

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 7, 2002

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

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

Meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m.

Mrs. Cannella: Approval of the minutes of September 16, 2002. Any changes, additions, deletions? If not, they stand as read. Approval of the agenda.

Mr. Wade: Mrs. Cannella, I'd like to hold item number 4 (RYF football field) please.

Mrs. Cannella: We will hold item number 4 and I would like to remove from Other Legislation, *1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Wade: Mrs. Cannella. I'm sorry. I think I said hold. I want to move that into Other Legislation. Item 4. I'm sorry.

Mrs. Cannella: Alright. Mr. Wade would like to, with the discussion of the football field into Other Legislation. Could I have a vote on that please? A second from Mr. Wade. Oh, you can't second your own.

Mr. Stake: I'll second it.

Mrs. Cannella: Mr. Stake will second it then. Thank you very much. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). And with that we will adjourn at 7:33.

* Item #1 (Other Legislation) Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio: City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio Employee Provisions Chapter 165-Section 165.05 "Authorized Positions, Personnel, Classification and Pay Grade" Subsection (f) "Department of Development"

Item #2 (Other Legislation) Ordinance authorizing Mayor to purchase a Toro 580D Groundskeeper mower for Parks and Recreation Department and declaring an emergency

Item #3 (Other Legislation) Ordinance amending Ordinance No. 177-01 passed December 17, 2001 to reflect substitution of item(s) to be purchased by the Parks and Recreation Department from Capital Equipment Funds and declaring an emergency

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

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 7, 2002

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee at 7:34. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of September 16, 2002 Safety Committee Meeting. Are there any corrections? If not they'll stand approved. The next item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions to the agenda? If not they stand approved.

The next item is discussion, Liquor Permit Request, transfer, from W W S H Inc., to YUMI Inc. dba Arrirang, 6078 E. Livingston Avenue, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, 43068. Is the Chief here or representative from the Police Department?

Mayor McPherson: Lieutenant Moser is here to address it.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Lieutenant.

Lieutenant Moser: Our investigators completed the investigation of this liquor transfer, permit transfer, and could find no reason to keep said from happening.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. Thank you. And we'll send this back with nothing on it then.

The next item on the agenda is discussion, accept FY 2002 Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (Digital Camera); and appropriate funds. Lieutenant? Do you want to explain this or do you want to go, have you discussed this with the Chief on these digital cameras?

Lieutenant O'Neill: I'm aware that there was a question that came up. I don't know exactly what the question was and if you can direct them to me maybe I can clarify some things.

Mr. Clemens: The only question I have on this, since it's only a 10% contribution and it's a 90% grant fund is that the total amount of the digital cameras is \$10,650. Is this a bid out item or how is that handled?

Lieutenant O'Neill: I'm not sure how they're going to handle the bidding or whether or not we're going to do it that way. I don't anticipate it being that high and I don't have the numbers in front of me. We ran into some problem a couple of years ago when we first started looking into digital photography for the department. We contacted the prosecutors of each one of the counties since typically we're talking about major cases or horrific traffic accidents when we need to take a significant number of photos. What the prosecutors told us is if we were going to go to digital photography we needed to have one of two ways of storing our photographs. Either they had to have what they call a digital fingerprint on each photograph which would make sure that the photograph that they were looking at was exactly the photograph that came out of the camera. As you are all aware, or as you may be aware, you can get in with the right program and manipulate

the photograph, make it look however you want. You can make someone look older, younger, taller. With this digital fingerprint they would be able to assure that the photograph they were looking at was exactly what they saw when the photograph was taken. These particular cameras are extremely expensive. I think the closest we could come, the lowest we could come was about \$2200 a piece. The other option that the prosecutors gave us would be that if we wrote a policy in our department that stated, whenever we took a photograph we would store the media that the photographs were held on in our property room and enter it just like any other evidence. That left us with three different kind of cameras we could use. We could use a camera that stored it on a regular 3 1/2 inch floppy disk but they're very limited to how many pictures you can put in each disk. High resolution you can get about three to five of those photographs and to take 30, 40, 50 photographs depending on your crime scene it was going to be cost prohibitive just to store that number. The other one was a smart card type of camera which I think most cameras are now dealing with the little computer chip that's lodged inside the computer. Those chips are very expensive and since our property doesn't move through the property room very fast, we'd probably be talking about 50 or 60 of those chips just to get us started. So the camera that we found was a camera that actually went to a readable/writable CD. It's about a 3 inch CD. It holds 150 to 180 high resolution photographs on each CD and they only cost about a dollar a piece depending on who we're getting them from and what's on sale. So we can virtually store an entire crime scene, an entire accident in our property room for about a dollar. These cameras run \$800 a piece. We're trying to outfit each one of the Sargents with them. With one of those which would mean \$600 to \$800 a piece plus carrying cases and then a certain number of these readable/writable CD's which I don't have the exact number right in front of me. I would say we're looking at between \$6,000 and \$7,000 total.

Mr. Clemens: Like I said, I have no problem with it. I know we need them. It had down here \$10,650 and I know there's only 10,000 bid price and I just didn't know how we were going to handle it. But if it's going to be under there's no problem then.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens. I'm not on Safety but if I could ask a question, because this ordinance is about accepting a block grant, right? A grant from the federal government. Or an enforcement block grant for digital cameras. So we supplied the federal government with some data that said, we're going to spend 10,000 plus or, it's either 10,600 or our 1183 makes it roughly 12,000. I don't have my notes in front of me but we have said we need this amount of money because we're going to do this in the cameras. Are you telling me now that we're not going to spend that much? And they've authorized a grant to us but we're not going to spend that much money to do it because it's been a couple of years delay and the technology is different?

Lieutenant O'Neill: I think when we bought our first camera we looked into our first camera a couple years ago and they ran about \$1,000 a piece. Since then I pulled it up off of Microcenter's web site today and they're selling for 799. So we're probably going to be less than our initial grant figure and it really depends on how many of the cameras we're going to go forward with. And it looks at this point as though each one of the patrol Sargent's would be issued one _____. That would keep us under the \$10,000. Much under the \$11,000 grant number.

Mr. Hills: But once, I've had this funny feeling about the federal government because once they

said, we're going to give you this much money, you're going to get that much money. Once they document it that it's coming here then I guess my concern is do we adjust those federal grants? Do we know that offhand? Or does anyone, do you, or maybe the Mayor? Do you all know if these become adjustable? I mean if you budget it, when you sent them your request, the one thing about the federal government and grants is you give them all the data. If you want a Cadillac, you give them the numbers for the Cadillac. If you want a Ford, you give them the numbers for a Ford. So when we applied for a grant through the City of Reynoldsburg we gave them the data we had at the time which is the best available data. And I guess they've come back and they say, okay now we're going to give you this amount of money, but if we can save 20 or 25%, do we want, are those grants modifiable so we don't...

Lieutenant O'Neill: I don't have the grant in front of me.

Mayor McPherson: I can answer that Bill.

