it any way.

Mrs. Reichard: Sure.

Mr. Clemens: And give us an opportunity to look this over. And if you could have the lady come out and talk to us in the meantime.

Mrs. Reichard: I certainly will.

Mr. Clemens: Explain some things. Because I know the situation with SWACO's a little different. It's hard to understand. I've always had a hard time understanding it.

Mrs. Reichard: It gets more complicated all the time.
Mr. Clemens: Why everybody's required to dump here when they've got their own dump some place else. But any how, if she could come out and do it we'd appreciate it.

Mrs. Reichard: I certainly will.

Mr. Clemens: But if you could let us know what Rumpke has to say.

Mrs. Reichard: I will call tomorrow and...

Mr. Clemens: See if you could get an extension until after the first of the year.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. Until January 1?

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. Something like that. Until we come back until say, after the middle of January if you could. That would give us a chance to do our passage and have it passed by first meetings in January.

Mrs. Reichard: Alright. I'll do that.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mrs. Reichard? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion, and I hope it's correct, to send to Council, first reading, Agreement for the processing of recycling materials and generated and collected from within the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

The second one is an ordinance to send to Council for its first reading, Request authorization for the Mayor to enter into contract with Rumpke of Ohio, 19795 Hughes Rd., Cincinnati, Ohio 45251, for the collection, transportation, delivery or residential solid waste recyclable materials and yard waste and processing recyclable materials. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Ms. Smith: Mr. Clemens. You need two for SWACO and two for Rumpke.

Mr. Clemens: I did two. Didn't I do two?

Ms. Smith: But you need a total of four.

Mr. Clemens: I thought I did two, two. I didn't do two, two?

Mr. Hills: He just modified it to two, two.

Mr. Clemens: It's really hard to figure out what I've got to do two. Did we do two for SWACO?
Ms. Smith: No. You did one for each I believe. But you need two for each.

Mr. Clemens: I'm looking at it. One was for request authorization for the Mayor to enter into contract with SWACO and so forth. And the other was an agreement, composition of yard waste generated in and collected from the City of Reynoldsburg.

Ms. Smith: For SWACO. So you need to do Rumpke too.

Mr. Clemens: I thought I just did. Okay. Let me give this one a shot. Request authorization for the Mayor to enter into contract with Rumpke of Ohio, Hughes Rd., Cincinnati, for the collection, transportation, delivery of residential solid waste recyclable materials and yard waste and processing the recyclable materials. That's the first one. Okay. When you read the minutes, you'll see that I've did that. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Joseph on that. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye").

Now, let's see if we've got the second one right. Is this the second one? Agreement for processing of recyclable materials? I mean, I'm reading through this and I can't make any sense out of any of it to start with. So I don't know which is which. Is that the second one?

Ms. Smith: You need the second one for Rumpke.

Mr. Hills: He's trying to find exactly what is it you want to put in the notes for the second one. There needs to be two contracts. The two contracts that were attached to the yellow sheet need to be executed to send forward for a first reading next week. And I have a feeling they're probably going to get, some of the ____________ will come off of them and everything else by next week. So, two for two. Two for Rumpke and two for the other.

Mr. Clemens: Right. Well, we've done two for SWACO and we've done one for Rumpke. What I'm asking, what is the second one for Rumpke? Is it the agreement for processing the recyclable materials _________ and collected from the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio?

Mr. Hills: It's the second document that's attached to that yellow sheet. Let's just pull the title off of it and prepare it for next week.

Mr. Baxter: It is recyclables.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. Maybe we can get them all straightened up by next week. Because I don't know which is which. But any how, they'll be sent on to Council for first reading and give us an opportunity to go over it and figure out what it's all about.

I'd like to call the meeting over at 8:45.

Service Committee
November 21, 2005
- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
November 21, 2005

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Lane J. Beougher, Brett Baxter.
Other members of Council present: Antoinette Newman, Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: And I would like to call the November 21 Finance Committee meeting to order at 8:46.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held November 7, 2005. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. I don't have any changes to the agenda. Does anybody on the committee have any changes to the agenda? (No response). Then the agenda will stand.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Amendment of 945.02(c), Sewer Rate Schedule Increase. Mr. Kipp. And in a memo from Mrs. Reichard, November 3, some good information in there in regards to the Advisory Board. Columbus Sewer and Water Advisory Board meetings. And I appreciate the work Mr. Kipp and Mrs. Reichard has done in trying to get Reynoldsburg represented and some of the suburbs represented there. Mr. Kipp, you want to just give us a brief overview on that?

Mr. Kipp: On the Water and Sewer Advisory Board meetings?

Mr. Stake: Right. And how there was no representative for a while. And then I guess one was...

Mr. Kipp: We've been attending the Water and Sewer Advisory Board meetings for a number of years. And on that board, there's representatives from industry, from Ohio State, from low income, and the suburbs, and probably one or two other areas that the City of Columbus, their Water and Sewer Departments take their rates to. And before they go to Council, they go through the Water and Sewer Advisory Board. We've not been well represented over the years, so we've kind of followed it on our own. We notice this year, well last year as you remember, I'd originally presented a three year water and sewer rate increase. And Columbus at that time, mentioned that they look like they would be having 15% sewer rate increases for the next three years. So we didn't want to proceed any farther until we have a little more better figures. During the summer, they had some meetings where they were addressing the afford ability for their, the improvements they're required to make. And I gave everybody a copy of their Clean Water For Life. And this kind of gives, well this is what they hand out showing what they're going to do and the monies they're going to spend. And the reason they met with the Water and Sewer Advisory Board meeting was to determine how it would affect the citizens and the businesses in Columbus. We notice that Dorothy Pritchard from Bexley usually attends along with myself. And we noticed we didn't have a representative there. So we kind of pursued this to where our representative was and found out they had resigned. So we requested that our position be filled before we went into these meetings in October. Normally the meetings start October 1. They meet the first week and the second and third, right on through October. They determined, one of the things they determined in the summer was that they wanted a water and sewer rate study done. It wasn't completed the first couple of weeks. It wasn't complete, or Columbus wasn't ready to present it until like the third week. As you know in what we gave you, we finally did get a representative who we asked to meet with us and all the suburbs to understand what was going on. And we met together several times. We wrote several letters to Columbus which you have copies of. We made several requests through our representative that died for a lack of motions, of a second. But we did have somebody speak for us this time. So while we weren't pleased with necessary results, we were pleased we did have a representative. So the one thing they did talk about, and this all ties together with this, that on the second page it shows a chart that more than

60% of the overflow reduction will be reduced by 2010. And that's why they're going to have so much money required to be spent up front. And that's why there's the 15 to 20% rate increases. And this year, they're actually having a 20% increase in revenue. And they're collecting part of that through rate increases and the other part is through sewer capacity rate increases. They say that next years rate increases will be through rates only. So we've included in our ___________ , is we've included the information they've given us as to what they expect the rates to be in the next couple of years. That's kind of the background on it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you Mark. Appreciate that. And here on the sewer rate schedule increase, you're looking for an increase from $3.90 per 1,000 gallons to $4.49 per 1,000 gallons. Correct?

Mr. Kipp: Correct.

Mr. Stake: And this is a reflection of the increase being passed on to us by the City of Columbus.

Mr. Kipp: Yes. And allowing for our increase in a cost as we would see them also. We're looking, Columbus increased to us in sewer was 16 2/3%. And we're adjusting it of 15% increase.

Mr. Stake: We're able to absorb a little bit of that at this time.

Mr. Kipp: Actually, since we have a different base that we're starting with as opposed to theirs. But yeah, we didn't feel it was necessary to raise it the full 16 2/3 at this time.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Kipp from members of the committee? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Mark. You and I discussed this and I understand the pass through. I've been through this and how Columbus has to handle that. But I think the easiest way to make it available so that the public understands what the increase will be is, like you and I had talked, $5,000, we don't have the minimum but 5,000 gallons is usually the low on what senior citizens would use. What would the increase be a quarter of the combined water and sewer rate of 5,000 gallons?

