

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2006

Members of Safety Committee present: Brett Baxter, Ron Stake, Doug Joseph. Donna Shirey was absent.

Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Mel Clemens. Council President William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor. Antoinette Newman was absent.

The meeting was called to order at 7:31 p.m.

The agenda was approved.

Minutes of the Safety Committee meeting held May 1, 2006 were approved without objection.

Discussion: Amend Ordinance No. 19-06 passed March 13, 2006 that named alleys. (Only five were named, and there are really six). Mr. Baxter stated that this ordinance needs to be amended. Mr. Baxter made a motion to send this to May 22, 2006 Council for first reading. Seconded by Mr. Stake. All voted "Aye". Motion passed.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO THE REPLACEMENT OF THE SUMMIT ROAD BRIDGE. Mr. Baxter made a motion to table this item indefinitely. Mr. Stake seconded. All voted "Aye". Motion passed.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Safety Committee

May 15, 2006

- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Minutes compiled by - Susie Smith)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2006

Members of Service Committee present: Mel Clemens, Doug Joseph, Preston Stearns. Donna Shirey was absent.

Other members of Council present: Ron Stake, Brett Baxter. Council President William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor. Antoinette Newman was absent.

The meeting was called to order at 7:36 p.m.

The agenda was approved.

Minutes of the May 1, 2006 Service Committee meeting were approved without objection.

Mr. Clemens: Item number 4, Authorization to re-bid Taylor Road Sanitary Sewer Extension. There were some questions to be answered. And Sharon, if you want to get up and take a beating on this, you're welcome to.

Mrs. Reichard: Besides that, Mr. Parkinson is going to speak to this issue too. Right Dave?

Mr. Parkinson: Absolutely.

Mrs. Reichard: Absolutely. You can see, the information that I have is what you have in terms of the re-bidding of Taylor Road and why we believe, our engineers believe that it came in so much over the engineer's estimate. So I would ask Dave if he would please speak to it.

Mr. Parkinson: Well I hope that the memo is fairly self-explanatory. I can answer any questions that you might have. We had made some assumptions, and had anticipated some benefit from joining the two together, that were not realized. And we're working on some alternatives. We're negotiating for the contractor for the roadway project at the moment. As one of the comments that was rendered, dealt with, not knowing that they would get the big contract, not being able to lump the overhead and other factors into the, from the smaller one. Now that Savko knows that they have the big one, we asked them if they could visit their bid. If there is an acceptable negotiated resolution to it, perhaps it could be addressed through a change order to bring to you before we would make any further efforts. But that's just one of the avenues that we're pursuing on how to resolve this.

Mr. Clemens: Then what you're saying is, we're not ready to re-bid it at this time.

Mr. Parkinson: I don't think there's a need to rush into a re-bid at this time.

Mr. Clemens: Sounds fine to me. And there are some other questions that Mayor wanted to answer and it will give him time to answer those when he gets back.

Mrs. Reichard: Hold it for two weeks?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mrs. Reichard: If you could hold it for two weeks.

Mr. Clemens: Will that give you time to do a little negotiating, Dave? Because until you get this worked out, there's not sense to...

Mr. Parkinson: Yeah. We just met with Savko late last week and we expect to have some response in the next couple of days.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. Sounds good to me.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Clemens, I have a couple of questions here. Because when I read through this, and I do remember this coming back and forth, and the intent was to separate those and try to get a better deal. Was that not why we split the two contracts up?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes. The works were, there was a lot of thought put into it. Some of it right and some of it not so right. But the thought process was that sewer work is completely different than roadway work. So we thought we might get better bids from people that only did sewer work. And we also thought again that, okay the roadway guy's thinking, I'm already going to be out there, I don't have the wait of all of that and maybe we'll get better bids on that. And just none of that happened.

Mr. Baxter: It's one of those best laid plans _____ concepts. I see that. My biggest concern here is that, are we going to realize those savings? And should we maybe step back and re-think the whole process. Maybe it's too late for these two contracts, but we might want to re-think that in the future. That if we were to re-bid this now with the first contract being known, it's been accepted by one person, and then they re-bid it knowing they've got the second, that gives an undue influence to that contractor. Where someone else now would have an unfair disadvantage because they did not receive the first contract. I know we didn't have a whole lot of bids on it so I understand that relays a moot point in this case, but that's just something to think about as we move forward with this type of contracting.

