SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 1, 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, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Baxter: Good evening. I'll call to order, the Safety Committee meeting at 7:33. And I apologize. I was actually waiting for Toni to start her meeting and realized she didn't have one. So I apologize. First item is the approval of agenda. And I need to make an amendment to the agenda. Number 7, I will ask that we take off the agenda. That actually doesn't belong in this committee. And I believe Mr. Clemens will be adding it to his agenda. I believe that takes a motion Nancy, correct?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So moved. Do I have a second? I have a second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

With that, I'll go to item number 3 which is approval of the minutes of the regular Safety Committee meeting held April 17, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion of Liquor Permit Request, transfer, from LARRIG PLL, a partnership dba Putters Pub to Uhrig LLC dba Putters Pub, 6014 E. Livingston Ave., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43232. And I believe I saw the Chief step in.

Chief Suciu: Yes, Chairman Baxter. We did a background check into this transfer of liquor permit, and find no reason to recommend holding up that transfer.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. So with that said, then we'll have no action on this item then. Thank you so much sir.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Authorization of Professional Engineering Services, Summit Rd. Bridge Reconstruction and appropriation of funds. Mayor, who do we have here to discuss this?

Mayor McPherson: Well, I'd be glad to answer any questions. I might add that we want to move forward with the engineering, but we've also had some issues come up with who's responsible for the actual construction. So as we go along, we'll be bringing some information back to City Council as to whether it's more in line with the County Engineer. We're still looking into several areas. Our Street Department and Safety/Service Director's looking into those issues. So we'd like to just go ahead and move forward at this point, and we'll discuss as we go along.

Mr. Baxter: So you would like me to move it to Council for a first reading?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. You can go ahead and move it for the first reading and then we'll bring it, by the next committee we should have some definitive answers.

Mr. Baxter: And we'll have some numbers and costs and stuff like that next time?

Mayor McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Then I can move it to Finance Committee for their review. Thank you very much. And with that said, unless there's any questions from committee? (No response). Council? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Mayor, I was going to ask you on this, I know you can check on it later, on this, are we allowed to use our Permissive Tax Funds on that bridge from Licking County?

Mayor McPherson: Well it's, I'm not sure. Those are some of the things we're looking into. The only definitive number that we have is, how much it's going to cost for the engineering. And that's why I say, you know, it's okay to move this forward. But there are some issues that you know, we need to discuss as we get a little bit further into it. We'll also make sure that that question's also answered.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: Mayor, it seems to me like we're not quite ready to move forward with this. Do we have language?

Mayor McPherson: Well, the engineering's going to have to be done one way or the other. So the language is...

Mr. Baxter: So it's just for the engineering at this point?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. That's all we're asking for is the engineering.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Then with that said, President Hills, I see you moving forward.

Mr. Hills: I believe that we were just sending it forward for first reading, right?

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: It was to come back and some of these will be answered. Because I would assume, that if for some reason, some of these answers are jurisdictional, and we don't have the jurisdiction, then somebody else will be paying the engineering.

Mayor McPherson: Well, I think the question is, we have jurisdiction, but should somebody else, either share in that jurisdiction or maybe have more of a jurisdiction than we do. So that's what we're looking into. And if you sent it, you know, if it goes for its first reading and goes back to committee, we should be able to have all of those answers within a couple of weeks.

Mr. Baxter: I think that's fair. I don't see a problem with that. Any other questions? Yes, Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I have a question. If we don't have total jurisdiction here, should we be paying all the engineering fees for the whole thing?

Mayor McPherson: Well, that's why I say, just send it for the first reading and if it turns out that we shouldn't be, then we'll just withdraw it.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Baxter: Would we not be able to just amend that legislation that you're working on at that point to be a percentage? Or make an agreement with the parties?

Mayor McPherson: Well, or we're nothing. We may not be responsible, period.

Mr. Baxter: Very good.

Mayor McPherson: And that's what we're looking at.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions from committee or from Council? (No response). Hearing none, I'll move that we send this to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item number 6 is Discussion, Authorization to advertise for bids for the 2006 Fireworks Display. And this is something that comes up each year. And I'm rather glad to see it hit us this soon because it usually comes to us like last minute. So it looks like we're doing our housekeeping on time this year. And I believe everything is in order on this. Is it not, Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. This will be our annual request to advertise for the bids for 2006 fireworks display.

Mr. Baxter: And with this said, if it went through its normal readings, when would we actually be doing the advertising?
Mayor McPherson: We probably, it's probably going to be awfully close.

Mr. Baxter: I was just looking at the calender and see what's ________________.

Mayor McPherson: It could go for a couple of readings. But if we could add an emergency to it after the second reading.

Mrs. Frazier: It's just a motion.

Mayor McPherson: Oh, it's a motion. Well then, we don't need to. I'm sorry.

Mr. Baxter: You don't need that then. Okay.

Mr. Hills: I think it is a motion.

Mayor McPherson: I was thinking it was an ordinance.

Mr. Hills: It's a motion. But also I believe, in the notice to bidders, they're due by May 18. And I think you can open the bids right after that. Is that going to give enough time if this is passed on May 8? Are you meeting your legal limits on notice?

Mayor McPherson: Probably not.

Mrs. Frazier: I think that when they submitted this, they thought they had it in time for the last committee, which they didn't. So they're going to have to adjust the times that they're advertising in the paper. But I think they still have enough time to pull it off.

Mr. Hills: But for our purposes, to get the advertisements, would be a different motion. But I have a feeling that next week we'll see a different date on the notice to bidders sheet.

Mr. Baxter: Notice to bidder. Right. That's one of the things I would bring to attention. I looked at this and it didn't seem like we had time.

Mr. Hills: Correct, Mrs. Frazier? Isn't that what you're saying also?

Mrs. Frazier: That comes from the Service Department. I'm sure they'll adjust this.

Mayor McPherson: We'll have to adjust it for the next week.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So if you'd bring that to Mrs. Reichard's attention, then we can make that adjustment for next week. So with that, I'll move, unless there's any other questions from committee or Council? (No response). I'll move that we send this to Council for its first reading.

Mr. Hills: No. It's a motion. So it's just one reading.

