

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday September 4, 2007

Members of Community Development Committee present: Preston Stearns, Donna Shirey, Antoinette Newman, Brett Baxter.

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

Mr. Stearns: We'll start the Reynoldsburg City Council Committee meeting at 7:30 now. And I'll call the Community Development Committee together. It's the first thing on the agenda.

The second thing on the agenda will be approval of the agenda. Are there any corrections or deletions that anyone would like to bring forward at this time? (No response). Hearing none, then we will accept the agenda as it has been presented.

Also, number 3 is approval of the minutes of the June 4, 2007 Community Development Committee meeting. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). Hearing none, then we will accept those minutes as they have been presented.

Item number 4 is a Discussion: Amendment of Section 971.08 A Program and Facility Fees and Charges of Chapter 971 Municipal Parks. Mr. Walsh.

Parks and Recreation Director Paul Walsh: Thank you Councilman Stearns, members of Council, President Hills. Our department annually does a review of all fees and charges, and we've completed that. We've completed our pre-program analysis for our programs that we'll be providing in 2008, and as always, we annually stop by and request some additions or changes to the fee structure. This year, we are only going to be asking about a couple of items here, and they're all related to contractual programmers. Those folks tell us how much they're going to charge us, and then we have to adjust our fees appropriately. So the ones that are in there are in italics. Drama, challenger soccer, pumpkin carving, and officiating classes. And that's all. That's probably the least number of changes since I've been here I'm happy to say. And we're going to hold the line on fees in 2008. So with that, I'll be happy to take any questions.

Mr. Stearns: Any questions on the Community Development Committee? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I don't have any questions. I just want to comment. The increases are very minimal. And as usual, you're doing a very prudent job in that respect.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you.

Mr. Stearns: Anyone from Council have any questions, comments? (No response). Okay. That's all then. If no one has any other comments or questions, then I will make a motion that we move it on to Council for its first reading. Do we have a second? Mr. Baxter seconds. All in favor, use the sign of voting and say aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Alright, that's it. With nothing else, we will adjourn the Community Development Committee at 7:34.

Community Development Committee
- - - Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

September 4, 2007

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday September 4, 2007

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

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

Mr. Joseph: I=ll call the Safety Committee to order at 7:36.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or changes to the agenda tonight? Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Yes. I=d like to make a motion to amend the agenda for discussion of a full time Compliance Officer.

Mr. Joseph: Is there a second to amend the agenda? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, please say aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Okay. I will add this item as 4a. I will also add as 3a, I=m going to give a report for the Liquor Permit investigations that occurred in the month of August. So I=ll make that motion. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor? (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Okay. The agenda is therefore approved and amended.

The next item is the approval of the minutes of the July 16, 2007 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes, additions, or deletions to those minutes? (No response). If not, those minutes will stand as submitted.

The next item is 3a. I=m going to give a brief report on the Liquor Permit investigations that occurred in the month of August. As Council might recall, we gave the Clerk the jurisdiction to work directly with the Police Chief on any Liquor Permits that came through. There were two. One was from World Beverage and Snack Incorporated; and the other was the Outside Corner. Both investigations showed nothing negative on those and they were sent back to the Clerk. Are there any questions from the committee on those two investigations from Council? (No response). Okay. So again, those went back to the Clerk and that matter was taken care of.

The next item is Item 4. Discussion: Chapter 711 Billiard Rooms - listed at the request of Chairman Joseph. I added this to the agenda, having done a little bit of investigation on our current ordinance, and it seems that Reynoldsburg is pretty much the only municipality in the area that has the restriction on pool tables within establishments that serve liquor. And there have been some businesses that have been impacted by this ordinance. There=s additional establishments that are looking to open their doors in the city that could be impacted by this ordinance. And I=ve not seen any evidence that, and the section we=re talking about is Section 711.12, Subsection (g) which states, AThe sale of or consumption of alcoholic beverages on the premises of a pool room containing more than one pool table is hereby prohibited.@ I=ve not seen any evidence that having more than one pool table in a drinking establishment is causing problems. And there=s been, there was an article in The Dispatch not too long ago that talked

about this. That a number of bars in the city were operating, they had more than one table. Now I'm not saying that that was right that they were violating the law. I don't think anyone knew they were violating the law, but there was no problems with that. No other cities have had problems with this type of arrangement. And I think that it is only fair to the businesses that choose to locate within our city limits, being given a fair shake, if they're going to be able to operate in other cities, we should give them the same shot here in Reynoldsburg. So I'd like to, we do have some speaker slips on the topic as well. But I'm going to first open up to the committee to see if anyone has any questions or comments on making a change. And basically the change I'm proposing is that we strike Subsection (g) from the code restricting establishments from having more than one table. But I'll open that up to the committee at this time if anyone wants to have any comments. Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Councilman Joseph. I'd just like to inquire with the Administration - have we had any problems in any establishments that have liquor and pool tables...ongoing problems or anything?

Mayor McPherson: I'm not aware of any problems at all, other than the normal activities that you have in bars. As far as police being called, fights, things like this, I'm not aware of any. And Lieutenant McKinley may want to say something..

Lieutenant McKinley: I think you're correct, Mayor. Like the Mayor said, we have the occasional disturbances like in many other businesses, but nothing out of the ordinary.

Mr. Stake: Nothing you could relate to having pool tables and alcohol together or anything like that?

Lieutenant McKinley: No.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions of members of the committee? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes, thank you, Mr. Joseph. I'd just like to agree with what you've said. I think probably in view of the fact we do have one person who wants, I mean, he wants to put a billiard room or a sports bar where The Motherland Grille was. Well, Section (a) says, ABilliard rooms shall be open to view from the street or from a location open and accessible to the public. Does that mean there has to be windows that people passing by could look in and see what's going on? If that's the case, I don't know whether we may want to look at that, too, because that building obviously isn't, it's not open to view. It's all closed in, which I think is kind of a creepy appearance anyway. It's probably the reason why everybody goes out of business when they go there.

Mr. Joseph: That's a good point. We may want to take a look at something like that as well.

We might want to get an opinion from the City Attorney on exact definition of whether that would apply in that area. Other questions?

Mrs. Newman: Mrs. Shirey also had a question about (b). You ought to be able to see from the front to the rear. I don't know why that is, but what the problem would be with that.

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

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman. Question I have is that when we spoke about this prior to the session, I believe Jed had stood up and said that was a state law that we were also required to do that. This wasn't just a Reynoldsburg issue. Am I forgetting something here? I thought this was not just around Reynoldsburg in our ordinance but it was also something to do with the state.

Mr. Hood: If I said that I might have been mistaken. I'm not aware of any Ohio Revised Code that limits the number of pool tables in liquor establishments. As Mr. Joseph, and I think he characterized it correctly, that if you take a survey around the outer belt, we may be the only suburb that has such an ordinance, such a prohibition. But I did say that it's from 1968. So it's well-established, and depending on your opinion, may be archaic.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you. And secondly on that, as far as being a pool table, I don't see any difference between that than shooting darts, playing volley ball, or many of the other activities, or games, or sports that you see played in many of these types of locations you see around the outer belt. And you see them in Dublin and Hilliard and all the way around. And why pool was chosen back in '68 as the game of choice to prohibit along with alcohol, I don't understand. But I would agree with you Mr. Joseph that it's time to revisit that and clean that up.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. It's true. When this passed in '68, there might have been a valid reason, but I don't think anyone can tell us what that reason is today. I wish we could. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Baxter: Mel was here, so maybe he can tell us.

Mr. Clemens: I might have been here, but I can't remember what happened yesterday. No. I can understand the change of the ordinance. It's forty years old. It hasn't been enforced so I don't believe in having ordinances that you're not going to enforce to start with. That's immaterial. I do think there's a lot of different things in the chapter that needs to be looked at. And I think possibly you and the City Attorney could get together and look at it. If we're going to do something with the ordinance, let's make sure that we correct everything that's in there, or if it's even needed. Because there is a lot of different things that's represented in the ordinance other than just the beer problem. Like I said, forty years ago I had no idea why we did it or what it was done for. And I can see no problem. You shouldn't have ordinances on the book if you don't enforce them. And so there seems to be no problem with changing it.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. Under Section 711.13, the hours of operation go to 2 a.m. We might want to look at that, too, because I think a lot of these businesses want to stay open until 2:30. And then I also have another comment. Is that when the Music Man was such a popular stage play, and movie, and they were all upset in River City that they had pool halls there?

Mr. Clemens: I don't think he came through town. I don't remember the parade, but I was quite young then so I don't know. I've got one more question. One thing that does, I think we should look into, but we have a lot of bars that have and so forth, I think that space is the important thing. I don't think you should be able to just cram pool tables in. If you see a pool table and you see, and I don't play pool, I've watched it and I'm no good at it, but you have to have room. And I think that's what causes some problems. When you've got them right close together, they bump into each other shooting pool. So I think the restrictions on the distance in between that and the wall and in between each other ought to be looked into. Because I could see a place just going in and cramming in pool tables that would cause a problem as far as being able to play pool. And I think that's something that we should watch because it should be in view of the public, and it shouldn't be where everybody's cramped in together trying to shoot pool at one table and next to the next one. So I think that's something that possibly we'd want to look into, is the space area and where it's at.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I'll just comment on what Mr. Clemens just said. I don't want to get into the habit of telling businesses how to do their job. But I will go to your point of, from a fire safety point, that's still going to have to meet the requirements from fire safety so people can get in and out of the business. So to the point if that's what you're trying to get to, I'm okay with that. But I don't want to tell them how to set up a game and how close or far apart to put it.

