

## SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday July 6, 2010

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Chris Long, Nathan Burd, Fred Deskins, Jr.

Other members of Council present: Doug Joseph, Barth R. Cotner, Council President William L. Hills. Councilwoman Leslie Kelly was absent.

Mr. Clemens: I'll call the Safety Committee Meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. First item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Do I have additions or deletions to tonight's agenda? If not, it'll stand approved.

Item No. 3 is the approval of the minutes of the Safety Committee Meeting held June 21, 2010. Are there any corrections to the minutes? If not, they'll stand approved. Also I'd like to thank Councilman Long for holding our last committee meeting; I do appreciate it.

Mr. Long: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Clemens: Item No. 4 - Discussion: Authorization of 2010 salt contract. Pam, Service Director, please.

Safety/Service Director Boratyn: Good evening Chairman Clemens, members of Committee, Council. I'm just here to request authorization for the Mayor to enter into the contract with American Rock Salt Company. They were the winners of the bids, were part of a consortium bidding for salt and they were the ones that bid the lowest amount for Reynoldsburg. It would be \$58.98 per ton. That includes the bond, the Performance Bond and we would order 3,000 tons to start, around our standard. So it would be a total of \$176,940. It comes from the Street Department Account Fund and the State Highway Account Fund, both which we use to pay for salt. We have about 1,000 tons on hand for the winter and we ask for an emergency so we can go ahead and get it entered, get the contract underway, and go forward with this.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Pam. Are there any questions for our Service Director from the Committee? Councilman Long.

Mr. Long: Pam, what was our cost per ton last year?

Mrs. Boratyn: The cost per ton last year was \$61.59.

Mr. Long: So our price has actually dropped then?

Mrs. Boratyn: Yes, it's down \$2.61 less.

Mr. Long: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Other members of the Committee, members of Council? President Hills.

President Hills: Chairman, if I could. Pam we have, what's our full capacity now, 2,000?

Mrs. Boratyn: No, we can hold 3,000.

Mr. Hills: Three thousand we can hold?

Mrs. Boratyn: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Okay, so we're talking about bringing in one whole year's supply now. Is this mandatory this year? I mean, this isn't like some of the previous ones, is it?

Mrs. Boratyn: No, no. We actually can buy off of this. We don't have to like buy it all at once and bring it in. So we can purchase it as we need it and we're not obligated to purchase the whole thing.

Mr. Hills: And we're not obligated to have to do the 3,000 tons. So this contract's much more favorable to the cities than we were stuck in the last couple of years.

Mrs. Boratyn: Correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you President Hills. If there's no other questions for the Service Director, I'd like to send this to Council for its first reading as an emergency.

Mrs. Boratyn: Yes, yes.

Mr. Clemens: Seconded by Mr. Long. All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion carries. Thank you. Thank you, Pam.

Mrs. Boratyn: You're welcome.

Mr. Clemens: **Item No. 5** - Discussion: Liquor Permit Request - Transfer - from X-Hot Inc dba BW-3 to Lancaster Wings Inc, 7076-7082 E. Main Street, Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. I discussed this with the Chief and they had run their report and they had no problems with this. So if there's no questions, why, we'll let it stand and send it as is. Thank you.

**Item No. 6 - ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Section 537.14 "Curfew" of Chapter 537 Offenses Against Persons REQUIRING SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND ESTABLISHING A DAYTIME CURFEW FOR MINORS BETWEEN THE AGE OF SIX AND UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN-** -first reading 6-14-10; *item held 6-21-2010 for two weeks.* We're now bringing it up again before we go to Council for any discussion; we do have, I do have, I think, eleven speaker slips. I think it would be best that we hear those first, if that's fine with members of Committee. We will, I would like to say that some of these are people that have spoken before, which that's fine. We'd rather there wouldn't be repetition on this because we do take minutes, they are, if you do it, we do have minutes from our Clerk so we do know, we do have everything you've said. So we'd rather you come up with something new. We do have eleven of them. I would hope that you would hold

your talk to at least three minutes, three to four minutes, no longer than four. I don't like to interrupt, but I've been known to interrupt, and I probably would, so try to hold your, you know, to around three minutes, if you could. So we go to the first speaker is Dr. Benjamin Kelch. Would you please give your name, address.

Dr. Kelch: Dr. Benjamin Kelch, 1600 Rosehill Avenue, Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

Dr. Kelch: Thank you. Members of Council, my name is Dr. Benjamin Kelch and I'm here on behalf of the daytime curfew ordinance currently under consideration. My wife is a life-long resident of Reynoldsburg graduating from Reynoldsburg High School in 1980 and I have been a resident of Reynoldsburg since the late '80's. We have three children who have graduated from Reynoldsburg City Schools and six grandchildren, four of which are currently enrolled in Reynoldsburg City Schools and two of whom will enter the school district in the next three years. Besides being a physician, I am a Substance Abuse Counselor and am pursuing a PHD in Counselor Education in a large state university.

In 1995, the US Conference of Mayors surveyed 272 cities and the survey was then updated in 1997 to include 347 cities with populations of over 30,000 residents. Mayors and city officials were asked a variety of questions including but not limited to, the use of day and night-time curfews, perceptions of whether or not curfew enforcement was a good use of Officers' time, perceptions of whether curfews make streets safer and cut down on daytime truancy, effectiveness of curfew enforcement and curbing gang violence or activities, increases or decreases in crime rates since the curfews have been in effect and several other questions. The 347 cities surveyed, 26% had a daytime curfew. Nine out of the ten cities said that curfew enforcement was a good use of the Officers' time, 100% of the cities that had a daytime curfew said that it cut down on daytime truancy, reduced daytime burglary and holds parents accountable and helps to increase school attendance. In one major mid-western city, less than 7% of the children that were cited for a violation of the curfew were recidivists; 88% of the cities said that curfew enforcement helps make streets safer for the residents, 83% of the cities helped to curb gang violence, and 22 out of the 72 cities that had both day and night-time curfews were able to provide data on the reduction of juvenile crime, which averaged 21% overall, with a low of 2% in Richmond, Georgia, with a high of 70% in Charleston, South Carolina.