Mr. Baxter: Oh it's just one reading. Right. Send the motion to Council. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake was the second on that.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Stake was the second on that. I looked at him and didn't acknowledge him. I apologize Mr. Stake.

Number 8 is AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING A REQUEST TO THE OHIO BOARD OF BUILDING STANDARDS TO CERTIFY THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG FOR ENFORCEMENT OF THE RESIDENTIAL CODE OF OHIO TO EXERCISE ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY AND ACCEPT AND APPROVE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS, AND MAKE INSPECTIONS. It had its second reading on 4-24-06. I see our Chief Building Official coming up right now.

Mr. Hopper: Good evening. As we discussed in previous meetings, this is something that has been brought down by the State of Ohio. It will be in effect on the 27th of May of this year. At that point in time, we will have to start enforcing the State Residential Building Code. Our enforcement depends on Council recognizing the City of Reynoldsburg Building Department as a residential Building Department. And as we've discussed Mr. Baxter, last week, that we wanted to add some emergency with some time constraints that we're under. I still have to make application to the Board of Building Standard for certification, and would like to start that process just as soon as I can.

Mr. Baxter: And this also Chet, has to do with giving you the ability to get certified, correct?

Mr. Hopper: Just the department certified. The inspectors and myself already have applied for our residential certification to do the inspections and everything that goes along with that.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Nancy, do I need to adjust this here, or can we have that language changed for next week?

Mrs. Frazier: The language is actually in there. You just need to add it in the title.

Mr. Baxter: Add it to the title. Okay. Very good.

Mrs. Frazier: And then you'll amend it at the table.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Then I'll do that at the time that we go to pass next week.

Mrs. Frazier: You want to send it out of committee with a recommendation for emergency.
Mr. Baxter: Thank you very much. Do I have any questions from committee? (No response). From Council? (No response). Hearing none, then I'll go ahead and recommend we send this to Council with an amendment to the language of the title to add emergency language and recommend adoption. Do I have a second? I see Mr. Stake raising his hand. Second with Mr. Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And since you're standing up there already, we'll move on to item number 9 which is also in your area Chet. And it's ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REPEALING AND REPLACING CHAPTER 1325 <u>1999 OHIO RESIDENTIAL CODE FOR 1, 2, AND 3 FAMILY DWELLINGS</u>. Second reading was on 4-24-06.

Mr. Hopper: This is just following up with item number 8. The state has adopted a Residential Code. With us being a certified department, we have to enforce what the state recommends without any amendments to that code. And we'd like to be able to enforce that code.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And there were some changes that were presented to us that were in our packet and I wanted to make sure that all members of committee and Council have had an opportunity to read those and understand them and ask any questions. So members of the committee, any questions? (No response). They seem very straight forward to me. And to Council? (No response). And do we have the situation here with emergency on this as well or not?

Mr. Hopper: No. I think this will have plenty of time once we get it adopted to go through its 30 days.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And as it turns out, this has had its second reading on 4-24. So unless there's any other questions. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. It's my understanding Chet, that the questions we asked and so forth, and the things we wanted to add will be coming later if they'll amend it. After we adopt it.

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. We're talking two different things now. This is the Building Code. And the things that I'm following up with that I still have to work on, continuing to work on are with the Property Maintenance Code.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: And that's correct. We still have quite a bit of work to do with the Property Maintenance Code that we'll be working on throughout the rest of the year to get it cleaned up.

Mr. Hopper: Some clean up work.

Mr. Baxter: And that is not this piece of legislation. With that said, if there are no other additional questions, I'll then recommend that we send this to Council with a recommendation of adoption for its third reading. Second? Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. I thank you for your service sir.

Item number 10 is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: CHAPTER 160 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION, SECTION 160.02 "Authorized Positions, Personnel, Classification and Pay Grade" Subsection (f), AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. Second reading on 4-10-06. We held the item at our last committee meeting on 4-17. And it was to give us an opportunity to get a better feel for what was happening with this. And also, to give me additional time to work with the Chief and get a better feeling for what the expectations were. With that said, a couple of things that were identified, bring the committee up to speed here is that the next class for our officers is in August, about mid-August. And that in essence, what we would try to do is bring some officers in as a lateral. Which means if we have some great candidates, we'd like to bring them in directly and immediately. The legislation also carries the dollars to be able to outfit the officer completely. So there wouldn't be additional funds coming from that. And with that also said, that we have the funds today to afford these officers. But next year that may not be the case. And so there were concerns on my part, and other Council members have expressed their concern that if we hired on these officers and the other positions, would we have the funds to support them? So we really do need to work hard here to be able to get the funding we need for next year. And I think it's a positive that this city values its Police Department and looks to the fact that we know we have a need. And that we need to pass this type of legislation now to get the officers on board as soon as possible. And I know the Chief and I worked on that over the last week to see how soon could we pull people in. And how would they be utilized? And how would they best help the city? And I think I had my answers. And I thank you Chief for your time. And Mayor, also for your time as well. Do we have any questions from committee? (No response). Everybody's good? (No response). Any questions from Council? (No response). Boy, it's awful quite tonight. With that said then, I'm going to go ahead and send this piece of legislation to Council for its third and final reading with a recommendation from the Chair that it is passed. Do I have a second? Councilman Stake. Thank you. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. And I thank you for your time.

I'll now close the Safety Committee meeting at 7:49.

Safety Committee
May 1, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 1, 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, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:50.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I have two additions. First, number one, I would like to remove from Other Legislation, item number 1 (Discussion item, Special Exception Use Permit for the Calvary International Worship Center, Inc.). Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye").

The second item is add as 3a, Rejection of Taylor Road Sanitary Sewer. That would be item 3a. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted “Aye”). Thank you. Are there any other items anybody would like to add to the agenda? (No response). If not, we’ll move on.

The next item is approval of the minutes of April 17, 2006 Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they’ll stand approved.

Next item 3a, Legislation to reject the bids for the sanitary sewer extension, Taylor Road. I think because they all came in at 10% over.....

Mayor McPherson: This was slightly over. I believe it came in at like 12% over. Is that correct, Dave?

Mr. Parkinson: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mayor McPherson: Roughly 12% over. So we’re requesting to reject it.

