

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 5, 2007

Members of Community Development Committee present: Preston Stearns, Donna Shirey, Antoinette Newman, Brett Baxter.

Other members of Council present: Doug Joseph, Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stearns: We=ll call to order the Community Development Committee meeting for November 5, 2007 at 7:31.

The second thing on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any corrections, deletions? (No response). If not, then we will keep the agenda as it has been printed.

The third item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the Community Development Committee meeting held October 1, 2007. Are there any corrections on that or anything? (No response).

If not, then we=ll move on to item number 4, Discussion: Motion to authorize advertisement for bids for maintenance of the landscaping beds and plants - Phases 1 and 2 Main Street Corridor Revitalization 2008 and 2009. Mr. Walsh.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, Chairman Stearns, members of Council, President Hills. Back when the revitalization project was begun on Main Street, we had determined that we wanted to maintain that landscaping on Phase 1 through a service contract with a private company, and that contract ends at the end of this season. And at the same time, the warranty maintenance, which is going on in Phase 2 will also be ending. So it=s now time to advertise for bids to maintain both Phase 1 and Phase 2 sections of the landscaping on Main Street. The contract itself has in the past included things like mulching, edging, weed control. And then the weed control is not only in the beds but in the sidewalk cracks. Trimming trees and shrubs, and handling disease control fertilization and all those types of things as needed. We think we=ve been pretty successful with the last two years of contracting out the Phase 1 maintenance. The landscaping has been maintained in a pretty high quality manner. It=s been very consistent throughout the entire section of Phase 1. And that was our goal. Was to maintain quality and consistency in the landscaping. We did create the details of the contract from our department. And this year, we=re suggesting that we add another small item to the contract or the request for bids. And it has to do with turf. We had some issues with some of the turf areas within the landscaping beds. Some of them, well we call them the eyebrows. And we=ve had discussions on those before. But those are like the half moon shaped, small pieces of turf. Not a whole lot bigger than the table that the Mayor is sitting at right now. Well, maybe they=re about twice that size. At 35 miles an hour, they look that big. But the issues that we were having is that these were not being maintained consistently by the property owners. We had determined that we wanted property owners to maintain turf areas throughout Phase 1. If it was grass, they took care of it. If it was mulch beds and plants, we took care of it. And we did not get a consistent look. Our contractor expressed concerns about that. That he felt like he was getting some blame for that. For the turf

areas not looking so well. And that's true. Some people were figuring that was his fault. So we're not asking about mowing all the grass out there. We're just suggesting that we see what kind of price we can get on a bid to maintain those little eyebrow areas, and the small areas that are in front of the walls, which are typically, have been considered to be part of the landscaping over the past two years. That's kind of the impression that we're getting from the public and from others. That that is the city maintained section, just like the rest of the landscaping. You'll notice that on some of those eyebrow areas, they were cut, sort of, periodically. They met our ordinance for weed control, or for the height of weeds or grass. But the quality did not come close to matching in some cases. The quality of the landscape beds themselves. So these turf areas were full of weeds and did not look that good. So we're just suggesting that we go ahead and bid and ask for a price for the turf, see what it comes in at, and determine at that time whether we think that's a worth while thing to have a contractor do. That will give us a nice consistent look throughout all the landscaping. The cost for the services for Phase 1 over two years was \$49,200. And that's a section that's about a mile long on both sides of the road. And that was pretty significantly under the original estimate of about 73,800 that we had estimated a couple of years back. So we're looking at not quite doubling the amount. Because Phase 2 has somewhat less landscaping than Phase 1 does. But again, it's 2 years later. The economy's different. We're not particularly sure exactly what we're going to get. We've had a lot of interest in this. We've been getting contacted over the past 12 months by various landscaping firms. So we have compiled a list of approximately 12 landscaping companies who are interested in getting specs and bidding on this project. So I think we'll probably get a pretty competitive bid. So we've got the specs prepared. I think you've got a copy in your packet. And we would like to go ahead and get authorization to advertise for bids for a two year contract to maintain the entire corridor for 2008 and 2009. And that's all I have to present so I'll be available to answer questions if I can.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walsh. Are there any questions from the committee for Mr. Walsh? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Walsh, the questions that I would have are not so much around the bidding process, because I know we need to do that, but to help us come up with a better decision on if we should go with contracting or have it done in-house. I would like to get a feeling for the cost from a material and resource cost through your department to be able to maintain those. So we have something to weigh in this. If it's 13,000 or 49,000 for a contract cost, and it costs us 100,000 to do it, then it's an easy decision. But without both sides of that equation, I don't know how we can make a decision other than yeah, okay, I think that's good. So I would ask at the time that we go to authorize the bids, that we also have that additional information. Not necessarily for the purpose of getting the bids.

Mr. Walsh: Certainly. We did that when we originally went out to bid two years ago. We did do the, and I think, yes, we did that then. And we did take a look at the difference. And we were talking about having to hire additional staff. And at the point of bringing Phase 2 in, it was going to be at least an additional full time person for Parks and Recreation to be able to maintain it.

One of the other benefits of having a company do this versus Parks and Recreation is, they can bring in a small army of people for a few days and do the whole thing really quickly and really nicely. We don't have that capability. We just don't have the bodies available. So that's one of the benefits of hiring a contractor who has adequate resources to bring in the people to handle the job. We could do it, but we wouldn't be able to do it nearly as quickly or efficiently. With our current staff we would have to obviously, add some folks. But yeah, we can put that together.

Mr. Baxter: And you do augment your staff during the summer to be able to handle many of these types of activities for more than the parks areas and whatnot. So in my mind, this might be something that could be justified through an augmentation of your staff for a summer type of position and then would not be needed for the remainder of the year. So that's why I suggested that type of thought process as you come to Council.

Mr. Walsh: True.

Mr. Stearns: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I can really see your point Mr. Walsh because I can see weeds growing up at one end of Main Street while the crew is working at the other end of Main Street. By the time they work their way down there, they might be 10 feet tall. So I think that that's a pretty remote possibility there for that reason, to do it with our own staff.

Mr. Walsh: We'll put some numbers together and see what they come out to be.

Mr. Stearns: Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Walsh, two quick questions. First of all, when you talk about the turf issue, how many of these turf areas are we talking about throughout sections 1 and 2?

Mr. Walsh: Section 2 only has one and that's in front of the Kroger property. And Phase 1 has about a dozen scattered throughout. Some are in front of Taco Bell. Taco Bell, Ethan Allen, McDonald's, moving on down to the area in front of Reynoldsburg Car Care, and some more down in that area. And there's a couple on the other side of the street too.

Mr. Joseph: And when you said you were going to try to work that, work that price in, are you going to try to break that out separately so we can see what that looks like?

Mr. Walsh: Right. It would be a separate price.

Mr. Joseph: And if it's higher than what we want to do, do you think your department has the ability to maintain just those in house?

Mr. Walsh: We might be able to do that. We would have to kind of look and see what we=d probably would have to not do some place else to take care of that. It=s more than just actually mowing. It=s an additional putting in materials such as fertilization and weed control and manage it that way as well. So it=s a little bit more involved than just keeping it cut. But we=ll take a look at that.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stearns: Any other questions, Council? (No response). If there are no other questions then, I will make a motion that we will pass this on to Council. This is a motion. So that would mean that, one reading, correct? So we can pass this on to Council for next week. So do I have second? Second by Mrs. Shirey. Are there any questions, discussions? (No response). If not, all in favor of voting for this, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Okay. It will be passed on to Council.

With that then, we=ll close the Community Development meeting at 7:42.

Community Development Committee
November 5, 2007
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 5, 2007

Members of Safety Committee present: Doug Joseph, Ron Stake, Antoinette Newman, Donna Shirey.

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

Mr. Joseph: And I'll call the Safety Committee to order at 7:42.

The second item is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda tonight? (No response). Seeing none, the agenda will stand approved.

The third item is approval of the minutes for the October 15, 2007 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes or corrections to those minutes? (No response). Seeing none, those minutes will stand approved.

Item 4, Discussion: Authorization for preparation of plans, specifications and advertise for bids for 2008 Street Program and appropriation of funds.

Mr. DeBolt: Mr. Chairman, members of Council, Mr. Mayor. I come before you tonight to discuss our 2008 Street Program. I wanted to start out by saying I have some good news and bad news. The good news is, last year we were able to pave approximately 4 3/4 miles worth of streets in the city. That=s with the assistance of both ODOT and the county, as well as the funds from within the city. The bad news is, we have approximately 12 miles worth of streets that are in poor condition. And we have nowhere near the total funds of 4 million dollars it would take to pave those streets. Larry Ward, our Street Superintendent, I think should be commended. Because after last year when we came in with a later Street Program, we wanted to try to do something so we could plan for the long term to address the street situation. So Larry spent the last few months out on the streets looking at every street and evaluating them. And that=s part of the charts you were given with both the marginal and the poor streets. This year what we=d like to do is again, originally put forth a 1 million dollar Street Program approximately. But we know in talking to the Auditor that we don=t have the funds for that many streets to be paved. So we=ve toned that down to the revised Street Program that I provided to you in the mail this past weekend. And we=d like to go forward with that program totaling, hopefully, \$550,000. And we=d like to put those streets out for bid. Again, we did narrow those down to the streets that were most in need. We felt that basically, had the most traffic or connector streets. And at the same time, we tried to identify some streets that were not given attention in last years Street Program in the northwest part of the city to make sure they got some attention. And again, address the other streets that were, or many of the streets that, in the neighborhoods that had the most streets that were in poor condition. So again, the bidding, the amount that we=re asking for is for the bids documents. But also so EMH&T can go out and do the borings to find out exactly

how much asphalt we need on each of those streets. Then they'll come back to us with more specific prices of what we think we're going to need. The prices that you see that we gave you are streets and amounts that Mr. Ward put together based on this years amounts that we paid for streets. And we can expect, because of asphalt being oil based, the prices will go up next year. How much? Talking to EMH&T, it could be anywhere from 5 to 15%. So if we added 5% we probably should add about \$22,000 under those prices. 10% would be about 44. And I think 15% is about 66. So the amount that I provided to you is \$439,000. It's less amount of money we have available to factor in the amount that we're going to have to pay for inflation. And then if we can still keep it under the budget that's been agreed upon, I put a couple of contingencies in there. We'll look at those streets to identify how much money they would take. And if we can fit those in under the \$550,000 budget, we would go ahead and add probably no more than one of those streets most likely. But I put two just in case we got better bid prices. So I'll go ahead and answer any questions, and Mr. Ward is here as well if you'd like to ask him as well.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. DeBolt, on your contingency streets, you had two listed here. One had some numbers and the other did not. For Summit Road, why was there no number for that particular one?

Mr. DeBolt: Because Summit Road is a road that's going to need a lot of repairs. And we're not projecting to pave it. But it might need to be in repair. And in order to do that, we would just want to check how much of the road would need repaired. The only way you can do that is to have EMH&T check it. We can't estimate that. We've gone out and looked at some parts of it. If you've drive down it, the sides of it are kind of caving in. So we could really put a good estimate together. Therefore, if we did have enough money to go look at that, it again, would be the second contingency street. But again, the road is in such bad condition that we felt like it would be in need of at least some partial full depth repairs. But again, that money that, if we went that far, would not go above that budget of \$550,000. We would only look at that as a serious consideration if the bids came in lower than expected.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Are there any questions from members of the committee for Mr. DeBolt? Yes, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Joseph. Mr. DeBolt, you're still asking for \$30,000?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. That's correct. And that money would only be used for a fraction of that. Approximately 10,000 of the actual work for the inspections. The rest of it is for the actual bidding process down the line. They'll come back to us with the actual cost. And then I can bring that forth to Council to let you know exactly what the specific cost will be. And then if we go forth with the Street Program at that point, we would use that additional money for the bid process.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Anyone on the committee? (No response). Council? Yes, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Joseph. Mr. DeBolt, my question is, comparing last year with next year, what is the, how much are we spending, how much did we spend this year?

Mr. DeBolt: This year we spent approximately, I think it was \$890,000 I believe.

Mr. Stearns: And this year is going to be a little less, right?

Mr. DeBolt: Much less. \$550,000.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Yes, President Hills.