Mr. Hills: Sure. Please.

Mayor McPherson: First of all we need to understand that the grant is not just for the digital cameras. The grant is to buy the digital cameras and to pay for the overtime for enforcement in using cameras and things like that. So it's a dual grant if you read it. The grant for the cameras could be 5,000 or 4,000 or whatever. The balance of it is used for overtime. So it's a dual grant.

Mr. Hills: The balance of it is used for overtime?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. Whatever less the cameras, let's say we get \$10,000, we spend 5 on cameras then the other 5 has to be used for overtime.

Mr. Hills: Because that is one of the things...

Mayor McPherson: Because that's the specification of the grant.

Mr. Hills: That is one of the things that the federal government will allow you to use grant dollars for is overtime.

Mayor McPherson: They were specific that we will use it for overtime.

Mr. Hills: I believe I have that and it's one of the seven items that they will approve. So I guess you're saying if we thought we asked for 12 and we're only going to spend 6, we use 6 in overtime and it helps us.

Mayor McPherson: You are correct. We'll get the whole grant, the \$10,600. We'll spend \$5,000 for cameras. We'll spend \$5,600 on overtime.

Lieutenant O'Neill: In this particular grant, the overtime isn't tied to the cameras.

Mayor McPherson: No. It's just overtime.

Mr. Hills: No. It would be because we now have a grant that has been granted and more monies than we need to buy what we initially thought we needed.

Mayor McPherson: Well, when it was originally presented two years ago we anticipated spending about \$6,000 for cameras and then the balance would be overtime. Now it's going to be about \$4800 and the balance will be spent on overtime. But again, it's a two pronged grant. It's not, part of the grant is for the cameras. The other part of it is for overtime.

Mr. Hills: Well I think the ordinance would just say cameras but I'm appreciative of the fact that there's other things in those numbers because I believe, Mel you correct me if I'm wrong, but the ordinance says cameras.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. It says 10,650 and it is for overtime, film development, things like that. My point was if we're going to bid it. I just didn't know if we were going to bid out over \$10,000. If we're not, I have no problem with it.

Mayor McPherson: Actually I think it's even more specific than just overtime. I think it's for community oriented policing overtime.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Good.

Mr. Clemens: Any other questions? Thank you Lieutenant. I'd like to make a motion we send this to Council for it's first reading as an emergency for passage. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Wade. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

The next item, discussion, status of intersection of Graham Road and Main Street. The intersection, I've discussed this with Mayor McPherson and he is working on this and he's on the situation and he said it's in the works so we don't have to worry about anything. It'll be coming along. Right Bob? He said he'd report back to us.

Mayor McPherson: Right.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to remove that from the agenda. Do I have a second on it? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

The next item, Ordinance accepting the US Department of Justice COPS More 2001 grant for mobile computers and related equipment for Reynoldsburg Police Department. This has had its first reading and it's up for its second reading. I know there's questions on this. I don't know whether the Lieutenant's going to answer it or not. Chief, nobody's here this evening.

Lieutenant O'Neill: I've had an opportunity to review the minutes of the Safety Committee meeting on September 16 of this year. At this point I have nothing further that I can add to that. If there are questions though I can...

Mr. Clemens: I think its been discussed as far as computers and been well explained and what the benefit would be and so forth. What we've been discussing is of course getting the cost down which the Chief is working diligently to get our portion down to where we set our budget. There have been questions as far as the maintenance program and I see a report that you gave us that the maintenance will run per year anywhere between 25 and \$28,000. This, we'd like to have more discussion on plus as far as the in car computer, has this been discussed with our Computer Director? Have they met with the Chief and met with the department on how this is going to be obtained and how it is going to be operated and so forth? Do you know?

Lieutenant O'Neill: Yes there has been some discussions. I've not been involved in those discussions myself but I do know they have taken place.

Mr. Clemens: You have met with the Computer Department Director?

Lieutenant O'Neill: I believe Chief Miller has met with Mr. Anthony about this but I myself have not been involved with those conversations.

Mr. Clemens: Well, that would bring it up next time. Because I've discussed it with him too.

Mayor McPherson: There's one question that's still outstanding on the cameras and that's whether they'll interface with our system and that's something that Bart and the Chief are working on and I'm certain some time this week we'll have that answer so in the normal process, by the next time it comes up to committee we should have those answers. But that's the remaining question. So I know there's been conversations between them.

Mr. Clemens: That solves one thing because that was my next question and I know very little about computers but I did wonder if it interacted with the equipment that we have now.

Mayor McPherson: That's the remaining question they're working out.

Mr. Clemens: What I would like to do, are there any more questions for the Lieutenant or for the Mayor? I'd like to move this on for the second reading, then when it comes back to committee we'll have more discussion on it and move it to Finance to work our finances on it. So I would like to move it on for the second reading. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Beougher. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

That ends the Safety Committee at 7:47.

Safety Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 7, 2002

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

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:47 p.m. The first item of business is the approval of the minutes of the September 16, 2002 committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to these minutes? None being heard, they will stand as read. Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. Several changes here, seeing the first I would like to change the order of discussion of items number 4 and 7 making the rezoning of the 8450 East Main Street tract from R-1 to CC item number. Making the amendment 1131.02 of Chapter 1131

“Definitions” item number 4, now item number 7. And I have two items that I would like to add that we received from the Planning Commission as items 4a and 4b. Item 4a being the Final Plat of Jordan Crossing and item 4b being the Final Plat of Farmington. Are there any other changes to the agenda from other members of Service? Do I have a second on that motion? Mr. Beougher will second that. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is discussion of the rezoning of 8450 East Main Street from R-1 to CC, applicant, Kroger Real Estate and we have with us here Mr. Glen Dugger for Smith & Hale this evening. Thanks for coming Mr. Dugger.

Mr. Dugger: Thank you Mr. Gilbert and I appreciate you moving us around on the agenda to accommodate my trying to get to two different places at the same time tonight.

Mr. Gilbert: My pleasure.

