COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 17, 2005

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

Mr. Baxter: I'll call the Community Development meeting to order at 7:35.

First order of business is to approve the minutes of October 3, 2005 Community Development Committee meeting. I ask if there are any changes or updates from the members of the committee? (No response). Hearing none, I ask that they're approved as published. I so move. Second? Mrs. Newman. Thank you.

Before I start with discussion point 4, I'd like to welcome Doug Joseph to the committee. I'm looking forward to having you part of the committee. So welcome.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Item number 4 on the agenda is to discuss the amended Section 971.08 of Chapter 971 "Municipal Parks" to set and change fees and charges for parks and recreation programs and facilities. Mr. Walsh. This is yours. I see you're ready to go.

Mr. Walsh: Yes, sir. Thank you, Chairman Baxter, President Hills, members of Council. As we do, and have done for the last couple of years, we need to get fees approved by Council in order that we can continue to operate. We have a couple of things in here. Some are adjustments to existing fees, and others are some new fees for some new proposed programs that we've come up with. Some of the programs involved here are the Mad Science Camp, Soccer Camp, Summer Play Ground Program, Soccer, Baseball, and Softball. And some of the new programs that we're talking about include, Art Camps, the Sign Say and Play Program, Hip Hop Dance, and Baby Signs Parent Workshop. The exhibit that you have should be familiar to most of you. It's very similar to what we've provided in the past with some changes. I don't really know what to tell you except that we do take a look at all of our programs each year and we try to adjust fees as necessary to help cover some of our costs. And with that being said, if you have any questions, I'd be happy to try to answer them if I can.

Mr. Baxter: Well thanks, Paul. I noticed that you had scratched out the old prices and put in new prices on the ones that have change. So it made it very easy for us to see what activities are changing. So thank you for that.

Mr. Walsh: Correct. Items in italics would be the new items whether it's a fee or a program.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. That was going to be my next question. How to identify the new ones. And these programs are going to begin next year, correct?

Mr. Walsh: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Very good.

Mr. Walsh: And as I believe you had requested at the last time we did this, we did try to hit everything for the entire year rather than doing the 6 month update that we had done in the past. So we believe we touched on everything. The only caveat I would make is that if a program comes up or comes available that we might be able to provide some time next year, we may have to come back to you at some point and say we'd like to add this program and add this fee. But at this point, this is the programs for 2006.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. How are the fuel costs? As we've all seen that increase in the last couple of weeks. How are those impacting your programs, if any of them?

Mr. Walsh: It doesn't impact our programs as much as it impacts our park operations.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Are there any questions from members of the committee? Doug.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Chairman, I was just curious. Most of these did not have any fluxuation in pricing. What was the methodology used to establish fees for the new programs, and the increased fees for established programs?

Mr. Walsh: We use zero base budgeting when we do program fee structures. And we do what we call a pre-program analysis. And we do come up with all of the costs, the direct costs that we believe will be in the program. And for the major programs, we typically look at them a lot more often. So for example, baseball, softball, soccer, those are the bigger programs. And we do take a look at those fees. Now there is one where, we would have some issue with some fuel because we do maintain athletic fields. So that is a consideration. The other types of programs that we operate include what we call contractor based programs. So for example, the Challenger British Soccer Camps, we contract with the Challenger Company that provide these programs for us. We negotiate a rate with them. When they tell us what the rates are, we tell them they're too high and we negotiate them down. But as with anything, prices do typically go up. And that's how we come up with their fees as well. We typically try to come up with about a $5 per child revenue over and above the fee that's being charged by some of these other programmers so that we can cover some of our in-house costs.

Mr. Baxter: Okay Paul. I also notice on the request, it was asking for a rule suspension. The reason for that is?

Mr. Walsh: We are going to be going to press in November with the new brochure that will come out in January. So it would be helpful if we could get these done basically, before we go to print.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And what's that time frame for doing that? You said November, but.

Mr. Walsh: What's our final? December 1.

Mr. Baxter: Okay.

Mr. Walsh: About December 1 is when we would absolutely drop dead, need to have them in place.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And the printing time on that would be?

Mr. Walsh: It's about two weeks to print, and then compile it and get it out.

Mr. Baxter: Two weeks? Okay. That is rather tight, so I understand.

Mr. Walsh: Yeah, it is.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. If there are no questions from members of the committee. Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Mr. Walsh, what are, I don't understand the changes you've made in the soccer program here. Would you explain that a little bit? First you had soccer, and then spring soccer for the ____________ etc., etc.

Mr. Walsh: Okay. Yeah. That was more of a let's clean it up type of a thing. When we first brought these programs to you, we outlined every single thing that we did, every single season. And we decided that after looking at our costs, that we should combine, instead of having spring soccer as a set, and then fall soccer as a set, that we would just put it in as soccer. So we did eliminate the entire essentially, spring soccer section of this. And we crossed out the word 'fall'.

Mrs. Newman: But are you still going to have it like spring and fall?

Mr. Walsh: Yes. We will still have two seasons of soccer. But we will just have one set of pricing.

Mrs. Newman: So would this $28 then for example, would include both sessions, spring and fall?

Mr. Walsh: No it doesn't. That's one session. It's a one session price.

Mrs. Newman: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: I also noticed Paul, that the prices did not go up for the soccer. At least for residents. There was a slight increase for those non-residents or after deadline.

Mr. Walsh: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: I think that's fine. I just wanted to make sure that the committee members had noticed that change. Okay. Any other questions from the committee? Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Joseph: Yes. All the programs listed here, what would you say are the most popular programs that you get the most bang for your buck out of?

Mr. Walsh: The sports programs. All of them.

Mr. Baxter: One other question Paul. If a resident would like to see new programs, what is the process they go through to have them added to, or at least look at to see if the program we might want to sponsor?

Mr. Walsh: We do it different ways. We take suggestions by e-mail. We take suggestions by phone. Typically, if a person comes up and says, I have this business that I provide a program, and I want to provide it through your department, we ask for a written proposal with pricing and construction fees and the type of program they want to do, the group they want to attract. So we do ask for some written information from those types of folks. But if someone comes up with just an idea like hey, this would be kind of cool, we'd take a look at it and see if it's feasible.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I brought that up because I did have a gentleman come to me and suggest that it would be a very nice program to have an equestrian program here with the city. And he does have a program with other cities close by us, and suggested that would be something very nice. So I gave him your name and suggested he call you. But I wasn't sure what that _________ the process or not.

Mr. Walsh: No that's fine. That would be great. I'd be happy to talk to him.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Very good. Okay. Any other questions from committee or Council members? (No response). Hearing none, I'm looking then, I'd say we move to send this to Council for its first reading with a request for rule suspension. Do I have a second? Mr. Douglas. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). All opposed? (No response). Hearing none, motion carries.

And with that I will adjourn the Community Development Committee at 7:44.

Community Development Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
October 17, 2005
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 17, 2005

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

Mr. Beougher: I will call to order, the Safety Committee at 7:45.

Item 2 on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the October 3 Safety Committee meeting. Any changes to those minutes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda for tonight's committee meeting. I do have a speaker slip. And I would also like to add a discussion on a Resolution in Support of Red Ribbon Celebration Week which is next week. And I would make that motion to amend the agenda. It doesn't need a second. All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion carries. Agenda is amended. Item 3a will be the comment from Jeff Morrow and 3b will be the resolution. Mr. Morrow, please.

Mr. Morrow: Thank you, Chairman Beougher. My name is Jeff Morrow. I live at 2042 Belltree Drive. The issue I'd like to bring up tonight is some paint in the street in front of 6402 Birchview Drive North. About a year and a half ago, somebody vandalized a vehicle in front of that address by dumping blue paint all over the hood of the vehicle. Consequently, when the vehicle left, it left blue paint all over the street. In fall of 2004, I brought this up to an Officer Mielke and asked her to address the issue with the Street Department. She said she would. She got back to me and said that they would take care of that in spring of '05. It's now the fall of '05 and the paint's still in the street. I'd just like to know when this issue would be addressed. I don't know if it was an oversight or somebody forgot or whatever. I'd just like the issue to be addressed. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you for the reminder Mr. Morrow. Mrs. Reichard?