Mr. Hills: I want to follow up a little bit on Ron=s question if I could. Because I believe EMH&T said it would be \$30,000 on the 2008 Street Program. And that would be preparing estimates on the 14 items that were prepared on 10-25-07, correct?

Mr. DeBolt: Originally, the larger amount. Correct.

Mr. Hills: I mean, that=s where they said the \$30,000 was going to come from.

Mr. DeBolt: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And now we=re talking about nine items. And are we still, I think Ron asked the question, are we still looking at the \$30,000?

Mr. DeBolt: The only amount that they were asking is up to that amount. It wouldn=t go any higher. But no, we don=t expect it to be as high because there=s not as many streets. The original program was for a 1 million dollar program. So we don=t anticipate spending near that for the initial review of the _____.

Mr. Hills: But we=re still going to authorize. Because I guess my concern is, when I read these, it=s you know, \$30,000 we=re going to do this, this, this, and one is advertise for bids. Well, I=m glad to see us starting, looking into 2008 Street Program some time before May or June of the year you=re trying to do it. I think that=s a great thing. But we do have some changes. We will have a new administration coming in. And we also, we don=t have, and I appreciate the job that you do, and Mr. Ward does, but one of the key things we have, what do the engineers think it=s going to cost us? And if they=re going to do all, 14 or whatever, that=s fine if it=s within that range. Because an estimate what the cost is going to be to do it, is get something that, if you choose not to do it in that year, it still is at least the basis that you don=t have to do that work the next time around.

Mr. DeBolt: Correct.

Mr. Hills: But I guess what I'm trying to figure out, if we're going to do it for 30, for 14 streets, and now we want 30 to do it for 9, with the understanding, we're not bidding any of this. I mean, money's set aside. But it won't be bid until there's more discussion on it. I just think we all need to understand, if we're going to do the 30, there ought to be money left over if all you did was the 9 streets. You do the 14 streets, maybe there's not as much left over. But it's always nice to think there's something left over. And with dealing with you and EMH&T, there's never anything left over. It just depends on how you use the magic math to make it look like it.

Mr. Joseph: Do you have a question, Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: Yes, I do. It's falling under the same principle Bill's brought up. What are they going to do? I mean, are they going to do the 9 or are they going to do all that we talked about before? Because if they're only going to do the portion that you're talking about here, then you ought to bring that price in, and that's what we're going to do. I don't like to leave money laying out on the table. I mean, why would we talk about 30,000 when we're doing less than half of these streets? I mean, I don't mind paying. Now if they're going to do the other and we have it there so we can look back to it for future use within this next year if we come up with additional money and things like that, that's fine. But I'd like to know.

Mr. DeBolt: I understand your concern. And in talking to Dave Koch with EMH&T, he was willing to provide a smaller amount. But then we would have to come back to Council again for the additional amount, which we could do. But at the time, we were looking at a 1 million dollar program, so the 30,000 seemed appropriate. But at the same time, one of the streets, maybe there are others, they've looked at them before. So they won't have to go out and spend as much time on it this time. Again, if by chance we don't move forward and they do look at the streets, a lot of those streets will have been looked at. But we won't come near the 30,000 on this proposal.

Mr. Clemens: Maybe I've got a hard head, but I'm having a hard time getting it through to me. We're either going to do the project that it came in the first time of \$30,000, and then we will have this for future use. Or let's cut it down to this project that you've shown right here. Because this includes the bidding it out and doing the construction cost and all that. I don't care what Mr. Koch said, you know that, well, we may do a little less and then we won't bill you for it. I've been down that route before with, not necessarily them, but other people. So I believe in appropriating what the cost, if this is the project we're going to do, and this is the only thing that they're going to come back with a figure on, bring in the cost that that's going to cost us. If they're going to go ahead and do the other streets that we had talked about earlier, and we'll have that for a future use, and we'll know what the cost of those streets are if we come up with additional money, that's fine. But I want to know one way or the other which it's going to be before I support it. I mean, that's just how I feel about it.

Mr. DeBolt: Well, I think what=s going to happen is, they=ll come back after doing the inspections without even spending any money for the bid process and tell us how much it=s going to be. So you=re going to see a much less amount just because they=re going to just spend the initial amount on inspections of the streets. So the bid process will come back later when they give us actual prices. So we=ll come back to you and they=ll say, I spent maybe 5 to 10,000 on inspections. And then if you agree, we=ll go forth with the rest of it.

Mr. Clemens: That=s true. But that=s not what you have on here. You have the layout, what it=s going to cost us, bid documents, advertise for bids and all this. 2008 Program, \$30,000. Now that=s what the ordinance says. Period.

Mr. DeBolt: Right.

Mr. Joseph: Go ahead, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Mel, what we=ll do, we=ll get with EMH&T and we=ll get a specific number. I too agree, the \$30,000 was for the entire project. To reduce it, we certainly should get a reduced amount to pay EMH&T. So we=ll go back to EMH&T tomorrow and have them draft up exactly what they=re going to do and how much it=s going to cost us. Because I agree with you. It=s very vague in what we gave you and we=ll correct that. Also, while I=ve got the floor, I=d like everybody just to refer to the letter that Steve sent you on October 25 where we spelled out all the problems that the City of Reynoldsburg is having on our streets. We listed the fact that there=s 468 streets, or 112 miles. And it was in no uncertain terms, that we said there are 25 miles that considered marginal. And there=s 12 miles that are in poor condition. We went on to say that the Street Program that was needed to correct all the problems could be upwards of 4 million dollars. Just to do next years, we were looking at a million seven to correct what should be done next year. And as you go through this, you need to understand that these streets do not get better. They get worse every year. So I kind of just wanted to remind Council that even though we=re getting \$550,000 this year, and if you=ll recall, I=ve said this a ton of times in the past, we have far more money available than that between the Street Fund, Permissive Tax Fund, CIP, all of the other funds that are available. We have far more than the \$550,000. So it=s not like we=re bleeding the system dry. The 550 is very small in the whole scheme of things. And anybody that wants to sit down and go over where all the money is, I=ve done that several times now and I=d be more than willing to do it again. But the point that I=m trying to make here, these streets are not getting better every year. They=re getting worse. And every one of these streets that was listed on there, next year, whoever the administration is, is going to have to sit down and look at all these streets again. And folks, it is not going to get any easier. If we=re only going to spend \$550,000 this year, I can assure you that next year, you=re going to probably have people starting to call you about how bad their streets are. So please read that letter from October 25 and just keep that in the back of your mind as the Street Program comes forward to you next year. There=s a lot of streets in the City of Reynoldsburg that need a lot of help. And I will tell you that I=ve also asked EMH&T to change their specifications, or at least look at their specifications both on sidewalks and on streets. It would appear that we have some streets and

some sidewalks that are between 45 and 50 years old that are faring far better than the streets that we've done in the last 10 to 15 years. And I believe that is totally the responsibility of our engineers to work on those specifications. And I have charged EMH&T with starting immediate, actually weeks ago, to start reviewing the specifications. Because I don't want these streets and roads falling apart in 10 years the way they are now. Something's got to be done. Something has to be looked at. So EMH&T's agreed to start looking at their specifications. And maybe we ought to go back to the ones we had Mel, back when Brookside and Marabar and all those were built. Because they're still holding together. And I think that's been at least what, 50 years ago?

Mr. Clemens: It's been a while.

Mayor McPherson: And the sidewalks are still there. They're still being walked on every day. And although the streets don't get a significant amount of traffic as Slate Ridge or something, they do get a lot of traffic. And there has to be something that we can do in our specifications to correct some of these problems so the city isn't the one that ends up every 10 years having to spend millions of dollars for streets. Maybe we ought to ask the engineers when they do their specifications to provide us with a warranty. What do you think? About a 20 year warranty, or 30 year warranty?

Mr. Hills: They'll warrant the paper that's on the specifications.

Mayor McPherson: But anyway, we will get the numbers to you. I see they're up there conferencing now. Maybe we'll have the number right now.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Chairman, if I could. And just to follow up a little bit. Let's simplify it. Let's say we have a million dollar Street Program and a half million dollar Street Program. Okay? And the \$30,000 was to come up with estimates on that million dollar program. And I don't think anybody's saying we shouldn't spend that. It may be good to have those numbers. So the 30,000 may not be all bad. We've just got to understand, if you're going to do the 14, do the 14. Are you going to fix all 15? Well, somebody said no, we've got this half million dollars which is a part of the 14. But one of the key things we've got to find in here, what is the engineers estimates of what the cost is going to be?

Mayor McPherson: That's what we're going to tell you.

Mr. Hills: That's what we're looking for.

Mayor McPherson: We'll check tomorrow.

Mr. Hills: And before any bids are going to be going out, and it can be on all 14...

Mayor McPherson: I agree.

Mr. Hills: The ones that we know that need it, but before anything other than, what do we think it=s going to cost from an engineering design standpoint to make these changes, not just the engineering work, but how much is it going to cost to do it, that=s what we need to see next. And if that be 14,000, it be 30,000 to cost to get that information, that=s information that is a good expenditure of the tax payers dollars because we=re going to be able to use that, if not next year, the year following or the year following. I think the confusion comes if you say, I need \$30,000 to do a million dollars and now I=m only going to do a half million, I=m not going to sit here and say it=s only 15. Because I don=t want to nickle and dime them. We need some of the work done. But as you said, much of the work is the advertising. That isn=t getting expended yet. So it=s going to be coming back to Council to decide to authorize any advertising, and/or some participation in the selections of what the streets are once we have better numbers. But I think it=s great we=re getting started, now let=s go ahead and get the engineers to put some numbers on it to say how much it=s going to cost. And I don=t think there=s a problem with appropriating that amount of money to get those done.

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Hills, I agree totally with you. And that=s what we=ll get EMH&T to give us. What those numbers really are and what they=re applicable to. So we=ll get that to you by tomorrow. And I=m sure that the engineers are more than willing to do that. One of the things that you heard my spiel about specifications, I would certainly hope that on the Street Program that we do in 2008, some of the new specifications are applicable for the streets that we=re fixing. So we=ll also continue to follow up on that aspect also.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman. I remember sitting here a little while ago back when Mr. Parker was out there standing where you were. And he would put a smile on his face and go, well you know, I can do >x= number, but if I do half that much, it=s still going to be so expensive. That from an engineering standpoint, taking half the number of streets still could be \$30,000. The work that=s done I think is an economy scale in this case. That=s what he was trying to project to this Council that 8 or 16, your cost may only be 20 for half. But if you do the more it could be 30. And I=m using examples here. I>m not saying those, he said those numbers specifically. Just that there=s an economy of scales what he was trying to inform the Council of. And I definitely would want to see us gain some of that economy of scale. And if we could see the numbers of all those streets, even if we don=t elect to bid them out and do the work on them, we have at least the information of what it=s going to cost us in the future to do so. And I think, Mr. Hills, that=s what you=re trying to get at. We just want the information and we can use it at any time at our leisure. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Like I say, once again I agree with Bill. To do half the job and do the whole job would cost half the job. Because you come out and measure the streets and you look at them.

So you don't put any more effort into it, any more cost because of that. But any how, I agree. All we want, and it could be for future use, and I agree with the Mayor, and he's said this many times, and I have too, we're 6 million dollars behind in our street improvements. Last year's the first time we've done anything in probably the last 6 years to amount to anything. Each year we drifted back. That 6 million we're behind, we'll never catch up on. And that's what I know and that's what the Mayor's arguments is. And ours is too. We were turned down when we went out and asked for this to come in and help us as far as our bond issue was concerned because I don't think the people realize what the streets cost. But we do have to figure out some how, the first of the year or whoever comes in. I think Dick had one good idea, is to increase the amount that goes into the Capital Improvement Fund on the income revenue from 2% to 4%. And then let that other 2% go directly for streets. That would be there every year. And that would allow us to come up with that million dollar program. So that's something they could think about, is doing that on our income tax revenue. Some how we've got to adjust our self to know that we're going to have to do a million to a million and a half dollars a year, starting next year some how if we're ever going to catch up with these streets. And the Mayor's completely right. A lot of these streets haven't been repaired in 40 years. And I agree with him. The sidewalks we put in 45 years ago are harder than a brick. The ones we put in 10 years ago, you can kick apart. So there's a difference in the way the concrete's made any more. I know EPA's done this. Everything's unhealthy for everybody and that's why we're all coughing. But our sidewalks are falling apart because of the elements they don't let us put in it any more. But any how, we've got to straighten that up or we're going to come through the same issue 15 years from now. The work we do today's going to fall apart. And that Council's going to be worrying about where they're going to come up with some money. But I'm hoping the first of the year, the Mayor can help, and Bill, and Ron, the financial wizards of the city, and Dick Harris, some how we're going to have to come up with revenue to do these streets without additional tax. Because I don't believe the people want an additional tax. So we're going to have to take it upon ourselves to do that. That's an important part of the city. If people can't drive down the streets, they're not going to shop here. And it's that simple. They're going to leave Reynoldsburg because nobody wants to walk on gravel any more. That was back in the olden days. So I think that this is an important issue. One of our most important issues. I hope that after the first of the year, the gentlemen that are here, or whoever is left, or who's going to be here, really take that seriously and gets with the administration, with Mr. Hills, get with Bob, I'm sure he'd have a lot to say, and get this arranged. And get with Ron because Ron knows what our problems are. Thank you.