Mr. Parkinson: Yes it is, and we'll do that.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I think that possibly too, Savko is a sewer contractor. And since he did get the job, wouldn't he want to make it better?

Mr. Parkinson: Well, he does a lot of that type of work. But 78% of this project is a boring and he doesn't do that.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Alright. Well, I'd like to, we'll put that on hold for two weeks. Yes, Dick did you want something on that?

Mr. Harris: Mr. Baxter, I think the other reason that that was separated out was, the roadway is being built with bond proceeds which cannot be used on the sanitary sewer because it's going, it will be outside the zone of what the bond ordinance calls for. So therefore, I think that's the other reason they had to have them separate. They wanted to put them on, but they couldn't put them in

the same contract.

Mr. Baxter: That makes a lot of sense, too, for the funding source. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Harris. Are there any other questions from members of Council? (No response). If not, we'll hold that for two weeks.

The next item on the agenda is ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED - 8015 East Broad Street; southeast corner of Broad Street and Waggoner Road; from CC to CS; applicant, Giltz & Associates, Inc. (51.225+/- ac.). The Planning Commission did have a hearing on this, and they moved for approval. They had their meeting 5-4-06. Mr. Dugger.

Mr. Dugger: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. There were a couple of actions that have occurred since this was last before you. Number one, the Planning Commission did approve this application with a recommendation from Mr. Brandt that brick be additionally used as a facade material. I have to apologize, I asked one of my young guys to make that change in the text, and that did not get done. We realized that this morning, and we will be submitting a new text which indicates that the brick is an acceptable exterior facade material. Mrs. Reichard's smiling because when we got the Design Review portion of the hearing, which was later that same evening, Mrs. Reichard made sure that, in fact, the building was going to have brick all over it both with the west, north, and east facades of both the furniture store building as well as the main focus of the main building of the shopping center, as well as the, for a lack of a better term, the home improvement store that would also be a part of this development. So we did go through the Planning Commission, Design Review, and have been through those, and I think that the site plan, building elevations, were significantly worked over as a part of that process. There's also some additional information that I think I needed to get to Mr. Baxter with some questions that he raised at the prior reading of this. And that concerned possibility of access along the east side of Waggoner Road from this shopping center to the middle school to the south. Our engineers have told us that there's very minimal right-of-way on the east side of Waggoner Road. And that with the farm preservation easement, that the construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Waggoner Road over Mrs. Trotter's property to the south of this, it's probably not possible. So I needed to get that information back to Mr. Baxter as well. If there are any other questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Are there any questions from the committee? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. I've got one question. It's probably dealing with the same situation as with Streetscape. Would that be any of the walls in that area? Will we have that kind of a landscaping at that time _____ like what we have of Streetscape walls that are going up? Will that be a part of that? Or should that be a part of that planning?

Mr. Dugger: Mr. Stearns, where would that, there's a fence that's required of this applicant along their south boundary since it backs up to Mrs. Trotter's field immediately to the south. Which would be a 6 foot tall board on board or other type of fence. To my knowledge, that's the only sort of fence wall type thing that's part of this application. And that was reviewed and approved as a part of the landscaping plan that was submitted to Design Review on April 4. Is that what you

were talking about?

Mr. Stearns: Well yes. And that's basically it. I just wanted to kind of get an idea of what any of the Streetscape fencing would be going on at further east. Just say like in future planning.

Mr. Dugger: Yeah. There's a second, also there's a decorative type of sort of entrance feature I guess, for lack of a better term, Mrs. Reichard saw it, at the southeast corner of Broad and Waggoner. There's a large portion of that site, 3 or 4 acres, which will be left essentially undisturbed. It's sort of segregated from the rest of the property by that stream that runs through there, except for the immediate corner. It'll have a brick with a number of brick piers, and those piers will have fencing in between that serves sort of an entrance feature both to the city as well as to the shopping center. So there's that component as well as the fencing that would be built along the south boundary line of the property.

Mr. Stearns: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Glen, I've got a question. Along that acreage where that creek will come through there, the stream line, that will be cleaned up so that it's presentable? It will really look nice?

