

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 19, 2003

Members of Community Development Committee present: Sarah Cannella, Jim Wade, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher.

Other members of Council present: William Hills, Mel Clemens, Council President Bradley L. McCloud. Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m.

Mrs. Cannella: Approval of the minutes of May 5, 2003. Any additions? Deletions? If not, they'll stand as read. Approval of the agenda. I'd like to add a couple of items. 3a will be a discussion of Plant Reynoldsburg and 3b will be the mower. Any other addition? Changes? If not, the agenda's approved.

Item 3a. Paul Walsh will talk about a little bit of gardening here in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Walsh: Good evening all. Thanks for taking a little time for me today here. Earlier this year we had two classes of students from Hannah Ashton Middle School. About 60 children in all, who helped us out a great deal by weeding and putting in new mulch in the beds at the Senior Center, the parking lots, and the Veteran's Memorial flag pole over in Huber Park. This equaled about 60 man hours of free labor which equates to about \$600 of using approximately the lowest pay rate that we have for our seasonal help. So in our continuing efforts to reduce costs using sponsors and volunteers, we're planning an event that we're calling "Plant Reynoldsburg". A number of years ago, former Director Phil Kiser, along with the Beautification Commission, had a number of different Saturdays each year where they would plant flowers in the community. And since it hasn't happened for a few years, I'm going to bring that back and we're going to add a few new wrinkles. So we're inviting anybody who wants to, to come out on Saturday, May 31 and help us beautify the city. Our bicentennial theme this year is red, white, and blue, so we will be using red, white, and blue flowers. And in keeping with that color scheme, we've also changed our mulch color from black to the reddish brown that you've seen at the Livingston House and at the Senior Center. We've been receiving donations for various businesses for refreshments, and gardening gloves, and planting tools, and other items and things that we'll be using for door prizes. We will have staff on hand as well as members of the local garden clubs to help folks to get them in the right places to plant, and teach them how to plant if they need to know how. So "Plant Reynoldsburg" is going to be on Saturday, May 31 from 9 a.m. to noon. We're going to start here at the municipal building. The idea is to start here in these beds and if we get even more people we'll start sending them out through the city in the different beds that we maintain, to put flowers in. So anybody that wants to plant should come to the tent that we'll have set up here at the municipal building. Check in, sign in, pick up instructions and directions and flowers, and we'll go to it. So we're looking forward to seeing all the green thumbs in our community and big thumbs and little thumbs to help us "Plant Reynoldsburg".

Mrs. Cannella: Thank you, Paul. Stay right there now, because 3b is necessary for us to have a mower. I understand you're in dire need.

Mr. Walsh: That is correct. I have an additional handout for you too. Let me drop these off before I start talking. Last year you might recall we had come to Council to discuss the need for a new replacement mower for the large mower that we use, and we pulled it at the time due to budget constraints and concerns, and it's time to talk about that again. We did make additional repairs on that machine last year to try to get it through the summer. According to our mechanics it was down about 66% of the time which is not a good thing when we needed to keep mowing. It's currently not operational. We got an estimate to make repairs on the machine to try to get it through this year, and the estimate was nearly \$11,000 in repairs. And that's not with any guarantee of it will actually continue to operate. It's just kind of old. What I've handed out to you is a copy of the lease proposal. Now what I'm talking about here is, we talked about purchase outright. This is another option. If we don't want to impact our funds significantly, in one year, this is a five year proposal to lease this machine. The payments, actually it's adjusted just a little bit, but essentially the monthly payment is \$1,195.66 and there's also a \$250 documentation fee at the front end of that. So it's a 60 month lease. That would bring the price of that machine approximately \$10,000 additional dollars over the five year lease. Now we've had discussions amongst some staff, and the mechanics, the Mayor, and others about what's the most appropriate thing here. Mr. Whitney, the Auditor, suggested that we do have funds this year to make the purchase outright, which obviously would save us \$10,000. But this is another option that we might want to consider, to do a five year lease/purchase.

Mrs. Cannella: Thank you, Mr. Walsh. We do have that money then, Mr. Whitney to get that outright?

Mr. Whitney: Yes. I think that would be the preferable way to handle this. On a present value basis, we'll save approximately \$10,000 over a five year period rather than lease it.

Mrs. Canella: And you're planning on putting the old one up for auction I understand?

Mr. Walsh: Right. They basically said it wasn't worth much to them. They said they would give us \$1,000 trade in. We think we might be able to do better on auction with that. So that was the recommendation. One of the things that this mower will help us do is going to help us save a lot of man-hours. There's a chart in your packet I believe, that says approximately 32 man-hours a week and there's some things that we would like to do with some of those saved hours. Now one is, certainly in the spring we can keep up with the mowing better than we have. It's always a challenge in the spring with reduced staff, and certainly equipment that's not working to keep up with the mowing. And you've seen that this spring. We've put in more hours of overtime to try to keep the mowing at a better level. But we can do better than that with the right equipment. The other thing I would like to do to save time, is we need to put out again, our playground safety program. And I could use those hours that we save to put folks into those playgrounds for inspections and cleanups on a very regular basis and more often than we do now. So that's kind of what we'd like to do.

Mrs. Cannella: And you want this as an emergency. Correct?

Mr. Walsh: Yes. On the legislative request, the number's adjusted a little bit on the lease number. So if you're going to go with the lease number, on the front of the request form it said, \$10,369.62. That's actually down now to \$8,619.62. That is basically the prorated amount for about eight months. So we're talking about paying for the first part of the lease through December 31. Now, obviously if you do a purchase outright, that won't make any difference at all.

Mrs. Cannella: Do we have any questions?

Mr. Stake: Mrs. Cannella.

Mrs. Cannella: Yes, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Walsh, how many mowers do we have operational right now?

Mr. Walsh: We have 4 mowers right now. Two of those are, one's a zero turn radius. It just like, spins around really tight. We have a Toro out front mower which I believe is a 72" deck. Those are more for trim work and smaller areas. And we do have a walk behind mower which is used a lot of times around this building and some smaller areas. And we have a bat wing, the large bat wing woods mower which - it broke down again today. That one is a continuous problem for us as well. And we do have a small rear mower for the back of the tractor.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Mr. Whitney, I have a question for you. I guess if we're going to do this, I guess with the interest rates the way they are right now on what we're getting on our savings, we'd be better off to purchase it outright, wouldn't we?

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Stake: Thank you.

Mrs. Cannella: Are there any other questions? Yes, Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: Just curious, and I don't want to imply that anybody has done anything wrong, but it seems like the life span of the mower that you're replacing is only about six years. Is that attributed to operator abuse, or is there something wrong with the mower from the get go? It just doesn't seem like a very long time for a \$50,000 mower.

Mr. Walsh: There's two pieces to that answer. One is that, if you look at the mechanic's records from the Street Department, they don't show any of the repairs being made due to the operator error, or damage caused by misuse of the equipment. The second part is that, it's been my understanding that this machine has never been the best quality piece of equipment. Other people that have had this, other communities that have run this machine that I've talked to, have not been pleased with it and it doesn't have a very good resale value. Now, we've had significant problems getting parts for this. We've waited as long as 4 weeks to get parts to make this thing run again. So, that's another significant problem with this piece of equipment. Their parts availability is a real problem. In the six years, actually before I came here, there was a list created that showed the

different spans of age that equipment should be, typically should last. And mowers of that type are listed at six years. I think that came from the City Mechanic.

Mr. Wade: Of that type?

Mr. Walsh: Yes. Mowing equipment.

Mr. Wade: And what kind of life expectancy do you have of this equipment that you're talking about purchasing?

Mr. Walsh: I would expect ten years out of this, for sure. Possibly more.