Mr. Clemens: I’d like to do this in two sections. Yes, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: I heard the 10% last week, and maybe 20. The bids came in, the lowest bid was 30% over the engineering estimate. And that was one of the concerns I had is, is there something for a timing of our bidding that we would be 30% off? And I’m sure Dave doesn’t have an answer tonight. But I hear the 10%, we’ve got a 10% tolerance. And then I guess the reference was, was that 10% or another 10%? But it was actually 30% over engineers estimate. Was this just a bad year or bad timing on the bids? Or do we have any idea?

Mayor McPherson: I’m not sure we’ve even looked that up yet. Have we Dave?

Mr. Hills: That much over, if we’re going to rebid this, maybe we ought to be looking at the engineers estimate. Wouldn’t you think David?

Mr. Parkinson: We will revisit the engineers estimate. We’ll discuss with the bidders that submitted a price to us what their primary issues were. I think it was, we probably underestimated the difficulty of this project. And in light of how little sewer pipe was being put in the ground, that reflected largely upon the enterprises that were provided and it came in a much higher price.

Mr. Hills: Sorry, Mr. Clemens. That was being discussed....

Mayor McPherson: When that report is completed, we’ll make sure you get a copy of it as to what the reasons were for the high discrepancy. It clearly was over the 10% which is what we’re dealing with.

Mr. Clemens: I’d like to send to Council, a motion to reject the bids. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted “Aye”).

The next section is, Authorize the rebid, Taylor Road Sanitary Sewer Extension. Did you want to go ahead with that right now Mayor? I had some questions on it. The question was, how are we going to pay for it? Do we have the money and so forth?

Mayor McPherson: If we could, let's hold that for two weeks.

Mr. Clemens: That will be fine.

Mayor McPherson: I appreciate that.

Mr. Clemens: We'll hold the second part, to rebid for two weeks. Thank you, Mayor.

Next item, ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT AN APPLICATION FOR ANNEXATION OF 79.1+/- ACRES IN ETNA TOWNSHIP, COUNTY OF LICKING, STATE OF OHIO, TO THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO (Harrison W. Smith, Jr., agent for petitioners (Harvey)). It had its second reading 4-24-06. Do I have any questions from the committee on this issue? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion we send this to Council for its third reading for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

That ends the Service Committee meeting at 7:55. Thank you.

Service Committee
May 1, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 1, 2006

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman.
Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph, Council President William L. Hills. Donna Shirey was absent.

Mr. Stake: And I would like to call to order, the Finance Committee at 7:56.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I want to switch some things around here tonight if I could. I invited a Mr. Stype. Is he here? He's here. To come speak with us in regards to the Impact Fee Study. And I'd like to move item number 6 to 3a. I don't believe I need a second on that. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

The next item is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held April 17, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item 3a is the Discussion, Police and Parks and Recreation Impact Fee Study. It was added to the agenda January 17, 2006. And was held several times, and is back here this evening. First I'd like to start off discussing that, or add to that, discussing the New Community Authorities which Mr. Gregory Stype with Squire, Sanders and Dempsey will talk with us this evening about. Please come forward Mr. Stype. Good evening. Thanks for coming tonight. The members, in your packets this weekend, you should have received some copies of the presentation that Mr. Stype is going to do this evening. And Mr. Stype, go right ahead.