I live in an area close to the High School and have observed many, observed first-hand, many school-aged youths loitering around for no apparent reason during school hours. As you were well aware, the recent shooting at the High School was alleged to be gang-related. If 83% of the surveyed cities responded to these curfews, reduced gang violence, then why not implement this ordinance. As both a Physician and soon to have a Doctorate in Counseling, I am intimately acquainted with the impact that peer pressure, youth violence and truancy have on the overall physical and mental health outcomes of adolescents, and as both a medical and mental health professional, I humbly ask that you enact this ordinance.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Sir. Are there any questions from members of Committee? If not, thank you. The next speaker is Cornelius McGrady, III..

Mr. McGrady: Good Evening Council. My name is Cornelius McGrady, 8675 Kingsley Drive.

Thank you for this time. Recent conversations with several residents have been mixed and I must say that upon returning from military leave when I first heard of the proposal, the first thing that came to my mind was the Arizona Immigration Law. It's aim is to identify, prosecute and deport illegal elements. I'm not that naive to think that all issues only happen on the west side of Reynoldsburg. After letting it marinate for a few days, I began to delve into the proposed amendment. It's no secret of my military background and my years of service with the Military Police, more importantly, during my bid for Council last year, I advocated for increased Police personnel to increase deterrent measures for the safety of Reynoldsburg. During my walks and talks through the community, I recall a resident making reference to his neighbor's child getting jumped by teenagers that did not belong in the neighborhood. Most recently, I had a former co-worker say that they were in favor of the change in the law as their home was recently burglarized during the day and believe it was probably some of the kids seen on a regular basis roaming through the neighborhood. As for myself, I don't see a fixed plan for the child or parent. I understand, you may encounter the parent that may not care or be unable to control the child but it should not be, but it should not end there.

I believe there needs to be a mechanism in place to try to instill in the parent and the child the importance of this ordinance and the child's education and need for success. Currently, our Franklin County Juvenile Court, where I'm a volunteer mediator, there's a program called Juvenile Restitution. This program is linked with the non-profit organizations. Teenagers are assigned to these organizations through the Court and all matters are held in abeyance pending satisfactory completion of the program. Additionally, I would like to see a mandatory \_\_\_\_\_ attended by the parents, similar to the three hour block instruction that Columbus has for both parents and child. With no additional learning infrastructure in the city such as the Boys Club, or YMCA, in conjunction with this ordinance, I would recommend a corrective action plan as well. So that we don't become confused with what I am saying, I understand the intent of the amendment and once again, I advocate for increased Police deterrence, but I would recommend to the, I would recommend to the child and parent a corrective action plan versus a possible life of crime in an attempt to correct the child's life of wrong-doing and build teens for success. Finally, this issue should not be viewed as the total responsibility of the education systems. Let's be proactive in this endeavor and effectively address the issue before it really impacts the city financially. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the Committee? Thank you. The next is Kevin King, next speaker.

Mr. King: Good Evening, my name is Kevin King, 7922 Hazleton-Etna Road, Pataskala, Ohio. I've come tonight to speak in favor of the new daytime curfew ordinance that's currently before Council. I own and manage rental units, approximately fourteen units in and around the Reynoldsburg High School area. I've reviewed the ordinance dealing with the daytime curfew and I believe it would be a positive step in dealing with many of the issues that surround the congregating and grouping of unsupervised juveniles during the daytime hours. I do not believe and am not suggesting that this ordinance is a cure-all for every juvenile problem that exists in and around the entire City of Reynoldsburg; however, as a landlord and owner of property in the Reynoldsburg area, I have found over the years that the unsupervised congregating of juveniles often times results in many activities that reflects negatively on our community. Many times the negative results start as an innocent gathering, but escalates into other situations which include but

are not limited to, excessive trash being left behind, unruly activities, fights, drug behavior, burglaries, and sometimes even worse situations, such as shootings. Let's face the facts that many of our juveniles today are unsupervised at home and many parents have shifted some of their responsibility of raising and supervising their children to the school system and our local Police Departments. We must give our Officers the tools to protect our community and its citizens and to help control inappropriate activity of those juveniles who choose to use our streets for abusive or criminal activity. As a landlord, these types of activities make my job harder to rent and keep good quality tenants for our community. Prospective tenants often see these groups hanging on the streets and around buildings and it becomes increasingly difficult to rent these units. Prospective tenants believe that criminal activity is at hand and move on to other communities. This ordinance gives our Officers additional abilities to investigate suspicious or unusual activity during school hours and provides alternatives for the disposition of the juveniles found to be in violation. These investigations may actually prevent juveniles from committing a violation, which could have negative consequences in their lives for years to come. This law gives our Police slightly broader authority in the area of regulating activities which may lead to criminal activity during the daylight hours by juveniles who should be in school or be supervised by their parents or legal guardians. I believe that our licensed, professional Officers can and will use this expanded authority with discretion and the result will be a safer and more orderly neighborhood for all. I support our Police Officers to the fullest extent to effectively enforce this new ordinance and I urge Council to pass this ordinance as soon as possible and to give our Officers an additional tool to help keep our community safe.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Sir.

Mr. King: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions from the Committee, members of Council? Thank you.

Mr. King: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Next speaker is Lori Johnson.

Ms. Johnson: Good Evening Council. My name is Lori Johnson, I live at 7331 Victoria Court, Reynoldsburg. I have been in this city for fifty years. I came tonight because I kind of, I have a dual purpose. I not only have lived in this city for all of my life, graduated from Reynoldsburg High School, raised a family here, both of my children graduated from Reynoldsburg Schools, but I'm also a school bus driver for Reynoldsburg City Schools and I am on the road approximately six hours a day driving the streets of Reynoldsburg, in the assigned area, but none the less it grieves me when discipline issues take a student off a bus because it puts them on the street. If parents are working, that child gets, they leave school, they're free. They're free to go do whatever they want to do, nine times out of ten there's a lot of mischief involved, at least in the area where I seem to have done my routes the last couple of years. Personally, I have been a victim of daytime burglary, radio was stolen out of a vehicle in my driveway. I see children in the day, daytime hours, teenage children that I believe should be in school somewhere walking up the street trying the handles of vehicles that are parked in the street. Where do these young people belong? I believe they belong in school. I know that we have taken on a great burden, not a burden, a lot of

