

•SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 21, 2002

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher. Councilman Jim Wade was absent.

Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, William L. Hills, Council President Bradley L. McCloud. Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.

Mr. Clemens called the meeting to order at 7:30.

Minutes of the October 7, 2002 Safety Committee meeting were approved without objection.

The agenda was approved.

Mr. Clemens asked Mayor McPherson to address Ordinance accepting the U.S. Department of Justice COPS MORE 2001 grant for mobile computers and related equipment for Reynoldsburg Police Department.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you Mr. Clemens. As we discussed earlier, I'm going to make a request to City Council to remove this from the agenda. Based on our conversations it's going to cost us quite a bit in maintenance. When we originally applied for this back in 2001 our finances weren't where they are today. At this point we just don't even think that we can realistically accept a grant that we can't afford to keep so we are going to request that it be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Stake said it would appear money could be saved. If it would be more efficient, why remove the issue?

Mayor McPherson: Well we have several problems. Let me just go over some and I gave a copy of this to Mr. Clemens and I'll provide the rest of Council with one. The first thing is the maintenance cost itself. It's estimated to be 10 to 20% which is 25 to \$50,000 a year. We also have discovered since getting with our IT people that we can't use our present CAD system so we would have to then find a wireless network to use the system with. There's three or four options for that. Suffice to say that not even the cheapest one is cheap. Once we get the technology implemented there's a recommendation from both in-house and outside of house that we would have to hire another information technology specialist to keep the system up and running. So the offset for two officers when you start figuring out developing your own RF system or 800 system, hiring an in-house person to run it, the expenses just, or the savings just weren't there at this point. As we go down and we become more mobile if you will, and we get some of the wireless systems, it might be economical but that's probably three, four years down the road for us. So that's why. It looked good initially but when you sat down and really get what it's going to cost us it just wasn't an even trade-off. It was still going to cost us money. And I understand the question. Again, I just got this and I just gave it to Mel and I'll see that everybody gets a copy of this.

(Inaudible)

Mayor McPherson: Well, yeah. Some of the suggestions in here is to contract it out but that's still going to cost money.

Mrs. Cannella asked the Mayor if anyone checked around to see if anyone could do the maintenance cheaper?

Mayor McPherson: Well we're just going from their, they're the ones that have indicated, the suppliers and the vendors are the ones that are indicating, they're saying 10 to 20%. It's a quarter of a million dollars roughly grant. So it's 25 to \$50,000. And that's by their own. We don't know. But that's what the vendors are saying it'll cost to maintain it.

(Inaudible)

Mayor McPherson: Transfer of what?

(Inaudible)

Mayor McPherson: Well, yeah. You need a tech person and besides that like I say, our CAD system, our present system won't accept it. We would have to go out and build a system to accommodate a wireless system. We don't have a wireless system in the city so we would have to build a whole system.

(Inaudible)

Mayor McPherson: I don't want to question the numbers but I can't imagine it is going to save us \$400,000 a year even if you use the efficiency factor and you add say, two police officers you'd save, that's still only \$100,000 a year.

(Inaudible)

Mayor McPherson: Well, again, that's if you build the system and that's all it costs and if you don't have to hire another IT person. And these are all a lot of if's that we don't have answers to other than what we are getting from the vendors and what we are getting from our own IT people that are just saying, we just can't do it.

Mr. Clemens moved to remove the topic from the agenda. Mr. Stake seconded. All voted "Aye".

Meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Safety Committee

- Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

October 21, 2002

- Sound system/some microphones did not seem to be working correctly thus causing inaudible sections on tape. -nf

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 21, 2002

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

Meeting was called to order at 7:37 p.m. by Vice Chairman Lane Beougher.

Minutes of the October 7, 2002 Service Committee meeting were approved without objection.

The agenda was approved.

Ordinance approving amended Final Plat of Jordan Crossing entitled “Resubdivision #3 of Jordan Crossing” and Repealing Ordinance 126-96 - Mr. Beougher said provided stamped, signed copies were received within the coming weeks, he would move to send ordinance to Council for the second reading with a recommendation for a rule suspension and adoption. Mr. Stake seconded. All voted “Aye”.