Mrs. Reichard: Tomorrow.

Mr. Beougher: Tomorrow. Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. Item 3b is the Resolution in Support of Red Ribbon Celebration Week. And this is an ongoing program. And we last passed a resolution of support of this in the year 2000. And we've missed the past 4 years and I'd like to kind of re-establish that tradition. With that point, it would come from the Safety Committee. And I hate to spring on you guys, but does anybody want to take a look at the resolution we passed then? I showed it to the Safety Committee members. Maybe we could just pass it down. But basically, it's opposing abuse of drugs and alcohol by youth, sponsored by Ohio Parents for Drug Free Youth. And I would like to make a motion to send this forward as a Resolution of Expression for passage at next Monday's Council meeting. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). Any questions from members of Safety or members of Council? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion carries.

Item 4. This is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE REYNOLDSBURG DIVISION OF POLICE TO CONTINUE TO ACCEPT "GANG RESISTANCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING" GRANT AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. We did hear presentation from Mrs. Reichard on this two weeks ago. Any changes in the time schedule for this? Do you need the money sooner than?

Mrs. Reichard: No. There was no emergency asked for on it. I did however, take the liberty of putting together just a little bit of information that if you wanted to know more about the GREAT Program, a lot of it you know, it's the Gang Resistance And Education Grant that we use with the youth in our schools. And there's sort of a brief little overview that I found in my files that I wanted to share with you. And I can either pass it out now or after the meeting, or send it in your packets, that I thought you might find interesting. And certainly goes hand in hand in many ways with the Red Ribbon Campaign. And I have to tell you, that's something that's really near and dear to my heart since I established it in Franklin County in the late 80's. And it is wonderful to see that that tradition has been carried on. And it's something I would like to see all of us wearing red ribbons next week. It is a show of force I think when adults do that and show to youth that we do stand for working with our children in drug and alcohol abuse, or alcohol and other drugs is usually what we say, for the abuse in our youth. And our adults too. So thank you very much for bringing it forward.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. So this will go on, I'll make a motion to move this forward for second reading at next weeks Council meeting. Does anybody have any questions before I do that? Does anybody have any questions for Mrs. Reichard? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Yes. I was just curious. How long has Reynoldsburg participated in this grant program?

Mrs. Reichard: Oh gosh, for several years. I am sorry, I don't have that information right in front of me. But it has been, how many?

Mrs. Frazier: 2003.

Mrs. Reichard: 2003.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Any further questions, or discussion, comments? Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. I will move to send this forward for second reading at the October 24 Council meeting. Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion carries. This will go forward for its second reading.

And with that, I will adjourn Safety at 7:50.

Safety Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
October 17, 2005
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 17, 2005

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:51.

The first item is the approval of the minutes of the October 3, 2005 Service Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item, approval of agenda. Does anybody like to add anything to the agenda? (No response). If not, it'll stand approved.

Item 4, Discussion, Taylor Road right of way donation. Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: I'm sorry. I don't have anything on that at all. (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Clemens: It's new to me. Mr. Parkinson.

Mr. Parkinson: I was worried for a second I might not have a reason to get up tonight. The Birch's purchased what I have always known as Harley Snook's old house on Taylor Road. And that was I think, a 14 acre tract. But they split off, the developer split off Harley's house and sold a little less than an acre to the Birch's. That was subsequent to the zoning that took place for the entire parcel. And within the zoning text for the entire parcel, was an obligation of the developer to donate 10 feet of right-of-way to the city along Taylor Road. Well the Birch's now being separate from the developers tract, are still under that obligation by virtue of the original zoning. And so this is their donation of the 10 feet.

Mr. Clemens: On this, do we have to have a plot plan on this, Nancy?

Mrs. Frazier: No. You just need to accept it.

Mr. Clemens: By a motion?

Mrs. Frazier: No. An ordinance.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Are there any questions for Mr. Parkinson on this? Members of committee or members of Council?

Mr. Baxter: Have we accepted the remaining portion of it from the developer?
Mr. Parkinson: No.

Mr. Baxter: And do we know when that's going to be offered up, or after development?

Mr. Parkinson: We don't know. We would anticipate that it would come approximately at the same time with any development plans.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you, Dave.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Are there any other questions for Mr. Parkinson? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council for its first reading as an ordinance to accept this donation of right-of-way. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Item number 5 is Discussion, Acceptance of easements. We've had these easements on before. I believe this will be up for the third reading.

Mrs. Frazier: These are the new ones from the school.

Mr. Clemens: We have a, .495 acres, Sanitary Sewer Easement, Board of Education of Reynoldsburg City School District (Slate Ridge Elementary); b, .0282 acres and .586 acres Water Utility Easement; Board of Education of Reynoldsburg City School District; c, three easement strips for waterline purposes; 29,182 sq. ft.; 25,765 sq. ft.; 17,019 sq. ft.; Board of Education of Reynoldsburg City School District (Waggoner Road Junior High); d, .462 acres Sanitary Sewer Easement; Board of Education of Reynoldsburg City School District (Waggoner Road Junior High). Are there any questions pertaining to these easements? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council for the first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye").

Item number 6, Discussion, Natural Gas Aggregation - replacement of expiring Aggregation Agreement with IGS. And I think Mr. Brandt's here to discuss this.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you, Mr. Clemens, members of Council. What we have before us is the replacement agreement for the IGS agreement with the City of Reynoldsburg's residents under the Natural Gas Aggregation Program which we entered into about 2 years ago. The current agreement is due to expire December 31. The replacement agreement calls for, or allow for, 3 ½ cents per CCF off of natural gas rates for a one year period. The gas market is, I'm sure you're all aware, is much like the gasoline market. It's very volatile and it's very fluid right now. And this is currently the offer that we have before us. And it is not the only offer out there for a resident. If they so choose, when the city entered into the aggregation world, it was new and exciting, and challenging. It remains exciting and challenging and new to most of us still at this point. The PUCO offers this is not the only opportunity available. Merely just another opportunity for residents. There's about 3500 to 4,000 that change depending on people moving out and other issues with current subscribers. And what we're planning or doing, or would be done, is once this is approved, there would be a letter mailed out. We're getting a lot of phone calls because there's been a lot of publicity. I'm sure all you've seen in the paper lately about anticipated higher natural gas cost for the fall and the winter season. And that's basically what it amounts to. It's an issue that we have our natural gas aggregation certificate by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. These agreements all go down to them as well. And we continually, or quarterly, send them our annual reports. So we wish we had a better price but that's what's being offered right now. In some cases, there are only the aggregators or the suppliers are only offering fixed rates. And the fixed rates are currently higher than what our proposed agreement is. Whether it's good or bad, I don't know. Anybody could tell you, it'd be like betting on the stock market tomorrow. But at least it's something people can count on and not enter into an agreement with possibly a consolidator or aggregator that's, we've all read where there have been numerous ones come and go. And in this case, that was the city's rationale for getting involved. And a lot of residents had concerns over receiving mailings as to who to sign up with, who not to sign up with. And we, the Council voted at that time to approve it. And we entered into the agreement. And to this date, we still serve somewhere between 3500 and 4,000 homes.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the committee? Yes.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to ask you Mr. Brandt, do you feel, in your opinion, it would be better for us to accept this agreement than a fixed rate? Is a fixed rate higher, do you think?

Mr. Brandt: Current rate is 3 ½ cents off of per 100 feet off of Columbia's GCR rate. Which as of this morning, was $1.29 a cubic foot, or 100 cubic CCF. Fixed rates right now are anywhere from $1.59 to $1.79 if you can get them.

Mrs. Newman: Well, it sounds good. Thanks.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mrs. Newman. Are there any other questions from the committee? (No response). From members of Council for John? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. One quick question I would have is based upon this agreement. Where does it stand in relationship to other agreements? Is this good, bad? Are we getting average? Are we getting anything better? As you said, (inaudible).

