

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
September 18, 2006

Members of Safety Committee present: Brett Baxter, Ron Stake, Doug Joseph, Donna Shirey.

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

Mr. Baxter: I'll call to order, the Safety Committee meeting at 7:30.

The second item is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as published.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes for September 5, 2006 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes or additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion of the barrier at State Route 256 and Main Street. And I asked this to be put on last week and give EHMT a chance to look into this. So if I can reach out to Dave and let me know what he's found out and what he thinks, I'd appreciate that. Dave Parker from EHMT.

Mr. Parkinson: To begin, I didn't expect to have to come and regale a list of things we found out. I was prepared to come tonight to talk to you about the matter, and possible solutions, and things that we might do to look into what might fit your needs. If you know, the barrier was put up by the city. In response, I believe you, several traffic accidents that occurred. Most likely, left turn movements from north bound Jackson, and possible also from west bound Main Street. And it seemed that the first, and best, and easiest opportunity was simply eliminate those movements. And so the barriers were put up and I think it's pretty, I don't have accident data, but I believe by and large, it's been somewhat successful at that effort. Are there other things that we could do? Certainly. Are there things that we probably don't want to do? Yeah. There's probably those too. For example, a signal would make for a succession of 3 signals very close together that would be very difficult to coordinate. So a signal at that location is difficult to put in there. The solution _____ around town, if you've read the papers, are the roundabouts. I don't think that we could get a round about in there without taking an awful lot of property. So that doesn't seem quite feasible. There's some interesting ideas that would be very expensive. For example, Lancaster Avenue coming down from the north. It'd be punched straight through those 2 or 3 buildings that sit opposite of it. And we could wind the road back around and tie in at the little bend there by Truro. Right there by Truro. Require an awful lot of property take, but it would allow for one nice signal at that location. The other thing we could do is kind of the opposite. We could take Jackson and punch it straight through the other way. And kind of come on in through Olde Reynoldsburg north development right there and then tie back in to Lancaster where it does a little bend. Again, multiple properties purchased for doing that. That generates a better solution because a signal would be located in, being further from the one out here out to Davidson and the other direction at Waggoner. We could eliminate the signal then at, help me,

the next one up, is it Jackson? Yeah. So that works real nice too. But again, it's a very complicated, there's a bridge involved. There's an awful lot of properties involved. So those are some options. We've talked about for years, the idea of one way this way, one way that way kind of things. I don't know that that helps your turning movement issues terribly. Because either way you work it, you've got the turning movement across the heavy road. One of the things we are prepared to do for you, if you wish to move forward with this, is to generate perhaps a proposal for your consideration, outlining the scope and some things that we could, that you would like us to actually look at. What options would you like us to consider? And we could initiate a study that would then evaluate those. We could put some cost to it. We could include, as part of our study, appraisals of the properties that might need to be taken as a result. Some of the other issues I forgot to mention is, that the radius at these corners are very tight because of buildings in some of those streets are literally right on top of the sidewalk. And there just isn't any room to open that up and make it any better just by the physical constraints of the buildings that are already there. So additional issues. But very difficult. It has always been difficult. It is still difficult. And it will be difficult. But we can look at some innovative ideas for you to consider and give you costs so you know what you're talking about.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Well, let's step back a bit if we could. What are we trying to solve here? There are a couple of problems. First off, I don't know if you've sat there or not, or anybody here has sat across the street, and just sit there for about an hour. And I've done that a couple of times just to see how big of an issue that area was. And during that time frame, I watched 4 vehicles make a right, and then a left around the barriers. I thought that was rather interesting. It's illegal. But they done it. I also watched one car hit 'em. Push 'em out. So if you look at them, even today, you'll see that not just one, but more than one vehicle has hit those barriers. As well as, because the barriers are in the middle, the traffic is rather tight going both the east and west up Main Street and down Main Street. In addition to that, another one of the problems we have is truck traffic. Truck traffic is forced to take an east bound direction. They can't make a west bound direction. So if they happen to come across that direction, they're going the wrong way. In addition to another problem is, we're bringing truck traffic right across a middle school. It's not better if we take them down Waggoner. In that case it would be Graham Road. Because you still have a school there. So we have some issues with how traffic is moving from 256, getting off of 70, and actually entering into Reynoldsburg and moving through Reynoldsburg. So those are a couple of the other additional problems I'm looking at trying to solve. In addition to it, this all came about because I received an e-mail from one of the business owners who are actually having financial concerns. Because of the barrier being there, they feel that it's subjective obviously, that their business has suffered because of the barrier being there. It makes it very difficult for the traffic that's heading east bound to turn into their business. And therefore, they feel that they're losing business. When there was a bike shop there, I actually sat there at times and watched cars try to maneuver that. In addition to it, I've seen cars actually coming east bound, stop right at that, and turn to go the opposite direction. So we have some real issues in that corner. I don't know. We haven't talked to the Chief. And I think it's something we want to move forward with with discussions with the Chief, and with Larry Ward, and a few other people, to find out, has it gotten better? Is this the best option? Are there, maybe just removing those barricades and finding some other solution to prevent left hand turns. I'm not suggesting we need to put a light in there. I'm just looking for what are our options. What can we afford as a city? And what can reduce

some of these traffic concerns that we've had? Traffic concerns as we've gone through. Not just in that road, but you know, take it out a step. Look at it from 256. Maybe there's ways we can solve it right there at 70. I don't know. Changing truck traffic at the moment, I know when Sharon was here, she spoke about putting signs up. And I don't know if that was something that was possible or not. Letting people know that there's another way to get into Reynoldsburg. They could get off at another direction rather than coming off at 256 if they were planning on cutting through. Now obviously, you have truck traffic that needs to do that. So this is the problem I'm trying to solve. I don't know what the answers are. And that's why I ask you Dave, to at least come up and think about it. And you know, open it up to Council and the committee to see if we want to pursue any other type of action looking at if there is a resolution or not. So at this point, I'll go ahead and open it up to the committee. Are there any questions from the committee members? I see some real heads thinking. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I personally think it's an Administrative function. The Administration put it up and I think basically, we ought to ask the Mayor why, and the reasons, and the outcome. Somebody that's been here, somebody that's here all day long and deals with this. I mean, I've heard from people too. But we have somebody that's here all day long that deals with the situations. I'd like to see what he has to think about it. You know, what he has to say about it.