Mr. Clemens: You've got to have aisles. You'd hate to sit at a bar and have somebody hit you with a pool stick. I've never sat at a bar, but I'm sure that could happen. So any how, I just think that's something you should look into.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thanks, Mel. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I just wondered if there are certain standards that apply to the required distance. I'm sure our engineering firm, or Chet would probably be able to come up with those so that people don't hit each other with pool cues and all that kind of thing. And you'd have to have room for two people in one aisle between two tables. They can look at that.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Other questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one last thing. We do have a gentleman that owns this bar here who=s going to be looking for some changes to happen. And his business is impacted greatly because of the request for this change knowing that we already aren=t enforcing the law that=s out there, why are we enforcing it on one but not the others?

Mr. Clemens: That=s what I said.

Mr. Baxter: Should we be able to work with administration and give an exception to this? Is there some way we can give....

Mr. Clemens: Who are we enforcing it on?

Mr. Baxter: I=m just saying, either enforce it to everybody or not to anybody.

Mr. Clemens: I just said that. Why have it?

Mr. Baxter: I agree with you. So right now, this man is impacted. Are we able to give him any relief at this point is what I=m asking.

Mr. Clemens: I don=t know who is being that impacted on. What are you talking about?

Mr. Baxter: If he can=t get liquor, he can=t improve his business.

Mr. Clemens: That=s a Special Exception Use Permit. That has nothing to do with this. We=re talking about this ordinance right here.

Mr. Baxter: Right. That=s what brought this up.

Mr. Joseph: One question, maybe you can answer this Mayor. Has this been enforced since it came to light that there was no enforcement?

Mayor McPherson: I think the first notice that we had of this was on this particular billiard hall. Lieutenant McKinley, you might be able to answer this better. Have we actually gone out and notified the other bars that they can=t?

Lieutenant McKinley: _____ not aware that we=ve actually sent out any kind of notification like that. I know we were looking in to see how many establishments actually exist, but I don=t think there was any notification sent out.

Mayor McPherson: At this point, we were kind of just holding off until we see what City Council=s going to do. If you guys are going to take this up as a legislative issue, then we=re

just going to put it on hold and wait until whatever you adopt is adopted. And then we=ll use that as our guideline as to what we do with bars that have more than one pool table.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Joseph, if I could, I think we have to be cautious. What we=re doing here is looking at our business regulation code, which is where the restrictions are. At the time that, I think you all are talking about Mr. Mascon and his place on Brice Road. This was not even discussed when the Special Exception Use Permit came up. So we=ve got to be careful we=re not mixing apples, and oranges, and grapefruit all together to solve an issue.

The issue here is, are we looking at some antiquated regulations that need to be codified and re-codified. And more concisely, I think the answer to that is probably going to be a unanimous, yes we do. Did this effect that Special Exception Use permit? The answer to that is, no, because it didn=t have anything to do with it. Mr. Mascon came in and he didn=t want alcohol here and now we=re at the position, (where he says) >now I want alcohol=. I don=t know that Mr. Mascon does or does not have a liquor permit. We=ve got to be careful. It isn=t all meshed together.

What we=re doing here is saying, are our codes antiquated to the point that now it=s been brought to our attention, how are we going to fix it? Then the Special Exception Use Permit, I believe that has been determined that that needs to start through the process again if that would be a separate Special Exception Use Permit. I may be wrong and I don=t know how we mix them all together, but just because it=s an issue that has multiple parts doesn=t mean you just change one thing and everything else went away.

Mr. Joseph: I agree, President Hills. This is one issue that=s a separate issue and that will have to be dealt with on a different day by a different committee. Other questions? Yes, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Chairman Joseph, there=s one thing that I don=t see in this ordinance that we have already. There=s no age limits or anything like that. Do we have anything on the books that says that there=s an age limit to alcohol that=s served and established under aged minors are not to participate in the activities of that establishment?

Mr. Hood: That=s a state law.

Mr. Stearns: That is a state law? That=s what I wanted to hear. So in other words, if they do, if an establishment does have a liquor license, the pool hall, and there are no minors allowed in there. Is that correct?

Mr. Hood: There are age prohibitions.

Mr. Hills: If I could ask, are those age prohibitions walking in the door, but if they=re accompanying some of their family members, I=m not so sure that there are some restrictions and they=re both in state law and liquor application permits, but I=m not so sure that if mom and dad

take the 9 or 14 year old in - they can sit there, they just can't drink alcohol, but they do other things...

Mr. Baxter: They can play pool.

Mr. Hills: ...I think they can. So again, I think there's an awful lot we have to look at. But yeah, there are some restrictions. Is it going to be no minors in that building? I think the answer to that would be, no.

Mr. Joseph: Very good. Other questions? (No response). Alright. We may come back to questions depending on what we hear. We have several individuals who would like to make a comment on it. The first one is Michael Mascon.

Mr. Mascon: I'm Mike Mascon with The Spot Family Fun and Billiards Club, 1762 Brice Road. Just a few things. I know one of the questions was about the windows. I know our establishment is well open from the view of the street. I believe that's something else that the Columbus ordinance, when we were looking into that, that's something else that's required from the Columbus ordinance as well. I believe it has something to do with the gambling and things to that effect. It's easier to monitor if you can see everything from the street.

As far as the age restrictions, I know our clientele is mostly, we're finding, is 18 to 55. We have some minors. With the State Liquor Board, I believe the way they require it is, if you only have a beer permit, you could allow minors inside the facility. However, with a mixed drink, or where you're taking shots, and it's actually a bar atmosphere, then it's I believe, 21 and under, or 18, I'd have to go back and look at that, but there are set up age restrictions depending upon the level of alcohol you have in the facility. I'm there pretty much every day. I know we're going to have the same people in the building. They're going to be doing almost the same thing regardless of beer or no beer, or alcohol or no alcohol. So I don't see how it would effect the safety of the city. Or just like the Police Officer said, nothing out of the ordinary that you would normally find. So if any of you have any questions, I know you know we've spoke before. So, is there any questions from the Council for me?

Mr. Joseph: Questions of Mr. Mascon? (No response). There doesn't appear to be any questions tonight. Thank you.

Our next speaker is R. Glen Skeen. Give your name and address for the record please.

Mr. Skeen: Thank you. My name is Glen Skeen of 8061 Goldsmith Drive. I'd like to take the opportunity to speak on behalf of The Spot Family Fun and Billiards. I'm a parent. I have two kids, 16 and 13. I helped coach their basketball and volleyball team through the years through Reynoldsburg's Parks and Rec's and through AYBT during the summer. I'm very involved with my kids and I enjoy family activities. I am very competitive. Myself, I like to golf and I like to shoot pool. Those are the two things I enjoy doing. I don't drink, but I do know that the state pool tournament and other pool tournaments, which are often sponsored by a distributor, require that you serve alcohol in order to have competitive tournaments. Pool is one of the few

activities that I could do with my kids. I do take them into The Family Fun and Billiards Spot. I'll shoot pool with a couple of people. And my girls will either shoot pool, play ping pong or listen to music. There are a variety of things for them to do, but I can keep an eye on them. I'm in there with them. I know that pool, through the years, has changed. I guess back in the 60's it was associated with maybe a different part of the community that you didn't want involved with Reynoldsburg. But the fact is, mostly right now, if you look at who the people that are shooting pool are people that are involved with the community in a number of ways. Most of them are parents. And most folks just want to go and remain competitive or be active in a way other than going out and walking or exercising in another way. It's a good way to be active and competitive. So I would like to say also that I've been to a number of bars and pool halls. I shoot in a pool league once a week. I do know that pool halls, as a rule, I would say are a lot easier going. You run into less trouble than you do in a bar. Usually if you're going in to shoot pool, you're not going to get drunk. It's not your intention. Some people will drink occasionally, but that hurts your game. And if you're going to be competitive, you don't go to drink. I mean, some people do drink a little bit as the evening goes on. And of course, like everything else, I guess some people would drink too much. But you know, that's a problem you run into everywhere else. But it's not like a bar where people go to drink specifically. You don't go just to put one beer after another. There's usually not a whole lot in the way of male-female diversity. It's primarily guys. I guess you don't run into a lot of trouble that you would have in a bar also where you have people trying to work out dating arrangements. Because usually when you go in there, you go in to relax. You go in to shoot pool. And I go in to be competitive. I enjoy shooting pool competitively. And in order to get some of the bigger tournaments in town, you do I think, need a liquor license at a pool hall. So hopefully we'll see some moving on that. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Skeen. Is there any questions? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to comment, that I would hope that we could kind of move this along and get it settled pretty rapidly, because I know that these people are waiting to operate their business to the best advantage. So I would hope that we could do that.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mrs. Newman.

Next speaker, Zachary Goldsmith. Please give your name and address for the record please.

Mr. Goldsmith: My name is Zachary Goldsmith. I live, I put Reynoldsburg on the sheet, but I actually reside in Baltimore. I helped Michael Mascon construct the facility over there at 1762 Brice Road. He's a friend of mine from high school. And I own a couple of construction companies and I'm pretty savvy with constructing interior stuff. So Glen pretty much summed up everything pertaining to the skill of pool. Having pool tournaments in our facility at The Spot would require, the minimal, a D1 beer permit just to serve bottled beer. But if we could do that, we would move forward with the abolishment of 711.12(g), and for that to happen, just to conform with the law, but that needs to be abolished. So as far as moving forward with the

Special Exception Permit, of course that would be a separate issue. But that=s pretty much all I have to say.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Goldsmith. Any questions by Council? (No response). Thank you.