Mr. Brandt: Some communities don't have an agreement yet from what I've told this morning. Inasmuch as we had an agreement previously with IGS, they went ahead and extended this offer to us. And some of the fixed rate communities that had gone, and some of you may have been here at the time. I think Mr. Beougher was, Mr. Hills, and it's hard to remember, Mr. Clemens was, adopted at that time for the fixed rate. We took a percentage off, which at that time was 5% off of Columbia's GCR rate. And that two year contract from what we're told, worked out to be, I don't know if it's an appropriate term, more beneficial than what those who opted for the fixed rate. But as I said before, it's kind of like driving from here to somewhere. The price of gas is all over the board. And natural gas is probably even worse is what they're telling us. I look at that ____ price once in a while on the computer, and you look at it and it's like reading somebody's EKG sometimes after a bad night. But as I said, this merely is an option. If someone chooses to go to the PUCO's web page and do their apples to apples and finds that one of the suppliers may be a better option than this for them, then they have that freedom as well.

Mr. Baxter: Follow up question if I may. The follow up question I have is, do our residents have to re-apply who already have this?

Mr. Brandt: No. They will, IGS wants this approved, we'll do a mailing to all of them and advise them as to what the situation is. We're getting phone calls every day. And as many as we talk to, we tell them it's in the process. And hopefully if it's approved, we can give you a firm answer. As of today, we can tell you it's on the Council agenda.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. One last question? Is there a time frame in which our residents have to then apply to these programs? Or this program?

Mr. Brandt: Once this is approved, the letter would go out and they would have I believe, 15 days to respond. That's why the more promptly it's passed, then the more promptly the letters will go out. They won't mail any letters out and tell them, here's what you've got until we execute the document.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Mr. Brandt, I appreciate your work on this and your leadership here. You bring an alternative to the citizens of Reynoldsburg and I appreciate that. I'm sure there's quite a few that do also. I guess what you're saying is, that we're always going to be 3 ½ cents lower than Columbia Gas? Is that correct?

Mr. Brandt: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Brandt: Their GCR rate.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mr. Brandt? Nancy.

Mrs. Frazier: John, you said that this expires December 31? The reference in here that they took out was November 30 and that's what your memo in August had said. So would you check and make sure that there's not a month difference there?

Mr. Brandt: Well, we had to notify whether we were going to do anything or not I believe was, by the end of September. And then that date changed. They wanted to know if we had intentions of doing something.

Mrs. Frazier: I understand that. But in this document that you gave them that's going to replace what we have, they say they took out November 30. So it's not December 31. That's what, that needs to be checked because you don't want to end up with a month that there isn't anything in there.

Mr. Brandt: Okay. Right.

Mr. Clemens: John, you have this as an emergency.

Mr. Brandt: Well, the sooner it's passed if it's acceptable, that way they can go ahead and do their notifications and mailings.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the committee about this not being an emergency? (No response). It seems like it needs to be for the public. If there are no other questions, I'd like to send this to Council for passage as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, John.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Clemens: Next item, Discussion, Bartlett Road Storm Relief Sewer. This has been before our committee for discussion and we discussed the issue. It was held last week for Mr. Whitney who informed us of how we could finance the project. And we did get a memo from Howard. The thing I'd like to ask, I think Mr. Whitney's here. If you read the memo it says, I recommend advancing the necessary funding from the unappropriated General Fund to the project account where appropriate when we know what other Enterprise Projects are going to be done. In the near future, we can switch to a permanent source of funding upon which the General Fund will be repaid. I think in the ordinance that we pass, we will have to, we should state where the finances, how the finances will be funded. And it's my understanding Mr. Whitney, it will be funded by the Storm Water account. Am I correct on that? Can't that be in there? Or do we have to, I don't know what we're waiting on is my question.

Mr. Whitney: Yeah. It will be serviced from the Storm Water account. Yes.

Mr. Clemens: So in the ordinance, that's how it would be financed through the Storm Water account?

Mr. Whitney: Yeah. The debt we incur for it will be serviced from the Storm Water account.

Mr. Clemens: Then that would be the appropriate thing to put in the ordinance, that the project will be funded through the Storm Water account.

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. The project itself is, low bid was, Underground Utilities Inc., $715,606. And the engineering from Evans and Mechwart is $69,000. So the total cost will be $784,606. And we will get that from the unappropriated General Fund to be financed, paid back through the Storm Water account. That correct?

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Whitney: It will be paid back from some kind of a debt issue which will be serviced by the Storm Water account. There's not enough in the Storm Water account to...

Mr. Clemens: I realize that will be paid back through debt service.

Mr. Whitney: And this is a long term project, so it should be funded over a period of time.

Mr. Clemens: Will you do me a favor? Will you get, if I move this on, will you get with Nancy and get the proper, how you want it, the proper printing on the ordinance?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: If you would please? Are there any questions from the committee pertaining to this ordinance? (No response). It will have to be an emergency because the bid was good for 60 days. And I believe that comes up around the 7th or something of November. And we won't have another Council meeting in time to do that other than this coming Council meeting. Because we have 5 Mondays. So are there any questions from the committee pertaining to this project? Yes. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I'd like to see if Mr. Parkinson can give us some inside information on this. I sat in one of the meetings one time. Could you give us some details about how it's going to be? And do we have any, all the do's and don'ts about it that was discussed at one time concerning the, are we going to go all the way to the creek? And all the other little details on it. Could you just give us a briefing on that?

Mr. Parkinson: The project begins at the intersection of Bartlett and Parkinson. There is a sump there. And in the current storm sewer system that serves that sump is insufficient to convey waters from high intensity, or long duration storms away from the site. The sump fills up and we get basically a pond. We have evaluated a number of options for the city to consider on how to address the ponding water. Some of the options merely move the water to other locations of ponding. And the selected approach by the city was a relief storm sewer that provided a positive solution by conveying large volumes of water from the sump, down Bartlett, little zig zag across the park, and directly into Blacklick Creek. So it is piped from the sump all the way to Blacklick Creek. The portion across the park will miss, and Paul may disagree, but it'll miss most of the good stuff in the park. We're not going to tear anything up that was put in. There will be some grass that obviously needs to be replaced. We're not mounding, or humping, or doing anything to detract from the usability of the park. We are going down the road for the most part, in the subdivision portion of the project. So we will have some pavement to put back after the pipe's put in. I believe it's designed to convey a 25 year storm. Where most storm sewers in town are designed, not only this town, but in Central Ohio, the design standard's pretty much 5 years.

Mr. Stearns: What size pipe is that going to take?

Mr. Parkinson: I don't know. I don't remember the size. It's a big pipe.

Mr. Stearns: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Stearns. Are there any other questions from the committee? Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. I was wondering, we have some funds in our Storm Water Fund. Has anybody considered perhaps not financing all of the cost of this and taking part of the funds out of our Storm Water Fund? Or would that be a good idea, so we didn't have to finance so much?

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Whitney. The question is, we have Storm Water Fund, surplus of maybe around 400 some thousand, I'm not sure. Would it be proper to take some out of that and not bond as much?

Mr. Whitney: I don't think so. This is an Enterprise Fund. It will not affect the General Fund at all. All the servicing will come from the Enterprise Fund. And again, this is a project which will provide benefits over a period of years. And therefore, it's very much appropriate to fund it to the time frame in which the benefits will be received.

Mrs. Newman: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: I do think we have a smaller project coming up that there's a possibility on our bike path, of taking that out of our Storm Water Fund. Because it may only be 170, $180,000. And that wouldn't depreciate it that much. So that could be a possibility when that comes back that we could take that out of that fund without hurting it at all. But that would be something to discuss and think about on that. Thank you, Mr. Whitney. Are there any other questions from Council? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you Chairman Clemens. Dave, a couple of quick questions if I could, dealing with the storm sewer. You used a couple of key phrases and I want to address those if I could. And high intensity and long duration was one area that I heard you discuss. And is that normal to go after a high intensity or long duration type of sewer project? Because you implied also that this is a 25 year sewer versus a 5 year which is normal. Do we have a 5 year? I'll get to the questions now. Do we have a 5 year in place now?

Mr. Parkinson: No.