Mr. Baxter: I think it's a great idea. Mayor, I see you standing up at the podium.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Do you have something to say about this?

Mayor McPherson: The barricade was put up to prevent accidents. Contributing circumstances, failure to yield. Contributing circumstance, failure to yield. Contributing, all the way down this list of accidents that we had there prior to putting the barricades up. Since we put the barricades up we haven't had any accidents. Going back as far as 2001, we had let's see, between 2001, 2002, there was 50% increase in accidents at that intersection. Between 2002 and 2003, they doubled again. And between 2003 and 2004, as of the date of this letter which was July, they were only 2 short of exceeding that in 2004. With the exception of maybe 1 or 2 running the stop signs, they were all for contribution circumstance, was failure to yield. So they were turning left in front of vehicles. We put that barricade up there as a safety issue to keep somebody from being killed there. We did have EMH&T do some studies on this early on. And primarily comparing it to the intersection in Pickerington where they have on Mill Street, and I'll just without going through the whole thing, summery and conclusion based on the review of the two intersections in question, traffic signal operation of the East Main Street intersection with the south leg of Lancaster Avenue/State Route 256 is not recommended. The amount of time needed to service both of the high volume legs of Lancaster Avenue under traffic signal control will cause undue delay to the major street movements and thus result in negative impact to vehicle progression along the East Main Street Corridor. There's, and this is going back January 11, 2006. So you can see I just recently asked EMH&T to study trying to put a traffic signal there. It is an urban principal arterial. Posted speed is 35 miles per hour. The average daily traffic east, 19,900. West, 29,000. And these were all numbers back as of '03. So they have significantly increased

since then. Distance between the offset intersection is 275 feet. And again, I appreciate the fact that Dave said he'd look into a whole bunch of other areas for you. But prior to your being here, and I think Mel remembers and probably Bill, I don't know that anyone else was even here, we actually went so far as to purchase property down off of Lancaster Avenue to straighten that road out. It was decided not to go through those historical buildings. That one building being the first building in Reynoldsburg. The old hotel. Bottom line is, it was not feasible. We subsequently sold that property. So there have been all kinds of studies done on this. And again, what you want to hire EMH&T to do is entirely up to you. But I can assure you that over the past several years, we have had numerous studies on how to straighten that out. Including one way each way. And the best solution that we've come up with at this time is the barricade to prevent left hand turns. Having been that bike shop that you were talking about being there, to the best of my knowledge, it had no impact whatsoever on our business. People that wanted to come to our business knew we were there. And they would go down, they'd either turn in at the light or they'd turn in an alley. And so if you're going to use the bike shop, don't use it as a negative. Because we were glad we didn't have to go out there and call emergency squads once a month or twice a month for somebody being hit. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mayor. I appreciate your comments. Any other comments, Council? Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I'd just like to say once again, I think it's the ugliest thing I ever saw. And I wish there was some way we could correct the problem without destroying the charm of that area.

Mr. Baxter: Well, thank you for your comments. And I also agree with you that I wouldn't know as far as ugly. But I would say that they are not the most pleasant looking dividers. And again, I think my biggest concern was, as I sat there watching, I watched a very large tractor trailer try to make that left hand turn and wasn't able to make it. Then I watched the tractor trailer try to back up. That was amazing. As traffic behind them was trying to get out of the way of this tractor to make enough room to make that turn. As you said, it is tight but yet _____ still get there. And that's a problem. So that's the issue I'm trying to solve here is a traffic concern. It sounds like from what the Mayor said, your traffic incidents from accidents have reduced because of it. So a safety standpoint, it's been functional.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. Just one other thing. You had mentioned the signs directing truck traffic. Those are now out on the freeway even telling trucks where to go. There are 'no truck' signs on streets they are not supposed to go on. But just like running stop signs and speeding on streets, they ignore them. And if we're around when they ignore them we'll issue a ticket. But we just can't be every place when they ignore them.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: We could paint them maize and blue. That's a pretty color.

Mr. Parkinson: They'll be driving over that all day.

Mr. Baxter: They wouldn't last that way. Alright. I don't have any other discussions on this. Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I would just like to say that, I don't see any point in moving traffic all that rapidly down Main Street. We really don't want to make it like a freeway, do we? It might be a major arterial but it might be a good idea to slow the traffic up. Maybe they would turn into some of the businesses there and shop.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I think that was one of the comments I made, was the commerce was complaining. President Hills, I see you reaching for the mike. Councilman Stake, I'm sorry. I just saw hand moving.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Given the fact that there haven't been any accidents since the barriers have been put up, I agree. They're not pretty. I wish they were prettier. That would be nice. But the reality of the situation is, we need to make it safe. We really don't have, I frankly don't think we have the money to spend on engineering to see about moving some roads and taking property and those kinds of things at this point. So short of that, I don't know, we don't want to do roundabouts I guess. And signalization isn't going to work. They've looked at this for several years. I really don't see any necessity of hiring EMH&T to do any kind of studies at this point.

Mr. Baxter: I hear what you're saying, and thank you for your comments.

Mrs. Newman: I agree.