Our last speaker, William Salyers. I=m sorry if I didn=t quite get your name right.

Mr. Salyers: Yeah. My name=s William Salyers. I live at 6333 Century City North, Apartment 5. I=m within 100 yards of The Spot. I have two small children. I don=t see, I mean, I wouldn=t see The Spot serving alcohol to be a safety issue for them. And also I play in a pool league at a bar which I have to play in a bar instead of in an establishment that I work. Because there=s a law that states that we can=t serve alcohol because we have more than one pool table. But I go play in these bars that are in violation of the law. And that=s pretty much all I have to say.

Mr. Joseph: Questions? (No response). Okay. Do any members of Council have any additional comments or ideas to recommend regarding this issue? (No response). Okay. What I=d like to do, to get the ball rolling on this, I think that I=d like to sit down with the City Attorney and start looking at the changes we would want to make to this city ordinance. I=d like to move it on for a reading, and then by the time it comes back to committee, I=m hoping we will have some legislation to look at. Is that okay with Council, committee? Alright. I make that motion. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor?

Ms. Frazier: Mr. Joseph? Do you want that to go forward then with at least (g) stricken? Is that what you want?

Mr. Joseph: Yes. We can modify it from there.

Ms. Frazier: And then you can add....

Mr. Hills: ...the deletion of (g) and other needed modifications.

Mr. Joseph: Yes. That will be fine. Again, that was seconded by Mr. Stake. All in favor? (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Our last item tonight, 4a is for Discussion, the hiring of full time Code Compliance Officer. This was added at the request of Councilwoman Shirey and I=ll let her discuss that.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you. In review and observation of the Code Compliance Department, and the responsibilities of the employees, I have been looking at the city as a whole, and really feel that to benefit us as a city, instead of going backward, that we should go forward to have a full time Code Compliance Officer. We recently lost two and it seems like it seems to be a pattern that

once we get a part time employee in, they=re basically trained, and then it seems like they go someplace else because there=s a full time position. And I would really like to see us go forward with that. And I=d like to bring that up for discussion.

Mr. Joseph: Members of committee? Any members that would like to talk a little bit about this?
Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I=d like to say that I agree with Mrs. Shirey, but also with the money problem, we need to find out if we can afford this, but I definitely think that we need to have, it=s not fair, really, to people to expect them to work a part time job then expect some form of loyalty from them. That=s just going to go with the territory. They=re going to leave. They can find something better, but I think we should look into this and work with the Auditor and see if we can afford to hire a full time Code Compliance Officer. I think we need them.

Mr. Joseph: I do know the Auditor=s had some concerns about this issue. Mr. Harris, could you make a few comments about where you believe the city is financially, and how this could be incorporated?

Mr. Harris: Well, we continue to spend more money than we=re taking in. It=s like everything else, you=re going to have to start prioritizing things as to what you want, and what you=re willing to live with and live without. I=ll certainly be glad to sit down with the committee and we can look at things, see if there=s some way we can=t put this together. But you=ve come through the worst part of the code season anyway. I don=t know if there=s any hurry to get this done in the next few weeks. I think it would be better off served to have a small committee take a look at it, see what can and can=t be done.

Mr. Joseph: I agree. Long term, it=s probably something that we=re going to have to do. I hate the idea of Reynoldsburg being the training ground of talent and sending it out to other cities and other municipalities benefitting from our expense. But at the same time, dollar issues are of high concern in the city. I think we=re getting a second wind on where we=re at. We=re doing better by being able to pay for city services, but I think that this is something we should probably take a closer look at, and I=ll sit down with the Administration and really see what kind of numbers we=re talking about, because originally something was going to come forward from the administration on this and then that was put on hold. So we never really got to see what kind of dollars we=re talking about by making this shift. Other questions? Yes.

Mr. Clemens: I agree that we need a Code Compliance Officer; the timing is bad right now. As Dick said, we=re coming into the time of year that it slows down. We=re adding to the budget probably 50 grand counting benefits, which we don=t have. We do have a new administration coming in. I think to just up and add personnel and add 50,000 to something we don=t have, I don=t think this is the time to do it. I=ll support it after the first of the year when we have the new administration come in, see what they want to do, and see if we have the money to expend for it. I think that=s the important part of it. I think this is not the time of year to do it; not in

September, and probably not have it ready until November, and it=s just not the time to do it.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Just two things. It always seems like there=s always an issue with funding. It seems like the city never has money to do anything any more. And when it comes to the safety issue, the streets, when it comes to the neighborhoods being up to code, to me that seems more important than spending money on landscaping on Main Street. We need to prioritize, I agree. But we also need to look at the safety issue within the city. We never seem to have enough money for anything, but somehow, money just appears.

The second thing is, why should we be waiting until the next administration comes in? We need to be making these decisions on how we are going to look at the city and what=s going to benefit it. I see us going backwards and not forward. And we should not have to wait until we get a new administration in here to make these decisions.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Joseph. I=m in agreement with Councilwoman Shirey and I think that we need to be looking at something like that. We have had a number of Code Enforcement Officers over the past few years, and I think that the full time person would serve the city well as far as keeping someone on for a long period of time. Just to have someone in here for about 6 months and then they=re gone, it=s not doing the city any good. So I think that we should look at that at this time.

Mr. Joseph: Other questions? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Joseph, I just have a comment. I=m in agreement with Councilman Clemens. I think the timing is wrong. I think that we owe it to the next administration to let them decide whether they want to have a full time Code Compliance Officer. And then what do we do? Do we get rid of a three-quarter time? We just have one Code Enforcement Officer patrolling the whole city and we=re losing a half a person there if you take the two three-quarter times and just add one full time. And the other thing is, where=s the money going to come from? We=ve barely got by with getting a couple more police officers this year and that=s after not providing overtime for parades and fireworks and community events. So I think it=s a tough decision. I=d be willing to sit down and look at the budget for next year with the new administration and see where we might be. If that=s what they want to do, we might be able to fit somebody in. I am in agreement with Councilwoman Shirey that I think we are missing the boat by keep hiring part time people. I think if we get the right full time person, it really could work out pretty well. But right now, I think the timing is bad.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: I still think that in regards to waiting for the administration is wrong. You know,

we obviously find money somewhere. And as it's been said before, shuffling the funds around from one account to the other, we've always been able to hire additional police officers. We've always been able to do other things. This is an important issue. Again, it's going to benefit the city by making it a full time Code Compliance Officer. We need to look at the whole picture. We need to look at it, how is it going to benefit that department as a whole. Right now, you're going to have employees that are going to be totally stressed and we're going to end up with nobody. We need to make it full time. We need to make it this year and not next year. And I know that there's money around there somewhere.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Joseph. I remember a few years ago back, I think it was, Councilman Clemens, we spoke about this when we first added a new position when we put the two three-quarter time people on. The intent of that position was to give retirees, or somebody who wasn't looking for a full time position. Not somebody that was trying to gain an education on Code Enforcement and go to another city and get a better benefit. This was an option to bring somebody into the city to give them some additional funds and allow them to be a Code Enforcement. That was the reason why those two positions were set up not as a full time position, if that's where we were heading. If you remember, I was against that position. I thought a full time officer would have been the way to go. And I thought that was because we were going to have this revolving circle of people coming in and out of the city. Well, that has proven to be what has happened. People have come and gone, so we've proven that to be the case. People don't want to stay unless they have the benefits and have longevity with the city. This is a very important issue with code enforcement, I hate to say it. I right now, have something I would like to report. Where do I go with it? To the police? Maybe I can get our city Service/Safety Director go out and do some calls for me. I don't know. But one thing for certain, we need somebody right now that we can make calls to and they can continue to keep the city moving forward. Not waiting for somebody new to get here. If we have two open positions, let's fill them. We don't have to wait to have a full time position. _____ fill the, right?

Mr. Hills: What is the status of it now? I read a memo from Mr. DeBolt that would indicate that there may be interviews and/or hiring that's already occurred.

Mr. Baxter: That would be great wouldn't it?

Mr. Hills: And let's ask. Let's before we make something bigger than it is, do you have an opening for a part time position in code enforcement? Have you hired people?

Mr. DeBolt: We currently have the two part time openings. And they're again, half time openings, not three quarter, but they are currently open. We've interviewed candidates over the last couple of weeks. We have one more interview tomorrow. Tentatively, we have one person that will accept one part time position. We want to complete the other interview for the other position tomorrow. Again, this was an issue that we had hoped to have on the agenda. We did

put it on hold, but I feel obligated to put the Building Department=s point of view in. Mr. Hopper=s not here. We=ve talked about it in depth. We think the position is needed full time. We=ve had quality people in the position in part time. We would have loved to have kept them. We would loved to have had just part time individuals of the quality that we had. I think it=s been clear over the last couple people that we=ve had, that have decided to move on, that we just aren=t able to do that. The job is a big job. I agree with Councilwoman Shirey on the fact that I think we=re taking a step backward. Because to get to the point we=re at, to have the Property Maintenance Code in place, and then not to be able to enforce it fully, would be doing the citizens a disservice. So I think we need to again, step up to the plate and make sure that we have the code in place, and we need to make sure it=s enforced. And the fact that we=ve had quality people enforcing it, by now stepping backward, and again having a training period, just in the last week or two, I think you can drive around the city and see things that you might not have seen in the past that we just don=t have the personnel to go out. Yes, Mr. Hopper has been going out. But he just doesn=t nearly have the time to keep up. It=s just major issues we=re addressing right now. We=ll continue to do that. And answer to President Hills= question, yeah, we hope to have someone on board as a part time capacity in the very near future. The other position, again, based on this discussion, we could hold that position and make it a full time potentially.

