

## SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 15, 2007

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

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

Mr. Hills: Prior to moving to the Committee meetings - there has been an incident today in Reynoldsburg. I think some of you probably would have heard it on the news, and there=s an awful lot of rumors going around. So I would like, I understand Lieutenant McKinley will give us an update of where, I guess the other side of the story, where things really are.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes. Good evening Council. I=ll just take an opportunity to tell you that today about 2:00, the high school as you know, is a pretty secure facility in terms of who comes and goes during the day. Most students enter and leave through one of several exits where they=ve got monitors. And today about 2:00, a student entered that showed a Reynoldsburg ID. And upon subsequent viewing of the video by one of the administrators, they realized that this did not appear to be a student at the school even though the person had a school ID. This young man was carrying a, what looked like an orchestra instrument case, and went into the school to the area of the band room, and was seen a short while later leaving the school without the instrument case.

Subsequently, at about this same time and unrelated, there was a car fire in the lot at the high school. So given that information, school officials made the determination that they were going to order an early dismissal from school. It was about 2:10 when this occurred, 2:15. Students left the building, were escorted out, buses came to pick them up, and as a precautionary measure, officers of course, were dispatched there to work with school administrators to try to determine what, if anything, to make of this individual seen in the surveillance video.

The Franklin County bomb dog was called and did a sweep of the building and it did have an indication of a positive hit on the locker of who they subsequently identified that student to be. The bomb squad from Columbus was called in, and using their robot, they were able to extract this orchestra container which turned out to have in it a clarinet and a couple of other items that we want to talk further with the student about. It was not a bomb. It was not any kind of dangerous device, but the investigation is ongoing in terms of the contents inside that violin case. But nobody was injured. A lot of people=s concerns were raised, as they probably should be when we have an incident like that at the school. But at this time, the investigation=s going to be contingent upon talking to the student who we are still trying to get a hold of.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Any questions for the Lieutenant? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills. Lieutenant McKinley, did the student have the school uniform on?

Lieutenant McKinley: I believe he did, although I have not seen the tape myself. I know that the initial concern was actually heightened when they saw the video as somebody, and I'm not sure if it was the school administrator actually misidentified the student, as someone who had actually graduated last year. Which of course made the initial concern even greater because you know, why was this person coming back into the school? But subsequently when additional administrators were able to view the video, they realized that in fact, it was a student that does belong in the school.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Lieutenant.

Mr. Hills: Anything else? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, President Hills. The only question I have is, then tomorrow everything's back to normal? Or are we going to clear the school for classes tomorrow?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir. As far as I know, the schools have not put any limitations on when they're going to be open for business tomorrow. So it should be business as usual tomorrow.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: And I'll call the Safety Committee to order at about 7:35.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda tonight? (No response). I have one change. I'd like to add for discussion, Grant application from the Department of Homeland Security for a live scan fingerprint system. I want to make that motion we add that. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). I'll add that as item 3a.

The next item, item 3 on the agenda, Approval of the minutes for the October 1, 2007 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any additions, deletions, or changes to those minutes? (No response). Okay. Seeing no comment on that, those stand approved.

The next item is 3a, Discussion: Grant application from the Department of Homeland Security for a live scan fingerprint system. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman. You'll see in the pack that we sent to you tonight, the description of the request is the letter that we're sending to the Homeland Security people setting out why we would like to have the equipment. You will also notice down at the bottom, that I made a hand-written note that said the deadline was 10-3-07. That has been pushed back to what they refer to as a >sliding date=. Which merely means, they're still accepting application until further notice. If you turn it to the back page, or the last page, the top portion, the top one-third is the information regarding the live scan grant from Homeland Security. We're requesting

a desk top scanner, \$49,784. Portable jump scanner, \$22,715. That will be the request that we=ll make to Homeland Security. Now it comes with a one year warranty. You=ll see in the middle section, if at the end of the year, City Council or the PD decides that they would like to get an extension on the warranty, those are the costs for a 12 month and 24 month warranty extension. You=ll also then see at the bottom third of the page, that we have put in there what the air card costs are going to be. We already have air card costs built into our budget. So that=s also not going to require any money. Just for information purposes, and I do have Lieutenant McKinley here tonight to elaborate on anything, we first started looking at this back when Lieutenant Nuesse was here. It did not become a priority item with us because we had several other things. As you=re aware, we got a lot of handheld 800 megahertz systems. We made application and received a lot of tough books, computer systems. So bottom line is, at the time it was not a priority so we didn=t submit an application, or we didn=t submit for it. We were notified however that, and I can only assume they didn=t give enough grants away, that they were opening this application deadline. And when you read through the letter that we=re going to submit to Homeland Security, especially the second paragraph, we outline why we feel we could use it. We tell you how many times we could have used it over the past three years. And as most people realize, when you have a piece of equipment like this, you would probably tend to use it even more. So any time you can get something for free, and again as I say, it=s not going to cost us a penny, we would like to make the grant application and see what happens. See if we can get it. And again, Lieutenant McKinley=s here if you have any other specific questions. But we tried to make the letter pretty self-explanatory and we tried to give you the breakdown of any costs that may be generated down the road. Again, this may or may not be a cost because we may decide not to warrant it an extra year or two. And again, the air card is already into our budget anyway for air cards. So no additional expense. Possibility, if we=re allowed to do this, that we=ll get \$72,000 worth of equipment.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mayor. Are there any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Joseph, let me ask a question too if I could. Lieutenant, I don=t like ever turning down something that=s free, but nothing is totally free. We now, if we fingerprint somebody, we bring them in, fingerprint them, correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And where our problem is, the fingerprints are accurate, but the name going with those, we find out from BCI&I, apparently is wrong.

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct. And there=s a time gap between getting the information from collecting it.

Mr. Hills: Now BCI&I, they pride themselves in turn around in less than 10 days on background checks. They don=t talk about fingerprints. So when we send a fingerprint what is their

turnaround time on the average fingerprint card?

Lieutenant McKinley: I know it's normally not in enough time for us to take action for a person that we have in custody that says they're one name, and we fingerprint them, send that information in. That person's through the process, through the criminal justice system and usually released by the time we get any information back from BCI. The real advantage for this particular case is that the mobile jump kit can go out on the street with the officer. So when we come across a suspect or a person who doesn't have any ID on them, and we want to ask, what's your name, and he says John Doe and we don't think he's John Doe, he puts his palm or his fingers on this machine and they can instantly tell us through interface with Columbus' automatic fingerprint identification system if he's got a warrant.

Mr. Hills: Now we're getting to some points of merit that sounds like they mean something other than just having another way to fingerprint somebody. There is one mobile unit. Who will have that? The Sergeant on duty or the commanding officer for that shift or something?

Lieutenant McKinley: That's what we envision is, we'll either give it to an officer who is senior on the shift, because sometimes the Sergeant spends some other time administratively on station handling paperwork and things like that. He may choose to give that to one of his Senior Officers who's out in the community to keep that machine out and available to officers as much of the day as possible.

Mr. Hills: Because there would be a centralized place where they can call back to get the machine to go to the individual.

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, the machine that's portable is actually connected through an air card back to our server on the police station. So when the person is fingerprinted in the field, within two minutes, we get an answer back from Columbus and BCI on whether this person has any outstanding warrants. And it'll also provide his identity if he has been fingerprinted through their system before.

Mr. Hills: So the jump scanner is not out in the field?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes sir, it is.

Mr. Hills: It is? Alright.

Lieutenant McKinley: The jump scanner's in the field and it has an electronic link back to the server in the Police Department.

Mr. Hills: And the air card cost is not anything new to us because we're paying that now on some system we have?

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct, sir. All of the cruisers have MDT=s, mobile data terminals, in them. And those have Verizon air cards that are in them that help them communicate back to the station. And that=s what this device uses also.

Mr. Hills: So the advantage here is, we=re going to get a quicker, and you=re saying basically, instantaneous verification of the fingerprints, or within five minutes?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir. Actually within two minutes is what they advertise. And that is the big advantage, because although it=s much easier to fingerprint someone with the inkless system such as this live scan, the real advantage is, the officer in the street will have that capability in the cruiser when he runs across a person that=s, you know, 3 in the morning, doesn=t have any ID and he=s caught behind some suspicious location, we can instantly get his identity and whether or not he=s wanted. Right now, that=s a much more cumbersome process.

Mr. Hills: And that=s going through the electronic base through Columbus, then through BCI&I.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir. That=s correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. And so we=re taking the, you=re becoming electronic in nature rather than the manual cards and doing the shipping and mailing.

Lieutenant McKinley: Absolutely. Yes.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Mr. Joseph, thank you. That makes a lot more sense to me now. Not, Mayor, not that you didn=t explain it, but it just, he did a better job.

