

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 4, 2002

Members of Community Development Committee present: Sarah Cannella, Jim Wade, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher.

Other members of Council present: William L. Hills, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Mrs. Cannella: I'll call the Community Development Committee to order. Approval of the minutes of October 7, 2002. Any deletions, additions? If not they'll stand as read. Approval of the agenda. Do we have anything on the agenda? I have a change for the agenda. Item 5 will be the Resolution for CEDA. All in favor of the amendment of the agenda say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Agenda's approved.

We have a speaker's form here and I think we'll call her first. Cathy Morgan would you please come forward and give your name and address?

Ms. Morgan: Good evening. My name's Cathy Morgan. My address is 476 Doverwood Drive and I'm just here to speak on behalf of Reynoldsburg Youth Football. Reynoldsburg Youth Football has been serving the community of Reynoldsburg for over 40 years. The organization has enjoyed an excellent working relationship with the city over those years and appreciates the access to the community parks that the city has granted them. Recent negotiations have taken place between RYF and representatives of the city to help RYF obtain a more permanent playing field. My understanding is that a mutually acceptable agreement has not been reached at this time. I have not been present at any of the negotiations sessions between the city and the league so I cannot comment on the merits of the proposal. I am only aware that there appears to be some points that the RYF membership is concerned about. RYF is fiscally sound and is financially ready for opportunities that may come their way. However, they are determined that any partnership entered into must be beneficial and safe for both parties. RYF board members have a responsibility to the community to safeguard the assets and finances of their organization. No matter what happens with these negotiations, I hope that Reynoldsburg Youth Football and the City of Reynoldsburg will maintain their partnership and continue to promote our community as one of opportunity, fairness, and respect. Thank you.

Mrs. Cannella: And I thank you Ms. Morgan. We will go on with item 4. John Brandt with the recognition of Marabar Heights Garden Club. Mr. Walsh is going to do that. Okay. Sorry.

Mr. Walsh: We have a group here that we do want to have some recognition for. They've helped the city for a number of years in beautifying the city and I had asked Mayor McPherson since he's known these folks and their operation longer than I have if he would say a few words about what they do for us.

Mayor McPherson: The work that the Marabar Heights Garden Club has done is quite extensive. But some of the things that I think we'll see and have seen over the years, they were the ones that

donated the initial funds for the hanging baskets in Olde Town Reynoldsburg. We see those as we go by every day and they have continued funding that through 2002. If you go to the Livingston House, each summer and early fall, the big garden sale that they have there and all the plants, that's also done by the Marabar Heights Garden Club. They've just been very involved. At one point in the Livingston House they took care of the herb garden and of course now I don't believe we have an herb garden there. They've provided flower shows for the city, awards to businesses and they continue to just be a very, very helpful and community oriented group in the City of Reynoldsburg and it gives me great pleasure to be asked to just say a few words tonight. And I understand that there is a presentation that Linda Johnson would like to make on behalf of the Marabar Garden Club. I guess we have a whole crew coming up, so.

Ms. Johnson: Yes, we're pleased to continue to support the hanging basket beautification project in Reynoldsburg and we'd like to present a donation of \$754.95 to support this for next year, and we hope that those baskets give pleasure to the people here in Reynoldsburg and also to visitors passing through the city. And thank you for mentioning our plant sale because that is how we raise the funds and it will be the first Saturday in May at the Livingston House parking lot.

Mayor McPherson: A lot of this money belongs to me from that sale. My wife loves that sale.

(Inaudible)

Mrs. Cannella: Before you do I'd appreciate it if you'd introduce all of you please.

Mayor McPherson: Linda, would you introduce those that are with you?

Ms. Johnson: These are some other members of the club. Janet Walker, (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Well, on behalf of the City of Reynoldsburg I personally want to thank you. Thank you on behalf of Council and all the people that enjoy all the things that you've done and especially the hanging baskets. We certainly do appreciate all of your efforts in beautifying the City of Reynoldsburg. Thank you very, very much.

Mrs. Cannella: Thank you ladies. We really appreciate all the work that you do. Item 5 is the Resolution for CEDA, the Cooperative Economic Development Agreement. Mr. Gilbert sponsored that.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you Mrs. Cannella. In light of the information that was provided to us last week from the residents of our Civic Association at Cobblegate and Windsor Forrest, it was a pleasure to hear that all three of the Etna Township Trustee's had sponsored and voted to approve a resolution to enter into preliminary discussions with the City of Reynoldsburg to discuss a Cooperative Economic Development Agreement, otherwise known as CEDA. It was my thought this week that it would be prudent and wise of Council and the city to enter into a similar resolution which is why I called you last week even though I'm not on your committee and asked you to entertain the idea of adding this resolution. I think, a short resolution stating our support of the efforts of the Director of Development to enter into these discussions with Etna Township and

expressing our appreciation to Etna Township for their willingness to discuss this item with us as an opportunity for both communities to pursue a truly cooperative effort towards responsible growth that I think will generate a mutually beneficial opportunity in progress. I think the specific language of the resolution can be worked out this week. However, as I stated I think as long as we indicate our support of the efforts of the Director of Development into entering in discussions regarding the CEDA, we are covering our bases and would encourage the members of Community Development to support this as well as other members of Council and would make a motion that we move this forward to Council for consideration.

Mrs. Cannella: I'll second that motion and do we have any questions from Council? Do we have any questions from anyone else?

Mr. Beougher: Mrs. Cannella, I think we need a motion and a second from within the committee.

Mr. Gilbert: That's right. I better be on the committee first right Mrs. Cannella?

Mrs. Cannella: There was a motion and I seconded it.

Mr. Wade: He's not on the committee.

Mr. Gilbert: I'm not on the committee Mrs. Cannella. If someone else wants to make the motion.

Mrs. Cannella: Oh, I'm sorry. I'll make the motion. You are correct. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: I'll second it.

Mrs. Cannella: We have a motion and a second on the floor. Now, do we have a discussion?

Mr. Beougher: I have a question. In order to respond in kind, should we do this as an emergency, or, so we...

Mrs. Cannella: It will be, I believe one reading as a resolution. Is that correct? No?

Mr. Beougher: It's not a resolution of expression it's an actual legal resolution so I think we need to waive, either do it as an emergency or waive the three reading rule or something like that.

Mrs. Cannella: Will it be necessary do you believe as an emergency?

Mr. Gilbert: That would be fine.

Mrs. Cannella: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: It's going to allow that recommendation to come from the committee since I wasn't on the committee.

Mrs. Cannella: We will move this forward as an emergency then and do I have a second on that

Mr. Beougher?

Mr. Beougher: Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Cannella: Thank you. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed, nay. (No response). Thank you very much. We'll have this on the agenda for next Monday night as an emergency.

With that I will adjourn the committee meeting at 7:43.

Community Development Committee
- Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
November 4, 2002

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES November 4, 2002

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Jim Wade, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher.
Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, William L. Hills, Eric Gilbert, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:44. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of October 21, 2002 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? If not they'll stand approved. Next item is approval of agenda. I do have something on this I should have brought up a little bit earlier but sometimes I'm a little slow on things, but looking at item number 4, discussion, ADA handicap sidewalk compliance on the Service Committee. Sidewalks fall under the Safety Committee, sidewalks, streets, gutters and all that, why would this be on the Service Committee? Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Well, Mr. Clemens I asked Mr. Gilbert to put it on his committee because I thought it belonged in that committee. If you want it on your committee that's fine with me. I really don't care.

Mr. Clemens: It isn't whether I want to or not it's where it belongs.

Mr. Underwood: Well, I didn't know that.

Mr. Clemens: I think it's in the Council rules. It states on what committees things go on so if there's no objection we'll add as item number 3a, ADA handicap sidewalk compliance to Safety Committee. Are there any other changes to the agenda? If not do I have a motion for approval? Motion by Mr. Beougher. Second? Second by Mr. Wade. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Agenda approved.

The next item, 3a, discussion, ADA handicap sidewalk compliance, Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: Did you add it as 3a or 5?

Mayor McPherson: 3a.

Mr. Underwood: Tonight the Mayor, Mr. Parkinson and Mr. Koch from EMH&T are here. I wanted to bring this to your attention as a Council and Committee. Over the past few years, you're all familiar of reading the papers of trials and tribulations the City of Columbus and some other suburbs that have been sued by a group called Mobile and they have been in Federal District Court. They have entered into some agreements about what they're going to do and its costs their cities a lot of money. Not that it won't cost us some money but we thought we'd be proactive and try to pursue a plan ahead of time. It doesn't mean we might not be sued but if we have a plan in place we stand a much better stead than not having a plan in place and ignoring the situation. Since 1974 the city in making the handicap ramps, has used standard drawings that were developed from what believed to be good engineering practices. There were no federal standards in place for these ramps. In 1994 there was a Federal District Court case in Philadelphia which adopt and applied the standards for the ramps from other facilities, buildings, and that kind of thing to public right-of-ways and those were very stringent standards. But still there were no federal standards in place and today there are not, however, the court adopted these standards for facilities and so they also applied to the right-of-way ramps. There is a proposed standard that will eventually be approved and people seem to think it's pretty close to being approved at this point in time. And so in 1999 there was a case in Toledo at the Federal District Court and that case adopted and applied the Federal Court Case in Philadelphia to Ohio and that's been a basis for suits here. Now, with that in mind since mid 2000 and 2001 and this year, in the street programs with the handicap ramps we have been using what we believe to be the federal standard that applies and the Mayor has got numbers on those. The city commenced compliance at that time with the program going forward. However, we do have to, under the law, we're going to have to probably retrofit back to 1994, maybe 1992. And looking at that there's about 715 ramps to be retrofitted. There are no guidelines as to time that I'm aware of and what the Mayor is working on would be a dual standard for the city plan of a number of ramps and/or money each year so we cap it at the

amount of money. If we do 20 ramps in a year and it uses up the money, so be it. If we can get 30 ramps out of the amount of money, then that's even all the better and will take us back even further. The ramps estimates by the engineer's anywhere from 2,000 to 25 to \$3,000 a ramp. There are some locations that will have specific problems where that cost will increase by three to four thousand dollars a ramp. Also, there is a requirement that has come in about people with special sight needs to be able to make the ramps with some kind of a strip so they can tell that they're on the ramp. Whether it be raised concrete, something embedded or something abrasive, and that's not expected to be a major cost per ramp in the retrofits. Now, we have proposed that we're going to add it to the city wide mailing done by the Parks Department that has to be ready on the 15th. That's part of our plan, a request for anybody in the city that has a special need to identify it to the Mayor's office so it can be incorporated in our plan. If somebody lives over here, and somebody over here, and somebody over here, we thought it would make sense to take care of their specific problem first instead of starting one end of the city and maybe not any of the people that had specific problems. Then as we get them out of the way first then we can start on an organized, much more organized, probably cost efficient method to cover the city and retrofit the ramps that we've done over the years. And the Mayor will be bringing a recommendation to Council about the amount of money and funding and potential number of ramps per year that the city can afford and we can do. With that in mind, at that time when that's all debated and everybody's in order, we will be asking Council and presenting a proposed ordinance for adoption to make that the city plan. Now, if there is specifics and any questions, bring them up while we have Mr. Parkinson and Mr. Koch here because they've studied this quite extensively.

Mr. Clemens: You say there's no, we can judge how many we want to do per year as long as we show that we're doing it over good time?

Mr. Underwood: The people that have entered into consent judgements have done that by negotiation, and rather than have a law suit filed and have the attorney fees from the other side and everything else we thought it would be productive on our part to bring it forward and get our plan in place. If there is one we can litigate that, if we've got a plan where we can see what it is. If it's a minor tweaking or whatever our plan is, that's one thing, but there's been enough consent decrees entered into. We think we have a fairly good feel of an acceptable plan to go forward.