Mr. Dugger: Yeah. We can't go too far with that, Mr. Clemens. Because if we start rechannelizing it or overdo taking a lot of the plant material out of there, it's actually, we have to go through the, that work has to be permitted through the Corp of Engineers. So we can clean it up a little bit but we can't clean it...

Mr. Clemens: When you clean it up and make it look....

Mr. Dugger: Yeah. We can cut out some of that underbrush. We can't clean it up too much though. And then we start having problems with them.

Mr. Clemens: You can cut the garbage away just in case like, I hit a golf ball in there, I'd be able to find it?

Mr. Dugger: Absolutely. Well, I don't know Mel. You can get down in the pretty deep swampy stuff. But I would never want to have to find one of your golf balls.

Mr. Clemens: That's true. What I mean, I don't want to come up there a year from now and see all kinds of stuff growing up there.

Mr. Dugger: Yeah. Mel, my understanding is that we can clean it up but we can't go too far. And what too far is, I don't know. I could get some additional information for you next week. And I can even get the engineer here to tell you exactly what that means. My understanding is, that we are not going to disturb the channel of that creek. We have to leave the vegetation that's around it, basically there. Although, obviously the underbrush, the junk, the garbage that's maybe been deposited there illegally over the years would obviously be removed. Does that make sense?

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Dugger: Also Mel, the concern is, that the long term would be, the maintenance of that thing is a long term obligation of the shopping center owner as a part of their agreement with the Corp. So in addition to what they would have to do under whatever applicable maintenance responsibilities that they would have with the city, they would also have some with the federal government as well. So I feel reasonably confident standing here, that they're going to have to do what they need to do to keep that corner nice.

Mr. Clemens: That's fine. Because you know, a lot of times, we bump into these things and they're not taken care of down the road and they look worse than what they did. When you put new buildings behind them, if they don't take care of stuff like that. So that's what I was interested in.

Mr. Dugger: Mel, the other thing we'll do is, I'll check and make sure that the maintenance of that will also be incorporated into the common area maintenance that will be associated with the entire shopping center. That way, all of the retail tenants would be paying, you know, they pay to maintain the parking lot lighting, and the parking lot, and the restripe of the parking lot, and all those sorts of things. You know, to sweep up the sidewalks and all that. What you're asking really, is to make sure that that ditch maintenance is in that too. And I'll check and make sure that that's done.

Mr. Clemens: That will be fine. Thank you. Are there any other questions? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Clemens. I have one more question for this gentleman. And we spoke about it at the last meeting. And I still have neighbors and constituents of mine who have concerns because of the large amount of development that's happened over there at Meijer's, and Target, and what not. And one of their perceived outcomes of this is, there's a stream, as you see that creek coming across, it goes over Waggoner and kind of meanders itself back in that area. And much of their property line has been eroded away from this creek. And I've seen decks that look like they're ready to fall in. They've had to go back and have work done in that stream to refortify their homes, and their decks, and things like that. And that's why I brought up that question about storm water. And again, the concern is, as we continue to build that area up, are we going to impact some of our residents downstream from the water that comes from that?

Mr. Dugger: I think generally, the answer to that Mr. Baxter is, yes. Whether it's from this development, from other development. Up until not terribly long ago, we really didn't have significant storm water management policies, not just for Reynoldsburg, but City of Columbus and everything to the north. And obviously, this entire water shed is also impacted by development which is occurring in Jefferson Township to the north which also has its own storm water management issues that are typically handled through the county. As I talk with the Mayor about a similar situation in another part of the city a week ago, the Mayor indicated to me that, hey, storms meander and that's what they, I'm sorry, streams meander and that's what they do, and the city really doesn't want to get into the situation of remedying those types of situations because there are apparently quite a number of these instances throughout the city. At least that's what I was told is the current policy of the administration of the City of Reynoldsburg. Obviously, if there are issues there now, we obviously haven't had anything to do with them. At least as this

stream cuts through this particular property. I will not stand here and guarantee you that peoples ducts downstream won't be washed away. That's beyond my professional confidence to do. I can tell you that we will do what we're obligated to do. Which is to meet the storm water requirements of the City of Reynoldsburg. If streams downstream meander, I don't know, quite unfortunately Mr. Baxter, what we're going to be able to do about that.