Mr. Baxter: I think what I'm looking for if I could, is maybe a better way of handling that divider. And as I've seen people driving around them, that's an issue. And we either need to extend those in some way to prevent that, or at least discourage it. But it's happening. They're making a right hand turn and looping around. And also, with the truck traffic, when I saw that truck, he could not make the turn. He had to back that huge truck up. And I've sat there for 3 days in a row for only an hour a piece. And I saw that much incidence. So it's not like it's uncommon. If I've seen it that much in 3 days, that's a lot of incidents. I think that's what I'm trying to solve. I agree with Ms. Newman, or Councilwoman Newman that there's got to be a better way of putting a divider in there. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Just to be serious for a minute. And I spend a lot of time around town because I'm retired. So I'm driving through town all the time. That traffic backs up from one traffic light to the other. And how you expect somebody to make a left hand turn, it's impossible. And I'm not talking about just during the peak hours. I'm talking about all the time. Any time that light at Lancaster Avenue is red, that traffic backs up to where Bob's shop was. Now, anybody wants to turn, can't turn unless they turn out in the opposite lane. And then they block people coming the other direction. So we have to have some way to keep them from turning left. People that do, and I've seen what you're talking about, I've seen them get out in that lane and sit there and block traffic. That's against the law. I mean, they can't read signs. But as a safety issue, I just can't see, the way our traffic is and the way it operates, once that light turns green and they're sitting and making that left hand turn, there's so many cars coming from the west, it's impossible any way.

And why people can't go up to Lancaster Avenue and make that turn, I mean not Lancaster but Jackson, which is only a block away, I don't understand that. We've got enough signs. We've always had enough signs. And people that get in that situation, or people that's in a hurry, they don't care about our signs. They don't care about the traffic. And I think that's the problem we have. It's people that really don't care. If they're bound and determined they're going to turn there any way because they don't want to wait on traffic. So I understand your point and I understand the businesses point. But I do see how that traffic backs up constantly.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you for your comment. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could add, I don't disagree, they're not the most attractive barriers to have. However, they are functional. And I guess the statistics show that they've been functional. And so they are serving their purpose. I did notice in the number that there's 19,000 vehicles east bound. 29,000 vehicles west bound. I think if you look today, we probably have more traffic on Main Street within the last 90 days than we've had because of the Taylor Road closure. Many people now are coming down Main Street, west side. Now when they come back home, they miss a lot of it because they can get off at 256, and Graham, and whatever. So I think that part of the problem we're having that has been this summer is with the closure of Taylor Road. I'm not a believer, and let's just sit here and don't do anything, but I'm not sure that we have an issue that there's any resolution to right now. And in fact, I think we've aggravated the situation during this summer. Which hopefully with 30 days maybe, we'd hope it will be open.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you for your comment, President Hills. And I want to recognize what Councilman Stake said. And it's very germane to this. We don't have a whole lot of money to fix this problem. And in this case here, I think what I'm trying to do is look for a way to, if anything, through enforcement, or through education, or even through our newspapers, letting our residents know that that's not a left hand turn area. And so we can do it just with education and with enforcement. Maybe that is one of the resolutions to, at least the issues I saw. The issues I saw were people breaking the law. Bottom line. So if that's an enforcement issue, maybe we can work with the Mayor and he can have talks with the Chief and see what we can do about stepping up enforcement in that area. As well as maybe a campaign to educate better methods of getting around through the city. And that's what I would recommend at least at this point. Because I don't see taking property is the right direction. I don't see timing lights. It would just be too close as Dave Parker said and many of the Council members here have said. I don't see that as a solution either. And changing Jackson, I don't think is going to be a solution either. It's going to be inexpensive to solve a problem that's already, at least from a safety standpoint, result. That said, I don't have any other comments on this. Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I do have to agree that as far as the barriers, I think they're a good idea. Because it is, as far as the safety measure there, I think it's really working well. Now one thing I would have a concern is, putting an additional traffic light there is going to cause a lot of congestion on Main Street. But if we are going to enforce the no left hand turn, we have to make sure that, as you said, have the added measures there. Maybe have the fines a lot stronger. But we also have to make sure that that's also addressed towards the trucks. Not just on Jackson but also on Graham. Because there's a lot of issues with trucks going down Graham

Road right now. And the speed limit's 25 and they're going down there at 35 to 40. They just had another house being struck. My in-laws parents house was struck. So you know, we've really got to look at the whole picture. And if we're going to make more enforcement there, make the fines a lot stronger.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you for your comments. Any other comments or questions from Council or committee? (No response). Hearing none, I'll go ahead and ask that we put this on hold for at least two more weeks in case any other questions or concerns would like to come up in the next two weeks. It gives me a chance also to sit down with Administration. And if not, then I'll go ahead and move that to Other Legislation if that would be the case in two weeks. Thank you Mr. Parkinson for your time.

Item number 5 is a discussion for registered sex offenders for residency. It was held on 9-5-06. And this is a very large issue in which it's going to take some time for us to get the information that we need. And even from last week, that information has changed. So what I'm going to recommend as Chair is that we put this on hold for two more weeks giving our Law Director and our Chief an opportunity to continue to compile the information that they need. And then work with them to see when best to bring it back up. Any comments or concerns for that from committee?

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter, I just want to mention that, have we given the Chief and the City Attorney the information that we're looking for? Or questions that we have?

Mr. Baxter: We had suggested that we need to first identify what it is we want to select as areas of which sex offenders could not live.

Mr. Stake: So that would be something that Council would...

Mr. Baxter: And to do that we would also need to know how many there were in the city to determine how viable it was. Thirdly, the Law Director came to us and said that the law was brand new in those places that had already passed. And that his recommendation was that we watch it for a little while at that time. So what I'm looking for from the Law Director and from Administration is first off, a report on how many we actually have. And that was asked last week. How many sex offenders we actually have in the city.

Mr. Stake: I think that was....

Mr. Baxter: So that we then can determine, should it be schools, day cares, public libraries? What are the sites that we don't want to have sex offenders living there? And that's where we left it last week. Being that we received nothing in our packet, and I have heard nothing from this. I'm making an assumption that they're not there yet. They're still compiling that information. And I guess Jed could speak to that if you'd like. If I misstated anything Jed, by all means correct me.

