

MINUTES SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
REYNOLDSBURG CITY COUNCIL
Tuesday, September 7, 2004

President of Council William L. Hills called the special meeting to order at 9:48 p.m.

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

Consideration of legislation for authorization of Graham/Main Intersection Improvement- -

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT FOR THE GRAHAM ROAD AND MAIN STREET INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT;

APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY (CIP #83)- -

-Clerk read ordinance by title for the one required reading. Mr. Clemens moved adoption. Mr. Beougher seconded. With the roll called, members voted: Mr. Beougher "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Gilbert "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 88-04 adopted.

Consideration of legislation for application for funds from OPWC for Taylor Road construction- -
-

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SUBMIT APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION DISTRICT 3 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY (Taylor Road Reconstruction, Main Street to Windsor Drive Project)- -Clerk read ordinance by title for the one required reading. Mr. Clemens moved adoption. Mrs. Newman seconded. With the roll called, members voted: Mr. Beougher "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Gilbert "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 89-04 adopted.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SUBMIT APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION DISTRICT 3 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY (Summit Road Bridge Replacement Project)- -Clerk read ordinance by title for the one required reading. Mr. Clemens moved adoption. Mr. Beougher seconded.

Mr. Baxter: I'm a little concerned that we're looking to do an emergency legislation on this one. I just heard about it tonight and I haven't had a chance to get my comfort feeling around it. I would hate to have to vote down something I think would be a great thing, but I just don't have any information. I haven't seen anything on it except the conversation tonight about the bridge work that we're going to apply for something I don't know we even want to do yet.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, I appreciate the comments. The problems I think we have, we inherited. There isn't any doubt about it. We inherited them, this Council. But the problem is 5 p.m. Monday, September 13, is your application submittal deadline. So all we can do is rely on what was said by the City Engineer, the Safety/Service Director, and I don't know if the Mayor had any

comments on that. The Mayor didn't have any comments. But, is this the most favorable way to go to Council? No it's not, but that's why we certainly have the comment period. Mr. Clemens, did you also have something you wanted to add?

Mr. Clemens: I agree with Mr. Baxter. We did discuss that though and it was brought up that if we don't do it tonight, we don't do it at all was the only reason. And my hopes are that we get Taylor Road and I don't really care whether we get the bridge or not. But I would not want the bridge to interfere with Taylor Road so I think that should be watched closely.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Hills. I would point out that that is a primary point of access for fire service from that direction. That bridge is, as Mr. Parkinson has indicated, falling apart. Having rebar exposed in the under side of the bridge, and I know the rails are decrepit as well. It's a concern. It's load carrying capacity is diminished and if we can get \$200,000 and spend 20 and get a new bridge, I think we've got to do it.

Mr. Hills: If I could just comment on that. I believe we're debating, it's quick to come to a point where we have to vote on this. The point certainly has been made and justifiably made. No one was aware of this until it pops up tonight with a one week deadline. Is the situation out there? Yes, it is. The statement being made to Council is "Trust me, one isn't going to effect the other". I do know, memory seems to say we do get an initial draft of what'll probably be approved and sometimes there's some juggling that can be done on that. Again, that's a trust me. That one probably doesn't deserve any more comments than "trust me". It was here. It's been thrown up here. We've been told that we don't feel one would effect the other, but we're going to be quick to come to the point I think we just have to vote on it one way or the other. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one follow-up if you don't mind. I'll be quick. I don't think anybody here believes that the bridge doesn't need to be fixed. We trust that it does have issues. I don't think anybody here has an argument about having to get that done. My major concern is that we've also put quite a bit of time and effort into Taylor Road and I don't want to jeopardize any funding. And if it will or will not is at question, effect that funding. That's my concern. So a vote against that is not of against this, this legislation would not be based upon the fact that we have concerns about building a bridge or repairing a bridge, but rather concern about losing funding for Taylor Road. So, recognizing a negative vote isn't against the fact that we want to build a bridge.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: President Hills, thank you. I think the statement was made that we would not jeopardize funding of Taylor Road with this. So I'm not understanding where you're getting your information that we would maybe jeopardize funding. I think the City Engineer and the Service Director...

