

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 18, 2004

Members of Community Development Committee present: Lane J. Beougher, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens, Antoinette Newman.
Other member of Council present: President of Council William L. Hills.

Mr. Beougher: I'll call Community Development Committee to order at 7:30. Second item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the October 4, 2004 meeting, and I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Gilbert for running the meeting in my absence. Are there any corrections to the minutes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

Item 3 is the approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to this evening's agenda? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, it will stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Section 971.08 "Program and Facility Fees and Charges" OF CHAPTER 971 MUNICIPAL PARKS. This item had its first reading on last weeks committee, Council meeting. And Mr. Walsh, do you have anything additional to add?

Mr. Walsh: (Inaudible).

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Any discussion on this item? (No response). Nothin' Mel? Alright. I'd like to send this forward for its second reading at next weeks meeting. And I make that into the form of a motion. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor of sending this forward for its second reading, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Okay. Item 5 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SUBMIT APPLICATION TO THE FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY BLOCK GRANT/HOME FUNDS FOR THE PROJECT KNOWN AS THE "REYNOLDSBURG MAJOR COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS STREETSCAPE PROJECT - PHASE II". And this had its second reading on 9-27, and last committee it was held for two weeks. And the deadline on the new application is October 29, and it certainly seems appropriate to ask for money if we have a chance of getting it. One of the stumbling blocks we've found is that we have to have a CIP in place that's been approved by the legislative body. So that's something we'll be looking at in Finance tonight. And Mr. Brandt is out of town until next Thursday? Or this Thursday? Tomorrow, he'll be back? Okay. I guess my thought is that if we can get the application filled out and submitted to Council for our packets on Friday, we would go ahead and send this forward for its third reading. And in order to have it in place by the 29th, we'd need to pass it as an emergency. Any discussion on that? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, I would make a motion to send this forward for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Mr. McPherson. Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Just for information purposes, the application itself is in front of Council at this point. It just isn't completed.

Mr. Beougher: That's correct.

Mayor McPherson: So we'll make sure that that is the one that we complete. But we'll get a copy of the completed one to you. I'm trying to think. Can we pass it next week and still make the deadline? Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Beougher: If we pass it as an emergency, it'll be in effect immediately upon your signature and that'll get us in place.

Mayor McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: I made the motion. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor of sending this forward for passage as an emergency, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And with that I will adjourn Community Development at 7:34.

Community Development Committee
- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
October 18, 2004

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 18, 2004

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:35. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of October 4, 2004, regular Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item is the approval of the agenda tonight. Are there any additions or deletions to the agenda? (No response). If not, it'll stand approved.

Item number 4, Discussion, Solicitation of Columbus Southeast Lions Club (Ohio). Held 10-4-04. And I don't know whether there will be somebody here from the Lions Club. Yes, sir. Please.

Mr. Woodworth: Jack Woodworth, 400 Pickerington Hills in Pickerington, Ohio.

Mr. Clemens: Your last name, Jack.

Mr. Woodworth: W-o-o-d-w-o-r-t-h.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. I have an application for your solicitation on November 26, 2004 and Saturday, December 4, 2004 between the hours of 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. at the locations of State Route 256, Taylor Road SW and State Route 256, Taylor Square access road. That's at O'Charley's. The reason we've requested you to be here, and we know what an outstanding job the Lions Club does. I'm a former member and they do an outstanding job as far as eye care and things like that and we appreciate that and I want you to know. The problem is, and the problem I have, and the problem I've brought up, Taylor Road, 256 at Taylor Road SW is an awful busy corner. We have some construction now. Even without the construction on Friday, and Saturday, and Sunday, we have enormous traffic problems.

Mr. Woodworth: (Inaudible).

Mr. Clemens: And especially Friday, November 26. That's one of the big days as far as sales and so forth. The day after Thanksgiving. How do you plan on handling this? Because it is a safety issue. We do have people that pay absolutely no attention to our traffic signals. They block the road. They pull across and...

Mr. Woodworth: What we do is, the people that work there, they are not in the middle of the street. They are on the meridian. They are on the side of the road. They're not going in the streets. We basically tell them that while the light is red and traffic is stopped, they walk up along the cars. If they give, they do. When the lights change, they turn around and walk back up and wait for their next group of cars to come up. They do not go in the middle of the intersections out there. Quite frankly, my cousin who has a lot of people help him out out there and everything like that, we won't allow it.

Mr. Clemens: In other words, you're not going to be going out in the street.

Mr. Woodworth: Like there's four lanes. We're not going to be in between the cars walking out there.

Mr. Clemens: 256 is six lanes right there now. They widened it on that one direction and over on the other. That was my only point on the whole situation, was the safety part of it because I know how traffic is handled down there and I know how they pay little attention to how we would like them to operate.

Mr. Woodworth: I have ran this for the club for about 15 years now. I started doing it on roads like Hamilton and Refugee, Scarborough and Tussing. We also do it out at Obetz and High. We do it various places and that and everything, and we have yet to have an accident. I hope that continues. But what we make sure is that we have, there has to be adults there all the time. Some of the people are only 17 year olds that try to bring us money for their particular things and that. So they have to have parents there or they're not allowed to work. And we keep the parent with the kids and everything like that. We do not allow them to go out in the streets. The only time there would be anyone crossing the street would be at the intersections they're preparing to take those hours, collecting the money and go back. And they would go back of course with the lights and those would be adults. We don't want them in the streets. Quite frankly, if anything would ever happen, it wouldn't be worth it.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Jack pertaining this subject from members of Council? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, and we've talked briefly about this and maybe we need some clarification from the City Attorney, but it seems to read, the ordinance, at 371.06 that the permit shall be valid for only one period of time. Mr. Underwood, is that interpreted in your mind to mean one date?