Mr. Kipp: Okay. What Mel's referring to is that a lot of the other communities have a minimum billing every month. So they'll have a minimum of 2,000 gallons per month, or a minimum of 3,000 gallons per month whether you use that or not. So we bill quarterly, so the minimums would be 6 - 9,000 gallons per month. So that's why when you look at the cost in the 5,000 gallons for water and sewer and the different ones, we're the lowest. We have no minimum fees. And why we have no minimum is, a long time ago when we started, went to this rate structure, it was asked about a senior citizen discount. And senior citizens use less water. So basically, we didn't create a minimum or an administrative cost. Columbus uses an administrative cost so much per month. So that if you don't use a lot of water, your increases are kept more to a minimum. Actually, when we look at the water and sewer rate increases, our 2006 rate for 5,000 gallons is less than Columbus' rate for 5,000 gallons for 2005. So there's less impact because we don't have a minimum bill.

Mr. Clemens: Mark, and I understand that and I hope the public understands that too. But what I wanted to get to, what would the cost be for 5,000 gallons a quarter?

Mr. Kipp: Okay. For 5,000 gallons...

Mr. Clemens: The increase. What would the increase be for 5,000 gallons a quarter?

Mr. Kipp: It would go up from $33.85 to $38.10.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. So that's an increase of...

Mr. Kipp: Is less than $5.00.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. That's good.

Mr. Kipp: And that's a quarter.

Mr. Clemens: And that's a quarter. So basically, we're only speaking about $20 a year.

Mr. Kipp: Yes. For 5,000 gallons usage.

Mr. Clemens: Right. And that's a low usage.

Mr. Kipp: That's on a low end. We figure an average user uses between 20 and 25,000 gallons a quarter.

Mr. Clemens: So you'd be speaking about $20 increase a quarter then for 20,000.

Mr. Kipp: For water and sewer?

Mr. Clemens: Water and sewer.

Mr. Kipp: For water and sewer, we would go up, for 20,000 we go up from $135.40 to $152.40. So that's $17 a quarter.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Stake: I see Mr. Underwood standing back there. Do you have something you'd like to add Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Yeah. I have a question for Mark. Mark, the City of Columbus has two mammoth tunnel projects they have for wet weather or sewer overflow which will essentially be dry. The tunnel's will be dry. In dry weather they'll be dry but in wet weather, the sewer overflow will go into these tunnels and go down to the treatment plants. And they're spending 5.9 billion dollars. And this is just for Columbus and their sewer overflows. Are we helping to pay for that in these sewer increases, do you know?

Mr. Kipp: Yes. I do know. Let me look at my notes. Maybe it's in the, I remember, if it's not in the letter that we gave to Council. Of their improvements that they're doing, they're doing, their large scale capital improvements will be 2.5 billion dollars over the next 40 years. The improvements will be in addition to the projects already under way and plans such as, rehabilitation of the older sewers, and upgrades at the Waste/Water Treatment plants. The total cost is currently estimated at 5.45 billion dollars. Of the, they broke it out for us, and that's what they explained in the meetings, of the capital improvements that affect Columbus, mainly their downtown and separating the storm water from their waste water, they're paying for 90% of those projects. And then the city's paying for, the suburbs are paying for 10%. So they did break out those aspects of it. Now the tunnels I think are not, everybody's paying for the tunnels. But the stuff that's breaking out, that they're breaking out where they're doing the improvements downtown, they're paying for those.

Mr. Underwood: Okay. The tunnels do nothing for the suburbs though.

Mr. Kipp: Not necessarily true. Our inflow and infiltration that's related to storms, still will back up in those tunnels. So we still have, in our system we contribute inflow and infiltration when there's a lot of rain. So our flows will go up also. And our flows contribute to the overflows at the plant. So that's, everybody's contributes towards those. That was one of the big things at our discussion was with Columbus about we didn't want to pay for their improvements to their system and then be, turn around and have to pay for improvements to our system also, so we're paying twice. And that's what a lot of our discussions that we had with Columbus was resolved around. And then we're supposed to start meeting quarterly with Columbus next year just with Cheryl Roberto.

Mr. Stake: Any questions from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, I have just one question. And looking at the Water Fund perform and the Sewer Fund perform, I'm just looking at some of the strategies that you used to come up with the numbers. And we look at the percent increases of the water, we're a little bit higher in each case than what we're being charged. But in converse to that with the sewer, we're a little bit lower. Why is the water higher and the sewer lower? There's got to be an obvious reason.

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. The water is higher because, in the past we did not, our Water Fund is all together. So all the water capacity fees and all the water rents are all together. So while in the sewer, they're separated into two separate funds. The Sewer Capacity Fund and the Sewer Fund. And that was set up during the 70's when we were, when you get government money and you had to guarantee you could pay that money back. And we still have those funds. Water Fund that was never in existence. So all the funds were together. When we were growing, and we were getting all our water capacity fees, our fund was, has always been healthy. Well it was really healthy when we were getting those capacity fees. And what's happened now is, we're not getting the growth. So our water capacity fees, and if you look at the line before the water capacity fees, you'll see where they've dropped dramatically in the last 5 years. So basically, the capacity fees were subsidizing our cost of water. And so now, we need to cover the cost of the water because we're not getting the capacity fees. I talked to them in Pataskala, they're experiencing the same thing now that we were. That's why their water stayed at $2.50 a thousand gallons for a long time. Because they've had all the building and they've had all the influx of water capacity fees. And so you can't, when you have that much money left, or balance in your account, you just tend to keep the rates low.

Mr. Baxter: One follow up?

Mr. Stake: Yes. Go ahead. The water capacity fees are charged at what time?

Mr. Kipp: When a house or a business is first built.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And from information I've been reading here from other projects, we're looking at about 260, 280 new builds a year? Do we not have anything coming out of that?

Mr. Kipp: No. You have to remember, I don't know how they came up with 260 to 280.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Well, we can talk afterwards. But I'm saying new builds that I'm seeing from EMH&T.

Mr. Kipp: Our subdivisions right now, we are almost built out. We have one phase, The Woods at Slate Ridge. We have Summit Ridge Section 8, which are both not built in. The other ones are fairly close to being totally built out. We're getting a lot of condominium complexes come in, which we only collect those once. Now that may change under Columbus' new structure for billing. But as it is now, we have very few housing starts going on. I wouldn't expect than in the 100, 150 range next year.

Mr. Baxter: That's surprising. Because the study I just read showed 18 to 22 years with a growth potential. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: And you took all that into consideration when you figured these rates up, right?

Mr. Kipp: Yes we did.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just one quick question. Because you're providing some answers in a discussion we had earlier. But, in 2004, how many new water customers did we get off hand roughly? I know you've got volumes in here, but just numbers of people.

Mr. Kipp: I don't know.

Mr. Hills: Do you think it's over 200 or less than 200?

Mr. Kipp: Under 200.

Mr. Hills: Under 200 in '04, and '05 would be again under 200?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. '05 is less than '04. '04 could have been closer to 200. But '05 has definitely been less.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions, members of Council? (No response). So Mark, just for me to sum this up, the average rate increase for a sewer customer would be about $5 a quarter?

Mr. Kipp: No. Is that for the 20,000 gallon? I figured it out. It could very well be a month.

Mr. Stake: Oh, a month?

Mr. Kipp: A month. For 25,000 gallons, which is a little higher end of it that I used, it's a $7 increase per month and some change. But basically, it's $7 a month.
Mr. Stake: Okay. And that reflects a 15% rate increase.