Mayor McPherson: Well, I would, along the line that Mel's talked about here, I agree that the percentages should be increased. And 2% is a good number. That's a number we kicked around. It was my thought that we probably should wait until the new administration comes in. That's why it's not before you. One of the other things that we could do is pass a specific street levy. But that's something that you'd look at after you adjust your percentage going to the CIP. The only thing that I didn't agree on, and that's just a personal issue, was increasing that percentage to cover debt service. And I was not in favor of that. But I have always been in favor of increasing that percentage to cover streets. So hopefully, when the new administration comes

in, whoever that is, they=ll work with Ron and Council and that=ll be one of their priorities when they come into office. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. DeBolt, I notice you and the engineer were discussing something. What to, if anything further to add on this?

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you. Yes. In discussions, we understand your concern of spending more money than we need to at this time. Again, the money that we asked for was just for the engineers to be able to go out and get that information for you for the streets. Again, that was based on the larger program when we thought we could do nearly a million dollars worth. So we have a couple of options. One is, we could go ahead and again, based on talking to Mr. Koch, the whole inspection process wasn't going to take 30,000. Part of it was for bidding. The bidding will come later. And the reason we=re coming forth now is because to get the bids in February, probably late January, early February, we need to move the process forward now to get that information. And therefore, we really don't want to wait. If we can, that=s to get the bids at that time frame. The longer we wait, the later the bids will go in and that affects competitive price we may be able to get. So that=s why we=re trying to get it now. Therefore, we would propose that we could lower the amount of the request to 15,000 which I think is a little more than what they=re going to need. And then be able to do all the streets on the first proposal. If you want to do all of them, to just do the inspections, then we would have those already on the books knowing which ones, the actual prices they=re going to cost. And then be able to pick from those. Including, since they all include the ones on the smaller list. But again, I=m pretty confident based on Mr. Ward and in evaluating these and talking to EMH&T, we probably won't be able to get to do more than the ones on the smaller list. But we can allocate some money just to do the inspections and they will come back with _____ tonight. So I=d like to ask that maybe you consider a smaller amount of 15,000, and then possibly either just do the smaller list or the bigger list.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Yes, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: You guys know me. I=m not into this spontaneous decision making. I still like Council just to wait. I=ll get back to you tomorrow with specifics. You know, there=s been a whole lot of generalities talked about here tonight. But I think you need specifics. And if you just move it forward, we=ll have specifics for you within a day or so. And as Mr. Hills said, we need to know for sure what this money is really for. And you just arbitrarily cutting it in half, doesn't necessarily mean we=re going to get what we really need. So we=ll get that to you tomorrow.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thanks. Any other questions? (No response). I=d like to ask the Auditor a question. Mr. Harris, are you fairly comfortable with the 550 number?

Mr. Harris: Absolutely.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Very good. Okay. I don't see any other questions.

Mr. Miller: I have one thing.

Mr. Joseph: Oh sure. Go right ahead, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller: I did want to add one thing that builds upon what President Hills, Councilman Baxter, and Councilman Clemens stated. The majority of the cost of the Street Program is the advertising and the preparation of the books. Going out and looking at the 17 streets that were originally intended for a million dollar Street Program, and cutting that back to look at a fewer number of streets for a \$500,000 program, I don't believe that you are going to see a large difference in the engineering fee involved for preparing books for two different size Street Programs. In addition to what the Mayor has said and what Steve has said, I would like to recommend that we move forward and look at all 17 streets. You will have a large pool of streets with costs associated with each of them to really sit down and decide what you want to include in your Street Program and what you don't want to include. And what you don't want to include will be ready for next year if it's wished to be considered then.

Mr. Hills: You all are never going to see your ball game. Mr. Chairman, I think that's what was said. Let's do the 17 streets. The only thing is, as you've just said, the bidding's where the money is. We need to see, what do you think as EMH&T, what's the cost going to be on the streets? Give it to us on the 17 streets. All the Mayor has said, give them the number tomorrow. Give them an estimate. If it's 7,000, 11,000, 12,000, that's fine. We're willing to pass it next week and get it out of here. But it's not the argument about 7 or 14. The argument is about, we all agree it can be used later. But just, we're not advertising tonight. And let me assure you, it's always bothered me, and maybe now is a good time to address it, whenever we say, we're going to put up this money and here's 4 or 5 stages that's going to be done, and then some days as these projects start to close, they look at it, wait a minute, I've got a PO over there that's still got \$7,000. I haven't spent that yet. Watch me go spend it now. So maybe we're going to try to do something different in the future. And don't just sit it out there. Right now you know there's a use on it. You have to do your engineering drawings, or your estimate drawings on 17 streets. Tell us how much that's going to cost. We're going to pass that next Monday and go get the numbers on the streets.

Mr. Miller: Okay.

Mr. Hills: I think that's simply what we're trying to get to.

Mr. Miller: I understand. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Any other questions or comments for Mr. DeBolt or Mr. Miller? (No response). Okay. Well, I'll make a motion then, we'll send this on to Council for first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Chairman, they did ask for an emergency on that. I don't know whether we want to pass that out as soon as you can get the number or not so they can get started on it. So I don't know whether, you tell, is there a need for the emergency?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. The need for the emergency is so that we can allocate the money so EMH&T can go out and do the inspections and provide us with the numbers. Again, to keep the bid process going in January. The farther we push it back, we'll be bidding later than February.

Mr. Hills: We're not going to be asking for 30,000, we don't know what it is yet. We're going to ask for something less. And we at least now, now we know how those dollars are going to get spent. And they're spent putting pages together.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Item 5 tonight, ORDINANCE TO ADOPT A AMENDED AGREEMENT CREATING CENTRAL OHIO TRANSIT AUTHORITY@

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Joseph, I don't think you voted on that.

Mr. Joseph: Oh, we did not vote?

Mrs. Frazier: And do you need to go to Finance even though you don't know the money? Because you need a recommendation from somewhere.

Mr. Joseph: Well, we did vote.

Mrs. Frazier: I've got a first and I have....

Mr. Joseph: We voted.

Mrs. Frazier: ..Toni seconded.

Mr. Joseph: We voted.

Mrs. Frazier: ..and Mr. Hills asked about an emergency. I don't have a vote.

Mr. Joseph: I recall, well, we can do it again. I recall a vote but we can do it again. Okay. We'll vote again on sending this to Council for first reading. Item number 4. Mrs. Newman seconded. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted A Aye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Mr. Miller: Excuse me, Councilman Joseph. If we're going to give you a proposal and a cost for estimating what the street repairs are going to be, and you're going to pass that by an emergency, there will be a follow up proposal to actually prepare the books and advertise the project which

will also require an emergency to meet the time frames of the spring construction. So I just want to advise you of that. That since we're splitting this \$30,000 proposal into two parts, passing one by emergency, we're going to ask that the second part be passed by an emergency also to start preparation of the books.

Mr. Stake: I have a question.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: When would the second part need to happen?

Mr. Miller: Once the city is presented with a cost for the repairs of the streets.

Mr. Stake: What are you estimating? What kind of time? What date are you thinking about, Jim?

Mr. Miller: Date?

Mr. Stake: Yeah. What time period?

Mr. Miller: I would like to start preparation of the bid books no later than mid December. I'd like to be done with the bid books in early January, mid January. We have a month for advertising. And then anywhere between 30 and 60 days to award the contract. So that would be awarding a contract in March or April.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And that all depends on when you get your figures back to us.

Mr. Miller: Well, it depends on when we get the figures back to you. And yes, when we get the field work done.

Mr. Clemens: Well, that's what I mean. Once you get your field work done and get the figures back to us and we know what the cost is, the next meeting, they can pass it and send it on as an emergency and we could pass it.

Mr. Miller: That's perfectly fine. I just wanted to inform you that, to take advantage of early prices by getting these projects out on the street earlier rather than later, we would want to pass that by an emergency to make sure that happens.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Joseph. There's a failure of communication or my mind is having a major meltdown here. Because my understanding was, what was just passed was to authorize the

30,000. Do both sides of it. Not to split them. But to come back with a total cost for the project. And at that point we would decide which one went forward. And now I'm hearing you talk about splitting them up and coming back with two separate sets of numbers. So I'm confused.

Mr. Miller: Well, maybe I'm the one that's had the meltdown then. I thought what we were passing was to do up front engineering and cost estimates first. And then come back to you and ask for the additional funds necessary to actually prepare the bids.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Is that what you thought?

Mr. Hills: That's what's been asked. The money is.....

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I wanted to make sure we understood that.

Mr. Hills: The money is for, whatever they're going to give to the Mayor tomorrow as a dollar amount to do an estimate of what the costs are going to be on 17 streets.

Mr. Miller: Correct.

Mr. Hills: It's not 30,000.

Mr. Miller: That will not be correct.

Mr. Hills: And I think we're trying to send it forward, I think with an emergency to fund those. Are you going to need more money? Yeah. You are. Because you're going to come back and ask again once you decide, well it's streets, then the engineering costs and the books and everything else for bids is a separate project. Right now, all we've asked for, is you all, let's come in with 30,000, let's cut it in half down to, let's take from a million to 500,000. There's enough confusion in this piece of legislation that we're going to say, let's keep it real simple folks. We want to know how, what you tell us that you think it's going to cost to redo 17 streets. And we don't have that number in front of us. You can get it passed next week if you get the number to the Mayor so the number can get to us, and then go walk the streets. Go do whichever you do to earn the monies to say this is what we think the costs are going to be.

Mr. Miller: I understand.

Mr. Hills: And then we go forward from that day on if we decide, let's do this number or that number of streets, then there has to be some things. I don't, I can't sit here with great comfort and say that your numbers are going to match with the number we've got in front of us. But once you put your numbers down there, we paid you probably a little more for your numbers, and you're going to have to back up your numbers because that's why it's called EMH&T.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Anything else on the Street Program? (No response). Going once. Going twice. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Frazier, do you have what you need?

Mrs. Frazier: I can tell you I'm not writing this until the minutes are done, I can tell you that right now; are you going to flip it to Finance? That's the only thing I need to know. Because they need to make a recommendation of whatever amount they come up with or that part can't go.

Mr. Joseph: Alright. We can do that. I'll make a motion we also send this to Finance Committee. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item 5, ORDINANCE TO ADOPT AMENDED AGREEMENT CREATING CENTRAL OHIO TRANSIT AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE THE CITY OF DUBLIN AS A MEMBER CITY; AND REPEALING AND REPLACING ORDINANCE NO. 3-71 PASSED JANUARY 11, 1971 THAT ADOPTED THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT THAT CREATED THE CENTRAL OHIO TRANSIT AUTHORITY. First reading was on 10-22-07. Mayor, do we have anything additional on this tonight?

Mayor McPherson: There is nothing additional, Mr. Joseph. The title pretty much sums up what the old ordinance is about. We're adding the City of Dublin to the agreement that created the Central Ohio Transit Authority back in '71. Pretty simple ordinance. Nothing like the last one.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Are there any questions on this for the Mayor on this from committee or Council? (No response). If not, I'll make a motion we send this on to Council for its second reading. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item 6 tonight is ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT TO PURCHASE ROAD SALT. Second reading was on 10-22-07. Does anyone on the committee or Council have any questions for the administration on this tonight? (No response). If not, I'll make a motion we send this on to Council for its third reading. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Shirey. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And item number 7 tonight, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FOR THE ENHANCEMENT OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATION FOR THE REYNOLDSBURG DIVISION OF POLICE. Second reading was on 10-22-07. I asked Ed Sherman from REM Communications to come tonight to talk a little bit about the 800 megahertz

system. If you could please step up to the mike, you and your associate and please give your names for the record please.