Mr. Stype: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be with you this evening. It's been a little while, so it's nice to come back and see some familiar faces as well as some new faces. You have the handout materials. I wanted to go through that briefly, highlight a couple of items, because I understand this idea has come up in the context of your consideration of Impact Fees and other alternatives. And then if I may, spend the majority of my brief time with you this evening on the last page. Because as I indicated to Councilman Stake when we spoke briefly on the phone, I think the best way to understand what New Community Authorities are and what they can do, is not by the sterile outline, but by the real world examples of where they've been used, and proposed, and how they've been implemented. But with that in mind, New Community Authorities have existed in Ohio law since the late 1960's when the law was drafted to facilitate a new Community Development in the Dayton area. At the time New Community Authorities were put into law, it was very fashionable to ask the question, what might cities become if instead of allowing them to evolve over the forces of history and the economy over say, 100 years, we instead let the urban planners go to work and put down brand new towns where they didn't exist previously? In fact, that notion was so much in vogue, that the federal government at the time, actually had grants given out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development which were designed to facilitate that notion. Out of that notion, we got communities like Rustin, Virginia, and Columbia, Maryland. Which were these new towns on their grandest scales that developed and became successes today. That was actually a feature of the statute that was enacted in the late 1960's. There was a requirement, that in order to use that statute, you must have one of these federal grants. And so, the project went forward in Dayton. At the time, because of other projects I was working on, I went back and read our firms files on this subject and it appears to me that at some point, the developer got frustrated dealing with all of the grants requirements, threw up his hands and said, that's it, I'm done, and walked away. And within a period of a few years, due to some very modest federal budget deficits, there were some cutbacks in federal funding, particularly directed at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. And these grants disappeared. So what we had was, one experiment in Ohio with this statute. Then the grants disappeared in probably the mid 1970's. And so the statute became completely dormant because you need a federal grant to activate it again. That was generally the condition of things until a project called New Albany came along in the late 1980's. And at that time, the question was presented, how is it that we have this kind of residential development, and at the same time insure that public infrastructure and public services keep up with that residential development rather than experiencing what we've seen elsewhere in Central Ohio which is that general, the public side always struggles to keep up with the pace in private development during robust economic times? And as part of that process, a lengthy list of options was developed. And through a process of evaluating each of those options and crossing them off because they all had various infirmities, the last option on the list was New Community Authorities. Except we had this requirement in the statute that you had to have a federal grant that no longer exists. Well, laws are made to be revisited and changed from time to time. And since those grants didn't exist, there was a request made to the General Assembly to please modify the statute to eliminate the federal grant requirement. And when that was accomplished, we had the first New Community Authority in Ohio, the modern version. And that would be the New Albany Community Authority which was responsible for funding the new high school campus in New Albany, the road that runs in front of the high school, about half of the cost of the township fire station, and about half of the cost of the initial township fire truck. So that's a very brief history of New Community Authorities in Ohio. Let's move away from history for a moment in my examples, and let me give you a couple of highlights about how Community Authorities function and operate. They obviously exist to form private/public partnerships in support of residential development in bringing the right combination of resources together to address related sets of needs. They are created by a developer/land owner filing a petition asking that the New Community Authority be created. That petition is filed and generally approved by a Board of County Commissioners. Although, if the New Community Authority is exclusively in the largest city of the county, it can be approved by that city's Council instead. A New Community Authority is governed by a Board of Trustees that ranges from 7 to 13 members. The number of members is selected in the petition that is filed to create the New Community Authority. Generally, the size of those boards stays at the low end. Seven or nine members just because of the practical considerations of getting the group together when needed, sending out the meeting notices, and having a manageable size for these purposes. And those members govern the Community Authority on a regular basis. Obviously, when you're speaking or talking about Impact Fees, the question becomes, what's the equivalent? How does a Community Authority generate its revenue that's used to build schools, and roads, and so forth? Generally speaking, that is accomplished through the device of the New Community Authorities community development charge. Now in most cases, that community development charge looks, acts, smells, walks, and quacks, like (Tape Change). Although it is not a property tax. It's an assessment for a community development charge. Because as we all know, to have a tax, you have to vote on it in Ohio. But because the Community Authority begins with a developer saying, this is my land, I see the benefits of having this land pay a charge so that I can continue my development and unlock that developmental value. That's not a tax. That's someone volunteering to have property they own submitted to a Community Authority and a community development charge, and that becomes a source of revenue that can go on for, usually a minimum of 20 years, but maybe much longer, but certainly, as long as is needed to support the public improvements that are identified in the petition that was submitted to create the Community Authority in the first instance. So skipping over the rest of the sterile outline, let's turn to the last page and briefly review how Community Authorities have been used. Because reading the statute really won't reveal this to you because the statute is intended to be broad and enabling in its nature. Not a set of handcuffs. We have the New Albany Community Authority that we'll briefly review. It basically used a community development charge that began at a rate of 9.75 mills to finance the public improvements that you're probably familiar with. At the other extreme, and among the most recent examples of Community Authorities, is the River South Authority that was created for re-development in downtown Columbus. The River South Authority is actively engaged in the conversion of the Lazarus building into its new future uses. It is different than most Community Authorities because it does not have a community development charge. Rather, it is a financing conduit for the City of Columbus. It issued 40 million dollars of bonds two years ago. Another 40 million dollars of bonds last year. All of those dollars are being used to renovate the Lazarus building. A portion of the land under the Lazarus building is leased to the City of Columbus. And the City of Columbus in turn makes lease rental payments to the authority sufficient to pay the debt service on those bonds. That is all because the City of Columbus identified a high priority to revitalize and redevelop downtown and committed the financial resources over time to that purpose. And the Community Authority enables that to be leveraged into the bond issues and the renovation of the Lazarus building. One of the examples that you may be most interested in, in coming from the perspective of Impact Fees, would be the Columbus Pay As You Grow Community Authorities which are occurring in the northwest and the northeast portions of Columbus right now. Columbus for example, annexed about 2800 acres of ground in the northwest last year. And as you may have seen in the newspapers or otherwise be acquainted, the Mayor of Columbus said, if we're going to have these kinds of major annexations, they need to help pay for the public infrastructure that is necessitated by that kind of residential development. And so a package was put together of financial tools to support in the northwest, about 30 million dollars of road improvements. Some that made up for being behind the curve in the northwest. If you drive down Sawmill Road at busy times, you're aware of that. And others that were designed to deal with the affect of the proposed new development. That combination of resources was residential TIF's, one time payments by the residential developers each time they drew a housing permit on a roof top basis, and a 4 mill Community Authority charge. The combination of those resources was agreed upon between the City of Columbus and the residential developers. And they signed the memorandum of understanding and an agreement, and that became part of the final zoning approval process for that area. Now needless to say, a 4 mill community development charge will not support 30 million dollars of road improvements. Some of the biggest bang in that financial package is actually the residential TIF's. But one of the advantages of the Community Development charge is that it can be used more broadly than a TIF and it lasts longer than an Impact Fee. Customarily, Impact Fees are that one time, up front payment when you draw a Building Permit. Not a long term stream of revenue. And customarily, those kinds of payments will give you some cash in the coffers. But like a Tax Increment Financing payment, they are only available for capital purposes, and only municipal capital purposes. Two things that a Community Authority can do with its charge that take you a step beyond those kinds of restrictions are first of all, it can be used to help support operation and maintenance for facilities that serve that developing area. And the second thing is, it can be used for more than municipal purposes. And there, we need only point to the high school in New Albany. You can take it a step beyond municipal purposes and look at other public governmental purposes as well. So that's briefly what Columbus is doing on the pay as you grow front. The Millstone Community Authority and the Newark/Granville Community Authority, which are on your list, also illustrate those school purposes being supported. Both of these Community Authorities are charges on comparatively small residential developments that are devoted exclusively to being payments to the overlapping school system to help absorb some of the cost of those new residential developments that are in the neighborhood of 200 to 400 acres, and building out over time. One in Westerville. One in a small portion of the Granville School District that overlaps with the City of Newark. And therefore, introduced higher density residential development into that school district for the first time. You all may recall some of the controversy in the newspaper about that about 10 years ago when the school district was attempting to resist that annexation. But the laws of Ohio didn't permit school districts to be successful at that time. Another Community Authority returning to the more traditional use, in fact, the next 3 return to that use, are the Pinnacle Community Authority down in Grove City, and the Liberty and Powell Community Authorities up in the northern reaches of Franklin County. Those Community Authorities were generally used for road construction in support of these major new residential developments in each of these areas. And part of what they illustrate is the range of the community development charge. At least the charge that could be supported at the time these developments were building out. So we had the example of the New Albany Community Authority charge being 9.75 mills. And now we have the example of the Liberty Community Authority charge being 8.75 mills. And the Powell Community Authority charge being 10.25 mills. So that gives you some sense. Since this all starts with a developers petition of what the developer felt the market would bear for that price point in that location in those circumstances in terms of a community development charge. But again, unlike an Impact Fee, this is a charge that sustains over time. Most of these programs were designed so that the charge will last anywhere from 20 to 30 years depending upon the particulars of the petition. And finally, there's one more school Community Authority in the picture in Central Ohio and that's Gahanna Schools Community Authority that's listed last on the page. And that's 2 mills for 30 years. So I hope what I've been able to do is give you some sense of the variety of Community Authorities that exist out there and how they've been applied. Sometimes to huge land masses such as New Albany which is now 5,000 acres. And on other occasions to much smaller land masses. But generally speaking, all either to support schools or for a range of Capital Improvements based on a sustained revenue stream over time. So I hope that also helps you contrast the Community Authority charge with Impact Fees or these one time fees, or for that matter, one other small point, but important point of contrast is, of course the difference between a Community Authority charge and a residential TIF, is a residential TIF is revenue neutral to the property owner. It's taking tax dollars that will be paid in any event and altering their application. The Community Authority charge is not revenue neutral to the property owners. It is a payment that is required to be made above and beyond the payments that would otherwise be made as tax payments on the property. And let me offer you one last thought on some of these Community Authorities because we're always attracted to that which is new and novel. But I know you also in your community, have experience with special assessments. And one thing I always urge when we're thinking about, how do we pay for public improvements, and how do we make that connection between new development on the one hand and public improvements on the other hand? Let's not get so caught up in the flavor of the month as I refer to it, that we don't also remember the long array of traditional public finance tools that we have available to effectively accomplish the same purpose in targeted circumstances. Many of these projects involve several public improvements being dealt with together. But if for example, it's a road improvement that's being made in connection with a new development, in addition to all of these choices that you now have in front of you, you have the tried and true choices of things like special assessments that have been successfully used and tested for decades in Ohio. And with that, I will stop talking and I will be delighted to answer your questions.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Stype. I enjoyed reading your presentation here and appreciate you coming and speaking with us this evening. I guess a couple of things I could point out, and correct me if I'm wrong, Community Authority versus Impact Fees, a developer would be entering into this voluntarily. Whereas with Impact Fees, they wouldn't be.

