SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 5, 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.

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Baxter: The first item is the call to order, which we just did.

The next one is approval of the agenda, if there are any changes or additions?

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add for discussion, revisiting the ordinance we passed in June that hired the three new Police Officers.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Do we have a second? Second from Donna. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries and it will be number 6 on tonight's discussion. Any other changes? (No response). So the agenda then, will be approved with one addition.

The next item is approval of the minutes of July 3, 2006 Safety Committee meeting, if there are any changes or additions. (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Registered Sex Offenders, residency. And we received some documentation in our packet last week with some items on there. And Councilman Stake, I understand you also were having some questions on this as well.

Mr. Stake: Yes, I believe myself and Councilman Clemens inquired the same day with one of the Clerk's in regards to this. So, great minds think alike. But my concern was that there are some other communities that are passing legislation limiting where sex offenders can reside. And I don't believe we have anything on the books at this time in Reynoldsburg. And my concern was that maybe as they leave those communities they would come here. And I want to generate some discussion on it. I had an opportunity to speak with the City Attorney today in regards to this and I believe he had some ideas and would like to do some research. But I just want to start the discussion and see what we can do to limit sex offenders close to places like parks, schools, and places where children are.

Mr. Baxter: I think it's a great idea. I know the state's been making changes and we see it through the news all the time about what's happening. And I think we do need to be prepared in our city to be able to have in our ordinances on exactly how we want to handle it locally. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Like you said, it was kind of funny that Ron and I mentioned it the same day and hadn't even talked to each other. And my point was, and the same as Ron's, I think it's

something we should consider as the other communities around us are considering and changing their ordinances. And I think we should stay in probably the same mode that they're in. Reading the paper, and I think a few weeks ago most of you read it, it came out and it showed how many sex offenders were released, city and the suburbs. We were second with 18. That's just something that I've known for a long time. We have 8 in my district. And I've known that for quite a while. I used to meet with Chief Miller on it and I've met with our new Police Chief. Because I know where their residences are. And of course, they do too. And they stay right on top of it. I mean, there's no problem as far as how the Police Department or anybody handles it. And I'm not doing this. I'm not bringing this up to crucify somebody that's made mistakes in their past, but I feel our children come first as far as safety's concerned. And go back to the old theory I have always went on, our judges don't do it any more. A lot of it's their problems. You commit a crime, you do the time. And I don't think that that's being handled correctly through our justice system. And therefore, I think that we should look at it more closely because there will be more and more in the districts. Not only ours, but in the other communities because of how soon they let them out and so forth. So I just think it's important, as Ron does, that we look over the material from the other cities and let our city solicitor look at it and all of us think about it. Get the opportunity, talk to other Councilmen in other communities. There's no big jump on this. It's just something I think that's important that we get the ball rolling.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I agree with you Councilman Clemens. And there's obviously some direction that we should go to get the knowledge on this topic. First off, what I would like to know is, looking at the different ordinances that we have here as examples, from Grove City, and Gahanna, and some from Pickerington. What would be the impact to those residents already in the city? And can we get that study? So I'd like to have our Chief take a look at that. How many people would be directly impacted of changes as proposed from Gahanna or from one of the other locations? Where implemented in Reynoldsburg, what would that impact be? And that way, we're ahead of the game. We would know who would be impacted by it. And then we'd also know how to deal with it ahead of time before the legislation then would be discussed. So I would request that be the first step that we do. Let's find out what our options are and who would be impacted by it.

Mr. Clemens: And that's one thing I had thought too. Because like I said, I'm not here to, people that have had their problems and are trying to correct it, I don't know how to handle that. Because if this is changed, I know of 2 and possibly 4 in my district that it would involve. So I think that's why I say that I think it's something the City Attorney should look at and so forth and know what would happen as far as these things are concerned. If people already live within the district within the footage that's required. And that's why I say, I think it's something that we should look at. And I think our City Attorney will be quite capable of looking at and the Chief. Get with the Chief and so forth. Because they're involved in day and day, so they know more about it than we do.

Mr. Baxter: Very much. I agree with you on that. So that would be one of the things I think it would be a right way to go. Any other comments from committee? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I have jokingly mentioned that maybe we should do the same thing with

people who have been convicted of selling drugs. Maybe they shouldn't be around schools and children either. Frankly, I think the whole thing just kind of seems unconstitutional to me. Forbidding a person to live some place. But yet, if other cities are doing it, apparently it's not. And I think it's something we really do need to, and I agree with Mr. Clemens, that the judicial system doesn't punish offenders sufficiently enough that they control themself. And the same thing goes with people who sells drugs. We just don't have any teeth in our law. So could we look into including drug salesmen in this?

Mr. Clemens: I believe it's Granview that's passed one that's strict, where they're trying to pass one where you can't live in the city. And I think that's probably unconstitutional.

Mr. Joseph: Upper Arlington.

Mr. Clemens: Upper Arlington, I'm sorry.

Mrs. Newman: They're having a city wide ban?

Mr. Clemens: That's probably unconstitutional. Trying to keep somebody from living in the city. But I do think that it's something that we should be on top of and I know the police are on top of it. Like I said, we have I know, and I've known, and I know where the residents are, I know the 8 in my district, and we've had no problems. But still though, we are here to protect the safety of our children, our grand children, and our neighbors children. And I think that it's an important thing that we do look into this. As I said, I'm not here to crucify people and they have the opportunity to better their self for mistakes they made. But they're the ones that made them and like I said, you do the crime, you do the time. And I don't want them to do it on our children. And it's that simple. And I think that that's where our City Attorney can handle it and look into it and better advise us. Because I can't. I can read their ordinances and so forth but I think they haven't been tested either. So that's what you get into. But I think as Ron said, the other communities around us are looking at the situation. Pickerington's looking at it right now. These other communities are looking at it. We don't want to be in a situation where they force people to leave their community to move into our community. So I think it's important that we stay on top of it and even out with the other communities so that we're all really in the same boat. And that's why I think it's important that we all look at it, get the legal opinions on it and possibly have the Chief give his opinion on what he thinks, and the Mayor. And on how we best should handle it. But I think the action should be taken.

Mr. Baxter: I agree with you Councilman Clemens. And I look forward to our Law Director's opinion on this and some of his recommendations. One moment please. Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I just wonder if anyone knows how affective this type of legislation is in actually keeping people from molesting children or doing things like that. Because you know, they get in cars and drive into your neighborhood. They go to parks and hang around any place where children are. So they could live anywhere and get in the car and go to where the children are. Which I think quite frequently, is what they do. So I just wonder if anybody knows if this is actually an affective deterrent. Though I'm in favor of any legislation we would pass.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills, you had a question?

Mr. Hills: Just wanted to note. I think the right path is for, certainly Mr. Hood to look at this. Because there are two cities, Grove City and Hilliard, which now have it in effect. I think Hilliard's been in effect for about 3 months. Pickerington, I'm not sure that they've passed theirs or it's just on the table. I do appreciate anything Mr. Hood can find out. Because you are dealing with, first of all, let me say it this way, I would certainly suggest, and I defer to what Mr. Hood comes up with but incorporating other things into a registered sex offenders ordinance, I would think that is not a real most appropriate way to do it. Because the registered sex offender is someone who has been found by a court to have committed the act and has been now required to be registered. And therefore, is still a part of the court system as long as they're a registered sex offender. But to add something else as far as the drug users, I think you bring a real question into the ordinance. I defer to Mr. Hood on that but I think they need to be fact specific of what you're dealing with. But I do think Jed, when he's talked to some of the other cities, you will be able to find out, is there an organized effort to challenge these, and if there is or isn't. But you are right, once communities start this, as we led the communities, and Bob will remember that, there are many of us, Mel will remember, we led in getting an ordinance through in a couple of weeks that was preventing nude dancing and other things coming into Reynoldsburg. And that became the model for many cities around the outer belt. So we've always been somewhat up front on these. But they're easier to do legislatively than some times they are to defend. So you need to know where the Chief is and where the City Attorney is. Because they're only as good as the enforcement techniques. Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: You're quite welcome. Mr. Hood, I see you're standing up at the podium. Could you enlighten us a little bit on this conversation?