Mr. Beougher: Item number 5 is an Ordinance approving the Final Plat of Farmington Section 5. Is there any discussion on this plat? We have received the red stamped copy. So once again I’d like to move this forward for a second reading with a rule suspension and recommendation for adoption. Is there a second? Mr. Hills with a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye. (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response).

Number 6. This is an Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances amending Section 949.04 “Additional tapping fees for nonassessed property” Subsection (a) of Chapter 949 Water Regulations. This had its first reading last week. Any discussion on this issue? Hearing none, we’d like to move this forward for a second reading on the Consent Agenda. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Hills. All those in favor signify by saying aye. (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response).

Okay moving right along. Item 7. Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances amending Section 941.26 “Determination of Sewer System-Capacity Charge” of Chapter 941 Sewer Regulations. Once again it had its first reading last week and I’d like to move this forward as a second reading on the Consent Agenda. Is there a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All in favor signify by saying aye. (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response).

Number 8. 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 and power supply, for the City of Reynoldsburg (hereinafter, “Ordinance”). This also received its first reading last week and what we are going to do with this is send it for a second reading and then the contract is not yet ready as I understand it, and then place it on other legislation on its return to committee. Is there any discussion on this issue? I’d like to move it forward. Can I put this on the Consent Agenda too or not?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Okay I'd like to move to send this to Council for the second reading on the Consent Agenda. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Hills. All in favor signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). All opposed. (No response). Motion carries.

Item number 9. Ordinance authorizing EMH&T to prepare compliance items recommended in the City of Reynoldsburg NPDES Phase II compliance assessment study. And this was sent for second reading with a recommendation for a rule suspension but we learned that there was miscommunication on the financial aspects and so we need to discuss this further. We received some correspondence on this issue. Who wants to start? Mr. Whitney we received a memo from you. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Well if you'll recall when we first brought this up I indicated that the numbers were not correct. I believe they were, Mr. Parkinson provided the numbers to Council and I knew that there had been some appropriations from the Storm Water Fund for another project primarily the riprap out of Tanglewood where the sewer line went through and the creeks and the creek beds were washing away. So in meeting with Larry then the next day he indicated, yes that's correct that there was not \$4,000 left in that Storm Water Fund that it had been used for the riprap and thus resulting in a need to get the total \$27,500 appropriated from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund rather than the 23,500. There was still some question on it so last week Mr. Whitney was asked to check the accounts and then you have the memo in front of you that he sent to you indicating that yes, that's correct. That monies had been used out of that unappropriated Storm Water Fund for other issues and the total amount of 27,500 would need to be appropriated. And that's where we are on it at this point.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mayor, if I could ask, or Howard. The ordinance that was deemed as the first part of the Phase II Storm Water NPDES did appropriate \$17,900 and it was done in November of '01 I believe. 161-01 is the ordinance and it appropriated that money from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund 740, general category to 740.737.5331 specifically which is Architectural and Engineering expenses. And monies were expended from that fund and paid to the engineering firm of EMH&T. Now in that Council appropriated too to the .5331 account, I believe those monies either would stay in that account or go back to the unappropriated Storm Water Fund when an ordinance has specifically appropriated it there so I don't know why and how monies would have been moved out but it should have stayed in 5331 and that's where I think EMH&T's records appear to be correct. That they didn't expend all of the funds that were initially appropriated and that's why this request of the 27 something was reduced by approximately \$4,000 that was there. I do see Howard's letter and I'm not sure that the balance left in the 5300 account, there may be, I'm not sure what totally is in the 5300 accounts. I don't think we've got our September report yet if I remember right, so we haven't seen those yet, but I know in August there was over \$10,000 in some other accounts within the 5300 series. I don't see that now but I'm a little unclear as how money specifically incorporated to Architectural and Engineering expenditures are expended and spent on an item other than that. And I guess that's why we would look at this and wonder; those

monies should be there.

Mayor McPherson: I'd have to look at the ordinance and the account. I don't have that in front of me so I'd be glad to look that up and try to get an answer for you. The only thing off the top of my head that I could think is that they're trying to, rather than appropriating additional funds we're trying to move monies around to utilize as best we can. That may have happened in that account. I don't know that though so I'll have to check it out. But you say that was Ordinance 161-01?

Mr. Hills: That was Ordinance number...