Mr. Joseph: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Could I follow up just a little bit? For some clarification, the two people who just quit, or left during August and September, it=s my understanding they were 32 hour a week persons. You bring everything to Council, it=s part time - or not you. The administration brings it at part time but they pay them 32 hours a week. That=s 4 days of 8 hours. Okay? So they=re 4 day employees, and we=ve had that. We started in to >07 with two part times, correct?

Mr. DeBolt: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And we=ve also supplemented in >07, someone out of our Building Department and/or out of our Service Department to fill that role as either the third Code Enforcement, or the second one. One was gone until you filled in. So we=ve had bodies out here.

Mr. DeBolt: ..the job as needed, needed additional time.

Mr. Hills: Now, I do agree with what you=re saying as far as the new building regulations that came out in >07.

Mr. DeBolt: ..Code Compliance.

Mr. Hills: That may be the strongest argument. For having someone at a full time basis that can understand and implement that code. But we did start into >07 with the two part time, right?

Mr. DeBolt: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And there certainly has been some discussion and things that I've seen as we're going to go into '08 under the same guidance we came into '07 and let a new administration, rightly or wrongly, deal with it. And I'm not sure what the Mayor's position is. I think that, I know the Mayor well enough and he's been here long enough, he's not out to hang somebody, but he can also see that it sometimes is better as you're in the transition to make some changes, not make major changes until he gets there. So I don't know if the Mayor wants to offer it, but I just wanted Steve to clarify some of the statements that you were making that there's more hours put to code enforcement by part time people than the public realizes. And secondarily, there are full time employees of Reynoldsburg paid to do some other service that provide a nuisance abatement service when it's needed. And I'd suggest to Mr. Baxter, if he's got a house that's got an address, you can call Chet, you can call the Safety/Service Director, or you can call the Mayor. I have yet to find any of them non-responsive on a valid complaint, to have somebody check it out. And I would do it. If you've got tires sitting all around your house, it's not a bad idea to do it. So I don't want the public to think there isn't anybody to call. There certainly are people to call. And they will respond, deemed on the level of importance of that call.

Mr. DeBolt: Right. Priority issues, important issues, we will make an effort to get somebody out there. Definitely. Just let me know.

Mr. Joseph: Other discussion? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Baxter: If I could finish my comments.

Mr. Joseph: I'm sorry.

Mr. Baxter: I was interrupted by Mr. Hills and he had some great points.

Mr. Hills: I thought you were finished.

Mr. Baxter: No. But you had some great points. That's why I backed down. I'd just like to finish some of the things here is that, and the point that I was making is, the Building Department is filling in, correct? While we're waiting for this to be.....

Mr. DeBolt: Very sporadically. Again, it's not as nearly as much as it needs to be. But again, Chet is going out himself. Stu on occasion, as available, is going out.

Mr. Baxter: The question came to me from some of my residents was, who do we call? I say I always call the city. They say, what for? There's nobody there to enforce it.

Mr. DeBolt: The Building Department.

Mr. Baxter: I don't believe that's the case. We do have people to enforce it is what we've come to.

Mr. DeBolt: Correct. Just the timeliness. I wouldn't guarantee obviously, the timeliness we've had in the past.

Mr. Baxter: And I think the point I was trying to get to, if there is no emergency of putting somebody here right now, full time, we have two positions that could be filled. They've already been authorized by Council and you can get those filled. So, to the point of waiting until the next administration comes, we have no emergency that says we have to get somebody in here full time. We can give it time until the next year to allow the next administration to make a determination if they want to fund that fully in a full time or not.

Mr. DeBolt: There's no emergency.

Mr. Baxter: No hurry is what I'm trying to get at.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. And I've been over this. We've talked about this many times. And I understand because I'm probably one that's more forceful on the code than anybody. I'm probably the biggest pain. I'm down here all the time and I get things done. I see the Mayor and he does things. I see Steve. The Mayor knows I'm a pain in the butt. But the problem is, and I've been here long enough to know, and I've seen where Building Permits were and where Building Permits are today. And I know what's happening as far as our construction's concerned. So we do have Building Inspectors here that can fill in and have filled in. As a matter of fact, we had one, they keep telling me no, but I know for sure, we had one that worked as a Code Compliance Officer probably for the last year off and on. Mostly on. Stu. And I know he has, because he's up at peoples' houses.

Mr. DeBolt: On occasion. Correct.

Mr. Clemens: He's been at mine. I've never been able to get anybody to tell me what he did. But I know what he did, why we had two others because we weren't that busy, and that's why it was done. So let's continue that. Let the next administration come in, look at the whole thing. Maybe they want to change how the Building Department operates as far as I'm concerned, I don't know, to make these things work out. I would like to see a full time person in there. But I think the way our budget concerns are, the things that we have withheld because we didn't have the \$50,000 to come up with immediately, like jumping out of a box, man I want this, we didn't have the money to do it and the Mayor made some decisions that I think were correct because we didn't have the \$50,000 to spend. We're working on the budget now. We just got it. It's on our agenda. That's something we can look at along with other things on how we're going to spend money for next year or whoever's going to come in, is going to. So I just think it's poor timing right now to put somebody on at the end of the year, and that's how I feel about it.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. One other comment about the thing with the money always being found. We're going to have to move, in this budget you're getting ready to do, between 350 and \$400,000 over to Debt Retirement to pay the debt service next year. Now until we get to the point where we can afford to pay the debt, it would be my opinion, we shouldn't be looking at adding any more payroll. Let's find a way to pay for what we've already spent before we go and spend some more.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Baxter: The Mayor's been trying to.....

Mayor McPherson: That's okay, Ron. Go ahead Ron.

Mr. Stake: Go ahead.

Mayor McPherson: Clarification. First of all, I signed a letter this morning, conditional letter of employment for one part time Code Compliance Officer. So we do in fact, assuming the drug and everything comes back okay, we do have one part time that'll be starting very shortly. I instructed Steve and Chet to interview quickly and get the second person on board. So the second person will be on relatively quickly. We prepared for City Council, a total package of a full time Code Compliance Officer to bring to City Council. But as a courtesy to the incoming administration, we decided to hold that. We'll turn it over to them. They can do what they want to with it. Whoever gets elected can do whatever they want. I have said from day one, probably a year, a year and a half ago, we need a full time Code Compliance Officer. That hasn't changed. Nor has my thought on it changed. We absolutely need it. We did in fact, talk about the fact that by hiring part time we're going to have tremendous turnover. That's proven to be a fact. We can't keep people. We train them. They go out and get a job someplace full time making a lot more money than they make here. I've heard people here say that we don't have the \$50,000. We don't need \$50,000 to hire a full time Code Compliance Officer. We have, and for clarification, two Code Compliance Officers that work 30, approximately 30 hours a piece a week now. So we only need the difference between what they make and what adding benefits and 10 more hours onto their schedule is going to be. And if Mr. Joseph wants to talk to me instead of the Auditor, I can show him where the money is, because we do have the money. I'm always hearing this, we don't have the money. We don't have a lot of money, but we do have the money if we should choose to hire this person full time. But my thought was, and I talked to Steve, I said, don't take it to City Council. All we need is 4 people to say we need it, and I think we probably have 4 people, but I don't (Tape Change), I don't want to stir the pot. And it's obvious just from the conversation tonight, that's exactly what happens when you do this. So I've instructed my people to hold the full time. Give all the information to the next administration when they come in. But please, don't use the excuse we don't have the money. Because that's crap. We can find that amount of money. I mean, we're not looking at huge dollars here. We're just looking at a few dollars. And you guys get the monthly report on the

revenue stream. Our revenue stream=s increased what, \$600,000. So 400 away from that to pay the debt service, you=ve still got an extra \$200,000 in there. And that=s just one place. I can go back and show you. Bill and I have argued for quite some time about 4 2, 5 million dollars that we have laying around and whether we should use it or whether we shouldn=t use it. So we=re talking peanuts here as far as what this employee is going to cost the City of Reynoldsburg. Now, do we need it immediately? No. We don=t need it immediately. And for clarification, Stu I think, worked probably a little bit every day probably for the last year helping out the Code Compliance Officers. Yes he did. I=m trying to set the record straight here so there=s no doubt in anybody=s mind. Yeah he did. He helped out tremendously. And then people also had to take up on his area too. And when you get the information about the full time Code Compliance Officer, you=re also going to see all the other things that the Building Departments do. You get the monthly report. You look at it. The hundreds of different calls that they have to go out on. The commercial inspections that they have to make now are so much more time consuming than going out to residences and checking a deck or a foundation. So yeah, there=s been an offset in maybe residential building. There=s been a huge increase in commercial. Every school that=s built and cafeteria. We now have to do those inspections. We never had to do those when Mel was here. This is all different. Life has changed over the past 3 or 4 years. Our Building Department can justify every minute of their day. And I get really upset when I have my Chief Building Inspector come in here and tell everybody what he=s doing and the needs that he=s got, and then have somebody sit there and say, well they have nothing to do. Because building inspections are down, they have nothing to do. Well that=s not the facts. And I=ve done this in the past, and I will do it again tonight. I invite every single one of you to come down there and spend the day with Chet. I don=t care what day because we=re not going to fabricate anything. Spend a day and let him show you what our Building Department does. Because I don=t think people realize what goes on in that department. Mel included. I=d love to see Mel come down there and spend a day with Chet going to all these places that he has to go. See where he has to send his people. See the inspections that have to be done. And then maybe everybody will get a different outlook on what the Building Department does. But again, Donna I appreciate you bringing this to the table, but we have talked about it. I don=t want to stir the pot any more. We can do it with the two 30 hour people that we have. We=ve got to retrain them all. So you=ve got this learning curve that=s probably going to be at least 90 days. Maybe a little bit more. But once they get through that learning curve, they=ll be back out there making sure signs aren=t up like they were this weekend. I notice on our Streetscape, we had signs all over our benches. But let me also tell you, you have at least two people that are on call 24/7 here, not counting the Police Department. I picked up 36 signs this weekend. And I did that on Saturday and Sunday. I don=t care. As Mayor, just because I=m Mayor doesn=t mean I don=t help the staff out. When I see signs up, and I see illegal signs up, I stop and take them down. When I see something that doesn=t look right, I go up and knock on the door. Now I realize that there=s probably not a whole lot that I can mandate somebody to do, but I still go knock on doors and ask people to do voluntary compliance. I also go back and I tell Chet, follow up, that I=m not going to follow up. I mean, I don=t mind stopping once, but I don=t have the time to follow up. So there is no time, never, 24/7, 365, that you can=t call me, or you can=t call Steve DeBolt, and whatever the issue is, we will have it taken care of. And if you call us on a Friday night, we=ll have it done by