Mayor McPherson: He works with it day in and day out.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions or comments on this item from members of committee or Council? (No response). Okay. I=m going to move that we pass this on to Council as a motion. Is there a second? Second by Councilman Stake. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item number 4 tonight, Discussion: Liquor Permit Request - new - (D2 and D3) - Epicures Inc., 7601 E. Main St., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Lieutenant?

Lieutenant McKinley: We actually have two liquor applications from Epicures. The first one for the D2 and D3 has been requested to be rescinded. The owner at Epicures is actually requesting a D5. He accidentally submitted for the wrong one. So for the liquor request for D2 and D3, that=s being rescinded. He=s changing it to a D5.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. So for this one, it=s being withdrawn?

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. So we can just, I guess we=ll just return that to the Clerk for disposal.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Joseph?

Mr. Joseph: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Lieutenant McKinley, could you give me a copy of the letter that they sent you requesting that that be rescinded? Or saying they will rescind it?

Lieutenant McKinley: I have a copy in the original investigation done by Officer Travis. He spoke to Tricia at the Ohio Department of Liquor Control. I don=t know, I do not have possession of that letter right now.

Mrs. Frazier: I need something that shows so we can send it back that way...

Lieutenant McKinley: Okay.

Mrs. Frazier: ...that shows why we didn=t take any action. Thank you.

Lieutenant McKinley: Okay. I=ll have to get that. I do not have that with me.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you. Okay. Item 5, Discussion: Liquor Permit Request - new - Coughlin Investments Ltd., dba Crown Sports Lounge, 6493 E. Main St., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Lieutenant.

Lieutenant McKinley: The investigation into this permit application also did not reveal anything of a negative nature that would cause us to say that this business should not get this license.

Mr. Joseph: Are there any questions by members of the committee or Council? (No response). Okay. We=ll return this to the Clerk with no action. I=m sorry. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I just wanted to bring up that this is not a, what you call a new establishment. It=s something that=s been there for probably 40 years. And I think it=s the, if I=m not mistaken, it used to be the Motherland Grille.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes. That=s my understanding, sir.

Mr. Clemens: Am I correct on that? I think that went out of business. And I think this is the location that is taking over.

Lieutenant McKinley: The location=s the same. I believe it=s a brand new business though.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. We=ll return this to the Clerk with no action. Item 6, Discussion: Liquor Permit Request - new - (D5) - Epicures Inc., 7601 E. Main St., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068.

Lieutenant McKinley: As with the previous liquor application, this investigation also revealed no negative information that would cause us to withhold this request.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee or Council on this item?  
Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I=ve looked for this and I don=t, would somebody explain to me where this is and where it=s at?

Mr. Hills: I=ll be happy to. Mr. Clemens, Epicures is at the corner of Graham and Main. They are a cooking class and demonstration. They are nationwide. This is the second of the nationwide coverage. They do a lot of research and analysis on foods and development of a number of corporate clients. They=ve got quite, if you ever haven=t gone in there, you ought to. It is just gorgeous, the amount of work they=ve done to that. And it=s very professionally handled.

Mr. Clemens: I thought it was the wrong address when I see it was a cooking school.

Mr. Hills: It was the old We Joy Sing or something. It=s totally been remodeled and it is absolutely first class.

Mr. Clemens: I thought it was in the building on the other side of where the new one went up. Because when I saw that was a cooking school, I thought maybe it was a wrong address on it. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Joseph, if I could just add to what President Hills said. I believe they do host banquets and functions and those kinds of things, and that=s why they=re looking for the liquor license.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions or comments on this? (No response). If not, we will return this to the Clerk with no action.

Next item, number 7, Discussion: Amend agreement that created COTA (to include City of Dublin). Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman. The letter that I attached to the request dated June 29 from William Lhota, pretty much gives the breakdown and the detail of what we=re doing. Back in 1971, which I think maybe Mel was here, I don=t know, but anyway, the COTA Board was

formed. There was 11 municipal corporations involved in it, Reynoldsburg of course, being one. They did not however, at the time, include Dublin. This request is, to narrow it down to, the purpose of it is to add Dublin as the twelfth community on the COTA. And if you read through the letter, it tells you what changes are entailed by doing that. They've changed the original agreement in minor ways. The board still stays the same number, but in order to do this, all of the participating communities have to adopt an agreement allowing Dublin to be a part of the COTA Board and to be a part of the COTA system, or the Central Ohio Transit Authority. And that's what this does; this allows Dublin to be a member.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: No change as far as anything with COTA.

Mr. Joseph: Have we voted to amend this in the past?

Mayor McPherson: I'm not aware of any other amendments. This will be the first amendment I'm aware of. Since 1971, the agreement has always remained the same. And the same 11 communities.

Mr. Joseph: Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: If I'm not mistaken, haven't they been running buses to Dublin?

Mayor McPherson: Oh, yeah.

Mrs. Newman: That's what I thought.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. It's just adding them onto the COTA Board to be a part of the authority. That's really the only change we've got here.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions from members of Committee, members of Council? Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just a question. What reasons do we have to accept or not accept them?

Mayor McPherson: We don't have any reason not to accept them. The only reason to accept them is, they're one of the suburban communities, and COTA runs bus service to them, and they just want to have a representative to speak for them about the buses.

Mr. Hills: They asked to be on the board.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. They've asked to be on the board.

Mr. Baxter: Should we charge them?

Mr. Joseph: Other questions or comments from members of committee or Council? (No response). Mayor, I'm assuming that there's no urgency on this.

Mayor McPherson: There's no urgency. No.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Well then, I'll motion that we move this on to Council for its first reading. Is there a second? Second by Councilwoman Newman. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item 8 tonight is, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT TO PURCHASE ROAD SALT. First reading was on 10-8-07. We have, is there anyone here to speak on this tonight?

Mayor McPherson: Well, there's nothing new from last time when Larry came and talked to us. Checked with him today, everything's exactly the same as he communicated to us two weeks ago.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the committee tonight? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'll make the motion to send this on to Council for its second reading. Is there a second? Second by Councilman Stake. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item 9 tonight is, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FOR THE ENHANCEMENT OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATION FOR THE REYNOLDSBURG DIVISION OF POLICE. First reading was on 10-8-07. We have, Lieutenant, would you like to speak to this? I've been informed, and I think I was told two weeks ago, that the 800 megahertz system would only apply within Franklin County, correct? It would not have any impact on the portions of the city in Licking or Fairfield County. Is that correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: For the public safety forces, the police forces in Licking County and Fairfield County, they do operate I believe, on a low band meaning that the 800 megahertz would not work. I do believe that the fire services in those counties have 800 megahertz, but I'm not sure.

Mr. Joseph: So again, what's the, what will we do for those areas that don't have 800 megahertz systems service?

Lieutenant McKinley: Currently, what we have is a radio called LEARN which is a secondary radio in the car that allows us to speak to those agencies. And that's typically how we do talk to them. The other option is, we can go through their Dispatch. The officer in Reynoldsburg would

call Dispatch and say, please call Licking County Sheriffs for instance, and have them come up on LEERN so I can talk to them.

Mr. Joseph: And that=s, I=m assuming, there=s a difference of \_\_\_\_\_ service, fees for that system?

Lieutenant McKinley: That, I=m not familiar with. I don=t know if we pay a fee for LEERN or not. I do know we pay for the radios and we have them in all of our cars. I don=t know if there=s a fair share fee for that service.

Mr. Joseph: Do you happen to know what some of the other suburban cities, how they handle it that might be in more than one county, such as Westerville and Dublin? Do they have a, what type of systems do they use? And do we even know if the other counties that they overlap into have or don=t have the 800 service?

Lieutenant McKinley: My understanding right now is that all the suburban agencies in the Columbus area with the exception of Gahanna, Whitehall and Reynoldsburg, have access to the 800 megahertz system. They also have the LEERN to be able to communicate to those outlying agencies, such as those in Delaware County, Licking County, that don=t have access to the 800 megahertz system. So in Westerville=s case, I believe they=ve got the LEERN radio and they would utilize that to talk to Delaware County.

Mr. Joseph: Are there questions of Lieutenant from committee? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Joseph. Lieutenant McKinley, are we able to communicate with Licking County currently under our present system?

Lieutenant McKinley: If you=re talking about the 460 megahertz system, no. However, as I spoke to Councilman Joseph, we have the LEERN as the option.

Mr. Stake: Through the LEERN. Okay. So by changing to the 800 megahertz, we wouldn=t be losing communication with the other agencies outside of Reynoldsburg?

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct. It really is not going to change the relationship with those agencies that don=t have access to 800 megahertz.

Mr. Stake: And this really is the way that the safety forces are going? With the 800 megahertz system?

Lieutenant McKinley: I think the numbers speak for themselves. There=s only three suburban agencies in the Columbus area that do not have this at present. More seem to be going to it. I=m not a radio expert, but it seems to me that it does offer you more flexibility. It does allow you to speak to more people, and most of the agencies have it.