Mr. Clemens: If we do, there is a standard to go by now? Am I correct?

Mr. Underwood: There's not, there's a proposed standard that's been circulated for comments and our engineers seem to think that that's pretty close to what it's going to be.

Mr. Clemens: So if we would do, say our street program figuring it for next year if we start early, we could use the proposed, if it's not finalized as the...

Mr. Underwood: We're using it now.

Mr. Clemens: We're using it now.

Mr. Underwood: We have been since mid 2000.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Underwood: There's some things and bugs to work out but this year I think we did 138.

Mayor McPherson: 135 we did. 28 were new and all 135 were compliant by the standards that are acceptable today.

Mr. Underwood: And last year we did like 64.

Mayor McPherson: Last year we did 90. 90 of them were new. 86 of them were compliant. The other 4 are marginal in that there was a slight discrepancy in the percentage grade. Whether or not they are compliant or not, you know we'd really have to determine because by ordinance we can put a 1% variance one way or the other into the ordinances as we pass them.

Mr. Underwood: The standards when they're adopted, hopefully will have a tolerance and those may be within tolerance. Just not real sure right now.

Mayor McPherson: Right. Right now I believe I've been informed that they are less than 1/2 of 1% off on grade. So that's pretty insignificant. The 4 that don't comply. And the year before in 2000 when we started the program, we had 44 ramps put in that year. 22 were new. 23 of those ramps were compliant. 21 were not. The reason for that is part of the program started before the July deadline and they were put in prior to us knowing that what the new standards were. So since we've found out about it we have every year, made all of our ramps compliant with what's in existence right now. (Tape Change)

Mr. Underwood: This is Dave Koch with EMH&T.

Mr. Koch: The guidelines we are using currently are very similar to the original guidelines with a few minor changes. The minimum widths are more currently in our current standard drawing. The original width for an ADA accessible _____ was 36 inches. The new proposed guideline is 48 and that's what we're currently requiring in our specifications. That's one difference. The other difference is that a matter of interpretation before the words "to the greatest extent feasible" were attached to the guideline and that was misinterpreted in the past by all parties as meaning feasible or greatest extent from a scale of 1 to 10. It used to be closer to 1, now it's almost 10, whereas greatest extent feasible means you have to, money is no object and now you have to comply with every single requirement in the guidelines. Whereas in the past when the guidelines were first established, the advice from Council in different localities was, well they're called guidelines, not regulations. But the court decisions have interpreted the guidelines as being very rigid and so that is one of the biggest differences in our practices now than what we had in the past. So, 8% maximum running slope, 2% maximum cross slope, no abrupt changes, not even a minor lip. All of these things over time we've come to understand as, from the court decision as being no tolerance. Whereas before tolerances were allowed.

Mr. Beougher: So is this legislation part of the expanded and revised accessibility guidelines that

extends to Recreation and Parks facilities and so forth.

Mr. Koch: I'm not aware of the guidelines as regards to Recreation and Park facilities. I believe that they may have been recently adopted new regulations regarding those, but I don't know those very well. I have studied extensively the public right-of-way proposed regulations and that's mostly what we deal with.

Mr. Beougher: So what is the name of _____?

Mr. Koch: Public right-of-ways. Say it again please.

Mr. Beougher: I thought you gave us an acronym. Public right-of-ways?

Mr. Koch: Public right-of-ways regulations.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Sorry.

Mr. Koch: It's a section, the proposed Section 14 to the ADAAG. Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you. And they have stopped arguing about the _____ cones finally, or?

Mr. Koch: Well, no. That's still a very contentious issue and currently our advise is to install the detectable warning with the trunk heated domes. For the benefit of the Council, it was an original idea in the guidelines that was immediately withdrawn by a federal judge. And it was for a period or two years or three years each time, they withdrew it and allowed it to be studied. They didn't come up with any better idea for allowing the sight impaired some sort of warning before entering the roadway. And so he did not renew the withdraw of that regulation in July of last year and now our advice is to, until the new regulations are adopted to comply with that.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mr. Underwood or Mr. Koch? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just for clarification. We estimated that there are approximately 715 ramps that are...

Mayor McPherson: 117 to be exact.

Mr. Hills: That are, have not been incorporated and/or updated need to be updated somewhere within the city, corporate limits of the city.

Mr. Underwood: That's what our count is.

Mayor McPherson: That are not compliant since 1994.

Mr. Underwood: Now the programs and everything haven't discussed contractor, subdivisions, and that kind of thing. Only the right-of-ways when we do street programs and repaving. The ones that are being built now, would be compliant it's my understanding. What happened five or six or eight years ago, I don't know.

Mr. Hills: Currently all new construction they would, we are saying that they are compliant and it appears within the last 2 ½ years of our street program we have addressed about 200 of these of warranting compliance before so we were closer to 1,000 at one time?

Mr. Underwood: Maybe about 220 total.

Mayor McPherson: Almost 300.

Mr. Hills: Okay. So we as a city certainly have been aware through the advice we've received and addressing this issue. If the issue would ever stop moving we may be able to define what the issue is.

Mr. Underwood: That's right. And everything that was done before that, as I'm sure it was in other municipalities was done on what was believed to be good engineering practice. And then the federal government and their guidelines say, no this is what you want. And it's kind of hard to put it in. Years ago on what was considered good engineering practice to meet a standard that wasn't even in existence.

Mr. Hills: I take it the courts today then are not looking at the ramp situation, the sidewalks as they have and always have on the guardrail situations on highways.

Mr. Underwood: No.

Mr. Hills: Which would just require, you didn't retrofit, you just had to update upon...

Mr. Underwood: And I think one of things that brought it to head of course was the fact that everybody was dragging their feet and nobody wanted to do it and so they came down with the hammer.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Do we have any other questions? If not we'll move on.

The next item on the agenda, and before I say this, on item number 5, I do want to thank Councilman Ron Stake. If it hadn't been for his effort and input getting all the parties together and work out some issues that need to be addressed, these items would not be on the agenda this evening so Ron did put hard work in this. He did have all parties move and meet together. We were able to address the issues and work them out and to the Mayor's satisfaction, he's asking to put them on the agenda. So they're here again this evening and item number 4 is legislation accepting the U.S. Department of Justice COPS MORE 2002 Grant for mobile computers.

Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you Chairman Clemens. I too want to thank both you and Ron for taking the time to meet with me and going over some of the issues that I had. Again, if everyone will probably recall I asked a couple, three weeks ago to have this removed from the agenda. As everyone knows we've been working on some very tight financial issues in the city, especially with General Fund. But based on our conversations, based on some things that I've found since, I am going to recommend tonight that Council authorize us to accept the COPS MORE federal grant for the in-car computers. If you'll look at the documentation that I gave to you dated October 31, 2002, this is a memo that the Chief had sent to me regarding comparisons that we had talked about both with the information technology people, with the Chief and several other people that were involved in this. Our recommendation is going to be to go with the CDPD option and if you go to attachment 1, you will see that that is the CDPD total, \$229,149.50. If you go back then to, and I'll just skip through this because I'm sure you've all gone through it, if you go back to attachment 3, attachment 3 is what it will cost to do the CDPD, mobile computers, the top half of it. The bottom half is the RF option, and again we're not going to recommend the RF option. So our total annual cost when you break everything down for the CDPD will be \$23,924 a year. Now we won't really incur this cost in 2003 but it will be closer to 2004 before we actually incur that maintenance cost. It's going to take several months to get everything rolling. So what I've done is go through and try to find sources of funding outside the General Fund. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to give you a verbal summary here. I didn't type this up and I apologize for that, I should have. I will give you a copy of the summary that I've written down here. The estimated project cost for the grant itself is going to be \$248,050 and most of these numbers you have in your files but I just want to go over them. The 75% federal share is going to be \$186,038 leaving 25% for the local share which is \$62,012. Now of that, we're going to apply for a 10% Attorney General's match which is \$18,600. We cannot apply for that until we've been granted the grant itself, so that will be down the road. Leaving a final local share of \$43,412. I broke that down. We estimate the first years cost to be \$23,525 in 2003. That \$23,525 is to upgrade our UNIX program to SISCO, or our SISCO program up to a windows based software program. That upgrade's something we're going to have to do whether or not we go with these computers or not. So when you take that into consideration our first year expenses should not exceed \$23,525. Now, to get that money we have several funds and as you get your monthly report each month it shows your fund balances. We're going to take \$16,415 out of our Law Enforcement Fund, \$5,075 out of our Federal Forfeiture Fund, and \$2,035 out of our Drug Enforcement Fund. Thereby, paying the \$23,525 for the first year of the grant, no money coming out of our General Fund. Now based on that, that's why I've brought it back and that's why my recommendation is to go ahead and go with it. It just seems when you look at the long haul, we're getting roughly a quarter of a million dollars and our total investment is going to be, in the first year at least, \$23,525 coming from funds that we already have established to do things like this. So if we go on into the second year then, and again you have to hypothesize here a little bit because we don't know exactly what the numbers are going to be, but it would look like in the second year and the subsequent four years, it's going to run the \$28,724 that I showed you in the third exhibit. Again, we anticipate paying for this. Number one, out of our fund accounts because we know that money's there and each year those funds build up. Our Forfeiture Fund builds up, all of our various funds. Our Mobilization Fund, our safety belt program. Those all continue to grow. So

we anticipate that that money will be there. Secondly, and the thing that really brought this to light, was when Mr. Stake showed me an e-mail that he got from Cathy Crandall who handles some of the grants for the county, and she informed Ron that the Homeland Security Grants were going to start becoming available in '03. Those people that are in a position to apply for those grants, which means those people that have in-car computers and are ready to apply for the grants, will probably be given the first round of the grant money. So we will continue to try to subsidize not only through our funds, but we will try to get grant money through the Homeland Security Grant Funds. So again, I see this as putting no extra money, well I'll guarantee you, no money is going to come out of our General Fund to do this, and I think that was our ultimate goal was not to take any money out of our General Fund. When you go through and look at the report that the Chief gave to you earlier on, the grant is supposed to save the equivalent of seven sworn police officers. Now when I see something like that I think well, we need police officers but if this is going to be the equivalent of seven police officers, then that's also going to delay our need to come to City Council and say, we need more officers. So in my opinion it's a win/win situation, and again I appreciate all the work that the Chief did on it, our information technology people, Bart, and Bobby, Ron, Mel. I am not above changing my mind on an issue when I feel that it would be a benefit to the City of Reynoldsburg and that's what I've done on this. And I'm just here to try to answer any questions and again assure you that none of the funding for this program is going to come out of our General Fund.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Mayor. Do I have any questions for Mayor McPherson from committee? Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: Mr. McPherson, you know I haven't been totally supportive of this from the beginning because of my views about the unexpected cost in the future, and nobody seems to be able to nail that down and as with all computer systems they come and go, and it concerns me a little bit when you say that this is going to replace seven police officers.

Mayor McPherson: No not replace but it would just...

Mr. Wade: But it would be the equivalent of.

Mayor McPherson: The equivalent of is what the grant says.

Mr. Wade: I've got a real problem with that. I find that very, very hard to believe. And more importantly, the longevity of a program like this, and I'm not saying that's not a useful program, but I'm concerned with the longevity of it, and if in fact we get comfortable that this has done the work of seven police officers and then all of a sudden we're in a situation where this software or this system isn't up to current standards and we decide to remove ourselves from the data base or the information, are we then seven police officers in the hole because we've gotten comfortable with those? And if so, are you going to come to Council then and say, okay now we need seven officers to replace the computers because that's what's been happening? I'm sorry Bob, but this is not, I think information technology is a very insecure place to be facing funds. As far as the General Fund, I'm not comfortable with that statement either. I would like to not see any money come out of the General Fund, but money's money regardless of what fund it comes out of and I've said that since we've had our budget debates. As far as Mr. Schonhart's statement that we need to

ship it from one fund to make that fund look better, I don't see that as the big picture and I don't see those as a solution toward our problem. And for that reason I have an issue with this legislation.