responsibility. As the other gentleman stated, with what we try to do with our youth today, you know, feed them, you know, the breakfast, the school lunch programs, the school district is, you know, we're trying to help the best we can, and we do take on a lot of responsibility of the parents in today's world. That just seems to be the way it is and anybody that works with kids, we're going to do what we can for kids, but there does come a point when a community seems in total outcry at the increase of crime, and here we have something so simple as to ask these kids to do no more than I demanded of my own and that's, if you're not in school, whether you're ill, had a doctor's appointment or otherwise, you belong at home. You don't belong on the streets. You belong at home. I really do feel as Mr. King stated that this is one more tool that we as a community, you as City Council can give our local law enforcement to help the entire city, not just one localized area but everyone. It is going to take a community. Unfortunately, it is going to take a community to fix a lot of things. My bus route last year, previous year was up and down Baldwin Road. Many, many, many times I've had a group of students, high school kids that I know, launch from those air conditioning units out to jump in front of my bus, throw snow balls at the bus, throw rocks at the bus. Obviously, they're not, you know, they're not school-friendly people or they'd be in school. These are things that I think this curfew has an opportunity to remedy. It's pretty scary. It's quite entertaining to them, but for me with that bus, it is very, very scary. When, I will say this before I close, when the Police presence was increased in that area, after the shooting that took place on Redwood, before school dismissed and after, I will attest to the fact that there were no gatherings, there were no more gatherings of students at Nishi's or there at the apartments at the intersection. I know that the additional Police presence works, so I'm asking you as a life-time resident of this city, we have an opportunity here, I feel, to truly do something that's going to make a great impact. I know it's going to make my job easier and a lot safer. If you'll, you know, please consider this and pass this ordinance. Thank you gentlemen.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Are there any questions from members of Committee, members of Council? Thank you. Next speaker is Karen Godsey.

Ms. Godsey: Good Evening Council. My name is Karen Godsey and I live at 8426 Priestley Drive. I would like to begin by saying that I am against crime, my husband and I are both Block Watch Captains and participate in keeping our neighborhood safe; however, the more I think about this proposed daytime curfew, the more I dislike it. There are too many variables and unknowns in passing the legislation. It's proven to be a topic that's brought on much controversy. As a freedom-loving citizen, there are few God-given rights such as freedom and liberty, protected by the US Constitution that are being disregarded, such as innocent until proven guilty, according to the due process of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Amendments, and the right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures, the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, and the freedom of movement on public streets, which is the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. I am unsettled at the push to pass this piece of legislation prior to the August Council recess. I do not think many options have been considered and I think that one of the options that I heard talked about was the possibility of adding another Police Officer, which would go along with the bus driver who said increased Police awareness or increased Police presence in the area makes a big difference in crime. So I don't believe we need the daytime curfew. I think if the city would hire another a Police Officer for the Police Department, that could make a big dent in crime also.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

Ms. Godsey: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions, Committee, members of Council? Thank you. The next speaker is Jor-El Godsey.

Mr. Godsey: My name is Jor-El Godsey. I am at 8426 Priestley Road, Reynoldsburg. You know, I'd like to start by apologizing for the nature of things in Reynoldsburg being so dire that we need to entertain such an ordinance, and particularly the failings of others would require we come to you and ask you to take on this weighty matter, but it is important clearly to members of this community, but I just feel like it belongs elsewhere and that leads me to say that this ordinance targets a particular segment of our community in which it has been suggested and includes those that are more likely to commit crime during the daytime hours. The premise, as I understand it, goes something like this: minors not in school during school hours might see the largely unguarded, inadequately patrolled neighborhoods and public places as targets for crime; therefore, a law is needed to empower our fine Police Officers to profile citizens according to age, question their right to be out in public places, examine their identification information, and then turn potential offenders over, perhaps to their parents or other authorities, or possibly, although it was said very remotely, juvenile services, or even jail. In this way, it is expected, if the success found by this law in the City of Columbus is to be believed, a 40% reduction in daytime crime. If the City Council is indeed willing to do this in the name of keeping crime low, then I would suggest a companion law considered that reasonably follows the same logic. In addition to minors roaming our streets unquestioned, let's be quick to add adults. Perhaps those who are illegal to this country, perhaps parolees, perhaps the homeless or other particular segments of our population from which criminal activity arises at least as high as the school age students you are considering targeting. Why stop at seventeen? Why start at six? I'm pretty sure that there are not roving bands of six-year-old gang members around the City of Reynoldsburg. Why not five and four? Why only school days? Why not holidays, weekends and summers? If some curfew is good, then perhaps more should be better. Why are we limiting the idea that might only address 40% of the crimes? Why not expand this concept, when another simple law drafted on paper, captured as an accomplishment on the city records and posted on the bulletin board of the Reynoldsburg Police Department can accomplish the estimates suggested? Just some notes on the daytime curfew - existing city laws clearly aren't working; compulsory education laws don't work; truancy laws don't work; school rules that clearly don't work; and of course, errant students, particularly those that are expelled or suspended, who seem to benefit from a school policy or lack thereof, that doesn't then consider them truant. So this new law or new ordinance will work - hardly. If the desire of this Council is to increase public safety, deploy more Public Safety Officers. It's been said, additional Police presence, cited by others, is really what would make a difference and I would heartily agree.

Speaking of Public Safety Officers, since the last committee meeting, the Block Watch email list that was discussed then \_\_\_\_\_ to encourage support of this ordinance. I believe in Officer Mielke's zeal to advance this issue, she decided it appropriate to use the Block Watch list for the political purpose of influencing the Council to adopt this ordinance. This, I believe is at the least, a misuse of the Reynoldsburg P.D. resources. Moreover, the email names only one Council member to contact, Leslie Kelly. This is curious since Councilwoman Kelly is not a member of the Safety Council to which this ordinance is recommended. Now I respect the time

and energy this Council uses, not just for this issue, but in dealing with all of our city and I'm grateful for what you do and how you take on this task for us; and I want to thank you for your willingness to hear my concerns, but there's an interesting sign hung out in this hallway and I would invite you to stop and read it and consider this ordinance in light of that, what that very simple sign tells us to do as citizens and as involved members of the community. So with that being said, I would ask that you would reject this ordinance. I'll leave it there.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Sir. Are there any questions Committee, members of Council? Thank you. Next speaker is Jason Fuller. Excuse me, just one second Mr. Fuller. I think you spoke the first night.