Mr. Underwood: Yes.

Mr. Woodworth: Yes.

Mr. Hills: So we're either November 26 or December 4?

Mr. Woodworth: Yes. "Or". Yes, sir. We put an alternative date. Yes, sir. It will not be both.

Mr. Hills: Because it reads Friday, November 26 and Saturday, December 4.

Mr. Woodworth: It was supposed to say "or". I apologize.

Mr. Clemens: I think we do have a memo this evening on another letter we received and it does say 'or December 4'.

Mr. Woodworth: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: And your preference is Friday, November 26.

Mr. Woodworth: It is, but we're working within your parameters, sir. We did do this last year thanks to your allowing us to do it and everything. It was very lucrative for the people that we support.

Mr. Clemens: Mayor, do we have any problems on this that you know of?

Mayor McPherson: No. We're not aware of any, Mr. Clemens.

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

Mr. Woodworth: Thank all of you.

Mr. Clemens: It would be Friday, November 26.

Mr. Woodworth: Thank you very much, sir. I do appreciate it.

Mr. Clemens: The next item on the agenda, Discussion, Liquor Permit Request, new, 5978 E. Livingston Ave Inc., dba as R&N Carryout, 5978 E. Livingston Ave., Reynoldsburg, Columbus, Ohio 43232. This was held 10-4-04. Chief.

Chief Miller: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. We've conducted an investigation into this matter. This is an existing location for a liquor license and this is really a transfer of ownership. We've run the calls. There are 64 calls for service at that location since May 1, 2001 which would really not be a high enough call load for us, and the types of calls. We do have a couple of concerns regarding this gentleman's past record. However, the issues that arise are not enough that would merit the Department of Liquor from denying the license. It is our recommendation at this time, that we not appeal this liquor license. But I assure you, the police department will be watching the licensee and the business closely.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Chief Miller. Are there any questions for Chief Miller regarding this subject? (No response). If not, then we'll let it stand as it is and not appeal it.

Chief Miller: Mr. Clemens, just one issue. When this came up on the agenda the last time, Mr. Baxter asked a question regarding the number of licenses around this location. This address is at 5978 E. Livingston. We have a licensee at 6014. Now this is like a retail drive thru. 6014 would be a pub. Then you have 6078 which is the Japanese Stake House. 6201 is the Sunoco station. 6336 is Wasabi Bar & Grill. 6505 Livingston is _____. And then 6622-24 would be The Well. So those are the kinds of licenses on Livingston. In addition to those, there are seven in the city on Brice Road. A combination of both restaurants and then carry out. So

between the two, we have a total of 14 licensee's just in that area.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chief.

Mr. Clemens: Nobody should go dry I wouldn't think. Thanks, Chief. I appreciate it.

That will end the Safety Committee meeting at 7:45.

Safety Committee

- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

October 18, 2004

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 18, 2004

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

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

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:45. The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the October 4 meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they will stand as read.

Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. I have two changes. That is to hold items 7

(Discussion, Commercial Corridor Revitalization Project/Phase II Utilities; authorization of attorney services and appropriation of funds) and 8 (ORDINANCE TO ENACT A COMPREHENSIVE RIGHT OF WAY MANAGEMENT POLICY (Chapter 907)). Are there any other changes to the agenda? (No response). None being heard, do I have a second to that change? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is the Discussion, Resolution of Services available to the proposed annexation, 4.75 acres, Truro Township, Franklin County, applicant; Stevenson. We are in receipt of the Resolution of Services information that has been provided by the appropriate parties. Are there any questions or comments from members of Service at this time? (No response). None being heard, this item will need to go to the special Council meeting as an emergency. So I'll make a motion that we forward this on to the special Council meeting as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is the Discussion of flooding issues. This is in regards to two areas. One being Broadwyn Drive. The other being Bartlett and Parkinson. The members should have received several weeks ago, a scope of services for these two projects provided by City Engineer, EMH&T. And I had asked at that time that the members look over the proposal and bring any questions back with them to this committee meeting. At this time, what I'd like to do is open it up to our representative from EMH&T just for a brief overview. I had spoke with them last week and they'll make a brief presentation and then we can bring any questions forward that we might have.

Mr. Nolan: I'm Jim Nolan with EMH&T and I'm here on behalf of the engineer, Dave Parkinson. He wasn't able to be here tonight. I've asked Mr. Miles Ebert, our Storm Water Resources Chief who put together the proposal, to give you a brief overview and address any of your questions and keep it brief.

Mr. Ebert: Good evening. I am Miles Ebert with EMH&T. Would you like me to provide a brief summary of the project?

Mr. Gilbert: Sure.

Mr. Ebert: The Broadwyn Drive Storm Sewer Relief Project was proposed some time ago, and EMH&T did provide design services for that project. The current proposal which includes now also the Bartlett Road Storm Relief Sewer Project, incorporates Broadwyn Drive to create a package of Storm Water Relief Projects so that once Bartlett is designed, the two can be sold and constructed coincidentally. The Bartlett Road Storm Sewer Project was derived from a study that was provided by EMH&T, again some years ago, to devise a solution to an observed flooding condition. And I understand maybe it could even be observed this evening at the intersection of Bartlett and Parkinson where a resident, or a number of residents were experiencing some storm water intrusion into their homes, due to excessive collection of storm water at that intersection that was not able to be conveyed in the existing storm sewer system. The present alignment for that

project was derived based on trying to find a, what I will describe as an efficient path between the problem area at that intersection and the eventual outfall which is Blacklick Creek. And that chosen path was down Bartlett Road, and then with a slight jog, and to the river itself. Are there any questions that I could answer to maybe clarify some of those issues?