Mr. Hood: No. Good evening Chairman Baxter, Council. First question, 39 is the number in the three counties. The majority obviously being in Franklin. But there are registered sex offenders

in all three of our counties. Secondly, I believe that, and Councilman Stake and I had a discussion about what I believe is a Councilmatic action of identifying the places that you want to encompass in this ordinance. I don't believe it's my job or the Chief's job to do that. I think that's a decision you'll have to make and should be discussed openly. And thirdly, I don't think you misstated me but I don't think we should wait and see where these go. But I did caution Council and the Safety Committee to not be hasty in passing something just for the sake of passing an ordinance. Like I said, I'm happy to do any research that you ask for. I haven't received any communications from Council. But for our discussion Councilman Stake, I'd be happy to do so. I have a meeting set with the Chief of Police tomorrow morning and we'll discuss this obviously. But I also cautioned Councilman Stake, I don't believe that it's a good philosophy to enact an ordinance looking at the impact it may have on residents. I think that if you believe this is a strong enough issue to where you need to enact an ordinance, then the affect on the citizenry should be secondary. If protecting the children is the main concern, and that's what this Council wants to do, then the affect on sex offenders in the city should be secondary. I told Councilman Stake, the way this works is, is this is an injunctive relief. It doesn't punish the sex offender but it gives me the power as the Prosecuting Attorney to remove them from that radius of whatever type of business you guys choose. So I envision, being that we have a large number of registered sex offenders, if an ordinance is enacted, I will start the process of filing law suits against those people to remove them.

Mr. Baxter: Well, thank you for your comments. First question I would have for you, that I'd ask you to find out is, how many of the sex offenders in the counties that you have researched, presently reside 1,000 feet from the schools?

Mr. Hood: I believe there are none.

Mr. Baxter: Second question I'd want to know is, of the list of possible sites that we have discussed, one of the concerns last week was that if we chose too many options, they would not be able to live in the city at all, and that would be unconstitutional.

Mr. Hood: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Therefore, what I need to know is, what is the happy medium so that we aren't unconstitutional but yet protecting our children?

Mr. Hood: What I would suggest....

Mr. Baxter: I don't know how to get there. I need your help.

Mr. Hood: Okay. What I would suggest Chairman is, that this committee and Council at large maybe, discuss the types of businesses that you want included. Once you identify those businesses, I can get with Mr. Parkinson and put a presentation together that we've discussed in order to give you the latitude to see physically, how much of the city will be left once you choose what businesses and how big a radius you want. You're not limited to 1,000 feet radius. There are cities around this country that have gone 1500 feet radii and 2,000 radius. So those are also

options that need to be discussed. But I think the only way to do that is to identify first, where you want to start, draw those radius out, and then find out how much of the city is left.

Mr. Baxter: And do you have a recommendation?

Mr. Hood: I do. We can discuss that. I think that the committee is on the right path. Looking to the place where children are predominately there, parks being one. Day care facilities being another. Schools obviously are covered by the Ohio Revised Code so that's not a concern. But places in the city that are predominately patronized by children and their parents.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And I would also suggest the public libraries. Those would be the 3 that I know of. Does any other Council member have comment on what else should be added? I'm sorry, Councilman Newman, I didn't see you.

Mrs. Newman: I would agree with you about the libraries. Because I have heard of instances where molestations did take place in the library. So I think we should include that.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. And so have I. So why don't we start there Jed? Take those three as a starting point. I ask the rest of committee and Council members if you have other types of locations that you think would be germane to this discussion, to please submit them to me by e-mail and I'll pass them on to the rest of Council for the next Council meeting. Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I'm just looking at the one here for Hilliard ordinance and it says, residential premises will stay 1,000 feet of any school premises, licensed day care facilities, preschool or city owned or operated public park. And I think probably you're right about the library. That could be _____ upon the one that Hilliard just passed. So I think that might be something you'd look at.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Councilman Clemens, you raised your hand?

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stearns had said what I was going to say. So that's fine.

Mr. Baxter: That's a first. Alright. Those would be the requests I have of you sir.

Mr. Hood: Absolutely.

Mr. Baxter: Is two weeks enough time? Do you need four weeks? I don't know how long it will take you to compile this information. I want to give you what you need and I can put the legislation, or this discussion on hold for that period of time to give you that time frame. Also time for the Council members to sit down and talk with you and have some open dialogue on it.

Mr. Hood: I will try to prepare it for two weeks in the next committee meeting. I'll do whatever I can to get the presentation done.

Mr. Baxter: Why, thank you so much sir. Any other questions? (No response). Hearing none, then I'll ask that we put this discussion on hold for two weeks.

Item number 6 is Discussion, Revisit the legislation that authorized three additional police officers, added to 9-5-06 agenda at the time of approval of the agenda. Held for two weeks. First thing I want to make a comment of is, I had suggested that we had brought this up in one of the committee meetings and I was wrong about that. In essence, we spoke about it in other conversations. So I just want to make sure that I cleared the record on that. It was not part of a committee meeting. So I apologize for misspeaking. With that said, I would like to open up for any questions, concerns. If not, I would like to move this, or hold this for eight weeks until after the election and then have a conversation after that fact. Hearing no objections then, I will...

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, rather than hold it for eight weeks, just move it to Other Legislation, and bring it back up so it's not printing every week. If you hold it for eight weeks, are you going to move it to Other, if it's held for eight weeks, Nancy?

Mrs. Frazier: No, it would just be listed as held in committee.

Mr. Baxter: Whatever recommendation, it's fine with me Nancy.

Mrs. Frazier: No. I wouldn't place it in Other.

Mr. Baxter: Okay.

Mrs. Frazier: If he states to put it in Other, I'll place it there.

Mr. Hills: It's going to show on the agenda every week.

Mr. Baxter: Alright then. With that said, so that doesn't impact the rest of the meeting, I'll go ahead and ask that we move it to Other Legislation. Do I need a second on that? Can I have a second? Second from Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And with that said, I will go on to item number 7, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT TO PURCHASE ROAD SALT. First read on 9-11-06. Mayor, this is a pretty straight forward contract requesting you to bid out again.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Are there any questions from committee? (No response). Hearing none, any questions from Council? (No response). That said, then I'll go ahead and ask that we move this to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second from Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

I will end the Safety Committee meeting at 8:00.

Safety Committee
September 18, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
September 18, 2006

Members of Service Committee present: Mel Clemens, Doug Joseph, Preston Stearns, Donna Shirey.