Mr. Hood: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. To alleviate some preliminary concerns, I have done some research today. First off, Councilman Newman, we have an ordinance in place that requires a registry of all convicted felons who move into Reynoldsburg. They are to register with the Chief of Police. It doesn't prohibit them living here. But we do require registry. And failure to do so is a misdemeanor offense. What the purpose of these ordinances do effectively, they are not punishment. What they do is, they give me the power as the prosecuting attorney for Reynoldsburg to seek injunctive relief. Which basically means, I get to file a law suit to remove them from Reynoldsburg if you choose to pass an ordinance that's modeled after the Hilliard or Upper Arlington ordinances. It does not require, it's not a misdemeanor offense. It's not a felony offense obviously. But it does give me the option to file a law suit to have them removed from the city if they are, well, I shouldn't say removed from the city, but removed from that radius of 1,000 feet. Another preliminary concern that I heard was the constitutionality of such ordinances. The reason you've seen this in the newspaper, and in <u>The Dispatch</u>, and on Channel 4 and 10, is because these are ground breaking laws. Hilliard had taken initiative and I believe that they're the first suburban community that I was aware of, in Central Ohio community, to pass such an ordinance. I would be willing to bet it will be challenged. The Ohio Revised Code Chapter 2950, has passed constitutional muster and has been upheld as constitutional. It does not violate the constitutional right to interstate travel which is what we're talking about here. A persons right

to go from one community to another and live where they would like to live. So there's a balancing test. And you have to balance the factor of the public concern and obviously the great concern for our children. And also, the concern and the fundamental right to interstate travel. So there will be challenges. I'm sure of that. I understand Councilman Stake and Councilman Clemens' decision and forethought on this when they saw other communities pass such an ordinance. It does raise eyebrows. I'd be more than happy to look into this for the good of the Council and the good of the city. However, I would caution the Council to not act hastily to see where these ordinances go and see if they are challenged. As President Hills said, they're only like 3 months old. So there may be challenges that we would be included in. So when the Ohio Revised Code was challenged, it was as a class action law suit on behalf of the entire State of Ohio. So it may be something to think about.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hood, you mentioned the state law. What's not in the state law that Hilliard and Grove City did? Could you explain that in a little bit more detail? Because I know that we are _____ somewhat by state law.

Mr. Hood: That is correct. The state law prohibits someone living within 1,000 feet, or living, or domiciled, or as a resident, who has been convicted as a sex offender, a habitual sex offender, or a child predator with some exclusions of some types of offenses that excluded from the registry. But they prohibit them from living within 1,000 feet of a school. What these ordinances do is, it does not spread the 1,000 feet. What it does is, it includes that which are not a school. Pre schools, nurseries, day care facilities, and as Chairman Baxter pointed out, that he would like Chief Suciu to kind of look at the impact. I would suggest to the Council, and maybe to the committee, the first thing you need to do is identify what types of facilities you would like included in the ordinance. And then we can go and find out what the impact to the city and the existing residents would be. That's the difference.

Mr. Baxter: Correct. My concern would be that, with our demographics, you could actually prohibit a sex offender from living in the City of Reynoldsburg because 1,000 feet to any one of our schools, and public libraries, and any of those public places where we have children, would actually prevent them living any where in the city.

Mr. Hood: And I think the chance of that passing constitution muster is slim and none.
Mr. Baxter: And that's why I think we need to have this study. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. And that's why I brought it up. And that's why I said we have to take time and look it over and study it and have you look at it and the Chief. As far as day care centers and so forth, I know of two in my district that would be removed. But the day care center's a big day care center. It's not a registered day care center. So that would not count. Because that's against one of our other ordinances that we're not enforcing because, we should enforce it, we're not, but I know where the big day care center is and that would be within 1,000 feet and have it involved too. So there's where you get into it. You'd have to be registered there. You'd have to be careful on how you do it.

Mr. Hood: And like I said, I think that's where the committee needs to start. You have to identify what types of facility you'd like to be included, and maybe the ones that you wouldn't like included.

Mr. Clemens: This is not a secret business. It's handled, the policing of this is handled by Franklin County Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Hood: That's correct. They are required to registered with the County Sheriff that they reside.

Mr. Clemens: Right. And of course, our police work with them and they know the situation and they know where the homes are and so forth. And anybody can get it on the internet. I know where the 8 are in my district, their addresses and all that. So it's not a secret thing. And it's something that we can handle. But like you said, it's something we have to decide on what facilities we're talking about and what would happen to the people that live that close right now that are already there, how we would handle this and so forth. So it's something that I think it's important to look at and get your thoughts on it, and get the Chief's thoughts on it, and the rest of the Council. I didn't bring this up to move on or anything like that. I brought it up for all of us to think about and discuss it with other communities. But I think we should be on top of it because the other communities are doing it. And if it's found to be constitutional and they do eliminate, and they start moving out here and we don't have the ordinance to handle the moving on sex offenders to our community, I mean, we have 18 now, who wants 17 in Whitehall, or 20 in Whitehall to come out here and things like that? So I think it's something we have to look at, and be interested in and take seriously. But I'm not asking to move it on tonight. I'm just asking that it's something that we all should think about and discuss.

Mr. Baxter: Right. And I think that's exactly what we've done here. Had the conversations. We know we're going to take it a little bit further with conversations with our Police Department, and with our Law Department. And I'll look forward to seeing this moving forward. One thing I don't want us to do is, as you said, be sitting in a position we're having to rush through judgement to protect our citizens. With that said, do we have any other questions? Councilman Joseph.
Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Mr. Hood, you mentioned how it's policed by the Franklin County Sheriff. That would only be for the Franklin portion. Is that correct?

Mr. Hood: The offender is required to register with the County Sheriff of the county that they reside. So since we encompass three counties, we do have to maintain those registries with the three different County Sheriff's Agencies. However, the enforcement would be with our Police Department. The city Police Department.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: And were there penalties that were being considered in this other than the ability for you to ask them to live wherever they're residing?

Mr. Hood: No. As I said before, this is a remedy for injunctive relief. We're forbidden from punishing twice. I understand that you may have concerns with sentencing judiciary. But that's not an area that the Council can undertake. However, I believe that the injunctive relief will serve a purpose that Councilman Clemens and Councilman Stake are concerned about.

Mr. Baxter: Great. What I was trying to do is bring that point out. We're not trying to be punitive in this case. We're trying to be more protective.

Mr. Hood: In fact, it's forbidden. We cannot be punitive in passing this type of ordinance.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Are there any other questions? (No response). I thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Hood: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. As always, I'm always available to answer any questions from the Council. You may call the office.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I would ask you to keep this in focus and keep it on the agenda. We can always, if there's no discussion on it, we can always keep moving. I'd hate to see it go to other business and not be brought up.

Mr. Baxter: I don't see a problem with that also. I would believe that probably be the right direction. To leave it on as a discussion item for a period of time until we have some direction. Either an ordinance or in legal decision to go ahead and drop it. That we can't go forward with the type of discussion. So I don't know if I mentioned, do I need to do anything to leave it on the agenda? Or just ask that it remain?

Mr. Hills: Just hold it.

Mr. Baxter: So then I'll just go ahead and request that we hold this in committee. Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Does this mean we're dragging our feet on this? Because I don't see any point in that.

Mr. Baxter: I don't think that's what it means. It means that before we can pass the legislation, we'd have to actually write it.

Mrs. Newman: Yeah well, then we should move along with that. Should we not?

Mr. Baxter: And we would have to know what it means. And we'd also need to be able to get the information we spoke about here tonight. So I don't think that's dragging our legs. What I would say, that's very much proactive. And in fact, I would like to see by the next committee meeting, some of these questions we talked about worked out. And I'll take the lead on that as

well with the attorney, and with the Chief of Police to make sure that we do get the answers for the next meeting.

Mrs. Newman: Alright.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Any other comments? (No response). Alright then. I'll go ahead and move that we leave this on, you said, Other Legislation?

Mrs. Frazier: No; just hold it in committee.

Mr. Baxter: Just put it on hold. Thank you very much. I move that we place this on hold for two weeks. Do I have a second. Second from Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Motion carries.

The next item on the agenda is the discussion to authorize contract for highway rock salt. And this is something that we do pretty much every year. It's an ability for us to continue the contract, or lock the contract in. And Larry I see you. Come up to the podium, Larry Ward. So we do this every year. So go right ahead.

Mr. Ward: Yes. Since it's over $10,000 purchase, we have to have a contract. For approximately the last 10 years, we have been part of the Southwest Ohio Purchasers Co-Op. This year, they bid it out early because last year with Hurricane Katrina, the bids came in about nine dollars and a half a ton higher than the previous year. So they bid it out this year and we got the bids on July 27 and it was only down 31 cents per ton. But again, American Rock Salt was the lowest bidder and we are asking that the Mayor be able to enter into a contract to purchase the salt for this coming winter. Currently, both of our salt barns are full. We have about 22, 2300 tons of salt. And we also have around $45,000 in our account to purchase salt for the rest of the year. So this would be providing us a mechanism after January with the new budget, that we would be able to then, purchase salt as we need it.

Mr. Baxter: In case we have a tough winter and those type of things.

Mr. Ward: Right.

Mr. Baxter: Otherwise, if we don't need it, you're not going to purchase it.

Mr. Ward: That's correct. The way the contract is written, that's 2500 tons plus or minus. And all the communities do that. And the salt companies accept that. They also know, you just never know how much snow you're going to get. And this past January, we were only out 4 times. December, we were out several times. But January, 4 times, and none at all in February and March which is very unusual.