Mr. Stake: And I would think eventually, probably eventually, that these outlying areas would go towards the 800 megahertz system as well?

Lieutenant McKinley: From what I've been described, the problem for them is money. Unlike Columbus and Franklin County who built their, I believe it's an 11 tower at 2 million dollars per tower system, Licking County financially may not be able to put that up throughout the same, of course their area's much bigger than the City of Columbus. So it may be a financial issue that they can't erect something like that.

Mr. Stake: And if I recall, in previous discussions, we do have a problem with maintaining our present system, getting parts and those kinds of things. They're becoming more and more scarce, correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: For our older handheld Maxon radios, which is what a lot of the officers carry to operate on the 460 megahertz system, those parts are harder to get. And obviously, the further time goes along, the harder those parts will be to get.

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

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman. The questions I have are basically on the towers. And one of the issues we've had with our 460 radios is, holes throughout the city where officers can't get connectivity to their Dispatchers. Can we anticipate reducing that? Staying the same? Where do you see us with that problem? Moving to the 800 megahertz?

Lieutenant McKinley: From my conversations with the gentleman on the support services for the City of Columbus, the system's not perfect. No radio system's going to guarantee 100% coverage all the time. And as an example, one of the areas that we experienced problems is down in our area 3. There are sections where it can at times, be difficult to get out on a portable radio. Particularly, if you're inside of a structure. Inside the high school for instance. There's multiple cinder block walls. And if you're on a portable radio which transmits at lower power than say a car radio, it can at times be hard to get through. Atmospheric conditions also play into radio communications. So I'm not guaranteeing, and I don't think anyone can, that the 800 megahertz system is going to provide 100% coverage. Whether it's got the same limitations and holes as the 460, I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I'm looking at it from a perspective where the towers are, where our equipment are today, and if we're looking at towers that are downtown Columbus, are we now having to use a radio system that's having to reach out to Columbus to be able to communicate. Whereas, we have towers close by here in Reynoldsburg on our existing system. My concern is, are we potentially going to make it worse?

Lieutenant McKinley: Columbus= 14<sup>th</sup> Precinct is the precinct that=s just to the west of us. But it kind of wraps around the city on the northern part up along Broad Street. And also south along Tussing, just south of the interstate. Their cars operate throughout that entire range and sometimes into our city. And they use the 800 megahertz and they have not, I mean, they=ve been able to utilize it in a functional way because that=s what they have. I don=t know where the towers are physically located, but I do know that the first batch of the Homeland Security radios that I mentioned before, we got 29 portables, officers have taken those out and utilized them. I have had no one come back saying, hey, I can=t talk on this. I can=t hear anybody. So my preliminary feedback has been positive in terms of how the radio allows us to communicate. But again, it=s still new in the process. We don=t have one of those towers that I know of, in the city that=s providing that kind of service.

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

Mr. Joseph: Lieutenant, how long has Columbus been using the 800 system? Do you know?

Lieutenant McKinley: I know when I came here and started, they were on 460 because we could talk to them on our radios in our cars. So my guess would be sometime in the early 90's they may have switched over. But again, that=s just my guess.

Mr. Joseph: Do you know of any plans for further upgrades to something even higher than that?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, the FCC announced that they are releasing the 700 band of frequencies which are going to be a portion of it dedicated for public safety forces. And that=s supposed to be the next greatest thing for radio communications in the public safety sector. The radios we have, I understand, are programmable and will be able to accept this new band down the road. Now when they=re actually going to implement that, I don=t know. But it=s in the future soon.

Mr. Joseph: So if we were to switch over, and then they were to make that change at 700, we could modify that without going out and getting a lot of additional equipment, new equipment.

Lieutenant McKinley: My understanding is, the existing equipment that would come with this grant is programmable to accept that 700 megahertz frequency.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Other questions or comments from members of committee or Council? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could, I take it the 240 system we have today is not as good as we would like it to be or we wouldn=t be talking about these other things. But the question I would ask is, when we built that building, because I remember the system we had in the old building and it was held together by duct tape, so when we moved into the building less than 8 years ago, it was my understanding that the radio system went in at the time, was state of the art. It was as good as

you could get. Have things changed that much in the 8 years?

Lieutenant McKinley: No, President Hills. Actually, a lot of the electronic equipment that I think you're referring to that exists in the police dispatching, it is brand new equipment. That equipment operates on the 460 megahertz frequency which is what we currently have. And we can buy new radios and upgrade that system with the existing infrastructure. The radios, the portable radios. But again, the problem is, the shortcoming is, the inability to talk to other agencies. There is the ability to buy what they call the, I think it's called an ACU1000. It's an electronic cross patch that you can put with our existing equipment. It would enable us to cross patch over to the 800 megahertz. My understanding is, that's kind of a temporary thing because you would have to call in to dispatch and have them set this link up that would allow the existing radios to talk. But then you'd be talking on Columbus= channel. So there's some limitations.

Mr. Hills: Because in the memo, it's referencing some cross band patching equipment for the radio room. That's in this whole grant I take it, isn't it?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes sir, it is.

Mr. Hills: So we are going to have that ability. So I guess whatever we get, there's always something better; and I'm glad the 700 was asked because I can take that off of my list, but again, sometimes I like things simplified. We've got a cruiser over here on Rosehill and Main, and there's another cruiser sitting out in far eastern corporate Reynoldsburg.... which is by the way, Licking County and Fairfield County make up about 23% of our population, so I am concerned about those people and their coverage ....let's say sitting in front of Councilman Joseph's house, which is within a quarter mile of the east city limits, can they communicate today?

Lieutenant McKinley: From what I've heard from the officers that have taken these portable radios out, and they take them out on.....

Mr. Hills: Under today's system? The radio we have in the vehicles, they can communicate fine today with those?

Lieutenant McKinley: Oh, yes sir. Yes, they can.

Mr. Hills: Now, when the 800's come in, are they going to be able to communicate as well? Because is this going to be in addition to what we have? Or substitute for what we have?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, going back to what Councilman, I think what Councilman Baxter asked in terms of where the holes are and what the quality of this.....

Mr. Hills: We don't have a hole today. I guess what I'm trying to say is, is the 800 going to, I don't want to see any more holes generated.

Lieutenant McKinley: I agree. I agree with you. And from my understanding, talking to Dave Bordon and Dave Ziegler who worked with support services, they have what they describe as very good coverage throughout the entire Franklin County, and extending into the fringe of the surrounding counties. Because that was one of our concerns is, but we're not totally located within Franklin County. We actually go out into Licking and Fairfield County with portions of our city. They said the portions that you've got or could conceivably annex are fully covered by this system. And in taking the radio out, the officers say, yeah, I can hear 14<sup>th</sup> Precinct talking clear as day over it. Whether that'll always be the case, I don't know. I don't know if additional building of infrastructure on the ground affects radios.

Mr. Hills: I'm just concerned about whether we hear, the 14<sup>th</sup> Precinct were able to hear our own officers.

Lieutenant McKinley: That I don't know because we haven't taken those out and communicated amongst each other. We've been just using them in a listening mode for the most part.

Mr. Hills: We have, what 29....

Lieutenant McKinley: Twenty-nine. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: ....I think you mentioned. And you're talking about buying another 68. Should we reduce that 68 by the 29 we already have?

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, 68's the final number. That's what we're trying to get to I believe.

Mr. Hills: So we're not buying 68. We'd be buying 68 less 29, the 29 we've already got.

Lieutenant McKinley: Well we have 29 and the grant that we're seeking now would add an additional 39 portables. That would give us a total, I believe, of 68.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Well, the memo indicates we're getting, okay, our goal. Alright.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yeah. Our goal is to get to 68. That would give every authorized sworn officer, which is 58, plus 10 reserves, a dedicated radio.

Mr. Hills: So the dollar amounts we're looking at here are based on 39 portables purchased.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct. For the new grant which is the total 300,000, it does take into consideration 39 handhelds.

Mr. Hills: Okay, that answers that. We do not, and a dumb question, we're able to use the 800s today when we had an interagency issue where we needed to talk with Columbus. Did we use

our 800 systems that we have in hand?

Lieutenant McKinley: No, sir. Those were issued, we had just obtained them from Franklin County Emergency Management Agency. Officer Manny had them because we wanted to get their serial numbers entered in for asset purposes. They weren't distributed to the officers until probably the week of the exercise which was September 6.

Mr. Hills: We know we didn't use them back then.

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Hills: But were we able to use them today when we had to communicate with the Columbus Bomb Squad?

Lieutenant McKinley: No, sir. No, sir. We did not.

Mr. Hills: Is that just because we haven't trained our people? We've got them but they aren't, haven't been....

Lieutenant McKinley: Well, we're in transition right now. The 460 system, which is what we've been using for a long time, is currently in place. Everyone's trained on it. Dispatch uses it to dispatch cars; and that's currently what's in the cars. The cars themselves do not have the 800 megahertz system in them. The officer would have to physically have to take that portable wherever he goes, in the car, out of the car. So we currently have not switched over to using that as a regular....