Mr. Gilbert: Miles, we were just looking at some minor changes to the Broadwyn proposal, and I think what was suggested was an actual tunneling. Correct? Underneath Main Street to get to the creek. From Mr. Parkinson.

Mr. Ebert: Yes. You are correct. The plans that were prepared originally did not include that. And so the current proposed, the city would include making that change to the plans to specify that tunneling is required under Main Street. Not an alternative but an actual requirement.

Mr. Gilbert: And you were involved in the makeup of this proposal? Right?

Mr. Ebert: Yes. That's correct.

Mr. Gilbert: The choice, I know there were a number of alternatives maybe, in regards to the Bartlett outlet.

Mr. Ebert: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: Obviously, there was a path chosen in the existing right-of-way of Bartlett and then south along Haft. What was the rationale behind that?

Mr. Ebert: Well again, going back to some of the alternatives, not only did we look at a storm relief sewer, but we also looked at some other improvements such as a detention basin, again designed to mitigate flooding. The Storm Relief Sewer Project was derived as, determined to be the most efficient solution in terms of reducing impacts to surrounding private property cost of acquisition in related issues. The alignment itself is fairly efficient in terms of being a direct route to Blacklick Creek. It will also provide a storm sewer system that is now lacking along that portion of Bartlett Road between Parkinson and Haft. Presently there are no storm sewer inlets, and we can provide that with the extension that is proposed, the alignment that is proposed. So that's a supporting position as far as that's concerned.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Other members? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Miles, the Bartlett Road sewer, we have another storm sewer that comes out above it by our Senior Citizens Center. It comes out underneath Davidson Drive, then we have an open ditch that goes to the creek. And our problem's been on that one, when the creek gets high, the ditch backs up, it's not able to flow into the creek, and it backs up and covers the outlet between the storm sewer, and no more water comes down. It backs up behind Bartlett in an open, we have an open retention basin and it's give us problems because the water can't get out. Now on the one proposed here, coming down Bartlett, I see you've run pipe all the way down, then you have an open ditch. I don't know how long it is, but I assume it goes through 2/3 of the park. Would we

have the same problem with that? With the water backing up when the creek rises? Would we have a problem with the water backing up and not being able to flow into the creek? Therefore, not relieving the water that we're trying to release? Or would it be better to run the pipe to the creek and angle it to the south so it angles with the flow of the creek and can get out? Is that a...

Mr. Ebert: Well, we are, and I think it's described a little bit in our proposal that as far as the absolute outlet configuration. That is left to be determined during the design phase of this project. What we represented in the exhibit that's attached to the proposal is somewhat a conjecture at this point. We may end up extending that pipe. We wanted to give the city the opportunity to maybe consider both options, depending on whether or not you want another open ditch running through that portion of the park.

Mr. Clemens: Our only problem is, when we get a really big flood, we get them every so often, that section down there is flood-way and it all floods up. It all fills up with water. Our park does, and our ball diamonds and everything. Especially the lower section down there. My problem was, I think the problem was that if this happens, how would we relieve the water out? Because the water wouldn't be going out.

Mr. Ebert: Well, certainly having that condition at your outlet does compromise any storm sewer design. Our thinking looking at the situation was, that there was a considerable elevation difference between where the problem is at Bartlett and Parkinson, and the elevation of the river, and then the flooding actually associated with the river. So barring any extraordinary circumstances where you've got both very high water along the river, and also then a large storm event that would put water at that Bartlett and Parkinson intersection, you probably shouldn't have a problem. Meaning, that water can still drain from the Bartlett/Parkinson intersection. It will push water out down at the bottom. Certainly not as much as it would if that flooding condition didn't exist. But still there's enough of a drop between one location to the next that that intersection should not be compromised by the outlet condition. That would happen infrequently.

Mr. Clemens: One other thing. I noticed you had two quick bends in it. Would that cause us a problem? The bend where it comes down Bartlett and the bend where it goes into Davidson off of Haft?

Mr. Ebert: We'd certainly rather not have those. Our consideration there was, unfortunately this exhibit may not show it well enough, but there are some private residences there, and it did not appear to be good access that would continue straight through along that Bartlett Road alignment down to the river. We felt that would be better in the city's prospective to stay within the public right-of-way. As far as our design process, there are actually ways within our calculations to account for what we call, losses attributed to those bends. And we'll make sure that the pipes are sized accordingly to count for those losses that do occur when you have to make tight bends like that.

Mr. Clemens: But this is just basically a temporary drawing and you haven't designed it. You'll go through to design it?

Mr. Ebert: That is correct. This is a preferred alignment based on all the considerations that we have at this point. Obviously for discussion with the city as we move into the design process.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Miles.

Mr. Gilbert: Any questions from other members? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Gilbert, thank you. Miles, just a quick question here. The existing sewer system, how much can it handle today? And as a part of that same question, versus what's being proposed? Almost like a percentage is what I'm looking for. If we're getting "x" today, how much more percentage improvement can we anticipate after the project's complete?