Mr. Baxter: What do we have in place now, and why is that insufficient? Because you also made the comment that it was insufficient. So I'm going to tie it altogether if I could.

Mr. Parkinson: It's insufficient to carry the high intensity __________, a heavy thunderstorm for example where a lot of rain comes down almost instantaneous. All systems are designed for some spacial distribution of rain fall. It comes down softly over a long period of time. It comes down heavy all at once and it's a problematic, probabilistic kind of analysis. And what we do today, we size our storm sewers to convey what's called the 5 year storm, and I think it's a 24 hour rain fall event that would recur once every 5 years. Which is a heavier rain fall than you would expect to have in a 1 year rain storm that you would get every year. So that's our design standard. When these storm sewers were built, and I don't know this to be true, but I'm assuming that the standards were not nearly as rigorous. And so when we went to evaluate how big should we make the pipe, because you can't make the pipe big enough to carry every rain fall event because there's always one bigger. So we decided, do we make it 5? It doesn't make much sense to do this kind of an investment if all we're going to do is protect it. How about 10? 25 seemed to be a good break. That seemed to go from 5, to 10, to 25. Didn't get the pipe too terribly much bigger. To go any higher, it got crazy. And so that's sort of why we picked that rain fall event. So what's going to happen, if we get the 50 year storm two months after we build this thing, you're all going to look at me like I'm nuts. So I'm banking on the fact that we're not going to get the 50 year storm for another 50 years. I'll be gone and you won't have to yell at me.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. A few more follow up questions if I could Chairman?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: The condition of the current sewer where we're at right now, would the cost be similar if we had to replace it? Say it was totally destroyed. Would the cost be the same? Or similar?

Mr. Parkinson: No. We're counting on using the capacity of the existing storm system that we have there today. We're not going to replace it. We're going to enhance the capabilities of the existing storm sewer system.

Mr. Baxter: So this will be a new one that would be, it would augment the existing sewer line.

Mr. Parkinson: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Will other communities, areas around that, be able to tap into that sewer system that we're building to be able to give some more value to other areas that may have the same type of situation with flooding?

Mr. Parkinson: The quick answer to that is, yes. The longer answer is, that the more you put in, the less capacity it has at the upper reaches to access the conveyance that you're providing. So we would diminish at the upper levels, the benefit that we're deriving by building it to obtain, enhance performance somewhere down stream. Does that make any sense?

Mr. Baxter: That makes sense. So in other words, we'd get 19 years instead of 25 years out of the sewer.

Mr. Parkinson: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: That's what you're suggesting. Okay. The last question Chairman, if I could? With this storm sewer being put in, the community in total in that area would benefit from that. Today, it's suggested that maybe one or two homes are being impacted by that. During the last event, how many homes, if you can remember, were damaged by the flood?

Mr. Parkinson: I had no first hand involvement in evaluating the, so I don't know.

Mr. Baxter: I didn't think you did. Yeah. I know we had some documentation if you remember, at the beginning of the year that showed how many that were there. I thought there were pictures of it that showed many different homes that were under water. I'm looking at some right now and I'll pass them to the rest of the Councilmen to see what we were looking at here. And I've got one right here that's perfect. It shows the whole street and pretty much everything that you see under water. Time helps you forget some of the things that have happened, and shows the importance of the project and why we're discussing it. And I think that's where I was getting with. There's going to be more benefit than 1, 2, or even 3 homes in this ____________ event. Thank you for the time, Chairman. I appreciate it.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Dave, do we have easements for this project? Do we need easements?

Mr. Parkinson: No. We do not need easements.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Good. And now just to follow up, be a little bit more specific than Councilman Baxter, we heard about a flooding problem at Hentz. And I was just wondering, if maybe it would be possible to hook into this and relieve that a little bit?

Mr. Parkinson: We've just briefly looked into that mostly to see if the sump does exist as was suggested. It does, to no surprise. It would be a little beyond utilizing this particular pipe to provide any benefit to that location. That may take a whole new approach in another _________ . We've been asked just today by the Service Director to drill into that a little more and see if we can come up with a little more detail.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clemens, I have one more question but it's for the Auditor, but if you want to wait on that.

Mr. Clemens: In the situation with Hentz, we're going to have a meeting and discuss that I think, this coming week. Looking at Hentz, you could probably go in in a relief area between Parkinson and Hentz Drive, and over in through there. There's a big relief area there. The only problem with that is, it fills up. It all drains to the creek down through the, it fills up deep. Our storm sewers weren't big enough. They're bigger now than when those projects were built. It goes into the big outlet that comes by the Senior Citizen's. When it fills up and it can't get in the creek, it backs up. And then that causes problems filling up all of our area. So there's not one project. There's quite a few because of the size of our storm sewers that were put in 48 years ago, and our drainage underneath our curbs were smaller. So we do have those problems all over town. Mr. Stake, you have a question for Mr. Whitney?

Mr. Stake: Yes. Dr. Whitney, I guess we'd be borrowing about $784,000 from the General Fund. That would leave our General Fund balance at what?

Mr. Whitney: The unencumbered balance right now is about 3 million.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So about 2 and a quarter?

Mr. Whitney: I think it's $2,946,777.73.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And then, how long do you anticipate replenishing the General Fund? If we go ahead and go with this project, how long would it take to get the necessary funds to replenish the General Fund?

Mr. Whitney: We can get them in a relatively short period of time. Three or four weeks.

Mr. Stake: So, we could have the money....

Mr. Whitney: Depending on how we do it. If we go to the market, this is not big enough to go to the market, so we'd do a private placement on it, and we can do that quite quickly.

Mr. Stake: So by the end of the year, we'd have it replenished?

Mr. Whitney: We could. If we chose that alternative. Yeah. Sounds like we've got other potential projects coming up, and we'll probably have to check their status before we make any permanent ___________.

Mr. Stake: I agree. Thank you, Chairman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Are there any other questions pertaining to this? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, if I could. David, just to clarify some of the issues, certainly, what you had recommended and what we put out to bid, you had found some remedies, or suggested remedies that would have cost less. Some remedies that would have cost more. This is your recommendation from the information you have on the issues, this was the most reasonable way to address it to try resolve those issues. Is that correct?

Mr. Parkinson: That's our opinion. It provides the most positive approach to resolve any issues.

Mr. Hills: Thank you very much.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Hills. Any other questions? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion to send this to Council for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Also, I'd like to send this to Finance Committee.

Next item on the agenda, is Adoption of Rules and Regulations and Forms, City of Reynoldsburg Right of Way ordinance.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Amy Elwood, the Assistant City Attorney, asked, sort of sent this to me on October 4, the day after she sent it to you all, and asked me to carry it forward since in fact I had made a lot of the requested changes that you see in the rules and regulations, and the one in the ordinance which we will get to shortly. The changes in the original document are fairly brief. I must say, Columbia Gas representatives were extremely helpful in walking us through this process. And what it meant to them as a utility, and one of those big things was the map that Exhibit "H" had asked for where all their facilities were. And I think in today's society, no one really wants to do that because of terrorists and whatnot. So we thought that was really reasonable and we had no reason to really have it. I think it was just part of what was proposed. Maybe had been used in some other communities. But we didn't feel it was necessary here. The other changes are very minor that you see on the rules and regulations. Just bringing them, updating them in terms of when it would be passed. And hopefully that will be in October, and hopefully that will be next Monday night. And then also, added a hardship application. It was created to address some of the issues on the strict applications of the right-of-way ordinance. And that was included in your packets. So I will attempt to answer any questions you may have about the rules and regulations for Chapter 907.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the committee for Mrs. Reichard? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Clemens, thank you. Sharon, I'm looking at the Reynoldsburg AEP road dispute discussion here. I won't go into it deeply, but if we accept this legislation and pass it, does that mean as it's written and we see it here, we are accepting these terms?

Mrs. Reichard: No. One has really, one's not connected to the other.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I was looking for. These are not connected, correct?