Mr. Hills: So they're not really, we've got them, we can say we've got them, but it's....

Lieutenant McKinley: We have not instituted them. Correct. Not all of the officers have them issued. Right now we issued them to our 12 member SWAT Team, all of the command level officers and supervisors. But your typical run of the mill street officers, not all of them have that. So we've not switched over to utilizing 800 megahertz because not everyone has them.

Mr. Hills: None of the people had them today to do the intergovernmental communication that could have been used.

Lieutenant McKinley: The Sergeant that was down there had one as well as Officer Mauger, who is the School Resource Officer. He's on SWAT and he's also got one issued to him.

Mr. Hills: Now, were they able to communicate to Columbus, or did they have to come back through our, back into the radio room to do it?

Lieutenant McKinley: I think they, to call the Columbus Bomb Squad, they just called the Dispatcher and said, please call the Columbus Bomb Squad. We didn't have to do any field

communication with the bomb squad personnel. We were just face to face with that.  
Mr. Hills: Okay. And bottom line, back to the, we still don't know what the cost of these additional 39 units? Supposedly, we're not going to have a cost on our Agift units@, right?

Lieutenant McKinley: I think we do have an estimated cost for the 39 handhelds. Is that what you're asking, sir?

Mr. Hills: At the \$1460 a year. Is that what we're saying we think it's going to cost?

Lieutenant McKinley: No, sir. I understand your question. I did get more information on that. On Friday, I did communicate with Dave Bordon, who is the Administrator for the Division of Support Services with the City of Columbus. He explained that each radio would cost \$11.75 per month, per radio, with one talk group. If you want additional talk groups, they are \$1 per radio, per month. So if we went with 4 talk groups total, it would be \$15.75 per month for the 86 radios, which gives you a figure of somewhere around \$1200 per month. That's the fair share cost according to Mr. Dave Bordon, who runs their system.

Mr. Hills: Subject to increases as they deem appropriate.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir. That's correct.

Mr. Hills: That's probably why we had our own system before. There was some merit to it. That was the, the 800s were debated when we did the construction of the new police building. Mr. Joseph, that's all the questions I have. At least right now.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Joseph. Lieutenant McKinley, are we able to test the 800 radios on the far east side of the city to make sure that we're able to....

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir. I think we can do that. We have not done that.

Mr. Stake: ....make sure they work out that way before we go ahead and do this?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir. I think that's a great idea. I'll make sure that happens.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. That's all.

Mr. Joseph: Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. I was coming down the same place. I was wondering, if we have these 29 handheld units, and to access the tower requires to pay some type of lease for these, are we paying a lease for these? And if so, how much?

Lieutenant McKinley: For the 29 that we got through the first Homeland Security Grant, there is no fair share cost for those radios.

Mr. Baxter: And for how long is that?

Lieutenant McKinley: I think it's only for the time that we were operating on our own independent 460 system. Once we make the, if we make the switch over to going to Columbus=800 system and we got additional radios, they would then start to charge us the aforementioned 15.75 per radio to include those radios.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So you are able to communicate today both ways. Not just, because you had mentioned, we're listening. So it kind of sparked my attention. Why aren't you talking? And I had thought was, maybe because we're not allowed to. I'm looking for reasons why we're not trying to use them.

Lieutenant McKinley: Mainly because they're so brand new. Most of the officers have had just a very brief orientation to them. They're not as simple, the radios we currently have, simple on/off, and one channel knob. These have zones and channels. A little bit more complicated. It takes a little bit more time to train and get used to it. But probably the biggest reason is, they're brand new and not all the officers have them. But I think to take them out and test them throughout the city, I'll get that done. That's a good idea. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And lastly, we have 29 of them. How many officers do we have? Forty-three, forty-eight, around that range, correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: We have a total I think, of 54 sworn officers.

Mr. Baxter: Sworn officers.

Lieutenant McKinley: Now we've got about 40 working patrol. I think there's 7 in the Detective Bureau. There's 2 Lieutenants, the Chief, the Administrative Sergeant. So not everybody's on the road in a use-the-radio-everyday mode.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. That was my thought is, you have more than enough to handle an entire shift right now.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: And so my thought was, we would want to make sure we get them trained as soon as possible so we can get on with this new network and start utilizing it to find out before we throw away the old units, what our impact's going to be with the 800s. We can find out today where the holes are. If they have them and they're trying to use them today, we can find out if

somebody out there on Rosehill can communicate with somebody out on Mink Road.  
Lieutenant McKinley: I agree.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. Maybe I'm mistaken, but it was my understanding that we're not going to throw away any old units. We're going to be using those too. Is that correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: That is correct Mrs. Newman. Chief Suci, before he left, made it clear to me that he intends, or he would like to keep the 460 megahertz radio system as a backup. We own it currently 100%. The radios, some of which are old, some of which are new. Like any system. And as President Hills mentioned, a lot of the equipment in the radio room is brand new. Although that can be utilized with the new 800 system with this cross patch ACU1000. But no, I don't think the intention is to get rid of the 460 megahertz system.

Mrs. Newman: Well, but you're going to need the 460 for some areas, aren't you?

Lieutenant McKinley: No ma'am. I think if we switch over to use the 800 megahertz, we would utilize it like we are with our system right now. Which is every officer and cruiser would have the 800 megahertz radio and they would utilize that as their primary means of communication. Not only amongst themselves, but with fire, Columbus Police, FBI, any other agency that's got that capability.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. But they wouldn't be using it for Licking County for example. Or Fairfield.

Lieutenant McKinley: No ma'am. They would use the traditional way we've been communicating, which is the LEARN radio.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Joseph: Lieutenant, if we continue, if we use the current system as a backup and we continue to have breakdowns and things like that, are we going to keep replacing parts? Or is the idea to eventually phase it out because the parts are going to get too hard to obtain?

Lieutenant McKinley: That's a good question. I think currently, if we don't go forward with the 800 megahertz, the only choice I'm aware of is to stick with the current system and continue to maintain it like we've been doing and use it.

Mr. Joseph: But do you think there'll be a point, even if we use it as a backup, that we will have to drop it because we just won't be able to get parts?

Lieutenant McKinley: It depends on how frequent and how much the need is to replace parts. I don't think any year=s similar, in other words, like anything that breaks down, you kind of don't know when the big parts are going to break down. The cost could be minimal one year if you don't have much in the way of breaking. It may be a lot if you have things breaking.

Mr. Joseph: Is it getting harder to get the parts?

Lieutenant McKinley: For the older radios. The Maxon radio like I=ve got right here is the older style. And those parts are harder to get a hold of.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Any other questions? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Joseph. Lieutenant McKinley, what about spare radios? If you have some that have to be repaired, would you be able to maintain your same amount of \_\_\_\_ with the ones that are left?

Lieutenant McKinley: The current plan of getting one for every authorized officer, there would be no spares. I could foresee taking some folk=s that are not on the road in a regular everyday function and probably utilizing those until such time in the future, we could start to build a cache of spare radios for that purpose.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. But right now, you don't think you need any spares.

Lieutenant McKinley: Well I think we will need spares. We would probably have to go to other officers that aren't carrying the radio on a regular shift. Or someone who=s going off duty, you know, someone who=s coming on duty has a broken radio, you say, hey, can I use your radio and give it back to you tomorrow? I think we can make do in the short term until we could get a plan to possibly add some in the future so that we=ll have some spares sitting on the charging bench.

Mr. Stearns: To me that seems a reasonable way to use some from the other shifts that are not on duty at the time. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: And that brought up the question around backups. When you say you=re having backups, you=re not planning on having every officer carry both radios. You=re going to use the 800, and the 460 will be retired.

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: And in the event that there=s some issue where you need to have a 460, then the officer will go out with the 460, correct?

Lieutenant McKinley: Exactly. Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. You're not going to have two side \_\_\_\_\_ with them. Okay. Great. And the second side of that is, why are we outfitting each officer and not having a pool methodology of using radios? Whereas we need 40 of these radios and we share what we need throughout the day rather than having every officer who is not on duty every shift.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's a good question. Columbus does that. They don't have a radio for every officer. And that actually became a big contention, if you remember 3 years ago when the officer was killed working special duty. He did not have a radio. He had to turn the radio in that he used on patrol because they just don't have a radio for every officer. We want to avoid that. There are times when an officer goes off shift, and rather than turn that radio in, he goes to continue to work on a special duty job. Or if officers are held on overtime. There might not always be a big enough cache of radios for them to take enough to go into service on the next shift. Additionally, you've got city events in which you've got many officers on duty. Such as the Mount Carmel Fitness Challenge. We typically have about 20 officers working in addition to the road units. So there's a number of arguments you could make towards individual issuing of the officers. Is that going to cost more money? Yes. In this case, with the federal government paying 80%, I would make the argument that outfitting each officer with the radio is the right way to go.