Mr. Sherman: My name=s Ed Sherman, and thank you for inviting us to come and talk about your radio system.

Mr. Perry: My name=s Brian Perry with REM.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you. Could you talk a little bit about the 800 system? Your experience with it and just general thoughts about your experiences with it.

Mr. Perry: Basically, we haven>t had a lot of experience with the 800 system itself. We do have customers that are on it. We do not maintain any 800 systems. There=s a lot of reasons why people oppose to go 800 megahertz. Monthly cost. The system, you do not own the system yourself. Someone else owns the system. There=s a dead area for some reason in your guys township. You wouldn=t have the capability to go in. If the police, basically, if they couldn=t talk in a certain area, you wouldn=t have the capability to go in and take care of that area. The City of Columbus or whoever maintains that system would have to come in and take care of that area for you. It=s very costly to come in. The last time that they had to do that, the City of Columbus was up in the Polaris area, it was about 9 million dollars to add that site up there. So I mean, there=s a lot of disadvantages to go to 800. I=m not sure what you guys actually have been told. I mean, is there any questions as far as the 800 system and why you should go to it?

Mr. Joseph: Well, one question I had was, I mean, it seems like a lot of cities are going to this. Do you think this is going to become the standard eventually that other subsystems are going to be largely phased out over time?

Mr. Perry: As far as 800? I mean, I don=t really know how to answer that.

Mr. Joseph: Because I know that future upgrades are going to be programmable on this system we=ve been told. So that this is basically something that could be altered as time goes along. But our concern was parts of the city will not be covered under this. The parts of the city that are in Licking and Fairfield Counties would not be covered under this because they don=t have those systems in those areas. And that=s been a concern to many on Council.

Mr. Sherman: I might interject here. The City of Gahanna has chosen not to go this way. They=re going to go with a digital system like I had showed you and dropped off to you the power point presentation. One of their concerns is that it=s a proprietary system. You=re at the mercy of Motorola. There are no more 800 megahertz channels. Nextel has taken and purchased all those channels. As more and more cities go on to this system, you=re going to have a chance of being what they call Abusied out@. If you have a natural disaster, a terrorist attack, they have a proprietary system that if Columbus needs the channels, they=re going to be on them. You=re not going to be able to talk. Because it=s owned by them. You have a monthly recurring cost of anywhere from I believe, it=s \$14 to \$17 a month per radio. The other thing you=re going to

have is the portables. Hand mobiles are very, very expensive. You're looking at cost anywhere from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a unit. Cost on repairs are going to be very expensive as well. As Brian had indicated, we don't do service on them. I don't think that any of the local Motorola dealerships do service on them that I know of. So I'd like to just clarify that. So I don't know if you're going to purchase spare equipment for, a patrol car goes down, a portable goes down, they'll be going back probably to the factory for repair. That's one thing. And as time goes proprietary, I know you're getting grant money, I believe it's an 80% purchase price, 20% price, 80% reduction. As you add equipment later, that's going to go away. We don't know how long that equipment's going to be available at that price to you. You also then are locked in, like I say too, that if you go with a digital Kenwood system as we've recommended, or another one, you can go to other people for sources of repair and purchase of equipment. You're not locked in to one vendor.

Mr. Joseph: Mayor, you had a question?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah, you mentioned that it had a multitude of down side things but you only gave one. Can you list some of those down sides?

Mr. Sherman: Well, service is one thing, as far as service and repair costs on that. Like Brian had indicated....

Mayor McPherson: Okay. Stop on costs. What's the difference in cost between what you would charge and what we could get the cost for? For any radio?

Mr. Sherman: The Kenwood, the I Com, some of the other brands that your city's familiar with would probably be about what you're going to pay with your 80% reduction. \$4,000 radio through this system on the proprietary system opposed to the digital system by Kenwood, I Com, some of the other vendors, you're probably going to be looking at 6 to \$800 of radio. Range is going to be another thing. If you have some dead spots in the city....

Mayor McPherson: Okay. You're aware that we already have 29 of the radios as part of our grant? So there would be no cost to us. It would be a cost to buy the Kenwood though. Correct?

Mr. Sherman: Correct.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. Sherman: Have you, obviously if you have 29 of them you've tested the system _____ dead spots?

Mayor McPherson: Yes. We've tested them. There's no dead spots.

Mr. Sherman: There are no dead spots in the system.

Mayor McPherson: No. So that=s not a down side. Am I correct, Lieutenant? We did test those?

Lieutenant McKinley: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mayor McPherson: I=m sorry. I didn=t have the opportunity to know you were going to be here tonight. So I could have asked these way ahead of time.

Lieutenant McKinley: I didn=t either. These gentlemen actually do perform service on our current radio system. And I did not know they were going to be here tonight.

Mr. Hills: Thank you. You answered my question there.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes. I did not know there were going to be speakers tonight.

Mayor McPherson: We didn=t either. I didn=t know either. I don=t mean to put you on the spot, but these are a lot of questions.

Lieutenant McKinley: We did have an opportunity to do a test with the current radios that we do have. Like the Mayor said, we have 29 radios. We did have officers go out throughout the city and test those radios in a variety of situations. One officer went into the basement of his house, talked to another office at Home Depot. They did it from cruisers. They did it, and a map was provided to the Mayor of the city, showing the locations, and it=s basically peppered with green dots all over it which were the locations of the tests. The only area where we had reduced communications but we were still able to understand each other on the radio was a spot right behind WalMart for some reason. They said that the signal strength which is shown on little bars on the radio went down and they had kind of a scratchy sound to them when they talked. They could still understand each other but they could tell it was definitely an area with a problem. That was the only area that we could see that there was a degradation of service.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Chairman, if I could ask clarification, because I=m still a little confused on the Licking and Fairfield, and that is a concern. But if I understand what you=ve just said, we are able to communicate on an 800 radio in a cruiser between Franklin County and our far east Summit Street in Licking County. And we can communicate on the 800 system, correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: That is correct. The county....

Mr. Hills: What we=ll never be able to do is talk to the Licking County Sheriff on the 800 system.

Lieutenant McKinley: That is correct. We can talk to them on LEERN but not on the 800

megahertz. And during that test, I should also point out, that the officers doing the test ran across a couple of the guys from TTFD Fire Department who were using 800 megahertz radios of their own, and said well, how long have you guys had this and what has your experience been? And they received a favorable response saying they had no issues with it in the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Hills: And our recommendation was not to terminate our existing system any way. Is that correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: That=s correct. The Chief had relayed to me prior to going to his training that he did want to keep the current system as a backup. As these gentlemen mentioned, we do own that system. There=s an advantage to that. You certainly do give away some when another entity owns and operates the system. But in this case we would want to keep our own system as a back, a second system.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Stake, go right ahead.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Joseph. Gentlemen, are you able to service and sell the 800 system?

Mr. Sherman: No, we are not. No. That=s a proprietary system and Motorola is the only one that=s allowed to sell that, and service it.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Perry: So I mean, after your two year warranty=s up on that product, I mean, your repairs budget could exceed three times what you have currently.

Mr. Stake: And I appreciate what you=re telling me. But also what I=m hearing is, that you=re not able to service or sell that system so I really can=t see why you=d come here and talk favorably about it. I mean, I=ll be honest with you.

Mr. Perry: I understand.

Mr. Stake: And my other question....

Mr. Sherman: Mr. Joseph asked us to come.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. Okay. And my other question is, the reason the 800 system came about is so many different safety forces can communicate with each other. Are there other systems out there able to do that?

Mr. Perry: I mean, your current system has the capability to do interoperability and add to, to be able to talk to Columbus Dispatch through what=s called a patch through your current

communications. All that would be would be the Dispatcher actually pushing a button and link your guys= system up with Columbus= system. So I mean....

Mr. Sherman: It=s a cross banding. Your UHF to the 800.

Mr. Perry: I mean, buy one radio instead of having to purchase and pay for the communication of 50, 80 radios in the Columbus system. So I mean, interoperability thing came about after 911.

Mr. Stake: Then why I guess, would Homeland Security be providing all this grant money for these radios so that safety forces can communicate with each other? And why I guess, are people who are able to, going to it? I know, I understand there=s some hold outs and they don=t want to be beholden to Columbus I guess for some service.

Mr. Perry: I mean, the system=s already in place. They don=t have to put, you know, build the infrastructure. I mean, it=s something that they don=t have to maintain at that point. They can kind of buy the equipment, use it, and not have to worry about the maintenance of it. There is advantages. I mean, there are advantages of the 800 megahertz. I mean, there are down sides. A lot of down sides to it too. The priority part of it, they=re only capable of so many channels on that 800 system. Who gets priority at that point? If there is a disaster, I mean, it=s your guys= four channels that you guys buy off of it. As they=re going to busy out, you guy=s are not going to have communications if something happens. Who has the priority of that system? It=s definitely going to be on who owns the system.

Mr. Stake: Lieutenant, have we thought about that at all?

Lieutenant McKinley: We have. And to my knowledge that the other systems, the other suburbs that are using this system have, in my talking to them, never complained about having completely lost the ability to communicate within their own city on this 800 system. And my thought is, with Columbus running this, the first time they would take away that ability for an agency to communicate on their primary channel, you=d be looking for a different system to go to pretty quick. I mean, that=s a basic, I mean, when you lose that service....

Mr. Stake: It doesn=t make much sense does it for them to do that?

Lieutenant McKinley: It doesn=t make much sense. _____ possible and I don=t know certainly, the technical aspects of the system like these two gentlemen. And I certainly don=t portray myself to be a technical radio expert. I go a lot on what EMA has told us. And they certainly are a big proponent of this system as many of the agencies in the Central Columbus area are using it.

Mr. Stake: Right. We could sit here and talk about what if=s all night.

Mr. Perry: I=m not a salesman. I maintain you guys= communication equipment. If your guys=

console dies at midnight, I mean, I'm the gentleman that comes out and takes care of it and makes sure the cops have their communication. I'm not here trying to sell you into anything else. There's reasons why people have held off. Like with Gahanna and stuff like that. 800 megahertz frequencies have been around a long time. Kenwood Manufacturing no longer makes a trunking 800 megahertz system like Motorola sells right now. And the reason why is because they're not out there any more. Nextel, they've bought up the whole frequency band basically. So I mean, these major manufacturers are no longer making equipment like that except Motorola. I mean, there are disadvantages. I'm not sure what else.

Mr. Stake: There's advantages and disadvantages to everything. I guess, I'm a pretty straight forward kind of person. I think the Homeland Security and the grant money being available, they'll tell you, hey, let's get on the same page and we're going to give you the ability to do that. And we're not going to lose our other system. We're still going to have that other system to fall back on. So I frankly, don't see the down side.

Mr. Sherman: Based on that, I don't either. To be honest with you, I didn't realize you were keeping your existing system up and operational.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

Mr. Joseph: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Chairman Joseph, my question is, if and when we go to the 800 system and we need to get those regularly serviced, who would service those?

Mr. Perry: I'll leave that to you because we don't know.

Lieutenant McKinley: You're talking about if we get the new 800 megahertz radios?

Mr. Stearns: Right.

Lieutenant McKinley: I do not know.

Mr. Sherman: We think they have to go back to the factory but we're not sure.

Lieutenant McKinley: I do not know who would actually, I don't know the vendor's name or what the process is to get those serviced. I could find out from EMA who their agencies are utilizing for that service.

Mr. Stearns: I think we need to know that before we decide to go that far, who the City of Columbus uses. I'm sure they would have that information.

Lieutenant McKinley: That shouldn't be too hard to get. I can certainly research that

information.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: The question I have is, we talk about having four channels. Correct Lieutenant? That we're planning on utilizing if we head this direction?