Mr. Dugger: My name’s Glen Dugger. I’m an attorney at 37 West Broad Street and I represent the applicant Kroger Real Estate. The property that they request the rezoning is at the northwest corner of Taylor Road and East Main Street. It was recently annexed to the city about a year or so ago and we did that at the time. It’s about 12.8 acres. The property is currently being used for a mobile home park and used car lot. We’ve asked for the CC classification to allow construction of a 60,000 square foot Kroger store. You’re all familiar with the intersection of the neighborhood and it’s probably in need of some reworking. We’ve been working over the last year on a couple of issues that are necessary for this property to be developed and I’ve really been glad to have the resources that a company like Kroger can devote to it. We’ve had some, been working diligently with the Ohio Department of Transportation on traffic issues relative to that intersection. We’ve been working with the Ohio EPA on relocation of a stream that also bisects this property. A couple of challenging issues and Kroger has gone a long way to resolving them. With the uses in that particular neighborhood with the neighborhoods to the north along Taylor Road they are in need of additional retail or grocery. It’s not anticipated by Kroger but they are going to, this store would be a compliment to their existing store on Main Street. I know that that’s a question that all of Council has. Are we rezoning this new store to immediately close the other one and that’s not Kroger’s intent. Their studies indicate that both stores, there would be some _____ but both stores can both be successful. We have I think a fairly complete submittal. I know that there have been some, more recently its been challenging for us to sometimes get a complete submittal together but Linda Patterson from Kroger has done a great job of putting the submittal together. I’m looking forward to working with your staff. We’ve already been doing some work with staff, both the development and zoning staff on some of the issues that are raised by an application that has this level of complexity. We’d just like to move this along so that we could start working with them and get some of these questions answered. I think it’s a perfectly appropriate use for that corner. I don’t think anybody would disagree that retail and significant neighborhood service retail like this is an appropriate use for that corner. So if there are any questions, I’m here, happy to answer them. Linda Patterson is here from Kroger. But that’s what we expect to do with Council here over the next several months. Thanks very much.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you Mr. Dugger. Are there any questions from members of Council for Mr. Dugger at this time? Members of Service? Other members of Council? None being heard, I would just like to give my compliments to Kroger's and yourself. The packet that you put together for us was in compliance with every request that we have and under our 1151 code which is a rarity since I've been chairing Service and I want to thank you for that. I just would point out that the creek easement and how the EPA and Kroger's addressed the creek provided a natural buffer between some residential areas that I think _____ and certainly a benefit to the community. Mr. Brandt, being the Development Director, anything you might want to add from the city's standpoint before we move this forward?

Mr. Brandt: Thank you sir. No, we've tried to work as close as we can with the applicant and we're in strong support of the project in that particular location and the phone calls that we've received since the first publication in the press of the proposed Kroger store has all been very positive into the point some people will call and ask when are the bricks and sticks coming. So at this point we're very pleased and I think it's an excellent use of the corner and the Kroger company will be a fine company to work with. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you. With nothing else coming before us on this issue I would like to make a motion that, let me just check with the Clerk, would this application for the rezoning require a Public Hearing?

Mrs. Frazier: First reading.

Mr. Gilbert: Just a first reading?

Mrs. Frazier: It would go to a first reading and then set a Public Hearing.

Mr. Gilbert: Right. Okay. I would make a motion that we forward this item to Council for its first reading where a Public Hearing will need to be set. Do I have a second? Mr. Hills with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). The motion passes.

Mr. Dugger: Thank you very much.

Mr. Gilbert: Item number 4a is a Final Plat, Subdivision of Jordan Crossing, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. The members would have had this item at their desks before them this evening. It is my understanding that all of the items have been submitted and are there any questions from members of Service regarding this Final Plat at this time? Other members of Council? Mr. Roehrenbeck is here if there's any questions. With none being heard I would make a motion that we forward this to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second on that? Mr. Stake with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thanks for coming out.

Item number 4b is Final Plat, Farmington, Section 5, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. This item was in

before you this evening. Are there any questions on the Final Plat at Farmington at this time from members of Service, other members of Council? None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is discussion regarding Amending 949.04(a) Additional Tap Fees for Nonassessed Property. This item comes from our Water/Wastewater Department. Mr. Kipp is with us this evening. Mark take it away.

Mr. Kipp: This is just an updating of our ordinance. Our front footage fees for water was previously set at \$10 per front foot in 1989. Costs have risen since then. I brought this forward now because we had the other, we were looking at the sewer capacity fees so I brought them both together at the same time. The City of Columbus set their front footage fee at \$22 per front foot in 1999 and I've checked with Mr. Parkinson and he still felt that that was a relevant charge to use so we kept it at 22. The fee is typically charged where we, the city installs the water line at the city's cost and that's how we recoup our fee when other people would tap into that line.

Mr. Gilbert: Does this raise any questions from members of Service? I know this was referenced in your packet of information regarding, it was, actually it was provided in our packet. This is, the biggest impact this would have is on property annexing into the city. Is that correct?

Mr. Kipp: That don't have water service. For properties _____ water. It effects only lines that the city installs or if a developer should put a line in and didn't provide taps or something on a way to service the property then it would be collected.

Mr. Gilbert: Any questions from members of Service? Other members of Council? Mark is there a need for this, or can we just run it through the regular process for a first reading.

Mr. Kipp: If anybody has any questions, we'll be on vacation the next committee meeting. You can talk to me before then.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Great. Then I will make a motion that we forward this item to Council for a first reading. Do I have a second on that? Mr. Hills with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you Mark.

Item number 6 is the discussion, authorization of contract WPS Energy (Electric Aggregation Service). It's here Mr. Brandt. _____ work on this program. And also I believe for the members benefit Mr. Greg Sloan is here as well this evening.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you Mr. Gilbert, members of Council. As you're all aware this is, shall we say, ongoing effort that we got involved in about a year ago when we went to the ballot on gas and electric. We're coming to the hopefully, somewhat to the end of the road or at least the culmination of a long process with respect to the electric issue. The document you have before

you indicate a draft agreement. We realize that the final passage would require a complete agreement and to that end we will certainly comply. But what we're doing is merely getting things in the process because with the volatility of the market place these days, if we finally arrive at an agreement and then go forward for passage, by the time this happens in our time span so to speak, we could find ourselves with an offer withdrawn. So at that end we got the process started a little bit early to hopefully stay in step with the way things are in the marketplace. In that end I have Mr. Greg Sloan here who's been working here with us from AmpOhio and he can give you some other details on this issue as well as give us a bit of an update on our gas project that we're working on as well. Because we had both issues, electric and gas for aggregation.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. While Mr. Sloan's coming forward I will ask Mr. Underwood if he had approval as to form on the contract the way it stands right now.

Mr. Underwood: No. There are some items still under negotiation and when negotiations are finished I will do it at that time. What we would like to do is take it two readings, two committees, two readings and then hold it so we get it close and if it's a real quick offer then we can take a maybe special meeting along with a committee meeting or whatever. But I think you ought to see probably 90% of it's set but there's still some items that are being negotiated.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Because I know the request was to move this forward as an emergency on the legislative request. You're saying a minimum of two readings?

Mr. Underwood: I'd take it two committees, two readings, and then hold it on Other Legislation unless we have the final agreement by then.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Thank you Mr. Underwood. Thank you Mr. Sloan.

Mr. Sloan: Thank you Mr. Gilbert. Just to give you a little update on where we stand, and the reason that the contract is still in draft stage, one of the main pieces of the contract that hasn't been finalized is the actual offer of savings to the customer. And where we stand with that is we've made a request, formal request to AEP to get their customer list for all the residents in the city and we're probably about a week away from getting that. And then this is what we have to provide WPS so they can actually go through the number of customers, the load calculations of what the customer is going to use in order to actually make their offer. And what we had in the actual ordinance, the sample ordinance, was a range that you need to at least be at a minimum in this 3-5% range. But they can't get this information. The city has to get it for them from AEP and then that's what they've actually got to go through the evaluation process to determine what type of savings that they'll be able to offer. So it's a combination of customers, load profile, and then what's the market conditions at that point and time. They may go through the calculations if the markets change and they may have wait a couple of months or they may be able to make an offer at that point. But what we were trying to do with the draft agreement and this ordinance was at least get through some of the process so we weren't in a 6 week time frame to actually go through the readings and to uproot the contract and the ordinance. And Mr. Underwood has not had a chance to see the final draft. I think we'll be able to get everything to him in short order except for the actual savings offer because that may take them several weeks to go through. That's sort of the, the latest update.