Mr. Baxter: Let's hope for another year like that.

Mr. Ward: It would be nice.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. With that said, are there any questions on the contract? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just one question. Is this a January effective date? Or is this on some seasonal? What's the end of our contract year? Is it October/November?

Mr. Ward: It's actually September 30, is the way the contract is with the co-op.

Mr. Hills: September 30.

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: So the funds that you have in account can buy salt up through September 30?

Mr. Ward: Well, through the end of the year. We have about 2300 tons on hand. We have enough money in the account to buy an additional thousand tons til the end of the year. So ____ 3500 tons, and we have never used that much salt.

Mr. Hills: When does Council need to pass this? By October 1 for the new contract year?

Mr. Ward: No. Because we should not have to, really what we have on hand should be more than enough to carry us through until the end of the year. That was one reason I did not put any, ask for an emergency on this. In past years, we have. Because usually it's middle or late October when we get the contract, or get the bids. But this year, since they awarded the bids early, it could go through the 3 readings without any problem.

Mr. Hills: You could order in November with your current existing funds at the contract rate we're currently?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: Then this rate is going to go into effect with determination of that contract, which you're saying is the end of the year?

Mr. Ward: Well, it would be whenever the city and the salt company signs it. But with the co-op, they run from October 1 to September 30. Even though, because of our process...

Mr. Hills: We will still get the co-op price?

Mr. Ward: Oh, yes sir. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: You're quite welcome. And the whole idea here would be, if we did have the need, you'd want to make sure that contract was signed so we can get it 30 some cents cheaper.

Mr. Ward: Right.

Mr. Baxter: So we've gone through this every year. It threw me for a loop last year because I didn't quite understand that delay that we had between October and the end of the year. But now I understand that you have an additional purchase you can make throughout the end of the year on that remaining contract.

Mr. Ward: Right.

Mr. Baxter: Whereas, if you needed to, you'd want to sign the new contract and purchase off that one as it's cheaper.

Mr. Ward: Well, and also, one thing that affected this year was, last fall we came in for an additional appropriation in order to fill the buildings. And then since we had such a mild winter, we just didn't, like I say, we've got $45,000 left in the account. And normally, we'd be down a lot less than that. Less than 10,000 probably.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Mr. Ward, you say we have 2300 tons on hand now. What did we use last winter?

Mr. Ward: It was less than 1,000 ton. That included December. January, like I say, we were only out 3 times. Less than 500 ton in January.

Mr. Joseph: And as far as memory, what would you say is the most we've ever used in a real rough winter? At least since you've been around.

Mr. Ward: Right at 3,000 ton. And that winter, which I believe was about 3 years ago, we purchased some salt from Franklin County Engineers. Because everyone was having trouble getting a delivery. But Franklin County had enough. So we even purchased some salt from them. But around 3,000 ton is the most that we've ever used. And I think the least, in the last 12 years, the least we have used has been around 400 ton. But that's when the city was much smaller.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Larry, I see that we had 6 bids. Correct?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: And this one was the lowest of the 6 bids?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: And I guess, if we didn't have this contract in effect, and let's say you tried to use what you had right now, and come February we ran out and we needed a bunch of salt, I imagine the cost would be quite higher at that point, trying to find some salt.

Mr. Ward: Yes. Without bidding it out. We tried that. Again, I think it was 3 winters ago when we were having a lot of trouble, we had a bad winter, everyone was having trouble getting deliveries. Our contract was with American Rock Salt. We even called Cargill and they just couldn't make the delivery. When you have a bad winter, an entire area is hurting for salt, and getting delivery is the tough part about it. That's one reason a few years ago, we built the additional salt barn. Because getting delivery in the winter time, that's the toughest part.

Mr. Stake: So worse than paying more than what we'd be charged here, the bid would be, not having salt at all to be able to keep our streets safe. And your guys do a great job out there. So I know that every time it starts to snow a little bit, they're out there right away getting the salt down to keep the ice off the streets. But the money, if we were to approve this, if you don't use that money, where does that money go?

Mr. Ward: It will return to the Street Fund at the end of the year.

Mr. Stake: At the end of the year, it goes to the Street Fund to use the following year for the same thing?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Larry. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: You're quite welcome. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just wanted to note, Larry thank you for mentioning the fact, for those of us who were around when there was shortages of salt, that is why we have two barns now. The investment into the second barn has prevented Reynoldsburg from being out of salt. Because one year we were out for about 4 days of which we couldn't get salt anywhere. And the year before that, we might as well have been out. We just had salt on the trucks. So at that time, the city made a decision. And hopefully, at storage of 2300 tons or so, we won't hit a position where we are going to not have salt available. We'll have enough back up to continue to provide for the citizens. So I'm glad you did bring that up. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly I see that at least giving us a 60 day window to cover if we do have a real terrible winter. So with having those extra storage areas, we know we have that longevity of restored salt. With that said, any other questions? (No response). Hearing none, then I'll go ahead and move this be sent to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second, Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). All opposed? (No response). Motion

carries. And thank you, Larry.

Mr. Ward: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Item number 6 is discussion of the additional officers that were added back in June. And the intent of this conversation is to bring up the discussion we had back in June prior to the knowledge of what would happen with the income tax and if it's passed or not. And at that time, we had agreed that we were going to bring new officers into the city, and they would be paid for with that income tax. So the question here is, now that we know that hasn't happened, and we have it again looking to go on in November, what should the direction be? And I remember the conversations in my committee that we'd want to at least bring it up again for a conversation and maybe make some decisions at that point. So what I'd like to do is, just open up for discussion and get some opinions from the different Council members and from Administration, what they think the direction should be. With that said, I'll open it up to committee. Any conversation? That's a quiet crowd. Well, I'll start it up with, start it up with Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Well, just a matter of information. We have that ordinance on hold. We have not, nor do we plan to fill those positions. We're going to have to see what the budget looks like for the coming year. And the bottom line is, if we can't pay for them, we're not going to hire them. Because our policy is, if you're going to hire somebody, you keep them and you pay for them. So it's on hold. And until the budget is put together for 2007 and we see where the money is, we have no intention of filling those positions.

Mr. Baxter: Great. I'm glad to hear you say that, Mayor. My concern would be that we bring them in in November. And here we have them on for 2 months. And that was a discussion if you remember back in June, was the last thing we want to do is bring somebody in for 2 months, and then have to release them again. That just doesn't make good sense to the city. It doesn't make good sense to anything.

Mayor McPherson: That's all on hold.

Mr. Baxter: So with that said then, we don't have to move any further on this? Or the question I have is, do we need to remove those from the numbers that we have?

Mr. Hills: In order to do that, you'd have to bring a new ordinance to reduce that.

Mr. Baxter: And that's why I'm questioning.

Mr. Hills: And I think being on hold, there's a commitment from Administration, they're not going to be filled to start with. And I will take this opportunity to clarify some things that, in the recent, the 3 hires that we met, the gentlemen that came in and were introduced to Council, have filled vacant positions in the quota of, what is it, 41 - 43?

Mayor McPherson: Forty one.

Mr. Hills: Forty one. And the new would have taken it to 44 or whatever. But they're in the 41. We have not gone outside, nor does any hiring indications would be that we aren't going outside and the Mayor's committed he's not. If somebody wants to bring an ordinance, you can't reconsider it. The only way to reconsider it is at the following meeting with recommendation from somebody in the majority. And the only way to eliminate that is on hold right now, and there's commitment not to fill it. We're in September now. If nobody's being hired, I'm not sure there's a need to go in a rescind that or do an ordinance in essence to reduce that quota. The budget is what's going to determine whether it will be or won't be. And before there would be any hirings, it'll come to Council in the budget form. So the subject matter's here.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I wanted to hear. Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. One idea that could be considered is, an ordinance could be prepared that would be worded such that if the tax does fail in November, that they would be, the number of officer's would be reduced to the previous levels. But only if the tax fails in November. If it would pass, it would not take effect.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens.
Mr. Clemens: That would tie the city down if the Mayor felt, in the budget, in the Police Department, cut other things out of the budget to accomplish hiring maybe one more policeman or two policemen, by reducing their budget. Not increasing the budget, but be able to hire somebody. That would disqualify them from doing it, would be my thought. If we'd pass an ordinance that says that you can. If it's turned down in November, then you can't hire any more policemen. I don't think I'd want to go that far. Because then we would be in a situation, if the money would be reduced from the Police Department's budget to add on additional policemen, maybe 1, 2 or whatever, by cutting their budget. And that would be the only way it would be able to be accomplished. You couldn't cut other services in other facilities to hire policemen and reduce other personnel. I mean, I don't think the Mayor has that in his mind as far as the budget's concerned. But if they're able to reduce some of the cell phones, and maybe some of the other things, or whatever they're reducing as far as the budget's concerned, then they are able to pick up maybe an additional one policeman and so forth. I think if we pass an ordinance such as that, that would disqualify them from being able to do it. I don't think we'd want to do that.