Mr. Ebert: Well, let me speak in terms that I'm familiar with which are design storms. You may be familiar with design storms that the city, most communities use to determine the size of the storm sewer. Most communities require that the storm sewer pipe holds a two year storm event up to the five year before any flooding would occur in surrounding areas. I believe what we found, again the study portion of this project based back a considerable number of years, but I believe we found that this system had the capacity for that. Unfortunately, what it didn't have is flood routing capacity. Meaning that, once water did leave the system for those higher storm events, the ten year, the twenty-five year event, obviously less frequent events. It couldn't go anywhere except in collect, in that intersection, in that there were some low driveways that allowed water to back up into some structure. So what we did is, we looked at those larger events. The ten year, the twenty-five year, and I believe _____ the size up to the twenty-five year event that the pipe would hold that amount of flow before you had any substantial ponding of water in that surrounding area.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. So then what you're saying then, if I could follow up Mr. Gilbert, please, that the design you're looking at at this point is to handle a twenty-five year event?

Mr. Ebert: Yes. Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Miles, you had indicated, this will be a system we're putting in on Bartlett?

Mr. Ebert: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: There's not a system there presently.

Mr. Ebert: Our records show that there is no connected storm sewer system, part of the public infrastructure particularly at the intersections of Golding and Mariner Drive. So as part of this improvement, certainly we would add those inlets. And that's just a way of collecting storm water that now simply runs down that street and doesn't get picked up until you get down to the Haft Drive intersection. So the sooner, the quicker you can get it into the pipe system, the more relief is provided to the area.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you. Other members with any questions at this point? Mr. Beougher, then Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Miles, the reason for the open ditch section, is that topographic? Is there not enough cover to provide over the pipes, storm sewer?

Mr. Ebert: That is our concern. We didn't have a good detailed field survey information as opposed to the Franklin County Auditor topo that's shown on this exhibit. It's possible that we will find that there is enough cover for that with a little bit of mounding that we could get the cover that we needed. So again, an option. This particular exhibit does include an open ditch section, but it's possible that you can avoid that.

Mr. Beougher: And I'm assuming that the portion that kind of parallels on Haft would be replaced by this system, and that would become the outlet for that part of the system?

Mr. Ebert: That is correct. Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Miles, how long will the project, do you think it would take? I mean, just a rough idea. I know people will be concerned about how long it will take, just roughly.

Mr. Ebert: Well, certainly within one single construction season. I don't know, Jim you've had enough time to look at this and might have an opinion about that?

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

Mr. Ebert: Six to seven weeks. The intention here would be to leave one lane open to traffic. I know this alignment shows it going down essentially the middle of the street. Certainly within the right-of-way, and we would look at that very closely. I say that, but obviously the design will tell the story and this is a fairly large sewer. Some parts of it will be deep, and it's possible that there may be certain areas where we can't keep both lanes open, but that will be certainly a goal of the design of the project.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes, thank you. Can you start this kind of project any time of year in any season? For example, in the winter time?

Mr. Ebert: I think that they would probably wait until early spring to begin construction of the

project.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions? Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Jim, just a comment. In talking with Paul Walsh, our Parks and Rec Director and Safety/Service Director today, I think there's a great deal of concern about what Mr. Beougher brought up. The open ditch in the park. It almost divides the park, and we absolutely would be opposed to having an open ditch down in Huber Park. So then we really would need to find a way to cover that _____ mounding. The way it's design just would not be conducive to the use of the park after that. I guess my second, I just want to make sure I understand what you're saying. I guess, what is the elevation at the Parkinson area and Bartlett as opposed to the creek? How much drop are we talking about? Ten feet? Three feet?

Mr. Ebert: Closer to ten. But that's a round number.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. So my question is, if the creek comes up the way it has in the past, goes over the banks, will this still draw water out of the Parkinson area? Or is it going to back up the way it does now?

Mr. Ebert: We believe there's enough of a difference in elevation that it will continue to draw or drain the area of Bartlett and Parkinson. Even during high water events.

Mayor McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And that's why I brought this up before. I think that we should hold the pipe as high as possible. Because the higher it goes in the creek, the less problem we have because we're up above when the flood comes up. So I think it's important to hold the pipe up when we go clear to the creek. As far as mounding it, we can mound it and put a blacktop path down it to meet our other path that we have. Even though that would divide the park, but it would divide the park with a mound. It wouldn't be an open ditch and that would be I think much better. It might cause a ponding problem for a little bit when we do have a flood because that is a low part down there. But I agree with the Mayor. I don't think that an open ditch is the answer because our open ditches seem to be hard to take care of and create us nothing but problems. I think if there's any way that you could look at it designed a little bit different, I know that I would be more happy about it.

Mr. Ebert: Certainly. If you're willing to consider the mounding, and we could also use what they call squash pipe or elliptical pipe that would be a little flatter at a higher cost, we can find solutions certainly to this problem. There's no doubt about it.

Mr. Gilbert: Miles, if you would just note that in regards to the ditch at the next committee

meeting, provide us with financial impact if that other type of pipe is an option.

Mr. Ebert: Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: And then maybe an alternative to the open ditch in two weeks. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think this is important to get moving as soon as possible. I think all you're asking for is money to do the design work right now. Am I correct?

Mr. Ebert: I believe that's the case.

Mr. Clemens: And whether it's an open ditch or a closed ditch it's not going to change any, it's not going to change the cost of the design work.

Mr. Ebert: That is correct.

Mr. Clemens: Am I correct on that? I would think we should, I would ask Eric if other Council members agree, I think Broadwyn's a problem and this is a problem, and move this on as soon as possible.

Mr. Gilbert: I would agree. Both projects are covered under this scope of services. There's already engineering plans in place for Broadwyn, and the changes that were noted by Mr. Parkinson can be covered under this scope of service and the initial conversation with the Safety/Service Director was, that the administration had preferred a bonding route to cover the cost of the total projects, or total project with parts a and b, Broadwyn and Bartlett. That can be discussed at a later date and it was noted this being an Enterprise Fund, it does not impact on our bonding ability for other projects. And with that, we don't drain the Storm Water Utility Fund that we have in place. Any comments in regards to Mr. Clemens' suggestion with moving this scope of services forward with an appropriation? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Not on that issue. But I would ask Miles another question. If we do the mounding, we're altering the flood plain. Are we in the flood-way? And do we have to make application to the Corp of Engineers and all that fun stuff? Which could delay the project. That's where I'm going with this.