Mr. Fuller: I did. None of my comments are duplicative.

Mr. Clemens: Am I correct?

Mr. Fuller: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: Okay, we do have minutes of that and it is taped you know so...

Mr. Fuller: Like I said.....

Mr. Clemens: Try and come up with something new this time, okay?

Mr. Fuller: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: You're welcome.

Mr. Fuller: I am a husband, I am a father, my wife and I have several children, I am a Block Watch member, not a Captain but a member, I am a Military veteran, I am a lawyer, and I am a theft victim, who opposes this ordinance. Last week, or last time we met, there was a claim that this law was undisputed in its constitutionality. That's not true. The Attorney who made that comment, relied on the 10<sup>th</sup> District case in Ray Carpenter, 287 NE 2<sup>nd</sup>, 399 which explicitly said on page 405 'that we do not consider the arguments against this ordinance with regard to the first, fourth and fourteenth Amendment arguments to this case'. Explicitly said, we are not considering the first, fourth and fourteenth Amendment arguments to this case. If that's the best case that the proponents of this ordinance can come up with to support the constitutionality of this ordinance, then I'm sorry, that's a pretty weak argument. By contrast, there has been no Supreme Court, or Ohio Supreme Court case law that deals with day time curfew ordinances. There has only been one curfew case ever in the history of the United States Supreme Court. In 1942, the case of Kyushi Karabachi vs U.S. ruled that curfew imposed on Japanese people during World War II was constitutional as a wartime measure. In 1970, Janet Scott vs Pennsylvania 398.US 916, the Supreme Court denied certiorari on a curfew issue, but in that denial of certiorari, Justice Douglas argued that curfew laws raised serious questions about the right of assembly. He said that he was concerned about the possible abuse of curfew laws and clearing the public of undisputed people, I'm sorry, undesirable people like minorities and he argued that any curfew law should be temporary and narrowly defined. So I challenge the proponents to come up with a reason within

the text of the Constitution of this State, or of this Country, that this law is even legal.

Two, correlation is not causation. There are many studies pro and con on this issue. There are several studies that suggest that curfew, curfews enacted nationwide have done no good. For instance, Mike and Dan McClaire, 1999 in an Article titled, *Analysis of Curfew Enforcement in Juvenile Crime in California*, Western Criminology Review, Issue One, Volume One, Issue Two stated, quote “in 1992, San Francisco authorities dismantled the previously vigorous curfew enforcement which has resulted in 1,400 arrests during the previous five years. Only three curfew arrests were made during 1993 and ‘97 years following. Crime plummeted. From 1992 to ‘97 juvenile murders declined 50%. Property crimes reported to Police, declined 36% and violent crimes reported by Police declined by at least 41%, the latter of which was the largest crime decrease of any large California city. Similar cases have been done in Los Angeles and other cities nationwide.”

Three, I was very disturbed at the last meeting to hear the Police Officer state that if an Officer who stops a child is not able to get a hold of the child’s parents, then the child will be sent to Children’s Services and placed into the Foster System. That should alarm many, many parents. I certainly would not want my children sent into a Foster System that can be very dangerous to their physiological well-being, just because I’m on the other line, or just because I’m in the bathroom, or something like that. That’s absurd and not an appropriate measure to take if Police cannot get a hold of parents. We are putting, I think that what we’re doing with this ordinance, or at least what the proponents are suggesting, is a bull’s-eye proposal; and what I mean is the bull’s-eye of the proposal seems to be suspended and expelled kids, like we heard last time. That seems to be the main problem that proponents are trying to get rid of keeping expelled and suspended students off the street. The problem is that the good kids are on the rest of the target. Yes, the ordinance tries to exempt the good kids, but only after the error has been loosed. The proposal says, we can take aim and fire at any kid we want, but don’t worry if we miss the bull’s-eye, we’ll pull the arrow out. It’s not good enough to just put up the easiest target. The Police should only be allowed to stop kids that have been identified as truant. So for example, there are probably many solutions we could take, but for example, say a kid gets expelled. Before sending that child home, take his picture and give it to the area cops. If they see **that** kid during school hours, then make the stop. And again, I will just reiterate my concern that this ordinance seems to take the attitude that many adults do not seem to care about the rights of young people at all making their presence illegal.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

Mr. Fuller: So I challenge the proponents to come up with a constitutional argument for this ordinance.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Are there any questions from members of Committee, members of Council? Next speaker is Brett Sisbarro.

Mr. Sisbarro: Council, my name is Brett Sisbarro, I live at 536 Killin Court. I’ve been a Reynoldsburg resident since 1988. I graduated from Reynoldsburg School District in 2000. I’m here to talk about the curfew ordinance. First, my concern is the wording as many people have brought up for this ordinance. It is very broad and does leave a discretion for the Police Officers. We are targeting a segment of people that can only be done visually and going after the

trouble-makers. Police though are going to be stopping a multitude of people that will not fit the trouble-makers they're trying to reach. They'll be stopping people who don't belong in public schools, home-schoolers, but will be stopping people also for over-age that will not, may not have ID's on them, maybe out just running for the evening, the afternoon, and will be held accountable for these things. I would hate for Councilman Long to be found during the day and stopped by a Police Officer and mistaken for his age. The, so this will be, this will be an inconvenience for many. So I ask that we look at other resolves. We look back across the street at the school district where most of these problems are coming from. We ask them to take additional steps to resolve some of these situations before we start attacking the freedoms that are built for us in our Constitution; let's see what happens if we take additional steps through the school district first to bring down crime rates. Let's not follow statistics because in systems something might be working. Maybe there is something better. I have always wondered why we are taking expelled students and rewarding them by allowing them to be home. If they don't want to be in school in the first place, we were all students and it wasn't the best place to be, so they probably are going to go out regardless and find ways around even this system, and for them, I challenge them to come up with stronger punishments for truancy children, that we hold up parents to be more accountable for those children and create new boundaries for that. This is a poor attempt to restrict a very, you know, 3% of the trouble-makers on 97% or however many it is, who are not causing any problems. Stats are wonderful, but we cannot stop crime this way. As the previous speaker had mentioned, we are targeting a segment, and we can't look at always doing it that way. If we look at segment-wise, we could start going down as we see the problems in Arizona arising at race and start segmenting and saying well, we can't have this particular race out at this time of day because statistically, that's when they commit most of their crimes so we could stop this much if we allow Police Officers to say that we cannot have this race out from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m and that is not the freedoms that we fought for as declared by our independence just a couple days ago. So I implore you once again, that we look at this and we look at other avenues of exploring how to raise this town and let's be a light for other cities and show them that there are other ways and go that way. So please, I implore you to vote no on this.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Sir. Are there any questions from the Committee, members of Council? Thank you. Next speaker is Teresa Allen.