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct. That's currently what we use and that meets our need now. And that's what we would, the pricing quotes that I included, I think last week, did include four talk groups. Four dedicated talk groups.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I thought. And that's enough for the city for our growth now and into the future? At least for the next 5 or 10 years?

Lieutenant McKinley: For the foreseeable future, I believe it is. It certainly serves our needs now.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. One of the things we talked about was having those pre-programmed. You can drop them down to 700 megahertz if that's the channel direction we had. Would we also be able to drop them down to 460 where we are today?

Lieutenant McKinley: I do not know.

Mr. Perry: No.

Mayor McPherson: No, we wouldn't. I asked that.

Mr. Joseph: Yes, Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: I personally am more confused now than I ever have been on this whole subject. And I know you invited these gentlemen here to talk about it. I'm hearing a lot of pro's, I'm hearing a lot of con's. And personally, my opinion, I think this is something that we need to look into a little bit further before we pass it on. Because I'm right now, I'm speechless. I have totally no idea what's going to, I know we need to do something better for the Police Department. But again, we've got two gentlemen here talking about the radios that they can't speak highly of. And yet we're trying to get something better for the Police Department. So in my opinion, I think we need to do some more research on this, get all the questions answered, and then look forward to passing it on. But I can't pass this on for tonight.

Mr. Joseph: What's the feeling of the committee? Go ahead, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: I would disagree. We've got the recommendation from the Acting Chief here to go ahead and do this, the Mayor, Safety Director. The money's being made available. There's grant money being made available through Homeland Security for these things. And I think the gentleman up there agreed with me that he doesn't see the down side either. He came here I guess, to speak against it and he's determined that there is no down side for us to do this. So I don't see why we shouldn't go forward.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Shirey, is your concern over the servicing end of it? Or is there other things that you're, because that's the one question we don't have an answer tonight. Is there other aspects specifically that you're concerned about?

Mrs. Shirey: The servicing. But I'd also like to find out what other areas are going to the 800 megahertz versus the lower one. So those are some questions I'd like to have answered before we proceed.

Lieutenant McKinley: One suggestion I have would be, the officer's that have taken the 29 radios out, because they've actually used them more than I have, they're the person on the, feet on the ground, users of the radio. If you talk to them, they can give you a good perspective of what they've seen of it so far. And to answer the second question about what agencies are not, in the Central Ohio area, my understanding is, the only agencies that are not currently using the 800 megahertz system is Gahanna, Whitehall, and Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Sherman: That's correct.

Mr. Joseph: Go ahead, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Well, that's correct. I was just going to answer a question. Those are the only three suburban communities that have not gone to the 800 megahertz. And I guess Gahanna, from what I'm hearing tonight's decided not to. But I believe Whitehall and Reynoldsburg has pretty much decided to, because of the grant, to move toward the 800.

Mrs. Shirey: Do you know for what reason Gahanna and Whitehall have not decided to do that?

Mayor McPherson: I'm not sure. Whitehall hasn't. Gahanna, I have no idea why they chose not to.

Lieutenant McKinley: I was in a planning meeting, and the Whitehall Chief mentioned funding. That was at least one of their concerns.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Clemens, go right ahead.

Mr. Clemens: I have no problem with recommendation from the Police Department or the Mayor. But I do want to caution one thing. Grants aren't the greatest things in the world. I've

never seen a grant we=ve got yet that we didn=t get stuck in the end of it. Eventually, it all comes back to bite you. So once we=ve received the grant from the federal government, there=s always a tail end to it. So I don=t want everybody to think we=re going to go in and just, this is the only money we=re going to spend. Because in the long run, it=s going to come back. So just remember that.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: And I would, again, I do agree with Mr. Clemens. But we=re going to spend money. Whatever system we have we=re going to spend money.

Mr. Clemens: I=m not opposed to it. I just wanted to mention the part about the grants.

Mr. Stake: And if I recall, in previous discussions, we were told that our current system is difficult to find parts for. You=re saying no?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, if you, like he mentioned, you can buy the new radios. I believe he said the Kenwoods were about \$700 a unit. Those are newer units. Obviously, if you buy those, they=re not, now the older Maxon radios that we have, they can be a challenge to get parts for.

Mr. Sherman: That=s going to be true of any radio as they go forward. Motorola, we service a lot of Motorola equipment. Other than the 800 meg because that is proprietary. So we do service a lot of Motorola equipment. And once it reaches about 10 years old, which I think most of your portables are way past that, parts become a challenge as he mentioned.

Mr. Stake: So we=re going to be spending a bunch of money either way on parts, and service, and those kinds of things with our current system.

Mr. Sherman: You=ve recently purchased, I believe 40 or 45 new portables on your UHF system already.

Mr. Hills: Excuse me, we purchased what?

Mr. Sherman: So we=re getting rid of some of the portables.

Mr. Hills: We purchased what?

Mr. Sherman: I believe it was 40 or 45. Do you remember? I know it was 15, 15, and 10.

Lieutenant McKinley: Ten were purchased a couple of months ago. And I believe there was 35 more purchased.

Mr. Sherman: Thirty-five purchased. So you do have 45 additional, new radios that are replacing

the old Maxons that we could not get parts for.

Mr. Hills: Well then we shouldn't have a part problem in where we are now. But we just bought 45 new radios?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes sir, we did. As we obviously change out the new radios for the old radios, the old radios become less than an issue. But until the decision's made to go with this Homeland Security Grant, we have to continue to maintain and utilize the current radio system. So the current cost for replacement of radios and maintenance has not stopped. And won't until we know that we....

Mr. Hills: And that was just a budgeted item, I assume is where that came from? Because we didn't do any funding for new radios.

Lieutenant McKinley: I believe it was.

Mayor McPherson: Yes. It was budgeted.

Mr. Hills: We shouldn't have any problem with radios if you've got all brand new, two different types.

Lieutenant McKinley: Not to talk to each other. No sir. To talk to other agencies though, that's a challenge.

Mr. Hills: There are no free lunches any more.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: But I'm not so sure you all _____ on two radio systems pretty quick too. I don't know. I'll just be quiet right now. I've got to dwell on this.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions or comments from committee or Council? (No response). What I'd like to suggest is, that we move it on for the third reading, but in the meantime over the next week, get the answer to how the servicing is done. If we don't get any satisfactory answer by Monday, we can hold at that point. Would that be okay, Mrs. Shirey?

Mrs. Shirey: You're saying that we have to have that information by next Monday?

Mr. Joseph: I would like to have an answer on how servicing is going to be handled for this system by next week.

Mrs. Shirey: I'd like to put it on hold prior to that. Put it on hold and then get the information, then possibly move it on.

Mr. Joseph: Well, I=d like to, go ahead Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: We can have it in your packet for Friday. Then we=d have all weekend to review it. But it only takes one phone call to find out who services it. And that=s not a big deal.

Mr. Joseph: Because we can hold next week if we don=t have satisfactory answers. That=s the only issue I still have. Unless other members of the committee have additional issues that need to be addressed between now and then.

Mayor McPherson: Actually Mr. Joseph, we=ll just call Truro Township. They=re on the 800. They have them. We=ll ask them who services theirs.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Newman, go ahead.

Mrs. Newman: I don=t much care who services. I just want to know how much it costs. That would be nice to know.

Mayor McPherson: We=ll be able to get that for you and have it in your packet by Friday. You can probably pick it up down in your Council box even before that.

Mrs. Newman: Okay.

Mr. Joseph: Any other questions or comments? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Do we have any opportunity or loss of grant if we don=t move quickly?

Lieutenant McKinley: We did put a placeholder in to apply for the grant. It=s getting down to the wire. I=ll have an exact answer for you by next Monday. But the drop dead date is.....

Mr. Baxter: That=s what I thought. I don=t want to lose the opportunity for the grant and get this money because we drag our feet on this.

Mayor McPherson: If you all recall, this grant had already expired and then was extended. So right now, the longer we wait the more chance we run of them saying, okay, we filled our quotas, sorry, we don=t have them any more.

Mr. Baxter: I=d rather see us holding the equipment for a year and then make a decision a year down the line to use it and put it into action, then _____ on the equipment.

Mayor McPherson: Well, I think the point that I need to make here too, even though we get the equipment, that doesn=t necessarily mean that we=re going to run out right away and join the Mark System or the City of Columbus system. We=ll continue to evaluate which is the better system and how much it=s going to cost. What this does, is just give us an 80/20 split on the

equipment that we=re going to need if we go to 800. So we=re only talking equipment here. We=re not talking about signing up to go with a system. We=re talking about getting the 80/20 Homeland Security Grant for the equipment.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Shirey, go ahead.

Mrs. Shirey: I just have a couple of questions. You said that you=ve got 40 new radios. Is that right?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, ma=am.

Mrs. Shirey: And what was the cost on those?

Lieutenant McKinley: I don=t want to guess. Do you guys have the approximate price on those?

Mr. Sherman: Approximate? Probably about \$600 per unit.

Mrs. Shirey: Okay. With this grant, who is going to end up paying for, and I think you probably said this earlier, and please forgive me, servicing the radios should anything happen to them? And what is the approximate cost in that?

Mr. Sherman: We wouldn=t know.

Mrs. Shirey: You have no idea?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, we would be responsible for servicing because we would then own the radios. But one of the questions I think I=m going to try to get an answer for before the weekend is the servicing cost. That=s the part we do not know. Who does it and how much it costs.

Mr. Joseph: Additional discussion before I make a motion? Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I think it=s also important to note, you=re asking to go for the grant. Not even buy the equipment at this point. Correct? (Inaudible. Two speaking at once).

Lieutenant McKinley: I=m sorry. I misunderstood the question.

Mr. Baxter: You=re asking to go apply for the grant.

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: You=re not actually even going to purchase equipment at this time.

Lieutenant McKinley: That is correct. It=s just to apply for the grant.

Mr. Baxter: So you=re asking to apply for a grant.

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: Just a focus of what we=re asking for.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Even if we=re just applying for the grant, there=s going to be added costs towards the end of it. So we=re not just looking at what=s happening now. I=m looking at what=s happening further down the road too as a cost to the city.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Applying for the grant doesn=t implicate anything as far as what we=re actually going to do. If we think there=s any possibility that we might want to do this, then we should probably go ahead and apply for the grant because our time is obviously running out, if it hasn=t run out already. Right?

Mr. Joseph: I agree with that. Yes.

Mayor McPherson: That=s correct.

Mr. Joseph: Further discussion? (No response). Okay. I=m going to make the motion that we pass this on to Council for its third reading. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, please say aye. (Three voted AAye@). Opposed? (One voted ANay@). Motion carries.

And that=s the last item on the Safety Committee agenda for tonight, so I will close the committee at 8:47.

Safety Committee

November 5, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 5, 2007

Members of Service Committee present: Mel Clemens, Antoinette Newman, Brett Baxter, Donna Shirey.

Other members of Council present: Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I=d like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:48.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, it=ll stand approved.

Then next item on the agenda is approval of minutes of October 15, 2007 Service Committee meeting. Are there any changes to the minutes of that meeting? (No response). If not they=ll stand approved.

Item number 4, ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: ADDITION OF SECTION 1385.03 A Minimum Space And Use Requirements@ TO CHAPTER 1385 GENERAL PROVISIONS. It had its first reading 10-22-07. On this, I had asked everybody to kind of take a look at it as we go through. And I=ve been kind of looking it over myself and thinking about it. An area for sleeping purposes. I=ve been looking at this 70 square feet for one person, and additional person 100 square feet. And that=s 170 square feet. That=s 10 x 17 or 13 x 13. That=s a pretty good size bedroom. If you look at a 12 x 12 bedroom, and that=s pretty good side bedroom for two people, that=s only 144 square feet. Like I said before, I don=t want to put requirements on here that would in any way be any harm to a person that has a home in Reynoldsburg that the size would cause a problem. So I=d like you to think over it in the next week or so and possibly dropping that 100 feet of additional floor space maybe down to maybe if you dropped it down to 74 that would be a 12 x 12. That would be 144 square feet. Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I just wanted to point out that if you=re going to have one person in there,

it=s supposed to be 70 square feet.

Mr. Clemens: That=s right.

Mrs. Newman: But then if you have two people, it has to be 100 square feet which is only 30 square feet more.

Mr. Clemens: No. It has to be 170. It said, shall contain at least 100 feet for each additional person.