Mr. Kipp: Now that's, we kind of combined both of them.

Mr. Hills: That's both of them together.

Mr. Kipp: That's both of them together is $7 a month. And combined increase is the 12.6% increase when you combine the two.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Alright then, if there aren't any other questions or comments on this, you don't need an emergency or anything on this, correct?

Mr. Kipp: No. We will need an emergency on the third reading so that it takes effect by January 1.

Mr. Stake: Okay. But we still have time for three readings?

Mr. Kipp: Yes. We still have time for three readings.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Very good. Then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion passes.

Okay and the second part of this is the water rate schedule increase.

Mr. Kipp: The water rate, we've already kind of discussed it.

Mr. Stake: I know. Do you want to sum that up for us?

Mr. Kipp: We're requesting increase rates from $2.87 per thousand gallons to $3.13 per thousand gallons which is a 9% increase.

Mr. Stake: 9%?

Mr. Kipp: 9%.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee on water rate increase? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And I imagine third reading, you want emergency on this as well? Third reading?

Mr. Kipp: Yes. Please.

Mr. Stake: Then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion passes.

Mr. Kipp: Thank you very much.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Kipp. Item number 6 is Discussion, Salary increase for position of Auditor. And I believe a couple of years ago we did make a salary increase for the Mayor and City Attorney. We did receive some information from the Clerk, Nancy Frazier, dated Friday, November 11 in regards to that legislation and how that all came about. Have members of the committee and members of Council had a chance to review that? (No response). Are there any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Other than we are going to add the Auditor to the ordinance.

Mr. Stake: I think we need to do a separate ordinance, wouldn't we for that?

Mr. Clemens: Probably.

Mr. Stake: And what is the, I guess one of the questions I have is, what is the time frame on this?

Mr. Clemens: It would have to be before they took office. That's before January 1.

Mr. Stake: And I guess the goal here would be to provide the same salary increase for the Auditor that the Mayor and City Attorney had as far as percentage increase.

Mr. Clemens: Right. And I have something to say about that.

Mr. Stake: Well then, go right ahead.

Mr. Clemens: I didn't know the increase was going to be 5.2. And I think that's a little steep compared to the employees getting 4%. I know that we passed it, but I would have thought it would have been better if we would had held it at say, at a 4%. And it would have been a 4% increase or whatever the cost of living was, whichever the lesser is. I mean 5.2, it's a pretty good increase.

Mr. Stake: Yes. It sure is.

Mr. Clemens: And I'm not saying this to take away money from the Mayor or City Attorney. It just seems to me that, of course next year it might be 1%. We don't know. But it could be 8.

Mr. Stake: Well, what was it last year? Does anybody remember?

Mr. Clemens: 3.8 was it, Bob?
Mr. Hills: No. 1.9 or something like that.

Mayor McPherson: It was under 2%.

Mr. Clemens: Under 2%?

Mr. Hills: And has been for the last 4 or 5 years. If I could, we did a, and this is recapping for those people that weren't here. I know it helped me to read some of these notes but, two years ago when we entered into the discussion, which was for an increase of the two full time elected positions of City Attorney and Mayor, there was substantial discussions about the amount of the increase. And I think the increases in those salaries at that time ended up being about $7,000 to the base and then the CPI was put in. And I know Mel doesn't really care what Judges and members of the General Assembly are paid but, when they made an adjustment to elected officials, until two years ago, all elected officials in the City of Reynoldsburg were elected for a term of four years at a salary that didn't change for all four of those years. There's been a trend state wide and nationally to tie those elected figures to the CPI index. The State of Ohio ties it to a CPI not to exceed 3%. So you can get, whatever the CPI is, if it's less than 3% or if it's 5.2 you only get 3%. So in essence, there they've built in, elected officials have a 3% increase or less per year. There was substantial discussion among Council people as to number one, the amounts of increases that were going to the Mayor and the City Attorney, and the initial proposes had the minimum percentage in them. Due to the discussions and the base wage not being changed as much as (Tape Change). Four, a lot of different ways. And you never know which four are going to get there. But the four that it took to get there that time were without the capping in it. So it went on with the CPI increase only. And now Mr. Clemens, you're absolutely right. We're in a position now where we pay our employees a 4% increase. And if things stay as they are, the Mayor and the City Attorney will get a 5.2% increase because there was no cap on the CPI.

Mr. Clemens: Possibly, because this would not affect them now, they're in office, we could see how this works out next year. And if we see that this is going to give us a problem, we could possibly make a change then before the next election for the elected officials.

Mr. Hills: You could probably make the change now on that. Because they haven't received that in-term increase yet. And it would still get an in-term increase. It would just be 4% less 5.2. But that one is one that hasn't really been discussed.

Mr. Clemens: I would think a 4% and whichever is the lesser really. I know we have a problem giving our employees 4%. I mean we struggle and so forth. Four percent is a good increase for everybody. And I think that's why we did this, that the Mayor and our City Attorney weren't getting any increases. And this was set up to give them some increase while they were in office which I believe they should have.

Mr. Hills: I'm not sure either one of them really want the 5.2 real bad when they just gave their employees 4%.
Mr. Clemens: That's just a suggestion. That was just a thought.

Mayor McPherson: The actual increase last year I think was about 3%. But you need to understand, when the elected officials were getting 2 and 3%, the rest of the employees were getting 3, 4%, etc. So I think the concept originally was that at the end of a 4 year period, it was probably going to work out to be all about the same. Which in this case, at the end of 4 years it'll probably work out right around 3 to 4% which is about what most of the employees also, and also what the FOP received. I think one of the things that, I don't have all of the salaries in front of me, the City Auditor, City Attorney, or me but, at one point, back in the early 2000's, the salaries were set and every year you knew what you were getting. Whatever that percentage was. It could have been 3%, 4, 5, whatever City Council said. And then under the compensation, it just told you. January 1, '02 to December '02. And then '03, and '04, and '05 were 'x' number of dollars. And I don't know why it changed to the way it is now with the September 30, or the last day of September or whatever the CPI is. But again, I think that was the way Council ________ overall in four years, it was all going to average out. One of the things that Council has always done in the past, and this is somewhat a deviation from that, they all accept this salary prior to the filing deadline for the elected officials so no one could say well, you're giving this guy, you like the Mayor so you're going to give him 5%. If you don't like the Mayor, you'll only give him a half of a percent. So that's a deviation to what we've done in the past. But I think the bottom line is, when it was decided what the salary would be for the Mayor, what the salary would be for the City Attorney, they set that dollar amount and then they attached the CPI to it. And I think Bill, we've only done this once. Is that correct? This is the first time we've ever done it.

Mr. Underwood: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike). CPI was very, very low. Like 1%. So that's why they attached it to it.

Mr. Clemens: And I understand this. Don't get me wrong. And I understand that you weren't compensated with increases as the employees went along. But if you remember right, two years ago, we made a big increase for you and the City Attorney. Which they should have been. It should have been before that.

Mayor McPherson: I agree. It should have been before that.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct. And we did. And matter of fact, I think I presented the legislation for it. And I have no problem with that. I've always felt the Mayor should be the highest paid personnel in the City of Reynoldsburg. I'm not saying the City Attorney shouldn't be, but I always thought the Mayor should be. The only thing I'm saying is, I just brought this up for discussion. I have two. And that kind of stumped me when I saw it come in as that. I have no problem letting it go a year and seeing how it comes out. If it comes out 8% next year, I'll be back. I will say something then.

Mayor McPherson: Me too.