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:02.

The first item on the agenda, approval of the minutes of the September 5, 2006 Service Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

Item number 4, Discussion, Possible legislation regarding reference to tent sales, sidewalk sales. And I had requested this last week and we discussed it. The reason being, I felt it was an unnecessary use to have to go through the process of going before the B&Z Commission. Then came to Council as a Special Exception Use Permit. And I felt it should be handled by the Administration through the Development Department. In the mean time, we had received a, and I thought it was very good, draft from Lucas Haire, our Zoning Officer on how he felt it should be handled. If it was handled through his department, which I think it should be. Plus I believe he has other issues he'd like to bring pertaining to that ordinance that he's looking into. Am I correct on that Lucas?

Mr. Haire: Good evening Council members. After the last Safety Committee meeting when we discussed some of the issues relating to tent sales and looking into possibly doing it as an Administrative approval, I started calling around asking other communities how they regulated tent sales. And the consensus, at least in the suburban communities around Columbus, is that they don't regulate them at all for a temporary tent sale. Most other communities regulate for a long term sale for produce stands, or Christmas tree, things like that. So with that, I started looking outside of that area and I found some places other cities in Ohio that do regulate on the internet. And I tried to copy some of their ordinances and look into that route as well as considering what would be good for this city. And with that, I came up with the proposed language. At least a draft of the proposed language for discussion here this evening and possible future discussion by Council to consider.

Mr. Clemens: As I read it, it's a good draft, Lucas. It seems to control every part of it that we've discussed, and also gives the opportunity for, like you say, Christmas sales and fire wood sales for the length of time that they should be. I think the important thing is for us to get it back to the Administration to handle. Since we received it, I would like Council to look this over, read it thoroughly and see if there's anything you would like to add or remove from this, and talk to Mr. Haire if you would. Then we'll put it back on the agenda in two weeks. And in the mean time, if there's no changes in it, then we'll get with Nancy and draft up an ordinance.

Mr. Haire: There are a number of other areas that I'd have to cross reference in the zoning ordinance that would need to be corrected and I'm still looking into exactly where those places would need to be and where this would fit into our existing ordinance.

Mr. Clemens: Right. So if there's any changes to be made, I think the important thing, it would be a speedy situation for people that want the permit instead of going through the whole process and going to B&Z.

Mr. Haire: I did recommend time frames in here. But those are all open to discussion as well. For the length of periods these permits are good for a number of times in a year. So that's all up for discussion.

Mr. Clemens: Right. So look this over and see if there's any changes anybody would like to make on this or any thoughts that they have on it. We'll put it on hold for two weeks and come back with your opinions. And if there isn't any, we'll get with Nancy and work up an ordinance and get it before Council to make the change. Because they'll have to be a Public Hearing on it. Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens, thank you. I would like to ask that we do it two different ways. First off, not just what the proposed changes would be but the need for doing it. We've had this come about because of one request. How big is this problem? And I would like to know how many requests you have a year to be able to do these temporary sales. Because when I looked at the, say for the restrictions, I see that you can only do it once in a year in a given location in the calendar year. That would definitely be a problem for some of the businesses that we know that like to have small little tent sales if it's a temporary purpose. So in this case here, what I'd ask is that, how big is this? And do we really need to legislate against one or two requests a year? Maybe that's one of the reasons why other cities don't address this. So I'm just looking to see,

how big is the problem and are we trying to solve?

Mr. Haire: Sure.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions? (No response). If not, like I said, if you have a chance, discuss it with Luke. Give him a call. Give him your opinion and how you think about it. And we'll bring it up two weeks from tonight. Make our final decisions on how we want to operate with it and go from there. Thank you, Luke.

Mr. Haire: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: The next item on the agenda, item number 4, and it pertains to the same thing. Zoning Code Fees. This is not, as far as I'm concerned, an issue that has to be passed immediately. It's something we have to look at. I know that Mr. Joseph has things that he would like to look at before we do anything as far as the actions taken on it. Look at the fee schedule and see how you feel that it pertains to the City of Reynoldsburg compared to other cities and what the change would be, and the cost of the individuals that is concerned. Developers, the citizens, how it would increase our budget as far as it's concerned. As far as the development part is concerned. Helping make it self sufficient of helping do somewhat that type. I know Mr. Joseph is going to check with some other cities and see how they operate as whether it's self sufficient by collecting their fees for their Development Department. This is something I would like to get passed before the first of the year so we could put it in effect like January 1 on what fees we're going to do. But this is just his recommendation. It's not something that Council has to stand by. We make our own recommendations. But I think he's done a good job as far as checking with the other cities, showing what the cost was, showing what the average cost is, showing what each other city charges as far as their permits are concerned. Whether we need to do it as far as the other cities are concerned, that's debatable. But there are a lot of them that we're low on that we should increase. And I think it's important that we look at this. So look it over. If you have any questions, get with Luke on it. I'd like to bring it up two weeks from tonight and go over each item. We'll start on each item and go over them and see what the cost is and see how Council feels on each item and mark them off as we go and change them as we go. Then we'll work it into some type of an ordinance and have a Public Hearing on it and get it passed. Are there any other questions? Yes.

Mr. Baxter: I know, I promise to keep it quick Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: If you get too long, I'll shut your mike off.