Monday. And if you call us on a Monday, we'll probably have it done by Tuesday or Wednesday. I'm not going to say we're going to drop everything and run out. But within 24 to 48 hours, we will have made contact on whatever the issue is. So everybody needs to understand that. Not just City Council, but the public. My number's listed in the phone book. Every number I have is listed in the phone book. I think Steve's is listed. We don't hide from anybody. If they have a problem, I get phone calls all the time. There's no place I go that somebody doesn't stop me and talk to me about an issue. I'm already starting to get calls about Christmas. And I think we all know what those calls are. But anyway, I really appreciate the fact that City Council's concerned about our having a full time individual. If there were enough interest to go full time right now, I'd say it's the smartest thing in the world that we could do. But I will also tell you, that when we do the second set of interviews, and even the first set, we have told everyone that we're talking to, it's possible this job will go full time, would you consider that? So we're not hiring people, and hiring them in there blind. We're letting them know hey, down the road, 4 months, 5 months, we may be able to get this job full time, are you interested? Although it's part time now, be prepared that some time down the road, it may go full time. And if you're not going to be willing to go full time, we're probably going to replace you because we will be eliminating the 2/3 time, or the 3/4 time, or whatever it is. But again, thank you very much. But I did want to clarify all this. Because it seems like there's a misconception. And please, take the time to spend a day, shadow our Building Department. And if you don't want to go with Chet, pick anybody in the department. Pick Stu. Pick anybody in the department, say hey, I want to shadow that person >x= today and we'll hook you up. They come in at 7:30 in the morning. You can go out with them and see what really goes on. And if you have any questions, Chet's there, Steve's here, I'm here. We're there to help. We're not there to try to buffalo you or hide anything from you. That's not our job. Our job is to show you what we do. Show you what the Building Department does. And I would encourage you to please, spend a day or two with the guys in the Building Department and see how hard they work, because they work exceptionally hard. And they don't have all this time I hear that they have. Do them a favor, do me a favor, do yourself a favor and shadow these guys and just see what they do. And again, please, if anyone should call you, tell them to call me. You all have my cell phone number. I carry my cell phone 24/7. And tell them to call me on my cell phone and I can assure you, whatever that problem is, will be addressed. That's always been my philosophy as Mayor. I address the problem. I don't duck it. I don't avoid it. I'd much prefer just to go head on with it and get it resolved.

Mr. Baxter: You're changing your ways.

Mayor McPherson: Well, since before I became elected.

Mr. Joseph: Mayor, I appreciate your comments. I have one question that kind of is the crux of it all. In your opinion, what is the dollar difference between where we're at today and adding the 10 hours _____?

Mayor McPherson: Probably 15, \$16,000. It's the amount of the insurance. Well, it would be

even less than that next year. It would be, 12 to 15 maybe.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Yeah. Go ahead.

Mr. Clemens: Well, to start with of course, it=s usual spin. I wasn=t running down the Building Department. I know what the permits are and I do spend a lot of time down here. We do have a good Building Department. I was just saying that we did have a person that did work out of the Building Department, also worked with Code Compliance the last year. And I=m glad you could come up with all that money. I just wish you would have, a few months ago we would have had some fireworks and some parades that you said we didn=t have any money for. But it=s the same old stuff.

Mayor McPherson: I prioritize, Mel. The fireworks are not as important to me as personnel.

Mr. Clemens: You couldn=t come up with the 50,000 you said. But you can come up with the money. (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: I only have to come up with 15 now.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. We hear that all the time.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: First of all Mayor McPherson, I actually have driven with the Code Compliance Officers several times and I do know how hard they do work. I think it=s a shame that the decision to hire someone full time has to wait until the next administration comes in because it=s the citizens that pay for that. With the declining of the properties and everything like that, everyone says we need a change. Well, they=re right. We need a change. And that change should happen now and not later.

Mr. Joseph: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I think we should clarify. Are we talking about hiring two full time Code Enforcement Officers or one to take the place of two 30 hour people? Because if you hire somebody for 40 hours, which was the rationale in hiring the two part timers before, two part timers at 30 hours each is 60 hours a week instead of just 40 for a full time in theory. So I think that was one of the reasons we went with the two part time people. In defense of what you said Mr. Mayor, I read a lot of reports signed by Stu, so I know that he was out doing inspections. So that=s all I have to say.

Mr. Joseph: Other discussion? (No response). Okay. I=m going to hold this for two weeks. I want to do a little bit more fact finding. I want to talk to the Auditor and the Mayor and get a little better idea of the numbers from each perspective, and then we=ll take another look at this in

two weeks.

And with that, that takes care of Safety Committee for tonight. I will close at 8:33.

Safety Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

September 4, 2007

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday September 4, 2007

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

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee to order at 8:34.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, it'll stand approved.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the July 16, 2007 Service Committee meeting. Are there any corrections? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

Item number 4, Discussion: Transfer of Special Exception Use Permit - 6493 East Main Street; present zoning CC; proposed use, Crown Sports Lounge. If there's no problems with this or anybody on the committee would like to say something on this one way or the other, if not we'll just let it move on. Yes.

Mrs. Newman: Well, here again, do they plan to serve liquor or beer?

Mr. Clemens: In this place?

Mrs. Newman: Yeah.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. This is a bar.

Mrs. Newman: Well, that's what I thought. Well, a note on their plans, they show 5 pool tables in there I think.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mrs. Newman: And I think they also plan to stay open until 2:30 in the morning. And under the present codes, they're not allowed to. Now how are we going to be able to move this on until we get the codes changed?

Mr. Clemens: Well, since we haven't enforced it any other time, I think the Mayor said he's not going to enforce it, didn't you Bob?

Mayor McPherson: We haven't enforced it as far as the bars that have more than one, most have

two. We're dealing with this particular one. It's not two. It's five. There's a limit on what you do and you don't do. When we're talking about the billiards hall, it's a totally separate issue there. We're dealing with just the pool tables and the numbers of pool tables if they get a liquor license. There's nothing to enforce there. They're in total compliance with their special zoning permit. So there's nothing to enforce. The bars having two pool tables or more are the ones that we're kind of waiting to see what happens here. But I'm not aware of any bar, other than this request that's got five. Two is the most that I'm aware of.

Mr. Hood: Mr. Clemens, I'm sorry to interrupt. Once again, I would caution Council to allow a Special Exception Use Permit that's in violation of an existing ordinance, regardless whether or not the Mayor chooses to enforce or create a moratorium. Now what our Planning Officer has just informed me as I stood at the microphone, there is a change in that plan reflected in the minutes of the Zoning Board that there will only be one pool table in that establishment and in conformity with our ordinance. So if you check the minutes carefully, the plan that you see, the drawing, has been changed.

Mr. Hills: I know it was addressed at the meeting. I'm looking for it in the minutes. It was talked about and they said they would be complying with the existing code.

Mayor McPherson: That's one pool table.

Mr. Clemens: Which they have to. I mean, that's the code. That has nothing to do with a Special Exception Use Permit. They have to comply with it.

Mrs. Newman: Well, and then this is the building that has the solid front with no windows in it. That's another part that doesn't comply.

Mr. Clemens: And we have that in every one of them.

Mr. Haire: I was just going to state that the applicant was made aware of this regulation and they've agreed to comply with any city ordinances. So they're willing to reduce that number to one pool table. So that'll be enforced through zoning. I won't issue a Zoning Certificate to the applicant without getting a revised plan showing only one pool table in the facility. So it won't be considered a billiards hall. It will actually be an eating and drinking establishment which is what the Special Exception is for.

Mr. Baxter: Mel, once it's been approved and zoning's been approved and we make changes, will they be required to come back to Council to change their business if they decide, now I want to be a sports club?

Mr. Clemens: No. If we change the law, they go by what the law is.

Mr. Baxter: Add 5 pool tables, 6 pool tables, whatever they want.

Mr. Haire: It would depend on how the laws are changed. But I believe a billiards hall requires a Special Exception Use Permit. So they'd have to come forth with a Special Exception Use Permit to become a billiards hall.