Mayor McPherson: And the second thing that might have happened is at the end of '01 and the beginning of '02 it may have gone back. Whatever was left in that account if it wasn't carried over it may have gone back but again I don't know.

Mr. Hills: But if that was true then Larry couldn't have just taken it. See that gets into this 'then and now' that's a whole different issue. It seems to be it was carried over from '01 to '02 to be useable in the .5331 because it was transferred out of it to be used for something else.

Mayor McPherson: Well as I indicated, I'm going to have to look. I don't have those accounts in front of me but I'll certainly look that up.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Well I appreciate that but Lane I think...

Mr. Beougher: Just for everybody's information, 161-01 was passed November 26 signed by the Mayor November 27 and the draws from that account are dated 2-7-02, 3-13-02, 4-15, 5-17, 6-20, and 10-4 of 2002. So it obviously carried over into 2002 and the monies did not go back into the unappropriated Storm Water Fund and in EMH&T's letter they did note that as a two stage approach and that there would be a second proposal for completing the NPDES permit application. So the, every indication was that, we would, I guess, go back and reuse any money, any unexpended money in that account. Any other comment?

Mr. Hills: I'd just suggest we send it forward as written with a recommendation for a rule suspension.

Mr. Beougher: We have a motion from Mr. Hills to send it forward as written and appropriated. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake.

Mayor McPherson: What amount would that be then? The 27,500 or the 23,500?

Mr. Hills: 23,500.

Mr. Beougher: As written, 23,500. There's a motion on the floor. All in favor signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). All opposed same sign. (No response). Motion carries.

I will adjourn Service Committee at 7:50 p.m.

Service Committee  
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council  
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)  
October 21, 2002

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
October 21, 2002

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

Mr. Hills: I will call the Finance Committee to order at 7:50. Ask for any comments or approval of the October 7 meeting minutes. Are there any additions or deletions to those minutes? Seeing

none, they'll stand as submitted. Approval of tonight's agenda. Any additions or deletions to the agenda? Seeing and hearing none, we'll move to item number 4, a discussion of payment of bill from Schonhardt & Associates. This is a, it's been determined I guess to be a "then and now". I think the question would come, is this any more of "then and now" than the last one was, that we just talked about, but certainly there's been some communication or trying to determine this is the bill from Schonhardt & Associates for \$1,952 and I would request that this is for services that were rendered in payment of contracted services it says and I believe our invoice date on it was 10-8. Excuse me, September 20, received by Clerk of Council on October 7 and which is in essence being handled as a "then and now" and indicating the money is present and available to expend and I would request that we send forward legislation to pay the bill in the amount of \$1,952 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 for one reading next week.

Moving to item number 5, discussion, appropriation from Brice-Main TIF Fund for payment to Reynoldsburg School District. I understand this is a payment of monies that are owed to the school district from the TIF Fund. Is that correct Howard? Is there anything you wanted to add on this?

Mr. Whitney: No there's nothing to add. It is money that they owed to the school district.

Mr. Hills: I'm sorry, this was what?

Mr. Whitney: It is money that is owed to the school district.

Mr. Hills: And this is in the TIF agreement that they were supposed to get that and I see you do ask for an emergency in this because the time has come for us to release those payments to them. Is that correct?

Mr. Whitney: It's just something we have to do.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Any questions or comments from anybody on Finance? Anybody on Council in general? If not I'd recommend that we appropriate 89650 from the unappropriated Brice-Main TIF Fund 971 for payment to the Reynoldsburg School District to comply with the TIF agreement. It'd go 971.000.5527. I recommend that go forward 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.

Moving on to item number 6, Reimbursement to Sewer Fund from the Storm Water and Refuse Funds, collection of revenues. Mr. Mussi or Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: This is an annual thing. The Storm Water and Refuse accounts reimburse the billing office each year. One half the personnel costs for the Account Clerk. We've calculated what those amounts should be and it would be \$25,577.50 from each account to reimburse for the billing that's done for those items.

Mr. Hills: Okay and I see that this is one of those just a three digit general fund thing. Is that so, is this your, do you move it from whatever line to reimburse it over?

Mayor McPherson: Correct.

Mr. Hills: But it is again, all of this is out of the fund dollars and not the General Fund dollars?