Mrs. Newman: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: I don=t have something that would make the old man sleep in the closet or something like that. I want everybody to be able to be there and be a family. So any how, I would like you to think about that section right there of maybe reducing it to make it more available for some of the sizes of some of the homes in Reynoldsburg. Are there any other questions? I do have a speaker slip, but are there any other questions from committee that pertain to any part of this at the present time? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, Chairman Clemens. My biggest concern here is around enforcement. We have laws on the books today that says that we have a single family home and we can=t get that enforced. So what makes us think that we go through all this effort, that we=re going to enforce this?

Mr. Clemens: Okay. That=s a fair question. And I=ve talked to Mr. Hood about this and, Jed, do you want to tell him the reason the difference between it=s not _____ situations and what it is?

Mr. Hood: Well, what this does, and as I said at the last meeting, that it does relieve the city of some of the burden that the ordinance that you=re referring to Mr. Baxter, has with it. Such as the family relation requirements and such. What this ordinance does, it basically sets a requirement, a square footage requirement and in relation to the number of people that are residing in the home. I think that is an easier burden for the city to make. As I said before, I don=t believe enforcement of this ordinance will be easy, but I do believe that it will be easier for the city to prove in court.

Mr. Clemens: And the enforcement, why it shouldn=t be a stronger enforcement, because we don=t want it to fall under the Police Department. Am I correct on that?

Mr. Hood: Yeah. We had some discussion last meeting about making this a higher offense. And the discussion that I had with Mr. Clemens, Chairman Clemens was, that if we raise this to a level offense higher than a minor misdemeanor, then the Police Department would be charged with enforcing this ordinance as opposed to Code Enforcement. And I don=t think, and it may

be discussed, but I don't think that's a wise use of our Police Department. So that's one of the reasons we chose not to bring a higher degree of misdemeanor to the table. However, as I will point out, that each day of violation is a separate violation. So if the problem's not remedied, we could potentially cite the property owner or the resident with a violation each day.

Mr. Baxter: If I could follow up to that Chairman?

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Jed. Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: My biggest concern is the actioning of how it's going to happen. Are we going to bang on that door and ask them to walk in, measure their rooms, and identify how many sleeping areas are there? And at what point does this turn into the slippery slope? I want to go prove that you have too many people sleeping in a room, so I'm going to knock on the door. But the truth of the matter is, I just want to see what you have in your house for drug or other reasons. It can be abused. It's a slippery slope concern that I have on this type of legislation. And when we start looking into peoples homes and determining, do they have the right number of people living there, and what their contents, and who those people are, I think we begin stepping over cross that line of individuals rights and homeowners rights. And I have a very big concern on this. I understand why we're doing it, and I totally see the concern that you have Mr. Clemens, and I applaud you for trying to find a solution to it. I just don't see this as being a solution. Stepping over that line on individuals and homeowners rights and knocking on the door and saying I'm going to come in, reminds me of a state that happened in the 1940's over in Germany. And I will not allow that to happen in my city, where we have a police that comes into our homes and say, I want to validate the number of people you have living in your bedroom in a back corner. Is it 180 square feet or not? That concerns me.

Mr. Hood: Mr. Baxter, I think that you raise some very, very valid concerns. I think that's why we took our time in putting this ordinance together. And we did have a meeting with the City of Columbus. They informed us that enforcement of this code will be difficult. However, if the City Council chooses to adopt this ordinance and they believe it's for the best interest of our city, then as always, and the Mayor's policy, and I would hope that we will continue this as a city, that we try to gain voluntary compliance with all of our city codes. Once again, these will not be Police Officers enforcing this ordinance. It will be Code Enforcement Officers. So I think that also weighs in the favor of the city as far as your slippery slope argument. But absolutely very, very valid concerns. The concerns that need to be discussed before the ordinance goes forward.

Mr. Baxter: Again, I'm not trying to derail this. I think this is the right way you're going Councilman Clemens. And I agree with the way we're heading. I just have some concerns on enforcement and methodology of how we go identify that there is a violation and who would be responsible for that. So I'm asking us to be very attentive to that section of the ordinance as we put it together.

Mr. Clemens: And that has been a problem. It=s been a problem with the ordinance that we have on the books now, trying to figure out whether you=re blood related or not. Are we going to poke you with a stick or what are we going to do? So we already have the ordinance like this. It=s on the books. And it is something that we have to be careful with. And that=s why I=ve not pushed it. I really hadn=t intended on sending it on this week any way because I want everybody to come up with their questions so we could come up with answers. It=s an important issue. You can=t have an end to something unless you have a beginning. So you have to have a beginning to end something. And I think we have something that we have to end. This is just the beginning. So if we can build on this as we go, or make changes as we go, that=s the important issue. And Jed and I have talked about this. We want it to be something that=s satisfactory to Council. Something that is satisfactory to the residents. And it=s being done for a certain reason. I think most of us know that. And that=s why we=re leaving it and it reduced from what Columbus had from a one year old and under to eighteen years old and under so that we didn=t interfere with, tried not to interfere with families. And I understand your position. I=ve thought about that too. That=s why I=m thinking about a reduction in that area of the space because I want to make it adaptable to families that we won=t have this problem. Like I said, everything has to have a beginning before we can finish it, and that=s all that we=re building on. And I=m glad you brought up your point because that=s something that Jed and I discussed and....

Mr. Baxter: I think _____ my point clearly. My point is, how do we enforce it to make sure that it is enforceable? Because today we have situations where we=re not willing to go knock on that door and validate if they=re relations or not.

Mr. Clemens: That=s correct.

Mr. Baxter: And if we=re not willing to do that, what makes us think we would be willing to go knock on the door and validate if that square footage has been upheld or not? So why go through all this effort if it=s not going to be enforced?

Mr. Clemens: As he said, we would hope for the cooperation of the citizens, which we=ve had in the past. There are other issues. If you read in the other sections that this falls under, it falls under for health and safety reasons. There is a safety reason. If you have a house that=s over crowded, if you don=t have the proper ingress and egress for fires. If you go in one bedroom through another bedroom to a bathroom, it=s a health problem. So there are ways that it can be looked at and different people look into it as safety as far as the Fire Department, or as the Health Department as far as the county. So there=s all different ways to approach. And those are things that we=re looking at. Those are ways we hope to enforce it. But we don=t certainly want to fall under the topics that you brought up. That=s not the way we want to do it.

Mr. Baxter: Well, thank you for giving me my say. I appreciate it.

Mr. Clemens: And that=s something that we=ll certainly look into. Are there any other questions

on this? Yes.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I can understand the purpose of why you're wanting to go through with this. But I feel that we are basically violating people's rights. I do agree with what Mr. Baxter did say. If I'm living in a 900 square home and my mother and step father happen to come down with some type of illness where we have to take them into my home, basically I'll be violating the ordinance because I have more than two adults in the house and a certain square footage. One of these days it's going to come down to people are going to tell me where I can eat or go to the bathroom. And I think we're violating a lot of people's rights here. So I think we need to take this with caution and look at the whole profile of everything that we're wanting to do for the city before we go forward.

Mr. Clemens: And I understand your questions on it. It does state on the square footage, if you do have two people come there with the living area and the room and so forth, being three to five occupants, living room 120, that's only 10 x 12 living room. But we don't want to get into issues such as you brought up because that's not the issues that I'm looking for. So we'll take that under consideration and I agree with both of you on that. Are there any other questions? (No response). I do have a speaker on this and I believe it's Diane Seaton. Would you please come up to the microphone and give us your name and address please?

Ms. Seaton: Yes. My name is Diane Seaton and I live at 767 Laile Court over off Taylor Road. I had raised a question at that last Council meeting on this ordinance. I was provided a copy of the ordinance, thank you, in a timely fashion, and did have an opportunity to read it. Interestingly enough, it's very specific about square footages. It's very specific about the safety reasons that are involved with the request for this ordinance. However, two interesting things were just said. I have one question at the top of my list here, and I think that'll pretty much suffice to answer all the questions that I have tonight, or the numerous examples that I suggested, ____ going to suggest might be problems. Mr. Baxter, you said in your comments that you agree with Mr. Clemens' concerns. And Mr. Clemens, you said this is being done for a reason. Well as a citizen of Reynoldsburg, and having read what I can in the newspapers, and trying to understand this, and having read the ordinance, what I can't understand, or what I can't seem to wrap my hands around is, what is the motivation for this legislation? Because the over reachingness of it, and I have some ____ examples here on my list like, what if parents wanted to put a bassinet in their room and it's not more than 10 x 10? I realize it's a little bit comical. I was trying to ____.

Mr. Clemens: That wouldn't count because it's under 18 years. I hope you don't have somebody over under 18 sleeping in a basinet.

Ms. Seaton: No. And I understand that. But what I can't seem to get my hands around is, what is the motivation for this legislation that such a deep reaching into each home in the City of Reynoldsburg would be required. And if you can answer that for me, I'll be a happy girl.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. The primary reason, like we said before, was the health and safety part of it. And basically, it=s to stop some of our, stop our single family home districts from turning into boarding houses and such as that. And this, we=ve been trying to find an ordinance to handle this. We have one that we=ve not been able to enforce. We=re trying to come up with another one. We do have situations where we have up to 8 or 10 people that are living there that are of one gender, like working for companies and are just put there for a reason. It=s like a boarding house. It=s in a single family neighborhood which is not fair to the neighborhoods and the neighbors. That is one of the basic reasons. That can happen anywhere in Reynoldsburg because Reynoldsburg is made up of 2/3 of single family homes. A lot of them are up for sale. A lot of companies can come in and buy them, put their people in that work for them. Eight or ten people living in a house really should have only three or four people in them. Maybe they=ve only got two bedrooms. Such things as that. Basically, we=re trying to draft up an ordinance that will help us. We have one now but you have to prove that they=re related. That=s an awful thing to try to do, which we can=t do. We=re not going to make them take DNA and things like that. And that=s basically what started it all, was try to protect the neighborhood from such things as a boarding house used as a motel.

Ms. Seaton: May I ask how wide spread of a problem this is?

Mr. Clemens: It=s only a small problem now. But small problems turn into big problems. That=s the problem.

Ms. Seaton: Roughly 100 houses? 200 houses?

Mr. Clemens: No. No. Just like I said, it=s a small problem. But it=s not a small problem if it=s next door to you.

Ms. Seaton: I understand. Again, I=m just trying to understand what this is all about.

Mr. Clemens: We have residents that are upset about this. They live in the neighborhood. They live around these homes, and they=re upset about it because they are single family homes. The families are scared in a situation like this. Whether they should be or they shouldn=t be, it=s immaterial. But that=s what=s caused the problem. Now, is it 100 homes within 1,000? No. But it could be. We have that many homes up for sale. Anybody could do this and this seems to be one of our problems. I=m not saying this ordinance will pass. This is an ordinance that we=re trying to work something up to correct the situation that we have a little bit of now that could turn into a big thing within a year or in the future. This may not be the ordinance. It=s a beginning. This is a start. And if this doesn=t work out, we=ll keep on working trying to figure out another ordinance that will take its place to handle these situations. If Council doesn=t feel that this is stepping on peoples rights, and it well could be, then this ordinance will be ditched and we=ll try to come up with one that=s comparable to taking care of the situation that we=re in. Because as I said when we started this in the beginning, and that=s why I was very lenient on some of it, I don=t want to do anything that would interrupt anybody=s family or their homes.

We're just trying to correct the situation that could happen in anybody's neighborhood that is happening in some people's neighborhoods now.

Ms. Seaton: Well, if I may, I'll close my remarks and take my seat. But I wanted to say that I think perhaps the reason I had such passion around this issue is because I believe it to be a point issue. And this is a big city where I have chosen to make my home for the rest of my life. I've only been here a few years and I understand that. But it seemed to me a bit like going after a match with a fire hose. And if it is a point issue and you have an opportunity amongst yourselves to figure out how to address that point issue, more specifically, without involving the entire City of Reynoldsburg and each of the individual homeowners and families involved, then I think you'd be doing a great thing. So thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight and I appreciate it.

Mr. Clemens: I do want to say one thing. This is a Columbus ordinance. Columbus has this ordinance in which I know they're having a hard time enforcing it. And the reason they did it basically was for a safety issue. And it had to do with the campus area, which we saw a couple of years ago where they had a big fire and a lot of children were killed. And they're having a hard time enforcing it too.