Mr. Baxter: And I appreciate your comments. And unfortunately, the administration has felt not to pay attention to some of these residents. And as building is done to their north and to their east, it should be done with note that these people can be impacted and whatever we can do to make it at least not worse, I think we ought to do that. I'm not asking that we fix their problems. Let's just not make them any worse. And I think that's why I questioned this development. It looked like you had taken steps to make sure that the runoff ran into some type of retention pond to try to reduce that impact.

Mr. Dugger: Right. There is a very large detention pond at the southwest corner of this particular property which would hold the water to pre-development rates. I guess what I've learned in additional discussions with the Administration over the last month or so is that in fact, streams meander and maybe there isn't a lot we can do about that, and we being the larger we, and I don't know that that isn't the right answer, but I don't know how to answer the question other than to say that the city has some fairly straight forward storm water management regulations, which we have planned for and will follow as a part of this development.

Mr. Baxter: And we appreciate that and I think that's the point I'm trying to make is that we're not trying to make it any worse. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Dugger: Absolutely. Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Clemens: One question Glen, about the retention basin. Is that going to be a dry basin?

Mr. Dugger: No. It'll be a wet basin.

Mr. Clemens: It's going to be a wet basin?

Mr. Dugger: Yes sir. I know where this is going.

Mr. Clemens: Would you put a fountain in this one? I go to these other cities and really, they look nice. They've got a fountain in them.

Mr. Dugger: Yeah. Mel, I think the answer to that is yes. But to make sure definitively, let me make sure that I have the authority from my client to do that and I'll tell you that between now and next week.

Mr. Clemens: Tell me that in case I've got to talk to him.

Mr. Dugger: I understand. Mel's been Mr. Fountain for a long, long time and I'm aware of that.

Mr. Clemens: You know, you go into these others, and I was over in Arlington and Dublin looking

at a few of their entrances and it looks nice.

Mr. Dugger: Mel, I don't disagree with you. I'm not going to stand here and argue with you about that. I think it's a good thought. And I just didn't remember to talk to my client about that knowing that you were going to ask the question. I should have. And I'll have that answer for you. When I get that answer for you, if it's okay Mel, I'll just direct it to you and we'll go from there.

Mr. Clemens: I appreciate it.

Mr. Dugger: Thank you very much.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mr. Dugger? (No response). If not, I'd like to move this on to Council for a third reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

That ends the Service Committee meeting at 7:55.

Service Committee

May 15, 2006

-- Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2006

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Brett Baxter. Antoinette Newman was absent.

Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph. William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor. Donna Shirey was absent.

Mr. Stake: I'd like to call to order the Finance Committee meeting at 7:56.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I have a couple of changes to the agenda this evening. First I'd like to remove, at the request of the Auditor, I'd like to remove item number 5 (Discussion: Appropriation of \$50,000 - payment/deductible - lawsuits), and send number 8 (AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 191.02, 191.04 AND 191.07) to Other Legislation. I don't believe we need a second for that. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held May 1, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Appropriation of \$125,000 - Taylor Square School TIF. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Just let me explain a little background on this particular request and the need for it. The way the Taylor Square TIF works, the Fairfield County Treasurer and Auditor collect the money from the taxes on that property. The taxes from the TIF district get sent to us. We pay the debt service out of those and any excess goes to the school board. When I got here in January, there was a property that had not, was in arrears on their property taxes down there, and with the help of the Fairfield County Treasurer and the Fairfield County Prosecuting Attorney, we were able to collect the money that was in arrears which was \$235,000. However, we appropriate money every year from this account because it is something, it is a fund and money has to be appropriated out of that just like there is out of the General Fund or any other fund. So when we got the excess money in and paid them, paid the excess to the school board back in April, we had used up almost the entire appropriation for the year in that account. There is actually no money coming out of this account that the city could spend any way. It's the school board's money, but we do have to appropriate the money that gives me the authority to pay the school when the Fall taxes come in in late September, early October, so that we can make that payment to them. So therefore, we're asking for the \$125,000 from the unappropriated Taylor Square TIF Fund to account number 970.002.5527 so that in October when we get that money in, we'll be able to forward that on to the school board. If there are any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Harris from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one. And how much is, of the debt retirement is being paid for by the TIF?