Mr. Baxter: And I think that's the point I was trying to make, is they still have to come back to Council to become a special, or is this going to give them the ability to be a, if this is approved, will this give them the ability to be a sports club, and then, later can add pool tables?

Mr. Haire: This application will give them the ability to be an eating and drinking establishment with one pool table.

Mr. Hills: And then if the code is changed that there is no limitation on pool tables, then they aren't going to have to come back and go through all the hoops again to add the pool tables. If our code doesn't have a restriction of one versus six pool tables, or whatever you and the others get written within the next couple of weeks, would five....

Mr. Haire: Based on the amendments that are made.

Mr. Hills: Their Special Exception Use Permit is for the right of food and beverage in this establishment, and it just happens to have a pool table the same as it may have a pinball machine or whatever. I don't think it was done right. I don't think, if the code is changed to allow for multiple tables and alcoholic beverages under the same roof, I'm not sure you'd have to jump all the hoops. You're in essence, grandfathered in to what the law would be, are you not? Am I off base on that?

Mr. Clemens: This Special Exception Use Permit is for a Crown Sports Lounge. It has nothing to do with a pool table or such things. It's not in the special exception. They are allowed by law to have one. Now, if we change the law and they're allowed to have five, they're allowed to have five. It's not in the Special Exception Use Permit. What this is, is food and bar is what it is. It's not a billiard parlor. So it would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you, Mel.

Mr. Clemens: They have to follow the law under the one pool table law at the present time.

Mrs. Newman: Even though one of the exhibits attached to their application here shows five pool tables?

Mr. Clemens: I'm sorry?

Mrs. Newman: I said even though an exhibit attached to their application shows five pool tables. Is that still okay?

Mr. Clemens: They changed that at the last B&Z meeting.

Mr. Hills: I think Luke indicated that before the permit would be issued, that that drawing has to be updated.

Mr. Haire: That=s what they presented at the Zoning Board. They were made aware that they weren=t permitted to do that. So they=ve indicated that they will change the drawing to reflect one pool table prior to me issuing a Zoning Certificate.

Mrs. Newman: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions pertaining to this to make an ordinance out of it? Or do you want to go as it is? We can either make an ordinance and bring it to Council or....

Mr. Hills: Normally if it=s up and there is no disagreement, it just goes forward. Is that correct, Mel?

Mr. Clemens: That=s correct. Unless we present an ordinance.

Mr. Hills: So if anyone wants to continue the agreement, then we=d have to present an ordinance and start it back through readings and things. But generally, in a Special Exception, if there is no discussions, it just, like a liquor permit, it goes back to the Clerk. They go forward.

Mr. Clemens: That=s correct.

Mrs. Newman: Is that what we=re going to do? Just go forward then?

Mr. Clemens: It=s up to, if anybody feels we should introduce any legislation pertaining to this. If we don=t, then it just goes forward.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. I=ll just bow out.

Mr. Clemens: How does the committee feel about it? Is anybody interested in presenting an ordinance to deal with the Special Exception Use Permit? Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Well Mel, when we first looked at Motherland Grille when it was there, we made certain that the building improvements were there, the lighting was in there, parking lot, and those type of things were looked at. Are we going to run into any of those type of issues? Are we going to consider those in this Special Use Permit?

Mr. Clemens: Transfer of that Special Use Permit, that=s still there.

Mr. Baxter: So all those stay?

Mr. Clemens: It better be taken care of. It has to be taken care of. And I think that=ll be up to either Luke or our Building Department. Those things that=s in that Special Exception Use Permit has to be taken care of. Because we=re transferring the Special Exception Use Permit. So that would follow with it. And there are some items that have to be taken care of on that. It=s my understanding they=re doing everything new. But there are some items that were on there that weren=t taken care of.

Mr. Haire: They have applied for Building Permits and those Building Permits have been approved. They=re going to completely gut that building and completely remodel it.

Mr. Clemens: The outside canopy was to be removed and a new one put up.

Mr. Haire: Correct. The owner of Crown Sports Lounge is also the owner of the building. He=s owned the building for a number of years. So it=ll be his business. And he obviously wants to make it nice and attractive and become a good part of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Clemens: So I think there are three items on that Special Exception Use Permit that has to be taken care of, and make sure they=ll be taken care of. Because it follows the Special Exception Use Permit.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from Council or anybody? (No response). If not, then we=ll just let this move on. No action will be taken on it.

The next item on the committee, Discussion: Special Exception Use Permit - 6748 East Main Street; present zoning CC; proposed use, Automotive Repair (Quick Lube). We all have the application and we had the minutes of the meeting and what was discussed as far as the applicant was concerned. There were quite a few changes they made on before the Board as far as getting those U Hauls out of there and so forth, which was an important issue that they took care of that, they shouldn=t have been there and the property owner didn=t want them there. This is going to be a lube place in one of their bays, and also a dog wash, and a car wash. So I believe there=s three bays there if I=m not mistaken. Are there any questions pertaining to this piece of legislation? (No response). If not, we=ll not be taking any action on it. It will move on. Thank you.

The next item is, Discussion: Rezoning of 7961 and 7967 Oak Valley Road; from R-3 to CC; 0.648 acres; applicant, James L. Bates. Is Mr. Bates here? This will be removed from the agenda until Mr. Bates decides he wants to come and speak on this issue. So if that=s alright with the committee, we=ll just remove it from the agenda, and if Mr. Bates wants to come and discuss it, he can call and have it put back on. Thank you.

The next item, Discussion: Acceptance of unrecorded deed of easement - sanitary sewer; 0.186 acres **And** Acceptance of unrecorded deed of easement - waterline; 0.195 acres (Metropolitan Reynoldsburg, LLC). Mr. DeBolt, is there anything special about these?

Mr. DeBolt: No. Fairly standard on East Main Street. Basically, looking for the easement for the sanitary sewer and the water line. Nothing out of the ordinary.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Are there any questions for Mr. DeBolt pertaining to these two subjects? (No response). If not, I'd like to send them to Council for a first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All in favor, say aye. (All voted Aye). Thank you.

Next item, Discussion: Indoor Storage Facility - Amendment of Sections 1131.02 ADefinitions@ of Chapter 1131 Definitions; 1145.10 ASupplementary Requirements for Special Exceptions@ of Chapter 1145 Special Exceptions; and 1175.01 APermitted Uses and Special Exceptions@ (table) of Chapter 1175 District Regulations (CC and CS listings). Thank you, Luke.

Mr. Haire: Thank you, Chairman Clemens, members of Council. As Mr. Clemens just went through, there are a number of changes related to this. The gist of these changes are to allow indoor storage facilities as a special exception. They require a number of changes in the code to do that. Basically, currently our code only allows for mini storage facilities, is how it's defined. And those are, like what we see on Main Street, there's a number of those units available already. And those are only in Industrial Districts. Currently we have a large building that a developer is trying to re-use and put a new use to. It's created a number of challenges because of the depth of the building. So they've asked that we try to look at some changes and provide some flexibility with allowing them to do some indoor storage facilities, which won't change the exterior appearance of the building, except for possibly one entrance being incorporated into a wall of the building where you could actually drive into the storage units. Everything will be enclosed. They will be climate controlled facilities. And they're run almost like an office building. They'll have a leasing agent on site and an office where you can come in, check in to your storage facility with that agent, go back to your storage facility, then check back out, I believe is how they work. This developer that has inquired about this has done these storage facilities in other areas of the country and they seem to work out very well, and they run a very clean operation. So with that, if there's any questions, I'll be glad to answer those.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the committee on this? (No response). I think this will be an improvement. It's something that we do need. And I think this is a good change in the ordinance. Are there any questions from Council members? Yes.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Clemens, my thought was, when I first read this, that it seemed to be something that should be in an industrial area. I am familiar with the property you are talking about, and I'm still of the opinion that we need commercial availability for our residents in that area. But those are just thoughts that I have.

Mr. Haire: And that's what, we've tried to write this ordinance to provide that flexibility to leave commercial areas available. And with this, you're not excluding commercial from going in to that site. If we were to rezone the site for Industrial, then we exclude commercial activities from taking place. The property we're talking about has been vacant for a number of years because it's a challenging property to redevelop. It's a very deep building. And to sub-divide that building is almost, you can make like a bowling alley. It's long and narrow and it just doesn't work. So this would be a potential solution to get a reuse of that building that provides something to the city that's probably needed in that area because of the number of, the Huber homes are small and there's a number of apartments there, so it's probably a good location for this type of facility.

Mrs. Newman: Well, this probably isn't the time to ask, but I had several questions about who the customers would be and what kind of things would be stored there. But when their application comes in for a Use Permit, will we be discussing that and you'll have more information?

Mr. Haire: We'll have a lot more details. We don't have much detail at this point at how this is. This was written to basically be the first step in the process. We've taken this building into account, but this wasn't only written for this building. This is written for any other properties that want to do this in the future.

Mrs. Newman: Alright.

Mr. Clemens: This is a Special Exception, so it will have to come through us on that. And if you take a building that's similar to this size, I suppose 100,000 square feet, so we'd be left with 20,000 square feet of commercial retail also by this Special Exception. So that would be enough for a store, a grocery store or such things as that. Also, I'm sure that if they could get more retail in a section like this, then they wouldn't use it all for the climate control, because there's more money made on the retail.

Mr. Haire: Correct.

Mr. Clemens: It just gives them an alternate to do it.