Mrs. Cannella: I personally would like to see that you buy this outright. It will save us money in the long run and that's the way I will be sending this forward. I'll move to send this forward for it's reading as an emergency on Monday for \$61,854.89 and refer it to Finance. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Number 4 on the agenda is the authorization for the contract for the Reynoldsburg Major Commercial Corridors. Are there any questions on this? Any questions? I'd like to send this forward for the Special Council meeting this evening. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Then we'll also send this on, do we have to send this on to Finance again? No. Okay. Motion passes. That will go on to Special Council meeting.

Item 5 is the Ordinance to amend Chapter 971, Municipal Parks. Do we have an amendment on that from Mr. Underwood? Mr. Underwood has looked it over and has sent an amendment to it. So I would like to, are there any questions on this? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, Mr. Walsh. I'm still concerned about the parking provision as far as the availability of paved parking. I just came from Civic Park where my son's participating in RSA's workshop with the Crew, and there were about 100 cars on the grass. Is there anything we can put in here to say, if parking is unavailable on paved lots, or something that there's an exception, or can we provide more parking lots cheaply?

Mr. Walsh: I would refer to 971.09(d) that, it's a little more gray on purpose, "that no person shall park any vehicle except in places designated to this purpose". We have designated some areas in the grass as places that people can park their vehicles, and they typically have done that fairly well. Specifically at Civic Park. There are areas at the Tomato Festival grounds that they can use as well as areas along the main drive that go back into the sports complex. And so far, people have done fairly well with that. I'm not going to tell you it's been 100% perfect but it's been pretty good. And we typically just talk to the ones who are a little further than they ought to be.

Mr. Beougher: Right.

Mr. Walsh: I would love to have paved parking everywhere. That would be so great. That would really help, but someday maybe.

Mr. Beougher: And are we going to post these rules anywhere?

Mr. Walsh: They will be posted.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mrs. Cannella: Are there any other questions? No other questions, I would like to move this along for its third reading, the amended version for its third reading on Monday. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). That will be moved to Monday.

With that, I will adjourn at 7:50 p.m.

Community Development
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
May 19, 2003

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES May 19, 2003

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Jim Wade, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher.
Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, William Hills, Council President Bradley L. McCloud. Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:50. The first item on the agenda, approval of the minutes of May 5, 2003 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? If not, they'll stand approved. The next item, approval of the agenda. Do I have any items to be added or deleted from the agenda? If not, it'll stand approved.

The next item on the agenda, Discussion, Repeal of Chapter 1103 Design Review Board; amend BZBA Section 1139.03; amend Major Site Plan Section 1143.03; and amend Zoning Code Fees Table 1155. Mr. Brandt.

Mr. Brandt: Good evening members of Council. Thank you, Mr. Clemens. The legislative request you have before you this evening, the highlight of it is to look at the possibility of consolidating the Design Review Board into the BZA. We've prepared a little summary of what some other communities have done and the emphasis on this effort is to hopefully streamline the process for applicants, and move things along, shall we say a little more timely manner. Inasmuch as the Streetscape Plan or design guidelines are in place for Main Street, and a good many of the requests that come forward with the Site Plan Review, cover a lot of the issues that have been previously covered by the Design Review Board. Wherein the Design Review Board was created prior to the change of the Zoning Code which provided the Major Site Plan Review issue which previously hadn't been in the Zoning Code. So it looks like in many cases there's some duplication of efforts, and over the last several years we've had a lot of comments and so on and so forth, and thought that this might be something to bring forward and everybody look at and discuss. The issue about the Site Plan Review Fee is \$25, and I don't need to read it, \$10 for each additional square foot and there's a couple of other minor changes. But the highlight of it is the issue over the Design Review Board and the possible consolidation with the BZA.

Mr. Clemens: John, I have a couple of questions first. One has to do with the Major Site Plan really. The \$25 fee, who are you going to pay to look at it for twenty-five bucks? Who looks at it? Our engineers certainly don't look at it for \$25.

Mr. Brandt: According to the code, they are forwarded to the engineer for review.

Mr. Clemens: For twenty-five bucks?

Mr. Brandt: I'd have to find out what their fee would be for it. I don't know that off the top of my head.

Mr. Clemens: I can't visualize...

Mr. Brandt: And maybe that's something we need to look at.

Mr. Clemens: I think that's something you're going to have to look at because...

Mr. Brandt: Well, when you've got \$25 plus \$10 for each 1,000 square foot for the basic, so I haven't seen any that weren't three or four thousand square feet or more.

Mr. Clemens: I think that's something we better check into. Who's going to pay who on this one?

Mr. Brandt: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Another thing, on the Major Site Plan, this is just another thing, and I know that we bumped into it this last BZA meeting, I see you had your Major Site Plan up for approval before your variances. Then the variances were the next item. If your Major Site Plan has your variances and what they're asking for and everything on it, and you approve that, what do you have the variances next for? How do you do that? I don't understand that.

Mr. Brandt: That could be merely a sequencing thing. I know the Board's, at times when I've been there, which is most of the time, sometimes they read them all, vote on them individually, and on occasions have rejected certain ones. But we could be assured that we can fix that in the future - that the variances will come before the site plan.

Mr. Clemens: That's the only thing that kind of bothered me was, that if all of this is on your Major Site Plan and you approve it, then you turn around and then you're going to the variances which you've already approved, I just didn't know how that stood.

Mr. Brandt: Well, traditionally they are gone through individually and then voted on individually.

Mr. Clemens: During the Major Site Plan?

Mr. Brandt: Correct. Yeah, each item on the agenda is read off and traditionally each item is voted on independently.

Mr. Clemens: Then you eliminate the next items that are on the variances.

Mr. Brandt: Right.

Mr. Clemens: Because you've already done it.

Mr. Brandt: Well, I can't speak for the whole board but if there's an issue with any, there have been times when they've been held, so it's not shall we say, voted on in a situation where we're putting ourselves voting yes on that, and we're going to vote no on those. I mean, generally it's worked out or discussed with the applicant at the time at the meeting. And sometimes, it's probably just fallen that way just as a result of when the application comes in, which one was on the top of the pile, and when the secretary types them.

Mr. Clemens: I would think you would look underneath the pile the next time to see which ones...

Mr. Brandt: Yeah, we can make sure that doesn't happen but I can assure you they're gone through individually, and if there is a problem, the whole board will discuss it and occasionally the Chairman has asked them, would you want this to be held, withdrawn, tabled, etc. etc.

Mr. Clemens: Then you hold the variance. Right? The next item. I just think that's something you ought to look into.

Mr. Brandt: Yeah. I understand what you're saying.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions? Are there any other questions?

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens. I want to be sure I understand you right, you're saying that in the Major Site Plan that is approved, that may include the variances that are being asked for as another agenda item?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. So we're all on the same...

Mr. Brandt: The Major Site Plan could be one variance for a fence, could be two, three, four.

Mr. Hills: But the question is I think, the Major Site Plan would include one or more variances that are coming before the BZA. And if the BZA therefore then approves the Major Site Plan, they in essence by default have approved the following variances. I think that's what we need to be sure that we're all talking apples and apples here.

Mr. Beougher: Just ask the Chair.

Norman Brusk: As a general rule, I'm Norman Brusk, the Chairman of the BZBA, as a general rule, when we have that situation, what we do is go through the variances first. They're voted on first, and then the site plan is done.

Mr. Hills: And if that's true, if you didn't grant each and every one of the variances, you would have to modify the Major Site Plan.

Mr. Brusk: Right. The Major Site Plan now is going to be as approved with the variances that were not approved, if that's what happens.

Mr. Clemens: That's fine. The part I don't understand is if you've got the variances on your Major Site Plan, then why would you have the variances the next two items?

Mr. Brusk: They'd be the first two items. Then the Site Plan. It may be out of order on the sheet, but not on the voting.

Mr. Hills: The sheet is what the public sees.

Mr. Clemens: Well, you know, we get an agenda, and we expect the agenda to be the agenda.

Mr. Hills: That's right.