Mr. Harris: All of the debt service for the Taylor Square Bonds are being used to pay the debt service. So there's no money from the city going in to pay on those bonds. However, we did have to issue them and we are responsible for paying them as the paying agent. But as far as, there's no city money going into it. It's all being paid for out of the property taxes on the Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Taylor Square area.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I thought. Okay. Thank you Richard.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And so, Dick we're just working really as a pass through for the schools collecting the money and passing it on to them?

Mr. Harris: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. You don't need any kind of emergency language or anything on this?

Mr. Harris: We don't have to have it until October so there's really no reason to put this on any kind of fast track. We're trying to be a little up front here.

Mr. Stake: Good. Okay. If there aren't any more questions, then I will make a motion that we appropriate \$125,000 from the unappropriated Taylor Square School TIF Fund 970 to account number 970.002.5527. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). Send this on for its first reading. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 6 is Discussion, Supplemental appropriation, Civil Service Commission. I was asked to put this on this evening's agenda. And I thought it was important, so I did put it on this evening's agenda. In your packet, you received a letter from Robert Sanders, Civil Service Commission Chairman in regards to the Commission's budget that outlines the necessity of this. And requesting an appropriation of \$18,000 from the unappropriated General Fund for Civil Service Commission, \$17,000 for Testing, and \$1,000 for Office Supplies. And they're asking for emergency language to be provided here and ask for it to be passed on the second reading. I believe we do have Billie Reidel from the Civil Service Commission here. If there are any questions that folks may have, Billie would you like to come up please? Do you have anything you want to tell us before we get in with the questions?

Ms. Reidel: Questions might be easier. But just basically, we've spent almost \$15,000 from the beginning of the year for our Sergeant and Lieutenant assessments which is not a normal annual amount that we spend. So that took up half of our annual budget for testing. We've got what, 7½ more months left in the year with plenty more to do. So we just need to replace that money.

Mr. Stake: So with the promotions that we had, we needed more testing and then we're hiring the new officers which means that we need the additional money for the...

Ms. Reidel: Correct. It just took away from the normal funds. We do usually use our 30,000 a year for the testing which includes advertising for all of the positions throughout the year. And like I said, it's really expensive, the assessments. We don't have those every year, but we did have, since January, both Lieutenant and Sergeant assessments that totaled almost \$15,000, half of our annual budget. With the hiring of our new Police Officers, there's additional expenses involved in that that is required amounts for physicals, psychological exams that have to be done as a conditional offering for every officer that they select that they would like to hire. So we need to have that money that would normally be in the \$30,000. It's just simply that the Lieutenant and Sergeant assessments took up some of that funding.

Mr. Stake: And the reason for the emergency is for hiring purposes of Police Officers that can include enrollment at the Police Academy for the class starting in the Fall. So we want to be able to have that in place.

Ms. Reidel: Actually, the class starts in September but they have to have names to the academy by August. And you have to have actual names in place for them to be enrolled in the academy if need be. To do that, we're in the background stage right now with the top twenty some candidates. And the next stage of those that pass through that would be to do a conditional offering which is based on the physical and the psychological examination. So we need to be able to move forward with those quickly that we would have names to the academy by August 1 is our understanding. If this went through all of the readings, our understanding is, it would be maybe towards the middle of July. It doesn't happen often, but it could happen that you may send a candidate to the psychological or the fitness testing, and one of two things can happen. Actually three. One is that all goes well, and they're hired, and they accept the job, and sent to the academy, or start into the FTO Program if they don't have to go to the academy. Or they could not pass one of those tests. And then you have to start fresh and send another candidate forward. Or perhaps they end up taking a job elsewhere and they're in the midst of this. So you just have to provide enough room for that time wise and money wise should it happen. It doesn't happen often but you have to be prepared for that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes Chairman Stake. I have a couple of questions. First off, we talked about the new officers that we've just approved to be hired. When I spoke with the Chief, that was one of the questions that I had asked. That that legislation that we passed carried the funds to offer and pay for the psychological testing and the testing that was required. His answer to me was, yes. So it sounds like we've already paid for it, but we haven't.

Ms. Reidel: He just may not have been aware that those funds actually have to come. They're considered part of the Civil Service testing because they're part of a conditional offering to a candidate. So they actually come out of the Civil Service Funding. They may have the money in there, but I don't believe there's any way that you could transfer that money from the Police Department budget into the Civil Service account.