Mr. Haire: Sure. The reason we put this as a Special Exception is so it would give the city an opportunity to look at these on a case by case basis. We have the regulations in place to do that. And the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals and Council have the opportunity to consider each one of these case by case and see if it's appropriate for that site.

Mrs. Newman: I think this is a good way to approach it other than backwards.

Mr. Clemens: I think that's a good way to handle it. So that way, it does have to come to

Council and through the Board, each one. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, if I could, and Luke I commend you. Our codes are sometimes confusing at best. And I certainly appreciate the fact that here, you're defining this as an indoor storage facility. For the Special Exception, you need to meet a number of criteria which have been shown to work in these things nationwide. And then you've said under CC and CS, you're just adding it to that code. So you've clearly gone into our code and made this clearer to understand. Because it was not addressed. And I think, it is. It's a matter of what we're doing, is just changing the code. Any application still has to go through the whole process to grant the Special Exception. But the clarity I appreciate here in it, it does help set it out. Now, just go rewrite all of our codes and you'll be alright!

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the committee for Mr. Haire? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council for a first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted Aye@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item, Discussion: Multi-occupancy of residences - listed at request of Councilman Clemens. I had sent, and I had discussed this with our City Attorney and other people. This has to do with our space requirements for people living in our family districts of 1, 2 and 3. And what it is, I want everybody to look at this, it's Columbus is what it is. They handle their restrictions on a square footage basis on living area. And I'm not here to bring this up to penalize families that live in town in these family areas. What this would do, would eliminate some of our homes as being run as motels, and hotels, or whatever you want to call it, by stacking workers in them, or stacking people in them really, and would not fall under our family code. Just for an example, what it calls for as far as your sleeping areas, for one person 70 square feet. And that would be a room of 10 x 7 or whatever 70 square feet make up. And if you have a second person there, you have to have an additional 50 square feet of floor space.

Now this was instituted by Columbus, basically to try to help over at Ohio State University and all around that area where they're just stacking people on top of each other, 3 and 4 in a room. It makes it very difficult for fire code. And really it's not safe. If you look down below the box area where it says "Other square feet", the purpose of this section, it says, "A child under one year of age, should not be counted as an additional occupant". I wanted to change that to somebody under 18. And the reason was, this is not to penalize families. Say if you've got 6 kids, 5 or 6, and I have 5 and I know what it means, you take one of those rooms and you had to have bunk beds in them. I'm not here to move people, or families, or change their style of living that is legitimate. What this ordinance would be is to give us a way to enforce somebody to come in, like they have, and have put 8, 9, and 10 people in a house where they don't have the living area, or the space area that would fall under this code. It's called "overcrowding". And it gives what space you have to have as far as your living space for a certain number of occupants. Your dining room, your kitchen area, then of course your sleeping area, which is the important part. The other, it follows under your combined space. Like you can't have bedrooms where you have to walk through the bathroom to get to it. Such things as

that. Or walk through another bedroom. In other words, you can't just take one bedroom, ___ that, and walk to the bedroom through a bedroom and then out. So it covers these, and it gives closet space so that you have so much closet space. And I brought this up for everybody to look at and go over and see what you think about it. We can discuss it this evening some, but I do want everybody to get, to really look into it and see how they feel about the square footage part of it. It would qualify in all of our houses, but it wouldn't qualify for having two in there at 120 square feet. Because a lot of the bedrooms in these homes aren't 120 square feet. And that's why, like I said, I had changed it to 18 and under. So if you have a family raising children, they can bunk in the rooms and such things as that. And that's what I did. Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: In this particular code, I guess from Columbus you say that you gave us, Section 4541.05, ALocation of Rooms@. I don't like that language in there, dwelling unit or rooming houses, because I don't think, that should obviously be taken out of our ordinance as it's drafted.

Mr. Clemens: Right. And there will be some changes made in it. I had talked to Chet about this. That if Council was interested in this, and I'm interested in it, to get something moving, that I would meet with him and we would go over this and draft it up into an ordinance and make some changes that should be made. But I wanted the committee to, get their opinion on how they feel about this. I think it's important that we move on this, because I think the time will be coming, around the first of the year or so, when we're going to be in this problem again. And I think it's important that we do get something that will combat what is happening to us in our private home sectors. Some of these other ordinances that we've looked at have not held up in court, or are in court and it doesn't look like they're going to hold up. And Jed feels this one has been in existence and hasn't had any problems. Jed, would you like to speak on it a second, if you would?

Mr. Hood: As we talked over Council's break, Mr. Clemens, or Chairman Clemens I should say, it appears to me that this would be the most neutral way to go with an enforceable ordinance. Obviously, you still have the enforceability requirement. The ordinance is not going to be any good if we don't take steps to enforce it. However, this does alleviate problems that we ran into before. _____ family, family members, how big is your family, all that kind of stuff. This takes that out of the equation. This talks about how many people are in your home and how much square footing you have. And Chairman Clemens and I collaborated on the change that is reflected in the bottom about the 18 year old as opposed to a 1 year old. He's quite correct in saying that the City of Columbus did adopt this code to address problems they were having at Ohio State University. A lot of the information that I've given to you over the past few months had the same problem. And a lot of the challenges, the court challenges, came from college towns where you have a bunch of students who are not related living together in what were single family dwellings. So I think this is as good an ordinance as can be written to combat this type of problem.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Jed. This will help. This will help as far as I feel giving us the

credibility to put another Code Enforcement on full time. Because this would fall under the Code Department. And I think that would be an inducement. That=s why I say, I am for a full time person. It=s just a matter of whether it=s under the new administration when they come in or not. Because if we adopt something like this, this would fall under the Code Compliance. And that would be something hard to work on. Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Now I don=t want to pass any legislation that is too weak. For example, you gave us some information Jed, that was contained in the article, The Seven-Nun Conundrum: Seeking Divine Guidance in the Definition of AFamily@, I would like to have something to define a family. Because I thought that these were good, strong arguments in here.

Mr. Hood: Well, and that=s true. And understand that this is not the form of the ordinance that it will take.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. But you do intend to address that in the ordinance? The relationships of the people? And the fact that they should be permanent in that residence?

Mr. Hood: Well, no. And like I said, this ordinance takes that out of the equation. If someone challenges, if we write somebody a violation under this ordinance, they cannot challenge us based on to say, well we are all family members, we get to live here. This says, in the amount of square footage you have, you=re only allowed to have so many people reside in that dwelling regardless of family relationship. And that was one of the things that I advised Council as would be the hardest to prove.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I still don=t see any harm in strengthening it with some of these other very good arguments that were presented in this article.

Mr. Hood: Well, that=s for you guys to decide.

Mrs. Newman: If that=s the case, I just think we ought to make it as strong as possible.

Mr. Hood: I understand. But I do believe that this ordinance, after it=s tailored to our needs, will be enforceable, regardless of a definition of family.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just a quick question. To enforcement, what would we add as enforcement to it? We can put it into the code, how do we enforce it?

Mr. Hood: Well, I think you make it a General Offense Code.

Mr. Baxter: That=s what I=m looking for. Okay. The teeth that we can actually start penalizing and enforcing _____.

Mr. Hood: Yes. The purpose of this was to allow Mr. Clemens to introduce something that we've talked about to see whether or not there is any consensus on Council. I think that we're getting at least part of a consensus moving. And we can tailor this ordinance to Reynoldsburg's needs and then give it to you in a more final version that can be amended through the reading process. But this was just for illustration purposes to see whether or not this was palatable to Council.

Mr. Baxter: I think it's pretty good as it is right now to be quite honest with you.

Mr. Clemens: Would the committee go along with meeting, if I meet with Jed, and we do draft up an ordinance around this ordinance and bring it to Council? And if there's any amendments to be made, they can be made at that time. At least we'd be looking at an ordinance, and what the penalties are, and how we can enforce it. Then if there's any members of Council feels there's any need to make additional changes to it, or add to it, then we could go from there. But it would give us a start. Something of base to work from which we don't have now. We want something that's enforceable that we don't have to go to court on and so forth. So if that's alright with the committee, then I'll get with Jed and we'll get something drafted and get it to our next committee meeting and give us something to work on. And then see how Council feels about that and committee members feel about that, if that's alright.

Mayor McPherson: Just a curiosity question more than anything. How does the City of Columbus enforce this code? I mean, I call up and I say, >I think there's too many people living in Ron Stake's house=. I mean, who goes out? I mean, do we have a right to go out and go in the house and check? And how do you enforce it? Because you've got to get into the house to measure the room. And then you've also got to prove that they've got people staying in there. How do you do that?

Mr. Hood: That's all the hurdles that we would have to overcome. Obviously, having the burden of proof.

Mayor McPherson: I just see that as an impossible task.

Mr. Hood: Well, it's not necessarily impossible. But those are challenges that....

Mayor McPherson: How does Columbus do it, I guess is what I'm saying.

Mr. Hood: The way I understand....

Mrs. Newman: Well, wouldn't the Code Enforcement Officer do it?

Mayor McPherson: How do you get into the house?

Mrs. Newman: Knock on the door and tell them you're there to make an inspection.

Mayor McPherson: Do we have a right to do that I guess is my question.

Mr. Hills: I think Mr. Hood was going to tell us how he thinks Columbus has done it.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. That's what I'd like to know.

Mr. Clemens: This is a Columbus ordinance, so we will be checking with them on that.

Mayor McPherson: I'm just curious.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I know.