Mr. Clemens: This is a question on how you operate. That's all I want to know.

Mr. Brandt: We can verify that with the appropriate staff and see that the chronology of it should be in the order of action as opposed to possibly them picking up...

Mr. Clemens: The only reason I brought it up, I can see us getting in the situation where you can have a law suit or where you can get yourself in a bind.

Mr. Brandt: Sure.

Mr. Clemens: Any other questions for John? If not, John, I do have a question. This is.. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Stake had a question first.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Yes, I just have a comment I guess, and then a question. It seems to be that what you're trying to do here is to, it's a common sense thing to try and make it easier for our customers to go through the process.

Mr. Brandt: And quite frankly, part of the process I've used is, don't expect to come here and do less than you did somewhere else. By any stretch of the imagination. And I periodically have driven with other staff people to various sites taking pictures and so on and so forth, and in addition, the current area of responsibility for the DRB is somewhat limited as opposed to the whole city. And so it ought to be expanded as we grow to the east or possibly down to the southern end, the area along Taylor Square. That was worked out early on with Mr. Nelson and NOCA and Casto organization, and the west side of the road that's been done down there was strictly, shall we say, a negotiation process. Because there were no standards in place down there other than what had been established by NOCA which we had given everyone the assurance that those would be held to. But reality, it was purely negotiations as far as the completion of the projects.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, Mr. Brandt, you and I had a conversation this afternoon, and I do have some concerns with combining these boards, so to speak. Zoning, and Planning, and Design Review all have kind of one area of the code that they're looking at and being responsible for and being an expert in. And my concern is that if we try to make one board do too many things, we're going to have some problems. Also the makeup of the Design Review Board includes design professionals, graphic artists, landscape architects, architects, engineers, and so forth appointed by the Mayor, and then citizens appointed by Council. And not to criticize the BZBA Mr. Brusk, but that board has I believe one engineer on it right now, or a construction manager, I'm sorry, and is there anybody else that I'm missing that has a particular expertise in the design disciplines?

Mr. Brandt: Mr. Feeney was involved in the utilities engineering world for a number of years, and

currently still is with a private organization.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Well, my point is that they do two different things and one deals with aesthetics, one deals with where a property line and a setback line is, and so forth, and how many parking spots you have, and they do that very well. My concern is that when you combine these and you try to look at everything at one time, you're going to miss something. Having been through this process both in Reynoldsburg and in other communities, my biggest concern is the months off. When one board takes a month off, and another board takes another month off, and you end up waiting a month and a half to go before both. That can be a problem in the process of design and construction. I think this is a mistake and I just wanted to voice my concerns.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you. And the issue of months, that could be something we could look at very easily.

Mr. Beougher: Sure.

Mr. Brandt: That may be a valid concern and should be addressed.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, I just have one more question. By eliminating this board, we wouldn't reduce the safety to the public at all or anything like, Design Review Board doesn't have anything to do with that, does it?

Mr. Brandt: Safety is traditionally under the Building Department anyhow as far as life safety and so on and so forth. I don't know that there would be any "safety issues" that I could think of with respect to the elements in Design Review because basically, aesthetics as opposed to ingress/egress etc.

Mr. Stake: I guess I just look at it a little differently than Mr. Beougher. I see it as streamlining the process, making it easier for the customer, and also making it easier on ourselves.

Mr. Brandt: And maybe somewhere down the road there's a happy medium.

Mr. Clemens: I'm afraid I'll have to go with Mr. Beougher. It's not, we are streamline for our customers. They have a process to go through. They have a process they've had to go through for the last five, six, seven years, eight years. The Design Review Board is there for a reason. Its problem has been, it hasn't been followed through on after the design has been controlled. They are two different boards. The other board is made up of professionals. That's the way it was designed to be. I think it's a benefit for the city. I think it's there for a reason, to shorten our steps, to make it customer friendly. I'm not here to make it customer friendly. I'm here to do the best I can for the City of Reynoldsburg and the looks for the City of Reynoldsburg. Unless you can show me that you're going to have the people on there that can handle the situation, that's why it was set up with the different professionals in the positions therein to be on the Design Review Board. You just can't appoint anybody. They have to be of a certain criteria to do it. I've seen things that they've did and that have been proud of. Some of it hasn't been followed through. That's been our big problem, is following through on what the Design Review Board does. They do their job but the city fails in the process to follow through, and we've not had the personnel to

do it really after it's been approved to make sure that the correct planning is there, the correct design is there. No matter who does it, whether we change this or don't change it, we're going to have to change on how we operate or it won't be any different than it is today. We have nobody that goes out to see what caliber of tree they put in, what caliber of bush they put in, what type they put in, what type of mulch, how much greenery, who measures it off. We have nobody. And that's the process we've got to correct. I think it's a part of the whole situation that we're discussing now, whether we change or we don't change. We have to operate and we have to operate correctly and I think it can be done. It can be done by mingling our departments. Maybe bring the horticulturist into it to do this but we've got to get a little bit tougher than what's being done. We've got to either give them a temporary and then go back, go out and check it. If it isn't done within 6 months, take away their Occupancy Permit. I mean, I can take you to places around town that has been approved and it's never _____. That's our major problem. Yes. I think Mr. Stake, then.

Mr. Stake: Well I just want to say that I do have faith in the BZA and the Planning Commission. I'm sure that these people can do the job.

Mr. Clemens: That's good. Jim.

Mr. Wade: Mr. Brandt, I guess I'd like to know, and I respect your position and I would like to know more about what your motivation is in bringing this forward. What's, are you seeing it as a more user friendly system for our developers and those people? Is that why you're bringing this forward?

Mr. Brandt: I support Mr. Clemens and his comment that we're not necessarily here to be user friendly. We're here to do the job and assure that a quality development is brought about. For a "motivation" was in an effort, one, to streamline things; and two, wherein there's issues that the Design Review Board covers that, and maybe we need to look at expanding their area. Their area's somewhat limited as far as coverage goes because they have a specific area of impact where they can look at issues. And the others that they're not involved in could theoretically fall between the cracks that we're worrying about somebody falling between the cracks. So it's kind of a wherein the applicant could be coming to the BZA but the issues of the Design Review Board theoretically aren't under the BZA and they could go on down their merry way without having to go to the Design Review Board. So we're kind of in a little, so we could either say, the one's that don't have to go to the Design Review Board because they're not inside the Design Review Board area, BZA takes care of all that stuff. And that would become, I think a tad bit confusing for everyone. So it was, I guess, hopefully to streamline things. Not necessarily to be "user friendly" but to be a little more facilitative I guess. Because if you look at the, I think Mr. Beougher pointed that out, on the schedule of cancellations, or not cancellations but when the months are off, when they come in and submit, there's a whole month sometimes between the two basically before. We all know in the development community is, particularly if you've got something major you're working on, of course the last couple of weeks from what I understand you haven't missed a whole lot from digging prospective because of the weather conditions, but we all know that will end as soon as the Memorial Tournament is over, which has traditionally been the rain barometer, and once that's over, wasting a whole month, anybody that's done any

outside work knows that just drives you crazy.

Mr. Wade: Just a comment to that statement. I frankly don't support the comment that Mr. Clemens made about being user friendly. I think this does bring some user friendliness to us and I think it needs to be given some consideration. But working with developers in my industry, which I do every day, I hear a lot of scuttlebutt about how difficult it is in the City of Reynoldsburg with issues like this and the amount of hoops that you have to go through. And I think we need to be conscious about being an attractive city for development and working with those developers. So from that standpoint, if it does in fact make it simpler, I think it's a good thing to look at.