Mr. Ebert: Yes. Well, let's take the Corp of Engineers out of the equation. It's a FEMA issue when we're in the flood plain and flood-way. And certainly be extending the outlet all the way to the creek we are going to go in the flood-way. That's inevitable. Mounding is something that is permissible within the city's code. We would have to discuss a little bit, the permitting process and how that might be compacted. I see it as a minimal issue. But something that we could, I could discuss further with Dave Parkinson and he can elaborate with you on. There are some requirements the city would impose on the project due to that. But I feel that those could be met quite simply.

Mr. Beougher: And as I recall, it's a significant period of time in order to go through that process.

Mr. Ebert: That's only if you have to go to FEMA. And the purpose of this application, similar to the one the city considered for the bank stabilization project just south of Main Street along that Blacklick Creek, the premise of that design project would be to make sure that there is no impact caused by the project. And if that determination can be made, FEMA does not require their involvement, and the city will issue a permit based on those findings. So I would consider that process part parcel of our services in making sure that the proper documentation is filed with the city in accordance with the standards they have to meet, and meeting FEMA's minimum requirements for that sort of activity.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: So you're saying we should add that to the scope of services?

Mr. Ebert: I'm saying it's in there.

Mr. Gilbert: And do you know what section that would be?

Mr. Ebert: It may have been assumed and not necessarily...

Mr. Gilbert: Permit application, task 4. I see it.

Mr. Ebert: You're right. The Special Flood Hazard Area Development Permit. And we indicated that, this is assuming that the activities within the flood-way are defined to an underground utility as would be the case of this project.

Mr. Gilbert: Any questions from other members? Mayor, does that address your concerns?

Mayor McPherson: The only other issue is going to be the financing. How we go about it.

Mr. Gilbert: In regards to the scope of services, that would be Storm Water Utility Fund.

Mayor McPherson: Right. This part of it (inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: And just for the record, the Safety/Service Director has suggested the bonding route as a way to help fund this project in our initial meeting on this. Howard, I think we're right around \$100,000 in the Storm Water Utility. Do you know where we're at in this point in time?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. I'm way off. Mr. Clemens, do you have a question on that?

Mayor McPherson: We have been talking about the bonding route on more than just this project, so as we go along, we're probably going to have a lot more discussion on bonding and what we should and shouldn't be bonding. So I don't want everybody to have that stuck in your mind that

we're going to bond this project because that may not be the way we end up recommending it.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think that we discussed this before. The money we have now available, plus by increasing our fee like we did, we'll be bringing in about a half a million dollars a year. And I think our budget's run us around 370 or something like that. 365. I think we figured we'd have surplus of like 135 or 140,000 a year which would be able to be bonded if we have to. Because we'd be able to pay for it out of that. So each year we'll be, I think we're going to have a surplus at the end of the year of \$500,000. I think that was discussed that we have a surplus of \$500,000. Then by each year, have a surplus of about \$125,000 over our budget and so forth that it shouldn't be any problem as far as doing the projects and doing bonding.

Mr. Gilbert: Well, I think the question would be, what type of a balance that would leave us on an annual basis because I think there's other potential...

Mr. Clemens: Not with starting out with a surplus. We're going to be starting out with a surplus of 500,000. Not counting our yearly income that we will have a surplus on. So we will be able to control what we're doing.

Mr. Gilbert: Well, I guess at this point, I could make a motion that we at least forward to Council for a first reading. Eventually, this would need to go to Finance for that appropriation, but at least forward this to Council for its first reading, an ordinance appropriating funds for the scope of services provided by EMH&T regarding the Broadwyn/Parkinson and Bartlett Storm Sewer Project. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

We're going to stay on this topic. I do have a speaker slip here from a resident that wanted to comment on the project and that is Mr. Wood. I apologize.

Mr. Wood: I've been here before. My name's Joe Wood. Most of my questions were answered. I should say all of my questions were answered during the discussion. But seeing how I'm the chair of our little committee over there, there's two other areas that they wanted to look at. And I don't know whether this is the appropriate thing to bring them up or not.

Mr. Gilbert: I can discuss those with you after. This is a topic related specifically to Broadwyn and Bartlett. I'd be happy to entertain your concerns and we can take a look at it.

Mr. Wood: I'll call you tomorrow. But all my questions were answered. I think that they did a fine job with the questions that came up.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay.

Mr. Wood: My questions were answered until we see the final plans I guess.

Mr. Gilbert: Alright. Thank you, Mr. Wood.

Item number 6, Ordinance approving a Final Plat of Summit Ridge, Section 8. This item did have its second reading on October 11. We do have the signed and stamped copy. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this item? (No response). I make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 9 is Ordinance to amend the official zoning map of the city. Applicant, Robert Fiorita at 9613 and 9807 Taylor Road. The members should have received several weeks ago, a copy of the agreed upon overlay text in regards to this development. Last week there was a suggested revision, a revision suggested, an addition suggested by the developer. It was at the eleventh hour and I believe the members had a chance to look at that paragraph. We also had Mr. Underwood provide us with an opinion on that. It was the City Attorney's opinion that the paragraph added actually be deleted from consideration by Council to maintain the integrity of the overlay text as was agreed to with the developer and representatives previously. So it's my, based on that, I would just suggest to the members, we do have a signed copy of the original overlay text minus the addition that was provided last week. The developer agreed to withdraw that. I would just note that this ordinance would need to be amended at the special Council meeting to the redraft date of October 8, 2004. If you would note that. Is there any additional discussion on the overlay text for this project from members? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. When you said that it was withdrawn, are you saying that the added text has been agreed to be withdrawn?