Mr. Baxter: I don't disagree with you. I just wanted to make sure we recognize the reason why we're not using the same method that Columbus is using. And for the safety of our officers, not just the ones that are on duty, but the ones that are off duty. We do have a lot of events here in Reynoldsburg such as the parades that we have, and the fireworks shows and those type of things where we have several officers who are out. And we want to make sure that they're well-protected and can communicate. I remember a certain incident over here by my house back in the woods there where an officer could not communicate and was out there pretty much for what, 10 or 15 minutes without a communication. We don't want to see that in the future.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mrs. Newman, go ahead.

Mrs. Newman: I just have a comment to make. I'm so glad to hear you pronounce that word Acache@ appropriately.

Lieutenant McKinley: I was taking a guess actually.

Mrs. Newman: I was so sick of hearing our four- star generals mispronounce it as >cash=. Thanks.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions or comment on this issue? (No response). Okay. I=ll move that we pass this on to Council for a second reading. Is there a second? Second by Councilman Stake. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response).

And that is our last item on the agenda for tonight so I will close the Safety Committee at 8:17.

Safety Committee October 15, 2007- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council (Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

#### SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 15, 2007

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

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

Mr. Clemens: I=d like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:18.

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

The next item is the approval of minutes of October 1, 2007 Service Committee meeting. Are there any corrections? (No response). If not, they=ll stand approved.

Next item is the Discussion: Multi-occupancy of residences - listed at the request of Chairman Clemens. I=ve worked with the City Attorney on this and we=ve received the document that we had drafted up, from Jed on 10-11-07. What this does, adds this to Section 1385.03 to Chapter 1385. This would be 1385.03. It would be AMinimum Space And Use Requirements@. The basic principal of this is, and it=s stated in the 1385.01 and 02, which it would be added to, which gives the purpose of it and the objective.

The ordinance itself is ABedroom Requirements@, is the first section. And it says, Aevery bedroom shall comply with the following requirements: 1. Area for sleeping purposes. Every room occupied for sleeping purposes by one occupant shall contain 70 square feet of floor space. Every room occupied for sleeping purposes by more than one shall contain at least 100 square feet of floor space for each occupant thereof. 2. Access for sleeping purposes. Bedrooms shall not constitute the only means of access to any other bedrooms or habitable spaces that shall not serve as the only means of egress from the habitable spaces except units that contain fewer than two bedrooms. Water closet accessory. Every bedroom shall have access to at least one water closet and one laboratory without passing through another bedroom. Every bedroom in a dwelling unit shall have access to at least one water closet and one laboratory located in the same story as the bedroom. Prohibited occupancy. A non-habitable space, kitchen, or other interior public area shall not be occupied for sleeping purposes. 5. For purpose of this chapter, a child under the age of 18 shall not be counted as additional occupant.@ The reason (Tape Change) is, this is not to, this is for families who have children under the age of 18. We realize that you have 2 or 3 in a bedroom that are small, could have bunk beds and so forth. So this was added that the child shall not be counted under 18 for additional occupant. And the other requirements, Abedrooms shall comply with the applicable provisions of the International Property Maintenance Code as well as the Codified Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg.@

Next section AOvercrowding@. A dwelling unit shall not be occupied by any more occupants than are permitted by the minimum occupancy requirements table as follows.@ And it gives you the space for the living room, dining room. The bedrooms have already been stated in

the first section. So that=s what the next section, sleeping area, refers to. It doesn=t refer to the minimum occupancy requirements.

ABasement or cellar occupancy@. Except as modified herein, no basement or cellar space shall be used as a sleeping room, dwelling unit, or rooming unit unless it meets all standards as set forth in the International Property Maintenance Code, the Codified Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, as well as these additional requirements: 1. The floors and walls shall be impervious to leakage or seepage. The underground or surface water shall be drained and protected against dampness. Access can be gained to each room without passing through a furnace room. 3. Each room shall have no pipes, ducts, or other obstructions less than 6 feet, 6 inches above the floor level where it will interfere with normal use of the room or area. Each room shall be separated from the heating equipment by the standard partition. Location of rooms. A bathroom or water closet shall not be used as the only passage way to any habitable room, hall, basement, or cellar, or to exterior of the dwelling unit. Access to or egress from each rooming unit shall be provided without passing through any other rooming unit or dwelling unit. Closets. Each dwelling unit shall be provided with approximately 36 cubic feet of closet space or suitable alternative for the first bedroom plus 18 cubic feet for each additional bedroom. At least one half of the total required closet space shall be located within the dwelling unit. Penalty. Whoever violates any provision of this chapter or any regulation pursuant to the authority granted by this chapter is guilty of a minor misdemeanor. Each day of the continued violation shall be constituted as a separate offense.@ This will be added to the Section 1385.03.

And if you look to the back two sections, 1385.01 gives the objective. I=m not going to read it, but it goes through why this is the objectives, which is for the health, safety, and welfare of the community. And also for the public health of the people that live in the dwellings. And that=s what the purpose is also. It=s for the protection of the people that live in the units from any fire, or anything that=s any kind of disease and so forth. It=s basically an overcrowding ordinance. This is what Jed and I proposed to begin with as far as the ordinance is concerned. And what I=d like to do, I=d like for us to look at it, because it=s quite detailed and there may be questions that come up as far as this is concerned that we would want to change or discuss further. But what I would like to do is move it on for its first reading, give Council a chance to look at it. There=s no rush as far as having this pass or anything like that. I=d like to have it go through the whole process. Or even if it comes to a time where Council members feel that there are other changes that should be made, we can hold it and look at it, but this is the draft. This is the ordinance and I=d like to send it on for its first reading so Nancy can put it in an ordinance, the way the ordinance should be drawn up and then we=ll have it at our second reading. Are there any questions pertaining to this at the present time? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mel, I=d like to commend you and our City Attorney for a great job putting this together. You=ve spent some hard work, you can tell. So I want to thank both of you for the work you=ve done. I=d like to ask if we can be a little bit more severe in the penalty portion of it and if there=s some options that could be given to us for the next committee meeting on how we can increase severity as continuing offenses from the same house, or the same location is identified. Rather than just stating that each continued violation shall constitute a separate offense, I would like to see, and I have seen in other of our legislations, increases each time. So

if we could add that, I think that would be a great help.

Mr. Clemens: I'll meet with Jed on it. I want to make it plain on this, this ordinance is not to be anywhere detrimental to the citizens of Reynoldsburg. We want to make it so that it doesn't interfere with the families and their homes. And that's why the square footage has been changed some. It could be changed again. We want to make sure, a family of 6, or a family of 8, can live in their homes. But my feeling is, a family of 8 people over 18 years old shouldn't live in a 2 bedroom or 3 bedroom home. To me, that's over occupying it and you don't have the facilities, the health facilities, and you don't have the safety facilities to get out of the house. So basically, that's why I'd like Council to look into it closely because we do not want to do something, like I said, that would be detrimental to the people that do live in Reynoldsburg that own their own properties and have their families. This is not for that. This is strictly to protect people. When you get an overcrowding of adults over the age of 18, for health and safety reasons and disease reasons and such things as that, and that's the main purpose of the ordinance. So are there any other questions on it? Yes. Yes, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I don't have any questions. I just have a couple of comments. I appreciate the work that you've put into this and the work that the City Attorney has also put into this proposed legislation. I think it's sensible and reasonable. And we did become aware of some abuses of some places. So it definitely is necessary. So I am certainly in favor of this legislation. I just want to be sure that if we do enact this type of legislation, we're able to enforce it. We're able to get in the property, make sure the people are complying. So I don't know if you want to address that tonight or anybody wants to address that.

Mr. Clemens: Well, I'll address it just a little bit. If you read the objectives, in the \_\_\_\_\_, it falls under health and safety. Which when you fall under safety and the safety as far as the fire codes and such things as that, that means that our fire department could have ingress to the house at proper times, or the health department, or the safety department. They could have ingress to it if there's a problem. And that's why the objectives and the purposes are stated in that ordinance. And this was, I know for Jed, he feels that this is adequate, that you could enforce this. Am I correct on that, Jed? And that's why it's taking a little while. Jed, would you please, maybe he could give a little more insight into it.

Mr. Hood: Well briefly, once again, enforcement will be an issue. We talked about a few ordinances in the past where I believe, enforcement issues. We'll work with the Police Department and our city services to enforce this ordinances once it's passed. However, I would want to point out that this does have criminal penalties. And as Mr. Baxter pointed out earlier, if the penalties are changed, this will not be applied retroactively. You cannot apply a criminal statute retroactively and we will not do so. So as we spoke before, before Chairman Clemens and I undertook this, we are preparing for the future and we will try to enforce this as sternly as we can.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. And again, I do appreciate your work on this. Thanks.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Jed. Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Clemens, I went over and studied this commentary AThe Seven-Nun Conundrum: Seeking Divine Guidance in the Definition of AFamily@A, that Mr. Hood kindly distributed to all of us. It was a copyright from the American Planning Association. And it involved a long discourse regarding the definition of family. Single family. I don=t know why we=re not addressing this. Now I know you, and you have said, he said, that it would not be enforceable in court. But from what I read in here by these esteemed legal people, it sounds to me that it would be enforceable in court if anyone ever challenged it.