Mayor McPherson: Correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Does that raise any questions from anybody on Finance? Okay I don't see where there is any recommendation for a rule suspension or emergency so if we could...

Mayor McPherson: Not necessary.

Mr. Hills: Okay. I just move that we send this forward for a first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward for a first reading.

Number 7, discussion, establishment of "Computerization Needs of the Clerk of Courts Office Fund". Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you. Well I have the Clerk of Court here tonight to address the issue also. So I think rather than my repeating what she's probably going to tell you I'll just let her tell you in her own words you know, why we were asking the establishment of computerization account.

Mrs. Nofziger: Good evening. What you have in front of you is a request to establish a special revenue fund. This fund would be created by assessing an additional court cost to each of the cases in Mayor's Court where there's a conviction. The revenues generated by these additional costs would then be used to pay any computerization needs that the Clerk of Court office would have. I've provided you with all the documentation showing that the city does have the authority to create such a fund. I've also included a copy of the letter from the Auditor of State granting the Mayor's request to bring this before you. I've also included the technical bulletins that the Auditor of State's office has put out showing how this issue effects Mayor's Court, how Mayor's Courts in particular have to handle this issue. What we're hoping to do by establishing this fund is removing some of the costs that are paid out of the city's General Fund. If we could pay for some of our expenses such as hardware, software, maintenance agreements, computer supplies, those types of items, if we could pay for it out of our special fund, those are items then that would not have to be paid for out of the General Fund. The other thing it does, is it passes these costs along to the courts' users. So the users of the courts are then paying for these expenses instead of again, these things being paid out of the General Fund. So does anyone have any questions for me?

Mr. Hills: Any questions from anybody on Finance? I have a couple. Number one, has the City

Attorney looked at this and does he, you've seen this Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Yes I have. In fact we looked at it about five years ago at doing this and it was elected at that time not to do it but it is a very viable thing to do.

Mr. Hills: Okay. So you in essence, you've seen this as it's proposed now?

Mr. Underwood: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Okay. The question I do have I guess is, I'm a little confused because I did read the attached material and I know the fee can be up to \$10 but it would appear to be saying here, if you're already computerized, and I think we can say we are...

Mrs. Nofziger: Yes we are.

Mr. Hills: We are computerized, then do I read this correctly, it could not exceed \$3. Am I reading that MAS release appropriately?

Mrs. Nofziger: Well actually there are two different funds that are discussed in those MAS bulletins. There is a Legal Research Fund that is not what we are proposing at this time. That cannot exceed \$3. But the Computerization Fund for the needs of the Clerk of Court office is a separate fund that is allowed to be established and it can be anywhere up to \$10 per case.

Mr. Hills: The fee not to exceed \$10 that is charged pursuant to division B1 may be used only for the computerization of the Clerk's office. We are computerized, right?

Mrs. Nofziger: Yes we are. But again if you go to permissible expenditures for computerization fees, it does talk about the \$3 but that's if you're doing it for the legal research. It goes on to talk about the fee not to exceed \$10 per filing is only for the computerization the Clerk of Courts office. So then it goes on to discuss what those fees can pay for.

Mr. Hills: But we are computerized?

Mrs. Nofziger: Yes we are.

Mr. Hills: So therefore, the fees that we would be charging would be for the maintenance contracts, the supplies for the use of the computer, hardware, software.

Mrs. Nofziger: Correct. Hardware, software.

Mr. Hills: Not hardware. We've already got hardware.

Mrs. Nofziger: Well it would allow us to create, we would have a fund that any future needs. We would be building this fund to also help us offset any costs of future needs for hardware. If we decided to do a major upgrade on our software if that fund has the money in it we would then be

able to use it. So we not only want to cover our annual costs but we also want that fund to build to allow us to do any special projects for anything like that. So it can pay for a lot of hardware if we would choose to make some changes in the future.

Mr. Hills: What do you anticipate this fee to be?

Mrs. Nofziger: That would be at the Mayor's discretion. We have basically discussed about \$5. We don't anticipate doing the full \$10 at this time.

Mayor McPherson: When we ran an analysis I think that the \$5 per case, 3,000 cases, it would cut about \$3,200 off of our General Fund revenues that we'd have to ask for.