Mr. Gilbert: And you had an update for us on the natural gas?

Mr. Sloan: As far as the gas program, and we have been, we're a good 9 months behind on the electric program because the rule actually came out this summer. And as of yet we don't have any aggregation programs _____ on Columbia Gas of Ohio. But where we stand, we should have a plan of operation in governance to the city this week. I'm sure there'll be some changes and some tweaks that we need to make to it and then once we get the city to pass an ordinance accepting the final version of the plan of operation in governance, then we'll be in a position to do, we still have to then do two Public Hearings just as we did with the electric program where we will actually put a notice out in the paper that we'll be talking about the plan of operation in governance. And these are in the rules with the PUCO so that the residents can come learn about it and voice their issues on it. So we, the first step is to finalize the draft of the plan of operation in governance. And like I said that should be to the city this week. But we are still probably, from that point, probably a month or 6 weeks before we would be able to submit it to the PUCO, submit our application for their approval.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Gilbert. How did we come about to our, whoever came about selecting WPS Energy Services Inc?

Mr. Sloan: The really only, I've been trying to get as many suppliers to bid on the business as we can. There's probably only two legitimate potential offers right now. We're not, by doing this, if we can get an offer from Green Mountain who I think is the other legitimate candidate to service cities right now, then I think we're still in the position, we would take it. This, what we're setting up here, we don't know what the offer is. Technically we don't have an offer yet. We have interest from WPS who believes that they can provide us with an offer to save residents money. Their offer is just farther ahead than what Green Mountains is at this point. I've also had some discussions with AEP Retail and with First Energy Solutions but at this point First Energy Solutions which is part of First Energy Corporation, has indicated they're not ready. They don't see where they can provide a savings at this point. And there's been enough change over at AEP Retail that they haven't come forth with any offer. So this is just one of two offers that I hope we're going to get. It's just they're ahead of the pace of Green Mountain.

Mr. Stake: So if the other offer comes in looking better I guess we would replace their contract.

Mr. Sloan: We could replace it. My concern if we get an offer and we see savings just hearing Green Mountain say, well we want to make an offer is not the same either. At some point they've got to put something on the table. But they're in the same boat as WPS at this point. We need those customer lists to get to them. To be able to _____. We're ready to go. We've got all of our plans. We're approved as a certified governmental aggregator. Here's our customer list. This is the low profiles. We're looking for an offer of savings from you.

Mr. Stake: You don't think we're a little premature with this right now seeing as how we maybe

get another offer from somebody else?

Mr. Sloan: Well, we're not going to, are we premature? I'd like to have two offers I guess ideally so we can evaluate them. We may only get the one offer. And also the other issue is the time, the market was dropping for about the last year up until about two months ago now it's kind of spiked up and back down. So timing is kind of an issue as well. The market is not steady and depending on what happens in the gas market as well because we're going to use natural gas to produce some of the electricity that the supplier would be purchasing. It's going to have an effect. But this is, by the nature of this business, it's not one that we can get an offer and wait for another offer without acting on it. We're going to have to act on an offer if we get something that we believe is going to offer a savings and is a good offer. Now if there's, one of the concerns I have is that when the numbers are evaluated we may not get any offer at that point. It may be 4 months or 6 months depending on what the market does before a supplier actually will come in and make an offer to serve the customers for 2-4 years. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Greg, just to try to clarify, certainly any aggregator that we would go with and whatever relationship we would enter into as a city which the benefit is to the buying power in a larger volume certainly for more clarification purposes as anything else, we would not be entering into any agreement for any period of time unless that agreement would be something less than what the individual customer is paying to the only market provider at this given time. Is that not correct?

Mr. Sloan: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: So entering into an agreement through aggregation you are at a lesser rate than the retail customer is paying today for the same product.

Mr. Sloan: That's right. The type of offer that we will have to move forward is that they are guaranteeing a percentage off the existing rate from AEP or Columbus Southern Power.

Mr. Hills: And that's where, who's going to provide the offer? It comes down and that's where the marketing part comes to be, if once one does is somebody going to try to undercut that by a tenth of a cent or whatever, but certainly the position we are and the purpose of going to the ballot on this was to enable the customers known as Reynoldsburg customers to buy a rate, buy their electric service at a rate less than what the individual of Reynoldsburg customer could buy from the AEP provider.

Mr. Sloan: That's correct. We're actually taking it one step beyond that at not only the City of Reynoldsburg but Upper Arlington, Gahanna and Bexley. We've got an aggregation for aggregators to help our buying power.

Mr. Hills: Are they at the same point we are now? That was my next question. Are they working towards where if one enters then the other can become multiples of?

Mr. Sloan: The goal actually, I've made a request on behalf of all four communities for the customer list. The goal is to give all four customer lists to WPS for an offer for all four communities.

Mr. Hills: And what were those communities again?

Mr. Sloan: Bexley, Gahanna, Reynoldsburg and Upper Arlington.

Mr. Hills: Thank you.

Mr. Sloan: So the buying group, and it should be in the 40,000 customer range, but we may lose some customers depending on what rate class and how that shapes out.

Mr. Hills: Thank you Mr. Gilbert. Thank you Mr. Sloan.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions from members of Council? Mr. Sloan the one, I just have one quick question. It had noted that the terms of the agreement shall be through the end of the retail electric market _____ a period ending in 2005. I know that's just a general provision but are there any clauses that allow us to exit sooner if by chance the interest in the market is increased and there's other parties that would like to sign up with us?

Mr. Sloan: Well the reason that we have the market period of 2005 as the in period is the rates are fixed from Columbus and Southern Power for that period of time. So we know what their rates are going to be and since we have a known rate that allows them to offer us the savings for a longer period of time. Now I think we can, we always have the right to adjust the contract for a shorter period but I think the longer period we can go probably gives us more leverage for a lower offer of rates. And since, it seemed to make sense that since we knew the rates up to that point that that was a good point to end. And we'll have to see going forward from there what the deregulation brings as far as best prices both from the local utility AEP and from various supplies. But the purpose was to use the longest period of time where we had known rates that we could to hopefully get the best offer.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions? Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: Are we basically buying futures?

Mr. Sloan: Well the city's not buying anything. They are buying blocks of power over that period and that's why they're going to look at the load profile provided by the cities and they're going to say, this is how much energy we need to have for the month of June, 2003 for the month of July, 2003, here are the prices during that period of time and then roll it all together and come up with what your average rates going to be. In fact that's what you're doing.