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Newman, I=d have to refer that to Mr. Hood, because we=ve had the problem and trying to figure out who families are and trying to prove who families are.

Mrs. Newman: Well I think if you read this, it clearly defines what a family is.

Mr. Clemens: Jed, you could answer that.

Mr. Hood: Well, I did give that some months ago when we first started about that as an illustration of part of the problem. I do believe the ordinance that we put forth and that you have in front of you is reasonable under the circumstances to achieve the goal that we=re trying to prevent. The overcrowding of the homes. By taking the element of family out of the equation, it is much easier, I envision it being much easier to enforce it as opposed to trying to prove once again, who is family, who is not.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I believe if you wrote into your ordinance some of these definitions, they could very clearly be understood that a family was a group of people bonded by love who they were all on the lease, or they had an ownership interest in the property. There are various ways of defining this family. And it seems to me that could very easily, well maybe not easily be done, but it could be done. I also don=t think that just because something is easy and easy to enforce, that you might have an ordinance with no teeth in it and that=s essentially ineffective. If you \_\_\_\_\_ not that you know, the space requirements are very important, but as far as I=m concerned, if we=re talking about the invasion of a single family neighborhood by these large groups of people, I think then we better define what is a single family somewhere in our ordinance.

Mr. Hood: Well, I would just counter with the argument that, if there is a large group of people in a single-family dwelling, we will not need to prove whether they=re family or not. They=ll be in violation of our ordinance based on the square footage requirements we=ve written into the ordinance.

Mrs. Newman: Let=s hope so.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Jed. And Tony, that=s something I=ll look into too and think about it. That=s why I would like to move forward and have Council come up with if they have any other

suggestions. It has been difficult. It=s been difficult in the past on the situation that we=re in. That=s why we worked on the drafting this up, we thought this would have more teeth in it really. I mean really, that we could enforce. Because as Jed said, if we do have that many occupants over 18 years old and they don=t have the square footage, they=re out of there. I mean, it=s that simple. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Clemens. That was my question and my concern right there in item 5 where it says, after a child is 18, he=s got to go. Is that what this ordinance is going to do?

Mr. Clemens: No. No.

Mr. Stearns: I need some explanation on that. I=d like to know. Because I came from a large family.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Here=s the deal. I=m not trying to kick any kids out of their houses. What they=re saying is, two of them over 18 have to have a certain square footage. If you=re under 18, children under 18, say you=ve got, say you=re like me, I have five. Okay. I had five. And for some reason we had them right one after another. They call that love. But they all grew up together. So we had three bedrooms so one of the bedrooms, we had bunk beds in it so we ended up with three in that. And that would be allowed. As a matter of fact, you could have four. You could have two bunk beds for the little kids. And I understand that. Because our homes in Reynoldsburg, a lot of our sections, the square footage isn=t very large. And they couldn=t, if we didn=t allow, Columbus says under a one year old. And that=s not something that we want. We want families to be able to live in their homes, raise their children but not have eight of them 18 or over living in a house that=s got three bedrooms or two bedrooms. And that=s what it accounts for. If you go over that limit, then you=ve got to have a bigger square footage for your bedrooms if you=re going to have two people in them, or three people in them over the age of 18.

Mr. Stearns: So in other words, your younger age, you don=t take as much space. But when you get older, you=ve got to be along then at that time.

Mr. Hood: If you=re under 18, they don=t count as an occupant.

Mr. Clemens: That=s right. It doesn=t count as an occupant in the house.

Mr. Hood: So they=re not factored into the equation.

Mr. Clemens: If you=re over 18, you better start cutting the grass or you=re going out the door. But any how, and I want people to understand, we don=t want to harm families with their children. And that was the purpose of making this change. So I would like everybody to look it over. Talk to your neighbors. Talk to whoever you believe. But it is there for a purpose. It is there for overcrowding. We=ve had the situation that we=re trying to correct and we=d like to get

it corrected by the first of the year so it doesn't happen again. It's something that we'll be able to step in, because of the statements that's made on the objectives and the purposes, and that allows us to really put teeth into this. So if there's no other questions, I'd like to move this on for the first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All in favor, say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF  
ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: SECTION 1131.02

Definitions OF CHAPTER 1131 DEFINITIONS. This has had the second reading and this has to do with the indoor storage facility. Are there any questions? (No response). We've had a public hearing on this and so forth. Are there any questions pertaining to this? (No response). If not, I'd like to move this ordinance on for its third reading. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted Aye). Thank you.

The next ordinance, the Public Hearing, we've had a first reading on it 10-8-07. Public Hearing was set for November 1, 2007. The Public Hearing has been postponed. So I believe at the next Council meeting I assume, the President of Council will set a new date for this Public Hearing. So I'd like to have this ordinance held in committee until after the Public Hearing. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mr. Baxter. All in favor, say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

And with that, that ends the Service Committee meeting at 8:40.

Service Committee  
October 15, 2007  
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council  
(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

## FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 15, 2007

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

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

Mr. Stake: And I will call to order, the Finance Committee at 8:41.

Item number 2 is approval of agenda. I do have a request from the Mayor to hold item number 10 which is Discussion on the 2008 Budget so he has time to review the numbers received from the City Auditor. So I=ll make a motion that we hold item number 10. Any discussion on that? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is approval of minutes of October 1, 2007 Finance Committee meeting. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they=ll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is, Discussion: Amend 4.091 of Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual (Acting Chief=s pay). This did come from the Mayor and this is a two-parter. Go ahead, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you. If everyone recalls, back when we changed our 165 to 160, one of the clauses that was not brought forward was the Lieutenant being paid Chief=s pay when he was an Acting Chief. What this request does, as well as the \_\_\_\_\_ Chapter 160, the first one is for Policy and Procedures Manual. And then the second one that we=re going to be dealing with is to amend Chapter 160. And what we=re requesting is that the following paragraph be added: AA Lieutenant who is temporarily required to perform the duties of the Chief of Police for more than two hours in a work day shall be paid at the rate of pay equal to that of the Chief of Police for all hours worked in the higher ranking position. This section shall only apply to those periods of time when the Chief of Police is unavailable due to vacation, illness, or protracted absence due to conference attendance or training. The Acting Chief of Police shall not be eligible for overtime pay.@ I don=t know why it wasn=t brought forward. I really don=t. But in the past, you know, we=ve always, we=ve allowed for an Acting Sergeant to get pay. Up until we moved the change from 165 to 160 in the PPM, we always paid Lieutenants for Acting Chief. And our request is to fix that. And we=re in a situation right now where we have a Lieutenant that=s going to be the Acting Chief until January and in all fairness, that Lieutenant should be getting Acting Chief=s pay. And thus, I brought this forward. It requires two changes. One in the PPM and one in Chapter 160. And both editions are identical.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. It makes sense to me. I don't have a problem with it. I think if you have a Lieutenant doing the Chief's job, that Lieutenant ought to make the Chief's pay. He's probably doing the Lieutenant's job too.

Mayor McPherson: He's doing both.

Mr. Stake: Makes sense. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you. Mr. McPherson, now don't drop dead because I addressed you as Mr. McPherson, but one question I have is, the way that's written, if he works over two hours, that he would be paid the Chief's pay. The higher rate of pay. Does that mean that if he works two hours and one minute, he would be paid at that rate for one minute? All hours over two hours? Or for the whole two hours? That's not really clear.

Mayor McPherson: If you go on down, no. He would not get paid Chief's pay if he was only acting as the Chief for a couple, three hours. If you go on down in the paragraph itself, it's very specific that the section only applies to periods of time when the Chief of Police is incapacitated due to illness, or due to a protracted absence such as training or out of state conference or vacations. We're talking long-term, not two-hour increments.

Mr. Stake: Right. There would have to be a period of time the Chief's not going to be available for that to kick in.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. And two hours wouldn't kick it in.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: A couple of things. You're right Councilperson Newman. I do think more clarity wouldn't hurt there, because I think that two hours has come straight out of the FOP contract on how we upgrade a Sergeant to a Lieutenant.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. And that's a different situation. I don't think we've put protracted absence in there.