Mr. Stype: Well, I only pause in that regard. And I think perhaps it's the Columbus pay as you grow, is illustrative on this point. The Community Authority for the pay as you grow came out of the zoning process. It came out of the give and take between developers and their desire to move ahead with residential development on the one hand, and the fact that the City of Columbus had something they needed on the other hand, which was accepting the annexation and doing the rezoning. It may be voluntary in the sense of signing on the line, but it's a process of negotiation and give and take that results in several of these Community Authorities. And sometimes enlightened self interest.

Mr. Stake: And I'm not sure whether the carrot or the stick is used. But there's a little bit of that for probably both of those involved in this. Can Community Authorities be developed in conjunction with commercial development?

Mr. Stype: Yes. As an example, the New Albany business campus that you're probably familiar with, the properties there pay the Community Authority charge. So it's an example of it being applied in those circumstances though New Albany certainly started out as a residential development as it evolved to office and commercial. Those properties, even though they might be subject to a tax incentive of one kind or another, still paid the community development charge.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I'll open up questions from the committee. Are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee at this time? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Other than, I want to thank you too. I enjoyed your presentation. I look at it as kind of for a bigger project. I see Columbus ___________ acres and New Albany's encompasses 5,000 acres. And I can understand how that would work. But I don't understand how it would work on 60 acres. It seems like a lot of things to go through for 60 acres or 80 acres or something like that.

Mr. Stype: Well clearly, and this may be one of those cases where things like special assessments or other tools that are a little more scalable may come to mind. Because it is certainly true that Community Authorities bring things that special assessments don't bring. For governance, you handle special assessments. For Communities Authorities and community development charges, you have this Board of Trustees. And so there's an investment of time and effort. And I should emphasize a minimal amount of staffing involved. Usually these things run piggy backed on other existing kinds of public government functions. The school treasurer, or the municipal finance officer will have a lot to do with their day to day operation in overlapping kinds of circumstances. But certainly, there is a point at which you're so small that it's hard to justify these extra layers and effort.

Mr. Clemens: I can see say, 150 acres, 200 acres. We require them to do it all infrastructure. Lighting, streets, everything within their area of which they build. Unless you were running new roads to it or something like that and improving something that went to it, which I see Columbus would be and New Albany would be, that would be what you would use it for. Because you couldn't use it on the ____________. You couldn't use it on the interior because it's being paid for by the owner to start with unless you would change our whole system.

Mr. Stype: There are circumstances, and this is a question of what's in the mutual interest of the public body and the developer. But if you look at Pinnacle for example. Pinnacle, all of the infrastructure is being paid for through the Community Authority. It's a pretty substantial, almost self-contained, residential development that you see off I-71 headed south. And what that tells you is, the developer there decided that they had a choice. The traditional choice is to pay for those interior roads. The developer pays for them out of their pocket and they recover it in the sales price. What these examples would tell you is, a number of folks who are sophisticated in our real estate market have said, it is beneficial instead to view this like a special assessment to pay for some of that infrastructure supporting it from this charge. And then to have the charge paid by whoever purchases the ground for the next 20 years until those things are paid off. And I offer that not to suggest that it's good, bad, or indifferent, but just to illustrate the variety of approaches that can be taken with Community Authority.

Mr. Clemens: It would look to me like that would be paying for the developers instead of the developer paying for it. Really it's an assessment to the people that buy it. There's two ways to do it.

Mr. Stype: Yeah. It's two ways of getting to the same destination at the end of the day. But to your point about scale, because that was an important point you raised, there are the examples here of the Millstone Community Authority which is 136 acres. So fairly small by comparison. The Newark/Granville Community Authority started out about that size.

Mr. Clemens: That's the schools.

Mr. Stype: Right. Some hope of enlarging that. In the Gahanna Schools Community Authority, it's probably about comparable size. That's the back third of the Lucent site that's being developed residentially. So just to illustrate. But you're absolutely right. There is a point below which it's hard to justify the extra flavors.

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

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. A couple of questions. And I think we've made assumptions here and I want to make sure they're valid assumptions. First off, when a Community Authority is created, those funds that are raised must go back into that community that it encompasses. That would be the first assumption.