Mr. Wade: Right. And that is, and I want to clarify this because I've had a lot of questions on it, that is up to the individual. Correct?

Mr. Sloan: Whether or not they stay in the program?

Mr. Wade: Right.

Mr. Sloan: That's correct. The way our plan of operation and governance is written for the City of Reynoldsburg, there's actually a mailing done by the supplier once the deal has been struck that would go out to all the residents. And it would give them the opportunity to opt out the first notices that you have 21 days to opt out. And then there would be a second mailing by the utility for those people that have not opted out to say, you've got a second chance if you missed that mailing _____ then you can still opt out the second time.

Mr. Wade: Thank you. I wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions or comments? None being heard, once again Mr. Sloan you have a great ability to take a very complicated issue and make it understandable to all of us and we look forward to getting this implemented so Reynoldsburg residents have more consumer choice. Thank you. With that, nothing else to be heard on this issue, I'd like to make a motion that we forward this to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 7 is discussion, Amending of 1131.02 of Chapter 1131 "Definitions". Mr. Brandt. This comes from your department.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you Mr. Gilbert, members of Council. Before we start on this I'd just like to thank you all personally as well on the gas and electric issues as you have all become aware as I have keenly of the complexity of it and the involvement of it so it's kind of a, and it's even from that prospective from the electric company having talked to AEP there's a lot of the issues that they're kind of learning as well. So everybody is just kind of going down the path together but thank you. On this issue before us what we've sent forth is a request to add to the definitions and also to revise the code a tad to allow additional uses in the RI zoning. This was brought to us on behalf of one of our local business people who has developed an office flex space if you will and found that he had some problems in recruiting tenants because of the limited use of the RI zoning code. I got it to you today. I hope some of you had a chance to look at it. Flex space gives land lords extra utilities. There was an article just came out of the Business First magazine that I got I believe it was Friday. Office flex space is kind of a I guess a new hybrid in the zoning world. A lot of cities have wrestled with how to, what categories and so on to put it with and this is our attempt to make it a more saleable product in Reynoldsburg because I'm sure if you've driven up near the Worthington boarder of Columbus there's several big projects up there that have been developed using the office flex concept and we have the one here in Reynoldsburg on Main Street that the developer would like to add to it as well as another prospect for a project that will be similar in nature further east in town off of Main Street. And that's our effort to this design to help stimulate this type of development which as I said before I'm sure many of you have seen them in different parts of Central Ohio. It's kind of a hot product. It provides opportunity for incubator business, smaller ones to grow into and gives them the flexibility they need. In that end

also Mr. Jack Reynolds is here. We wouldn't want to short him out of his time. Mr. Reynolds is representing his client that has the development here on Main Street and would like to add another I believe it's about a 50,000 square foot addition which would encourage smaller businesses and the other uses that are outlined in the request.

Mr. Reynolds: Thank you John. Thank you Mr. Gilbert. Council members again, my name is Jack Reynolds. I'm an attorney with Smith and Hale and I was contacted by the property owner and the concern was simply they being good corporate owners here in the community would simply seek new clients to fit into their building and as they came forward and talked with the zoning staff here, found that the majority of the people who came to them to lease space in their building were precluded from utilizing that space because of the limited range of uses within the zoning category. So they simply asked what could we do in order to increase the types and ranges of uses (Tape Change) RI zoning classification. And at that point in time I contacted the zoning office as well as John to see a little bit of flexibility and what would be allowed. And we've looked at these uses and they would certainly allow a little bit more flexibility so that we could fill up the existing as well as the future uses.

Mr. Gilbert: Member of Service, does this raise any questions for Mr. Brandt or Mr. Reynolds? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Specifically on the development that Mr. Reynolds represents, I was on the Planning Commission when that came forward and I recall a lot of discussion on the mix of office to warehouse space and I think it was 25/75 or somewhere about that we ended up and the concern was if we had too much office there would be a requirement for too much parking and so forth. And with recreational facilities instructional it seems that you would have a lot of parents faring children to a gymnastic program let's say. How do we handle the parking issue in that case?

Mr. Reynolds: And I think what you need to look at is this is under the special exception zoning classification. So what would happen would be each individual user would have to come in and meet all of the requirements. Go before the Board of Zoning Appeals to insure that they met those requirements. So there is an additional gauge as to whether it's appropriate for that specific location or not.

Mr. Beougher: That would be the tenant coming forward.

Mr. Reynolds: Exactly.

Mr. Beougher: In planning the building process though for the landlord to come forward do we assume that there might be one recreational facility in the building or something like that?

Mr. Reynolds: Correct. And what you can always do is indicate the hours of operation for most gymnastics is like a Saturday morning or after work for the parents and at that point in time the parking spaces are freed up from the regular 8 to 5 type activities. So you'd still need to come forward and show the BZA that it would function without hurting the other users in the complex.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Just a comment. My son attended a birthday party a couple of years ago at Cyclone Gymnastics which is just south of Blacklick which is in a similar setting. I think there's a general contractor right next door and a nice facility.

Mr. Reynolds: You'd be surprised. These are the types of facilities where the gymnastics types like to go because they've got big wide open spaces and so that is one of the users that has expressed interest in the location.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you Mr. Beougher. Anything else from members of Service? Other members of Council? Is there something you'd like to add additionally?

Mr. Brandt: I was going to say exactly what, basically what Mr. Reynolds said, that part of the uses, and the one in particular too, of the instructional were looked upon and I drove around and looked at a few of them and they seemed to be busier in the evening which would free up the parking that's used during the day and consequently you get a little more use and also provide the property developer with the opportunity for that use. But as Mr. Reynolds has pointed out we still have to look at it from the BZA's viewpoint because it's under the special exception use. So be as though they could just put a school in there for 250 people without any oversight.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Gilbert, and generally, the other side of that coin I guess is the other two categories being added as special exception for business services, professional activities, those are, that's somewhat just taking the CC and CS and extending it in to the RI zoning on a special exception. Is that correct analogy of that?

Mr. Brandt: Right. That and as I said earlier, what led us to look at this was the fact that while, and I think Mr. Reynolds can attest easier than I but in many cases the industrial be it GI, RI, LM, L, whatever communities and traditionally offers a bit more uses than what we have at least crafted initially in our section of the code.

Mr. Hills: This would allow them to offer more opportunities for businesses, small business owners trying to run a business like a candy store.

Mr. Brandt: Right. Correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: Anyone else then? Questions? Thank you Mr. Brandt.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you sir.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Reynolds, thank you. I'd like to make a motion on this item to forward this to Council for a first reading where a Public Hearing will need to be set since this will be a change to our Planning and Zoning code. Do I have a second on that? Mr. Beougher with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Motion passes.

Item number 8 is the discussion for the determination of our sewer capacity charge. Mr. Kipp, once again.