Mr. Hills: I think that maybe, I'm not opposed to the concept. I go back and I see Mrs. Frazier provided us with some notes that we did this four years ago and it was left, we're going to bring forward something to clean up this and a number of other things. We're 3 2 years later and we haven't cleaned it up, but all of a sudden we react to instance, and now we have one. But let me just suggest, as I did back at that time, I certainly have no problem with the concept of upgrading to the Chief, from Lieutenant who's been upgraded. And last time we did this, if we all remember, it was upgrading a Sergeant to a Chief because we had no Lieutenants at that period of time when it was done back in '93 or '94. But my concern comes, let's take the Lieutenant that's got 15 years service and the Chief that's got 2 years service, it may be a reduction in pay.

And I'm not so sure that we shouldn't be writing this at some agreed upon percentage above what the current person being upgraded to Chief is paid. Whether it be his salary plus 15% for the hours worked as Chief. I'm just saying that I think that you could, or you could be, you have a 1 year Lieutenant and a 20 year Chief and he just doubled his salary. So I'm not sure that, and I know that Lieutenant McKinley is just, there needs to be some recognition. Now you can get paid just as much as I get paid to be Mayor when he's gone if you want.

Mayor McPherson: I already covered that with him. He didn't buy that. Well, what I can do President Hills, I'll meet with the Lieutenant, we'll sit down and try to draft up something that's....

Mr. Hills: And I think, unless I'm wrong, I mean, we have some officers who are, we have Lieutenants and Chiefs who are not in the FOP contract. So I'm not always sure that you need to take the contract language to apply to someone that's not under the contract. It gives us the opportunity as administration to be a little bit more working rather than in the standard of the black and white of a contract. So conceptually, I think it needs to be done. I guess the question I would have, and we have done this retroactively Lieutenant, so don't worry about that. We've made it whole before. I'm sure we'll make it whole again. But once we do this, then automatically, is the Sergeant going to be upgraded? Or is the Lieutenant still assuming his own role?

Mayor McPherson: A Sergeant is controlled by the contract itself.

Mr. Hills: Yeah but, you're the one who makes the determination, is that Lieutenant performing his function also? Or do you automatically have to go, the Sergeant to the Lieutenant? That's your decision.

Mayor McPherson: Well, I would think, the contract requires anybody that serves over 2 hours, isn't it, Scott? You know, if a Sergeant would fill in for Lieutenant....

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, Mayor. It is.

Mayor McPherson: It's 2 hours.

Lieutenant McKinley: I think what President Hills may be referring to is, is anyone filling my current job as the Operations Lieutenant? And the answer is, the other Lieutenant is.

Mr. Hills: Okay. And so there is no upgrade there because of the position you're acting in today.

Lieutenant McKinley: Correct. The two of us are doing the job of the three. He did not bring us...

Mr. Hills: Two of you are doing the job of three people.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir.

Mayor McPherson: Right.

Mr. Hills: And you're just not getting paid any upgrade and you're carrying the load, right?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Alright.

Mayor McPherson: If we could go ahead and move it forward, we would certainly work together and work with the Finance Chair and try to come up with a little bit better language that would put that in.

Mr. Hills: Because Ron and I, I hadn't talked to Councilman Stake about it, and I apologize for that. But I do see those notes that we got, or the last minutes really kind of addressed the same issue in '94.

Mayor McPherson: If I could ask, if you could share all those minutes with us or notes, we'd certainly be able to, that would help us in our conversations that you....

Mr. Hills: I know every Council person has them and I'm sure if you don't, I'm sure Nancy will get them for you.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. I don't recall having them.

Mr. Hood: I just think one point that shouldn't be overlooked is that this will make the position overtime exempt. So if his duties should carry him over the regular work day, by paying him as the Acting Chief, we won't be paying overtime. So it may be a savings to the city. So I don't think that point should be overlooked.

Mr. Clemens: Or he could work overtime as a Lieutenant and not be a Chief.

Mayor McPherson: That's what's being done now. If the Lieutenant, the Lieutenant is here tonight, he's on overtime.

Mr. Clemens: That's alright. That's no problem.

Mayor McPherson: And it's all a matter whether his accumulation of overtime is going to equal to what the Chief's pay is going to be. I think when we looked at this, Scott, didn't we kind of figure 3 2 to 4 hours of overtime is on average?

Lieutenant McKinley: Actually, 3 hours of overtime per week, would reach the point of the Chief=s pay.

Mayor McPherson: So it doesn=t take much overtime to get to the Chief=s pay in this particular case. Well, just coming to Council meetings I think is going to put him at Chief=s pay right now.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And I agree that something should be done. And I think the percentage deal or something like that, because I do know their pay scale=s close. I wouldn=t want him to take the job and lose money. I think he should make additional money taking over for the Chief.

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

Mr. Baxter: Yeah. Just to be a little bit funny, I=d like to see the Chief take the Lieutenant=s pay while he=s doing it.

Mayor McPherson: I don=t think he=ll buy into that.

Mr. Baxter: I=m not being serious, Chief.

Mr. Stake: Are you offering that as an amendment?

Mr. Baxter: I would think it would be great but I don=t think they=ll be able to take it.

Mr. Stake: Mayor, I notice that you do want a rule suspension on this. Of course, that=s going to require 6 votes of Council, President Hills?

Mr. Hills: That=s right.

Mr. Stake: And so do you think by Monday evening you=re going to have those changes?

Mayor McPherson: I think we can have them by Monday, can=t we Scott?

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes.

Mayor McPherson: We=ll have them. We=ll have them by your packet on Friday.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well maybe, we have a meeting tomorrow afternoon. Maybe after that meeting we can discuss this a little bit further.

Mayor McPherson: I have a meeting right after that meeting. So, are you in the second meeting? Yeah. You're in the second meeting too. So yeah, that would be fine.

Mr. Stake: I think I am. Okay.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could suggest. Lieutenant isn't hurting right now. He's getting overtime pay for every hour he's it. So I don't know that there's an issue of pushing this until we've all had a chance to read these notes that we're talking about. Let's think about what is the best way to do it. It's not just Lieutenant McKinley. We're getting ready to write something that could be applied to everything in the future. And so I don't, is there a push that you want to get this passed next week?

Mayor McPherson: Well, the only push is the fact that it's being done right now by the Lieutenants. And the reason I put the rule suspension in, was so that when we do get the verbiage that's acceptable, it goes into effect within 30 days after I sign it. We would also probably look at the overtime that the Lieutenant's got versus what it would have been with the Chief and decide at that point whether we want to make it retroactive or not. Because you know, we've made other things retroactive.

Mr. Hills: The last time we did this upgrade we made it retroactive. And I'm not so sure that if we have another week to look at it, you can pass it as an emergency and it goes into effect immediately. In that we've had the opportunity to read it, talk about it, and discuss it. We've just got too many things coming up as an emergency, or let's get it done right away when, let's just look at it a little bit.

Mayor McPherson: That's fine.

Mr. Hills: He's not going to lose any money.

Mayor McPherson: I know.

Mr. Hills: Lieutenant, you trust us enough to know.....

Mayor McPherson: We've already talked about the fact he's not going to lose any money. And if it takes an extra couple of weeks that's fine. And like you say, maybe we'll just have the emergency.

Mr. Hills: I think you go into effect quicker. Because you put it as an emergency and then you don't have to wait the 30 days on a rule suspension.

Mayor McPherson: I've just been leery of putting emergencies through any more.

Mr. Hills: Emergencies aren't a problem as long as we've all had the opportunity to talk about emergencies.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. Yeah, that=s fine.

Mr. Stake: Well, and I think we would be going back to language that was in a previous, in what, 164, previous language?

Mayor McPherson: 165 I think. Or 164, yeah.

Mr. Stake: Really, we=re just talking about the language that we previously had that was overlooked when we did the 160.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. Well, the only thing is, Bill has made a good point that if you get a 2 year Chief and a 15 year Lieutenant, for the Lieutenant to get Chief=s pay, he might be losing money. So we do need somehow to put that into there, into this verbiage. So we=ll get that taken care of.

Mr. Stake: Alright then, I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Are there any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Okay. I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Then we have the second part of this. That was the Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual. This is to Amend Section 160.04 (Acting Chief=s Pay). The same thing. It=s just....

Mayor McPherson: Different book.

Mr. Stake: That=s right. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this from members of Finance Committee or members of Council? (No response). Okay, in hearing none, I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6 is Discussion: Amend Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual to include Records Policy. And I believe this is a follow-up to what we had done previously. It=s an ordinance, 68-07 passed October 8 which amended 167.03 ARecord And Document Management@ of Chapter 167 City Records Commission to provide for the new Record Management Policy. This policy is now to be included in the city=s Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual and Council action is required on this. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. Then hearing none, I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted

AYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 7 is Discussion: Supplemental Appropriation - Special Counsel Account (Mayor=s Office). Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you Chairman. This is a request to add \$15,000 to our budget for special counsel. I think Council=s been aware, not only are we in negotiations with the Steel Workers, which has cost some money, but we=re also involved in several disciplinary issues. And we=re running out of money. We may not make it yet this month. We=re anticipating, based on our past expenditures, which I=ve attached, it looks like we=re going to be running right around \$5,000 a month. And we=re looking at perhaps some arbitration hearings as well as the things that are going on right now. We go to arbitration, that=s going to require quite a bit of money by itself. And it looks like that=s where we=re headed on a contract. So we need the money to pay our legal counsel. That=s what it=s for.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And you=re requesting \$15,000 from the General Fund. Are there any questions or comments for the Mayor from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And you are asking for an emergency on this and you are out of money, correct?