Mr. Clemens: The thing that I think maybe some of you don't understand is that, and I served on the Design Review Board, there's no holdup on their grade as far as putting in their design, their plans, as far as approving for their shrubbery and all of that. That is brought back afterwards. They don't hold up and say, you don't get this because you don't have your design ready for your shrubbery detail and so forth. You can bring that in after you've built the building. They give them six weeks or whatever. That's not something that holds them up. That's not a holdup deal. Those of you that haven't been there, I mean, I'm just telling you how that works. So that's not a holdup as far as your planting area, getting it approved. You come back later and get that approved. That's not something to hold them up on, Jim. I just wanted, that part, I didn't want you to think they held them up because you don't have your planting details and all that. That's done at a later area. And I know we all have different opinions on this and as far as being user friendly, I'm all for that. Don't get me wrong. I put the city first. Maybe I'm one of the few that do, but I put the looks of the city first and I think this is important. The Design Review Board was put there for a reason. I don't hold up anybody any further than we have to, and I don't think that we do. I don't think that we're any different than any other city as far as our commissions. But that's just my opinion. Yes, Sarah.

Mrs. Cannella: Mr. Clemens, do you know how long the Design Review Board has been in existence? I don't believe it's been that many years.

Mr. Clemens: I'd say it's been ten, twelve years.

Mr. Hills: Eight years I think.

Mrs. Cannella: And I remember when it went in and there was a big discussion about it and it was decided that it was necessary. And I hope we haven't changed our mind on that. But I don't, as far as, the only thing I see is sometimes the timing. So I would say we have to change the scheduling. I think maybe that would help. Do it in tandem. Have one at 6:00 and another one at 7. You can work it any way so that it works together. That would be the only thing I see wrong with it.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, I do want to praise the members of all the boards and commissions because I read the minutes pretty regularly and I see where Mr. Kucera or another member drives around and

looks for where a fence is proposed, and they do all this research outside of this room. And I'm just afraid that if we overload them, they will not have the opportunity to get out and see first hand and it would be a problem in _____ that process and keeping that process alive and well.

Mr. Clemens: I don't think this is anything that, we're not here, we all agree we have good commissions, I don't think we're, Planning and Zoning, BZA, all of them, Design Review Board. We're not discussing I think the members because I think they all do a great job. I think it's just the body itself and what it's there for.

Mr. Beougher: I do have one more question. You mentioned that outside of the commerce areas, perhaps the BZBA would be able to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Are you talking about expanding the scope of the requirement for a Certificate of Appropriateness?

Mr. Brandt: That's a thought. Inasmuch as the, and I unfortunately don't have a copy of the map with me, or the drawing that alienates the area that the DRB covers. And there's things that have expanded to the east. I don't know that the boundaries have expanded and things of that nature. So maybe there's other issues we want to look at.

Mrs. Cannella: May I say another thing?

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Mrs. Cannella.

Mrs. Cannella: I was on, when I was on BZA, I can recall one time that we spent more time that evening on what color a building was going to be. Now it seems to me that that could have been passed on to Design Review. The work could have gone on and Design Review could have handled it.

Mr. Brandt: Well that's precisely part of why we're here, is it gets passed on to the next group. And if you could put it all together in one, then they have avoided a 30 day delay waiting for the next meeting depending upon how the calendar falls.

Mrs. Cannella: Well that's why you have to change the scheduling on it. That's all.

Mr. Beougher: I see the difference as you can dig foundations after you go through the BZBA. It doesn't matter what color your building is. You can keep working with the Design Review Board as the building progresses but the BZBA is going to tell you where your building can or cannot be. It's a little different function.

Mr. Clemens: I think there's a difference between the two. I don't know whether it can be done, but I don't know whether the BZA wants to sit there and decide on what type of windows, what type of siding, what type of roofing, what color the building's going to be. Is it going to be split block, brick? What color is it going to be? None of these hold the process up as far as doing the building itself. I mean, this is done in a process that the construction starts, the footers are poured, everything's going. So the Design Review Board does not hold up the process of the construction

of the building. It holds up the process of the color of the building, the type of roofing, the type of work, the type of siding, what brand, what make, the colors, the brick, what colors, and things like that. What size of the plants, what caliber of trees, and all this, and I just don't know whether the BZA wants to encompass all of this. Do you understand what I mean?

Mr. Brandt: We did provide all the members a copy of this and asked for comments and unfortunately I was away on vacation during the last meeting to see if there had been any feedback from the members.

Mr. Clemens: This is just my thought, because I've sat on all of them before they changed the Charter and I know they have hard work and a lot of work to do, which you know that. You serve on it. I just didn't know whether this, they want to be encompassed with all this little detail and this other detail and the colors. And it does not hold up the construction of a project or anything like that. That's the part I want to get across because that all starts, this is done at a later time. But I think there's a lot of thought that goes into this. Bill. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: I've sat here and I've sat on Planning Commission a number of years ago, but and, you and I have gone head to head at times on those, but I think a lot of points have been made. There's a lot of diversity. A lot of different feelings as to the boards and how they function. I think John made a good point that you wanted to bring something and to open up some thoughts and comments. Well it's been opened. I'm not sure, but right now it's kind of spread everywhere. So certainly I think that the ability to be able to sit here and start talking about it, it gives us all more avenues to think, is there a way and what would be best. But I'm not sure we're really going to resolve anything right now until we do have some more discussions about it.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. What I would like to do if it's alright with the rest of the committee, I would like to hold this for two weeks, and I'd like to have a letter sent to the members of the different commissions and have them present two weeks from now to voice their opinions on how they feel. Because we have members that serve for a long time on both commissions and so forth, and see what their feelings are or how they feel about the different commissions. Because I think it's something that, after all we do ask these people to serve free of charge and donate their time, put their time in. So I think that they should at least have the ability to come and listen to our discussion and if they have anything to say, fine. If that's alright with the rest of the committee. So what we'll do John, we'll hold this for two weeks and I'd ask the Clerk, Mrs. Frazier, if she would notify the members, or unless you'd rather do it.

Mr. Brandt: We can send them a letter. We're happy to.

Mr. Clemens: Okay, if you would.

Mr. Brandt: And as I said, the members of BZA already received this but we'll just follow up with a two sentence letter, or three that says...

Mr. Clemens: That this is going to be discussed in two weeks and if...

Mr. Brandt: And another point that's just kind of a sidebar issue though, I think we all are keenly aware of the fact that getting volunteers isn't getting any easier. And possibly with this approach, we're only looking for "x" number, and I don't, and someone can possibly correct me if I'm wrong, could be a possibility of expanding the BZA to add somewhat to it, but I don't know if that's a Charter issue or not.

Mr. Clemens: It's a Charter.

Mr. Brandt: The content, or the makeup is Charter?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Brandt: Okay. So that would negate that thought.

Mr. Clemens: BZA and Planning Commission are Charter.

Mr. Brandt: Okay. But we'll take care of the letters, and I'll make sure the staff...

Mr. Clemens: One thing I would like to think about and I'd like to discuss with you, no matter which commission handles this, is the follow-up on what is being done and to make sure that after it is approved we have to do something. I think we can get together and work it out. My thought would be, I'm just throwing this out for you to think about, and the Mayor to think about, is the horticulturist, after all she knows what tree is a tree, and what bush is a bush, which I don't, and which caliber is what, and it would only take, not a large amount of time, we don't approve that many, until after the plantings are done, to take the plan that's been approved, go check it out, make sure we're getting what we approved, and the size of it and so forth, and then that, which we've never done, which we've never been able to accomplish because we don't have the people to do it. And that's something to think about. Maybe we can incorporate that and talk to Paul about that a little bit and incorporate this into somehow to take care of these things.

Mr. Brandt: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, John. Appreciate it.

I'll call the Safety Committee meeting over at 8:20 p.m.

Safety Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
May 19, 2003

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 19, 2003

Members of Service Committee present: William Hills, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher. Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.

Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, Mel Clemens, Council President Bradley L. McCloud. Councilman Jim Wade was absent.