Mr. Kipp: Under our new sewer contract, the City of Columbus would require to increase the percentage of the set Columbus sewer capacity fee that's paid to Columbus each year. It goes up percentage wise starting in January 1, 2003 and through January 1, 2007. We talked somewhat about this when we were accepting the contract. I looked at, provided a chart showing you the sewer system capacity fees that the other communities currently charge. And I also provided a chart showing what our fees would increase to for the next, through 2005. The ordinance does take care of the rate increase through the length of the contract in 2007 as they are stepped in. Basically what I found looking at it is just increasing it the same that Columbus increases it to us each year. We still stay under the majority of the suburbs that would be our main competition as far as water and sewer costs go. So I just recommend that we just keep it the same as we are now. That way our sewer capacity fees that we have coming in will basically stay the same.

Mr. Gilbert: Mark, for the benefit of the public, when you say sewer capacity fees, what are we, not talking about someone's monthly sewer bill we're talking about.

Mr. Kipp: No. It's the, when a new house or business is built, their sewer capacity fee is based on the size of the water line to the building or to the meter pit in some cases. So this is for new construction costs. It will not effect anybody that has an existing house or business.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Thank you. Any questions from members of Service? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mark the only thing I would note is we get into the period as we've discussed some this year and we'll be discussing '03, certainly we need to make this change because we are being charged that much more. So this just evens it out of what we're being charged and I'd just be asking I guess for thought purposes more than anything else, is there a reason or a justification to increase fees above that and that's a determination administration has to make. It certainly, if we're going to be looking at do we need to increase fees to continue to offer services, is this one that needs to be considered or do you all consider adding this and say, I just want to leave it exactly where it is?

Mr. Kipp: The sewer capacity fees go into a separate fund that are principally for the sewer lines or building new sewer lines or it could be for rehabilitation. Our sewer rates are set so that they do cover our operating costs. So these fees that we collect would be used strictly for the new sewer lines that we would put in or the rehab that we may be required to do as EPA would set the requirements. Currently our sewer capacity fund is in good shape.

Mr. Hills: You're comfortable that if you were looking at fee increases across the board you would not be recommending one for the sewer capacity fund.

Mr. Kipp: No.

Mr. Hills: That's all I was trying to clarify. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Other members of Service? Members of Council? With no other questions being heard this item can also move on the regular schedule?

Mr. Kipp: As a regular basis. Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: Great. Then I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for it's first reading. Do I have a second on that? Mr. Hills with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 9 is the discussion of the SBC/Ameritech Resolution of support. Mr. Brandt. While Mr. Brandt is coming to the podium I'll just note that we do have a representative here this evening from SBC/Ameritech, Christie Angel is here. Thank you for coming.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you Mr. Gilbert. Members of Council. The information you have before you was submitted to us after a presentation given by SBC on their desire to enter into the long distance telephone market. It seems we've been into the electric and gas and we're into the telephone. I don't know of anybody else that will be before us but we never know. The information to the details enclosed give you an update and overview of what this is all about. It seems to be kind of an easy shot in as much as it provides an opportunity for the consumer to save a buck on long distance by the entry of SBC/Ameritech into the long distance market in as much as they're the local phone company but yet they don't have long distance privileges. It would be in everyone's best interest to support them for it and let the consumer make the choice as to who their long distance carrier is and what their savings may be but it seems though today the more in the business the better it is for all, at least initially. Mr. Gilbert pointed out Ms. Angel's here and she can step up and give you SBC/Ameritech's coverage on the issue as well.

Ms. Angel: Thank you. Greetings Mayor and members of Council and Mr. Gilbert. As Mr. Brandt explained to you SBC/Ameritech is the local change carrier as most of you and many of you know. We are not allowed to enter into the long distance market primarily because of the telecommunications act of 1996 said that the incumbent local exchange carrier, that would be us, or as some people say, the big bad monopoly, cannot be allowed to offer long distance until there is true telephone competition. We applied to provide long distance service in the Ohio area last November. We did so because at that time we started to see true telephone competition in the business community as well as the residential community. We filed a report last week with the PUCO that says that we've lost over 200,000 lines to the competitors. Clearly residents have a choice and businesses have a choice for their telephone and long distance service but we would like to be allowed to offer long distance service. We're currently, as part of our application, going through what we call about at 13, 14 point check list to show, to demonstrate that our markets are open to the competition. And we actually set up, or actually a consultant is setting up dummy telephone companies and they go in and they test our market to see that we provide them with all of the services and all the things that they need to do to be a competitor or to offer a local exchange telephone service in this community. So we believe that the market, our markets are open. We

know that we've had some challenges along the way. We fixed those challenges and we've paid our fines unfortunately but that's what you have to do when your service is not up to par and so our services now, our service quality is back up. We're meeting our standards. We'd like to offer long distance. We had an economic development study or impact study done by Case Western Reserve University. They say that once the telecommunications landscape is more competitive on all levels that it makes a community more attractive to business and will bring jobs into the area. I did bring a couple copies of their study with me but there are some excerpts from the study in your packets and we'd like to ask respectfully for the City of Reynoldsburg's Resolution of support for our entrance into the long distance market. We certainly know that that doesn't mean that you will choose us as your long distance provider. It just means that residents and businesses will have a choice. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you Ms. Angel. Does this raise any questions from members of Service?
Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: You have an application in before the PUCO?

Ms. Angel: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: But then I notice that one of your "where as's" here is the FCC will also review it to be sure you're in compliance with the break up Ma Bell of 1996.

Ms. Angel: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: So, which comes first? Does the FCC have to say, Ameritech, Old Ma Bell company you can now do it and the PUCO has to find it or does it go both ways or how do they...

Ms. Angel: First it's the PUCO. We have to have approval from the state authority and then once they give us approval, and that's that 14 point check list that I mentioned, once they see that that check list has been completed and then our markets are open to competition and that the competitor is able to lease our service and use our services and we are making everything available to them so that they can do business in this community. Once we complete that 14 point check list, the PUCO then gives us the green light to move forward to the FCC.

Mr. Hills: The PUCO must okay the move to the FCC. And you're saying that you're the only, of all the local carriers in the state, 140 are and you're not?

Ms. Angel: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: And that's as you said because of some of the ongoing problems that are now being in essence resolved and/or still under appeal. One of the two.

Ms. Angel: Yes. That is correct.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions or comments from members of Service? Members of Council?

What I'd like to do, thank you Ms. Angel, move this forward to Council with the recommendation, before I go any further Mr. Hills you have a comment?

Mr. Hills: One question before that. Has the City Attorney reviewed this?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: Yes I have and it's not expenditure of city money. It's a resolution to allow them to go forward and I didn't see anything that would prohibit us from acting on it if we set it aside. The analysis about the cost savings and jobs, there's nothing there that would say that Reynoldsburg would get a fifth of them or a tenth of them or anything else. It's just a general area.

Mayor McPherson: That's a good point.

Mr. Underwood: So I don't know that it's going to directly effect us in jobs.

Mr. Gilbert: Does that raise any concerns?