Mr. Gilbert: Right. It was, just a paragraph was given in addition on a photocopy last week and the signed copy is the original that you had received three weeks ago that did not include that paragraph from last week.

Mr. Baxter: So in essence, we're stepping back to the original contract.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: And that is now agreed upon by the developer?

Mr. Gilbert: Right. And they signed that today with the Clerk's office.

Mr. Baxter: I just wanted to make sure we were clear on that.

Mr. Gilbert: Other members? (No response). Nothing being heard, I would make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 10 is Ordinance to amend the official zoning map of the city. Applicant, Mr.

Kenney. And this is for the address, 7559 Cherrybrook Drive. The members should have received the original text at the beginning of October. Since then, out of our discussions and meeting with the residents, several concerns that were raised that have been addressed. I would just point those out for the record. I just have two changes to note this evening. The first being in regards to storm water. We had received a storm water plan per our code from the developer and there was some additional concern as to the flow of storm water in that area being based on swails and level of water. And in previous development at Reserve Way, prior to some of our newer members being here, we had incorporated a storm water letter as to how the developer would address the flow of water across their property. And we had received from Advanced Civil Design, this letter indicating that all storm water drainage will be accounted for by the developer. As part of their due diligence, they will investigate any off site area that has been discussed or mentioned, which there were several areas that had been mentioned and notes, that is their responsibility to convey this off site storm water through their site to the adjacent stream. It's also noted in regards to elevations, that no blockage of upstream drainage areas will occur. And notes that also, that all design practices will be according to the (Tape Change) City of Columbus and Ohio EPA requirements. And I would like to add this in with the ordinance as an attachment, and I need to find the right section here. As Exhibit "C" in Section 1. And on the, in regards, now going to the actual overlay text, in reference to the 50 foot setback along the north property line, that is where the second change was made to include building and parking and we had mentioned roadway. And what I would like to do is to just change the verbiage to include building, parking, and roadway in that paragraph. And that would be to Section 3, letter a, paragraph 2. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Excuse me. Would you repeat that please?

Mr. Gilbert: Section 3, letter a, number 2.

Mr. Stearns: You're going to change that to 50 feet?

Mr. Gilbert: No. It's currently 50 feet. I'm just inserting the word "roadway" to go along with building and parking. And then in the same section 3, letter b, I'd just like to add the sentence "public access shall be maintained" after that paragraph 1. That's, well Mr. Kenney's here. I didn't see you come in. And that was, those were the areas, and what I can do at this point is open it up to any discussion if the members have that noted. Are there any questions or comments on the text at this point from members of Council? (No response). None being heard, some of the residents are here if they had any questions or comments. I hadn't received any speaker slips. Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert and members of Council. My name is Brad Wilson. I live at 7552 Palmer Road across the street from this development. There's a couple of things that I would ask the Council to take a serious look at the validity of. The proponents of this rezoning that were put forth at the Planning Commission. Two of them specifically, the first being that this type of zoning is an excellent buffer between residential development and other commercial property. And there's no question that there is commercial property on the south side of this development which is a very excellent, very attractive two story office building that is there on

Slate Ridge Boulevard. The question becomes, is there a buffer needed for that area? The buffer itself is currently a, about a 15 to 20 foot drop off cliff with mature trees and a creek that runs through it. So the fact that we need a buffer zone from that to the other houses on Palmer Road, I would ask for your look at that to see if that really has validity. The second issue becomes the amount of traffic and the amount of homes that can be put into this development. What was put forth at the Planning Commission was the fact that this property will be development and should be developed. And I have no question that it should and will. The question that I bring forth tonight is, should it have 60 plus condominiums on it, or should it be held to an R3 zoning which is in the other context? That zoning has been put forth as being able to hold 28 homes. And the truth of this property in the way it lays is that, I believe there are no more than 18 homes that could be platted and probably 16 homes in R3 zoning on this due to the severe flooding and with the creek that runs along the back of this property. And that on the current plat is not shown as being built upon. There's a very large green space there. It's there as green space but it's also there to allow water that builds up along there to do that. I have personally seen in the last 15 years, standing at _____ Luck's back door, water within 10 feet of his house which would make that creek about 80 feet wide and about 20 feet deep. And we had a very large rain. It might have been a hundred year rain, but it was serious. So that area back there really can't be built upon as R3 homes. So that then takes the traffic study that was put forth that said, well we have 28 homes, that traffic is the same as 60 condominiums because there are smaller families, there's less traffic, and I would say to that, if we believe that traffic study, and they're all the same, we could take some solace in that, but I don't believe there's going to be that many homes to be able to be built in that area. So I would ask you to take another look at the amount of homes as an alternative that could be built there rather than 60 condominiums, but the 16 to 18 homes and what traffic that would generate versus what is going to be there with those 60 condominiums. These two things were put forth in order that the zoning would be in the best interest of not only the developer, but the residents of Reynoldsburg, the adjoining property holders, the several hundred homes that use Palmer Road as an access to 256 and the freeway, and the City of Reynoldsburg in general. And I would ask you to consider that as whether that is really a true fact that would we not be better off with an R3 development in that area. Thank you very much.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Anyone else? Yes, sir. Just come down to the microphone and state your name for the record.