Mr. Baxter: Just shut me down please. One thing I'd like to add is, is there a way that we could add to the ordinance, a revitalization zone that the Administration can select for those areas that need assistance in improving their property? I know we passed a Property Maintenance Code and we're looking at trying to revitalize some of the areas in the city. And I would look at a way in which we could waiver those fees for those people who are trying to improve their properties in

areas that we, or in this case here, Administration may deem as a need of revitalization? I don't know if that's possible or not. So that's why I thought I'd ask.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, if I could address, because there's three of us in here with gray hair. You, and I, and the Mayor. And when we did historic Reynoldsburg, there was a 50/50 match on renovations to those buildings. And that was in such a way that if you got an estimate to put on a \$3,000 roof, then 1500 of it was covered. And if you got it done for 1500, they didn't care. I believe the percentage, give or take 3% of the pot of gold out there, 17% was used. I like what your incentives are saying but it didn't work. And that was extended for a year period of time and still were no more expenditures coming out. There were one or two building owners that took advantage of it. And many of the buildings there are operated by tenants. The owners are not going to want to put a whole lot of money into them. But the concept of waiving fees and things are knife and fork innovation, I'm afraid that where you see true innovation and how it works, and it upsets people at times, but it is Streetscape I and II. Because that's where you have gone in and renovated. And there weren't too many options around. When you give the public the options, and it's not the tenants fault, it's often the owner of the building saying, I'm not going to go put in that money. But I don't think I'm far off on that percentage. But that was what, 10 years ago? 8, 10 years ago?

Mr. Clemens: Ten years ago we ended up giving money for parking lots to be honest with you. Because we couldn't get the people to do. We couldn't get anybody else to go in and split it 50/50. The grant was there and we didn't want to do parking lots because they had been asked for. But we didn't give them out to start with because they wanted to use the money for the buildings. And like you said, I think around 17% did something. So we did issue some money for parking lots to redo those, some of the businesses, and that was it. We did turn money back to the state which is, I never like to turn money back. But we did. So everybody look into this closely and we'll go over them item by item and make the adjustment for what we think the pay scale should be. Any other questions? (No response). If not, we'll hold this for two weeks.

The next item, item number 6, ORDINANCE APPROVING SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT - (HH Gregg, 2339 Taylor Park Drive, proposed use: outdoor sales - front sidewalk). First reading 9-11-06. We have this ordinance in front of us, like I say, we're trying to remove it and put it back into Administration's hands. Yeah, we have to do something with this ordinance, and the issue that's brought before us. And we do have a speaker on it from H H Gregg if you wish sir. Give your name and address.

Dustin Hague: My name's Dustin. I'm the manager at H H Gregg on Taylor Road. What we look to do with these events, we have them normally four times a year and it's just where we can move through some of our one only, scratch and dent items, or close out items. And we offer those to a discount to our customers. We had an approved through, I believe, the Zoning Board, maybe I'm wrong. And we were under the impression that we could have no more than five, and we needed to pay for the permit every single time we had one. And it's \$51.50. When we come down to pay our one for this tent sale that's coming up on Thursday, they told us we did not have the permit approved. And that's what brought this all about.

Mr. Clemens: The problem with this is the code calls for it to go before the B&Z Commission. Which it hadn't in the past, and it was handled a different way. I don't think it was known. There's a lot of ordinances and a lot of things that we have to do. We've had changes in different departments. The Zoning Office at that time that okayed the permit then, just a part time intern deal. When Mr. Haire came, he started going over the ordinances and so forth, and found in it that that ordinance 1145.10(c), calls for that to be a Special Exception Use permit and it has to go before the Building and Zoning Commission. Then after their approval, it comes before City Council. It made a problem as far as you're concerned. And somewhat of a problem as far as we're concerned. That's why we're discussing changing it for in the future, that it would be handled through our Zoning Officer and not have to go before the B&Z Commission and come before City Council. It would be handled by the Administration. At the present time, we have an ordinance in front of us to approve the Special Exception Use Permit. Now, we can do one of two things. We can turn it down. Turn it down period, until everything is changed then you could have it that way. Or we can change the conditions from 5 times a year to 1 time a year and send it on to Council and ask them to suspend the rules at the next Council meeting. Then it will become effective 30 days (Tape Change) from when the Mayor signs it. That would clear it for you to have a tent sale this year or more. By that time, you would probably be in the process of having an ordinance passed that would be handled by the Administration with the stipulation of 1, 2, or 3, or whatever Council decides on weeks per year. And it would be handled out of our hands and be handled by the Administration. That's the point, we can't I don't believe, say you could have a permit because it would be illegal as far as our ordinance is concerned. Whether it was done in the past, that's somewhat immaterial. Because it is on the books. And I personally don't know how you do anything contrary to what the ordinance says as far as Council's concerned. Maybe I'm wrong and somebody else can give me an opinion on it. But the ordinance is there. You went through the process. It's before City Council now. No matter what happens, whether it goes for approval or disapproval, or whatever we do, it still has to go back to Council to be either passed or disapproved one of the two. And if it's passed, it takes time for the Mayor to sign for it. If it's disapproved, it's done, period. Unless there's some other legal opinion on what can be done, I don't know what can be done that you can be issued a permit in less than probably 45 days. It's not an emergency. We couldn't pass it as an emergency because an emergency is for the health, welfare, and the city and so forth. Unless there's another legal opinion on it as far as how you could have the tent sales without us disposing of the ordinance, I don't know. Unless Jed would have an idea on this. I don't know whether you know what we're speaking about or not, Jed.

Mr. Hood: I'm sorry, Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: We're talking about the Special Exception Use Permit ordinance that's in front of us. Since it is an ordinance, and it's been through the B&Z and now it's before Council, I don't know how they could be issued a permit unless it would be contrary to the ordinance that it's called for. Do you?

Mr. Hood: Well, I think that if the BZBA passed it along to Council for adoption, that you can either sit on it for 30 days and it will be adopted, or you could move for adoption today and give them the permit.

Mr. Clemens: We can move for adoption but it has to go to Council.

Mr. Hood: Right. Since we're at committee meeting tonight, I think you would have to wait until next week and do it to the general Council.

Mr. Clemens: Right. But then it sits there until the Mayor signs it. It doesn't become effective for 30 days after the Mayor signs it.

Mr. Hood: Right. And this may be something that you'd need to point to the other committee members in your thought of taking it and giving it to the Administration as opposed to making it a Councilmatic function.

Mr. Clemens: That's right. That's why we're trying to do this. So we can approve it. If we do approve it, I'd like to put the stipulation on it at one week.

Mr. Hague: Yeah. Our tent sales are normally 6 days are what they run.

Mr. Clemens: I'm sorry?

Mr. Hague: We're on a 6 day time period are what our tent sales run. They run for 6 days.