Mr. Hills: I think Mr. Underwood is saying you ought to look at your resolutions before you pass them.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Move this forward with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 10, the Ordinance authorizing EMH&T to prepare compliance items recommended regarding the NPDES Phase II storm water compliance assessment study. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you Mr. Gilbert. We sent this forward for a first reading with the understanding that we would have to appropriate some funds before it went back for a second. And I think we were going to ask for a rule suspension on the second reading? Is that correct?

Mr. Gilbert: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And in talking with Mr. Parkinson this evening and is he out in the hallway? In talking with Mr. Parkinson apparently there is approximately \$4,000 remaining in the account where these funds will be appropriated to and EMH&T's fee will be \$27,500 and so I think what we ought to do is appropriate an additional \$23,500 going from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund to account number 740.737.5331 and that'll be taken care of at Finance if this goes forward and Mr. Parkinson do you have anything to add to the storm water compliance items?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Beougher that will effect the amount, you say four thousand some odd dollars is in the account still for this?

Mr. Beougher: Yes. We believe there's approximately \$4,000, Mr. Whitney if you could check

that out before we pass it that would be appreciated so we'll need an additional \$23,500 so any questions from members of the Service committee? Members of Council?

Mr. Hills: Mr. Parkinson are you saying we are here now the EPS's going to say, now you must do this or at drop dead point?

Mr. Parkinson: I think that's where we're at. Yes sir. We are moving ahead and this is a deadline we're going to have to meet.

Mr. Hills: All of their procedures and rules are in place?

Mr. Parkinson: I don't know if all of their procedures and rules are in place but the agency has advised us that the March 10 deadline for submission of an issue 2 application is in stone.

Mr. Beougher: Whether they're ready to receive them or not.

Mr. Parkinson: Well that's true.

Mr. Hills: Okay. The benefits of, do I understand the benefits of moving forward with this is there may be some dollars that they would have available? Or did I not understand that part?

Mr. Parkinson: I'm not sure what dollars may or may not be available. The agency has monies available for water quality issues. For resolving water quality issues and I imagine that if you had a project that was water quality related it might be eligible for such funding. I'm not aware of any monies that are available to assist with the application itself. But the agency is willing to, is in a position to help water quality issues and that's what this program, which would point it toward...

Mr. Gilbert: Which would assist, potentially assist with the implementation of the program. Correct?

Mr. Parkinson: If you had, yes.

Mr. Gilbert: That could be termed to water quality issue.

Mr. Parkinson: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: So I would certainly suggest that pursuing this irregardless of where the EPA stands is consistent with the approach Reynoldsburg has taken to storm water since the creation of the Storm Water Fund.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions or comments? If not, I guess I'll move this forward with a recommendation to Council as passage as a rule suspension and forward to Finance.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll second that Mr. Beougher. All those in favor, we have a motion on the floor with a second, all those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No

response). Motion passes. Thank you Mr. Beougher.

With that I'll adjourn Service Committee at 8:43 p.m.

Service Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

October 7, 2002

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

Other members of Council present: Jim Wade, Lane Beougher, Ron Stake, Council President

Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Hills: And I will call Finance together, to order at 8:43. Ask for approval of September 16 Finance Committee minutes. Any additions or deletions to those minutes? Or changes noted? Seeing none, they'll stand as submitted. Ask for approval of tonight's agenda. First of all I'd like to add item 3a, which just came, an ordinance authorizing EMH&T to comply with the NPDES Phase 2 studies, and also I would like to note I would plan on removing from the Finance agenda items *7, 12, and 13 as each of these issues will be dealt with within the next couple of weeks and it would be nice to see them just come in on a clean slate and be addressed. Also I will remove item number *1 in Other Legislation and I would also like to hold item number *6 and ask that I understand that there is still some ongoing work on that but I would like to see documentation. We've asked for a while now for this, but on item number 6 I'd like to see written documentation come to committee in the next two weeks as to why those accounts should remain on the list as exempt contracts. And I believe that's about all I can do to it. Unfortunately there's still some left after I do that, so I'd move to make those changes to the agenda. Is there a second on that? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor of amending the agenda state aye. (All voted "Aye").

We'll move forward with item number 3a and this is an item that came from Service, Mr. Beougher and it's my understanding that you're asking 23,500 to be appropriated from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund to account 740.737.5331.

Mr. Beougher: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And you all want this, you want this as a rule suspension and emergency?

Mr. Beougher: That's correct.

*Item 6 - Ordinance to waive competitive bidding for various exempted contracted and expenditures over \$10,000

*Item 7 - Discussion, 2003 Appropriation request

*Item 12 - Resolution adopting the revised Capital Improvement Program for the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio for the years 2002 through 2006

*Item 13 - Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio: City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio Employee Provisions Chapter 165 - addition of Subsection (b) to Section 165.04 "Longevity Compensation"

*Other Legislation - (1) Ordinance making appropriation for Council Chambers Audio-Visual Systems

Mr. Hills: Does that raise any questions from anyone on Finance? If not I'd move that we'd send it forward as appropriately stated. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). It will go forward.

Moving on to item number 4, Supplemental appropriation, Miscellaneous Engineering, Service Department. Originally held 9-3 and 9-16. Additional information received 9-25. The additional information received 9-25 does substitute for the previous information and I'm not sure

George is here tonight so I'm not sure who's going to address this. But of the original request we can eliminate that and this lays over it and it's an appropriation transfer rather than a request for appropriation of 40,000 it's a transfer of 10,000 from account 110.595.5361 Building Maintenance to account 110.448.5331 Miscellaneous Engineering to cover the expenses. I certainly appreciate the fact that rather than appropriating dollars we were able to go back and find a way to transfer a lesser amount of dollars to serve the same purpose and I would encourage all departments to continue to do those same type of things. But any questions or comments or, Bob are you addressing this for George?

Mayor McPherson: You just said it all, so...

Mr. Hills: I appreciate that. Because that's where we are right now. This is what we need to do to look at these things and we'll all work together and we'll work through this situation but does that raise any questions from anyone on Finance? Hearing none, I certainly would move that we send this appropriation transfer forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency in the amount of \$10,000. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward. My agenda's so marked up, I'm going to have trouble with this tonight folks so please bear with me.

Item number 5, Supplemental appropriation, Prisoner Care. We held on 9-3 and 9-16. We also received additional information on this one. The previous request of a request for some dollars has now been converted to a transfer of the following funds to account 110.111.5375 to help pay for prisoner care for the remainder of '02. It will be transferring from the Gasoline Account 110.111.5251 in the amount of \$11,000 and account 110.111.5632 Vehicles in the amount of \$14,000 for a total of \$25,000. And if I understand it properly this should hopefully will suffice for the end of the year and I see we only have one Lieutenant but would that explain correctly?

Lieutenant: The only thing I can address on this is I have the memo from the Chief's secretary to her numbers that I show here are what you have just read. People continue to do bad things out there and we continue to make arrests. But I hope that's it.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Raise any questions from anyone on Finance? Then I would recommend that we send this transfer authorization forward for recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Seeing none, it will go forward for recommendation for adoption as an emergency.