Mrs. Reichard: They're not connected. That's correct. We have received the application for right-of-way permits from all of the utilities with the exception of Insight. And in the ordinance it says, that I must, ordinance and the general rules, and the general rules as you know, are set down to apply Chapter 907 with the utilities and with others who seek to be in our right-of-way. I lost my train of thought. I'm sorry. It had to do with the AEP permit. What we're doing, those are very separate. The negotiations that are going on between the utilities and the city in terms of them challenging Chapter 907. Chapter 907 as you know, is in place. We have some minor (Tape Change). We're requesting in that ordinance for next week. But I have 45 days to respond to those permits. And from the first one I received, I must respond, I must put together a report and respond according to what we have on the books by November 9. That was my sort of drop dead date. And I need to get that information together. So what I was waiting for is this so that I can apply it. I don't feel like I have any strength to apply these rules and regulations until Council passes them and with the permit application. So it really is necessary to get this done, for Council to move forward for me to work with these utilities and to get these right-of-way permits on the books.

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you. Mrs. Reichard, this hardship application and circumstances, could you describe a scenario to me for example, what kind of hardship they would encounter and what kind of relief they would want? I mean, other than just the relief from the strict application of a right-of-way agreement. What kind of hardship could occur?

Mrs. Reichard: Mrs. Newman, I really wish I could give you a scenario. This is something that the attorneys put together. And I do not have the rationale. I just know that if you go through Chapter 907, it is a very strict ordinance. And there are certain dates, amounts of money that must be paid, certain adherence to things. And I think maybe, I'm going to surmise this, that there might be some smaller entity that would like to use our right-of-way. Especially for a short period of time. And there might be some issues surrounding that. Something that comes up at the last minute they didn't realize about. The dues dates etc. So those would be the kinds of things that might happen, and this just addresses that.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Are there any questions for Mrs. Reichard on this subject? (No response). If not, I'd like to make the motion we send this to Council as an emergency for approval. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, Sharon.

Next item is the discussion of Amendment of Ordinance No. 32-05 (Right of Way ordinance).

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. In going through the right-of-way ordinance, one of the things that I was really concerned about where they were giving the Service Director all this power. And that is that they can adopt rules. And I think really what it was is, what they meant was, develop rules. And so I ask that all of those be changed. And then there are some minor changes in the back. On 907.08, again, that's 'adopt' rather than 'develop'. And then down on 907.10, just took out some verbiage for some clarification. Especially with the 30 day publication period. There was some question about that and we changed it from 30 day period after such publication to 30 day period after receipt of regulations. And that is, hereinafter known as the comment. So it was just point of clarification. You should also know that the only, I brought up earlier about Columbia Gas, they're the only ones that really offered any kind of, and they were logic, it was logical sequence of comments that they had on the rules and regulations. So they were the only ones that took advantage of this 30 day period. No one else commented. We thought Insight was going to, but they didn't.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions for Mrs. Reichard from the committee? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Mrs. Reichard, struggling a little bit with the 'adopt' versus 'develop' concept, if you're developing regulations, don't you at some point want to adopt them and put them into place? I mean, you see where I'm going with this?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. This gave the power for the Service Director to adopt. I want, this is something that Council adopts. I can develop the regulations, and changing the regulations, and bring those changes to you. But you are the ones that adopt.

Mr. Beougher: Give you all this power and you don't want it?

Mrs. Reichard: No, I don't. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Alright. Is there anything in here that has a protocol for Council to make those adoptions of the regulations you develop? Is there a process stipulated in the ordinance?

Mrs. Reichard: I think that's in the ordinance. That's in the ordinance.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: And I do think that's a wise move. Because I know the complications that you can get in as Service Director and let Council make the adjustments.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, you do.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mrs. Reichard pertaining to this ordinance? (No response). If not, I'd like to send it to Council for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the Ordinance to Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Reynoldsburg Adopted by Ordinance No. 131-95 on November 27, 1995 and as Subsequently Amended - southeast corner of Lancaster Avenue and Slate Ridge Boulevard; from CC to PD and CS; applicant, Preferred Real Estate Investments II, LLC and C&T Slate Ridge LLC c/o Jill Tangeman.

Ms. Tangeman: Thank you. Good evening, members of Council. I'd like to make a couple of introductory comments. I understand, and we were in receipt of information today that was circulated, we understand, among members of Council that concerned the Scioto Reserve development in Delaware County. I was to just quickly address that information. First, point out, probably the most important part of this is, that while Mike Kenney and Don Kenney have the same last name, they are father and son. Mike operates his own development company. Preferred Real Estate is not a Don Kenney Company. It is not owned by a Don Kenney. It is not in partnership with Don Kenney. Mike operates his own company, does his own development, his own construction, his own landscaping. They are not related companies. Mike does use Village Communities to do its marketing for them. They come in. They are a sub-contractor just as if they would hire out any other sub-contractor to handle sales contracts and that sort of thing for them. But there is no relationship between the two companies. So you might as well have circulated information about M/I, or Homewood, or Dominion. That's the extent of the relationship between the two companies. The second that I want to point out is that the situation at Scioto Reserve concerns 1,000 acre development with more than 1,000 homes in it. And it's the relationship of a homeowners association and its developer. That situation can't happen here. First off, we're talking about an entirely different scale. But more importantly, we're talking about a condominium development in this project. By law, under the condominium statutes in

Ohio, a condominium developer cannot retain any interest or any involvement, contractual or otherwise, with the condominium project beyond one year. They have to release all interest within one year. That situation is not going to be the case in this proposal. I'm happy to go into more detail about that information. But frankly, it is unrelated to the proposal at hand. We would hope that the Council would look to our application and what's in front of you and address it on its merits. Not based upon some unrelated development, and unrelated developer. We have made every effort to address concerns of staff on this project. We've tried to work as hard as we can to address your concerns. And we'd certainly hope you would focus on what the merits of this application are and not unsubstantiated, unrelated information. And I would appreciate that in this concern. To the merits of the development, we did provide you, I think almost two weeks ago now, with some additional information. When we were here at committee the last time, there was some misunderstanding about what papers should be in front of you. What version of the development text should be in front of you. And so hopefully, you have all of that accurate information. We did add to the development text, a statement that the commercial developer will be escrowing $40,000 for a right turn lane if that's determined to be needed in the development. We also added some architectural standards. Also added some information regarding the garage door bays of any service related projects so that none of that is facing out onto Lancaster Avenue. We also provided you with some updated economic information. And I asked Mrs. Frazier to put that sheet in front of you again just to make sure we are all operating off the same page. They were so similar, and there weren't dates on them. I wasn't sure what had gotten into the packets. The information that we worked with Dr. Whitney on, the only change from the original that we showed you is relative to the residential condominium unit income tax. And overall, this shows about a $12,000 difference in terms of income tax between what the proposed application is in terms of a mix of retail and residential versus big box retail on this site. I want to remind you of course, that this site sits undeveloped at this moment. So any money you get is more than what you're getting today. But in terms of what could be, the difference is pretty minimal. Certainly in terms of property tax value, it's a substantial increase with very little impact on city schools. So that will bring, the real estate taxes will bring a lot of additional revenue to the Reynoldsburg City Schools without really adding to the burden on that. So we feel that this is a good proposal in that regard. I think those are the new information. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have on the project at this time.

Mr. Clemens: Ms. Tangeman, how long was the escrow on the...

Ms. Tangeman: I think it was for a period of 5 years. But I think that's certainly up to negotiation in that regard if you'd like to hold it longer than that. I'm being told it was 10 years. So it was a period of 10 years through October 31, 2016.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from committee? (No response). Questions from members of Council? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. My question is on the income tax projection here. On the condominium units, you're projecting $30,375 in annual income taxes from people who live in those condominiums. Can you tell me how you came about that?

Male: Yes. The estimate was for, out of 135 residents that are anticipated to live in the condominiums, 25% of those would work in the City of Reynoldsburg. And that information was from Dr. Whitney. We originally stated 50% and through our conversation with Dr. Whitney, reduced it to 25%. Which from what I understand is city average.