Mr. Stype: They need to be in support of that development. And I'm choosing my words carefully because I want to be clear that since this is a consensual arrangement, since the developer signs the petition, if the developer says, you know, my new development is going to congest this existing intersection over here that's outside of the development. And at some point, of this congestion, it's too bad. People aren't going to continue to buy houses over here in my development phase 3. Under those circumstances, a developer can step back and look at that and say, one of the public improvements that I want to put on my list for my petition is to take some money from over here and make sure this intersection over here continues to accommodate traffic so that I can continue to be successful in my residential ___________. So that's an example of an off site.

Mr. Baxter: Would you then also agree that police enforcement would also be another one of those areas that you would say, we know this area's going to be congested. We know this area's going to have a lot of traffic and hence, potential crime will increase. Thereby putting a larger burden on the police force. Could we then use funds there to augment our police force by adding additional officers and presence in that area?

Mr. Stype: That is a, generally I would say the answer to that question is yes. It remains a challenging puzzle to make sure that you're applying that augmentation to that area and doing it in a way that's acceptable from a community wide prospective because police are a community wide resource. The easier example might be in a very large kind of development where you get into like 2800 acres in the City of Columbus and somebody says you know, that's so far out. We need a police sub-station. Because now I have something physical that I can point to and say there's a cost associated with that structure, and there's a cost associated with manning that structure. And I offer that, not to say there aren't different ways to approach and think about it, but rather, that's the easiest, I think clearest, example from which you would work if you wanted to explore other options.

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

Mr. Baxter: Yes sir. I have one more question. That's dealing with encompassing the boundaries of the property we're talking about. And can those boundaries include existing development? Or do you have to exclude those and only be portions of which you're now trying to do a new development on?

Mr. Stype: Since it's a matter of ____________, the property ____________ be the developers or be the subsequent buyers have to consent to their property being included. Generally, what will be included as undeveloped ground or ground that has a plan for redevelopment. But it won't be an existing parceled off neighborhood or well developed business kind of __________.

Mr. Baxter: And he __________ exactly where I was heading with that. So if you were looking to do a redevelopment of an area, let's say an area that needs improvements at its infrastructure. Improvements to bring the neighborhood back as an example. If those neighbors decided to go create an authority, then they would have that ability to generate revenue for their neighborhood and then help themselves.

Mr. Stype: Yes. It would be, because of the numbers involved, probably a more time consuming and complicated approach. And depending upon what kind of assistance they were seeking, that's an example where if, what we were looking for were new sidewalks, or new street lights, or something like that where I would suggest we also turn our attention to thinking seriously about a petition for special assessment.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any other questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If I could just make one more point, I think may be correct but you'll correct me if I'm wrong, I think in relation to Impact Fees, Impact Fees are very narrow in scope and what the fees can be used for. These are a little bit broader. There's a little more leeway here.

Mr. Stype: I think so. Because Impact Fees of course, are born, they're not statutory in Ohio. They're case law. But they're born of this burden benefit connection. So to impose a regime of Impact Fees involves a process of undertaking studies and making those connections. And then each time the fee is applied, it's necessary to pause and make certain that you are staying consistent with the underlying studies. And Impact Fees I think, generally fair to say, are imposed. And thus, there is a danger that they will be challenged. And you need to be rigorous in the circumstances in which you use them and how you spend that money. Since new Community Authorities, in the circumstances we've been talking about, are a product of give and take, and ultimate agreement. That naturally leads to a little more flexibility about how they can at the end, be applied.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. If there aren't any more questions, thank you. Oh, you had another question, Mr. Baxter?

Mr. Baxter: Just real quickly. You said developers are the ones that initiate the action to create the authorities. Are they the only, the property owner is the only ones that do that? Because you mentioned with the city and with other, do you have like a cooperative where you would come together on that?

Mr. Stype: Oh, yeah. I mean, the petition is the formal result of the give and take. Everyone sits down and says, you need this, we need that. Is there a middle ground? Can we put all the pieces together? And when we know what the pieces are, they get captured in that petition that is then processed to create the Community Authority. So all of these Community Authorities are, it doesn't begin with the petition. The petition's the first formal step. But there's always a lot of thought and discussion that goes into it up to that point to put the right ingredients together as a matter of mutual interest.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Stype. Mr. Stearns, go right ahead.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Mr. Stake. One question I have is about Recreation and Parks. Could you elaborate on that and tell us how that would work? You said there were maybe some situations compared to the police in an area like that.

Mr. Stype: Well, certainly in most neighborhoods, there will be parks serving those neighborhoods either in the neighborhood. In which case, you have the physical cost of establishing the park and equipping the park. Or you may have a park nearby that you look at and say, there's that much more demand, there are these many more kids who need swings, and we need to start adding some things to those existing parks. So certainly, if that's an identified need, these dollars, on a consensual basis could be applied to those kinds of purposes. And I would expect that many developers would look at that and say, that's important. That's an amenity. It helps me sell houses. So I'm willing to make that connection and support that amenity.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions? (No response). Thank you very much, Mr. Stype, for coming here this evening and speaking to us about Community Authorities.

Mr. Stype: It's a pleasure. You know where I live. You have my number. I'd be delighted to answer further questions as they occur. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. I wanted to introduce this tonight because we did have the Impact Fee Study done, and we looked at possibly having a Road Impact Fee Study done, and then this came up after that. And we're always struggling to figure out how we're going to pay for new development, infrastructure in new developments. And I think after hearing Mr. Stype this evening, we have special assessments. We have TIF's. We have Impact Fees. We have Community Authorities, and there may be some others that we're not aware of. So I guess we need to consider all of those in conjunction with our Impact Fee Study. In getting back to that other, are there any questions from members of the committee or comments in regards to the Impact Fee Study? (No response). We did get some answers back. The Building Industry Association had submitted some questions. EMH&T had answered most of those questions. There are some legal questions I guess, that need to be addressed. I will sit down with the City Attorney and see when he might be able to address those for us. In the mean time, if there isn't anything else in regards to the Impact Fees, if we could just hold this for a couple of more weeks. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: The only thing I have to say about the Impact Fee is, I'm kind of waiting to see what we do on the other legislation as far as this is concerned. Because we are thinking about putting other legislation on the ballot to take care of some of our problems that would have been taken care of with an Impact Fee.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, my recommendation this evening would be to hold this for two weeks at this time. And if there's no objection, I will make a motion then that we hold this for two weeks. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, item number 4, Discussion, Approval of two appointments to the Licking County Tax Incentive Review Council. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: This is the request to appoint Jed Hood, who is our City Attorney, and John A. Brandt, who is our Development Director, to two year terms on the Licking County Tax Incentive Review Council. As is most of the time the case, I have appointed them, but the appointment has to now be approved by City Council. So I'm here tonight requesting that you approve the appointment of those two individuals to the Licking County Tax Incentive Review Council.