Ms. Allen: Good evening, Council. I am Teresa Allen, my address is 559 Brightstone Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. I do oppose the daytime curfew. I am both a parent, and a homeowner in the City of Reynoldsburg. I feel if the City Council passes a daytime curfew, like Columbus, it will send a message that our level of crime is just like Columbus; and I've wondered also, what are the Reynoldsburg statistics for daytime crimes by school-age children for Reynoldsburg? I've seen numbers for Columbus juvenile daytime crimes, but I haven't seen any for Reynoldsburg. I haven't seen those listed. None of the other suburban areas have, seem to have a need to pass a daytime curfew. Reynoldsburg would be the first. Is Reynoldsburg so much worse than other areas that we need to pass a curfew to deal with daytime crimes that are committed by children? One main focus of the school levy that passed was that it would increase our property values and it would help a sluggish home market. One realtor that I spoke with, said that home buyers look at all things when they're considering a locality in which to buy. Of course, they're going to look at schools, and they're going to look at levels of crime, probably Parks and Recreation, what sort of facilities are available, if there's a YMCA, etc. I feel a day time curfew would send the message

that the level of juvenile daytime crime in Reynoldsburg is out of control and it would send the message, it would act to decrease our property values and probably lead to a sluggish home market. I think we need to strive very hard to maintain the correct image of Reynoldsburg. I've seen plans for city improvements, there's recently been the Livingston garden added, there are lots of proposals to make steps in the right direction. I don't think that the press, the news, the newspaper, always treats Reynoldsburg fairly, nor are all of the news reports accurate. I did view a June 11, 10TV.com news report on the proposed curfew and in that report there were errors. First of all it said there was an error, it didn't say there was an error, I'm saying there was an error, when it said that Reynoldsburg has no truancy laws. Reynoldsburg does have a Truancy Law. It's a State law. A resident talked on this news report and said that she had a theft. That's unfortunate in her home. We all believe that. She said she felt and believed that it was committed by a teenager, but there weren't any reports given of people that it was known that a juvenile committed a crime, it was just something that she believed. Also there's bias in the media. Reynoldsburg seems to get reported negatively and often ignored by the Dispatch. The news stations, if it's reported, it's reported in a negative way. There was a news report for July 4<sup>th</sup> and it reported on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July parades. It mentioned Arlington and Dublin and Westerville. Why didn't they report on our parade? We need to work together to maintain a correct image for our city. There are strict laws to deal with truancy in Ohio. It's in the Ohio Administrative Code. I'm sure you're aware and it's a matter for school officials and parents. A daytime curfew would create a new law on the local level that already exists on a State level. A curfew would create a presumption of criminality. Police already have the authority to create, to deal with crimes when they are committed. Walking down the street shouldn't be a crime for a 6 to 17 year old. There is a problem from what I've heard people say, from suspended and expelled students, but this law would effect law-abiding citizens in addition to those who've been suspended and expelled. If there need to be changes made to the State Truancy Law, then I think we should alter the State law and then it can be used for the common good of everyone in Ohio. Let's deal with the crimes. Let's not pass a daytime curfew. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Committee, members of Council? Thank you, appreciate it. Next speaker is Bill Mackin.

Mr. Mackin (6350 Roselawn): I was here a couple of weeks ago so I'll be brief and try not to repeat myself. I just, as I said, I'm a Block Watch Captain. I've spoke to 20 - 25 people just on the street in the last couple of weeks. No one is opposed to this. They would all like to see it passed, 100%. I mean, what more can you say? Columbus has had this for three years, cutting daytime crime in half by, or almost in half by 43%. What more can you say? We don't have a Gestapo Police Department here, I don't think anybody's rights are going to get violated. I don't think there's anything unconstitutional about this. So I just want to say we urge that you pass this ordinance. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you Sir. Are there any questions from the Committee, members of Council? Thank you. The next speaker is Bruce Sowell. I hope you can read all that in three minutes.

Mr. Sowell: Hey, Mel, I'll get to the point for you, okay?

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Sowell: My name is Bruce Sowell. I'm pretty sure everybody down here knows me. I live at 2003 Baldwin Road. I have a front-line seat for everything that happens down in that area. Recently I've become very concerned what was taking place, in fact I took it upon myself to talk with the Supervisor for the Police Department in the area about the things that were occurring but I guess somebody listened and we got the extra patrols that we needed. At first, upon reading this code, at first I came to the presumption maybe that's something that we do need and maybe it's something I could support, but before I want to go that far, I wanted to do a little investigating and read some statistics and look at the things that are actually happening here in Reynoldsburg. I think for the current, the truancy law that we do have, as somebody's pointed out, is the State code. I believe that we do need to have a local truancy code, but it needs to be not in the current form that's being presented right now. I believe that we should rewrite it with the intentions of making some changes that are definitely needed by getting the city to also be a partner with the school board and what I mean by that is not only dealing with the kids that are causing the problem but we also give them something else. We need to couple that along with community service. We need to, I have talked to one of the ministers on the phone and found out that we did away with in-school suspensions. Now when I worked as a Supervisor for United Parcel Service, we had Teamsters there, and in order to get a day off or something like that, you would call the problem, we would suspend the person; well, that's where they want to be in the first place. So my suggestion would be, is to instead of doing just that, what we do is we put them in what we call in-school suspension. On the in-school suspension, they're actually in school doing their, have to be forced to keep up with their school work and not given a free day off. When we did what was called a working suspension, that means that if you did not follow the rules during the working suspension, you can lose your job. One of the things I looked into on the Columbus code, not only do they couple their processing of dealing with truancy, there's another part where they require that a parent comes in along with their child for three hours and during this three hours, they have somebody like from the Police Department Gang Unit talk to them about gangs. Then there's another counselor they have, will come in and talk to them about school issues, I mean home-parenting issues and then there was a third person that came in to actually explain what the real world was all about. I believe that the, what we should do is to take the law and rewrite it to a point where it doesn't effect the largest segment, which I believe to be good kids in the City of Reynoldsburg. We need to deal with those persons that are actually causing a problem, and we do have some people from other schools and stuff and we should prosecute them to the fullest extent of the law. The Police, currently right now they do pick up the truant kids and they do take them back up to the school. Now I understand that from when I talked to somebody over at the school thing, they said well, it all gets on an issue of priorities of different things and when they cut the budget, they cut the Truant Officer out. I don't know if we have a Truant Officer. There's a lot of things that we could do by in house to help solve this problem between the school and the city. I understand the problem, what we have so called, what we're talking about as far as targeting the good kids and the good kids shouldn't suffer from the bigger issues. Now as I began to research this even more, I don't know if the School Resource Officer has a list of the kids that have been suspended or expelled. It's a simple fact that the Police Officer, if they do encounter somebody that's been suspended, expelled, they can call the School Resource Officer. Okay, we've got this person right here who's supposed to be in school. So I was kind of torn about that and I'm listening to everybody both for, pro and con. I think what we need to do is to sit back, get everybody in the