Mayor McPherson: Yes. We=re just about broke right now.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Okay, not hearing objections then, I will make a motion that we send to Council for its first reading with recommendation for adoption as an emergency to appropriate from the General Fund, \$15,000 to account number 110.522.5332. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 8 is Discussion: Transfer of Funds - gasoline (Police Dept.). Lieutenant McKinley did speak to me about this. And Lieutenant, if you want to just let the rest of Council know you are I guess, out of money on gasoline. And as we all know, gasoline prices did go sky high.

Lieutenant McKinley: We are. The budget amount did not last the year.

Mr. Stake: And you are looking for \$24,000 to be transferred from the Overtime Account to the Gasoline Account?

Lieutenant McKinley: That is correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions or comments for Lieutenant McKinley from members of the Finance Committee? Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Yes, Lieutenant. How much was normally budgeted for your gasoline account?

Lieutenant McKinley: At the beginning of the year, we selected a figure, I believe it was in a low \$2 per gallon range. And we ran that times our usage compared to the previous year and I don't have that figure off the top of my head. But that came up with the budgeted amount for what we expected to spend on gasoline. The gas prices have been higher than we anticipated; therefore, we're short of the money.

Mr. Harris: \$90,000.

Mr. Stake: \$90,000 was budgeted.

Lieutenant McKinley: \$90,000 for the year.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other questions from members of the Finance Committee? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: This is just a transfer of funds?

Mr. Stake: It's just a transfer from the Overtime Account to the Gasoline Account. Which they've done very good on the Overtime Account. So, President Hills, did you have a question or comment?

Mr. Hills: No. I'd just like to commend any department that, as they need more money, they look around within their own. And Mayor, I take it you looked and didn't have anything left. But certainly, rather than appropriation from the General Fund, any time you can look within your own accounts and ask for the transfer, that's just good budgeting. That's good management. And I commend you all for doing that.

Mr. Stake: And I agree. Thank you. Any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Okay then, hearing none, I'll make a motion, you do need emergency on this so we can fill those cruisers up with gasoline.

Lieutenant McKinley: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Yes, Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: You can combine this with the one you just did if you wish. They're both emergencies. If you're going to do that, they can be written as one.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well then, let's do that. Do I have to say anything special in order to do that?

Mrs. Frazier: No.

Mr. Stake: Okay. We will combine this ordinance with the previous ordinance. And this is a request to transfer \$24,000 from account number 110.111.5105 A~~Overtime~~ to account number 110.111.5251 A~~Gasoline~~ to pay for gasoline for the remainder of 2007. I make a motion that we send this forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion?

Mr. Hills: One question. This is more of Nancy, it is appropriate to have both an appropriation ordinance and a transfer ordinance under one number?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Hills: You don't have a problem with that? And Dick doesn't have a problem with his accounting-wise? Okay. Thank you. That clarifies the question. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, President Hills. And I do see that the Auditor has certified that there are monies available. So I have a second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted A~~Aye~~). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 9 is Discussion: Appropriation of Funds - (Waggoner Road - Graham Road). And this is in regards to the Permissive Tax monies being received. Mr. DeBolt.

Mr. DeBolt: Mr. Chairman, members of Council, as you know, we have two street programs currently going on with ODOT in the City Street Program. One nearing completion. The other just started this month. We'd like to move forward to appropriate the monies for the two projects that have been completed already this year. Graham Road and Waggoner Road. The projects were done in a timely manner and under budget. And I think we were correct in going along with doing Graham and Waggoner with the county. So I think those were good projects to be involved in. So we'd like to ask for the appropriation at this time.

Mr. Stake: And you are also asking for an emergency. But we do owe the money and we do need to pay. Correct?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee for Mr. DeBolt? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. Just one thing so everybody on Council understands. Originally, you had passed an ordinance asking the Service Director to request this money from the Franklin County Permissive Tax Fund. The money is now here. And that's the reason now that he's asking for the appropriation to pay for it because it is now here and available to pay out from the Permissive Tax Fund.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harris. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Hills: I think it=s appropriate for emergency in that this is an item that=s been thoroughly discussed and we=ve just been waiting for the money to get here.

Mr. Stake: Okay then. I=ll make a motion that we appropriate \$106,357.18 to pay for the paving of Waggoner Road, and \$150,053.40 to pay for the Graham Road improvements. And as was stated, funds have been received from the Franklin County Permissive Tax Fund and need to be appropriated. They will be appropriated to account number 230.118.5651 for Waggoner Road in the amount of the \$106,357.18. And account number 440.002.5659 in the amount of \$150,053.40 for Graham Road. Do I have a second?

Mr. Clemens: I have a second, but I have one question. I=m not opposed to it, I just wanted to ask something.

Mr. Stake: Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? Go ahead, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I wanted to ask, the money is coming out of the Franklin County Permissive Tax Fund for....

Mr. DeBolt: Waggoner and Graham. Correct.

Mr. Clemens: So they=re both in Franklin County. That=s what I wanted to make sure of.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Okay. I made a motion we send this on to Council for recommendation for adoption as an emergency. And I have a second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 11 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY LISTED ON THE FIXED ASSET SCHEDULE. It had its first reading on October 8. And I did ask the Mayor and the Service Director to go ahead and put a list together of everything we=d be auctioning off, and I believe everybody has that. I appreciate them doing that. Thank you very much. They do wish to have an emergency on this so that they can get the auction done. Get the, I guess, notices in the paper for the auction and get this done while the weather is pretty decent. Does anybody have a problem with that? (No response). Okay then, I will make a motion that we send this forward. Let me ask, are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its second reading with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion?

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake, you need to amend it with the new list. They gave you the non-fixed asset list, and they updated the fixed asset list - that=s your Exhibit AA@. And so you want to send it forward with a new list.

Mr. Stake: Okay then. I=ll make a motion that we send this forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency with the amended list. Amending with the new list of the fixed assets. Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 12 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH THE DISTRICT ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE FRANKLIN COUNTY GENERAL HEALTH DISTRICT FOR HEALTH SERVICES. This had its first reading on October 8. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Hearing none, I=ll make a motion that we send this on for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All vote AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 13 is a RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE AMOUNTS AND RATES AS DETERMINED BY THE BUDGET COMMISSION AND AUTHORIZING THE NECESSARY TAX LEVIES AND CERTIFYING THEM TO THE COUNTY AUDITOR. It had its first reading on the 8<sup>th</sup> of October, and this is for Licking County, and, Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Mr. Stake. This is the companion ordinance to the Franklin County one that you did several weeks ago. This does not need an ordinance. It=s just a resolution accepting the amounts for the Tax Commission over there. There=s no problem with it. You can just go ahead and send it on for passage of the resolution.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Anybody have a problem with that? (No response). Alright then. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then hearing none, I=ll make a motion that we send this resolution on for its second reading to Council with recommendation for adoption of the resolution. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@).

Mrs. Frazier: Are you passing it as a rule suspension or emergency?

Mr. Harris: No. It doesn=t need to be effective. It just needs to be passed by Council prior to a certain date. So you don=t necessarily need an emergency on it. Just pass the resolution and send it on. Frankly, this is just a check in the box of somebody=s list. It just has to be done basically, by the end of the year or they won=t give you your tax money next year.

Mr. Stake: Okay then I will make a motion that we send this on for recommendation for adoption

with a rule suspension. I have a second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you, Mrs. Frazier.

Item number 14 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO EXTEND CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL AND PLAN REVIEW SERVICES. This also had its first reading on the 8<sup>th</sup> of October. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this ordinance from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Hearing none, then I=ll make a motion that we send this on for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 15 is an ORDINANCE MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENT (TAYLOR ROAD SEWER LINE EXTENSION). This had its second reading on October 8. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Mr. Harris, would you like to add anything?

Mr. Harris: No. Just, if there=s any questions, I=ll be glad to answer them.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Harris? (No response). Okay then, I=ll make a motion that we send this on for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 16 is ORDINANCE MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENT (BROAD STREET WATER LINE EXTENSION). This also had its second reading on October 8. Any questions or comments in regards to this from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Or for Mr. Harris? (No response). Okay. Then I=ll make a motion that we send this on for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 17 is ORDINANCE MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENT (PHASE II MAIN STREET CORRIDOR REVITALIZATION PROJECT). This also had its second reading on October 8. Any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Hearing none, then I=ll make a motion that we send this on to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 9:10.

Finance Committee

October 15, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)