Mrs. Nofziger: But we could bank up to \$15,000 a year. Right?

Mayor McPherson: For future development.

Mrs. Nofziger: For future. We want to pay for our annual costs but we also want this fund to be building for any future costs. There's lots of things that can be looked at. I mean, we can even pay personnel costs from this fund. So my data entry clerks for example. If we determine they spend, and I'm just throwing this out as an example, 50% of their time doing computer work, we can even pay for salaries out of that. So there's lots of things that we can look at but we have to get the fund established and start putting some money into it to be able to utilize it.

Mr. Hills: You can't spend it until you get it.

Mrs. Nofziger: Absolutely.

Mr. Hills: And you can't get it until we pass it.

Mrs. Nofziger: Absolutely.

Mayor McPherson: There you go.

Mr. Hills: Does this raise any, I noticed they are asking for an emergency on this but does some of this discussion raise any concern? Do you want a week or so and look at this and read. I'm unclear in my mind on the fees to be honest with you and I've got to understand this a little bit better. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I don't see any reason for an emergency but we could move it on to a first reading.

Mr. Hills: If nobody's opposed to that, you all can hold it for a couple of weeks until I read a little bit more and understand it or maybe you can explain it to me a little more clearly. You've got it here. For some reason I'm having a problem seeing, I want to be sure that, it doesn't seem to make sense. It says you can only charge up to 3 to computerize. We're already computerized.

Does that mean we can charge the other 7? So I guess what my suggestion is, let's send this forward for first reading and see if there's other issues or questions that come up and then we'd send it forward if there aren't any other issues raised. Because this is, it's a cost. It's anybody coming to visit you in the court system's going to pay an extra fee and I'm not sure what additional fees are out there now to find. I guess that study's going on right now I believe and I think Mr. Clemens is waiting for some of those results back. Other than that I recommend we send this forward for first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Thank you very much.

Item number 8 is discussion of Resolution of Support for the Reynoldsburg School levy. The President asked us, I believe this came from the President of Council, asked us to support the Resolution for the school levy. We historically have supported the levies in the past and certainly I have, does this raise any questions with anyone else on Council as far as supporting, or anybody on Finance first of all, supporting the school levy of Resolution? Does that raise any questions from anyone on Council? Then I would, Mrs. Frazier if you will have the Resolution or someone will for us by next Monday as to the appropriate, it'll be recommending the, just supporting the Reynoldsburg School levy. This is going to be on the ballot on November 5. Is there a second on that? Second by Mrs. Cannella. Mayor, did you have any comments on that, or?

Mayor McPherson: No.

Mr. Hills: Okay. And that would be a Resolution so it would just be one reading, correct Nancy?  
Mrs. Frazier: A motion.

Mr. Hills: It'd be a motion to accept the Resolution and Mrs. Cannella seconded. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). So it will go forward.

Item number 9, Ordinance to waive competitive bidding for various exempted contracts and expenditures over \$10,000. We did, we've been asking for a while to get a reduction in the list and some explanations and I think we all found in our packet, we did get some explanations and additions to the list. So I think some of the explanations have raised as many questions in my mind and from talking to other Council people and also in their minds, and I did have a brief discussion with Mr. Underwood today, our City Attorney, and I read both the Charter and the Code for the State of Ohio, as entering into proposed contracts or expenditures as a singular type action. We historically in Reynoldsburg I think look apparently at times at our expenditures on an annual basis, and I'm not sure, and I have mentioned this off and on for a number of years and, but I think Mr. Underwood and I talked today and looking at this just growing and growing and some of the explanations in here I'm going to have to say I think are probably weak at best. A nice person, and we work with them well, and we don't work well with others-I'm not sure that that is much of a selling point to ask the legislative body to waive competitive bidding. So I'm going to suggest that we all hold this for two weeks and take another look at it and where it may be appropriate and Bill I don't know if you've had a chance to think about it any more after our discussion, but possibly seeing a break down of all the purchase orders that made up this list for this year and what the encumbrances are for the remainder of the year, and I think that we can get an idea if we have to see that listing as to are these separate projects or are these the same project. And I believe the

Mayor also is, this may be something the Mayor and I semi-agree on.