Mayor McPherson: If I may?

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Well, one of the things, you know, the grant says seven officers. Will it be seven officers? I have no idea. Will it be three officers? You know, we just don't know. What they based their numbers on was the amount of time savings that would occur by using the in-car computers. Now, first year, you obviously aren't going to have that much of a savings because that's going to be a break-in year, a training year, things like that. That's why in the second year through the fourth year, we anticipated what our maintenance cost and our fees were going to be for each one of those years. Now that takes into account warranty programs on our computers because you can buy extended warranties instead of having to fund that out of your own personnel. And let's just say down the road, and again I have to hypothesize because I don't know. I mean I don't think anybody really knows. But let's just say three years from now we decide that this program is so labor intensive that we're going to have to hire another computer technician to work on it. Okay, at that point we'll be able to come to Council and show you in black and white, have we saved money, have we saved time on police officers, is there a savings? Right now we can't do that. We can only tell you what other departments tell us. We can only tell you what the Justice Department tells us, and they all are telling us you're going to save man hours. How many man hours? I don't know. You know, I gave you the number that the Justice Department said you're going to save, but I can't guarantee that. I do know that you're going to save some hours. You have to save hours just on reports because the officers are not going to have to come into the station, rewrite everything that they wrote out in the field because with these computers they type it in in the field and that's it. It's transmitted to the station and it's done. So that alone is going to save a huge amount of time.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to, and I can understand Jim's feelings because I've had those too. You know I've spoke to you about this. I'm not a computer person and I have to take peoples word on computers. But I would hope if we do go with this program, years to come, two or three years to come from that, three or four years, if it is labor intensive and we do see additional costs or costs for additional persons to operate the system, more computers, computers wore out, I would hope that you or, and the Chief will come to us and say that, this issue failed. We don't want to go into debt for another half a million dollars or something like that. I don't think it's the kind of system that I want to see every year go up, go up, go up, and four years from now be spending \$500,000 or have spent \$500,000 or with the anticipation of spending that because we started out free. So I would hope that if this is a failure, and it could be, I mean those things happen that you would come to Council and we'd ditch it. It's as simple as that.

Mayor McPherson: You can rest assured that is what would happen Mel.

Mr. Clemens: I put the faith in the people that operate that. They would, because we don't want to be just throwing money down the hole. To explain something to Jim, and it's hard for me to

explain, we did call the computer people in on this and went over it extensively with Bart, and Bobby, and the Chief, and the Mayor, and the two Lieutenants on the operation of this and what it would do for the city and some of the drawbacks, some of the expense and so forth, and at that time it was stated, and I think that if they could come up with a cost not to the city, out of the General Fund, that it would be beneficial to bring it back to Council and show how they could do the maintenance without additional cost out of the General Fund. But I understand Jim's feelings as far as what could happen, what could happen financially and as far as the personnel, I don't believe we're going to save seven men. I mean, I can't believe in all the minutes and all the hours saved and so forth, I mean that's, to me it's hypothetical because one person's faster on the computer than the other and such things as that. But in the situation we are as far as hiring personnel I think that we all know that we can't put on additional full time personnel at the present time or maybe next year this may make up for it, and two or three years to come maybe we'll want to put somebody on and eliminate this if it doesn't work out. That's my only feeling on it. I think Mr. Gilbert wants to say something.

Mr. Gilbert: I was just going to add my thanks to Ron for his work on this and just mention in regards to the Mayor's comment as far as manpower, I think there's a practical way the members can relate to the time savings. I was fortunate enough to do a ride along with third shift in Officer Mauger's cruiser and there was, when the process of this application was explained to me in comparison to the process and the procedures that the officers had to do on routine traffic stops or calls for service at a minimum how the officer's explained it, and just visually seeing the time that's consumed on let's say an OMVI or a DUI, you're saving time on the call, which in return if that time is saved that's more time that the officer gets to get back out on patrol. There was a safety aspect in terms of information that could be provided to the officer through the terminal that might expedite having to go through a dispatcher which does two things. Provides valuable information to the officer and also it frees up some of the time that our dispatcher's have to utilize to respond to inquiries from the officer, and as well as the aspect of duplicate paper work. I'm convinced at a minimum we are becoming more efficient, saving officer's time, having them out on patrol and doing the things they've been trained to do to protect us on a more efficient basis. At a minimum, with the computer, that's where our cost savings are. Manpower wise, one officer, seven officers, I think at a minimum if we can provide a more efficient, effective environment to better utilize the time of the officers that we currently have, this program provides it. And if the Chief and the department's willing to agree to the assertion that was made in the grant that you are going to save manpower. You are going to save time. You're going to have more of a presence on the streets because of this. I know them well enough that they're going to back it up and they feel they can make that happen. So I would be supporting this when it comes forward. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: First of all let me say I think I would be fiscally irresponsible to support this legislation with the unknowns that are still out there. To just say it saves manpower is ludicrous when you still have as many unknowns as we have. I too appreciate the work that Ron has put into this. However, the question still has not been answered what the software and hardware support is going to cost us. Bottom line.

Mayor McPherson: That's in attachment 3.

Mr. Wade: But it's not in the bottom line. It's guaranteed price?

Mayor McPherson: Oh yeah. It's in the bottom line. It's in the report that I gave you.

Mr. Wade: It's in all, I don't see it.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. Go to attachment 3.

Mr. Hills: If I could clear, we don't have an attachment 3. We have an attachment 4.

Mr. Beougher: I think the page that would have the attachment number at the top.

Mayor McPherson: Go to the one at the top that says "Annual User Fees, Licenses and Maintenance Costs". And then the CDPD option. That is our total annual cost. \$23,924. So those are knowns. We do have those.

Mr. Wade: But I still don't see software support.

Mayor McPherson: The software support, down, well, see where it says Unix Hardware service? Where we're reducing \$4,800. Okay. That's what we pay now to have the Unix system. Once we go to the windows base system, we no longer have to have outside support. We can handle that internally. That'll be done by our own in-house computer department.

Mr. Gilbert: And the actual transfer to the windows is being provided for by grant money as well.

Mayor McPherson: No. That's going to be provided for by the funds.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Special funds.

Mayor McPherson: We're going to use the funds to provide the upgrade for the windows.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Wade. Mr. Wade has the floor.

Mr. Wade: Well, I'm sorry I don't buy into that. I don't buy into they're not going to charge you anything for unlimited support, nor do I think our computer department has the technology wherewithall to support a system like this. No offense to Bart. And I think Bart does a great job. I can tell you we bought into an accounting software 6 years ago that cost me \$47,000 and I spent in excess of that this year on support. Just on information support when we have problems.

Mayor McPherson: We do have an annual maintenance support for SISCO. We will continue to stay with that support for SISCO. That's in here. That's \$5,868 a year. Okay, that's for our software support program. But the actual day to day operation, day to day things that have to be

done will be done in-house. But again we've included that in there Jim. The \$5868 is the software maintenance program for SISCO.

Mr. Wade: I would like to see contractually where all support for the system and software are covered in the initial price.

Mayor McPherson: Well the SISCO is not for the hardware. It's for the software. And if you look down at the very bottom, the SISCO annual cost right now at \$3210 for their annual maintenance, and when we go to windows based it will go to \$5868. So that is the software maintenance agreement. And on the laptops, or the notebooks and things that we get, those are going to have three year warranties on them.

Mr. Wade: Do you have contractual information that says that all support...

Mr. Stake: Mr. Wade I have exactly what you have.

Mr. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Stake: And I would think that the Mayor and the Chief and the computer people have done their homework and know what they're talking about.

Mr. Wade: I would like to see that.

Mayor McPherson: The SISCO contract?

Mr. Wade: The contract that says that all software and support is included in that price.

Mayor McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Chairman Clemens. And thank you Mr. Clemens for having an open mind and Mayor McPherson for having an open mind and taking the time to sit down with myself and the Chief to discuss this further. I do appreciate that. I think that the e-mail that I received, I thought all the Council members maybe received this. I might be wrong. It didn't deal with the cost of this system, r. Wade. And I certainly respect what you're saying. We all have differences of opinion here. But you've got to look at this a couple of ways. Number one, we need to protect the safety and security of our citizens and I think this is a way to help improve that. I think that this system will help us integrate with local, regional, and federal law enforcement agencies to help provide our police officers with up to date information. We're facing a time today of national security issues. We have some places here around Reynoldsburg that I guess could possibly be threats to us and I think we need to be able to deal with those as efficiently and promptly as possible. So I see this as something going forward. In one of the statements you made about having problems with computers, I remember the first computer I bought cost me about \$2500 for something nowhere near what you can buy today for about \$600. So computers

don't go back. The development of computers, I haven't seen as going backwards. I've seen advancements in computer technology, not retreat. So I think that probably what will happen in the future, the prices of these things will come down where we have an opportunity now to have the grant pay for most of this. I think we need to take advantage of that and put ourselves in a position to be able to apply for grants that I believe are available or will be available in the future to help with the maintenance of this technology. So I think it's a step in the right direction and I appreciate everybody who worked on this and helped bring this back to the table and hope we can bring it forward. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Mr. Stake. Are there any other discussions from members of the committee?

Mr. Wade: Mel. No offense Ron. Congress spent some 12 billion dollars on bin Laden in technology and manpower. You know where he's at? Neither do they.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, thank you Chairman Clemens. I will be supporting this and I've had several conversations with the Chief over the past couple of weeks, and my concern was not only not having the computers but also what this would do to our future ability to receive grants and the Homeland Security Grants are key to that and if, in the paper it said that you'd like to see this in three or four years. Well if we turn this down now, they're going to see that in three or four years when we apply again and it may not be a possibility in three or four years. So I will be supporting this and I appreciate all your work on it.

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Cannella.

Mrs. Cannella: I definitely will be supporting this and I want to see this go forward because I feel if we don't keep up with technology that we will really be behind the eight ball in everything we do with the city.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to say one thing and this is to all members of the committee. I think we all understand safety. I want that known even though maybe this was not addressed at our first meeting. Everybody understands safety and where it comes from and we all feel that way, but there is a fiscal responsibility and I think Jim is right on that too that we have to hold accountable not only technology and safety but you do have fiscal responsibility to the citizens of Reynoldsburg and you know, we do handle their money. And when it comes to a situation like this I think we have the right and I think we should pursue it as far as we can to find out where the cost is coming from, what it's going to cost us in the next year, the next two years, the next five years and whether we were dipping into something that's going to cost us half a million dollars in three years. I support this, but I also agree with Jim on this point that computers are here today and they could be gone tomorrow, and new ones could come and you could come back two years from now and say, we need another \$250,000 to upgrade the computers. Things like this that I wouldn't go for. So I think I could go for the plan that you've brought forward, the cost that you and the Chief has worked out and the way it would be maintained for the next two or three years,

but I know if I'm here later in these other few years and you do come back for more additional funds or personnel, there better be a big reason. Because I'm taking your word for it and I'm taking the departments and the computer word for it, and I expect it to be done that way, and that's the only thing I want to say. I think we do have that fiscal responsibility and I think we do have the answers. We should ask for the answers. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, if I could just follow up. Again, sometimes I'm a little slow picking up things. I think earlier you may have mentioned that the grant was saying, like insinuating that maybe the federal's were saying we'd save this much but this number of savings of 7.8, this was computed by our own staff. This wasn't computed by the federal government.