Mr. Clemens: If it averages out. But I do think the Auditor, he's an elected official. Why it wasn't done last time, I have no idea. It should have been done at the same time. And I think the Auditor is an elected official, he has no way to get an increase, and if we're going to pay our other two elected officials, the Mayor and City Attorney, I feel the Auditor should have the same increase, the same direction. Now as far as Council, and I've discussed this with Bill ________, I had Ms. Susie Smith do a study for me from other communities, and just happened when I got it, The Dispatch come out with one, it was the same thing. Just about identical. And I think most of you saw it. Just to see how they stood and so forth. Ours falls pretty close in the middle, if not a little bit high, in the middle. Some are much higher. Some are much lower. And the same way with President of Council. I don't see, at this time, I don't feel that there's any reason to go with an increase. But I was looking at it to see how it did stand and we are in the middle. And that's a good place to be.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Stake, as far as Council goes, I would settle for some new chairs.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I'll give up mine for something to sit on. But any how, I do think the Auditor should have an increase. I would not push for Council to have an increase. Maybe in another couple of years or so and see how it goes.

Mr. Stake: And ____________ to increase the Auditor's salary...

Mr. Clemens: The same as we did...

Mr. Stake: As what we did with the Mayor. I mean, not the same figure, but the same percentage.

Mr. Clemens: Just the same way that we increase it each year. Not raise it up to the Mayors salary. No. Just so that he has the same type of increase tied into his elected position.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, we really don't have anything like that in front of us tonight. But, are there any other questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of

Council? (No response). I would like to send this forward for a first reading if we could just word it in such a way that we'll drop some legislation that would be similar to what we did for the Mayor and the City Attorney. And that's my motion. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And item number 7 is, Discussion, Adjustment to overall Salary Schedule. This is something that is in our Policy and Procedures Manual, which is the pay grades. And it has been recommended to us that we go ahead and change these by the CPI each year in order to keep current. It doesn't mean that anybody gets a salary increase necessarily. But I know we've done this the last couple of years. We have increased the salary schedules by the CPI. And the CPI currently is based on September 2004 to September 2005. As we said earlier, it's 5.2%. Are there any questions? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, correct my memory here but, did we adjust by the CPI or did we adjust by the amount of the increase we gave? When we gave the 4% increase, did we not adjust the rates by 4% minimums to max?

Mr. Stake: Mr. Turner, do you want to address that question?

Mr. Turner: The salary schedule is adjusted by the CPI.

Mr. Hills: It is adjusted by the CPI?

Mr. Turner: I believe it was 2.4 last year.

Mr. Hills: 2.4 last year and so, that's all that was adjusted although we gave the employees a 4%?

Mr. Turner: Yeah.

Mr. Hills: And that's why we had no employees sitting at the bottom of the range, right?

Mr. Turner: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And so if you make it 5.2, will you have some that will not meet the minimum?

Mr. Turner: I haven't looked at it but it's possible.

Mr. Hills: Okay. I just couldn't remember exactly. I know we did adjustments but didn't know what it was.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions, members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, is it a requirement we do this every year?

Mr. Stake: It's not a requirement.

Mr. Baxter: We don't have to do this if we don't wish to.

Mr. Stake: No. We do not have to if we don't wish to. However, it was suggested by Mr. Turner that we go ahead and do this in order to keep pace. Correct?

Mr. Turner: We paid a lot of money to have our salaries, our scale, I guess our jobs were rated so that people should be paid the right amount based on what they do. And if we don't change it in accordance with these indexes which represent inflation, eventually they're going to get, they'll be worthless and we'll have to do the same thing again.

Mr. Stake: We'll just have to come in later on with a much larger...

Mr. Turner: Right. We wouldn't be able to hire quality personnel. Our minimums would be way lower than the rest of the world.

Mr. Baxter: But if I remember right Mr. Stake, that as we do this, we fall into that trap where, oh somebody's below it, so now they have to get a higher increase. Leave it alone for two or three years and come back. I know in a business environment, we don't review it every single year. We do review it every other year or every third year, but we don't do it every year. And we keep pace with it on an individual basis as well. So there are other options rather than doing this on a straight, flat, let's do it every year. Because it sounds like an increase being given behind the scenes every single time.

Mayor McPherson: Just a note on this, as you go through it, what this does on taking an increase of 5.2% at the bottom rung if you will. A person hired in last year at that bottom rung, if you increase that minimum 5.2%, they're automatically going to be getting a pay increase. Well, the people above them are not taking a pay increase which means that, very shortly within one year or two years, you're going to be hiring people in at the same level that people have been here three or four years are making. So you need to look at that and take that into consideration if you're going to change it every year. Because it's like a compounding affect. The more times you change it, the more you increase it, the more that lower person that you hire in goes up and catches up with the other employees. And that's a bad situation because you've got people that are here four years, and all of a sudden the guy's coming in the next day and making the same thing you're making. So the way it's set up you know, I think you need to look at and maybe Mr. Baxter's right...

Mr. Baxter: That's where merit raises come into play here then.

Mayor McPherson: You see the compounding affect of what it's doing. And you and I have talked about a lot of things in 160 that really need to be reviewed.

Mr. Baxter: I agree.

Mr. Stake: Mike, go ahead.

Mr. Turner: In this situation, you're correct. But in theory, the increases we're giving our employees as they become seasoned and their jobs should be higher than this pace of inflation.

Mayor McPherson: In theory. Great theory.
Mrs. Newman: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Yes, Mrs. Newman. Go ahead.

Mrs. Newman: Don't we give longevity pay to the employees?

Mr. Stake: Yes.

Mrs. Newman: ______________ this difference?

Mayor McPherson: I think the longevity starts after 5 years, isn't it?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mayor McPherson: And it's like $400.

Mr. Clemens: So much a year.

Mayor McPherson: It doesn't compensate anywhere near ________________.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: The other problem is, if we don't do this, then as we increase our employees, they get to the top scale. They get to the top and they're done. And then you have discontent because they can't go any higher. I mean, that's it.

Mr. Stake: Right.

Mr. Clemens: So it's a two way battle on how you even it out.

Mayor McPherson: I think you and I had the answer to that last year. When we talked about these same issues, we talked about putting the step program back in.

Mr. Clemens: That's right.

Mr. Baxter: Mayor, I look at this, and Councilman Clemens, I certainly hope we don't give that kind of pay increase to go from the minimum to the maximum of a three year period.

Mr. Clemens: Not a three year period. But I mean, you've got your employees though eventually that are going to get to the top but you don't change the top level.

Mr. Baxter: As you know, one of my arguments has been that we don't work on a merit basis. And so if somebody comes into the city and they work very hard the first year. That merit ought to show that work effort. So that when somebody else comes in the following year and starts at the base salary, they aren't at the same level. And by doing appropriate review of the employees, and insuring that those who work the hardest get the highest merits, you're not going to run into that situation. Now I totally agree, we need to do this on a timely manner. But each year, I don't see where that's affective. That's my opinion and I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, go ahead.

Mr. Clemens: Our problem is, we have people doing the same job, are classified as their same . Water Department, Sewer Department, Clerk, Secretary and so forth. And whether they've been in there, once they get in the position, one of them is making more than the other all the time. Now that's always been an argument around here. I mean if you're in the union, you're an electrician, you make this and I come in tomorrow and make the same as you do because I'm doing the same job. So that's always been an argument around here. How do we do it? We've never been able to do it to satisfy everybody. I mean, there's got to be a, so I think, we paid to get this done, and I'm not sure this is the correct way to do it. It cost us $40,000 to have this done. We were trying it. If it doesn't work out in the next year or so, I would say dump it too. But I think we ought to give it a try. I mean, after all, we did invest a lot of money in the way that we're operating our schedules and so forth. So I think we have to try it for another year or two and just see if we've accomplished anything. If we haven't, then we better do another in-house study. I don't want to go outside again, but an in-house study.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I've been here two years Councilman Clemens, and I don't see it working yet. So I agree with you. Maybe not right at the moment, but we definitely have to re-review how we do this and come up with a better method. Because for $40,000 we didn't get our money's worth. And I would rather put that $40,000 into doing the job right than to continue to waste money based upon some poor legislation we ended up with a few years ago back with Clemons/Nelson.