Mr. Corbin: My name is William Corbin. My office is 7596 Slate Ridge Boulevard. I represent the owners of the property. I am one of the principle's in the owning company. I would have to differ from the analysis of the prior speaker. We as some of you do know, we had a preliminary request, or we preliminarily presented a request for consideration for a single-family development on that property, and we were able to show I believe, it was 25 or 26 lots on that in the category . There is a flooding question with regard to the property to the rear of the _____ Lucks house that he referred to. He's correct on that. But all of the planning that we did and that Mr. Kenney's engineers are doing has access, all of those people that are doing the planning, have the access to that flood information, and we're using that particular information to determine the number of units that are appropriate for it. Our numbers came out, I believe it was 25 or 26. Maybe some of you even agree on it. Maybe some of you remember that. I don't know.

Mr. Gilbert: Any questions or comments from the members? (No response). Any one else?
Ms. Scatterday? I know I spoke with you today. You mentioned you might have something you wanted to say.

Ms. Scatterday: Sue Scatterday, 7617 Palmer Road. The only thing that, I think Eric, you and I didn't talk about was the privacy fencing. We talked about mounding, trees, whatever at the back of our properties. Mounding we knew was not an option because of the flooding back there. But I didn't know if you had addressed that any further.

Mr. Gilbert: What?

Ms. Scatterday: As far as trees, privacy between there, or fencing. It was even talked about mounding but that was quickly dismissed.

Mr. Gilbert: I think we covered the landscaping in the paragraph with screening commitments.

Ms. Scatterday: Okay. That's what I wanted to hear _____.

Mr. Gilbert: Then I'm missing something as far as a privacy fence. That's completely new to me.

Ms. Scatterday: Well, the terminology, the screening.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay.

Ms. Scatterday: Is that included in this?

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. It's written out in "c". I thought the privacy fence was something separate. I apologize. That is set out in Section "c". Screening commitments. And in that discussion, there was some debate about how best to screen off the parking aside from the remaining trees. Additional landscaping that the developer would put in to replace those that go out with normal construction. But additional screening for the parking areas, the mounding was thought to be a threat as far as blocking any type of the natural flow of the storm water and some aesthetics as well. And that's where it was moved to the pine trees. Minimum feet of 6 foot in those areas specifically.

Ms. Scatterday: Okay. I just want to make sure that was addressed.

Mr. Gilbert: Yes.

Ms. Scatterday: And of course Mr. Allen's access there.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. And that was with the sentence for, 'public access shall be maintained'. And I had spoke with Irene Allen, Friday and today as well. And Mr. Allen, were those questions answered?

Mr. Allen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Very well. Nothing else being heard, Mayor did you care to comment on this at all?

Mayor McPherson: Thank you for asking. It's a difficult position to be in as the Mayor that's responsible for the development of property, and a property owner who's adjacent to a condominium project that's going to drop 60 units in behind your house. I guess my summary is, if something has to be built there, I had always thought it was going to be single-family residential. That's why I bought that property. Because I knew, I saw the plans, I saw the lots. It was designed as being a Cherrybrook Subdivision and it had always been my thought that single-family residential would be put in there. I am still of the belief today that single-family residential is the best use of that property. But that's from my standpoint as being a neighbor. Obviously, from an economic standpoint to the developers and to the property owners, that is not the most economical thing to build back there. I guess my concern is that we, in real estate and as elected officials, we tell people time and time again, look at the zoning of the property adjacent to what you're buying so that you know what's going to be put there. When I bought that I did that. I know that that was zoned for residential. That's what I expected to be put there. I am not in favor of the condominium project, nor have I ever been in favor of it unless they wanted to drop it down to 12 units. And I said that to them. I continue not to be in favor of the condominium project, but would much rather see residential property there. Being a realist also, and realizing that something is going to go there and it's probably going to be condominiums, I am certainly appreciative that the quality of the builder that's coming in to do that is of the quality that they are. I think the units are going to be very, very nice units. When I look out my back window, I think I would much rather see a single-family residential across from me though than 50 feet and seeing a condominium complex of 60 units. And 50 feet folks is not very far. I'm on the north side. Fifty feet is just a little bit more than from here to the wall. It's less than 30 years. So you know, when you talk about 50 feet it sounds like a huge distance. But it's not. It's not like looking out of your back door and seeing a house two or three hundred feet away from you in the zoning we are. So I have said from the beginning, I would like to see it remain residential but that is out of my hands. It's not my decision and I don't envy you because I was there a few years and it's a tough decision to make, to change zoning on existing properties and put things adjacent to it that it was not intended to be there. So, there you have it. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mayor, and you expressed this to the developer?

Mayor McPherson: Oh, yes. Yeah, I've talked to the developer. We've talked many times about my feelings about condominiums as opposed to the single-family residential.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Very well. Thank you. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Mayor on that, I just want to kind of question it some. You're talking about looking out the back and looking 50 feet. You're talking about 50 feet from your property line. Am I correct? You're not looking 50 feet from your house. You're looking to the property line and then 50 feet.

Mayor McPherson: (Inaudible).

Mr. Clemens: Okay. I just wanted to make sure what was going on.

Mayor McPherson: I was just trying to show people what 50 feet is. Like from here to the wall.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other comments from members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I will, this item has had its second reading. I would make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading, and this will need to be amended to the redraft date of October 13, or the changes I made Ms. Smith, that would be today's date, correct? On the redraft?

Ms. Smith: October 8, I believe.

Mr. Gilbert: I think with incorporating my changes that I noted this evening, that would make it today's date. So that would be the 18th. Do I have a second on that motion? Second by Mr. Clemens. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I'll adjourn Service at 8:33 p.m.