Mayor McPherson: Right. That's correct.

Mr. Hills: And it was on a grant portion that says this is what we think that we could save and those things have ranges that could go from one to a hundred and twenty, and I have a feeling that anyone putting together a grant and not being critical the way they're done but certainly you always make the grant look to the best possible. Do I think that 15 computers are going to offset 7.8 officers? No, I absolutely do not. Do I think you can make numbers say that? I think you've done that here. But can it certainly save time from your explanation, I don't have to write it, now I have to type it. I hit a button. I don't have to come back in. It keeps the officers on the street. I think there are certainly some points to that. And I will second, third, and fourth the comments about hiring more officers because they do come from the General Fund. I don't care where else you think they're coming but eventually you'll pay for them out of the General Fund. I read the paper every week. It seems like we're going to hire more officers and designate them to spots and everything else. I'm not sure who speaks for who on what we're hiring or not, but it normally comes through Administration and I'm not hearing a request for more officers. If anything, the restrictions we're under in an absolutely tight budget situation and as the Saturday morning conference and everything else with the Chief, we're going to have to work with what we have in the best way possible. The dollars are not there. These are tax payers dollars. Now, in this case I absolutely see where Jim is coming from and these grants, grants are dollars and grants, can you use them as General Fund dollars? Not only. They have to be designated. That's the only thing that makes it something you can't shift it around. Is this an area that can be used? You are all telling me that it is. I have no reason to disbelieve that. I certainly do believe. Is this a proper expenditure? Is it the best expenditure? It certainly is acceptable in that we're not going to go fund a million dollars for new officers right now. It's not there to do it. The tax payers dollars aren't there. Is this overstated? Sure. You write your grants to where they look the best. I think 7.8, 15 computers will not offset 7.8 officers. First of all an officer working 8 hours a day is not 100% productive. Just like none of us sitting here are 100% productive on the hours that we're compensated for on any given day. They're not eating donuts but they're not productive in police work 100% of the time. So, it's not before Finance. It looks like it's going to get there but we're talking about something that's been near and dear to my heart which is we don't have any General Fund dollars to spend and I don't know that I have to count very high to figure out where this is going. So I certainly will see where we go and how it gets there. But I do think that our 7.8 officers, there may be a savings and would be a savings in officer time. Is it overstated? Yes, Jim I think you're right. It is, and I think we just need to understand that. But

there does appear to be a savings by using computers versus an officers physical time of handwriting and doing things and running back and forth to the station all the time. So yes I do think there's advantages there.

Mr. Clemens: If there's nothing new to bring before the committee...

Mayor McPherson: Could I just say one more thing?

Mr. Clemens: Sorry. Yes. Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: No. I'm done.

Mayor McPherson: Well, you know rest assured, there was no intent to mislead Council. Those figures in the grant did in fact come from us, and I think I stated earlier, is 7 officers high? Probably. I think I even threw the number out maybe 3. Maybe not even that. We won't know until we have a year or two under our belts to determine how accurate those numbers are. And in answer to your question of who speaks for who we're going to hire. I do. No matter what any employee says to a newspaper, if you don't get a request from me, it isn't valid. And I'll make that crystal clear because the individual that indicated that we needed personnel in our police department probably doesn't have any concept of what we do in the management level. So, that will come from me if there's a request for personnel.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Mayor. I would like to move this on to Council as an emergency I believe. Do you need it as an emergency?

Mayor McPherson: We'd like to have it so we can go ahead and apply. That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: Do I have a motion from anybody on committee to move this to Council for its third reading for adoption as an emergency? Mr. Stake. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher seconded. Also I'd like to send this to Finance Committee. Thank you everybody for your input.

Mr. Beougher: Point of order Mr. Clemens, we need to vote.

Mr. Clemens: That would be good. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It does pass and it will go to Council and it will go to Finance Committee.

The next item on the agenda, this is the item that acceptance of the federal grant if awarded, which has been awarded, to the School Resource Officer. Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you Chairman Clemens. If you'll refer to the memo that I forwarded to you dated October 28, 2002 regarding cost for the School Resource Officer. Again, when I looked at the overall cost of the program for the year 2003, the city's share would be \$1,064. In 2004 the city's share will be \$4,598. And in the year 2005 the city's share would be \$12,358. To just kind of refresh the memories on people here, the School Resource Officer is a uniform officer

that right now we have one other one in the high school. It would be our intent to put this individual in the junior high school. We have an agreement with the school system. Dr. Ross and I have talked about this. They have agreed to continue to fund 69% of the cost of this employee. The only exception to the numbers I gave you is if we would have to send the individual to school for training and that would increase our first year cost to \$5,180. As has been my goal since we started the budget process, if we can find money outside of the General Fund to fund areas like this we would attempt to do so. And again this is one of those areas where we will attempt to go to the fund balances in our budgeting to pay for these expenses. And again, when you're looking at getting a full time School Resource Officer in our schools with all of the problems that we have in America today for a cost of the first year of \$1,064 and the third and continuing years based on increases but roughly \$12,000 a year, I think that's a good investment. And I look at things as an investment and again trying to not take money out of our General Fund to do it. And that was my goal in this one, to get the individual into our junior high school and continue the funding of the 69% with the school system and then try to find alternative means of financing the other 31%. And I believe that's what we've accomplished and we would like to request that this be moved forward with a recommendation to allow us to adopt, or to accept the grant.

Mr. Clemens: Do I have any questions from members of the committee? I think it should be brought, and I think you could update us on this Bob, just so everybody knows, and I think, so it gets out, how much input, how much expense we do put into the safety program as far as the school's concerned. We do have, what do we have, we have four?

Mayor McPherson: We have four safety specialists in the schools.

Mr. Clemens: That's \$80,000.

Mayor McPherson: It's roughly \$100,000 this year with the pay increases. So we spend \$100,000 on our safety specialists and then we have one full time School Resource Officer in the high school and I'm not positive what the salary is, but you know, it's...

Mr. Clemens: Probably around 14 or 15, our share.

Mayor McPherson: Probably our share is right around \$15,000.

Mr. Clemens: So we will be putting in, probably, this will make six.

Mayor McPherson: This will make six people.

Mr. Clemens: This is putting effort of over \$115,000 of our money and the police department's time to serve the people in our schools and I think that's something a lot of people don't know and should know what City Council does do. Because I don't think that they realize that we do take part in something like this and I think it's beneficial and I think it's something the citizens should know, how much money and how much effort we do put in the safety of our children.

Mayor McPherson: Well there's even more than that Mel. There's something a lot of people forget. We also work on, we provide crossing guard money for those crossing guards also. So that's another \$12,000 or so a year.

Mr. Clemens: Plus our DARE program.

Mayor McPherson: We work very, very well, hand in hand with the school system here in Reynoldsburg and safety and protection of the students has always been uppermost in all Councils mind and mine.

Mr. Clemens: Is there any other discussion? Yes, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, I appreciate you bringing that up. I agree with you. The public should know the effort that the city's making in the schools and I know that Dr. Wright, the principle at the junior high, this is something that he feels he needs. He asked me to support it. I do support it. I'm glad you brought it to the table here tonight and I think it's a wise investment in the future of our kids.

Mayor McPherson: I agree.

Mr. Clemens: Any other members of the committee? Yes, Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Do we need to send this as an emergency also, Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Anybody from members of Council? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: I would like to note, I believe this, certainly the grant is a depreciating grant. It starts at 50 to 45 to 30 and we make up the difference in the percentages but what we do need to recognize and at least acknowledge publicly, is we do increase our officers by one. Our 165 officers do go up. It's not like the computers where you buy an item of equipment and rather than having x number uniformed officers we now have x plus what. And what we end up doing I believe is filling it with the currently serving officer and then sending an officer, a new hire back to the academy and then train them. Is that not correct?

Mayor McPherson: Well I think it's on a bid basis. They bid for it so it would definitely be one of our current officers and then we would replace that officer with the new street officer.

Mr. Hills: So we are sending, we're getting the federal grant and we're sending...

Mayor McPherson: We're getting x plus 31% of an officer.

Mr. Hills: Getting the federal grant we're sending an experienced officer into the school system and hiring an inexperienced officer to train to bring back on the street. So we are losing a street officer to put him in the school. I'm not saying that's bad but I'm just saying we're dealing with facts.

Mayor McPherson: It would just depend on whether we hired someone that had the experience or not.

Mr. Hills: Right. Just wanted to make the point so we all understood what we were doing.

Mr. Gilbert: Without, all respect to Mr. Hills, I don't think there's any determination at this point on the new hire as to what level of experience they might have. Whether it be inexperienced or an officer from another community. So I think we have to be careful in defining actually what the new hire will be.

Mr. Hills: I think we just learned tonight what we did. I didn't know that. We learned a lot of things.

Mr. Gilbert: I think we learned we would have a new employee rather than defining what type of a new hire.

Mr. Hills: We will have a new employee. Absolutely.

Mr. Clemens: If there's no other discussion could I have a motion to send this to Council for the third reading as an emergency. (Tape change) Motion and you want to second it?

Mr. Stake: I'll second it Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: All in favor we'll take a vote. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Also we'll send this to Finance Committee. Thank you Mayor.

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

Safety Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

October 4, 2002

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 4, 2002

Members of Service Committee present: Eric Gilbert, Lane Beougher, William L. Hills, Ron Stake.

Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, Jim Wade, Mel Clemens, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:46 p.m. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the October 21, 2002 Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to that? None being heard, they will stand as read. Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. Item number 4, ADA handicap sidewalk compliance, let me offer my apologies to Mr. Clemens for mistakingly placed there, allowing Mr. Underwood to put it on the Service Committee agenda. It was a misunderstanding. Certainly I'm not trying to step on your toes. But I would note that the Storm Water legislative request was supposed to go to Safety until I scratched your committee name off. So we do have mix ups. I appreciate your patience,

Mr. Clemens. I do apologize. Are there any additions or deletions to the agenda from members of Service. I would make a motion that we delete item number 4. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Stake. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is the discussion, detention basin improvements, Taylor Ridge East Sections 1 and 3, Leighton Village Section 4 and Godfrey Circle. At the Mayor's request I did add this. We had rejected the previous bids. This had come before Council earlier in the year and I'll let the Mayor take it away from here.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you Chairman Gilbert. The third time's a charm. We bid this out again. Friday I provided you with the bid sheets, recommendation for entering into contract with Shaw & Holter Inc. of Lancaster, Ohio for the detention basin improvements. Total amount for the project, \$79,955, engineering \$13,000, contingency \$8,000 for a total of \$100,955. We're requesting this be appropriated from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund to the CIP Fund and appropriate it into account 410.081.5623. We have given the contract to the City Attorney for his review which we just got. He has reviewed the contract and approved it as to form. So, and I think, I sent a contract down for you all earlier today.

Mr. Gilbert: We did receive it at our desks this evening Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: So we would like to move this forward as an emergency so we can get these detention basins finally done before winter hits us.

Mr. Gilbert: Mayor, I just have a question for Dave if that, Mr. Parkinson if you can just come forward. Thank you Mayor. Dave, on the, when this had come before Council previously for the rejection of the bids, the City Attorney had mentioned that if the funding exists which the Mayor established that it did, he requested the engineers estimate to be checked for accuracy. Just as I review dating back to your detention basin improvement for Taylor Ridge East starting July 12, 2002, and I'll just use this as an example because it might apply to the other items where I see a difference on the estimates that you had provided us for July 12, August 23, and then on the October 25 bid document that we would be basing our acceptance off of this evening. On clearing and grubbing, the original estimate you had at \$3,480. That was the July 12 estimate. On the August 23 estimate, the unit cost for clearing and grubbing, or the item cost is \$8,000 and then on the October 25 bid document it is \$10,000. So we've seen an increase of \$6,800 for an item such as clearing and grubbing. Can you help me with, just so I understand this, the difference in the cost.