Ms. Seaton: That was going to be my next question. Who's going to pay for it and all that?

Mr. Clemens: It's part of a safety issue. I appreciate you coming, really. That's what we want. We have very few people come and address Council and tell us how they feel about things. And that's what we should have more of. I appreciate it.

Ms. Seaton: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Clemens: I know Mr. Baxter's going to tell me what he thinks about it because I see him all the time.

Mr. Baxter: And in this case here, I think the reason we're looking at this is because many of the central city issues do find themselves coming out our direction. And I see this as a bigger problem in Columbus and I don't want to see it become a big problem in Reynoldsburg. So that's why we're looking at the issue and trying to find ways to resolve it. Have we found that way yet? I don't know that. Columbus does have it on their books and I don't think they're doing a great job about making themselves enforce their own as well. That's what my issue was with enforcement. I'm in favor of making a change like this. I just want to make sure that it's enforceable so we don't fall into the same trap that Columbus has and not be able to enforce it. I want to make it work for us.

Mr. Clemens: I do too. Of course, I don't believe Columbus enforces anything so I don't really worry about that part of it.

Mr. Baxter: And that=s why they=re coming out our direction.

Mr. Clemens: Why don=t we put this on hold and everybody look at it and we=ll discuss it again. Because like I said, it=s not an ordinance I want to rush through. I want everybody to feel that this is a correct thing to do before we do it.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to put this on hold and we=ll discuss it again at our next Service Committee meeting. I want to thank all of you for your opinions, and Ms. Seaton and everybody.

As they used to say, good night for this evening. It=s over with for the Service Committee at 9:06.

Service Committee

November 5, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 5, 2007

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Doug Joseph, Preston Stearns.

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

Mr. Stake: I=ll call to order, the Finance Committee at 9:07

The second item on the agenda is the approval of agenda. And I have one addition. Street Program Engineering Funding. Make that 3a. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is approval of minutes of October 15, 2007 Finance Committee meeting. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they=ll stand as submitted.

And item 3a would be the 2008 Street Program partial funding I guess, for engineering. This comes from the Safety Committee. Mr. Joseph?

Mr. Joseph: Yes. The Safety Committee tonight reviewed this issue after speaking with the Safety/Service Director, and feel that we can do up to \$550,000 program next year for the streets that were identified during that committee. We passed it on to Finance and to Council.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And the original request was \$30,000 from the CIP Fund to account number 410.120.5651. Although we=re not sure what that amount=s going to be until prior to next

Monday=s meeting. Is everybody on the Finance Committee okay with that? Everybody on Council?

Mr. Baxter: It=ll be less than that amount, correct? Do we know that much?

Mr. Stake: It should be. Yes. Okay then, I=ll make a motion that we send this forward recommending that the, up to \$30,000 I guess, but it shouldn=t be that much, from the CIP Fund to account number 410.120.5651 be authorized. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is Discussion: Amend 953.01 - Water Rate Schedule Increase for 2008. (Tape Change).

Mr. Kipp: Increasing the 2008 Water Rates from \$4.17 per thousand gallons to \$4.28 per thousand gallons. That=s at 2008. It=s in the ordinance when we passed it last year. What happened, we went to the Water and Sewer Advisory Board Meetings and there was an article in The Dispatch last week that talked about those. They had originally projected a 14% increase in water rates. And they increased that to 18% this year. And we, I sat down with Mike Turner and we looked at our balances as to whether we would be able to absorb it without changing it, and we could not do that. I provided you with our pro forma=s that shows what our balance will drop to next year. So we=re here to increase the rates.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And as you said earlier Mark, we did try and participate an increase and that was done by previous ordinance. Although, it was not done as much as, there=s a higher increase than we thought it would be.

Mr. Kipp: Correct. We used their pro forma=s that they gave us last year to base our projections on.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And for those who don=t know, and probably everybody up here knows, we do get our water from Columbus. We are subject to a contract with Columbus. There=s really not a whole lot we can do about it short of building our own water plant and all that other stuff which does not seem feasible. At least every time I ask.

Mr. Kipp: It=s still not.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee? Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Mr. Kipp, a couple of quick questions. First question, this will take effect first of the year, correct?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. It'll show up on the bills in April.

Mr. Joseph: If Columbus wants to change it again, can they do that? At any point in 2008 if they wanted to change it again?

Mr. Kipp: They do go through a Water and Sewer Advisory Board before they take anything to their Council. And they start those in July. We met in July this year, and then they skipped August and September, and then we met in October for just a couple of meetings. There were three meetings in October. And at the third one, they just passed. There wasn't nearly the discussion that there has been in past years.

Mr. Joseph: I guess it just alarms me a little bit when you look at these projected increases over the next five years. Our increases are a lot larger than what Columbus has projected to increase. Are these realistic? Because we had to do an adjustment this year. Is it feasible there could be adjustments every year?

Mr. Kipp: There will be adjustments every year.

Mr. Joseph: Above and beyond what's shown here?

Mr. Kipp: On the pro forma?

Mr. Joseph: Yes. Where you're comparing the Reynoldsburg rate and the Columbus rate. For example, it shows twenty percent increase for '08. Twenty percent for '09. Ten percent for 2010. And ten percent for 2011. Those increases could be greater than that. Correct?

Mr. Kipp: They could be. Those are what our rate increases....

Mr. Joseph: Okay. But ours is based on?

Mr. Kipp: Ours is based on theirs.

Mr. Joseph: On what they charge us.

Mr. Kipp: What was for sure is this year they went to 18 instead of 14 and they're projecting 17 in 2009. And I'm not holding my breath that there'll only be a five percent increase in 2010.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: And I would like to point out, if you look at your last sheet attached to the legislative request, Reynoldsburg still is less than all the other communities I believe, other than Columbus who controls the water, all the other communities that get their water from Columbus. Correct, Mark?

Mr. Kipp: Well, we're right at there. I think there's one that's \$190, well, that's in 2007. In 2008, we're the same as Grove City's projected rates. And then everybody else, we're slightly less. You can see, they're all pretty much, pretty close actually except for Gahanna's. Gahanna's \$270 last year. They're not sure what they're going to do this year. So I don't have anything for their projected rates for next year.

Mr. Stake: Well, when you look at the comparisons, the 2007 versus 2008, every community is facing this challenge. That doesn't mean it's alright. It's just that there's really not much we can do about it I guess.

Mr. Kipp: I would explain, part of the reason on the water rate increase has to do with the water beyond 2000 which they did. They did the study in the 90's. And it was to make sure that Columbus and the suburbs have water beyond the year 2000. And part of that was, they bought some upland reservoirs, land for upland reservoirs up in Delaware County. They bought the land successfully. The problem was, it didn't hold water. They have to line all the reservoirs. So that's the reason for the 18 and 17% increases this year, next year.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any other questions from Finance Committee or members of Council for Mr. Kipp? (No response). And this can go the three reading route, right? With an emergency?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. With an emergency at the end so it's in effect January 1.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And that way the public will have plenty of time to comment if they wish and all that good stuff. Okay. Then I'll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is Transfer of funds - (prisoner care). And I believe Lieutenant McKinley is still here. And you're requesting \$30,000 transfer from Enforcement-Wages to Prisoner Care.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, Chairman Stake. That's just a transfer from one account to the other. \$30,000.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And it's good to see there's still money left over in the Enforcement-Wages to be able to transfer.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, there is.

Mr. Stake: Without an additional appropriation. Any questions from members of Finance Committee? Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman. Lieutenant, the 30,000 here, will that cover the prisoner

that=s at Grant Hospital? Because you said the cost is yet to be determined since we have to pay that.

Lieutenant McKinley: Four days ago when I checked, we still have not received a bill from the hospital on that. That could take several months before we get those figures in from the hospital. It=s hard to tell whether those costs would be covered or not.

Mr. Joseph: Why is it we=re liable for his medical care?

Lieutenant McKinley: Whenever we take a prisoner into custody, we=re responsible for their care, feeding, and medical care should they need any. Typically, if the charge is a misdemeanor or something like that, we=ll bond the person out or find another way to release them so that we don=t have to encumber that care. In this case, the person was guilty of an F1, aggravated robbery where they implied the use of a weapon during a robbery of a business on Brice Road. Since that=s the most serious felony, we felt in this case, this person should be held. Initially, the persons symptoms were high blood pressure so we weren=t expecting the person to need an open heart transplant or anything like that. As it turned out upon later checking, the person was supposed to be taking medication for that high blood pressure, but we found she was throwing it under the bed. The doctor started an IV treatment and she was able to be discharged and taken to jail.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Is there any way the city can recover costs such as this?

Lieutenant McKinley: If the person has assets, I guess that=s always a possibility. In this case, the person was a destitute crack addict.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments from members of Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman. Do we have costs from overtime? Costs from guarding this prisoner? And that number?

Lieutenant McKinley: I do believe there was some cost. We tried to use people that were already on duty, but there were a couple of instances where we had to have someone stay on overtime for a half hour, hour while we got the next shift person to their location. So it was minimal.

Mr. Baxter: So in essence, because of this prisoner, we lost that officer to our streets.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, we did.

Mr. Baxter: Was there any better way we could have handled this?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, we try to always utilize the officers that are on a shift which range from 4 to 9 during the course of that shift. Obviously, if we can have them out serving the community. But oftentimes, for instance, if they get a drunk driver, they could be tied up for 4 hours in the paperwork processing, taking the person to jail. We don't like to have them tied up in those types of duties but that comes with law enforcement.

Mr. Baxter: And do you think this person is going to be charged with the F1 or is this going to be pleaded down?

Lieutenant McKinley: That's up for the prosecutors to decide. I don't want to speculate what will happen.

Mr. Baxter: Yeah. That's what my question is. If that's something we may consider before we hold somebody for several days. We need to determine that.

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, there was certainly enough, well, to take the person into custody, we had to have probable cause and we certainly had that. She was identified very near the business. She had the money from the robbery. So it's a very solid case. We don't arrest someone unless we have probable cause. To try it in advance is difficult to do. If we've got the probable cause, we make the arrest.

Mr. Baxter: Fair enough. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Lieutenant McKinley, I was out on a ride-a-long at one time and we were transporting a prisoner down to the Franklin County Jail, and of course when they get down there I guess they do some tests on them and found out that prisoner had some, well, I guess they had some questions. Found out that person had a medical condition and the decision was made, because it was not that serious an offense, the decision was made to release that prisoner. So I know that you do that and I'm sure you had good reason to keep the one who was under care.

Lieutenant McKinley: The Supervisors make that call. And typically, if we can release them, we release them. We do not want to hold on to people with medical problems.

Mr. Stake: Sure. Any other questions or comments? Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Were we able to try to take this person to Franklin County? Were we denied access to them at that time?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, that's my understanding. When they had the screening at the Franklin County facility, that's when they found the high blood pressure. And typically, they'll take a detour to a local hospital to have it checked out. Some times, that can only be several hours and they end up getting the clearance from the doc and they end up getting them into the jail facility.

Mr. Baxter: I'm just trying to figure out a simple sign of blood pressure turned into \$30,000 to the city. It seems to me like we missed something here.

Lieutenant McKinley: Actually, let me clarify. Most of these monthly costs are actually the jail billing us for the daily keep of the prisoners. These aren't all medical costs. As a matter of fact, the vast majority are the daily costs of the prisoners in the facilities.

Mr. Baxter: So this just isn't on this one incident. That's what I'm trying to get.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes. This is just one additional item. A small part of actually the \$30,000.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Then I was misinformed. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Right. This is the overall, prisoner care is going up overall. It's not this one incident that we've been talking about, correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: It generally runs about \$13,000 a month for the cost from the different facilities that we take prisoners to. We take them to three different facilities. Every once in a while we'll get one with a medical issue that we do receive a bill on. In this case, it's hard to estimate what the bill's going to be for this person. But the vast majority of these costs are for the daily incarceration from the County Jail. Not medical costs.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions from members of Council? (No response). And you would like an emergency on this?

Lieutenant McKinley: We would.