Mayor McPherson: I think we've always agreed on this issue that they're separate projects whether they're the same vendor or not that...

Mr. Hills: If they're truly separate.

Mayor McPherson: Truly separate projects.

Mr. Hills: If someone separates a contract or a job in order to avoid competitive bidding then that violates the spirit of it.

Mayor McPherson: Right.

Mr. Hills: So I think we ought to try to get a little bit more information on this. It seems the longer it goes, of course we're looking at this as this is now, what, October 21. We should have had it in January or February and we got it in July and we're still looking with it so maybe if you wait until the end of the year it goes away. Right Howard? So we never see where we are.

Mayor McPherson: But then it starts next year so you might as well get the \_\_\_\_\_.

Mr. Hills: Then we can start early. We may have this years go into '03 and see how we do but with that I would like to just hold this for a couple of weeks if there isn't any opposition from anybody on Finance or anyone else on Council. But I would suggest everybody do take a look at it and if we can put that, some of the more detail together I think it would be beneficial.

With that we'll move on to item number 11 which is an Ordinance making transfer of funds from General Debt Retirement Fund to the Sewer Capacity Fund. Howard I believe this is yours and could, everything appears okay. Did you have anything you wanted to add on this one?

Mr. Whitney: Nothing here.

Mr. Hills: Okay. With that are there any comments from anybody on Finance on this? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think Henry said this is number 10 and not 11.

Mr. Hills: I'm sorry.

Mr. Clemens: Henry said this is number 10 and not 11.

Mr. Hills: You know I've heard Henry mumble all night but I never could hear him. Henry you can always come to the mike. I may not pay attention to what you say but I will allow you the right to say it. But I appreciate you for correcting my, if I'm wrong I appreciate you correcting that and I'm glad we got it on the record. Thank you. Alright any other questions on number 10? Mrs. Cannella.

Mrs. Cannella: Mr. Hills did you, you have questions whether they should have numbers?

Mr. Hills: I believe it has been determined that it is okay and there is not a need for those numbers now. Correct? He is inserting these numbers? Mrs. Cannella I do have a hand written comment from Mr. Whitney. The Sewer Capacity Fund does have a number in Section 1 and that number is 310.991.5501 and that will be inserted before a second reading. The General Debt Retirement is the 310 and the Sewer Capacity is another generalized 250.

Mrs. Cannella: (Inaudible)

Mr. Hills: Is the fund number. Okay?

Mrs. Cannella: That's fine. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: So that will be adjusted as it goes forward for its second reading so therefore I would move item number 10 forward for a second reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward. Moving on to item number 11, Ordinance accepting Fiscal Year 2002 Local Law Enforcement Block Grant for purposes of obtaining digital cameras; and increasing community oriented policing patrols in specific geographic areas; and declaring an emergency. It is my understanding that the question on this the last time was some information as to whether we needed some account numbers and also fund numbers in this and the answer to that I believe has been resolved today and I appreciate everybody's efforts in that, that we do, and it will be inserted. What we will be seeing next week is this Ordinance's Section 1 being the same, Section 2 will state that the City Auditor is hereby authorized and directed to establish the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Fund and some group of numbers; and Section 3 would be an amount of 1,183 in the appropriated Special Law Enforcement Fund probably 290 being here transferred and appropriated to Local Law Enforcement Fund with a number there, and appropriated to account, whatever, for the city's contribution. And I understand they will be providing you with those numbers. Is that correct Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And that would mean the original Section 2 as you see now would become Section 4 so what that does do is fill in any doubts that any time you do have a Law Enforcement Grant it apparently has been determined that it does need it's own set of fund numbers so it can be verified that the funds were spent appropriately for the services rendered. And so with that I would recommend, does that raise any questions with anyone on Finance? Anyone on Council? So with that I would recommend that we send this ordinance forward for second reading with recommendation for rule suspension and adoption. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. Yes Mel.

Mr. Clemens: It should go as an emergency if it could.

Mr. Hills: Excuse me. It is an emergency. It's not recommended for rule suspension but as an emergency and it will go into effect when the ordinance is signed by the Mayor that way. It was an emergency request and not a rule suspension. Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward and I do believe that completes Finance at 8:12 p.m. Thank you very much.

Finance Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

October 21, 2002