Eight, discussion, Resolution accepting amounts and rates for Licking County. Mr. Whitney, is this, I take it this is similar to the Franklin County, but again, are we, how do you sit up here and tactfully say, is this an issue of discussion or ongoing debate in any legal type of form or remedy with the County of Licking. I looked to you for a no. I looked at Mr. Underwood for a no.

Mr. Underwood: It's the rates that are set every year.

Mr. Hills: So certainly our ongoing issues we're working with Licking County...

Mr. Underwood: It has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Hills: Have nothing to do. That's all that I'm trying to clarify for sure. And you do need an adoption, an emergency to move this forward. Is that correct? Does that raise any issues or questions from anyone on Finance? Anyone on Council? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: I just noticed, the documents are due in the Budget Commissions office on October 1, 2002?

Mr. Hills: That should be on or about.

Mrs. Frazier: No. That's when they send it. We act on it as soon as we get it and some don't.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So we're okay.

Mr. Hills: So the date is not a concern from what we've determined from up here. They'll let us know if it's a concern but it does appear to be okay with that. I would recommend we send the Resolution to accept the amounts and rates authorizing necessary tax levies in Licking County forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward with recommendation for adoption.

Moving on to item number 9, discussion, Payment of moving expenses for Parks & Recreation Director. Mayor, is this yours to address?

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Hills, it's been our practice when we agreed to pay moving expenses we always require the individual to get three bids and we take the lowest of the three bids. In this case it was \$2267.68 and we're recommending that that amount be approved and an authorization to pay these expenses be made by City Council.

Mr. Hills: And if I understand it correctly these are in your budget now to pay Parks & Rec, in somebody's budget to pay.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. No appropriations needed. We found the money.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Any questions raised from the Mayors statement with anybody on Finance? Anybody on Council? If not I'd recommend we authorize the payment of \$2267.68 for the moving expenses consistent with Paul G. Walsh to the Palmer Moving and Storage Company. Is there a second on that? I'm sorry and recommend adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Seeing none, it will go forward as an emergency.

Item number 10, discussion, transfer from Debt Retirement Fund to Sewer Capacity Fund. Mr. Whitney. We're transferring \$57,644. Is there any information you can give us on this?

Mr. Whitney: This is purely to update the books. The transfer was made back many years ago. It

was not used. We're transferring the funds back where they originally came from. The remainder.

Mr. Hills: So we transferred 185,000, we used 127 and therefore the balance, we're just moving the balance back to the operating fund. The Sewer Capacity Fund. Correct?

Mr. Whitney: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Does this raise any questions or concerns from anyone on Finance? There is no, you're not asking for an emergency on this, is that correct? Okay. Any comments from anyone on Council? If not I recommend we send this forward for first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Seeing none it will go forward for first reading.

Item number 11, discussion, appropriation of video evidence processing. This is an amount of \$1482 from the Law Enforcement Fund. Lieutenant, are you here to talk to us about this one this evening?

Lieutenant: Yes I can address it briefly. Currently our investigators, when it comes to using photographs from time lapse cameras are required to take these video tapes to VCI in London to process them. Currently we're looking at a 6 week turn around minimum. This equipment would permit our investigators and officers to make still photographs from time lapse photography upon bringing the tape back to the station with no turn around time. So we're eliminating our travel time to and from VCI to transfer those video tapes down there. And like I said, we've eliminated a 6 week wait. So the crime that occurs, we'd have video evidence and photographs to discriminate immediately.

Mr. Hills: And I do note that this is coming from the Special Law Enforcement Fund 290.000.5529 which is a non General Fund item and this is an appropriate expenditure for authorized equipment from that fund. Is that correct Lieutenant?

Lieutenant: _____ sir, I can't address that because I'm not sure.

Mayor McPherson: I can address that. We checked into that and it is an appropriate expense.

Mr. Hills: Does that raise any questions from anyone on Finance Committee? Any questions from anyone on Council? And the emergency on this, is this in order to meet some time frame for the price? Or do you have any idea?

Lieutenant: Not that I know of. No sir.

Mayor McPherson: The reason for the request as an emergency is to enable us to start doing this immediately and eliminate the 6 week delay in crime processing.

Mr. Hills: Alright. Anybody have a problem with the request for an emergency on that from Finance? Seeing none, I would recommend that we send this appropriation, request appropriation

of Special Law Enforcement Fund of the numbers as previously noted of \$1482 for the purchase of the video processing equipment with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency.

Item 12 and item 13 was held.

Item number 14, Ordinance making appropriation to purchase equipment for police cruiser won by Reynoldsburg Police Department. This is an appropriation of \$4300 in the unappropriated blank fund. Let me look here. And I guess the question here is this 110.000.4612 is actually a revenue account. Is that correct Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Which may be housed within the General Fund but is not a General Fund type of expenditure. Is that correct Mr. Whitney? And so I do just want to note that for the record that monies coming from this account for this purchase are not out of our General Fund that's used to open and close our doors daily on the city. This is a specific use of funds account. Am I correct in that Mr. Whitney? So we are following consistently with what our goals are at the present time. So I just, this purchase of this equipment from the 110.000.4612. Does that raise any comments by anyone on Finance? Does it raise comment by anyone on Council? Because my suggestion would be, the cruiser is due in here fairly soon I believe. Is it not?

Lieutenant: Yes sir. At the time we won it they told us about 6 weeks. Six to eight weeks.

Mr. Hills: And I would suggest that this had one reading, I recommend that we send it forward for second reading with rule suspension to move this forward so we can go ahead and get the cruiser equipped when it gets here and that would be in the amount of \$4300 from the above stated account.

Mrs. Frazier: Do you want to put General Fund in there? With the reference that it's coming from there?

Mr. Hills: From the unappropriated General Fund and is hereby appropriated to 110.111.5639 and then with a note that that General Fund item is listed as the above, the earlier stated number of 110.000.4612 to purchase equipment for the cruiser is second reading with recommendation for adoption with a rule suspension. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Seeing none it will go forward with recommendation for a rule suspension.

Moving on to Ordinance making appropriation for expenses related to asset forfeiture. This is one where there has been assets forfeiture dealing with the Franklin County court system. We do have the appropriate amount of \$284.20 which is the amount which has been referenced in a bill received from them and that bill was in late August. We sent it for first reading last time. Does this raise any questions? This is our normal forfeiture proceedings where the prosecutors do get back their court costs and a percentage of the proceeds. Any questions from anyone on Finance?

Any questions from anyone on Council? If not I recommend that we send this ordinance forward for a second reading with recommendation for a rule suspension. Go ahead and get these people paid. Is there a second to that? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Hearing none, we will go forward with second reading with recommendation for rule suspension.

With that I will adjourn Finance at approximately 9:00 and look forward to seeing everything in a couple of weeks. Thank you very much.

Finance Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)