Mr. Stake: Any problem with any Council members, emergency with that? (No response). Okay then, I'll make a motion that we transfer \$30,000 from account number 110.111.5113 AEnforcement-Wages@ to account number 110.111.5375 APrisoner Care@ to pay for prisoner care for the remainder of 2007 as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. And if I didn't say it, I meant to say, send this on to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency.

Item number 6 is Discussion: Supplemental appropriation for City of Columbus Water Contract. Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: I'm requesting an additional \$60,000 from the unencumbered Water Fund be appropriated to 710.735.5378 to Columbus Contract. This is just to pay our bill to the City of Columbus. We do our best to judge what was going to be. Each year it varies depending on if

it=s a dry year or a wet year. We know this year was a much drier year. It was slightly higher than we expected and I need, I=ve estimated I=ll need \$60,000 to cover our last bill.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And we have collected money, or are in the process of collecting monies.

Mr. Kipp: We will collect those monies. They follow.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee for Mr. Kipp? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And you would like an emergency on this?

Mr. Kipp: It will save it from being a Then And Now later on.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any problems with that members of Council? (No response). Then I=ll make a motion that we appropriate \$60,000 from the unencumbered Water Fund and appropriate it to account number 710.735.5378 AColumbus Water Contract@. Make a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 7 is Discussion: Supplemental appropriation for refuse. And this comes from Mr. DeBolt.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We=re coming close to our two year conclusion of the Rumpke contract. And again, it=s a 2 year contract that=s projected out how much we need. It was projected at 1.6 million approximately at the time that the contract was initiated. Now that we=re getting close to the contract conclusion, we=re finding that the fund does not have sufficient funds to carry out through the end of December since the contract ends in November. So we=d like to ask for \$80,000 to get us through the end of the year.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And this \$80,000 would come from the unencumbered Solid Waste Fund?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Stake: And it would go to 750.738.5315.

Mr. DeBolt: Trash Fund, I guess. Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And we do not need an emergency on this one.

Mr. DeBolt: Actually, we need it to be in place by the end of the year and we can go through the readings, but we would just need it approved upon signature. Not 30 days later if possible.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Okay thank you, Steve.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Then I'll make a motion that we appropriate \$80,000 to pay Rumpke for the remaining refuse accounts invoices for 2007, and available funds to be appropriated to account number 750.738.5315. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). Yes. It will be sent on for its first reading. Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 8 is Appointment to Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. And Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, the current appointments expire on January 14, 2008. Mr. Tom Kucera who served on the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals and served very well on that board, has indicated he'd like to stay on. Would there be any discussion from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we reappoint Tom Kucera to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 9 is Appointment to Planning Commission. Same thing. Mr. McGrath, his term expires on January 14, 2008 Planning Commission. He's indicated he'd like to stay on, and he also does a fine job and it would be great if he would stay on. Any comments or questions from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we appoint Mr. McGrath another term to the Planning Commission and send this on to Council for recommendation for adoption. Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 12 is Discussion: Amend Chapter 160 AEmployee Compensation@ - various sections. And this comes from the Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Stake. If you look at the first page of the legislative request, all of the changes throughout the document is put into colored text. There's really no significance to the color of the text, but it was to point out any of the changes. And I would just ask that if anyone has any questions regarding any of those changes. This was by the way, discussed by all of the full time elected officials. And we brought in the HR consultant that we use. And so these are all pretty much changes that everyone agreed should be in the policy. And of course, the Finance Chair was also asked to sit in on these meetings.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And just to clarify that Mayor, you did have the City Attorney, City Auditor, in on that.

Mayor McPherson: That=s correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And you are asking for emergency on this?

Mayor McPherson: I am. We=d like to get it done by no later than the last meeting of this month because as we go through here, it relates to insurance and things like that. And you=ll see as we go on in another one or two items, we=re also asking that we extend the insurance for 30 days. So we=d like it all to come together as one group. We just don=t want to pass one without the other.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). We actually could have two readings on this and pass it by the end of the month, correct?

Mayor McPherson: Yes. You can have two readings, pass it as an emergency, and then we=ll still be able to sign it in time.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I would like to at least have another committee hearing on this.

Mayor McPherson: That=s fine. Sure.

Mr. Stake: I know we got this just in our packets this week so maybe the members have not had a good chance to delve into it. Some of it just is, if I can briefly explain, some are just some changes that were recommended because of the way some of the things were working over the years. I think some was recommended by the Auditor. Some was recommended by the City Attorney and the Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Some clarifications on things that were a little bit muddy.

Mr. Stake: And also, and we=ll get into this in a little bit, but the insurance situation is changing and there=s some verbiage in there that has to relate to that. Any questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Then I=ll make a motion that we send this item forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

The next item is item number 11, Discussion: Amend Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual; Section 3.20, Subsection (b) AIndividual Merit Increases@. And this is something we=ve been dealing with for the last few years. We=ve called this Merit Increases, but basically this has been an increase for every employee that we=ve had. So I guess the language has been revised to reflect that.

Mayor McPherson: And my farewell gesture to Mel. We're taking merit out like you've asked for several years.

Mr. Clemens: I can see that part of it. But the evaluation part I don't know about.

Mayor McPherson: Well, the evaluation part's still in. We didn't touch that. And we still do the evaluations. It's not the merit. There is no merit system per se. But we still evaluate.

Mr. Stake: I still would like to see a merit system. Some kind of system that rewards productive employees better than the rest of the employees.

Mayor McPherson: A good project for next year.

Mr. Hills: If I could, because I was around when this was originally done.

Mayor McPherson: We worked hard on this, didn't we?

Mr. Hills: Well, the intent of this was a merit program. And to have a merit program, there had to be evaluations by the Chief Executive Officers, the Mayor and/or his appointees. And every time the evaluations, or everybody's the same, they all need the same amount of money. Because ideally, what we talked about here, was to say there will be a 2% increase for all employees, and then there's this pile of money that would be determined there's also \$100,000 available. And then that was to be done on the evaluations that were done and it's up to the Mayor and the Appointing Authorities as to whom within those areas were going to get that. Some would never get more than the 2%. Others percentage wise, may have gotten a 5 or 7%. And the goal behind this was, two people in the same position at the same rate of pay don't always do the same amount of work. And it was to recognize those who were successfully doing it. Now it's never been done. It hasn't been your favorite project. And you delegated it and didn't get much back in your delegation. Which I'll let you worry about. Those are your appointees, not mine. It just has not functioned. Now I certainly would not, my preference would be, just do this no more than for first reading because I think it does need to be looked at by whoever may be coming in. Is there something they want to try to do on it? So I wouldn't rush this one through on a real emergency. A lot of these are very much needed. I'm not sure if this one is or not. But the system that was passed has not worked. And there's probably a number of reasons for that. And everybody can point fingers everywhere else and I don't know that that serves anybody any benefit.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of Council? Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thanks, Chairman Stakes. The only thing I would make note of is on page 17 under AGroup Insurance@, removing Aor appointed officials@. I think we've had, even in our own mix, somebody who was appointed that would be impacted by that type of decision. So I

recommend we look at that and see if that=s what we wanted to do or not.

Mr. Stake: You=re referring to our previous ordinance we discussed?

Mr. Baxter: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well we=re on item 11.

Mr. Baxter: I=m looking at Chapter 160 Employee Compensations.

Mr. Stake: We sent that on for its first reading.

Mr. Baxter: I just want to make note of that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Just bring that up at the next committee meeting and we=ll discuss that. Any questions in regards to this item from members of Council, or comments? (No response). Then I=ll make a motion that we send this on for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 12 is Discussion: Authorization of city=s health insurance to be extended one month. Reason for that is, that we are going to a new plan effective January 1. And the present plan renews the first of December. So we=ve asked for an extension of one month of the present plan, and then to switch over to the new plan January 1. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And this also, you=re asking for an emergency. We could do the two reading deal with this?

Mayor McPherson: That=s correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So the intention would be to have two readings, have another committee hearing on this. Then I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 13 is Discussion: 2008 Budget. This was discussed on 9-4-07. It was tabled until October 15, 2007. It was held October 15, 2007. 2008 Interim Appropriation was received 10-31-07. And I know members have not had a chance to really go through this because it was just put in their packets this weekend. If I could just highlight a couple of things. And if I forget something Mayor, I=m sure you=ll remind me. Really, the only things that are in there are the necessary item. Wages, those kinds of things. That=s all been figured in here. There are some capital purchases but those have been ongoing yearly capital purchases. But if

you look in the capital purchases column, you see a lot of zero=s there. So it will be up to the next administration to decide what they=d like to plug in there. But really, this is non-discretionary spending I guess I=ll put it. The next administration will have the ability to tweak this, or have their input. Council will have the final say. But are there any questions or comments? Mayor, do you have anything to add?

Mayor McPherson: Well the only other thing is the Service is 5300. Contracts that we already know what the costs are going to be. Board of Health Contract, Columbus Water Contract, Rumpke. We changed those slightly. But other than that, if we don=t have a contract, we don=t know what the contract price is. It stayed the same as last year.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I=ll make a motion that we send this item on for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 14 is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ACITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL@ ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 14-03 PASSED MARCH 10, 2003 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED, CHAPTER 4 COMPENSATION AND HOURS OF WORK, SECTION 4.091 ACompensatory Time (Senior Police Management)@, addition of paragraph 5. to Subsection A. It had its first reading 10-22-07. And the last committee meeting, we did request some language to clarify and I believe Lieutenant McKinley wrote a memo with some requested language that has been attached. And I would imagine that members of the Finance Committee and members of Council have had an opportunity to review that. Are there any questions or comments in regards to that language from the Finance Committee or members of Council? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake. The only thing I ask as I did on the earlier one, when we put in a minimum time, in the second line where it says, ALieutenant is temporarily required to perform the duties of Chief for more than half a work day@, is that really necessary language? Once you read the whole paragraph, it says that, AFor that time frame it must have been appointed by the Chief due to illness, injury, absence due to training, conference, vacation. And the Chief must issue a directive and if he doesn=t the Safety/Service Director does@. So I=m not sure I see the benefit of having, the last was two hours and this is a half day. Is there a reason that we need that minimum time?

Lieutenant McKinley: I think the two hours mirror the contract that we have with the Fraternal Order of Police.

Mr. Hills: With the FOP Contract?

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Hills: Yeah. But I guess, we're a little bit out of that now. But bottom line, if he's gone for two days and you don't have an order, you don't become Acting Chief.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: And if he wants to give you an order that was for two hours, he could possibly do that.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: But you're limiting yourself when it says just for the half day, I don't know why you, I can see where the contractual relationship, you'll set standards. This is taking over from the Supervisor to a super Supervisor. And I'm not sure why the benefit of the limit of the hours there, when it still requires an action by the Chief or the Safety/Service Director before the event can happen any way.

Lieutenant McKinley: It could be seen as contradictory there. Yeah.

Mr. Hills: That's all I looked at.

Mayor McPherson: I think you're right. We should probably, it says "Duties of the Chief of Police shall be paid at 12%". I think you're absolutely right. There's really no reason for those other few words.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So we'll strike "for more than one half of a work day".

Mayor McPherson: Correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then with that correction, I'll send this item on for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 15 is ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: CHAPTER 160 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION, SECTION 160.04 "OTHER COMPENSATION" by adding Subsection 4. This had its first reading 10-22-07 also. And this is just a companion ordinance to what we previously discussed.

Mayor McPherson: We'd like to have the same verbiage in this one as in the last one.

Mr. Stake: So we would strike those words in that as well.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: We'll strike Afor more than one half of a work day@. Any questions or comments from members of Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I'll make a motion that we send this forward for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 16 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH THE DISTRICT ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE FRANKLIN COUNTY GENERAL HEALTH DISTRICT FOR HEALTH SERVICES. It had its second reading 10-22-07. Any questions or comments in regards to this item from members of Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we send this on to Council with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 17 is RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE AMOUNTS AND RATES AS DETERMINED BY THE BUDGET COMMISSION AND AUTHORIZING THE NECESSARY TAX LEVIES AND CERTIFYING THEM TO THE COUNTY AUDITOR. It had its second reading 10-22-07 and this is the Licking County portion. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I'll make the motion that we send this on for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And item number 18 is ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO EXTEND CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL AND PLAN REVIEW SERVICES. It had its second reading 10-22-07. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I'll adjourn the Finance Committee at 9:45.

Finance Committee
November 5, 2007
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)