Mr. Hills: And as Vice-Chair of Service, I'll call Service Committee to order at 8:20. Asking for approval of the minutes of the May 5, 2003 Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions from those minutes? Seeing or hearing none, they'll stand as submitted. Approval of tonight's agenda, I would like to add item 3a which is the Ordinance to proceed on the Pleasant View. I think all of the information, timing has now been completed. Is that correct, Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And so it is appropriate to send it forward as to start, let me read exactly what the ordinance says, it's an ORDINANCE DETERMINED TO PROCEED WITH IMPROVEMENT OF PLEASANT VIEW DRIVE, SCENIC ROAD AND CERTAIN CITY EASEMENTS BETWEEN CERTAIN TERMINI BY CONSTRUCTING SANITARY SEWERS, SERVICE CONNECTIONS, AND ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Does anybody on Service have any questions or comments regarding this? It's been all the way through the process. If I don't see any questions or comments, I'd recommend we send this forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency for a one reading item. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Hearing none, it will go forward to the Council meeting next week.

Moving on to item number 4 (Tape Change), discussion of Final Plat, Quarry Park, Section 3, Part 3. Having sat on Planning Commission, I'm glad I wasn't there that night. That was a confusing evening. I have read the minutes, and the minutes are pretty much a transcript and I sympathize with everyone there that evening. It was obviously some confusion and some discussions and I've tried to piece it together, and I spent some time this evening with Mr. Parkinson and I don't know how many questions Mr. Gilbert had but I'll preface all this by saying, I'm going to try to relay if it's okay with people on Service since I'm acting as Chair, I'm going to try to relay to you on each of these, my conversations I've had with Mr. Parkinson this evening, then recommend that we send them forward for the first reading and anyone that has any questions or comments, get with Mr. Parkinson and see if we can't get them resolved. But on Acceptance Final Plat, Quarry

Park, Section 3, Part 3, there were some discussions about a road that was changed from one name to another. That was a road that has been a dead end road for 25 years into a farm that the, farm off of...

Mr. Beougher: Oldham.

Mr. Hills: Oldham farm. And in settling the estate they sold off the lower tract of that and what had happened is we had built up into that area and so between the re-approval of a preliminary and the final, there was a, Quarry Park was extended up and it read Quarry Park instead of Maugham. Is that correct Mr. Parkinson? Which when you look at it, there was discussion about it, but it is the best way, it appears to be handled on that plat and it's not causing any confusion. The minutes cause some confusion but when I see it I think I can see what they're doing on that one.

Mr. Parkinson: The road that runs from the north to the south was always Quarry Park.

Mr. Hills: Was always Quarry Park and that one's already been developed through two sections of Quarry Park.

Mr. Parkinson: Right. And this is just the third section then, just tied these two pieces - parts together and made for this continuous..

Mr. Hills: So the issue is the Preliminary was approved the second time, but there was some street changed name but in essence all the lots are saying that changed, nothing else changed at all. So is there any other questions on that one from any other members of Service? If not, I'd suggest we just send this forward for first reading and any further questions we can try to address with members of Planning and/or Mr. Parkinson. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. So it will go forward for first reading.

Mr. Beougher: You need to vote.

Mr. Hills: I'm sorry. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, Lane. It will go forward now for a first reading.

Item 5, Discussion, Acceptance of Final Plat, Taylor Woods, Section 9. Here we have a similar name changes between roads where the name, there was a discussion, and I've been here long enough I can remember this one from a number of years ago and I suspect others up here, Mel may, and I think Bob may, and I think Brad probably will. Remember the Robert Gardner Drive and it was determined that there would be a court named Robert Gardner Court? Well somehow between the plat to the plats the Robert Gardner Drive didn't get changed to Mastel but it was cleaned up on this coming through from the second reading of the preliminary. So it is in essence is codifying in this one what we had done, I'm going to say five, six years ago. If that rings a bell with anybody. If anybody has any questions or comment about that one? Once I saw it, it did come back a little bit. But that one is a matter of Mastel now is known as what it, we had thought previously it was to have been. And only the court now is the Robert Gardner. Is that clear to anybody on Service? And with that, I'd recommend that we send this forward for a first reading.

Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). It will go forward for a first reading. And again, I would encourage anyone on Service or anyone on Council that has any questions, please check with Mr. Parkinson and Mr. Brandt, and whomever else and they can attempt to clarify those.

Item number 6, discussion, Acceptance of Final Plat, Summit Ridge, Section 5. This one, certainly there have been some modifications. There's been from, I think the estimation is 7 or 8 lots less than there were on the original Preliminary. On the re-approved Preliminary, the lots have been reduced and a whole court was somewhat eliminated and made into a modified where they lost the lots. They had to extend out the back yards of the lots to address a wetlands problem. Is that a clear explanation, Mr. Parkinson? Do you have a better one? It sounded better earlier when you told me so why don't you try it again on this one.

Mr. Parkinson: If I have a better one or not remains to be seen. Let me clarify something that you initially said. The Preliminary Plat that was approved by the Planning Commission that includes that this Final Plat is part of. It's approved as it was before. The Preliminary Plat was not revised. The Final Plat was altered from the approved Preliminary Plat to take into account a wetland issue that was not known at the time of the original Preliminary Plat. That sounds awful. The Preliminary Plat was not revised because we didn't want to confuse people. Why is this different than the one that was before what's going on?

Mr. Hills: Let me ask before you get started then. Was the Preliminary Plat on this one not over 12 months old?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes it was.

Mr. Hills: Then it was re-approved?

Mr. Parkinson: It was re-approved but the Preliminary Plat that was re-approved was the exact same Preliminary Plat that was approved back in 1996.

Mr. Hills: And you hate for me to ask this question. Knowing that we're going to do a Final Plat that's different from the Preliminary.

Mr. Parkinson: It is. There is a minor alteration to the Preliminary Plat in the Final. The intent of the Final Plat still matches the intent of the Preliminary Plat. There were no changes to the intent. There was one...

Mr. Hills: The intent meaning to build homes on dirt.

Mr. Parkinson: And in the general concept of the whole layout of the subdivision in general. The only thing that was removed was a small connector street between two roads really. It had no significant change of the traffic pattern whatsoever. It reduces the number of trips within this area by roughly 80 trips per day by virtue of the 8 lost lots, if you will. A cul de sac was created. There was one in the Preliminary Plat. On the Final Plat, it's somewhat extended.

Mr. Hills: And this is a dead-end building project. This is not going to be expanded on into another section.

Mr. Parkinson: It's the deepest corner of the development. There will be no further extension and there was never planned to be any further extension. So that has not been removed as a result of this minor deviation from the Preliminary Plat. So again, there's really nothing striking about this. The intent of everything that was hoped to be accomplished through the Preliminary Plat process is being conveyed here in this Final Plat.

Mr. Beougher: It's not substantially different.

Mr. Parkinson: Correct. That's what I'm trying to say but not very well.

Mr. Beougher: That's the language in the ordinance I believe that allows you to alter.

Mr. Parkinson: Okay. Thank you. Right and my opinion is not to substantially _____ altered.

Mr. Hills: I can give you a definition of substantially that if you change a word it's substantial. But that's in the _____. Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: Has Council adopted any of these Final Plats before? Like this one? Are all the Final Plats new? Because if they adopted it before we have to repeal that one and replace it with this and I was of the understanding that these were all new.

Mr. Parkinson: No. This Final Plat has never been adopted.

Mr. Hills: These are all coming to us for the first time?

Mrs. Frazier: It's just that the configuration on it is different is what you're saying?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay.

Mr. Hills: I appreciate the Planning Commission for asking some of these tough questions; what makes the minutes hard to follow is, there are some questions, they are looking at these and saying, why is it different? And that's what they're supposed to be doing. Any questions from anyone on Service? If not, I'd recommend we send this forward for the first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). So it will go forward for a first reading next Monday. And again, if there are any questions, please follow up with the engineer.

Item number 7, discussion, Acceptance of Final Plat, The Park at Waggoner, Section 2, Part 2.