Mr. Stake: Dr. Whitney, is that correct?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Are there any other questions? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I have a question. We've been dealing with sidewalks requested at the Livingston House in order to get children walking from developments on 256, apartment developments on 256, to school at Graham Road and Hannah Ashton and so forth. In the course of my wandering around the Livingston House property and the adjacent property, which is yours under a separate development, there's a stream there. And really for anybody to walk to school, they'd have to walk on the road to get there. And I'm assuming that even though you're saying not many school children will be living in either this one or the previous development, if there was a bus pickup, that would be their primary means of transportation. But I wonder if there's any way to maybe look into easing access in both locations. And maybe giving some thought as the construction documents are developed. Especially for this one since it's not done yet. Thank you.

Ms. Tangeman: Absolutely. We'll try to make sure we bring an answer back to you as quickly as we can.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from Council or members of the committee? (No response). Do I have a motion from any member of the committee to send this to Council for approval? There's a motion by Mr. Stearns to send this to Council for approval. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (Two voted "Yea"). Opposed? (Two voted "Nay"). I believe it's 2 - 2.

Mr. Hills: It will go forward for approval.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Hills has sent it on to Council for approval. Thank you.

That ends the Service Committee meeting at 8:40.

Service Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
October 17, 2005
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
October 17, 2005

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

Mr. Stake: And I would like to call the October 17 Finance Committee meeting to order at 8:41.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held October 3, 2005. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. We have one addition to the agenda. 3a would be the appropriation from the General Fund of $784,000 as an advance for the Bartlett Road Storm Sewer Project. Are there any other additions? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I'd like to add $69,000 to that for the engineering.

Mr. Stake: So we would add $69,000 on top of the...

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. It should be...

Mr. Stake: 784?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct. That's correct.

Mr. Stake: No? Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: No. 784 is the total.

Mr. Clemens: That is the total.

Mrs. Frazier: That's the total.

Mr. Clemens: We're counting engineering.

Mrs. Frazier: Engineering is 69,0000 and the project amount...

Mr. Clemens: 715?

Mrs. Frazier: The bid amount was 715,606, and that includes contingency. And then 69,000 was added onto that. So your total's 784,606.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct. Is that what you said, Ron?

Mr. Stake: I think that's what I said, Mr. Clemens. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: I'm sorry. I misunderstood.

Mr. Stake: I appreciate your clarification on that. Okay. So I have a motion. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Okay.

3a is the appropriation from the General Fund, $784,000. And this would be an advance from the General Fund to start the project. And this is recommended as an emergency from the Service Department. Right Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Is there any other discussion? Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: It's 784,606.

Mrs. Frazier: Yes. I said that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I'm sorry. $784,606. No change. Okay. Thank you. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake. Yes. The question I have is based upon the funding. I've heard a couple of discussions on how we need to go get funding. Are we doing bonding? What's the method of funding we're going to go to? Are we going to go out to the market and get a bond?

Mr. Stake: Dr. Whitney.

Mr. Whitney: The charges associated with going to the market would make it very high cost. We have an alternative of doing a private placement bonding with many different institutions.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And the turn around time on that if I could follow up?

Mr. Whitney: We get the attorney's opinion, then we'll go.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: And Howard, while you're still there, what do you think we're going to pay for that? What's our interest going to be do you think?
Mr. Whitney: We're probably talking in the neighborhood of 4%.

Mr. Stake: Around 4%? Okay.

Mr. Whitney: Don't hold me to that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Is that off the record?

Mr. Whitney: You realize it changes daily. And the Federal Reserve is still pushing rates up. So, who knows?

Mr. Stake: By the time we go, we don't know what it's going to be. But you're figuring around 4%?

Mr. Whitney: Yeah.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Howard. Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, one other question. Dr. Whitney also stated that in his conversations earlier when we discussed this in committee, that there were additional projects that we need to look at prior to going to funding. Are we going to get a list of those projects? Or are those determined as if we're going to go to funding or not? So if it's approved this evening to go to Council for full passage, at that time will we need to know that information?

Mr. Stake: I would think the administration would be making a recommendation on that. Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: You have 10 other storm water projects. If you'll recall, when EMH&T brought those forward, that they're recommending we also consider, we also have two new ones now. The Hentz that we just heard about recently, and a couple of other projects coming down the road. So we have approximately 15 projects that, now that we're into the storm water project, we'll be bringing forward and you know, trying to figure out how much money they're all going to cost us. But at that point, the City Auditor's going to have to make a decision on whether it's then worth it to go out to the bond market and replace that money. Because you know, we're starting to talk about a considerable amount of money now on these projects. But you already have 10 of them in the project that EMH&T did and the ones that were, I know we're meeting with Mel I think, Thursday on the one that was just brought up a week or so ago. And as we meet on the projects, and we'll be bringing the CIP to you. Those of you that sat in on CIP a week or so ago, we'll be bringing some of those projects to you also. And all those kind of fit together as to whether or not you want to bond them you know, in the open market or whether you want to do a private bonding issue.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Does that help?

Mr. Baxter: I have just one follow up question if I could. And that's where I was heading with that, Mr. Whitney. Is if we have multiple projects coming down the pike, and maybe Dave can help me out with this as well, is there a time frame in which we have to begin construction on this? Or can we look at a total portfolio of what we want to do with our storm water? And reassess what's the best way of funding those rather than trying to do in piecemeal. Can we save some money that way is what I'm asking?

Mr. Whitney: Well, I would recommend against doing it piecemeal.

Mr. Baxter: I agree.

Mr. Whitney: I'd recommend against figuring out what we've go to do and doing aggregate funding.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Whitney: Does that answer your question?

Mr. Baxter: Yeah, it did. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: I think what we want to do is get this bid here. Or we do have the bid. We want to sign the bid and get the deal going here as soon as possible on this one. Correct?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from member of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Clerk of Council.

Mrs. Frazier: I need to understand something here. In the ordinance, you're going to appropriate $784,606 from the General Fund. And you're going to pay that back with a bond issuance and sale. And that'll be paid back from the Storm Water Utility.

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

Mrs. Frazier: You're going to service that from the Storm Water Utility?

Mr. Whitney: It will be paid back from the results of the bond issue.

Mrs. Frazier: And you're going to service that with Storm Water Utility?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Now, what you just explained though a minute ago when the Mayor was talking about the other project, when the Mayor's talking about going to, how we're going to decide what we're going to do and all these 10 __________ projects that are out there, probably on the CIP, we can't wait here. And if we put this in the ordinance, we're almost bound to do a bond issuance.

Mr. Whitney: Yeah.

Mrs. Frazier: And we're going to do that come hell or high water. Is that right?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay. I just want to know that when we're writing the ordinance and it says we're going to do this, that's what we're going to do regardless of however many projects there are.

Because initially, when we were talking about putting projects together, the only two that we had on the table was this one and the erosion in the park. Now there's other projects out there in the CIP, but those haven't come up here yet.

Mr. Clemens: And I think that's correct. I think CIP's something you just look at. In other projects, that's something you look at. You have to bring them to Council and we'll decide. We understand there's probably thousands of projects in the City of Reynoldsburg that needs to be done. Just because we're doing one storm water project or the bike path, doesn't mean we're going to turn around and do 10 just like that just because we feel it's going to rain. There's things to look into and things to discuss. So even though we can say there's 10 that have been approved by our City Engineer, I think there's 25 at one time 15 years ago, doesn't mean that we're going to do them all at once. And this is something that has to come to Council, has to make decisions, and we have to really see what our problems are. So the one's that we're talking about now, we have the one that we're discussing and we have the bike path. After that, it's pure whatever comes to us for discussion, come before the committee. And then we can decide how far we're going to go and what the best way to do it will be.

Mrs. Frazier: Well I think the other thing to that was 784,000 coming out of the General Fund. While it's showing that there's almost 3 million there right now that's unencumbered, to put that back as quickly as possible, whatever you need, City Attorney opinion, bond counsel opinion, whatever, I think that should be done as quickly as possible so we can put that money back in there. So if you need something Howard, you need to yell.

Mr. Stake: Well and I think we did earlier speak about this being done and the money back in there by the end of the year. Correct?

Mr. Whitney: It can be done if that's the way the projects fall out. Sure. If you want to wait, we should be able to do that too.