Mr. Parkinson: Well the original estimate was based on, I'll use the phrase "typical cost". We put our estimates together and as you know we didn't get a bid that was acceptable. We went back and we talked to people that had purchased the books, people who had made bids, people who did not make bids, and we tried to understand why they bid what they did and why they didn't even bid. And we got a better understanding of some of the issues associated with these basins that scared them. Scared them away. And one of the problems that became clear in talking to a couple of the contractors was the Leighton Village basin behind the church has become

significantly overgrown with small trees, not even brush. And that caused them some concern on getting in and getting that material out of there to where they could do their work. And so every time we looked at it and every time we talked to somebody they were a little more frightened by it. We started hearing word that bypassing the basins would be an issue and that they would have to put some effort into that and they would expect some compensation for making sure that if it rained while they had the forms up or half the concrete down that the water didn't wash out all the work they had just done. So they needed some effort for that. So we got a little better at understanding the real difficulties associated with what looks to be a very simple project. And as a result every time we revisited it we found additional effort that the contract is going to have to do to make this project be a success.

Mr. Gilbert: Would that apply to items such as the other significant areas excavation for disposal? We had an increase at your unit price was \$7, total being \$2100 then it went up, unit price was \$30 to \$9,000. That stayed the same as we conversed. How does that, does that tie in with the same explanation? I guess if you're clearing and grubbing big roots and knotted trees more so than just brush, you're looking at more excavation, things of that nature I'm assuming.

Mr. Parkinson: And the original prices of excavation were more typical where you might have some place to waste it on the job site as opposed to these are developed areas and we failed to account in our initial estimates that you have to put it in a truck and haul it somewhere. And so the subsequent estimates continue to be refined to get a, as I say, a better understanding of what the project really entails.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Does that raise any question from other members of Service in regards to this?

Mr. Beougher: I will vouch for the trees. They are thick behind the church.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Mr. Parkinson, thank you. I just noticed the difference in the numbers and we've had fiscally responsible defined this evening along with fiscally irresponsible and it's pretty relative term so I just want to, in clear we're physically responsible across the board, Mr. Clemens. With nothing else to be said from the members, other members of Council, does this raise any questions or concerns? None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency as the Mayor had requested. I would note that this does first need to go to Finance. Mr. Hills another item for you this evening. In the amount of \$100,955 from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund to the CIP Fund. The number is 410.081.5623. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6 is the Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, amending Section 949.04 "Additional Tapping Fees". This item has had two readings before Council. Are there any questions or concerns or comments at this point from members of Service? Other members of Council? None being heard, I would recommend that we forward this to Council with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No

response). Motion passes.

Item number 7, Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, amending Section 941.26 "Determination of Sewer System-Capacity Charge". This also has had two readings before Council. Are there any questions or concerns from members of Service? Other members of Council? None being heard I will recommend that we forward this to Council with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 8 is an Ordinance to authorize the Mayor of the City of Reynoldsburg to enter into a contract with WPS Energy Services, Inc. for the provision of competitive retail electric aggregation services. There was some discussion at some point with this resolution as it came forward for its third reading that it may need to be held for some time, if I recall reviewing the minutes in that discussion. Was there any input from the Administration on this, if this needs to be held until negotiations are completed or is it okay to move it forward for the third reading?

Mayor McPherson: It's okay to move it forward.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mr. Underwood, anything you might want to add to that? You'll have to sign off on it as to form.

Mr. Underwood: I haven't heard anything about it but the Mayor has. The negotiations are completed. If they're not completed we probably ought to hold it.

Mayor McPherson: They're completed.

Mr. Underwood: Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: Is there a chance we could get, I think we were provided with a general outline of a contract that had the spaces in it for the name of the company but we hadn't received anything over the weekend. If you could bear with me, I'm going to pull my copy here.

Mr. Beougher: I think what they were looking for was the proposal with the percentage of savings and that was what was being negotiated. Is that correct? And do we know what that percentage is?

Mayor McPherson: Three to five percent is the estimate.

Mr. Beougher: Three to five percent.

Mayor McPherson: Three to five percent is the estimate of savings.

Mr. Gilbert: Well, the Mayor has said the negotiations are completed. We have a contract before us. It's going to have to be signed off by the City Attorney before we can approve this. Mr. Hills go right ahead.

Mr. Hills: My only question, I know that he had not, it is my understanding that the City Attorney had not reviewed it or it was not completed last time and certainly, you have not signed it off as to form as of right now because you're not aware of the terms. Is that correct?

Mr. Underwood: That's correct. I received nothing since the last time it was in committee.

Mr. Hills: I don't have a problem sending it forward for a third reading Mr. Gilbert, but I'm not sure that it's, I mean, Bob, the Mayor's saying it's fixed but they've got that one little prong that isn't there yet.

Mayor McPherson: I apologize it was my understanding that it had gone to Bill. Since it hasn't, we'll make sure that it does get to him this week and if there's a problem we'll let you know. But, Bill we'll get it to you this week.

Mr. Gilbert: So you want us to move this forward Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. If you want to go ahead and move it forward, if there's a problem we can always hold it but I think everything's alright.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other comments from members of Service? Other members of Council? I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for it's third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I'll adjourn Service at 9:00 p.m.

Service Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
November 4, 2002

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 4, 2002

Members of Finance Committee present: William L. Hills, Sarah Cannella, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens.

Other members of Council present: Jim Wade, Lane Beougher, Ron Stake, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Hills: I'll call Finance to order at 9:00 p.m. Asking for approval of the October 21, 2002 Finance Committee minutes. Any additions or deletions or changes to the minutes? Seeing and hearing none they'll stand as submitted. Approval of tonight's agenda. I do want to add item 3a as the in-car computers, 3b the school resource officer and 3c the detention basins. Are there any other additions or deletions to the agenda? If not I would move that we add 3a, b, and c. Is there a second on that? Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It is amended.

Moving to item number 3a, computers. I'm not about to sit here and try to go through all the fundings that the Mayor referred to earlier but it's my understand that, the purchase of 15 in-car, or the acceptance of this grant...

Mayor McPherson: Acceptance of the grant.

Mr. Hills: Will allow the city through the use of it's existing funds to fully pay the city portion of the fund. And you're asking us for, I take it an ordinance authorizing the Mayor to accept the grant.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. That's it.

Mr. Hills: Any other comments? Any additional comments?

Mrs. Frazier: Let me ask a question.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Frazier, would you like to have a question? You've got your calculator there.

Mrs. Frazier: You don't need any money?

Mayor McPherson: No. We don't need any money at this point. If there's any monies needed, we'll have to come back to Council next year because this, it may take months to get the thing rolling.

Mr. Hills: As long as everybody's comfortable with that.

Mrs. Frazier: But when do we pay our share?

Mayor McPherson: Once the grant and everything comes forward.

Mrs. Frazier: How do you get the money?

Mr. Hills: Chief, I believe, did you want to add something to that?

Chief Miller: Yes. Thank you Mr. Hills. What has to happen is we accept, you pass your legislation, and then the next thing is we're going to have to spend probably several months, anywhere from three to six months drafting specifications and request for proposal. At that point, when we go out with that, that's when we'll have to actually start drawing down. And when we start to draw down on the funds, once we actually start purchasing is when we're going to need some money. But at that point we should be able to use our Special Law Enforcement accounts in conjunction with the 10% match and then begin drawing down on the funds. It'll be 2004 before we're actually, in my estimation, up and operational.

Mayor McPherson: We've estimated three to six months before any funds would have to be expended.

Mrs. Frazier: Do those funds just carry over?

Chief Miller: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay.

Chief Miller: Once we draw, and we will draw down next year. But as long as we've sent the letter in to the federal government they will set those funds aside for us.

Mrs. Frazier: Yeah, I know their funds, I was concerned about our part.

Mr. Hills: But you're going to freeze those funds that you're getting right now and they will be noted as such and carried over until the next year for expenditure.

Chief Miller: Yes.

Mayor McPherson: That's right. They'll be no spending in those funds we've designated over and above what we _____.

Mr. Hills: And you're going to apply for the AG's grant before of this year, right?

Chief Miller: That's already happened sir.

Mayor McPherson: So we've already done that.

Mr. Hills: Thank you.

Chief Miller: We didn't let a lot of grass grow.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions? Comments? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: I have a question. Thank you Mr. Hills. We're buying 15 in-car computers and all 15 will be installed in city owned vehicles?

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mrs. Frazier: Excuse me. Is that correct? There's a page in there that says one of them goes to Truro.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. The amended grant request did say that one would go to the fire department.

Mayor McPherson: Boy I missed that.

Chief Miller: Yeah.

Mayor McPherson: I apologize.

Mr. Beougher: Are we re-amending the grant?

Chief Miller: They're all coming to the police department.

Mr. Beougher: I would like to see that.

Chief Miller: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: They're all coming to our department and not going to Truro?

Chief Miller: That's correct Mr. Clemens.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. Yeah, I.

Mr. Hills: The grant is an application process and then once your funds are here, certainly you have to document, and for accounting purposes I think Howard would agree, all those federal grants must be extremely detailed as how they're expended. But certainly I would sit here and hope that if we're doing this the federal dollars are coming to the City of Reynoldsburg for use in their vehicles. And I would hope they're all city owned.

Mayor McPherson: It is our intent, all 15 will go to our vehicles.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Any other questions or comments? Some good questions. Thank you for bringing those up. Those little details here and there. So with that I would send an ordinance, recommend we send an ordinance forward accepting the US Department of Justice COPS MORE 2002 Grant for mobile computers and related equipment with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward. Please note that took less time in Finance than it did in Safety.

Moving on to item number 3b. This is, all we've got is interoffice communication but I believe we're asking for an ordinance, which would have to be prepared by next week. Would you get that taken care of Nancy? Accepting a School Resource Officer grant of which the school does participate in 69% of the grant and we pay 31% of the, and when I say they pay 69% and we pay 31% that's of the costs that are not covered by the grant. Correct? The cost of the local amount of the employee individual.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. A decrease in each year, our portion of that grant.

Mr. Hills: And within the, beginning of the fourth year everybody's on their own.

Mayor McPherson: Right.

Mr. Hills: And at that time the school still pays the 69%. Correct? Of the full salary of the individual.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Alright. Any questions or comments from anyone on Safety? Again the Mayor has assured us that this isn't coming out of the General Fund. And I assume the same thing, this won't go in place until actually into '03. Correct Mayor, or correct Chief?

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: We're again talking about, just an ordinance accepting the grant for the School Resource Officer. It would be 2002 money, be here, the officer would be some time in 2003. Any comments from anybody on Finance? Then I'd move we send an ordinance forward accepting the School Resource Officer. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella.

Mr. Clemens: With an emergency, Bill.

Mr. Hills: I'm sorry. And recommend adoption as an emergency. Mrs. Cannella would you still second that? Mrs. Cannella seconds that. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Moving on to item 3c. Detention basins. Mr. Gilbert. You would like \$100,955 appropriated from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund to finally fix your basins. Correct?

Mr. Gilbert: Responsibly appropriated.

Mr. Hills: Responsibly appropriated. Well again, it's not out of the General Fund. It's a fund.

Mr. Gilbert: Yes. Chairman Hills. \$100,955 to the unappropriated Storm Water Fund and the Mayor's indicated they have checked the fund and the funds are available. And this will be a great help to the neighbors in that area that suffered the consequences of the project not being finished at this point.