Again, there are no, on this one there are no changes to the actual plats. I believe there is, this was a large multi-acre approval and someone started building on the west, and somebody started building on the east, and it was known as Waggoner Woods or something on one side and Park of Waggoner on the other side, and as they started to meet in the middle, I think you'll see a name change here, but it is all the same lots within the same Preliminary Plat that was originally approved and I think the only change here was Woods at Waggoner, Park at Waggoner is the appropriate name for this section of this development and not Woods at Waggoner.

Mr. Beougher: Woods at Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Hills: The Woods at Reynoldsburg. It's the same plats, are just alike, it's just that two different names of who was building from the east and who was building from the west. Confusing, but again, I guess it does take a while to build this many homes, so this is where some of this comes about. Questions? Anybody on Service? Mr. Beougher I can see you have one.

Mr. Beougher: Yeah, well I need to clarify something. Is the City Attorney available? I abstained from voting on Section 2, Part 3 which we approved last year because I purchased a lot in Section 2, Part 1, and that contract has been closed since October 28, and I believe that puts me out of conflict. Does it not? If I was ever in conflict.

Mr. Underwood: I don't think you were ever in conflict.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I'd rather be safe than sorry and by disclosing everything tonight, I think I'm more than covered. So, I just wanted to clarify that point.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Beougher. I would recommend we send Park at Waggoner, Section 2, Part 2 forward for a first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward for first reading next Monday.

Moving on to item number 8, discussion, Addition of Chapter 1180, Landscaping & Buffering Standards. This comes from Department of Development. Mr. Brandt, would you like to give us a little overview on this and there's a lot of reading material here and I'll tell you right up front, I think we'll probably listen to what you have to say and then have two weeks to digest what you've said. You're batting a thousand tonight.

Mr. Brandt: It's fun. I'm just so pumped up after coming back from California. I'm glad I was in Berkeley, now I feel good.

Mr. Hills: You being in Berkeley, it's not bothering you being back.

Mr. Brandt: No it isn't. As it indicates on the cover page, addition of a landscaping and buffering to the City Code, and to follow along with Mr. Clemens' comment on our other legislation, this would certainly require, or at least by virtue of adoption, some type of monitoring, because we do have specifics with respect to landscaping and buffering. The area that is of primary concern, and this could possibly be looked at as well from the committee that's looking at the code review with

respect to residential because there's a few parts relative to that, but the area of real concern and interest in moving this along, or at least sending it forward was the commercial aspect wherein as we all know things transition over time and quite frankly, without a code in place, it becomes strictly the job owning aspects of getting it done. And as Main Street and Brice, we seek to improve the quality down through there with a major developer potentially coming along to do some projects, we felt that it's in everyone's best interest to have a code in place that provides some standards for the landscaping and trees, etc. as well. These codes are not uncommon. They're in the code books in a lot of cities. I'm sure Mr. Beougher's probably seen one or two before and possibly some other folks. So, and as you've said this is a, shall we say a large volume of goods to digest, but that was the reason to at least get it started down the track. I don't know that it's in a great hurry by any means, inasmuch as we don't have one to begin with other than what's set up in our subdivision regulations currently, to have everybody have plenty of time to look at it and comment. And we'll certainly see, if they haven't received it, the members of the other commissions receive a copy of it for their comments as well.

Mr. Hills: I think that would be good. Some of this looks like we may have seen it on the, similar language on the 256 overlays. Is that where some of this came from?

Mr. Brandt: Or vice versa.

Mr. Hills: Or vice versa.

Mr. Brandt: That's right. Quite frankly, we worked early on with one of the landscape people at NBBJ on this.

Mr. Hills: Okay.

Mr. Brandt: Their community development sections they had up there which is no more but, and we also looked at some codes from various cities in Central Ohio. We had an issue on tree preservation a while back. There's some specifics in there with respect to those issues, and it was just an overall attempt to assure that we raise the bar.

Mr. Hills: But this is in essence establishing a chapter in our own ordinances that we now use same or similar language in some of our overlays that lay against the plat. Is that correct? And this would be codifying that in our own code.

Mr. Brandt: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Well, one thing that jumps out at me relative to our discussion of whether you approve variances or Major Site Plans first. Down at the bottom of page one it says, "no variance, Zoning Certificate, development plan approval, site plan approval, or conditional Use Permit shall be granted or issued until final approval of the landscaping plan". So if you have to have all your variances in place and your Major Site Plan reviewed before you can, let's assume we keep the

DRB and they are the ones that will be reviewing this chapter then it's kind of catch 22 or something. I mean, you have to do this before you do that, but you have to do the other before you do the first one. It's, I want to say the flow chart..

Mr. Brandt: Well the fact that they all hit at the same time was maybe coincidental.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, do you have a question?

Mr. Clemens: I think it's a step forward, John. And I agree that we definitely need this and we've needed one for a long time and I agree with Mr. Beougher, the landscaping plan can be, that should not hold up the approval. That should be something that can be passed at a later date as the construction goes. After you give the approval. It's something that can come in and then be done. But, and I also agree with your first statement, this is absolutely no good unless it's enforced. You know that, and I know it. So if we do this, we do want to follow through as a way to do the enforcement of these different things. Because like back here on office space, and nursing homes, so forth, it calls for one tree within 19,000 square feet and so forth, and inch and a quarter caliper, 24 inches off the ground, and so forth. I mean, somebody's got to check it. If we're going to do something like this. I know Sharon probably has the time to do it but I don't know whether she'd want to do it or not. But this is something I agree we should have. We should have had it a long time ago. That way everybody when they come in, they know that they have to supply so many trees at a certain distance, a certain size, and it's not left up to who did and who didn't and why they didn't. And this states the size and the caliper and things like that. So I think it's a good thing that you brought it forward, and I think it's something we should look into and in the process before and now, think how we're going to enforce it.

Mr. Brandt: Oh, I agree with you wholeheartedly. But it's kind of a chicken and the egg thing. You probably wouldn't run out and hire somebody or look for somebody to enforce it until you had it. So once we get down that path to a certain point, then maybe we evaluate the needs and what would...

Mr. Clemens: We'll start pointing and say, he's in charge of it.

Mr. Beougher: Something more for the horticulturist to do I'm sure.

Mr. Brandt: And you know, maybe we look at outsourcing on some of that. I think it looks possibly a rather daunting task, but if we go down through the list of how many that there's really effect, it may not be a major cost. And what can you put a value on, on quality? That's kind of hard to measure. But my thought would be that we go down the road, then we look at the possibility of possibly either outsourcing, and the Mayor may have some other thoughts with it as well because we've talked about this and the lack of, and the potential for. Because it ties into other issues as far as long term aesthetics.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions? If not, John thank you for the overview and we'll talk about it in a couple of weeks.

Moving on to item 9, Ordinance accepting two unrecorded scenic/conservation easements (Maronda Homes, Inc). First reading was on 5-12-03. Any additions or any additional comments or questions regarding this? Seeing or hearing none, I'd recommend we send this forward for second reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Hearing no opposed, it will go forward for second reading next Monday.

Item number 10, Ordinance accepting two unrecorded quit claim deeds (Reyno Holding Co.). Second reading was held on 5-12-03. Does anyone have any additional information to add or share on this? Seeing or hearing none, I'd recommend we send this forward for third reading with recommendation for an adoption. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward for third reading approval next Monday.

And with that I will adjourn Service at 8:45.

Service Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
May 19, 2003

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING May 19, 2003

Members of Finance Committee present: William Hills, Mel Clemens, Sarah Cannella.
Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.

Other members of Council present: Lane Beougher, Ron Stake, Council President Bradley L. McCloud. Councilman Jim Wade was absent.

Mr. Hills: I'd like to call Finance to order at approximately 8:45. Ask for approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on May 5, 2003. Were there any additions or deletions to the minutes? Seeing or hearing none, they'll stand as submitted. Approval of tonight's agenda.