Mr. Stake: Well, I don't know if I'd agree that it was poor. I would say that there are going to need to be changes made along the way. And I think everybody probably at the table agrees with that. But I don't think we've passed a piece of poor legislation. And I would add that, our practice has been, our policy has been that if somebody did get at 5% increase because of CPI was 5.2 for instance, and in order to get above the minimum and the Mayor decided he was going to give a 4% increase and Council passed that, they would not get that 4% increase if they got 5%. So I mean, it kind of evens out I think. Correct? I mean, if somebody already got a 5% increase, we're not giving them 4 on top of that.

Mr. Baxter: I don't know if that's true.

Mr. Stake: Well, I know it is true.

Mr. Baxter: __________ try not to.
Mr. Stake: Well I mean, we haven't done that I don't believe. When we gave the extra 2%...

Mayor McPherson: (Inaudible). The only place it becomes a real issue is when you hire somebody or remove somebody, October, November, and then you know, you have your increase in January, well do they get it or don't they get it? I think the way 160 reads, it's an optional thing they may or they may not get. I think the thing that I want to point out to everybody is that, when we passed that with Clemons/Nelson, we all kind of agreed that that was a document that we will continue to look at, that there were going to be changes made to it, that there was going to be flaws in it that we were going to discover as we went through the process. But I think Ron's absolutely correct. You know, and we've sat down and talked about some changes. And this year, there will be changes coming forward to Council to try to fix some of these things. The way it basically reads, well there's a lot of issues that we're going to bring forward. But the system is what it is and you guys have to make a determination at this point whether you want to change the whole school or let it ride and that be part of the change that we present this coming year. I just wanted to point out one of the flaws is an immediate flaw and that will happen January 1. So you know, somebody will be on the bottom and somebody will move up, and that somebody that moves up is going to be a lot closer to the person that may be you know, 50 cents more an hour than _______ . But that's an issue that we need to work through. It's not something that makes the policy bad. It just, we need to work through it and change it as we go along. It's a living document. And we just need to continue to stay on top of it and work through it and make changes as needed.

Mr. Stake: Mike, do you have something?

Mr. Turner: Mr. Stake, I believe you can increase that scale by less than 5.2%. Just because that's the index, you have the option to do it by 2% and then give the 4% increase and that would alleviate some of the problems that the Mayor's talking about.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I believe that this is good for some, in some respect. I mean, particularly when you're looking to the future and staffing needs and that sort of thing. This provides a frame work for planning if nothing else. And it's a good thing to have. So you can look to the future and know what you're, so you don't end up totally out of the ball park when it comes to knowing what people need in order to be employed. Or what we need to offer to attract the employee.

Mr. Stake: And I agree. And I think what happens is, if you don't keep up here, I think you end up with a problem later on. You need to make a significant increase later on instead of keeping up with inflation. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could add, I believe we'll be looking in early '05 about potential increases for the salaries in '05, correct? I mean in '06. '05's we did in the two standard, we started the first of the year and then July and did, we'll probably be talking about, is there going to be an increase? As part of this adjustment factor, we're looking at what monies are available for another increase for the employees. And where we will have a problem, let's assume we follow the assumption we have over the last few years, a 4% increase, if we haven't modified the ranges by the amount of the increase, we're right back to everybody being at the cap which has created some of the problem, or being below the bottom. So as we determine, do we need to change the ranges, which does not change anybody's salary, only the ranges, then we have to look. Those need to be adjusted in some way before we would look at what our overall percentage increase in what some of us call merits and some of us call, cost of living. But we've been paying people 4% for a while now. So it's been quite consistent. So I do think that as before we get into that subject, we need to have looked at modifying the ranges that we have out there now, or we do create the same problem we get into overlapping?

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, I'm not against paying our employees appropriate wages. That's not what my goal here is. I just think that the way that we're doing it is not equitable amongst all employees. We look at it from both the non-union and union, and arguments come back on both places and say, well union got 'x' so we should give the same thing to our non-union. So we have these arguments throughout the year. And I think if we can do a better job within our legislation, we might be able to clean this up a little bit so it makes your life easier Mayor to say, this is how we're going to execute a program in the next couple of years so that your employees know exactly what to anticipate out of their position and where they may be over the next several years. Rather than every six months, they have no idea if they're going to get 4% or 2% now, and a recovery 2% later. And then they're going to get a bigger check in October because they didn't get it in June. Try to make a more consistent pay structure is what I'm looking to try to do out of this.

Mr. Stake: Well, and I appreciate that comment. But we're talking about salary ranges here right now and not merit increases.

Mr. Baxter: Well I understand that and that's why I'm bringing this up. Because this impacts both of it. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments? (No response). What I'd like to do is to send this on for its first reading and we can adjust the percentage along the way if need be. And if there's not objection to that, then I will make a motion that we send this on for its first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Next item on the agenda is Discussion, Bond Ordinance for Bartlett Road Relief Storm Sewer. I know we got an e-mail in regards to the bond ordinance from Chris Franzmann, the attorney who has worked on this. Did everybody get that? Does everybody have that? Okay. And I, just to refresh everybody's memory, I believe we advanced money out of the General Fund for the Bartlett Road Relief Storm Sewer. And then we were going to do this and replenish the General Fund with that. I know this went to Dr. Whitney. Is there anybody here? Mike, are you familiar with this at all? Is everything in order here do you know? And Mr. Underwood, are you familiar with it?

Mr. Turner: I believe everything's in order. Like you said, Dr. Whitney is working with Chris Franzmann to initiate a private placement of the bonds. And all that means is that we'll be dealing directly with financial institution as opposed to underwriting the bonds and putting them out to market.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee on this? (No response). Members of Council? (No response).

Mr. Turner: Bill just wanted me to say that these bonds, the debt will be paid for out of the Storm Sewer Fund.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Do we take the money out of the Storm Sewer Fund?

Mr. Turner: The money was advanced from the General Fund. So we'll use the bond proceeds to pay it back.

Mr. Stake: To the General Fund.

Mr. Turner: The General Fund will get it's money back but that will be paid for out of the Storm Sewer Fund.

Mr. Stake: Right. Okay. Any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). This is something I think that we need to do fairly quickly. So I would like to send this forward for its first reading. Are there any, I'll make a motion we send this forward for its first reading. Is there a second? Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: I think Mr. Franzmann said that if that was done as an emergency, then Dr. Whitney could pick the bank and close by mid December and then the money could be back in the General Fund by the end of the year. So I think it's been prepared as an emergency if you look at it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Then I will make a motion that we send this forward for a first reading as an emergency, with recommendation for adoption from Council as an emergency. Yes, there is emergency language on the legislation. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And the next item on the agenda is ORDINANCE MAKING FINAL APPROPRIATION FOR CURRENT EXPENSES AND OTHER EXPENDITURES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, STATE OF OHIO, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2006 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. This ordinance has emergency language included but was read for the first time 11-14-05. And will have three readings I believe. I do have two speaker slips on this. Ms. Curnutte, do you have anything in addition to say other than what you said before the Safety Committee?

Ms. Curnutte: (Inaudible).

Mr. Stake: No. Okay. And just to address your comment, I pulled members last week in regards to having a special Finance Committee meeting. And the indication I got was that people were getting questions answered by folks on their own. So I didn't see any need to set a special Finance Committee meeting. Obviously, President of Council can set a special Council meeting and the Mayor can call a meeting I guess, as long as he gives public notice. But I don't have any desire to set a special meeting. There will be, this did have a hearing in the last committee. It'll have a hearing tonight, and it'll have another hearing, more discussion in another Finance Committee meeting as well as three readings. So there will be ample time to present comments and questions and those kinds of things. So just to let you know. Yes, Ms. Curnutte.