Service Committee
- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
October 18, 2004
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 18, 2004

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

Clemens.

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

Mr. Stake: I'd like to call the Finance Committee to order at 8:34 p.m. The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held October 4, 2004. Are there any corrections to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. The Mayor has asked to hold items 5 and 6 dealing with the Sewer and Water Charges, and we'll also need to hold item number 7 (Discussion, Commercial Corridor Revitalization Project/Phase II Utilities, authorization of attorney services and appropriation of funds) since it was held in Service. So I'd like to amend the agenda to hold items 5, 6, and 7. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 on the agenda is, Discussion, Resolution supporting education. Members have in front of them this evening, a motion supporting, or to adopt a resolution of support for the 4 school districts. In your packets you received a Resolution of Support where we support the efforts of the 4 school districts this coming election. Is there any questions or comments by members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. None being heard, then I will make a motion that we send this to the special Council meeting this evening to adopt the motion. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 8 is RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE REVISED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO FOR THE YEARS 2004 THROUGH 2008. We've had plenty of time to look at this and we've had some changes to it over the weeks. We did get some new sheets in that showed some changes in financing of a couple of projects. One Taylor Road, and also we had some information on Phase II, Streetscape Phase II should we proceed to do that. This is a planning document I've been told. Council will have final say on any programs that will go forward from this. I believe we need to have this passed in order to get the Block Grant so we would like to go ahead, at least I would like to go ahead and move this forward. But I believe we have a question from Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I have only one question after looking at it. We received a copy tonight, October 15, 2004, having to do with the Taylor Road Reconstruction. And as I read it, and I understand I read the third column that shows that we've cut our project down into less than half because we're only going to do the sections in Reynoldsburg. Then I read the project estimate and I just wanted to ask, check on this, project estimate 2005, design and engineering, \$5,050. Now we're authorizing legislation for 284, what I wanted to get to is the \$550,000 in the right-of-way, and the construction, and the contract, and the contract administration and inspection and all that, \$6,577,000, is that the complete road? Then why should the complete road be in

here? Because I don't think we should put anything in our CIP if the project is something that's not in the City of Reynoldsburg. I think the section we're going to do that is in the City of Reynoldsburg, that's fine. But I don't think anything should be in the CIP to do something that's not in the City of Reynoldsburg. Some day it may be. Don't get me wrong. But at the present time, it's not. And I don't see any reason to project it in there. So I'd like to have those figures corrected.

Mr. Stake: And I agree with you Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Other than that, I have no problem.

Mr. Stake: Mayor, that wouldn't be a problem, would it?

Mayor McPherson: Well, did we not already pass legislation authorizing them to do that?

Mr. Clemens: To do the design and engineering on...

Mayor McPherson: Five hundred and fifty thousand? Yeah.

Mr. Clemens: No, no. We did the 248.

Mayor McPherson: Or was that Streetscape? I'm sorry. That was the Streetscape.

Mr. Clemens: Design and engineering was 284. Five hundred for the...

Mr. Hills: On your own sheet Mayor, it's 284,500. There had been some engineering on Phase II Streetscape which is around that five hundred and something.

Mr. Clemens: So if we could, I'd like to have that...

Mr. Stake: Revise the project estimate.

Mr. Clemens: Other than that, I don't have any problem.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Which would be roughly half of that.

Mayor McPherson: That 284, the 300,000 I believe. It doesn't work out to half.

Mr. Clemens: No.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, are you asking also that the construction and those things be modified?

Mr. Clemens: Yeah.

Mr. Hills: You need them modified so it reflects what's being done in the limits of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Clemens: The 284 that's fine, because we've already appropriated that for them to do that. But I'm looking at six and a half million to do the project which would be, the way I look at it it's the whole road. Am I correct on that?

Mr. Stake: Well, yeah on the location map the whole road is effected.

Mr. Clemens: It shows the whole road.

Mr. Stake: Right. And I think we need to...

Mayor McPherson: We'll send you an amended page to that.

Mr. Clemens: If you would. Just on the section that we're going to do.

Mayor McPherson: As far as passing it tonight goes, we'll amend it and we'll reflect the correct amounts for the amount that we're actually doing and then we'll get those figures from EMH&T.

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

Mr. Whitney: Turn to page A4 and you'll see that for the Taylor Road Reconstruction, only 1.75 million is scheduled for '05. The rest of that has been pushed back beyond '08.

Mr. Clemens: I'm not really interested in that. I'm interested on the section. I want everything broke down on the section that's in the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Whitney: Well, that's the one that's in '05.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. But we've got a sheet here that shows the 6,577,000, that's for the whole road.

Mr. Whitney: But the road is then broken down back in the more detailed...

Mr. Clemens: I understand that. I want it off this sheet.

Mayor McPherson: We'll change the fact sheet.

Mr. Clemens: You know what I mean. I want it off the fact sheet.

Mayor McPherson: We'll change it.

Mr. Stake: Right. The fact sheet is not current.

Mayor McPherson: The fact sheet doesn't match the...

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. We would need to send this on as an emergency. This has been around a while. We will need to send it on as an emergency. Pass it as an emergency in order to be able to apply for the grant. So I will make the recommendation, or I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its third reading as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: You're going to send this on for next Monday's meeting? Not for tonight's meeting?

Mr. Stake: Yes. Next Monday's meeting.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. I just wanted to be clear on that so we can see it prior to approving it.

Mr. Stake: Right. We will have that prior to passing this. Okay. So there's a motion with a second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And we will adjourn the Finance Committee at 8:42.

Finance Committee
- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
October 18, 2004