We'll be adding item 3a, which is the, was the lease of a mower, now may be the purchase of a mower. Referred from Community Development and coming from Parks and Recreation. This is a request, and I believe that it has been converted now to the purchase of a Toro 580D Groundsmaster for \$61,854.89. Any questions from any one on Finance? Paul, do you want to come forward for just a second? I have a couple of questions I didn't ask before. I know Howard, you'll have a chance in a minute. He said he's got all kinds of money so I just want to ask him where it is. The mower, you made a couple of statements. Number one, we have four mowers now there's a fifth mower that doesn't work and that's the one that we're in essence replacing. Right?

Mr. Walsh: Yes, the biggest one.

Mr. Hills: Which is the major cutting mower.

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And we've had that for how many years?

Mr. Walsh: It was purchased in 1996.

Mr. Hills: In 1996. So it's about 6 years old?

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And I gather you say, the track record on that mower is not very good and nobody else has liked them, but that certainly, we didn't buy that, we probably thought we were buying top of the line at the time. Would you not say, I realize you weren't here then, but we're not noted to buy something that is anywhere near the lower line level when we buy equipment in this city.

Mr. Walsh: I don't know what to say on that because you're right, I wasn't here so I don't know what the reasoning was to purchase that at the time.

Mr. Hills: You've used this specific mower before though and you say you have not had luck with it?

Mr. Walsh: You're talking about the one we want to replace?

Mr. Hills: The one that's broken down.

Mr. Walsh: The one that's broken down. I have not personally used it. No. But I am familiar with it and I am familiar with what has been said about it by others.

Mr. Hills: Okay. I had some questions and they were related to you this afternoon on the lease amount, but let's see, we're not going to lease any more, we're purchasing. But, does that raise any questions from anyone on Finance or anyone on Council about the purchase of this mower?

Howard, you're saying we have the money available? Where would you suggest this? Right out of the General Fund?

Mr. Whitney: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: There isn't any doubts, grass hasn't been cut around here lately. So, if the mower will get it cut, that would certainly help. I'm just a little surprised when it comes forward as a lease, all of the sudden we're purchasing. If I'm not hearing any opposition I'm probably not going to say. If Howard said we got money, Howard will have to tell us at the end of the year where it went if we had some.

Mr. Whitney: Yeah, the purchase is my recommendation because the course of the lease, it would save us effectively \$10,000 in today's dollars.

Mr. Hills: I can see where there would be a cost. I don't know where we stand. We were going to have a quarterly, we were going to be updated in April as where we stood so we may want to try to put that together. Maybe we'll have our April update by some time in early June to find out where we are this year money wise.

Mr. Whitney: Yes. I can keep you posted on that on a daily basis.

Mr. Hills: Okay. We could have a better track record. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah, I agree too, and I'm not opposed to buying it but to say we have the money, that doesn't really mean a lot to me. We don't have a report on it. I would like to see an update on it too.

Mr. Hills: Well I think we, and we do Howard, we need to sit down and you and I can talk or whomever, but we talked about something coming forward in April and there's been a lot of things coming up and a lot of things happening that hasn't happened. Certainly, I'm going to repeat, and everybody doesn't like it when I do, but we as a city last year spent two million dollars more than we brought in and our budget is, I'm not sure I can tell you exactly where it is coming in. I think we've got more money coming in than we thought so far this year. I hope.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct. Yes.

Mr. Hills: I haven't seen all of those to be sure but I'm not sure of but what our expenses are going up too. So, it's nice to see all the pieces together at one time. But, Paul there's no doubt, there needs to be a mower. You've got your major mower that doesn't work. Why, I don't know other than it is what it is. And, I guess my questions on this was along the lease lines, is it available, number one. And do we already have it is the second question.

Mr. Walsh: Oh, no.

Mr. Hills: Okay. That's good because I noticed you said we've been using it so I always wonder

how we...

Mr. Walsh: Oh, you mean the 580D.

Mr. Hills: The new mower. Yeah.

Mr. Walsh: They have a, what do you call it when you can borrow it and test it out? We did that last year. We tested one for about a week.

Mr. Hills: That was last year or this year?

Mr. Walsh: Last year.

Mr. Hills: Okay.

Mr. Walsh: The new style of mower. Yeah. We tested it. That's how we got all the different mowing times and the different parks.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Because I didn't remember seeing, I thought this schedule was a little bit different from the one we had seen last year. But, maybe not. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Hills, I'm not on your committee but I have a couple of questions for Mr. Whitney and one for Mr. Walsh.

Mr. Hills: Go right ahead.

Mr. Beougher: You're talking about the cost of borrowing the money or leasing versus the yield we're getting on our savings, for lack of a better word.

Mr. Whitney: This is purely a lease/purchase decision. How we finance the purchase is irrelevant. We do have the cash to make the purchase and we're only getting, well we're getting less than 2% on our investment. So you might as well use the cash.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. The spread between what we're getting and what we'd be paying on the lease is approximately...

Mr. Whitney: Well, again, over the five year period of the lease, determining the present value of the lease payments, it'll cost us well, depending upon the rate you use, I figured that a 2% rate at this point and time would be a reasonably appropriate rate. And again, present value cost of the lease is almost \$72,000. Present value cost of the purchase is \$61,000, no \$62,000.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So what would be our yield on savings from that same \$62,000?

Mr. Whitney: What would be our yield on savings? Don't cry. It's less than 2%.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. That's a percentage and then you gave me a cost then, \$10,000. Can you

convert? Can you make the two the same? Either put both in percentage or both in a lump sum?

Mr. Whitney: Well, the lump sum is the savings of \$10,000 based on the fact that we can get 2% interest on our investments.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So the cost of the money for the lease is how much?

Mr. Whitney: That's irrelevant for our purposes. What's relevant is the amount of cash we have to pay out for it.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. What I'm trying to get Howard is what our savings would be if we purchased it outright.

Mr. Whitney: What our savings would be?

Mr. Beougher: Because I know it's not \$10,000. I want the net.

Mr. Whitney: No. It is \$10,000. Because you have to take the lease payments and bring them back to a present value basis. Doing that at the current rate on our savings of 2% and the cost of the lease is \$72,000.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So the actual cost to lease it is somewhat more than \$10,000.

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: How much?

Mr. Whitney: Well, it's approximately \$10,000.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Whitney: It's, the specifics I can give you if you like. \$71,990 is the cost of the lease. \$61,854.89 is the cost of the purchase. That's assuming an interest rate of 2%. 2% that we can get on our money.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Hills: Because this is a dollar buyout lease. This is a 60 month, one dollar, and you own it.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: So the cost of it, the \$71,990 is the _____ times 60 months.

Mr. Whitney: The residual value plays no role because it would be effective the same either way.

Mr. Beougher: Do I get an answer?

Mr. Hills: You'll have to determine that one. I'm just along for the ride on this.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. The second question I have for Mr. Walsh is, we're doing this on state contract from Century Equipment?

Mr. Walsh: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: And we have a Toro dealer in town. Do we not?

Mr. Walsh: I believe Century is the dealer listed as the state contract dealer.

Mr. Beougher: Understood. Is there an opportunity to allow our local dealer to match the state contract price in the waive of competitive bidding or something like that?

Mr. Hills: Not for us to, I don't think that.

Mr. Walsh: No.

Mr. Beougher: We'd have to waive competitive bidding.

Mr. Hills: We'd absolutely have to waive competitive bidding.

Mr. Beougher: But we wouldn't be costing any more. I mean, if he can't match it, that's fine.

Mr. Walsh: I would have to see if they're listed as part of the state contract.

Mr. Hills: They're not part of the state contract. We've got a couple of people that sell Toro but I'm not sure the one out here on Main Street sells this size equipment.

Mr. Walsh: No. They wouldn't sell that commercial size equipment.