Ms. Curnutte: In that case, I do have a question. How will the public have access to the budget information so that we can present questions apparently to our Council representatives to have asked?

Mr. Stake: This is public information. You can do a public records request and get all the information you like I believe.

Ms. Curnutte: Okay. So if we want to see what's being proposed for the 2006 fiscal year budget, then we would need to make a written public records request to the Auditor's Office?

Mr. Stake: City Attorney, can you give us some advice on that? The Mayor's Office? Would that be correct?

Mr. Underwood: I believe it would be the Mayor's Office because he puts together the budget.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Then Ms. Curnutte, does that answer your question?

Ms. Curnutte: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: You're welcome.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could? Ms. Curnutte, you may, when I heard you say direct your questions to Council, in that it is administration and the Mayor's budget, you may want to address the question as to why the numbers are what they are to the person who proposed the number. The Mayor is administration. And then Council, I guess if you all haven't figured it out, you can bring the issue to Council. But we're seeing it just like you are. We're not saying, Mayor, this is what the dollars ought to be. The Mayor's saying, I need these dollars to operate the city. So as far as you've seen them, and having questions as to the number, I think, address it first to he who proposed the number. Either the Mayor or his appointees. Does that make sense?

Ms. Curnutte: Certainly. Certainly.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills. Okay. I have another speaker slip from Richard Harris, Auditor Elect. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you Chairman Stake, members of Council. I hope you had gotten, this evening I had asked Mrs. Frazier today, to provide you with a letter and a couple of spread sheets that I had done. And I would just like to read the letter into the public record if I could. Dear Council members: As the incoming Auditor, I felt obligated to look over the revenue projections prior to the budget process. I am attaching a spread sheet that I have put together with information that will be helpful to you as you begin your discussions on the 2006 budget. The Mayor has told Council that this is his last balanced budget that he will be able to propose. While the word balance can have several meanings, the real question is, are we going to be spending more money than we are taking in in the next fiscal year? And I think these numbers will show you which direction I think we are going. In section 1 of the attached spread sheet, you will find the current projections for the General Fund for 2006. I have 5 columns which are the 2005 budget, the actual year to date as of the end of August of this year, projection for the remaining of 2005, the projection for 2006, and a few lines that I have made a revision on. There are four lines which I believe need to be changed. Number 1 is account 110.000.4146, the State Tax. The current projection is for $350,000. In the last 5 years, this has averaged between $148,000 and $320,000. They believe this will come in at $270,000 for this year. I am projecting $290,000 for next year. The 2005 budget was for $150,000. Account 110.000.4601, Interest Earnings. The 2006 projection is for $700,000. The actual as of 8-30-2005 is $236,000. Even with the expected rise in interest rates, it seems very optimistic that this number will come in. I am proposing a figure of $600,000. Number 3, prior year carry over figure of $350,000. Council has already had three departments receiving additional appropriations for 2005, totaling it around $150,000. With the Mayor's statement of 2 weeks ago that budgets will be tight and additional appropriations will be coming in December, it seems very unlikely that anything close to $350,000 will be carried over. A much more realistic number I believe is around $200,000. Account 110.000.4991, the Income Tax Transfer. With the $500,000 increase that was realized in 2005, an additional 6.5% increase seems optimistic. Much of the construction on major businesses like Kroger, Staples, HH Gregg, and the Ag-Lab were already in the 2005 actual. To receive a $500,000 increase in the Income Tax Fund would require payroll increase in the city of over 33 million dollars. Therefore, I think a 3% increase is much more realistic. Let me just add one thing to that. The way this has always worked before when you have a construction project, the people working on the construction project, their salaries are taxable to Reynoldsburg for income tax funds. So what happens, when you start the project, you have the construction, then when the business opens up, you have the salaries of the people working there. So you've actually already been getting this money for several months prior to the people moving in. So therefore, I think for those reasons, to expect another 6 ½% increase next year looks very optimistic. The second section of the spread sheet gives the recent history and projected spending of fund 310, General Debt Retirement. Since there was new debt that was taken on to 2005 to pay for the Main Street Phase II and Taylor Road Project, there was no change in the funding of the debt service. Therefore, there will be a $424,000 shortfall in this account 2006. The fund will be totally depleted in 2007 which means almost $500,000 increase from the income tax money will be needed to pay the debt service. The third section of the spread sheets lists the projected shortfall for 2006. In this I have taken revised 2006 revenue numbers and the $424,000 completion of General Retirement Fund to show what the actual over spending for 2006 will likely be. If you'd like to meet with me on these spread sheets or have any questions, feel free to call me. I look forward to working with each and every one of you next year. And if you have any questions right now that I can answer, I'll certainly _______ .

Mr. Stake: Does anybody, any members of the committee have any questions for Mr. Harris? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. Thank you, Dick.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: I know it'll probably take a little while for folks to digest some of this information. So, and the Mayor to be able to review it. So Mayor, do you have any comments at this time?

Mayor McPherson: Well, I guess I would just say that being blind sighted by Mr. Harris is kind of par for the course. He did this for two years when he was Auditor. And I thought he had at least waited until the election. But obviously, I was not given the courtesy of receiving this letter. Nor did I receive a phone call. I can tell you just on the overview of what's going on here, it's obvious Mr. Harris wasn't in any of the meetings that I was in with the Finance Chair or other Council members. And what I'll do is, I'll be more than happy, if I'm provided a copy of this, to document how we arrived at our numbers. I guess you know, the only thing I can say, you know, as you read through this, and again, I'll document everything. But I just happen to have some numbers here that I think you'll find interesting. I was __________ budget versus actual. The estate tax, and it was mentioned here earlier. Back in '01 for '02, Mr. Harris budgeted $150,000. We got in $243,000 which was a 62% error. Our interest income, he budgeted $650,000. We got in $502,000 which was a 22.8 shortage. And in the income tax, he budgeted $7,779,000. And we actually got in $5,018,000 which was 35.5% less than he budgeted. I just happened to have these numbers because I'm working on other things relating to that. And I'm running a history on it. So when you start talking about numbers and budgets, I think everybody realizes that if you put 7 people in a room you're going to get 7 different opinions on what those dollars are going to be. I will, during our conversations on the budget, be more than happy to tell you where my numbers came from. A couple of things I can address right off the top of my head when you're talking about investments and you're talking about the revenue stream, and I think that was one of his questions, we have about a 28 million dollar budget that we invest on a monthly basis. If you take 8 million of that out because it's bonded money, we still about 20 million dollars that we invest every month, that Mr. Whitney invests at the advise and concurrence of the Treasury Investment Board. And let's just say that for the next year, our average isn't going to change. It's still going to be right around 20 million dollars. We started out the year, we had interest rate, investment interest rates as low as probably a half a percent and it went up, and now it's anywhere, you know, we've got some 4, we've got some 5 and even higher. But if you round it all out and say that for the coming year we're going to have a 4% average and we have a 20 million dollar investment portfolio, right there is $800,000. But rather than using those numbers, we tried to be conservative and we dropped that down I believe, to $700,000. I'm going to have to look it up. I'm trying to do this from memory. Could we have put 6 like he read? Yeah, we probably could have. Could we have put 8? Yeah. We probably could have. But from what I think everybody needs to understand is, this is not a science. This is a, you look at your history, you look at your what you think is coming this year. You look at your interest rate proposals and then you sit down and you make a determination. I've been very fortunate the last 4 years in that I've been able to work with Dr. Whitney and with Mike, and we sat down and we've run a lot of projections. Had they all come __________? No. But again, I think anybody that's been involved in budgets realize there's going to be different opinions on how much money you're going to bring in. There's going to be different opinions on how much money you're going to spend. And again, I can't address all these off the top of my head because again, as I say, I wasn't given the courtesy of getting this letter ahead like you gentlemen were, and ladies. But I'll gladly, over the next couple of weeks when we have our next committee meeting, I'll address all of these issues in detail and move forward. Again, you know, as we go through this, I think you're going to find that there's numbers that we project that you may think are high or low. But again, when you start taking into consideration all the things that go into a budget, and again, Charter says that I'll present the budget to City Council. But I've always tried to get advice. I try to seek help from the Auditor's Office and from the Accounting Manager. Because they help. But again, I'm just, I should have expected it but you know, I didn't really. I was hoping that it wasn't going to happen again like it did a couple of years ago. That there be much more conversation between the Auditor's Office and the Mayor's Office. Especially on budgeting items. But from tonight I can see that that's probably going to go downhill. That old slippery slope of politics. But I'll address the letter as soon as I get a copy of it and address it to City Council and maybe verbally go over it with everybody at the next committee meeting. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mayor. Mr. Harris, do you have something else?