Mr. Baxter: He probably wasn't discussing the Civil Service side of it. When I asked the question, it didn't come out that way.

Mr. Stake: Right. I'm not sure the Chief is real familiar with the Civil Service budget and the things that are involved.

Ms. Reidel: Could be. And again, understand that the \$30,000 that is annual budgeted for our account would have been plenty of money to do all of this were it not for the assessments that we have just taken care of.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one more. The fact that, in the document that we read here that came to City Council, instead that since half of our normal budget has been spent, that implies that you still have half of your budget left. So why do we need an emergency?

Ms. Reidel: Well some is encumbered. As an example, we've spent \$5,000 thus far just to The Columbus Dispatch. We've had so many openings this year. An unusual amount of openings that we've had to advertise for. So just as an example, 5,000 of a purchase order just to Columbus Dispatch itself, is gone. And I'm sure between now and the end of the year, that we would have a need for that. More of that as well. And that just goes on and on. We've hired a Dispatcher since January that had these conditional offerings as well that we had to send to the psych and the fitness testing. And a Property Room Clerk is starting next Monday. We had a retirement in there as well. So there's other expenditures that have occurred from January up until now that took part of that money out as it normally would.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you for your time.

Ms. Reidel: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Do I hear any problems with the emergency language contained in this ordinance at this time from anybody on Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just a quick question, Mr. Stake. What's your intent on moving this through? Read the first reading, then have it passed? Or are we going to go through a couple of readings?

Mr. Stake: I think what they're asking for is to have a vote at the second reading.

Mr. Baxter: The second reading? I think that's acceptable.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions, comments? (No response). Alright then, I'll make a motion that we appropriate \$18,000 from the unappropriated General Fund for Civil Service Commission to the following accounts: \$17,000 to account number 110.534.5339, Testing. And \$1,000 to account number 110.534.5201, Office Supplies. I make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading, and also contain emergency language. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

And item number 7, Discussion, Police, and Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Study. This was added to the Finance Committee agenda, January 17. It's had some hearings. It's been held several times. Last time it was held was on May 1, 2006. At the last meeting, we had Mr. Stype here, who talked to us about different types of funding for various projects. Special assessments, Tax Increment Financing, Community Development Authorities, Community Authorities. And of course, we have our Impact Fee Study. So we have various way I guess, to do funding on these

things. Are there any questions, or comments, or observations from members of the committee at this time? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I think, since we have discussed this, and it's been a draft, I think I'm ready for it to be completed and the report to be made to us. I think everybody's agreeable.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. Mr. Clemens, I agree. I see Mr. Baxter over there shaking his head. I guess the rest of the members of Council. I guess Mr. Parkinson, if we could wrap this up, this study, get us the final version and whatever else you were contracted to do I guess to complete this. And I know that you folks did address some of the BIA questions. There were some legal questions in there. Maybe if you would, get with our City Attorney prior to the final copy to get those addressed and get that to us. And if there are no other questions or comments from members of the committee, or members of Council, or anybody else out there. Mr. Stearns, do you have a question or comment? Okay.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you Chairman Stake. My question is, did we ever establish the amount for the study? Has that been determined? Or is there a price tag on that?

Mr. Stake: I believe that was done last year I believe. Wasn't it? When we commissioned the study.

Mr. Clemens: Right. The appropriation you mean?

Mr. Stake: The appropriation was made.

Mr. Stearns: It was part of the appropriations last...

Mr. Stake: I believe that was done last year. We appropriated the money for this study I believe.

Mr. Clemens: I believe it was 40,000. Am I correct?

Mr. Baxter: 40,000. Correct. And it was done last year and paid for. We're just looking for the final I believe at this point.

Mr. Stake: Right.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Unless what Mr. Stearns is suggesting is, the discussion of the road side of it. That has not been paid for.

Mr. Stearns: I understand that.

Mr. Baxter: Or other sections that we have brought up in those conversations that are outside that scope. Correct?

Mr. Stake: Right. I don't believe we're going to commission a study on the roads at this time.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well then, I guess I'll make a motion we hold this for two more weeks and see if we can get the final information from EMH&T. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 8:10.

Finance Committee

May 15, 2006

- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)