Mr. Stake: Okay Thank you, Mayor. Mrs. Frazier, this would be a motion?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Are there any questions or comments for the Mayor from members of the committee? (No response). Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, Chairman Stake. The question I have is, _______ to our Auditor. Is he part of this as well? And should be potentially?

Mayor McPherson: Well, what I tried to do is pick our legal counsel and the Development Director. Because if you read this, it's pretty clear that it deals with Enterprise Zone, Community Reinvestment Areas, and Interacts with the Licking County Commissioners. So, it is the Mayor's appointment and I felt those were two very, very good individuals to appoint.

Mr. Baxter: No disagreement in that. I didn't know if it was also outside of that purview that maybe the Auditor would be part of that board or some other type of request.

Mayor McPherson: Like it says, it deals with job creation, retention, investment, things like that which kind of fit in to the other bailiwick I think. But there's not a whole lot of finance to it.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments, members of the committee? (No response). Then I will recommend that Council approve this motion. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And item number 5, our final item this evening is Discussion, Revenue Enhancement. This was listed at my request on April 17 and held. And I see Mr. Harris is up here. He has been kind enough to get us some legislation drafted and get it to us over the weekend. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Mr. Stake. First of all, I'd like to thank Chris Franzmann at Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, Mrs. Frazier, and Brenda Browning, our Tax Administrator who worked with me on this to make this possible. With the short amount of time as Council had expressed some interest in the August 8 ballot, we only have until May 25 to get this passed, get this to the Board of Elections with all the proper language. And as I got involved with this, I found this was a fairly complicated process. So let me take just a few minutes to go over this with you. In order to take this to the ballot, the first thing you have to do is, you have to pass a resolution asking that this go to the ballot. And that is the first page here of the handout that you have in the resolution declaring the necessity of election on the question of approving passage of an ordinance to amend the certain sections of the current Reynoldsburg Tax Code. Basically, we took the tax code, and every place where the 1.5% was in there, we changed that to 2%. Now the reason this is done this way is, Council does not have the authority to pass the ordinance to do that. So therefore, the resolution says, we would like authority from the voters to pass an ordinance. So the ordinance is also listed in here as well. If you get permission from the voters on August 8, this can be passed and take effect in January 1 of '07. So it is kind of an unusual process. You have to pass the, you have to bring the motion forward, and then also read the ordinance. And once the ordinance is read, the motion is passed, then the ordinance goes to Other Legislation to see what happens with the ballot issue. So what we've done here is, the first part is the language that will actually appear on the ballot. And the last page of this actually shows the ballot, next to the last page, shows the ballot language and what it will say. We took from what Council had said and put the purpose of providing funds to pay general operating cost of the city's Division of Police and to pay cost of Capital Improvements improved by the city after December 31, 2006. The reason that particular language was put in there, there may be in the future, some kind of improvements that Council would like that would have to be bonded. And we wanted to make sure there was nothing to stop Council from using these funds to pay bond debt service on anything that they would do in the future. So that was the reason that was put in there as part of the Capital Improvements part of this legislation. That's basically the way it works. If there's any questions that maybe I can answer, I'll certainly be glad to try.

Mr. Stake: Are there any questions for Mr. Harris in regards to the wording, and I guess the coordination of these two items? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. The only question I have, and I read through this, where we had pay cost of those Capital Improvements. And we may also wish to have those same type of services if we wish to reach out for future revenue that we know that's coming. That way maybe we'll be able to get the officers sooner for example. So in 2007, if we were able to put a bond out and say for 2007 fund it fully for officers, for vehicles, for whatever else we needed, knowing that that revenue could come in the future, would it not make sense to also, or not to limit it to just Capital Improvements, but Capital Improvements and any related items for the Police Department?

Mr. Harris: Well it says, pay general operating costs of the city's Division of Police. Which I would assume we certainly meant it to pay for things like police cruisers, computers in police cruisers, uniforms, guns, ammunition, whatever they would need. Anything that would fall within what the Division of Police could spend money on.

Mr. Clemens: Cutting the grass, whatever. It takes care of everything. That's true. I mean, it's there.

Mr. Baxter: But only up to those funds collected for that year, correct?

Mr. Hills: The officers and the equipment necessary to be an officer on the street.

Mr. Harris: Absolutely. It still has to be a police function. They have to be performing some kind of police function in order for this to be there. It would have to go for the Division of Police to ____________ not only officers, but possibly dispatchers. It would not be Police Officers. To pay for certainly, cruisers, uniforms, whatever else the Police Department would need to function as a Police Department.

Mr. Stake: Excuse me a minute. With passage of this, we wouldn't need to go out and borrow money to do that. And I think maybe that's what you were talking about.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I'm trying to get at. For example, if we wish to bring in digital radios into the city in 2007, and the cost of that would be greater than the amount of revenue generated in the first year, could we go out and bond with this legislation, those dollars, to purchase that in 2007, and then have the revenue over, if the tax increase passed, over 7, 8, and 9 years to pay that back?

Mr. Harris: If you're looking at radios, that's a Capital Improvement.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So it's covered then. Certainly. Thank you.

Mr. Harris: You would never want to go out and borrow money. I don't even think the state statute's going to allow you to go out and borrow money to pay general expenses such as somebody's salary.

Mr. Stake: Are there any other questions in regards to the language here or anything else? (No response). Mr. Harris, do you have anything else you'd like to add?