Mr. Hills: And I'm not sure...

Mr. Walsh: (Inaudible) We'd be going back to Century for service. They have all the trained technicians there.

Mr. Hills: I think on this one they sell the commercial mower. I don't think this J&M nor that __
. I don't think either one of them are going to handle this.

Mr. Walsh: No.

Mr. Hills: If you want to check, you can check. You can check on that and see.

Mr. Walsh: Well, I haven't checked on this specific one but when I've done this in the past, Century is the one that handles the commercial equipment in the state.

Mr. Hills: I have one other question. The trade-in, \$1,000, and someone says keep it and sell it at our city auction. When was the last time we ever made \$1,000 off anything sold at the city auction?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: In fact I may ask when was the last time we made any money at the city auction?

Mr. Clemens: I don't know why you'd want to put it before the city auction.

Mr. Walsh: There's another option that's just recently come up that I haven't had a chance to look into completely yet. But I did talk to the purchasing director for Franklin County and they have started a new program where they're actually auctioning online. And they said that they have been auctioning things off but they've had to pay to get hauled away. He said they recently auctioned off a number of tires to some guy from Tennessee who paid them hundreds of dollars to come, and he came up and bought them. So, this was a few days ago. I read an article in the paper and I called the purchasing director to ask him how this works and potentially, maybe this is something we could look at to reduce our cost for auctions and maybe bring in some more money.

Mr. Hills: I'm just looking at your statement here that says, staff recommends the mower be sold at the next city auction, and I think over the last two city auctions anyway, I don't think any money was raised to speak of and I'm not sure someone coming to our city auction doesn't anticipate spending \$1,000 I don't think. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: It would be my thought that staff would probably buy it. My feeling would be...

Mr. Walsh: I wouldn't buy it.

Mr. Clemens: I'm not talking about you.

Mr. Hills: Would it run better then?

Mr. Clemens: I've held too many auctions. I know who buys them and who doesn't. My thought would be that if you can get \$1,000 out of it, get \$1,000 out of it rather than get \$50 or \$100. I've done too many auctions and the Mayor can speak up. He's been at many auctions. When have we ever gotten anything out of it? Do you know, Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: Well, we always make some money on auction. We don't make a lot.

Mr. Clemens: We make our money but we don't...

Mayor McPherson: What we typically do today, the higher priced items like this, we join with other auctions, professional auctioneers. Like vehicles. When we auction vehicles we don't do

them at our city auction. We combine them with, like the City of Columbus auction and there's like a \$25 fee and then we get whatever we get out of the vehicles and we tend to get a lot more money because there's professional people doing it. When Mel did it, you know, we ended up giving stuff away just to get rid of it. And that's the way with some of the stuff we have. It wasn't worth anything. But part of what we also do any more, we don't hold auctions where we give junk away like we did when Mel was doing that. We declare it to be excess or no good and we just throw it out. Because it's easier to throw it out and it costs less money to throw a lot of stuff out. So that's what we've done recently instead of trying to auction off paperclips, and staplers and things like that that don't work. If you want us to get the \$1,000 that's fine. That's just as easy as taking it down and...

Mr. Hills: We're sitting here now and getting ready to spend \$62,000 in less than a week without much discussion other than, here it is, let's do it and now we've got this other thing coming up with . I don't really, I just need to clarify my mind.

Mayor McPherson: A bird in the hand and a bird in the bush. We've got \$1,000 that it's worth and the thing, it's going to cost tens of thousands of dollars to fix it. I'd say take the \$1,000 and run.

Mr. Hills: I see you shaking your head, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I'd say grab it and go.

Mr. Hills: Take it and let them have it and when they bring us ours, take the old one back. Right? Is that what we're saying?

Mr. Clemens: My thought would be to take the \$1,000 because we're talking about something that we paid fifty some thousand dollars for and we're going to worry about letting it sit around and maybe have the city auction and, or send it to Columbus, we may not get \$100 out of it. _____ worry about it. Take the \$1,000 and forget about it.

Mr. Hills: If it was sold, it's not going to be sold at the next city auction any way because it would be _____. Tell you what, why don't we just... Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: Paul, do you have documentation on the state contract? Information on that?

Mr. Walsh: Yes. Not in front of me.

Mrs. Frazier: Could you give me a copy in the morning?

Mr. Walsh: Yes, I can.

Mrs. Frazier: Thank you.

Mr. Hills: And you'll have it, that \$61,854, and you'll do it with \$1,000 off of that on that trade-in

and it will come in that way so we'd be, an ordinance to purchase Toro 580D Groundsmaster mower for, approximately we'll know by next Monday, \$60,854.89 with recommendation for adoption as an emergency so we can get the grass cut. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). It will go forward for next Monday.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Thank you. Moving on to item number 4, discussion, 2004 Tax Budget. Howard, if you were just going to give us a little overview and if you would on why we do these things so everyone can understand and then we'll let people know as you're walking up here that when we send this forward for first reading, it'll have to have a public hearing set on it so there'll be plenty of opportunity to ask any questions if need be. Mr. Whitney.

Mr. Whitney: Thank you, Mr. Hills. Council. This is something we have to do every year. It's required by the counties. The term tax budget is really quite, that's what it's called, but it's really, well, that's not a good name for it. What Mike and I tend to be calling it is the Certificate of Available Resources. What we're doing here is projecting what our income is going to be for next year and very much on a _____ basis because, well, we've got a long time before next year. And the same thing with the spending. That's what this is. We're going to submit this to the counties. The counties will then approve it and that will be the, that will put a cap on how much we have to spend including both the revenue and the available resources from the General Fund balance. And that's what it's about.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Brief overview. Any questions from anyone up here on Council? Knowing that certainly we do have a public hearing, I would encourage when we send this forward for first reading and the public hearing as we review, and have any questions, either address them at the public hearing or even preferably give Howard a call ahead of time or give me a call and we'll try to work through those things if the questions come up.

Mrs. Frazier: How did you come up with the estimates?

Mr. Whitney: Basically, projected expenditures. I think tax revenue to increase it 4% and approximately the same thing for spending. We have no other basis at this point and time to make any specific projections. It's an initial best guessed estimate.

Mr. Hills: Same thing through on the revenues. Right?

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Questions or comments from anyone on Finance? Anyone on Council? I would suggest that we send this forward for first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). It will go forward for first reading next week. Anyone opposed? (No response). Hearing none, it will go forward for first reading next week.

Moving on to item number 5, thank you Howard, discussion only, Amendment of ordinance regarding Selection of Design Professionals. We added it two weeks ago for comment. I've had some discussions with some other people. Does anyone on Council have anything to add or questions from this this evening. Then I'm going to suggest we hold this for about two weeks and I think there's still some discussions that need to be conducted. So I plan on holding this item for two more weeks and we'll talk about it then. If there are questions, anybody wants to talk about it, please feel free to give me a call.

Moving on to item number 6, Ordinance returning remaining funds to the Storm Water Utility Fund from those originally appropriated for Broadwyn Drive Storm Relief Sewer Project. We had our first reading on 5-12-03. This is returning those funds, and we did have passed out to us this evening the Auditor's Certification in the amount of \$5,482. I will try to explain this, and somebody please correct me if I'm incorrect, but there was an expenditure made from those funds in that amount of money which was a fabricated type item that was purchased. The fund has now been closed out. We've had to reactivate it. The money's there. This is now treated as a Then and Now. But this item was purchased. It is in our inventory and it is anticipated it will be used on further projects at a later time. So it's not monies that are lost in any way, shape, or form. It's just they were expended and now it's an item that's in our inventory. Does that raise any questions or comments from anyone on Finance? Hearing none, I recommend we send this forward for a second reading and incorporating the Auditor's Certification in the ordinance. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Hearing none, it will go forward.

And I believe that completes Finance for this evening at approximately 9:07.

Finance Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
May 19, 2003