Mr. Hood: The way I understand it that it occurs now, is they do have Code Enforcement Officers like we do. They do make contact on a complaint-driven basis as we do. Whether or not someone allows us into their home is their right. But it's like any other general offense, if we believe that there's probable cause for a crime or an offense being committed, then we have a right to get a search warrant and search the premises. We haven't done that in the past. But that is something that needs to be discussed if that's something we want to do. But that's the way we would enforce it.

Mr. Clemens: I can understand, as the Mayor said, I can understand problems where people would call on their neighbors and so forth. And that's not basically right.

Mayor McPherson: I just can't believe the number of neighborhood disputes that we have. And I can assure you, somebody is going to call and complain on their neighbor and I just don't want us to be hung out to dry on it.

Mr. Hood: It kind of equates to like, when we have a Board of Health complaint. And the Board of Health draws up a search warrant signed by a judge that allows us to go into the house to inspect to see if there's infiltration of rodents or whatever the complaint may be. It allows our code and the Board of Health to go in there to inspect. So it would be very similar to that.

Mr. Clemens: I think if we had something like, if you called, or I called you and said, my neighbor's got ten people living in his house. And I think we could have someone say, that's fine. Do you want to come down and sign something? And I'm sure they could put their selves up for lawsuits for lying about things like that. There's all kind of ways probably to work on it. But the whole point of the idea is not to bother families. What we're here to do is correct the situations that we're in and not have any more of them. Because this can happen all over Reynoldsburg in every section of town that we have. There's no saying that they can't come out and buy a \$300,000 house and move 30 guys into it. I mean, it's that simple. So we have to restrict it somehow. And I think we've found out that it's hard to prove who's your daddy. Because we haven't been able to do it. I mean, I think that's, that's the way it is. And if it's

alright with the committee, I=ll get with Jed and we=ll go over this and see what we can work out and get it back to Council, if that=s alright.

Mr. Hood: Yes, sir. And we=ll get in contact with Columbus before we report to Council and make sure my understanding is accurate, and how they go about enforcing it.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. Thank you. We=ll move that on.

Mr. Baxter: So are we going to just hold this Mel, for two weeks?

Mr. Clemens: If you would. We=ll hold this for two weeks and we=ll put it back on the agenda. This is just up for discussion and we=ll put it back on there.

Mr. Baxter: Very good.

Mr. Clemens: The next item is ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT AN APPLICATION FOR ANNEXATION OF 3.78+/- ACRES IN JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP, COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, STATE OF OHIO, TO THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO (Thomas M. And Trulee Barnett). It had its first reading 7-23-07. Is there any discussion on this from anybody on the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I=d like to move it to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mrs. Shirey. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

And that=ll end the meeting at 9:09.

Service Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

September 4, 2007

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday September 4, 2007

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

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

Mr. Stake: I=ll call the September 4 Finance Committee to order at 9:10.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Item number 4, Appointment to Income Tax Review Board, I would like to hold that for two weeks. Brandon Wright, we have not been able to get in contact with him. We appointed him to the Income Tax Review Board earlier this year, so we need to replace him. I heard that we might have a candidate. However, we don=t have any documentation yet. Or I have not heard from that candidate yet that they are willing to serve. So I would like to hold it until I do hear. Also, if there=s anybody else interested in serving, please submit something in writing. So I make a motion that we hold item number 4. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is Approval of minutes of July 16, 2007 Finance Committee meeting. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they=ll stand as submitted.

And then item number 5 is Discussion: 2008 Budget. Over the break, I had a conversation with the Mayor in regards to preparing the budget for 2008. And we both agreed that it would be a good idea that the next mayor have a say-so on what the final budget is for 2008. And I think folks might have got an e-mail in regards to that. But I did want to bring it up for discussion purposes this evening tonight, to see if there=s any disagreement with anybody on Council in regards to that. The Mayor=s Directors will also be submitting suggestions for the next mayor. But I did ask him to pretty much submit the same budget request as last year as an interim budget. We=ll finalize the budget by April 1 of 2008. And that will give the incoming administration an opportunity to weigh in and give their recommendations for the final budget. Are there any questions or comments in regards to that from members of the Finance Committee? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Stake. My question is, does that mean we won=t be doing anything now until that new administration comes in as far as preparing for a budget?

Mr. Stake: No. It does not mean that. The Mayor will be preparing a budget. Go ahead, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: There are certain things that we know. Those >givens= will be in the budget. For example, the FOP pay increase; the FOP-OLC increase; insurance; perhaps increase for non-union employees; everything else stays the same. (Tape Change).

Mr. Stake: Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Stake, thank you, Chairman. The questions I have for the Mayor is, as far as we=re talking about budgets, are we going to be able to get a picture view of what type of expenses are expected to happen in 2008 with equipment, cars, those type of things? I know we=ve done a great job in the past making sure that we make sure that they=re budgeted items. But it would be kind of nice from a Council perspective to know that we=re going to be looking at maybe three cruisers, and two bucket trucks, and those types of things.

Mayor McPherson: I=ve asked all my directors to go ahead, prepare the documentation just like they were going to submit it to me, but then, sit down and go over it with the new administration, whoever that might be. And then, after the new administration looks at it and says, >yeah, that=s a pretty good budget=, then it will come to City Council in the detail that you=re talking about.

Mr. Baxter: So we=re not going to see that this year then?

Mayor McPherson: Well, you=ll see the same thing as we had last year, which I think was three cruisers. It=ll still be, it=ll be in the budget for this year, but it=ll be last year=s numbers.

Mr. Hills: If I understand what Mr. Stake is saying, that your directors are going to give to you a recommendation, these are things that need to be done. Rather than incorporating those in the numbers of the budget, they=re going to be in a narrative form, I have to do this, or I have to do that, or I would like to see this, or I would like to see that. Or I could save money here or there.

Mayor McPherson: Those will actually be held over for the next administration review.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Plus, you know, the election=s the first of November. So I=m sure the Mayor and whoever=s elected mayor will be getting together after that and we will still have six or seven weeks before it comes up for passage.

Mr. Stake: Right. I think October 15, the Mayor submits an Operating Budget and Capital Improvements Budget to City Council. So that=ll be October 15. But there will be time in between then and in December if anything=s passed, we could adjust things.

Mayor McPherson: The thing by doing an Interim Budget, there=s really then no necessity to

really sit down and go over details. Because obviously, last year=s budget will still give you adequate finances during the first quarter of the year for anything that might come up. And then that also allows then that the new administration has three months to really go over the budget in detail and say yeah, this is what we need, meet with the directors, get that history that needs to be there. So I agreed. Ron and I talked about it and I have no problem with just submitting basically, the same budget as we did in >07.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Hills, you had something else?

Mr. Hills: Just one other thing. Along with that budget, I think the Auditor does plan to come in with what he anticipates appropriations, or funding to be in >08. Is that not correct?

Mr. Harris: Yeah. That=s correct. We=ll go ahead and do the, as we have done before, all the revenues and that kind of thing. And as the Mayor said, basically the 100 accounts, which are all the payroll accounts, are going to be done anyway. That=s 70, 75% of the budget anyway. So basically, all you=re looking at is things like office supplies and those kinds of things being kept at the same.

Mr. Hills: In many of the salaries, there=s some statutory requirement or ordinance guide requirement that there is going to be a modification.

Mr. Harris: Absolutely.

Mr. Hills: Those are going to be incorporated.

Mayor McPherson: Those have to be done.

Mr. Harris: Those have to be incorporated. So we=ll basically have the 100 accounts done pretty well. And the only thing that will be, if there=s any changes in some of the office supplies and miscellaneous contract services and those kind of things, and any Capital Equipment that would have to be purchased would be what the next administration would basically be looking at.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake. And I don=t mean to beleaguer this point, but the reason I=m bringing it up is, we know January through March is when we get hit with the emergency legislations to pass these types of purchases for trucks and whatnot. Because that=s when we get the best opportunity, and that=s when they=re available. If you don=t get them right away, you lose out. That=s what we hear every year. And my concern is that if we don=t know what those are, we=re missing out on an opportunity to say yeah, we want to, as Council, yes, focus in on bucket trucks versus cruisers or whatnot. If we=re taking exact same budget from last year to this year, I don=t think we have the same need as last year to what we have coming up next year. We may need to have a van versus a truck.

Mr. Stake: Well, I don't think that's something for Council to decide. I think it's something for the next administration to decide and bring that to us as a recommendation and....

Mr. Hills: These are going to come in as department recommendations.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. That's what I'm looking for. (Inaudible).

Mr. Hills: They are going to be attached to what the >07, in essence, the extension of the >07 budget into >08, modified by statutory changes, and there'll be recommendations of the existing directors through this administration, we think we need to do these actions. And that way, the new administration will have the best available data we have without saying, we're going to hire seven more people here, or we're going to get rid of five people here. It's just, this is what we did in >07, modified statutorily, and here's what the recommendation is that makes >08 run in a different way, or better, or worse, whatever.

Mr. Stake: We've done interim budgets before. I mean, it works out just fine. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: The other thing is, it won't really extend the process. Because when whoever is the directors or whatever at that point in time will be bringing stuff down to buy cruisers or whatever. And the only thing, in order to have them do that, that they would have to do additional now, they'd have to have the Mayor authorized to enter into contract. And the only thing they'd have to do is add, appropriate the money in the request. So it really wouldn't change anything in that respect that much.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments? (No response). Then I guess we can table this until October 15. Do I have a second for that? Second by Councilman Joseph. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee meeting at 9:14.

Finance Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

September 4, 2007

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)