Mr. Joseph: Well, the only issue I have there, is that to get the dollars, without the additional revenue, I don't know where we're going to have the funds to do it without laying off other city employees considering that salaries are such a huge percentage of the city's budget. We'd be looking at laying off other city employees to hire new Police Officers. I don't know if we want to go that direction either.

Mr. Clemens: I think I just said that. We're not going to hire additional Police Officers by reducing other departments. I'm not saying we wouldn't reduce other departments. I mean, that's something that has to be taken into consideration. If the Police Department can reduce their budget by $100,000 they certainly can put on another policeman, but not reducing services as far as the other department's concerned. If there needs to be layoff's and so forth, I'm sure that's what the Mayor is considering. That would be his policy to bring it before us. But if the Police

Department's able to reduce their budget in a term that they can hire additional policemen, that's fine. It has to come from the Safety Department. Not from the Service Department or any other department. Recreation and anything like that. They have their own problems. But as far as the Police Department's budget, we'll see how they can do it and how they can reduce it. And if they're able to and take the _____, then we have no reason to hire somebody.

Mr. Joseph: Would that mean that even if the tax fails we would not be interested in rescinding those increases in Officers? Because there could be, possibly down the road, that additional dollars could be found for police? Because that's kind of what you're basically saying.

Mr. Clemens: No. What I'm saying is, if it comes to the fact that it is defeated, then that's the time to look at another situation. We could reduce it off the books. But it hasn't been. And as far as the Mayor's concerned, he's not going to hire anybody. And we're not going to get additional money to do it with, I don't mind the number being at 43, 44. If we can't pay for them, we sure as hell are not going to hire them. To me it's that simple. Because we have to approve the budget. We have to approve what they're spending. And if we don't have the money coming in, we're certainly not going to approve it. I think it's time, and I'm sure the Mayor's worked on it, to see how they can reduce the budget. And the Chief is working on that. And it may not be too hard to reduce $100,000 out of the budget as far as the Safety Department's concerned. I don't know. But if it means laying off some personnel that are not officers, that may be done. And then maybe additional policemen could be hired. I don't know. That's strictly up to the Chief, and Safety Director, and the Mayor to come to us with a plan. Until I see that plan, I'd rather not take any action as far as rescinding that ordinance. Until we get the Mayor and see where we stand.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I think that's a fair conversation, Councilman Clemens. That we do want to look at the budget. And that's part of the process that's coming our way. And with that budget known, we'll know where we have available people. And I'm like you Councilman Joseph, I would be against eliminating offices outside of the Police Department to try to bring in more police. I think there's better ways that we can try to save that money. The Mayor's going to work very hard to try to find what we can to bring in as many as we can, and maybe none. But I would like to see if we could bring additional officers in however that might happen. Councilman Stake, you had raised your hand.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I agree with the sentiments that Mr. Clemens had expressed. I think we need to make these decisions in the budget process. I want to remind Council that we're the ones that approve the spending. So we can approve spending for more officers or not. I think it would only be fair to allow the Administration, the Police Department, to bring forward their budget and see where they want to prioritize. See where the Mayor wants to prioritize. I believe that we are realizing some savings in our overtime at the Police Department at this time. And if that can continue, then maybe we can fund an additional officer. And there may be other places in the city that we can use some money to fund another officer too. So my preference would be to just deal with that in the budget process this year. I don't see the necessity of legislation for that.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I agree with Mr. Stake. I don't believe in passing such legislation because it would frankly, hamstring the Administration in managing their assets to produce the desired results. We also might, this is probably theoretical but, so what if the tax matter does not pass, we might still get other sources of income. As I say, that's theoretical. But you cannot carve this in stone that we can only have so many policemen or put that in a legislative enactment. I just think that would be just ridiculous.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Newman, I'll disagree with you on that. Only on the basis, we did exactly that by increasing it. We set a number by saying we were going to allow additional officers to be held. So it was in the other direction because it was good for us. I understand that. It's a need versus finance basis. And I think Councilman Stake said it right on the head. He said, the budget process is going to tell us what that finance process is going to be. The need basis, we all know. We need the officer's here. Period. There's nobody on this table I think, that would disagree with that.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, if I could add that exactly with each, with differing views, I'm not sure they are so different. There was a staged increase in need in our safety forces for the protection of our citizens. One of that was for 2007, the increase of the officers. Six into seven. Okay? That was voted on, by I think the majority of Council. I believe the vote was 5 or 6 to one. Yes. We need officers. I don't think anybody doubted there were additional officers needed over the next year or the next year. Where we are now, for two reasons. Number one, the current funds. And number two, the tax increase did not pass, we can't fund, appears we can't fund the other additional need for the officers. The fact that you need something and you are authorized to get those people, comes down to, do we have the funds to pay them? And that's where we are right now. That's the budget process. I find, to turn around and say, no we wish we hadn't done that with the officers, that to me is totally inappropriate. We said that there was a need for the officers. We wanted to change that allocation to show that there was that need. To now turn around and rescind that ordinance or say, now we're going to wait. We're just running the horse backward here folks. It's not that we don't need the people. The problem the Mayor has right now is, where are you going to come up with the money to pay the people? And the problem that the citizens have here, they don't want to pass the tax increase, it just doubles his burden of not being able to pay additional officers. Reynoldsburg needs more officers. We all went through that presentation. And I think all of us even agreed that there were more officers needed. So I guess this was good to just bring up and have a discussion. But to back up, to do anything other than where we are right now to handle it through the budget process, is backing up and saying, gee we were wrong. We don't need officers for this city. And that's an absolute incorrect statement.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills, I appreciate your comments. In part I agree with them. In other parts, I don't. And I'll tell you how I don't agree with them. And it's a stretch so work with me on it if you would. And based upon your argument of need and giving the ability to have the Mayor funds where appropriate are found to bring these officers on, that same argument could be played right now saying, why don't we go ahead and add the other nine that we're looking for in 2008. And if you can find the money in 2007, hire them as well. My point isn't the fact that we do these allocations as a way of checks and balance with the Administration, the Council, and the

funds. So the question I have is, and the reason I brought, and asked for this conversation is, should we have that checks and balance as the people who are responsible for the funds in this city to make sure that we don't over allocate the staff, and make it available so that the Administration can make certain types of changes to be able to fund one area versus the area. It's a checks and balance. And one of those balances are, the fact that we allocate the number of positions available in that department. And so, my argument President Hills, and I disagree with you, I agree with most of what you said, my argument is that if 3 is okay why not 9? Why not the total 17 that we've talked about over the 'x' number of years? Where is the right answer is what I'm asking?

Mr. Hills: Well I guess Mr. Baxter, it is theoretical. Because we could have done that 6 months ago. But the point is certainly not to have done that. Now I guess I'm going to, you and I are going to agree to disagree. But what we're talking about here is the fact of, how are we going to pay the officers we have today? And if there is extra money, how are we going to pay additional officers if we hire them? We've got a commitment that they're not going to be hired. And they certainly can't be hired until the budget comes in to see the numbers. I don't know if we just, bringing this back up to debate the whole need versus the non-need. And if that's what it is, Mr. Joseph please say that's what it is if you're saying, I don't think we need the officers. And then I would ask that whoever feels that way, bring some numbers forward. He's going to have to come forward with the budget. I'm not going to sit here and make numbers for him. But I will also request, and I'll do this as a general request for Council, this issue, which obviously is somewhat touchy at times, was just added tonight. I would ask that the Chair of any committee, if they plan on adding something like this, to give a little advance notice. It doesn't hurt to stick something in the packet. Oh, by the way, I'm going to add this. To just walk in and add this when no one had any idea. I think three of you did I guess. Right?

Mr. Baxter: Correct.

Mr. Hills: Three of the four knew. The three of you knew. Now, you have 8 people up here.

Mr. Stake: It's disrespectful.

Mr. Hills: I'm trying not to go quite that far. But when you've got sensitive issues, obviously if you all were talking about bringing it up, you sat down and you have your plans. You have your statements made. Others are just now starting to think about it and talk about it. And so anything worth saying up here is coming off the cuff unless we're Joseph, Baxter, or Shirey. The rest of it is just we're addressing what just came up that we had no idea was a subject matter.

Mr. Stake: And Chairman Baxter, I just would like to add to what President Hills said. I frankly find that disrespectful to the rest of us here.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Chairman, that's been done before when we dealt with the Special Counsel issue, the dollars that were spent. We've had incidences when things were brought up here at the table and no one had prior knowledge. I don't believe anyone used the term 'disrespectful' or 'insulating' at that point. So I take issue with that.