Mr. Harris: First of all, the Mayor was provided with a copy of this. Mrs. Frazier brought it up to your office today. So I don't know where he gets the idea that that was, the other thing is, I did not do these sheets. These sheets have been around for a number of years and I'm sure you've seen them all before, Mayor. The fund 310, that projection's been done, how many years, Mike?

Mr. Turner: (Inaudible).
Mr. Harris: I mean, it's been around years and years. So this is not something you've never seen before I don't think. You've never seen the fund projection for fund 310?

Mayor McPherson: I see the fund projection every month just like Council does.

Mr. Harris: Okay. So to say that I bush wacked you with these is certainly not true.

Mayor McPherson: If you're going to bring these ________, Mr. Harris, it would be nice to consult with them ____________ and give me the opportunity to be able to respond instead of coming in and trying to grandstand.

Mr. Harris: No. I did not do that. You were provided with a copy of this today, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Well, I don't recall you giving me one.

Mr. Harris: I have to work and I dropped one off at City Council today. Mrs. Frazier was nice enough to make copies for everybody tonight. And she did provide your office with a copy of it.

Mayor McPherson: I didn't get it.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Are the members, were they able to get questions answered that they had on the budget? Are people working on that currently? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I just had some questions for the City Attorney on this Special Counsel Fund. Or his budget request. There's a note there that says, two neighborhood disputes that will require substantial resources as well as normal needs. How much are those neighborhood disputes going to cost? And what's that for?

Mr. Underwood: You know, I wish I could tell you how much. I put extra money in there. Because we have two of them that have consumed an awful lot of time. We plan to use special prosecutors and do some extra work on those two neighborhood disputes. One of them, you're very familiar with. The parties are here tonight. Their attorney keeps asserting that there's a conflict of interest. And we've asked Jeff Stearn, who's retired disciplinary counsel of the Supreme Court to do an opinion for us. And the other one is in another part of town. I'm not using names because I think that's unfair to the parties. It started out not being racial, but my greatest fear is that it is racial now between two parties. One neighborhood dispute involves about five parties, five families. And the other one is confined to two families at this time.

Mrs. Newman: So the special prosecutor's going to be used in both of these cases?

Mr. Underwood: I plan to. Yes.

Mrs. Newman: And it was because of a conflict of interest arising in these?
Mr. Underwood: It's because of allegations by the other attorney's, defense attorney's, that there are conflicts of interest in our office on these. And we have asked for opinions on that. And the judges, we've tried several cases, the judges are telling the parties now that they don't believe any of the parties, anything they're saying. Even after the trials, that they don't think that they're telling the truth. That they're not credible. And some of these trials are very time consuming. And we're searching for answers, trying answers. We're not getting anywhere because the parties are not willing to be part of the solution. They're not willing to mediate. The parties are going to have to be part of the solution. You've brought it in, talked to me. We've had David Goodman's office call. A State Rep office call. Everybody's getting their nose in it but until the parties want to mediate or be a part of the solution, nothing is going to happen. They all say they're very sad and they're very worried about damages and danger, but nothing's going to happen until they sit down and try to be part of the solution. That's what it's about.

Mrs. Newman: How do they do that?

Mr. Underwood: Well, mediation's one. You know, we can't, just prosecuting is not going to do anything when judges are not finding any parties guilty or putting anybody in jail. I don't know the answer. We're trying to find the answers. And we can't trample on anybody's rights. Both sides have rights. We've talked to the Mayor. We've talked to the police. We've had numerous meetings. And if you've got any ideas, I'm very willing to listen to your ideas.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mrs. Newman. Do you have any other questions at this time?

Mrs. Newman: No.

Mr. Stake: Any questions or comments from any other Council members? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, thank you. Mayor, I just have one. I note we had a couple of requests here recently to pay some bills that we need over in the Police Department. But when I look at the budget, I don't see the adjustments to the next years budget. For example, that is, for example, Law Enforcement Supplies and Uniforms. And I just want to make sure that we show that adjustment. The actual expenses, for example, on Uniforms Purchases on 2003 was $47,660. And in 2004, page number, on page 13 within the police section. And on 2004 actual expenses, $51,114. But yet we're only projecting 39,000 - 39,000 - 36,000 across the board. We're actually spending 51,000 in expenses. Don't you think we ought to be projecting that for the next years budget? I know you're trying to reduce your cost but I'm just trying to be realistic. Because here we were in October and we had to pay any ways.

Mayor McPherson: We reduced the cost because that money was utilized, it was transferred to another fund earlier (Tape Change) February of last year. So we had to put some money back in. We don't anticipate having the turnover that we had this year. So we reduced it down accordingly. Obviously, if we have a huge turnover that we're not counting on, we're going to have to come back to City Council. But this number's based on the fact, and if you look at the individual page, it'll show you that we don't anticipate having the turnover that we had this year. And I can assure you that we're not going to be transferring money out of that account in February of this coming year.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I'm not so much worried about the transfers, Mayor. I'm just more concerned to make sure that we're appropriately covering that.

Mayor McPherson: Well, it was almost $20,000.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you, Mayor.

Mr. Stake: And Mayor if I could, in regards to the budget, and for the Police Department, you have substantially increased the overtime. Correct? To reflect what you feel we may need next year.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. I think, one of the things that everybody needs to understand, and I told everybody this early on that I was going to be bringing a package to you some time the first quarter of the year and probably the first month or so of the year, regarding the need for additional personnel at the Police Department. Until we hire additional personnel, we're going to be into the overtime situation. As an example, and I think, I can't remember if I told everyone or not, but beginning the month of November, we have 7 people off on Family Medical Leave. Now that's a huge number that you have to make up with other people. That means you bring other people in on overtime. We have the 4 week, 5 week vacation. We have the comp time. We have all the sick time. So if you look at all the people that are off during any given year, and when I bring the numbers to you I'll show you percentage wise how many people, what percentage of our work force is off in any given month. So at this point though, we're having to use overtime. You'll also find that when you look through your documents that our traffic citations were up 100% from last year. We've written probably 450 OMVI's this year. So every time you increase your enforcement, and we do this because you all know, people are coming in complaining about us not enforcing the ordinances. Not enforcing traffic. Not arresting enough drunk drivers. And I don't think anybody can say that this year. But every time you do that, you have to understand, you have higher jail bills. It takes longer to sit there and do all your tests. On average, you're probably looking, Bill Underwood can probably tell me this more than anything, but I believe 2 to 3 hours Bill, on an OMVI.

Mr. Underwood: A good 2 hours.