Mr. Clemens: Right. So we could approve it for a week. But you still would not probably be able to have one for probably 37 days, something like that. That's the best I can do for you.

Mr. Hague: My boss sent me because he was, we come down with out money to pay for this. And when we were rejected he was totally amazed that they was telling us no. And that's why I've come tonight just to see what we needed to do to make this go through for us. And if there's not an option for you for this week then I'll just let him know that.

Mr. Clemens: Well, you can't have one this weekend. Like I said, it's in the process. It's gone through the process of our ordinance that we have. So it has to be followed through. It has to be approved or disapproved. Something has to happen with it.

Mr. Hague: Is there anything else that we would need to do as far as getting this through for our next event?

Mr. Clemens: When? I'm sorry?

Mr. Hague: Our next event that would happen, our next tent sale event which probably won't be until next year.

Mr. Clemens: By then, we're hoping to have an ordinance prepared that would change the whole situation where it would be under the Administration, which would be under the Zoning Officer, which you wouldn't have to go to the committee meetings. And you wouldn't have to come

before Council. It would all be handled by the Administration. And that would make it a lot easier for you and a lot easier for everybody concerned.

Mr. Hague: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: And I thank you too, sir. Yes, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Mr. Clemens, as I remember, there was a number 10 I remember a couple of weeks ago concerning the number of events that they wanted to have. Was that the main reason why we are in this position right now?

Mr. Clemens: Yes. It was to be 5 events, 2 weeks a piece. So it would have been 10 weeks.

Mr. Stearns: 10 weeks was what the BZA had given them the permit to do so?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. So in other words, we have to, we couldn't do anything with them because the BZA had given the approval for the 10. Right?

Mr. Clemens: Right.

Mr. Stearns: So we'd have to accept 10 or take it before Council and make a change. Is that right?

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

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, I would like to note, I believe we've seen tents in the city before. And I think there's probably been some permitting processes. I know H H Gregg had a tent and when Dustin called me the other day, and I note from what Nancy, Nancy sent us a memo and attached some things that there's been a Certificate of Plan Approval. We don't see those. Those don't come to us. And I don't know if we're dealing in a gray area or where we are. But let me assure you, I'm sure other people have paid money to have tents in this city for short periods of time. I will express where my concern on what's coming through BZA is, once we set that standard, BZA has said, and they said last week, well we would just say no if we didn't think it was a good place for it. As that's appealed to Council, how does Council sit here and say no? H H Gregg, you can have 5 tents for 2 weeks period of time, 5 times a year. But Just Because up here on Main Street, you can't have it. Council has to look at how it affects the totality. And I think that is the key reason why this should be an Administrative decision and not something that comes to Council. And obviously it's been handled through the Certificate of Plan Approval previously. How many? I don't know. I don't know that I want to know. But I do appreciate Lucas pointing out this isn't the best way to do these things. But if you look at his permit, he had a permit issued on somewhere between, it was approved on July 13. He didn't come to BZA until July 20. So his sale was over by the time BZA went through this. And I think H H Gregg has plans to have another sale. We can't make that happen from Council table. Now if you walk in, you can fill out a Certificate of Plan Approval and pay \$51.50 and go do it, I don't know that we can sit up here

and say you can't do those things. That's something certainly the Administration has to do. But I think we need to be cautious about putting that blanket all over the city and then be held to a standard. And I agree with you Mr. Clemens. It's here. We have to deal with what's in front of us. And I think what we're seeing is, this isn't the best way to handle it. And certainly the proposal of Mr. Haire's is getting much closer to the more appropriate way to handle temporary permitting in the city.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Bill. What I'd like to do then is send this to Council for approval with the restriction of one week sales for approval with a rule suspension for a one week sale. And that would take care of H H Gregg. Also, if anybody else comes in, they could have the tent sales for a week. So all I'm doing is changing the 5 times per year to 1 time per year. And that would handle it until we get the other ordinance...

Mr. Hills: Until the other one's in place.

Mr. Clemens: Until the other one's in place. And then that other ordinance, we can look at and decide whether we want it once a year, or twice a year, or three times a year. And have that in whatever everybody believes in. And it's outside sales is what it is. And that's what it falls under under our code. So I think I'd like to make the motion to send this to Council for approval at the next meeting with, change the restriction of one week sales with a rule suspension. Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

And that ends the Service Committee meeting at 8:29.

Service Committee
September 18, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
September 18, 2006

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman.

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

Mr. Stake: And I will call to order, the Finance Committee at 8:30.

Item number 2 on the agenda is approval of the agenda. The City Attorney had some information, legislation he wants to submit on the City Auction. So I'd like to hold that two more weeks. And that's the only change that I have. Are there any other changes to the agenda by members of the committee? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held September 5, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Amend Resolution No. 23-04 regarding city's contributions for Police Officers and Sergeants Pickup. This has been submitted from the City Auditor Richard Harris. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you Chairman Stake, members of Council. This is like a housekeeping type of resolution that we need to amend, 23-04, which I included a copy of. According to the police contract, the pickup went from 6% to 5.5 as of January 1, 2006. We have been sending police and fire fighters pension to 5.5%. However, this resolution is still in force as far as they're concerned. So we need to amend this resolution in order to make it match what it says in the police contract.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Harris from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Dick, do you want emergency legislation here?

Mr. Harris: Yeah. You can go ahead and read it a couple of times if you want. But we just needed to get it in within the next month or so to get it to them. The reason I would like to have it as an emergency so it becomes effective upon the Mayor's signature. And we can get this to police and fire fighters pension and they'll quit sending me nasty notes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And I guess basically, we're only changing 2004 to 2006 in this.