Mr. Baxter: And I thank you for that comment. And I was going to say, we have many times come into Council and found things on the table to discuss. But I don't want to change the point here. I want to redirect this back to (Tape Change) Back and forth all night and that's not my intent here. My intent here is to bring up a discussion. The discussion was specifically based around an agreement we made. All of us made back in June that we would revisit this if the tax increase didn't pass. That was part of my Chair and I agreed to do that. Therefore, it didn't pass and I'm bringing it back up for discussion. Period.
Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, then I ask to have a chance to review the minutes to see what was discussed and what's codified in the minutes of those meetings.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Then let's hold it for a couple of weeks so we have a chance to look at the minutes.

Mr. Baxter: I think that's fair. And again, I would like some action items that I'd like to take out of this. And one of those actions I'd like to do is have an ability to talk with the other Chairs. Ability to talk with the Mayor. And see where we head during the budget process.

Mr. Hills: I think the budget process is open. And the Mayor said, anyone has any questions or suggestions, get with him. And I assume that request is still available. But again, I can't remember what was specifically said and the way it was said. But when we start pointing back to those things, Nancy, I'd like to be sure to pull those minutes and excerpt them so we can see the minutes of the meetings where these were discussed so we know what commitments were made by Council people. I guess I'm getting old. I remember most things but I don't remember the exact wording of it.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate that. Like you President Hills, I as well have some issues with memory too. So I understand that. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I would like to say that Chairman Baxter did mention this to me before the meeting, that he's going to bring it up. And I had no problem with it, and I had discussed it with him. And I had said that I felt, and I had thought, and I'm glad the Mayor brought it up, but the Mayor had made the statement before that he was going to put it on hold until the first of the year and we discussed it. So I'm glad the Mayor reiterated his statement. And I think this can all be handled through the budget process. And I think that's what we should wait for. Keep a good eye on it and work close with the Mayor on it.

Mr. Baxter: And I appreciate your wise counsel, Chairman Clemens. As always. Thank you. Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. First of all President Hills, I just have to disagree with you on one thing. I did not have a statement prepared when I came in this evening in regards to this. So I did not have a statement prepared. I am one thought, who will sit back and listen to the whole conversations before I do judge anything or make a statement. In regards to the Police

Officers, as you know, we do need Police Officers. But there is an appropriate way to go about doing that. And as far as cutting expenses for the Police Department, we need to look at the Administration and the city as well. You know, what can we do there that we might be able to have some money left over for the extra Police Officers? So when we look at the budget, we need to look at the whole picture. And we also need to do it for the citizens and get their viewpoint. And not just because that's what we want. You know, we need to do it for everybody and look at the best interest of the city.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you very much for your comments. With that said, I'll go ahead and ask that we leave this discussion item. I put a hold on it for two weeks and bring it back up for discussion in two weeks. Do I have a second on that? Second from Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And with that, I will end the Safety Committee meeting at 8:21. Thank you.

September 5, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 5, 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 8:22.

The first item on the agenda, I would like to make a motion to remove item #1 (ORDINANCE APPROVING SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT - 1756 and 1762 Brice Road, proposed use of land/structure - The Spot Family Fun & Billiards Club); applicant, Pat Manley) from Other Legislation. It's already happened. It's no reason to be on there any more. Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Item 3a, Approval of minutes of July 17, 2006 Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to these minutes? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

3b, Approval of minutes of August 7, 2006 special Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to these minutes? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

Item number 4, Discussion, Special Exception Use Permit, 2339 Taylor Park Drive, H H Gregg (present business); proposed use: outdoor sales, front sidewalk with restrictions. We can either take action on this by ordinance or just leave it go. I have a few thoughts on this. Not that I'm saying that it should be an ordinance, and I don't understand it, and read all the minutes to the meeting and it's quite long and so forth. There was a lot of discussion on this. But 5 times a year, that's 10 weeks, we all know summer is usually 20 weeks, 22 - 23 weeks, we're talking about tent sales for half the summer for a business. Maybe this is alright. Maybe it's not alright. Maybe people want these businesses and have these big tent sales. But this sets a precedent. What if Wal Mart wants to have it 20 weeks a year? What if Jo Ann's wants to have it 20 weeks a year? Once you do this, I don't see how you can, somebody comes in and says, I want to have tent sales, and say well, you can only have them 2 weeks buddy. I'd say what the heck? You gave H H Gregg 10 weeks. And maybe this is no problem with anybody else. I don't want to see Reynoldsburg turn into a tent city. I mean, K Mart can have it. Everybody could have it. But it just seems odd to me that, and I know it says 10 weeks for a year but, usually you don't have tent sales when it's snowing or outside. So I just, kind of threw that out as discussion. I'm not anti-business or anything like that. But I just didn't understand why the 10 weeks. Because as I read the minutes, the guy didn't really know when he was going to have them. He said well, maybe I'd like to have this many because I don't know when they're going to ask me to have them. Well, they could ask him to have them for 10 weeks. It just didn't settle right with me. But any how, that's the exceptions, that's the restrictions they put on this. If committee wants to go any

further with it, fine. If not, I guess that I'm just being a grumpy old man and that's the way I look at it I suppose.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Clemens, if you want the restrictions on there, you're going to have to send an ordinance forward.

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Because it has to come from you.

Mr. Clemens: If we want the restriction on there, then we have to send it as an ordinance.

Mrs. Frazier: Right. If you don't want any restrictions...

Mr. Clemens: If you don't want the restrictions I meant to say, then we don't have to do anything.

Mr. Hills: When we talk about restrictions, are we talking about with the following conditions? So in order to have the conditions of one year, or 5 times, we must send it forward. Otherwise, it goes through. They can have a tent sale any time they want it.

Mrs. Frazier: Well, zoning has recommended that those restrictions be there. So you're pretty much going to have to send it.

Mr. Hills: There needs to be a piece of legislation in order to put the restrictions...

Mrs. Frazier: Yeah. Or you take them away.

Mr. Hills: Well then, let me add to that if I could Mr. Clemens, there's a letter attached to this.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I read it.

Mr. Hills: That apparently is faxed. There's no date on the letter. Those are always interesting letters that they don't date. But it was faxed on July 11. That this event is a regular summer and fall event that we have 2 to 3 times a year. So apparently, he's made the city aware, we only have these 2 or 3 times a year, but he made them aware after the BZA meeting. So it appears that he changed from what he was talking about at BZA into his letter. So maybe a piece of legislation is going to clarify this going forward.

Mr. Clemens: That could be true. But what I'm saying is, 10 weeks is 10 weeks any way you add it up. I don't know whether I want that restriction. If he's only going to have them 2 or 3 times a year, that's 6 weeks. It's either 4 or 6 weeks. You get 2 weeks each time.

Mr. Hills: Right.
Mr. Clemens: What I'm saying is, I don't know how you can restrict anybody else other than say you can have it 10 weeks. You know, it just doesn't make sense. If our ordinance is that bad that

they can have it any time they want, they'd have to come in and get it any way to have a tent sale. I mean, they can't just can't have it, period. The way I read the minutes, and Luke you can clarify for me if you would, is that if they didn't give them the 10 weeks, they would have to come in and ask for it 2 weeks at a time. That's the way the ordinance is stated. In other words, if you don't give them the 10 weeks, they just can't have a tent sale any time they want it. They have to come before the board. And this way, they gave them the 10 weeks so they didn't have to come back when they really wanted to have it. When they really want to have it, they don't want to have to come back. This way, they can either have it 10 weeks, or they can have it 2 weeks, 6 weeks, 8 weeks, whatever they want. But like I'm saying, I thought 10 weeks was overdoing it some. But they have to come in any way. They have to come in for their permit for 2 weeks. In other words, they just can't have it all year, period. They do have to come back in. Any how, they do have to come in to have it for 2 weeks. This keeps them from, he didn't know when he was going to have to have them see. And that was the problem. If the company never tells them, I think that's a poor way to run the company, if they can't tell you a month ahead of time you're going to have tent sales 4 weeks from now or something like that. But any how, this was a convenience to help them. I'm just thinking 10 weeks, 10 weeks without having to come back, anybody else could come in and say, hey I don't want to come back. I want to maybe have it for 10 weeks, but I don't want to come back every 2 weeks and ask you. So how are you going to turn them down? It makes sense to me that this kind of opens the door for everybody else. If nobody else cares, like I said, sometimes I get these crazy ideas and I guess that's just _____. I don't care to see tents all over the city every time I turn around. Big tent sales. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens, I don't think you're an old coot as you were implying. But I, like you have, the problem with the fact that it can be done at any time. But we do have a process in place, do we not? That says they'd have to come in and file for a permit? And if that permit's approved, then they would be able, any business in the City of Reynoldsburg would be able to have a tent sale. Correct?