Mayor McPherson: A good 2 hours. And you know, and when you're writing over 400, 450 OMVI's a year, that one officer's going to be tied up 2 to 3 hours just on one arrest. And then somebody's got to cover. And so our overtime is just astronomical right now. And it will continue to be pretty high next year.
Mr. Baxter: Is there any way we can resolve that, Mayor? Bring in additional resources on temporary basis? Reserve officers? What other options do we have other than reaching out to overtime?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. One of the things we talked about with the Police Department is bringing reserve officers on board. The way our ___________ certification reads and the way our General Orders read, we have to have the same requirement for reserve officers as we have for full time officers. So what we're doing is, looking at the requirements, the minimum qualifications for ______________ police officers. And Lieutenant Suciu is in the process of meeting with some of the Sargent's and they're considering, how to re-write that so that we can get more reserves on board. There are a lot of people that are retired. A lot of police officers that are retired and still living in this town but they don't qualify because of some of our minimum qualifications. Even though they've had 25 years or more on our police force. So we're looking into how we can change those minimum qualifications for entry level police officers and yet still keep our standards very, very high. So that's being worked on now. And hopefully some time the first month or two of the year, we'll have that. And then we can start bringing some additional officers, or reserves on. But you need to understand, we can't supplement our full time force with reserves. For example, if they're out in a cruiser, they will be out in a cruiser with an officer. So you know, it's not like we're going to bring them on board and then send them out alone. Because we can't do that. They have to be with a full time officer. But if you've got two guys in a cruiser, then you don't have to have as much backup. Things like that. So we're looking at that very heavily. And the reserves are just one area we're looking at. We're looking at what jobs can be civilianized. And an example of that is our Court Liaison Officers. You know, they save us tens of thousands of dollars a year in overtime because guys don't have to go down to court and then get down there and they say, well we don't need you today. So you know, that's something we implemented this past year. And it has really saved us a lot of money. We're always looking at how to cut this down and save it. But it's awfully hard to cut your overtime down when you have the amount of time off that we've had this year and the number of officer's that we've been short. And the number of officers we're short this month. You know, we have the issue of one on administrative leave and so that's 8. That's a lot of personnel when you're only talking 50 people in the sworn division. So we'll continue to work on that. Any suggestions, we'd be more than happy to look at them and see what we can implement.

Mr. Stake: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mayor, you bring up a real good point. The number of people on Family Medical Leave Act and things like that. Because I've seen a chart that was passed out that I know they're updating now that shows that very evident. But just out of curiosity, we have what, 55 employees in the Police Department?

Mayor McPherson: 50 sworn I believe.

Mr. Hills: And then we have other employees that probably total what, 70 or 80? Of that 70 or 80, do we have 7 of them off on Family Medical Leave Act?

Mayor McPherson: Out of the 50 some?

Mr. Hills: No. Out of the 70 some that are non-police officer personnel. You say you've got 7 of the 50 police officers.

Mayor McPherson: No. We don't have that kind of people taking off in the non-__________ department areas.

Mr. Hills: Is that just something unusual through the Police Department, or Police Departments in general?

Mayor McPherson: I don't know if it's unusual but it tends to be the trend in Police Departments, that they take a lot more time off for the same incident that other people don't take time off, or take much...

Mr. Hills: You're not doing a study on that are you?

Mayor McPherson: I don't want to do a study on that. I'd be afraid to.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Mayor, have you considered 10 hour shifts? Would that reduce some of the overtime?

Mayor McPherson: Ten hour shifts require more personnel than we have. You can't provide the same coverage with 10 hour shifts that you can with 8. And at this point, we don't have the personnel to go to 10 hour shifts. I did, during the last labor negotiations meeting last month, tell the people that you know, depending on how the shift staffing pans out the first part of the year, that that is an area that I will consider. And it's an area that we talk about every year. But you have to, in order to work 10 hour shifts, you'd have to have more people. Ten hour shifts have advantages and disadvantages. You're able to cover, you overlap in certain areas so you can have more coverage at certain times of the day. But the flip side of that is, you also have to replace those people when they're gone. And if you don't have the personnel, we don't, it's very, very difficult doing 10 hour shifts. But we constantly look at it. We look at it every year.

Mr. Baxter: Well there's an incentive of if they want to have 10 hours shifts, let's have a little less Family Medical Leave.

Mayor McPherson: Well, you know, Family Medical Leave, everybody needs to understand, that's federal law.

Mr. Baxter: It is. Nothing that you can get around it.

Mayor McPherson: And they you know, well and you shouldn't tell people not to take off if they have sickness. So that's the way it is. It just makes shift staffing very, very difficult.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any other questions or comments in regards to the 2006 final appropriation? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I found the easiest way to do is set up an appointment with the Mayor and discuss it with him. I did.

Mr. Stake: I did as well. I met with the Mayor a couple of times on it. Yes.

Mr. Clemens: I think that's the way to do it. He'll give you his time. There's no problem with that.

Mr. Stake: And I'm sure if there are questions that he can't answer, he will get the department director as supervisor.

Mayor McPherson: I've got a couple of those tonight from the Finance Chair I've got to look up.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: One quick one. Mr. Baxter brought up the supplemental appropriation for the Police Department. And during that discussion, one of the items that was discussed was the replacement of vests. And it was determined that that was in the 2006 appropriation budget. Is that accurate?

Mayor McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mayor McPherson: That is in there.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Thank you, Mayor.

Mr. Baxter: Is that in the uniform allowance budget?

Mayor McPherson: I think it's in a separate one. I have to look in there and find it.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. If you would let me know what that is Mayor, I'd appreciate it. Because I looked for it and didn't see it.

Mayor McPherson: I think it might be in the miscellaneous ________________.

Mr. Stake: Okay. If there are no further comments or questions, I'll make the motion that we send this item on for its second 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 10 is RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE REVISED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO FOR THE YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2010. It had its first reading on the 14^{th} of November. Members have had a chance to look at this. I've heard the Mayor say several times that this is a living document. So there are changes each year and some times along the way during the year. Do any members of the committee have any questions or comments? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay then I will make a motion that we send this on for its second reading. 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.

And item number 11 is ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT FOR CITY INSURANCE. We did receive today, a copy of a proposal with some firm number I believe Mayor. Correct?

Mayor McPherson: Yes. The second page on the HRH, I think they called it a proposal, insurance proposal. This is in fact, the final proposal from the beginning. The one that I gave you originally was a preliminary. And we were able to get the final today, which was given to us just today. If you'll recall, on the budget, and we'll be changing that. And I think we requested not to exceed $220,000.

Mr. Stake: 212.

Mayor McPherson: 212,000. Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, 212. We'll be changing that downward. I believe that we are going to however, ask for a slight increase in this because we do have changes during the year. We have automobiles that are added. We have different things, coverages that need to be added. So we would like to move this to approximately what we spent this year. And our grand total for a premium this year was $200,819. So I think if we just round it and say $200,000, that should cover approximately $5,000 in any additional vehicles or equipment or buildings that we may get. An example would be, we're looking at putting in a new repeater with a generator and a small building at the Street Department to house our tower equipment in. But you know, the $5,000 over and above the cost shouldn't be more than that. If it's not, we'll just have to come back to you. But it should be more than adequate. So we're going to request $200,000 on that account.

Mr. Stake: Okay, Mayor. Any questions or comments from members of Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? President Hills.
Mr. Hills: Again on this one, I think the Mayor would probably join me in this. Mr. Stake, I know that you did get involved in the insurance contract this year and I believe you saved us substantial amount of money and I appreciate that.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. I would second that. And if you look at this years premium, even with the 5,000 extra, it's below last years premium.

Mr. Stake: Yes, it is.

Mayor McPherson: So we appreciate the help that Ron gave us.

Mr. Stake: Then I will make a motion, if there aren't any other questions or comments on this issue, it had its first reading on the 14^{th}, I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its second reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 10:15.

Finance Committee
November 21, 2005
- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)