Mr. Hills: Mr. Parkinson or the Mayor, would you like to further clarify that if possible? Or the City Attorney, if he wants to jump in this one.

Mr. Parkinson: The applications are stand alone applications that are submitted to a committee. They are reviewed on the merits of the application before them and they are scored and ranked. One does not effect the other. The submission of one does not effect the scoring of another. Where there is a slight potential for interaction is when the two are scored and when one bumps one, one scores higher, if Summit bridge scored higher than Taylor Road, it would knock it down a peg. If we saw that happening, we would simply ask to withdraw the Summit Road and that's why we say, it will not effect the scoring or the strength of the Taylor Road application.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And I think it's all, I've been through this many times and I think it's all done on how our proposal is. The board or whatever you want to call it, the Commission, is controlled by Columbus like everything else is. So our proposal really is, how good it is on whether we're going to get it or not. And we have gotten them in the past and we've done a good job on them and we've gotten them. I don't think there's anything, there's no way in the world we're going to get two of them we know that. There's too many things that's on there. But I think it's how good our proposal is and I think we have a fair shot at one or the other. I just hope it's Taylor Road. I mean, that would be my first choice. If we get the bridge, we get the bridge.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll be quick. If we get the funding for Summit Road Bridge, peg 7 for the bridge, peg 4 for Taylor Road, by eliminating this, do you gain pegs for Taylor Road or do you just eliminate one of those other projects we submitted from being scored above. Taylor Road's not going to jump three pegs because you get rid of Summit Road Bridge if it's pegged higher.

Mr. Parkinson: No. It'll jump one peg. The peg that we took out of the... Everybody will move up one.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. There could be other pegs interspersed on the way up with other projects from other communities. Correct?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes. In our submission, or withdrawal of Summit has nothing to do with their ranking and with the Taylor Road scoring in comparison to those rankings.

Mr. Gilbert: So if the money available is such that by withdrawing Summit Road Bridge, there isn't enough money to get to the peg that Taylor Road's at, and Summit Road Bridge was three pegs higher, it makes no sense to pull Summit Road Bridge.

Mr. Parkinson: We would not pull it then. Because in that case, we would not suggest the Summit Road damaged the Taylor Road application, or harmed it. It was harmed by competition with a lot of other good projects. If that's the right way to put it. That's the wrong way to put it, but...

Mayor McPherson: The other pegs.

Mr. Parkinson: The other pegs just scored better than we did and there's nothing we can do to overcome that. Then we'll keep the Summit Road Bridge in there and we'll take that money and we'll do a good project.

Mr. Gilbert: So there's an intermittent factor here of the funds available. It's not just which is pegged higher. That's the other factor.

Mr. Parkinson: Yeah. There'll be 36 projects on this list and they'll fund 8 to 12 of them.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions from anyone on Council? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Just one other comment. I would just say that should this bridge be determined unsafe and we don't apply for this money, we may be faced with fixing this bridge with our own funds, or most of our own funds and I don't want to be in that position.

With the roll called, members voted: Mr. Beougher "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Gilbert "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 90-04 adopted.

Request by Mayor for Executive Session to consider the employment, and dismissal of public employee(s)- -Mr. Hills said he would also add 'compensation of public employees' to the request. Mr. Stake moved to recess for Executive Session; Mr. Clemens seconded. Mr. Hills said those attending would be elected officials, Clerks of Council, Mayor, and Sharon Michael. With the roll called, members voted: Mr. Beougher "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Gilbert "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed. Mr. Hills said following the Executive Session, Council would reconvene only to call the roll and adjourn. Council recessed at 10:02 p.m.

Council reconvened at 10:23 p.m. With the roll called, members responding were: Mr. Beougher "Present"; Mr. Stake "Present"; Mr. Stearns "Present"; Mr. Baxter "Present"; Mr. Gilbert "Present"; Mr. Clemens "Present"; Mrs. Newman "Present".

Meeting adjourned at 10:24 p.m.

William L. Hills, President of Council

Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(transcribed/S. Smith, Ass't. Clerk of Council)