Mr. Clemens: They'd have to come before the board.

Mr. Baxter: And that option is to approve or disapprove. Correct? So I think we already have a process in place. And what I'm questioning is, do we want to put limitations on one business when we already have a process and procedure in place for all businesses in the City of Reynoldsburg? So what I'm questioning, is it fair and equitable to put a specific requirement on one business and not on all businesses when we already have that across the board?

Mr. Clemens: If this is a problem for businesses to schedule their tent sales, then we should have another process in effect. I mean, you just don't wake up one night and say, I'm going to have a tent sale next week. I mean, that's my only problem with it. And this is why it was given to them. Because this guy says, and if you read the minutes, I have no idea when they're going to ask me to have a tent sale. It's a big company. And I realize it's a big company. I don't know. It just seems to me like if you're going to let it loose for 10 weeks, somebody else comes in and you've got to give them 10 weeks too without having to come in every time and ask for 2 weeks. Right now, the process is, they have to come in and ask for 2 weeks. Am I correct? Now, I don't think that's a problem for the Board because they handled this quite well. They're helping the

guy really. They're not hurting him. It's not a discrimination against him. They really gave him that. And as I read the minutes, they're helping the gentleman really so he doesn't have to come back every time. But this is also, unless you want to do it for everybody else, it's kind of penalizing everybody else, they could come in, I don't know how you say that if Wal Mart comes in and say, hey I don't want to have _____ come in and see me all the time and file these papers. We've got Special Exception Use Permits and we're talking about increasing the fees, it could be quite expensive as far as asking for these things. The Board has a meeting once a month, so it could be handled that way. I'm just curious about, and I'm sure you could answer the question for me.

Mr. Brusk: This is Norm Brusk from the Zoning Board. One of the reasons that we did this was, also the location of this particular site. And it would not be problematic to have these tent sales there. The second thing was, we were promised on this, we gave them the 10 weeks. And that was kind of a discussion point, just in case they had that many. But they felt that they would not for the most part. And we also put a restriction that they only have one year on this. So that if it doesn't work out and we do have a problem, and we do start getting other people coming in, we can say, this will be terminated. And we have that option. I don't know if that helps you any on that. Mr. Baxter, I think the best way to describe this is that, this is a company that came in to ask for an exception to the regular process. And that's what we granted, was an exception to the process of coming in each time. The big problem we have is, not that they can't come in and ask and that they don't know exactly when they're going to have it, but they may get only 2 weeks notice. If they only have 2 weeks notice and it falls right after we've had our board meeting, then they won't be able to get it approved in time without us having to meet if we decided that we want to let them do that.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. This is a new business, Councilman Clemens. Is it not?

Mr. Clemens: I just want to ask Norm a question, and that's fine. I read the minutes, and I understand that's exactly what happened. I just want to ask one question. If Wal Mart comes in tomorrow and asks for the same thing, you're going to give it to them.

Mr. Brusk: We probably would not. And one of the reasons is the location. That would not be conducive.

Mr. Clemens: They've got a parking lot too.

Mr. Brusk: No. But they also have traffic and just too much congestion for that.

Mr. Clemens: And that's another thing. Then you would turn it down and they would come to us and we'd have to make the decision for you. That's the only problem that bothers me. I don't want to be making your decisions. Because once you set a precedence like this...

Mr. Brusk: But don't forget, the precedent is set based on the totality of the facts that we have. And Wal Mart, we would turn down. Not because we don't want to give them the same break, it's that they could not do it, we feel. At least speaking for myself at any rate. I would feel that they

could not do it without causing problems with the parking, traffic, etc.

Mr. Clemens: I don't know. Because they're going to use their parking lot. You're making exceptions is what you did. And that's fine if that's the way you want to handle it. I'm just saying, 10 weeks to me sounded odd. Period.

Mr. Brusk: We had our discussions on that. If you have to vote on this, we wouldn't be upset, at least I certainly wouldn't, if you want to restrict it a little farther than we restricted it.

Mr. Clemens: I just bring it up for discussion. It's up to the other members of the committee on how they feel about it. It's just something that I thought that just sounded odd because of the way it was handled. Because I do know we have a process where they do come in and so forth. And if that process is not going to be handled correctly. People know when our meetings are and so forth. That's why it's set that way.

Mr. Brusk: But assume that someone wanted to have a _____ and that's saying they have it a couple of times a year but they don't know when they're going to have it. They don't have enough notes. We probably use this as our precedence certainly.

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

Mr. Baxter: It sounds to me like the issue isn't so much with this business. The issue is immediate. They need the approval immediately. So it sounds to me, rather than making special exceptions throughout the city with the business, maybe there needs to be an exception to the process that you go through. In the case of an emergency, go to the Administration. Ask them if they can go ahead and approve something like that. I don't know if we can write that into the law and make that happen. But we've done it in the past. We used to approve all the solicitations in the street and we've turned that over to the Administration. And that's working pretty well, isn't it Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: It's working real well.

Mr. Baxter: So I would say, if the issue is immediacy, not just for this business, for any business in the City of Reynoldsburg who has a need, either tent, or sidewalk sale, or I need to use the corner, awning sale, whatever they want to call it, and they don't want to wait that time frame if we have written into the law, ability to have the Administration make a decision. And we put it squarely where it needs to be. In the Administration's hands. So I see this as an administrative matter. Thoughts on that?

Mr. Clemens: I understand.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Clemens, you brought us some good points here tonight. I guess what I'd like to see, if we could get some information from other communities on how they deal with this. Obviously, we're not inventing anything. This has been done in other communities. Especially if H H Gregg has a corporate policy and they have to go to other communities. I'd like to see what

their policy is. And also, I believe our Planning Administrator is here this evening. I don't know if he has anything to add to this at all. But if not tonight, in the future, see what he has to say about this.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Why don't we move this on for a first reading. It has to be moved on with restrictions. Move this on to the first reading and that will give us the opportunity to look into some other situations as Mr. Stake had brought up. And like I said, I'm not anti-business but I don't want to see tents sitting all over the City of Reynoldsburg either. And I'm not crazy about seeing that tent sitting down there for 10 weeks either to be honest with you. But any how, why don't we do that? We'll move this on for the first reading and we'll look into what other cities are thinking about and see what Lucas has to say about it and go from there if that's alright with the committee. I'll make a motion that we move this on to Council for the first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is Discussion to Amend Table 1155, Zoning Code Fees. Mr. Haire, are you here please? This was sent to us, and this is not something really we have to move on this evening. I think there's a lot to be discussed on. And I think Lucas has done a great job on this. Because I think if you look at this and compare it to the other cities that are involved in the same situation that we are as far as their code is concerned and as far as what they charge, we're way under. And I think that's one way that we can help supply money to our Development Department, is by upgrading our fees. When we're charging $50 and other people are charging $400 and things like that, it shows in the past, we've just not been up to snuff as far as our zoning code fees are concerned. So he gave us this report on what he would like to increase them to. He's gave a report on 9 other cities, on how they handle it and what they charge. And then he's broke down what the averages are with all of them together and so forth. And it falls in the recommendation that Lucas has brought to us. So no further of me talking and rambling on, Lucas would you like to discuss these fees?

Mr. Haire: I think Chairman Clemens covered it pretty much as far as what I've put in the reports. As far as I could tell, Reynoldsburg hasn't increased any zoning fees since 1999. And with the increase in costs of everything, including transcribing the meeting minutes, posting notices on the property, I like to go to the property and take photos of those so I can make those available so the Board's more informed at the meetings so they can make better decisions. So just all the staff cost, as well as all the cost associated with applying with an application, I just felt when I arrived here that it was time, the fees were behind other communities that I've worked with in the past and that it was time to at least consider an update and increase those fees to be more in line with other communities.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to bring one to Council's attention like I was just talking about the B&Z. Variances, Chapter 1147 will go from $30 to $100 for residential, and $250 for others. So that's quite an increase. But if you look at the other communities, they've been charging that all along. We've been way behind on it. So this might do away with some of the small items that people bring.

Mr. Haire: That's one of the reasons I proposed such a large increase there. We get a number of applications where people have other options to consider, but they think well, I'm only out $30 if I lose, but it takes a lot of staffs time and a lot of the Boards and committees times to consider those types of applications. And then if they're just denied at the meetings, people will say, okay well, I'll just do it the other way.