Mr. Hills: Okay. So, any other questions or comments from anybody on Finance? If not I'd send an ordinance forward authorizing the Mayor to enter into contract with Shaw & Holter in the amount of, for the detention basin improvement project, a total amount of \$100,955 with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Now we'll get to the other part of the Finance agenda which is item number 4. Discussion, supplemental appropriation, health care insurance. And Mayor I take it this is the start of our new premiums with United Health Care.

Mayor McPherson: This is the beginning. This is the United Health Care premiums for the month of December. You'll see attached to the legislative request I provided the breakdown as to the various departments and how the money needs to be appropriated. We would request the appropriation to move forward with our new health insurance program.

Mr. Hills: And this again has an emergency on it because it has to be in place by December 1. Right?

Mayor McPherson: Exactly.

Mr. Hills: Questions or comments from anyone on Finance? Let me suggest, the attachment calls for the first section in the amount of \$75,569.52 from the unappropriated General Fund. I would

like to see if that's possible to do that out of the compensated absent reserve, or Revenue Fund, 210.000.4990. Is that an appropriate or acceptable way to do that Mr. Whitney?

Mr. Whitney: I will have to check on that and get back to you.

Mr. Hills: Is Mr. Underwood here? Or is he around? I guess we've had some general discussions and I thought that was the way it was going to come forward and it didn't and so that's why I wanted to ask. Bill, the United Health Care first premium due December 1.

Mr. Underwood: Yes.

Mr. Hills: The breakdown on it has Section 1 coming from the unappropriated General Fund but Section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are coming from Storm Water Funds, Waste Water Funds, different things like that. I take that back with exception, number 7 is also the unappropriated General Fund. Is there a reason that we are unable to take that from the Compensated Absent Fund?

Mr. Underwood: I had nothing to do with setting up the funds and I can't answer that.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Well maybe we better get an answer before we send it forward because I think we've had a general discussion. Bob, I think you and I have talked and Howard, we've talked. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: How soon is that to be Bob?

Mayor McPherson: I believe we probably have to have it to them by around the 15th of November in order for them to put everything into effect on December 1 but I'll have to check. We have been shooting, it's our target, the 15th of November. So, we'll have to go back and look. I asked, I went to the Auditor's Department and this is the funds that were put together and I'm assuming that that's the funds that were recommended we use and I was not aware that we were looking at taking these monies from any other funds.

Mr. Clemens: Could we send it ahead Bill and have this answered and the funds changed by the Council meeting? Is that possible or not?

Mr. Hills: I don't have a problem sending it forward with an emergency with the understanding if we don't have some answers on those clarification questions it may be sent right back to Finance Committee.

Mayor McPherson: Well it should be easy to clarify. We'll just get with the Auditor tomorrow.

Mr. Hills: Yeah. Because this is one of the things as we were talking through the budget, the whole budget cycle, because we're asking for fairly substantial expenditures out of the General Fund.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. Well this may change our budget that we're going to talk about later

then because I think that will probably give our General Fund some more money. Because we figure that goes, when you take it out of the General Fund to pay a bill, then I'm going to have to look at that aspect of it. We had calculated it was going to come out of the General Fund in our budget. So for the monies that are left in there for the end of the year to go over to next year, so that might increase our revenues by seventy-five, eighty thousand. So it's a trade-off Bill. However you want to, either way you want to do it. If the General Fund increases then our revenues increase.

Mr. Hills: Well I just got a copy of the Treasury Investment report and the first thing it shows on the first line on the last page of the attachment to that because our General Fund balance is dropping in '02 from 4.2 to 2.4 million. That's why I don't have any desire to spend monies out of the General Fund.

Mayor McPherson: Well the Treasury Investment balance has got a lot of things besides the General Fund.

Mr. Hills: That's on the General Fund line of the attachment which indicates that in '02 it appears that we're going to be expending dollars in excess of our revenues which I think we know we are. That's one reason that, where I think we've been so emphatic in '03 that the expenditures will be less than the anticipated revenues. I agree these are indications and they may go away and they may get better by the end of the year and I think there's some adjustment that may help that situation but that's one reason I've sat up here and said we want to do everything possible to avoid expenditures from the General Fund. Because the preliminary numbers we're looking at now look like we need to be sure that we're cautious there.

Mayor McPherson: Well, like I said I'll have to verify that what the effect is going to be on the budget that we presented because I would assume that the General Fund revenues will increase proportionately to whatever we take out of the fund balance. So that will give us more in the General Fund for next year.

Mr. Hills: It may if that's where it was set, then next year...

Mayor McPherson: But that's where it was calculated to come out of. See, all that carries over. At the end of the year everything goes back to the General Fund.

Mr. Hills: Everything goes back to the General Fund anyway.

Mayor McPherson: It would just probably increase our Revenue Fund by seventy-five or eighty-five thousand dollars so we'll have more in our General Fund.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Frazier, did you have a question?

Mrs. Frazier: I was just going to ask Mr. Underwood, since Council established the Compensated Absence Fund, I would think that they could go in there and unappropriate money and put it in the General Fund and put it down in here. I mean I would think that's the simple thing to do. It's not

like it's some fund for a special cause that can't be used.

Mr. Underwood: That's correct.

Mrs. Frazier: So we could do that and it would effect your General Fund balance but for this purpose you can send it forward like that and be done with it.

Mr. Hills: And we'll get the adjustment as to what the proper transfers are by next Monday hopefully.

Mrs. Frazier: Thursday. This Thursday.

Mr. Hills: By this Thursday so that we have it in our packet by Friday. But with that, I'd recommend we send this forward. This is the payment we're going to need to make. How we make that is an accounting problem that we certainly should be able to resolve by next Monday.

Mrs. Frazier: Thursday.

Mr. Hills: So I would recommend that we send it forward requesting payment to Central Ohio Health Care Consortium. I'm sorry. Excuse me.

Mayor McPherson: The United Health Care.

Mr. Hills: Yeah. I just read this for Central Ohio Health Care and United Health Care. This is only going to United Health Care.

Mayor McPherson: No. It's a combination. It's paying our last, part of our last payment. You know, in December we adjust. If we're short in any of our accounts. This account will be somewhat short so they've put it into this appropriation. And again I don't know how much but I think that three or four thousand dollars was mentioned that we were going to have to appropriate to EV Benefits in order to pay their final payment. And I think that's why Mike put in there both UHC and EV Benefits. And again I can ask him what that breakdown is.

Mr. Hills: And footnote that as to what that is because certainly I know I've read this, I would assume this is into our new carrier and this is the payment for the first month which will overlap with the payment of the new carrier. So we could break it down but certainly I would recommend we send this forward to pay the health care premium with recommendation for adoption as an emergency contingent upon receiving the appropriate information. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Item number 5 is Amend 164.12 Group Insurance. Miss Milam. I appreciate the facts of your line outs and capitalization.

Miss Milam: You're welcome. Thank you Chairman Hills. What you have before you is a modification to Chapter 164.12 on Group Insurance. These are minor changes, just keeping in

fact that we are changing obviously from EV Benefits to United Health Care starting December 1 of this year. These are changes that reflect that and also the fact that it would just be one provider that we will have. It will not be two so we have striking _____ that mentioned to the preferred provider plan of _____ the city's plan instead. And the new document that the employees will be receiving is called a "Certificate of Coverage". They will be receiving previously under EV Benefits it was the plan document. Again, these are somewhat cosmetic changes but I did run these by Mr. Underwood and he did suggest that because obviously these were enacted as legislation previously that they should be made as a change as well.

Mr. Hills: Okay. And I take it we're not changing percentages because that's what our contracting has as an existing percentage and therefore we're having the same and similar and all employees being the same.

Miss Milam: Yes. That is correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. It probably takes us less time to pass this than it did for you to read it. I would hope. So I recommend we send this forward for modification, 164.12, an ordinance recommendation as adoption of the changes as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Moving on to item number 6. Miss Milam, this is Amend 165.14 Group Insurance.

Miss Milam: Yes. This is in keeping with the similar changes that we just made in 164. Very similar language in 165. One additional change in paragraph b, we are striking the last sentence in there because now that our Clerks are part of our system now, they are part of the non-union base employees, they are currently with our disability program which started this year so that item can be struck.

Mr. Hills: And that was only in there because of the timing, the last time we modified 165.14.

Miss Milam: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: So I appreciate the fact that we're taking that out. It's appropriate to correct those as they come due. Any questions by anyone? If not I'd recommend we send an ordinance forward amending Section 165.14 with the changes as noted by Miss Milam, with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward. Thank you.

Miss Milam: Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Item number 7, Amend 191.19 Allocation of Funds. Mr. Whitney I believe this is yours and I know you and I talked briefly today and I wanted to be sure that, what this is is a change, it is a percentage of allocations of our tax revenues. Well, I'll let you explain it.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct. Given the constraints we have on our income, especially the tax income, it's important that we allocate funds to where they are needed. They are needed in the General Fund, they are needed in the Debt Service Fund. Since there will evidently be no Capital Improvement budget for next year, they are not needed, tax revenues are not needed for our Capital Improvement projects. So what I'm recommending here is that for next year, we already talked about this year, not doing the allocations retroactively for this year.

Mr. Hills: This would be for allocations for '03?

Mr. Whitney: For '03, yes.

Mr. Hills: Right.

Mr. Whitney: I'm recommending 83% of the income tax revenue go to the General Fund and 17% go to the Debt Retirement Fund. This will provide us with a minimum, assuming the income tax projections are reasonable, this will provide us with a minimum balance of one million dollars in the Debt Retirement Fund, so as to not do any damage to our potential bond rating.

Mr. Hills: Okay. And that would be after the expenses of the Income Tax Revenue Fund and the contingency reserve. Is that correct?

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: This is what we had talked about earlier in some of our meetings where we used to take the funds and break them into three or four different spots. There is monies in those areas like the CIP that's in there now. We used to appropriate the tax revenues. In that our expenditures are close to what our revenues are it's smart to take what revenues you do have and put them where you're going to be having your expenditures which is out of the General Fund and the long term debt retirement. So rather than having a breakdown, I believe it was what, 7% and 5% in the previous year, in '02 or something, in additional funds or coming back basically so tax revenues coming in or going to the General Fund offset our going expenses on a day to day basis. This is for '03 so it's not an emergency to have to have it in for next week to be passed.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: What I would suggest, because I think we have a copy in front of us that has been altered and hand written and some adjustments made to it and Mr. Whitney I understand just had the opportunity to look at that today, I would open this for any questions or comments from anybody on Finance. I would suggest that probably the wording that's going to be quite, not exactly like it came in originally or is now proposed, but it will, the percentage wise will end up being the same. It will be the two totaling up to, plus expenses all monies coming in from tax revenues but in that there isn't a need to pass this next week, I'd rather see a cleaner copy typed up if that's okay with everybody so we can get a little more sense out of what's being said. I think Mr. Whitney has a new way of expressing it which is not totally incorrect but it historically hasn't been the same way and I think we need to take a little bit more time and he has the opportunity to look at it, see if we

can't come up with something that follows the format that we've had in a number of years. But does this raise any questions or comments? I believe, I don't want to speak for Mr. Whitney but he's saying to address our reduced income flows, we need to reallocate the incomes coming in to where our known expenses are.

Mr. Whitney: You speak very well for me. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Is that making any sense? Does everybody, I know it makes sense but just as every, not every year but a couple three years ago we did approve a different percentage and now we're moving back to a percentage where the money goes, in essence the tax monies go into two places. One, General Fund to pay the ongoing expenses of the city, and second, long term debt that pays those long term debt of funds, long term debt accounts that are wrote. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I understand but I'm not really too crazy about some not going into our Capital Improvement. I hate to see it without putting money into our Capital Improvement Fund. I don't believe in just stopping all of Capital Improvements.