boat, rewrite this thing to where it's acceptable to everybody and deal with those individuals that are actually causing the problems. Like I said, I have a front row seat. I would have had a front row seat at the recent shooting, I had a front row seat at everything else, because to where I live at Baldwin Road. So I thank everybody for bringing this up to Council and everything, but I think with some modifications and rewrite the stuff like that would guarantee that rights are protected and everything, we could have a good code and we can still deal with the situation we have at hand.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Bruce. Are there any questions from the Committee, members of Council? Thank you. Next speaker is Monica DeBrock.

Ms. DeBrock: Hi, my name is Monica DeBrock, 7400 Bryden Road. I've been a resident of Reynoldsburg for nineteen years and I'm very proud of our community. We are proactive, we are very family-oriented and I think I am for the curfew ordinance. I had mixed feelings at the beginning, but after reading it and talking to people, I believe it is what we need right now in our community so that we all have freedom, that I have freedom to move about this community, my kids have freedom to move about this community without fear of crime; and so I think that where the kids that are out and about, that are moving in our community, that show respect, that might be going to a piano lesson, that might be going over to their friend's house to play, they're not the issue. They're showing respect. They're not the ones that are trying every car door as they're walking down a street. Those are not the issues that we have in this community. Those are kids that are moving about. We want to make it safe. We want to make it safe for all residents, students, businesses, and I feel this ordinance, for right now, is going to help our community to be proactive, not to say that we have a huge amount of crime, but to say let's take the issues that we have and let's deal with it. So hopefully, an ordinance like this is seen as a freedom, so we all can move about and feel comfortable and confident and to know that all kids when they are moving about our community, are as safe as can be. The kids that are causing problems are not just from Reynoldsburg. So saying that we have a list of Reynoldsburg students, that's not going to solve the problem. We have kids moving about our community from all over surrounding areas. So I think that we need to look at this globally, we need to attack it and we need to solve this problem and I believe that this ordinance is a step in the right direction. School can work on other programs throughout the school community. Parents, you know, we can have options for parents, but we need to give the Police something that they can do for the kids that are out of control. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Monica. Are there any questions from members of Committee, member of Council? Thank you. I'd like to thank everybody that spoke this evening. We do appreciate having residents come to our meetings. You know, very few do, and it's good to see that people are interested in this subject. Now members of Council, are there any members of Committee that have anything to say? Councilman Long.

Mr. Long: Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to also reiterate a 'thank you all very much' for not only coming, but coming out the past few nights. I've had an opportunity to do a lot of research here in the last six weeks. I think I've probably dug deeper into this issue than anything else I ever have. Tools are great, but you have a sense of responsibility that comes along with the tools that you would have placed at your disposal. We as parents, we as citizens of the City of Reynoldsburg all have responsibilities. Some of the numbers that I received from the school

district in the 2009 - 2010 school year, we were dealing with 1,183 suspensions through the school district. That's been cited as one of the groups, or classifications of individuals, that we are attempting to control with this ordinance.

As was mentioned earlier, one simple solution to that would be to stop immediately all out of school suspensions and to bring them back into school to where the children are under control and supervised by adults. There were 75 expulsions in our school district last year. Now while that's not a great number, that's not a huge number or anything of that sort, my point is that in a population of 6,984 kids, we're talking about just a hair over 1%. We're ostensibly going to be locking down the youth within the City of Reynoldsburg, and in my mind, I see it almost as a house arrest during the school year for the actions of 1% of the population and punishing the remaining 99%. If, some of you may know me, that in 2007, I'm the one that proposed that we build a forty foot brick wall up and down Brice Road. You know, there are ideas to issues that are brought and on the initial aspect, the surface, they say 'wow, that's great', but when you start to peel away the onion and you start to look at the ramifications of what it is that you're currently dealing with....one of the individuals talked about Family Children Services earlier. I telephoned them to find out what would happen if a child were taken down there. And there would be an intake record created on that family if the child was taken in. So I don't know. We have budget issues in the city, we have budget issues in the school district. We have the Superintendent of Schools just after making \$20,000,000 in budget cuts, few programs to prevent erratic behavior including truancy remain within the district, but attendance rates are not poor. So once again, it removes the element of this being a truancy issue, and in the aspect of placing positive controls and removal of an entire age group of children from our streets during a certain period of time for the actions of 1%, as opposed to focusing and targeting the ordinance, in any legislation we bring forward, to go after these individuals specifically. That's all I have, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Councilman Long. Are there any other members of the Committee? Councilman Burd.

Mr. Burd: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Just to followup a little bit. I got the same numbers that Councilman Long received from the District and of those 75 expulsions, I was told that 16 were for truancy. In a district of 6,700 people, we had 16 expulsions for truancy. I was also told that was a number of expulsions and it's theoretically possible that there were students expelled twice because expulsions can only go up to 80 days. So I don't know the exact number, but we were told that there were sixteen.