Mr. Clemens: Our Major Site Plan, we've only been charging $50 and he wants to increase it to $400. Compare it with other cities, a lot of other cities are much higher than that. So I think it's something that needs to be done, and I think it's something that members of the committee, members of Council should look over and look at the different increases that the Development Department is asking for, and then look at what the other cities charge at the present time and see what the average is, and see where we stand there. And I think as you do, you see where we can bring in additional funds to help our Development Department, and help the City of Reynoldsburg. We've been way behind for years and I think it's really important that we look into this. I'm not asking for something like this to be passed on tonight. It's good information for us to study and look into. And what I'd like the Council to do would be, do that. And if you have any questions, contact Lucas and I'm sure he'd be glad to discuss it with you. And then I would like to put it back on, an ordinance back that we can discuss at our next committee meeting, have it in ordinance form like it is we have here this evening. Discuss the ordinance as far as sending it on to Council. After we discuss the increases and see that maybe Council will not want to raise some of these this much and so forth, and that'll give us a chance to go over all this information and then put it on at our next committee meeting for major discussion. And if committee feels we accomplished what we want and made the changes, then we can move it on. Yes, Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Haire, you had indicated that you looked at the other cities, departments, what their fees were for each city. Did you take into account what the cities allocate from their General Revenue Funds for their Development Departments? Or did you just look at what their fee structure was?

Mr. Haire: I'd only looked at fee structure.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. So for all we know, they may operate only on fees in some of these cases. Some of these cities may operate only on fees?

Mr. Haire: Correct.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Because I look at some of these numbers and I mean, I understand there's an increase in cost of business. There hasn't been an increase in 7 years, but some of these are outlandish. You know, 3, 4, 500% increases. And just because other cities have a fee structure that's higher than us, doesn't necessarily mean we have to do the same thing, is my opinion. I mean, if all these other cities jumped off the cliff, I don't think we'd follow. So my opinion is, that I think you should take into consideration the total dollar figures that these other city Development Departments utilized to come up with what they need to operate their department. Because I think in some cases, you're going to probably find that maybe they're getting less money from their General Revenue Fund or other funds that might be dedicated for that. Maybe

they're getting a lot more from their fees. Because the way this looks now, this is sticker shock. I think this is way out of line in most cases. I could not support this the way this it outlined tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Joseph. And there's another way you see, that you talk about the budget. You talk about decreases and increases. If the Development Department could handle their budget through the increase in fees as maybe other cities do, that's an advantage to the city and that's another way of saving money. Which is, if that's what they do, that's a fine way to operate, and that's the way it probably should be operated. I disagree with Mr. Joseph on this. If you can operate your Development Department with increased fees, that takes less out of your General Fund. It leaves money to operate other departments. I'm not saying all these increases should be increased. And I think I said that. And I agree with him that possibly some of them are too high. But there's many of them that are too low. So that's why I've asked everybody to look at them. I'm not making a decision tonight. I'm not going to say you're way off or you're way low or anything like that. I don't know until I look it all over and so forth and discuss it with other cities. So that's why I want Council to look into it and study the thing. And if you come up with a total increase that you, I'll tell you a good way to look at this. Go back 4 months, 5 months, 6 months, I don't care. Go over the different fees that have been charged on everything that's come before your department that has to do with these, and that's come before the Boards, see what they cost then, and see what these increases here would have cost, and how much money we would have made as far as operating the department. That's the only way we're ever going to know. How many permits did you issue? How many variances did we issue?

Mr. Haire: On one of the sheets that I gave you, I put the proposed fees, what they would generate based on what they generated in 2005.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. I don't think I saw that one. How much?

Mr. Haire: For the total fees generated in 2005 were $16,942. And the proposed yearly correction with the increased fees based on those numbers if all applications were the same would be $34,697.

Mr. Clemens: So there would have been a total savings of $18,000.

Mr. Haire: Correct. Approximately.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. That's $18,000 that would go to the department to help the General Fund. Any how, this is something for Council to look at, consider. If you feel some of the fees are too high, come up with a reason why and we'll discuss it at our next committee meeting.

Mr. Haire: The recommended fees, I just offered as an example based on some of the averages and things like that. And some of them are below average and some of them are right around average. But that's just for your consideration.

Mr. Clemens: We don't want to compete with Dublin. I see how high theirs was and so forth.

Mr. Haire: Right. And some of them are extreme, yes.

Mr. Clemens: We want to be realistic. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could ask, and I'll try to do this without making it convoluted, because I appreciate this and I appreciate the detail that came with it. It does give us something to look at. Backing up a half a step, Special Exception Use Permits generally are with some permanency to either the owner of the tract or the tenant in the tract. The Special Exception Use Permit on H H Gregg is some permanency of a temporary use for a period of time. Okay? Now, when I look here, Special Exception Use Permit, and yours has the charge for the fee. A banner doesn't come to BZA, doesn't come to Council. It's handled by Administration. So as you're looking at some of this, could you look at what other cities may do on a temporary Special Exception Permit as to whether something is available there, and if that's a standard thing. Because you can look at the banner's no different than a tent. It's just up high instead of on the wall. And maybe that solves some of the problems of not having to come to Council, and not having to have the permanency that's attached as we historically have done with Special Exception Use Permits. But when you're looking, see if other cities have done something along that line if you don't mind also. Thank you, Mr. Haire.

Mrs. Newman: On this last banner, that seems to me, something that you know, you mentioned about a banner that somebody should be able to get a temporary permit for. That should be issued.

Mr. Haire: That's something I can look into as far as doing an outside sales. We talked about that and I know that, the Mayor and I talked about that, and the Mayor and I have talked about doing sidewalk sales. Because we've had a number of businesses along Main Street that want to do those. The only way that's permitted right now is through the Special Exception process.
Mrs. Newman: Well, can I say something else here? I was so impressed with the job you did on the fees, that I thought, well we don't even need to discuss this. You just thoroughly researched it and substantiated everything, all your recommendations. And I just want to congratulate you. I think you did a very good job. I was ready to, of course I'm not on this committee but, it was great the way it was. I think it's great. And I really am surprised that anybody thinks it needs any discussion it was so well done.

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

Mr. Stake: Chairman Clemens, thank you. I guess I would just say, how much do we want the tax payers to subsidize these things? You know, we're talking about Police Officers, and then we're talking about how much we should raise these fees. The less we raise these fees, the more our tax payers subsidize these things for builders and developers. And I just want to raise that issue. Thank you.

Mrs. Newman: And if I can say something else, I agree with you Mr. Stake. I think that, and so far as possible, each department should be self supporting. You know, and they should cover

their own costs.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, both of you. And thank you, Lucas. And we'll put this on hold and I'll have it on the next committee meeting for further discussion. And I appreciate the work you've done and thank you.

The next item, Discussion, Amend 160.02 to add Asst. Serv/Saf/Disaster Director; position ends 11-10-06. This has been sent to the Mayor to add a part time Safety/Service Director that would end at 11-10-06. Because we have the one that has resigned at that time. Also, we do have the cost for the temporary Service Director which would be, the additional cost would be $15,953.71. And Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Well again, this is a request to temporarily hire an Assistant Service/Safety Director to fill in for the position that the full time Service/Safety Director has been in. Between sick leave, and some vacation, and things like that, the current Safety/Service Director's final day will be November 10. This is very similar to what we did when we hired this Service/Safety Director. We hired an interim to work for a few weeks prior to the previous Service/Safety Director leaving. And if you recall, we do it also in the Police Department. We'll hire ahead with the expectation that the allotted personnel will drop back at 'x' given date. And this particular date's November 10. You will see coming to you, probably in the next week to 10 days, we'll be bringing forward a supplemental appropriation for monies in various departments. We're going to be short. We're going to add that into that. We're not asking for an appropriation at this time. And I did cover that with the City Auditor, but apparently he had already sent you the letter about how much it was going to cost. So we'll know actually, how much it's going to cost prior to bringing the supplemental appropriation to you. But there's a lot of things. You know, we've talked about it in the past. There's going to be some for Prisoner Care. There's going to be several different areas that we're going to need supplemental appropriations in. So this supplemental appropriation will be brought at the same time so that you can deal with all of them at the same time.

Mr. Clemens: I have no problem with the position at all. Because I know it's needed and I have no problem with your hire. I think he's well qualified. The problem is, I don't like to hire people and not have money there. Because he could be hired tomorrow as far as I'm concerned. Once we pass it, you can hire him. I don't know why we can't just appropriate the money for it and forget about it and go home.

Mayor McPherson: Well, the money's there. There's enough money to pay the individual.

Mr. Clemens: There's money there?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. There's enough money in there to pay the individual. We wouldn't need the supplemental until toward the end of the year. So that's why I thought we'd just bring them all at once. I mean, if you want to put the money in here, that's fine too.

Mr. Clemens: No. If the money's there, I just want to make sure that we _____ hire him.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. The money is already there. We have enough to pay the Service/Safety Director through the end of the year. And with this position coming in, and with the supplemental request that we're going to bring in, we should be fine on the money aspect of it.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. No problem. Yes, Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mayor, I was looking at the document that Mr. Harris prepared, looking at the pay grade 25, insurance, PERS, all that's fine. I guess my question, why a 5% plus? What's the...