Mrs. Frazier: But do you need direction from Council when it comes to like, if that's what you want to do? Does that mean, does Council have to direct you with an ordinance to go do something? Or do you just do that on your own?

Mr. Whitney: No. Council will have to direct me for a bond issue.

Mr. Stake: Even private placement note?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, the only reason, I'm a little confused. I want to make sure we understand what's going to happen is, we are going to take funds out of the General Fund to pay for this. And in this legislation, I think this is what Nancy's getting to, we are also going to request a bond to be issued, a private bond, to pay back the General Fund immediately. Or is the conversation now heading more toward, let's wait and see what the other projects are, and then bond it but still move forward with this project because we can get the money from the General Fund? I heard two conversations here and I'm not sure (inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, Chairman of the Service Committee, how do you see it?

Mr. Clemens: Well, I'm trying to get the funding corrected. And it's my intention to do the project, get the money back in the General Fund as soon as possible. If we have other projects to consider, then that's something we'll do. That, we don't have yet. We don't have CIP yet. We don't have anything brought to us yet. So I don't think that's something we want to sit around and wait on. My thought would be to get the money back before the first of the year. And if we have other projects to coordinate and put together, it'll take some time to do it. We don't do it over night. It may take 3, 4, 5, 6 months to do it. Then we can go out with a big bond sale. Now the proper thing to do is get the money back as soon as possible in the General Fund.

Mr. Whitney: Well, if that's the way you want to do it, that's fine. We can do it that way.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: That works for me. I'd rather deal with the issue at hand right here and worry about the other stuff down the road.

Mr. Whitney: My point was simply that, if we have others at the present time that were going to need funds from that fund, then we can do them together.

Mr. Stake: Well Howard, if you would get with the administration and find out what other recommendations they may have, come back to us with a number so we can go ahead and get going on doing whatever we need to do to arrange the finance or to get the bonds sold, or to have a note placed, or whatever. Please, as soon as possible. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: The status of the bike path, I know there was a presentation. Was that going forward quickly also? Because I mean, that's a project that we have said we are going to do. And I think we have an idea of the cost of that. So possibly, those are two known things that Council's talked about. The others that we've heard about, we haven't seen yet. But if we know we're going to be doing the bike path, in fact I think our discussion was, we wanted to do it during the winter because that was the ideal time to work on that. So whatever those costs were added to this, ought to be what we're bonding and get the General Fund back as quickly as possible. But I think we have two known projects that Council has said we are doing these.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. We have the bike patch erosion deal which the plans are just about done and will be ready. I think if I'm not mistaken, we're talking around 180,000. Is that correct Dave?

Mr. Parkinson: More or less.

Mr. Clemens: More or less? A little bit more than that? So if we want to add that to the bond, that'll take care of two of the projects that we're having the plans drawn for and that we've accomplished. Then if there's more to do, they'll have to come before the Service Committee. They'll have to have plans and they have to have, you have to go through the whole process. So that's the way I look at it and that's the way we should do it.

Mr. Stake: So I guess what I heard, the desire of the Service Committee Chairman is to go ahead and do the numbers up, or do some kind of note or bond for both the bike path and the storm sewer, the Bartlett storm sewer.

Mr. Clemens: Correct. I think that would be the thing to do.

Mr. Stake: Work that up for us and come back to us with that. Mayor, did you have something?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. That's been our recommendation too. That we go ahead and replace the funds in the General Fund. The other project that you still have before you is the Broadwyn Drive storm sewer also. Which there's a few legal issues there. But we probably need to go ahead and put that in with this package also. Because it's a project that we're just waiting on some legal issues to be worked out for that to move forward also.

Mr. Clemens: And the Mayor's correct on this. And I'm sorry I missed that one. It's been laying around for so long. I think we've discussed that many times and there are legal issues that need to be corrected on it. And if they are corrected, we should do that project. I mean, we could bond with this and discuss later. But any how, I think we should get the money back in the General Fund as soon as possible.

Mr. Stake: I agree. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: So have we decided to move forward with this particular legislation without the bonding attached so we can go ahead and get it started? Since you do have an issue with timing (inaudible).

Mr. Stake: The recommendation from the Service Committee is to go ahead and move forward. We would go ahead and advance the funds out of the General Fund, and then we would have the Auditor come back with the....

Mr. Baxter: Later. Very good. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure (inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Soon I hope. And I think he will.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you, Chairman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Okay. Then I will make a motion that we appropriate from the General Fund, $784,606 as an advance for the Bartlett Road storm water project. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Supplemental appropriation for Parks and Recreation Department for recreation expenses. Mr. Walsh, I believe you’ve had a successful year and you’re looking to help replenish your accounts here.

Mr. Walsh: Yes. And I think you’ll see that the amount is relatively insignificant based on what you’ve been talking about tonight and are going to talk about some more. We have had a successful year. The good news is that we’ve had increased participation in many of our programs that also relates to an increase in revenue. The increase in participation also brings an increase in expenses. And we did provide an analysis for you that was created by Scott Lahman, our Recreation Supervisor. It shows a break down of some of the major programs that we have operated, and some of the changes that we were looking at.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Walsh, when we take in these funds, they go into the General Fund?

Mr. Walsh: Yes, they do.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Walsh: We don’t run any Enterprise Funds in Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Stake: And you based your budget this year, you didn’t foresee these, the additional participation, which brought in additional revenue. But it also brought expenses that you had to pay for out of the funds that you had.

Mr. Walsh: Correct. Yes. And so what that has us doing, we’re essentially spending funds, and have spent funds that we were going to use for things like volley ball and basketball and drama coming up here in the fall. So we need to replace the funds that we expended, utilizing the revenue that came in that was additional. So what we’re looking at in a nut shell is, the chart that you were given shows an additional revenue amount for these programs of $7,713. And so we’re really just asking for a little bit of that to help finish out the year. We’re not even going to ask for the whole amount, but just some of it. For sports officials, we’re looking at about 3750. For recreation supplies, about $900. And for some additional maintenance supplies, about 1,150. For a total of $5,800.

Mr. Stake: And I appreciate the spread sheet that was attached to this. Very informative and real easy for me to understand. I appreciate that. So you are looking for account 110.340.5338 Sports Officials, 3750. 110.340.5215 Recreation Supplies, 900. And 110.340.5213 Maintenance Supplies $1150, for a total of $5800.

Mr. Walsh: Correct.

Mr. Stake: And this will get you through to the end of the year.

Mr. Walsh: That's our anticipation.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And you're looking for this to just go through the regular process?

Mr. Walsh: Well, after having some discussions about this, I believe that I should have asked for an emergency on this. The reason being that we're getting close to needing to expend the funds, and the process would take longer than what we could probably handle. So I would ask for, if we could do that, to add an emergency to this so we can get this done.

Mr. Stake: Well, if you need the money, you need the money. I don't have a problem with that. Mr. Clemens, question?

Mr. Clemens: I have no problem with it. I'll go along with it. But you know, we've discussed this many times about emergencies on things that come before Council. Especially things that involve money. If this is being watched during the period of the year, you should know when you're running low on money. I mean you should know, things like this should be brought to Council at least so we can have one or two readings on it. I mean, I'll go with emergency this time, but I would like everybody to think about items that they want passed as emergencies that could be brought to us four and five weeks ahead of time by looking ahead. Now you looked ahead, you know you're going to be out of money. But I'm sure if they looked at it four or five weeks ago, they would have known the same thing. So I think this is something that...

Mr. Walsh: And if I, I'd like to respond to that if I could, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stake: Go ahead.

Mr. Walsh: Some of the things that we've been doing in the Parks and Recreation budget is, we have been shifting money from one fund to another in a lot of cases. For example, in our fuel expense side, we've shifted significant dollars out of our Maintenance Supplies to cover that rather than trying to come and find more funds from you. We've also shifted money out of Conference and Planning into Postage to cover additional postage costs. So we've been trying to work within the funds that we had. And I do apologize for coming to you at short notice for an emergency like this. But we really were trying to figure out a way to cover these costs without coming and asking Council for additional funds. So that being said, I do apologize for the short notice. But we were making a good faith effort to try to work within the budget that we had.