Also, just to follow up real quickly on the comparison from Reynoldsburg to Columbus, Zone 5, that seems like it's a nice comparison because geographically size-wise we are similar. In square miles, we're about the same and I don't mean to downplay the crime we have here. Everybody knows that we have some problems we need to address, but apples and oranges doesn't even begin to describe the situation between the City of Reynoldsburg and Columbus Zone 5. Just to give a little bit of background, there were 4,712 burglaries in Columbus Zone 5 last year and there were 195 in Reynoldsburg. Now all those are bad, I wish none of them would have happened, but I think we need to be a little careful saying 'well, in Columbus this is working' because they also are patrolled by 187 Officers for a geographic size the same as ours, whereas we have 53 Officers city-wide. They also said they took two of those Officers and put full time on the job of enforcing their school attendance law. We're a city that has a great Police force, but they're under-manned. We need more Police Officers. We have less than Gahanna. We have

significantly less than Westerville. We have less than Grove City, we have less than every suburb of our size, and I'm not at all comfortable with having them feel the need to enforce this ordinance based on the amount of crime that we're seeing in the city. I just don't think it's the right fit for the city at the time. I don't think it's the right answer. I think it sounds nice and it sounds good, but I think in practice, there's just all sorts of problems with it and just, my last point, you know we talked that home-school families have been the target of this discussion and we say, you know that we shouldn't base city law around the 103 families that home-school, but it's not just home-schoolers. There are over 300 kids who go to school online in this city. You couple that with 103, and suddenly the numbers start to get a little bigger. We have kids who go to St. Pius, we have kids who go to Grace Christian. These kids may have days off that the public school doesn't recognize and they have teacher in-service days. We have hundreds of kids in our public school system who are granted early release, or late arrival, and I just feel like we're creating an enforcement nightmare if we try to do this on those days where you may have lots and lots of students out for the right reasons. It's great to have exemptions in this ordinance. There's no way you couldn't, but the cop's not going to know that by sight. The cop's not going to see a 12 year old and just know that they're exempt. He's going to have to stop, he's going to have to take time out of his day, he's going to have to question, and then he can go about his business. I just think it's unnecessary. I don't support it, I would be for trying to explore other ways to target the people who are causing the problems and not blanketing it this way.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Councilman Burd. Are there any members of Committee, members of Council? Okay, if not this has had its first reading. It's up to be sent to Council for its second reading. What's Committee want to do with it? I mean it's not something that's going to go away. I know you guys would like it to go away, but it's not going to go away. There's too many people who's interested in it, and I think it's something that we should continue to work on, maybe not in the context it is, I think it needs a lot of work done on it. What I would like to do is hold it until the first Committee Meeting in September, give all of us a chance to look at it, give the Police a chance to look it over, and then see if we want to continue with it. Councilman Long.

Mr. Long: Yes, Chairman, we've had these good people, who have come out for the last six weeks.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Long: And in order for us to be able to move forward aggressively, I'm not saying quickly Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm saying aggressively, to specifically address issues that we have here, admittedly nothing can be done in that area that I'm aware of until this piece of legislation is taken off the table, is that correct?

Mr. Clemens: I don't know whether that's correct or not; you can put it on hold. You just put it on hold last week for two weeks. I mean, I'm saying put it on hold. Put it in "Other Business" if you want to, but it's not going to lay there. I mean I'm not just going to let it lay around. Eventually, it's going to come back. Now, I think there's something we need to work on. Now, if you want to dispose of it, then we should send it to Council for a vote. You know, there are other members of Council. I have no problem with that. My problem is that taking no action at all, I mean people deserve us to at least take action, up or down, and I have no problem with that.

I mean, in all my years, I've voted "yes" or "no". Okay, if you have no, if you feel that you dislike the ordinance, send it back to Council, take a vote on it. By putting it in "Other Business", that accomplishes nothing. It just lays there. This is going to come back. Yes, Councilman Long.

Mr. Long: Sir, I gave my word to Officer Mielke that I will not let these issues die.

Mr. Clemens: That's fine.

Mr. Long: You know as well as I do, we both live in Ward IV.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Long: We're very familiar with the issues that we're dealing with in this city.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Long: Now, I voiced my opinion that I do not believe that this ordinance, in its current form, is appropriate and nor does it address the issue directly.

Mr. Clemens: You know, I gave you the choice. I mean, what do you want to do?

Mr. Long: I just.....

Mr. Clemens: I'm not going to do it for you. You come out and tell me what you want to do.

Mr. Long: I'd like to introduce a motion that we move this to "Other Legislation".

Mr. Clemens: Then you should have said that to start with then; okay, do I have a second?  
Seconded by Mr. Burd. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: I was just going to comment that, you know, I've heard certainly there's some concerns that have been expressed, but I hear over here, well, what are we going to do? We can't do anything with it during that period of time. Well, I think if you stop and think where both of you got your information, it been since the last meetings. So you do continue to do things with it. You talk to the proponents, the opponents, you talk to the sponsors, you make up your mind during that period of time. That's why I thought holding, but certainly holding until the first of September does not mean that this body shouldn't be out trying to rectify what solutions there could be or what their feelings are with the sponsors that brought this forward. This came forward under the statement from the City Attorney that it was supported by School Administration, School Board and City Administration; and maybe as Council, if we're going to hold it for a month, maybe it needs some of those questions answered. You all don't have any problem going out and getting it from the sources you want, from week to week, or every week to two weeks. So when you say, on the other hand, say 'we can't do anything about this' - yes, we can. You can get answers to a lot of these questions that were raised tonight. The purpose and the wealth of knowledge that comes in from people coming in and talking to Council certainly opened up other lines of communications for Council members to try to answer some of those problems. I respect the fact that no Council wanted to get into the debate tonight because many of the things you heard

tonight, you heard the first time. They may have been similar, but you're hearing it in a different way and that's why you go get those answers. So I mean, it's semantics with us going to "Other Legislation" where it's held, it should keep Council's interest up by being held, more so than by sending it to "Other Legislation". "Other Legislation" says we'll just stick it there for awhile and once somebody brings it up, we'll start thinking about it again. This, I absolutely agree with Chairman Clemens, this will end up, this or as it is modified, will go to some vote before Council, because I think the public is very much telling. You add up the score sheet tonight, it's 6 to 5 and one I want a rewrite. So, you know, and if you go back three weeks ago, it was the opposite way. Like 8 to 2 or something like that. So the matter's before us, it's up to Council to decide and you can continue to work it. There's no reason, you didn't stop two weeks ago, so there's no reason you should have to stop over the next two weeks or six weeks. Does this have to be implemented, this is my own personal feeling, does this have to be implemented at the beginning of the school year? Not if it's not right, it doesn't have to be.