Mr. Hills: I don't believe the desires to stop the Capital Improvements. What is the balance in it now? There's a substantial amount of money in there now. We have not spent much out of the Capital Improvement Funds this year and this year's almost over. As tax revenues go up I think that then your percentages would be spread back out again but I believe that there's...

Mr. Whitney: There's almost a million dollars in there.

Mr. Hills: A million dollars in the CIP Fund now and there hasn't been any draws from it this year and we're almost through the year, so this is a movement of the tax revenues not between funds, it's just reallocating that it's going to go where most of our expenditures are. This is just, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: I guess maybe this parallels a discussion, just a clarification, and maybe George and the Mayor can help with this. I know we have some projects that are in CIP and I know one of the proposals was to hold off on doing some of those projects but we have the Graham Road project that we've been waiting on. Does this reallocation hurt our ability to pay a percentage of that, do you believe? Or we going to be in decent shape?

Mayor McPherson: No. We're still going to be in decent shape on some of the projects. The Graham Road in particular probably. But again, we have postponed most of the projects in the Capital Improvement projects. I believe the only one that we're even considering moving forward is the Graham Road one. And I think we have a little over a million dollars in there don't we Howard? I'd have to go back.

Mr. Whitney: Well, it depends on what happens between now and the end of the year.

Mayor McPherson: Right. But I don't see it jeopardizing that project.

Mr. Clemens: We'll probably have to do some wheelchair ramps to keep up with our progress.

Mayor McPherson: Well, and again, you know, based on the transition plan that I'm going to present to City Council, we're probably looking at capping the curb ramps at a couple hundred thousand dollars and doing maybe 75 to 100 a year. Just depending on, you know, we don't have hard numbers yet but those are just some numbers we've kicked around. So even with that, we're still going to have adequate funds still in our CIP to fund the transition plan that I'm going to bring forward.

Mr. Clemens: One thing on Capital Improvement, I know that we were talking about possibly cutting our street program, but we did a few this year that we _____ sealed. They looked good and I think that's something we should look into if we can do for streets like that at the cost we did on those and it really came out nice.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah they did.

Mr. Clemens: But we could still do a smaller, somewhat smaller street program but yet we'd make improvements with something like that.

Mayor McPherson: It's just going to depend on how much money we have in the CIP given, you know, March, April, May, or something of this coming year as to whether or not we have to ask for reallocation.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, I agree with you. I don't think you can stop doing things, however, in that we haven't done any of those major projects this year because we could see that the revenues dropped drastically. What we're doing now is just taking a step of reallocating through '03 knowing that those monies that you had in there for '02 can now be spent for some projects. Are we going to do a million dollar street project? I doubt it.

Mayor McPherson: No.

Mr. Hills: But is there going to be a street project done? Yes. Is there going to be services that need to be done like Graham and Main? I certainly recommend doing those. I believe the Administration's pulled off on everything when the monies kind of fell apart and the revenues are down this year. I mean, we can all talk about it and say it's not there but it is there and we're having to take some steps to adjust for that and it does take everybody working together. We're going to talk about the budget in a little while. We're not going to get in any great detail tonight but we're going to talk about some of the steps that have been taken. And this is one that's just a reallocation of those funds coming in and the tax revenues are, it's what you call this is how the city's operated. It's other peoples monies. I hate to say it that way but that's how the cities function. And where does that need to be? It needs to be in the General Fund and it needs to be in our long term debt. Those are two things we can't change. And so fortunately I will have to say, and I wasn't sure I agreed with the Mayor back in April or May when they say we're not going to do any CIP projects but probably by not doing them will enable us to do more in '03 than we would have been able to do had we gone ahead and expended that in '02 because the monies

wouldn't have been there to do it. So it is, in the long term I think it's worked as best as it could but any other comments from anybody on Finance or anyone on Council regarding this allocation? And we will put it in a little neater form because you have two different versions to look at.

Mrs. Frazier: You're the only one that has that.

Mr. Hills: Oh, I'm the only one that has it?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Oh, you haven't seen this other one but it's marked up all over the place.

Mrs. Frazier: I have a question for Mr. Whitney.

Mr. Hills: You have a question for Mr. Whitney? Let me, alright, go right ahead first.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Whitney, when you move that 2% up like that, does that change the amount that would ultimately go in the contingency reserve? Because your language of after providing for the requirements in subsection a there, then you're funds are broken up into your recommended percentages. So I was just curious to see.

Mr. Whitney: No. Are you talking about the 2% after the effective 2% which we have to pay to RITA? That's always been done that way.

Mrs. Frazier: No. It's on down in there and I'm curious that once you provide for the department and all their stuff that was required the way it was written, then you had, technically three amounts. Wherever you put the money, you ended up with 2% going into the contingency reserve and now that you've moved that up there, I'm just curious to see if that 2% makes the amount...

Mr. Whitney: That should not make a difference.

Mrs. Frazier: It shouldn't. That's not what I wanted to hear. I wanted to hear what the difference was. Could you look at that?

Mr. Whitney: I will, in fact I'll come by and demonstrate it to you.

Mrs. Frazier: Thanks.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: (Tape change). I was trying to follow along. Does your marked up copy delete Section 2 or are we still going to retroactively apply back to January 1, 2002?

Mr. Hills: As Mr. Whitney said earlier, there will not be any retroactive 2002 legislation. What adjustments they make internally is that it won't be done legislatively.

Mr. Beougher: It'll be fund transfers internally.

Mr. Whitney: Right. Fund transfers.

Mr. Hills: I think it's, I know, I as a member of the legislative body I don't really like to say, gee this is what I wish I'd done earlier.

Mr. Beougher: I apologize for missing that because I was going through my whole stack looking for the marked up copy and I couldn't find it.

Mr. Whitney: I don't have one either.

Mr. Hills: I apologize. I thought every, I guess I, what we have is a new format of putting it out and there's copies of how it would have looked under our old format. Bottom line, rather than going to a three or four stage allocation _____ General Fund and the long term debt which we, obligations we have over the next years, and I will hold this for two weeks and you will see a nice clean copy next week which will clearly explain what you have in front of you. Because there is not a need...

Mr. Whitney: That is correct. This goes hand in hand with the allocation budget.

Mr. Hills: Right. Absolutely. Okay. Any other questions or comments? We'll just hold that for two weeks and you'll see it in a nice clean copy coming to you.

Moving on to item number 8 is the 2003 appropriation and Mayor did you want to make any general comments, and then?

Mayor McPherson: Well I think the general comment that I'd like to make is that we have a General Fund estimated revenue of about \$10,739,000 and we have a General Fund expense estimate of \$10,668,525. That means that we are going to spend less money than we are taking in to the tune of approximately \$70,000. And that again is in the budget that I have submitted so far. Depending upon what some of the legislation, how it goes here in the next couple of weeks, the revenue side of that may change. There are also some things that I cut out of the budget that given the fact that we do have some money in the General Fund that I'll probably be coming to Council in the next week talking to you, going over the things that we've cut out and asking your thoughts on putting some of it back in. So, again this is just the first estimated budget and again, as things change we'll try to keep them current and I will be meeting individually with all the Council members over the next couple of weeks again, to talk about some of the things I've taken out and whether or not we can put them back in and still try to maintain the positive account when we do all this. Again, any questions whatsoever on it please stop by. Call me. I'll come to you. Whatever the case might be, I really, you know I think, you know I thanked my directors before and I will thank them again. They have really worked very, very diligently. They've taken some steep cuts to get the budget where it is. And I look forward to working out with Council through the actual adoption of the budget.

Mr. Hills: Okay. I'm just going to make a couple of comments. I, this will not be looked quite like the budget you last saw which was in April or May when it went downtown. It has been worked on. Certainly the Mayor has tried to refine some revenues and had to refine some expenditures. I will note that in order to get the revenues, the expenditures below revenues in some general areas which were cut, we're conferencing, going to conferences. Also police vehicles, seasonal employees, some memberships, and by taking those out which are somewhat drastic certainly brought those revenues down. Are there other monies in there that, and I would suggest everybody look through the budget and try to define some areas where they may have some questions. I have no desire, especially this late in the year to sit every department here and go through line by line and I don't think it's going to be productive. The Mayor through his administration has certainly spent a lot of time bringing it down and Bob and I probably had some relatively strong words about, well it's close. You know it's four or five hundred thousand dollars but it wasn't there and we reached an understanding that Council certainly was concerned about being asked to approve it in any budget where the expenditures exceeded the anticipated revenues. And Bob, and through Howard's efforts came in with this budget which is roughly sixty, sixty-five thousand dollars under. Are there some areas where I'm sure he'd like to put some monies back in? Yes. Are there some areas that as you look through this you can say, gee we can take this back out? Yes. That can happen too. Are there areas of raises? I know the Mayor has said there won't be raises. There certainly isn't any raises from the way it's laid out there now. Are there ways to find that? We have, we certainly are paying our contract employees 4% raises next year. What are we going to do with those others? These are some things we need to think about and talk about because I think the goal is, I think that all of us is in agreement, whatever it is that we do pass for '03, the expenditures need to be less than the anticipated revenues. And so if you know you're going to pay out more on one side, you've got to reduce the other side. So it's not always fun. It's not easy. It has not been easy for anyone that has been in any of the discussions whether it be Bob, Howard, myself, or anyone else that, I'm sure the department heads, and I'm sure the department heads would like to have some of our heads at times. But I think we as a legislative body, it would certainly held that we need to be sure that we are being fiscally responsible, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: That was Mr. Wade's comment. I was just responding to it as many times as I possibly could.

Mr. Hills: I understand what you're saying, but times are tight. It absolutely, I'm not sure that, I know in my times on City Council I have never seen the drastic changes that we saw in '02 in revenues. They're down. They're absolutely down, and significantly down. And has it taken it, now everyone is looking at them a different way and Howard's people are looking at them a different way. Yeah, we have to. And Bob's very optimistic that in March and April it's going to be better. And I hope he's right. Because whatever you remove in '03, if those monies happen to come back in you can always put it back. But once we approve it as a Council, asking him to give it back to us next June probably isn't going to happen. So that's what makes this part of it tough but certainly, please go through it and give your comments to, Bob get your comments to me. I would hope, I don't know, is a week enough? I mean, do you want to have a Special Finance meeting next half hour before Council next week just to point out some issues of where

you may have some concerns or discussions. Would there be a benefit to doing that so then we can see how much discussion we need to have? Finance?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Hills, I'll just speak for myself but I'm fine with how you've handled the process so far. If you consider where we started back in February and March and as Finance Chair, you had the unique distinction of facing a situation the city hasn't had to face before and I give you a great deal of credit on how you've handled this and Mayor and the department heads, you know, considering where we started, Howard too in the Auditor's office and Mike and the staff, where we started to come in under, the expenditures under the level of revenues we're going to have is a significant accomplishment. Especially in light of what's going on in the outerbelt here in Central Ohio. So my thanks and appreciation to Mr. Hills and the Mayor and the staff doing that. I would just note, I hope we can maybe look into the funds for the next week to make sure that our non-collective bargaining unit employees receive a similar raise that our bargaining unit employees have. That's one priority I would have that we might look at over the next week to two weeks. But I'm comfortable with all the information we've been provided so far.