Mr. Stake: Okay. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could. And Paul, help me out a little bit. Because _________ expense analysis do help. You certainly increased your revenue $7700. And increasing the revenue, you've increased your expenses 5500. So you've got a net increase of rounding to $2200. Now when you adjusted the fees earlier tonight where we started, is that making up the difference?

Because in essence, the 5800 you're asking for, 2200 of it came in increased revenues rather than the 7700. Because the difference between your revenue and expenses is what you net out. So you're 3600 is coming from the General Fund along with the 2200 that you had of revenues generated exceeding expenses applied. But now, have your rate increase from, you did earlier tonight, will that make up that difference based on your projections? Does that make sense, or not? You gave me the numbers.

Mr. Walsh: I did give you the numbers. I probably looked at the numbers differently than that so I'm not really following what you're saying.

Mr. Hills: Well, you tell us here that $7700 is the amount of additional revenue you've received.

Mr. Walsh: Correct. Yes.

Mr. Hills: At the end of that last column, 13th or whatever it is, you're saying additional expenditures because these revenues come in from additional people, is $5500. The difference between those two is approximately $2200.

Mr. Walsh: I see what you're saying.

Mr. Hills: And so you're asking for 5800 and sort of implied, well we've brought in revenues of $7700. So therefore, we're not even asking for all of it back. In reality, you're asking for 3600 out of the General Fund plus the $2200 difference.

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And my question is then, you're still, from your increased revenues and increased expenses, have you looked at your fees for next year to offset or increase those fees to offset this type of expenditure into '06?

Mr. Walsh: Yes. We did do that. Yes.

Mr. Hills: Sorry to make it complicated.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you. Thanks for making that clear. I appreciate that.

Mr. Stake: Even this year you've been charging enough. You just didn't anticipate the additional people enrolling in these programs.

Mr. Walsh: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. The programs aren't intended, and I remember we spoke about that before, to be a zero out each time. We do help out from a city in many of these programs as well. Do we not? You don't try to fully fund each program. Or do you?

Mr. Walsh: No. We try to fund as much direct cost as we can for the majority of the programs.

Mr. Baxter: For the majority of the programs. But you do have other programs in which we have costs for.

Mr. Walsh: Absolutely.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I think the point was, it was implying, I think from that conversation, you were trying to get zero. In essence, you're always going to have more expenses, not a whole bunch from the sound of it, but more expenses in revenues.

Mr. Walsh: That would be correct.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Mr. Walsh, just one other question. Do you have enough money for this to have two readings?

Mr. Walsh: We probably do but I would have to go look. We are currently closing out purchase orders for sports officials from what's remaining. That's a significant part of what we're asking about so that we can reopen for basketball and volley ball officials, drama instruction, art classes. We're pretty close to the edge.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I did want to try and accommodate Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I'll go with the emergency this time. But I'm just saying, I think....

Mr. Stake: I can appreciate what you're saying. Okay. Then I'll make a motion that we send this forward to Council for recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

The next item on the agenda is Discussion, Appropriation for the first payment on \$8,055,000 Capital Facilities Bonds, Series 2005 (Commercial Corridor Revitalization Phase II, and Taylor Road Reconstruction). This does come from the Auditor. Dr. Whitney, would you like to give us a brief overview on what you're asking for here, please?

Mr. Whitney: We're asking for a lot of money. When we created the budget for this year, there was no indication as to whether or not we would be doing any bonding. That was still up in the air. So we did not incorporate the interest payment for the bonds for the Taylor Road Phase II Bonds into the budget. Therefore, we need it. Payments due, I think around December 1. We need to get it to the paying agent probably a week earlier.

Mr. Stake: Okay. This was not budgeted for this year and you're asking for an emergency.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Stake: And you would like us to appropriate $148,260 from the unappropriated General Debt Retirement Fund to account number 310.991.5424.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Stake: Alright. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I didn't want to bring this up again. Did we just find this out yesterday or what? That we were going to do this?

Mr. Whitney: It's been known.

Mr. Clemens: Then I think it should have been brought up like I said, four or five weeks ago so we could have the proper readings on this amount of money.

Mr. Whitney: Well, I won't comment on that.

Mr. Clemens: Well, that's my comment on it. I'll go with it but I'm just saying, when we have time to do this we ought to do it so we have the proper readings on it.

Mr. Stake: I think the more this is in front of the public the better. So let's go, how long can we go before we actually have to pass it?

Mr. Whitney: We can go at least one more reading.

Mr. Stake: One reading?

Mr. Whitney: At least one more.

Mr. Stake: And then pass it on the second possibly?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: I was just going to say, I looked at the calendar and if we passed it on the second reading, that would still give us two weeks before the payment's due. So it would give you time to cut a check I think.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Then we can just send this on if it's okay with the members. But are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council?

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

And the next item on the agenda is the ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MERIT INCREASE (2%) FOR JULY TROUGH DECEMBER 2005, FOR THOSE ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 160, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. It had its first reading on October 10. This is something we've talked about pretty much all year basically. We wanted to make sure we had the funds available to do this. And we've checked, and we do have the funds available to do this this year. I know we got a couple of different papers in regards to the different departments and the total monies. And we were a dollar off in a couple of places. Dr. Whitney, we talked about this earlier today. A dollar light and a dollar heavy in some places. The same in others. And I think we ended up, the last sheet I have was received October 7 and the total was $35,783. And that changes from the one that came with the legislative request September 29. It was $35,782. So I guess my question is, which one are we using? 83?

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

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. I'll shoot my foot off on this point. Because this has always been a real stickler point for me. And I see the word 'merit' in there and I would really like to see us find some way to turn this into a merit program instead of a straight flat, let's do this. Which it seems what it turned out to be. I believe our employees deserve it. They deserve the ability to be recognized for the work that they've done. We have excellent employees here at the city and I think they deserve a right to say, let me stand up and show what I can do. And I think we should have a program that merits their bonus, or call it what you want, but there needs to be a way to say look, you did a great job this year and here's how we're going to show it to you. And not everybody in the city does an excellent job. There are people who do shine and we should take that opportunity to show them that. And that's my comment on that. So, there's my foot and it's shot.

Mr. Stake: Mayor, do you have anything to say in regards to how this has been figured out this year?

Mayor McPherson: We just pretty much put the additional 2% in across the board. You see on the one color there, people that we hired after January 1 got the 2 ½% that we did the first part of the year. And if they were hired after that, then they didn't get the 2% until they get their evaluation between November and December of this year. So they'll get a raise next year. But only got the 2 ½% this year.

Mr. Stake: And we are doing evaluations this year for consideration next year should the money be available.

Mayor McPherson: For the '06.

Mr. Stake: For the '06. And the evaluations have to be completed by?

Mayor McPherson: I believe it's December 10 maybe. I'd have to look it up. But the early part of December and it's to be done in November actually.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And if anybody who's here, different departments, Auditor, City Attorney and the Administration, as well as City Council. We want to make sure we have those evaluations done for this year and in, and we can take that under consideration for next year.

Mayor McPherson: I think the ordinance does ask that they be turned in after the evaluation's done and signed by the employee and turned into the Human Resources Department. And they'll actually put it as part of their file.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mayor, I was just curious, the unionized employees got 4% increase, and it was your intent to give 4 ½. I understand you were only going to do about half of that early in the year and now you want to do the balance now. Why 4 ½% for the non-union and 4% for the union?

Mayor McPherson: Union got 4 ½% also.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. I read it was 4%. Thank you.

Mayor McPherson: 4 ½.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Okay. Not hearing any, then I would make a motion that we send this on to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion?

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake, do you want to incorporate these numbers then?

Mr. Stake: Yes. I will make a motion that we send it on for its second reading with the numbers received October 7, 2005. Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Since we've talked about this since the early part of the year, do you think this might qualify for an emergency so we can get the people their salary increase before December? Mr. Clemens, I'm looking right at you on this one. But you know, it's not (End of tape).

Meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Finance Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
October 17, 2005
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)