Mr. Long: Exactly.

Mr. Hills: But as soon as it goes to "Other Legislation", it won't go anywhere for a while.

Mr. Clemens: That's right. Thank you, President Hills. Mayor McCloud, how do you feel as Administration, a principle such as this?

Mayor McCloud: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. When I first heard this ordinance, I thought it sounded like a good idea. Then issues were raised I hadn't considered. I hadn't considered the home-schooled children. My son goes to Grace Christian. There are St. Pius kids. I continued to research the idea and listen to constituents and at this point in time, I have not yet drawn a conclusion. I think there's a good idea here. I think the dialogue absolutely needs to continue to work toward a conclusion. What that conclusion is, I don't know, but I would happy to be a part of that process. I think a couple other entities may, might be helpful if they were at the table as well, but that's how I stand at this point, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mayor. Appreciate it. Alright, we have a motion to send this to "Other Business" and a second. All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye" except Mr. Clemens, who voted "Nay").

Mr. Hills: I'm not sure, was it 2 - 2?

Mr. Clemens: No, I don't know which way...

Mr. Long: I didn't hear Fred say anything.

Mr. Deskins: I voted "Aye", for it.

Mr. Long: Three for, one against.

Mr. Hills: To "Other", okay. You voted when they were voting the others, okay.

Mr. Clemens: Okay, this goes in "Other Business". It will not lay there. It'll come back. It just means it's going to be a little harder to get it back, but it will be back in form or another form, another ordinance. Officer Mielke did a good job and we'll bring it back as another ordinance, but it will contain some of the materials there now and appreciate all of you coming. You'll know what's going on. It will be in the paper and I know a lot of you got called from your Councilman. I'm sure they'll call you, make sure that you know. So thank you all, and thank you for coming. Appreciate it, really do appreciate it. That ends the Committee meeting at 8:36 p.m.

Safety Committee

-- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

Tuesday July 6, 2010

(Transcribed - S. Cochran, Ass't. Clk. of Council)

## FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES July 6, 2010

Members of Finance Committee present: Fred Deskins, Jr., Doug Joseph, Mel Clemens. Councilwoman Leslie Kelly was absent.

Other members of Council present: Barth R. Cotner, Chris Long, Nathan Burd, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Deskins: I will open the Finance Committee at 8:35 p.m. First thing on the agenda this evening is the agenda. Is there any changes to tonight's agenda? Hearing none, it'll stand as written.

Next item is approval of the minutes from our committee meeting held June 21, 2010. Are there any changes to the Finance Committee minutes? Hearing none, they'll stand as written.

Item No. 4 - ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING CITY AUDITOR TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM THE CITY'S FIXED ASSET LIST- -second reading 6-28-10. Dick, do you want to say anything or...

City Auditor Harris: Yeah, with the one month wait after the Mayor's signature, if we could get this passed so we can get these off of the city's tabs prior to the thirty days, it would be appreciated, so if we could pass it as an emergency, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Deskins: Thank you. Okay, I'd like to move this, send it, the redrafted ordinance to Council

for its third reading with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Seconded by Mr. Clemens. Any questions from the Finance Committee, any questions from Council? All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response).

Item No. 5 - RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TAX BUDGET OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG OHIO, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2011 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- -public hearing held 6-28-10; second reading 6-28-2010. Dick, you want to make any comments on that?

Mr. Harris: No, we have to, this already carries emergency language with it. It always has because it has to be to all the three counties by the 18<sup>th</sup> of July. So we will need that passed in order to meet the statutory requirements.

Mr. Deskins: Thank you Sir. Okay, I'd like to move this resolution to Council to be read for its third time with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Seconded by Mr. Joseph. Any questions from the Finance Committee, Council? All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion passes.

Item No. 6 - RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SEEK FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION FOR THE FUNDING OF VARIOUS CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (Brice Road Improvement Project, from south corporation limit to East Main Street)- -second reading 6-28-10. Jim is not here this evening. Oh, sorry, you got any comments, Jim?

Director of Engineering Miller: No, I have nothing to add unless you have any questions except that I'm asking that there be emergency language added to the third reading.

Mr. Deskins: Okay. If there's no other questions, I'd like to add the emergency language to this resolution and send it to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Mr. Clemens. Any questions from the Finance Committee, questions from Council? All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion passes.

Item No. 7 - ORDINANCE AWARDED DEPOSITS OF PUBLIC FUNDS- -second reading 6-28-10. Dick, I think you want to say....

Mr. Harris: Yeah, the current ones we have are getting very close to the end of the time so in order to stay current on these, if we could go ahead and pass this as an emergency so I can go ahead and get started getting the new ones signed, I'd appreciate it.

Mr. Deskins: Okay, thank you. I'd like to add the emergency language to this ordinance and send it to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Mr. Joseph. Questions from the Finance Committee, questions from Council? All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion passes.

Item No. 8 - ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COUNCIL TO CERTIFY GRASS AND WEED CUTTING COSTS FOR COLLECTION BY THE FRANKLIN COUNTY AUDITOR- -second reading 6-28-10. Pam, is there anything you want to add to this?

Safety/Service Director Boratyn: Only that I **don't** need an emergency.

(Lots of laughter)

Mr. Deskins: All right.

Mrs. Boratyn: As long as you pass it this month. I mean it is thirty days. They don't need it 'til the second Monday in September, so I don't need an emergency.

Mr. Deskins: So you're okay then. I'd like to move this ordinance to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Mr. Clemens. Questions from the Finance Committee, questions from Council? All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion passes.

Item No. 9 - ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COUNCIL TO CERTIFY GRASS AND WEED CUTTING COSTS FOR COLLECTION BY THE LICKING COUNTY AUDITOR- -second reading 6-28-10. If there's no comments from Pam, I'll move this ordinance to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Mr. Joseph. Questions from the Finance Committee, Council? All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion passes. We'll close the Finance Committee at 8:45 p.m.

Finance Committee- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council 7/6/10 (Transcribed - S. Cochran, Ass't. Clk. of Council)