Mr. Hills: Yeah, well then rather than have a Special Finance Committee before the next Council meeting, why don't we just, we'll discuss it in Finance in two weeks and those people who see things that they have a concern with, please get with me, get with the Mayor, let's see what may or may not, where people are feeling and what their feelings are, we'll just have to deal with in committee in two weeks. There's only so much revenue out there. It's got to the point now we have a pretty good handle. I appreciate Howard and others knowing this is what they anticipate the revenue to be. And is it conservative? I hope it is. If it's not we're too tight. But certainly if there's, if there's no need that there's going to be some additional costs we have to look at, we have to look at where we can have some additional cuts and the more you look at this the more you can find. It just doesn't make people real happy but I think we have to look at some of the things. And I do, I have heard the comments, I've read the papers, and I'm going to say up here as Chair of Finance and it's only as the Chair, it's just as a legislative body, I read about people going to ask contract employees, we're going to ask them to defer. Well, you can ask all you want. A contract's a contract. What we are entering into is the third year of a three year contract next year. Negotiations will be there. And I'm going to suggest on a very hard line, there is not money out here that we're seeing in the foreseeable future until our revenues turn around. What's going to make them turn around? I don't know that for sure. There have been substantial dollars spent. If you go back and look at what we've released to the Franklin County Auditor in June, there's certainly some substantial dollars spent from the reserves. The reserves being just monies in the General Fund that aren't going to be there at the end of this year. Is it hard negotiations time? I don't think money is a big thing that we're going to be negotiating about. There isn't money to negotiate. Now do we penalize our own employees that are non-contract employees or that next year not be able to give them a raise? That's what we've got to look at. If you're intent on doing that, there may be ways to do it. You've got to look to see the dollars you've got available but what I think and I'm going to encourage that just as we get through '03 doesn't mean that the problems gone away and I think Mr. Whitney and the Mayor will both agree to that. Is that going to make our negotiations easy for those people making the negotiations? No. But you've got to deal with the real numbers that are on the table and they're not real pretty right now. We're doing the best we can with what we have. But we sit up here and say, this is all going to be back in the

gravy within a period of a year or two, I don't know that I'm seeing it and Bob, I'm not sure that you or Howard, I mean there just aren't any promises can be made are there?

Mayor McPherson: Well I think we're starting to see, you know we can truthfully say at this point that the bleeding has stopped. And that in itself I think is making a pretty bold statement, but at this point I think we're going to see a turnaround in some of our revenues. We hope to see that turnaround but at least we are at the point that we're not seeing the constant decline every month that we saw for the first eight, nine months of this year which gives us some reason to be somewhat optimistic about what's coming for the rest of this year and in the next year. So only time will tell. We'll just have to wait and see. One of the things I did want to point out to you, I handed you a green sheet here, Mr. Hills had started talking to you about some of the things that we had done in the final cut. This is what that page is. Really if you just refer to the first section, General Fund Expenses, and then General Fund Revenues, anything below all other funds, we wanted to make you aware of it. But that doesn't effect the General Fund. So that the items that effect the General Fund are the first two sections there. The General Fund Expenses and the General Fund Revenues. And as you can see there the revenues are estimated 10,739, expenses 10,668. So we do in fact have less spending than we do revenues. One of the things that's also been mentioned here a couple three times is the non-bargaining unit employees and raises. I do have a proposal that I'm going to share with City Council members for a raise, a recommended raise for the employees. What happens to it, that's entirely up to everyone that's sitting up here but I believe, I have a percentage and I have a fund that I believe we can use for it and so I will, as I said earlier in the next couple of weeks be contacting all of the Council members and discussing these issues one on one. Also some of the items that we've taken out in the final cut, you know I'd like to sit down and discuss some of those items with everybody one on one too. So I look forward to the next couple of weeks and talking with everybody and hopefully when this budget's adopted it will be one of the best budgets we've ever adopted. So, thank you.

Mr. Hills: So we'll hold this for two weeks and we'll have a lively discussion and figure out how much detail we need to go into. I thank everybody for their efforts and we will move on to item number 9, discussion, Ordinance to waive competitive bidding for various exempted contracts and expenditures over \$10,000. Mr. Underwood, I'd like to thank him very much for his comments and suggestions on this. I hope everyone's had a chance to read and evaluate that. I also would suggest that we now are in November dealing with an item that in '03 if we follow the recommendation of our City Attorney we'll be dealing with in January or February which seems to make a lot more sense to me that we go ahead and delete from the ordinance in front of us the following items: Chester Wilcox Saxby, ESI, Sun Refining and Marketing, Limbach, Green King, Jesse Howard, and Productive Portfolios and with that deletion I would then recommend that we would send this ordinance forward for recommendation as an adoption as an emergency. First of all, Mr. Gilbert. You're on Finance.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you Mr. Hills. This, removing these eliminates them from qualifying for non-competitive, or from getting a waiver of competitive bidding, they still have to bid out their services by following this memo?

Mr. Hills: Well, what it's saying is that following his, Mr. Underwood's memo, "the waiver of

competitive bidding ordinance on three companies did not appear on the expenditure list that he had received from the Auditor's office. That was ESI, Sun Refining, and Productive Portfolios. These companies can be deleted from the waiver of competitive bidding ordinance. It also appears that Chester Wilcox, Green King, Limbach, and Jesse Howard can all be removed from the ordinance to waive competitive bidding. The information in my possession does not reflect if any expenditures exceeded the bid limit prior to waiver. By law, waiver of competitive bidding needs to be accomplished prior to the expenditure". So, if we were going to pick and choose who to take off here, I'd be down to a list of about seven or eight. I think what we have to look at here is passing a piece of legislation that minimizes whatever problems we've got because this list got much bigger than it ever should have, quicker than it should have.

Mr. Gilbert: That was my question. Okay.

Mr. Hills: And that is why that the recommendation is that this be presented and Mr. Underwood is going to come up with and work on a piece of legislation for '03 which will set out the competitive bidding standards.

Mr. Underwood: I am?

Mr. Hills: Well that's what you said here. "I recommend we pass a waiver of January or February and that ordinance should identify three different sections", that you were going to suggest or you have suggested here.

Mr. Underwood: I said "we". Recommend "we" do it.

Mr. Hills: "We". Well we can do that. But I...

Mr. Gilbert: I think he was referring to his staff.

Mr. Hills: But, bottom line is we have, we received this recommendation some time late in the year when it should have started a lot earlier. The law does say if you're going to waive competitive bidding you do it prior to the services being rendered. Have there been some services rendered here? Absolutely, there have been.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Just, we're deleting them from the waiver of competitive bidding which means their services still need to be bid. Correct?

Mr. Hills: Well not their services.

Mr. Gilbert: If it's over \$10,000.

Mr. Hills: It's if they have provided, competitive bidding is required when the service you are going to provide exceeds the limit established by the legislative body which is the \$10,000 here. Where the issue comes up and the confusion starts, John Smith Company doing something in February for \$8,500 and then doing another job some time later in the year in a different part of the city or different type of thing for \$7,500 may not be subject to competitive bidding. They're two

totally different projects. Where entities can get in trouble trying to avoid competitive bidding is breaking out a project, instead of doing, here is the project consisting of two elements, they do two different projects that are in essence the same but try to split it out. So that's where it gets real confusing. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I agree with you Bill and that's something that if they're doing two separate jobs, it's not counted as one. I surely would have never tried to break apart, well I might have thought about it, break apart a job.

Mr. Hills: I wouldn't go there Mel.

Mr. Clemens: What Bill's trying to say is if you take one job and kind of split it up, let them do a little bit and then let them come back and do a little bit again, that's not the correct way to do it.

Mr. Gilbert: Well, that reminds me of my days on the fire board.

Mr. Clemens: If a company is doing a job here and it's completed and then later on they do a job that has no connection with this job here, there's no reason it should not, that would have to be waived, they could go any amount they wanted to really. It's different jobs.

Mr. Hills: Just as we look at the budget in a new light, in '03 we're going to look at competitive bidding in a new light and have a different established method on how it's going to be followed. Does that mean we don't have this issue that's in front of us? No it doesn't. It's here. I mean, we started this back in, when did this come to us? July or August or something like that? It says, oh by the way here it is. We've got to take care of this. I think the original was in July 1. And we looked at it and several of us up here said, boy some of these ought to come off of here, and so it went back for comment and instead of it coming off, it went up. And that's when I said, Mr. Underwood why don't we take a look at this thing and where, I think we've got a conceptual problem. What is or isn't subject to competitive bidding and requirements and he spent some time going through it and working with the Auditor's office and getting a list of those expenditures that were out there and his recommendation is delete the ones that I read off, pass this one and get it out of the way and establish a new standard that people will follow in '03.

Mr. Gilbert: I was just trying to establish we were reducing the number.

Mr. Hills: Yes. We are reducing the number that was on the list that in '02 were waived from competitive bidding.

Mr. Gilbert: I appreciate the explanation. It just, sometimes with the wording it's a little confusing and I appreciate the assistance.

Mr. Hills: Question? Comments? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I was going to second it for you.

Mr. Hills: Any questions or comments from anyone else on Council? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Yes. Mr. Underwood, in your last page of your memo it says “for the year 2003 I would recommend we pass a waiver of competitive bidding”, so on and so forth, and you say “Section 2 will identify the purchases that are to be waived because they will be attached to State of Ohio bids such as office supplies”. My understanding is that we do not have to waive competitive bidding for items purchased under state contract.

Mr. Underwood: We, what we do at state contract is bid a bid situation. We buy a cruiser we attach to a state bid. And I’m saying that we should probably do the same thing for office supplies and other commodities that are state bid. Identify it so everybody knows it.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Underwood: Because right now it’s up in the air. I looked at two or three companies we buy from and we bought a lot of office supplies. They may be state bid. I have no idea. They may have state costs. I think our people just go into a catalog and get them out and order them instead of finding out what the state bids are and what we can attach to.

Mr. Beougher: I think we probably could do a little more research and examination of that issue. And your last paragraph also caused me to think that maybe for next year we can take off our independent auditor from the list when we pass it if they are not doing our auditing for the caffer.

Mr. Underwood: Well that’s a decision to be made. I think they are doing the caffer and the other conversion, the GASB. It’s planned by the Auditor’s office but I can’t speak for him. But the thing I suggested was that we’ve been through several Auditor’s and periods of time without an Auditor that it would probably be good at this point in time to have a state audit to put everybody on the true course for bidding and purchasing and everything else to find out if we’ve got any procedures that need to be tightened up.

Mr. Beougher: It would be a good opportunity to ask some of these questions. But my understanding is that the State Auditor bills us for that audit as well so we may or may not save money on the audit.

Mr. Underwood: It’s not a question whether we’re going to save money. It’s a question of do we want an audit to make sure our procedures are right.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Other questions? Comments? I’ll send a motion forward that we authorize an ordinance to waive competitive bidding on the modified list, the ones we talked about will be deleted and Nancy you have those, we coordinated, and send it forward with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Moving on to item number 10, Ordinance making transfer of funds from Storm Water Fund and Solid Waste Collection to Waste Water/Sewer Fund for reimbursement of funds that provided for

collection of revenues. We had its first reading on 10-28-02. Any additional comments? Concerns? Anyone on Finance? I'm not aware of any need to rush this so I suggest we just send it forward for second reading. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Item number 11, An ordinance authorizing the establishment of a computerization need of the Clerk of Courts' Office Fund as approved by the Auditor of State. First reading on 10-28-02. I do appreciate the attached explanation that was sent. It did clarify and I thank Barb for that. I don't think she stayed around for tonight but it did clarify some of the questions I had. This originally had come to us as a request for adoption as an emergency. I'm certainly not opposed to that now. Is there any other questions or comments from anybody on Finance? Is it clear in everybody's mind what we're doing? Anyone on Council? If not I would request we send an ordinance forward authorizing the establishment of computerization needs of the Clerk of Courts' Office Fund as approved by the Auditor of State with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Item number 12, Ordinance making transfer of funds from General Debt Retirement Fund to Sewer Capacity Fund. It did have a second reading on 10-28-02. Any additional comments? If not I just recommend we send this forward for a third reading with recommendation for adoption. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward.

Thank you very much for your patience and we will adjourn Finance at 10:00 p.m.

Finance Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
November 4, 2002