Mayor McPherson: I have no idea where Mr. Harris got that. He never talked to me about it. That is not the salary.

Mr. Joseph: Because I just don't know what the point is to have an additional 5% on top of _____ .

Mayor McPherson: I have no idea either.

Mr. Clemens: I agree.

Mayor McPherson: Again, there was no discussion with me what so ever on that form you got. I saw a copy of it but it's totally inaccurate.

Mr. Clemens: Would you tell us what you're going to hire him at?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. We're going to hire, well I don't have the number in front of me. But it's like 68,9 something like that. So that's probably off 3 or 4 thousand dollars what he submitted.

Mr. Joseph: With the 5% it says, 68,523 here. But again, why.....

Mayor McPherson: Again, I don't know why he picked the 5%. But if you calculate it back at what we're actually going to hire him in, it's going to be close to that any way. He may have overheard a conversation or something. But again, there was no discussion with me prior to that being sent down.

Mr. Clemens: In other words, just 5% higher than what the base was.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. Ball park. Roughly 5, 6% higher. Yes. That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from the committee for Mayor McPherson? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I would like to send this to Council as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Item number 7, ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT AN APPLICATION FOR ANNEXATION OF .52+/- ACRES IN TRURO TOWNSHIP, COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, STATE OF OHIO, TO THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO (Marvin D. VanFossen and Janet Marlene VanFossen). It had its second reading 7-24-06. Are there any questions from the committee about this annexation? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion to send this to Council for its third reading for adoption. Do I have a second? 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 8:55. Thank you.

Service Committee
September 5, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
September 5, 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 the Finance Committee meeting to order at 8:56.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I have a couple of changes here. Item number 4, Discussion, Authorization for City, I'm sorry, not that one. Item number 5, Discussion, Amend 160.09 Group Insurance. I spoke with the Mayor earlier today about that and he indicated he would like to remove that at this time because there are some other issues tied into that legislation that are going to need to be dealt with. We might as well do them all at the same time. So if we could remove that. Item number 7, Discussion on the Impact Fee Study. I do have some additional questions. I think we're waiting for a little bit more information. So I'd like to hold that for another two weeks. And in Other Legislation, item #1, I'd like to remove that since the income tax adjustment did not pass. That will not be necessary. And I don't believe I need a second for that. 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 July 17,

2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3b is approval of the minutes of special Finance Committee meeting held August 21, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Authorization for City Auction. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, President Stake. As you're all aware, December of '04, City Council passed an ordinance requiring that all fixed assets that are to be auctioned by the city needed to be brought to City Council prior to that auction. What you have in front of you is a list of everything that we're going to be auctioning. When you look at the list, the asseted items are the ones that have got item tag numbers to the left. The rest of the items are just miscellaneous items that we're going to auction. So what you're actually going to be looking at is the asset tagged items, and authorizing us to put those items into an auction. Part of the ordinance also requires that we advertise for at least two weeks in a row, all of the items to be auctioned. So we will probably need to add an appropriation to this in the next, by the next meeting that we have. We kind of were reviewing the ordinance today and just realized that with the price of advertising in newspapers with all the items that we have to advertise here, we could be talking a page or so in a newspaper. And that becomes very substantial in dollars. So we'd like to go ahead and move it forward for its first reading with the understanding that we're also going to probably add a supplemental to it after we determine how much money we're going to have to pay to advertise this for two consecutive weeks.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Is this auction inventory list, is this what we're going to ultimately end up with? Will there be any changes to this at all?

Mayor McPherson: At this point, I anticipate no changes. This is the list of all the items that we're going to be auctioning.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And this can go three reading route?

Mayor McPherson: We would like it, it could go three readings, but we would like certainly to ask Council to put a rule suspension on it at the last reading.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions from members of the committee? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I think it's time that we redraft back and eliminate this as far as advertising each and every item. We've had auctions here for 20 years. And if we're getting in the situation where we're spending money for a full page ad for some of the things that we're auctioning off, I think we're costing the city too much money.

Mr. Stake: Are we required to list everything?

Mayor McPherson: It says, "all personal property to be sold at auction shall be advertised not less than two weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Reynoldsburg". So yes, we're obligated to advertise all the items. We did get a City Attorney opinion on that because we thought maybe it was just assetted items. But it's all items.

Mr. Hills: Has the City Attorney rendered an opinion? Because I'm wondering if we could run the ad saying that personal property as listed on the form available at 'x'.

Mayor McPherson: We asked for an opinion April 15, 2005 subject to auction ordinance. Ordinance 134-04, Uniform Procedure for the Sale of Personal Property states that all personal property to be sold at auction should be advertised for not less than two weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Reynoldsburg. Does this mean that we have to advertise a list of the property we intend to sell? The answer from the City Attorney, 'yes'.

Mr. Hills: Have we asked our current City Attorney?

Mayor McPherson: No. This was an opinion that we had prior.
Mr. Hills: Could we ask our current City Attorney?

Mayor McPherson: I can have it for you by the next meeting.

Mr. Hills: Because what you just read to me, I'm not so sure but what we can't do an ad that the city is selling it's surplus personal property at an auction, and list of the property is available at such and such. I don't know.

Mayor McPherson: I don't either. I have no problem submitting this to our City Attorney for an opinion.

Mr. Clemens: We're advertising things that's going to go for 50 cents.

Mayor McPherson: Absolutely.

Mr. Clemens: I mean, I've been...

Mayor McPherson: It will cost much more to advertise than we'll ever get from out there.

Mr. Clemens: I've ran those auctions. I know what they go for.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. We'll be lucky to get back what we pay for advertising.

Mr. Stake: Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I was just wondering. What requires us to have a complete list to advertise? Just our own legislation?

Mayor McPherson: The ordinance. We passed the ordinance that said December '04 requires it.

Mrs. Newman: We can fix that.

Mr. Hills: We may fix that to go along with this.

Mayor McPherson: Let me tell you, if Council would want to entertain revising that ordinance or getting rid of the ordinance, we'll talk about some how delaying the auction until spring. Some of this stuff's been hanging around now for 3 or 4 years. I don't think another few months is going to, but that's a Councilmatic decision. And if you want, we'll wait until we see what the new City Attorney says about the advertising.

Mrs. Frazier: I'd ask him to look at the ordinance. Because Mr. Underwood did this one, and if he can adjust this so that it's real simple, then Council can make the decision.

Mr. Hills: We could run the ordinance with this if necessary.

Mayor McPherson: I'll work with Jed. We'll try to have something for you by the next committee meeting.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I heard the City Attorney say earlier, he's always willing to help Council out. So I appreciate that.

Mayor McPherson: He is. He's an asset to the community.

Mr. Stake: So at this time, do you want to send it forward for its first reading?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. Send it forward for the first reading and we can always....

Mrs. Frazier: If you send it for a first reading, you're going to publish it. Why don't you just hold it?

Mayor McPherson: Then hold it.

Mr. Stake: Why don't we hold this for _____ weeks then. Okay.

Mayor McPherson: We'll see what the results are.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Then I'll make a motion that we hold this for two weeks. Do I have a second? Second by Councilwoman Newman. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 6 is Discussion, Resolution Accepting Amounts and Rates, Franklin County. This is an annual item. And I believe this is a requirement by the county that we go ahead and

submit this. I did get a call from the City Auditor earlier this evening, said he would not be able to be here. But I didn't see any problems with that myself. He is asking for emergency on this. Are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Again, this is something that we've done every year. It has to be to the County Auditor by October 1. So it does give us a little time yet, but I guess we want to just send this forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. I'll make that motion. Is there 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. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Just a comment. When you look at Schedule A, we've told the general public about how much money we're getting. And the inside millage, which is all we have in the City of Reynoldsburg, you know, _____ $285,832. Divide that by the number of residents we have in the city and you see how much each individual pays the City of Reynoldsburg for all our services. I just thought I'd mention that.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Item number 8 is, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 191.02, 191.04 AND 191.07 AND ADOPT SECTION 191.191 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO, IN ORDER TO INCREASE THE CITY INCOME TAX BY ONE-HALF PERCENT (0.5%) FROM THE CURRENT RATE OF ONE AND ONE-HALF PERCENT (1.5%) TO A RATE OF TWO PERCENT (2.0%), BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FUNDS TO PAY GENERAL OPERATING COSTS OF THE CITY'S DIVISION OF POLICE, AND TO PAY COSTS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROVED BY THE CITY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2006, INCLUDING THE PAYMENT OF DEBT SERVICE CHARGES ON SECURITIES ISSUED TO PAY COSTS OF THOSE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. It was read for the first time on 8-21-06. And this needs to be sent to Other Legislation until after the November vote. Are there any questions or comments by members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we send this to Other Legislation. Do I have a second? Second by Councilwoman Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I'll adjourn the Finance Committee at 9:06.

Finance Committee
September 5, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)