Mr. Harris: And the 6% to 5.5. It also will go down next year to 5%. So you'll be seeing this again later in the year.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Harris? Okay then. I guess we can send this for a couple of readings any ways and I'll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Is there a second? Second by Councilwoman Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Supplemental appropriations and transfers. And this came from the Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Stake. As I indicated to City Council several weeks ago, I would be bringing the transfer requests and supplemental appropriations requests to you. If you look on the attached form with the legislative request, you will see that we're requesting 4 transfers. This would be from various accounts to accounts, and the amounts are shown on the far right hand column. The supplemental appropriation, this is monies that we do not have in the accounts that we're requesting. You'll see that the Service Department, we're requesting from the unappropriated General Fund to Wages & Staff. That would be for our Assistant Safety/Service/Development Director. We have two other accounts that we're going to run out of money in this year. One being Workers Compensation, and the other being Unemployment Compensation. So out of all the accounts that we appropriated money for at the beginning of the year, or actually the end of last year, these are the only ones that, these three accounts, are the only ones that we're going to need a supplemental appropriation in.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And on the supplemental appropriation, that'll come from the unappropriated General Fund.

Mayor McPherson: Unappropriated General Fund.

Mr. Stake: Are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee for the Mayor? (No response). Members of Council? (No response).

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mayor. And this can go the three reading route?

Mayor McPherson: Correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay then. I will 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 "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 7 is Discussion, Authorization of extension of contract, Professional Engineering Services, EMH&T. And I know this came from Safety/Service Director Reichard.

Mayor, are you going to address this?

Mayor McPherson: If I could, I'll address this one which will also be the same scenario for the next couple, three. As most of you are aware, when we entered into a contract with EMH&T and with our backup engineers, we had a clause in there that allowed us to extend those contracts for two years at the same terms and conditions. We in fact, contacted, in this case EMH&T. The backup, DLZ and Triad, we asked them all if they would consider not increasing their fees for the next two years, thus allowing us to do a renewal instead of going out and rebidding all the contracts. And speculation being, that everybody's going to increase their fees after this number of years. They all agreed to maintain their present rate structure. And so we are bringing to City Council, a recommendation to go ahead and extend our contract for two years under the same terms and conditions as we signed three years ago. I'm sorry, two years ago.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And I guess in the meantime, that would give us the opportunity with the new City Attorney to take a look at the process, the selection process.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: That we currently have been utilizing for this. I think last time around, Mr. Clemens and I were involved in, and we were, as well as you and Safety/Service Director. It was kind of the....

Mayor McPherson: It does need revamped. And I would think it's going to take several months of sitting down with everyone and coming up with a new procedure. But I think we all agree, it does need to be done.

Mr. Stake: And we're not having any problems with any of these folks? Working well with the city and all that?

Mayor McPherson: No. Everything is moving along fine. They work well with the city. They represent us in a very admirable manner. And as a result of those, and the fact that we keep the rate the same, we are recommending that we extend the contract for two years.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions for the Mayor from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Yes. I have one question. And I think it's for the Mayor and possibly the City Attorney. Asebrook, that's the fourth person we have a contract with, correct?

Mayor McPherson: They're not a part of this.

Mr. Hills: They're not a part of this. And I appreciate Jed's memo. It's quite clear that their contract renews automatically upon if we don't say it doesn't. And I guess it's, everyone is staying firm on the rates. The question I would have, does the Asebrook contract have an escalator fee per year or not? It's a flat fee?

Mayor McPherson: Asebrook did not hold fast on their rates. We are in communication with them now. They increased their rates. That's why you don't see it in front of you.

Male: But in order to renew the contract, there can be no changes to the terms of the contract. So if they do happen to increase their fee structure, it will take an ordinance by Council to allow the Mayor to enter into contract with them.

Mayor McPherson: If they don't change their mind and go back to their old fee structure, it requires a whole new negotiation with them in bidding out and everything.

Male: Absolutely correct.

Mr. Hills: So you both are on top of that. Because we certainly aren't going to keep everybody at.....

Mayor McPherson: That's why you don't see it in front of you.

Mr. Hills: Thank you. I appreciate the memo.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions? (No response). None being heard, then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion passes.

Item number 7 is Discussion, Authorization of extension of contract, Professional Backup Engineering Services, DLZ. And this is pretty much the same situation.

Mayor McPherson: Same situation. They've agreed to the same terms and conditions also.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions for the Mayor from members of the committee? Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Is there another option two years from now to do the same thing? Or is it, two years from now we'll have to absolutely....

Mayor McPherson: Two years from now, we're proposing that we're going to have a new procedure for how we select the engineers and architects. And that's what we were talking about earlier. It's going to take a lot of work. The procedure that we use right now is pretty flawed. And so by renewing, or by extending these contracts, it will give us also the option of sitting down and recreating, or creating a new system for evaluations on your engineers and architects.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I was just getting to the point. If that same engineering firm, or architect, or professional back-up engineering were selected, is it in their contract that we could ask them to renew in two years? That's what I was getting at.

Mayor McPherson: This is it.

Mr. Baxter: This is it. Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions for the Mayor from members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send this one forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And item number 8 is Discussion, Authorization of extension of contract, Architectural and Plan Review Services, Triad Architects.

Mayor McPherson: Same scenario. Same terms and conditions.

Mr. Stake: This is a one year contract extension.

Mayor McPherson: This is a one year contract.

Mr. Stake: Okay. That would be the only difference.

Mayor McPherson: That's the only difference.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions for the Mayor from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yeah Councilman Stake. I don't have a question, but I just want to commend the Administration for going ahead and putting this on and getting it done now so that we don't have to do it on an emergency basis like we have in the past. So I want to thank you for that.

Mayor McPherson: You're welcome.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Councilman Stearns. Any other questions or comments? (No response). Okay. Then none being heard, I'll make the motion that we send this item on for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilwoman Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 10 is Discussion, Police, and Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Study added January 17, 2006 meeting agenda and held for three weeks. And it's been held several times since then. It was last held on 9-5-06. And we did receive in June, a final copy of the study. City Attorney addressed some of the questions that we had, BIA had, as well as what we had. And I believe that the study is complete. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I'd like to move it to Other Business.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Clemens would like to move it to Other Business. Is there a second for that? Second by Councilwoman Newman. Any discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

We'll adjourn the Finance Committee at 8:42.

Finance Committee
September 18, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)