Mr. Harris: Yeah. There's a couple of things that I think you should be aware of that I did want to take just a couple of minutes and go over this. And that is, number one, as you consider this, I think there's three things you need to understand. And number one, as you put this forward, senior citizens will not be expected to pay tax increases, nor do they currently pay taxes, municipal income taxes on social security benefits and pension payments. So the people who are least able to afford it are not hit with this tax. Second of all, you're going to the ballot with this. People will be able to decide the viability of these projects as they go forward. Secondly, I think everybody needs to be aware that the last tax increase in the city was enacted and took effect July 1, 1982. I believe it also says in here, the original tax for the city was passed in 1969, took effect January 1, 1970. So it's been 24 years since this city has gone to the tax payers and asked for additional funding. And in this day and age, with the amount of people who have moved into the city, and the expenses with having all those people move in, that's a relatively long time to not have to go back to the tax payers and ask for more money. Which I think is a positive. Thirdly, it was mentioned here a couple of weeks ago, and I'd like to read from the minutes, it says, "So therefore, you're asking 17% of the residents to shoulder the responsibility to increase the services that are enjoyed by 100% of the residents". And in order to really take a look at that statement, I had the Regional Income Tax Authority pull some numbers for me and I'd like to share those with you this evening. Currently, there are three different groups actually, who are paying income taxes in the City of Reynoldsburg. The first group is businesses who pay city income tax on net profits. Currently, they pay right around 9.5%. 9.51 is paid of this tax and any tax increase would be paid by the business community. Second is, a group that's kind of forgotten by everybody but it makes up a relatively large group, and that is people who work in the City of Reynoldsburg but do not live in the City of Reynoldsburg. They may live in Columbus, they may live in a neighboring community. According to the people at RITA, there are a total of 18,536 people who earn wages in the City of Reynoldsburg. And they get this from the W2 forms. Now this may not be 100% accurate, but it's within a percent or so. Of that, 4,785 of those people work in Reynoldsburg and live in Reynoldsburg. So if you do the math on this, this tax increase as well as the regular tax, 9.51 is being paid by the business community. 67.13 is being paid by those people who work here but do live here. And the last part, people who work in Reynoldsburg and live in Reynoldsburg pay 23.36% of the tax and would pay that same amount of the increase. So when you look at this and say that 17% of the people are going to be asked to pay 100% of any kind of increase in taxes, that's just not true. Now for the middle group, the 67%, many of those people will not see an income tax increase. Because currently, if you are a resident of the City of Columbus and you work in the City of Reynoldsburg, you pay the City of Reynoldsburg 1.5%. You will then pay the City of Columbus .5%. So the other half of percent goes to the City of Columbus. Those people will not see an increase in taxes. However, the City of Columbus will see a decrease in the amount that they are getting from those particular people. Now I was on Council back in the late 90's when we set up the Development Department, and one of the things we said at that time that we looked for the Development Department to do, was bring jobs into the area with additional tax payers to offset so we didn't have to have the citizens of the City of Reynoldsburg pay increased taxes. And that's where we're at right now. We've squeezed, and squeezed, and squeezed the budget to the point where we need now to go back and ask the tax payers, do we have a need both for additional police officers, and for street improvements in our neighborhoods? And we're asking that the majority of this tax be picked up by people who work here but don't live here. So I want you to consider those as you consider this legislation. If you have any question on any of that, I'd be glad to answer it for you.

Mr. Stake: And most of those people, just to reiterate, most of those people who work here but don't live here are already paying 2% or better. But that extra ½% is going to another community. Not staying here.

Mr. Harris: That's correct. Because if you remember the presentation I did, virtually, all except for a couple of communities, are already at 2%. So if they're getting 100% credit, they're going to be unaffected by this personally.

Mr. Stake: And it should be pointed out also that we get very little property tax compared to other communities to be able to run our city.

Mr. Harris: Absolutely. That's absolutely correct.

Mr. Stake: Are there any questions, other questions or comments? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Dick, I thank you for getting with RITA. Because I've heard the comment made here, and I've heard the comment made out in the community that ½% tax increase would be shouldered by anywhere from 17 to 30% of the population. The only person being taxed would be that person who lives and works in Reynoldsburg. And that is, I won't say the statement is untrue, but what it is, it's certainly not complete. The resident of Reynoldsburg that was working in Reynoldsburg, the local withholding tax will go from 1 ½ to 2% assuming everything passes.

However, I'm glad to see the numbers because that's where I felt they had to be. The majority of the income we have coming in from tax is from people who work in Reynoldsburg and don't live in Reynoldsburg. I think your summary of this has been very good as far as the time line and everything else. As you know, I have some real questions on the property taxes and how do we get where we are. But you can go back and look at those things forever, but we are where we are. And the ability to pull the property tax, I don't think it's any longer there. Because I think the things that were dropping off where the cities could pick them up, I don't see that happening. So I think we have, I think your example of we've squeezed about, we have wrung it, squeezed it, and done everything else. And one of the concerns is, besides the safety forces, is the absolute concern that those of us who have been around for a while is, I don't want to sit here and say our streets have been neglected, but they certainly, some of the Capital Projects, including the streets, are not what they could be, should be, and have been historically until the last 3 or 4 years. And we have managed to balance, has always been an undefined word, but we have lived within in or close to the budgetary means by not doing some service work that we used to be able to do for the citizens on a year to year basis. And we need to pick that back up. And I'm not sure what, bottom line is, I don't know what our options are. Because we have certainly all turned gray headed up here trying to come up with what they may be. And this is the best and the fairest way. Especially when we're looking at impact here that, as the numbers come out, there's many people participating. And we are, good point made, just shifting some of the dollars we don't get back to us. And that's where they're needed, is in the community where they're working. But I do thank you for the summary. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills. My goal has always been, sitting here as a City Council member, to maintain the level of services that we have. I think our Police Department does a fine job, and so do our other departments. I know that we have had to cut back on our Street Program, and that's been very disappointing in the last few years. And one of the reasons I am in favor of this, so we can keep our city safe, and also continue on, or start back up our Street Program. I think it needs to be pointed out in the resolution that we would be wanting to get this on the ballot in August, correct?

Mr. Harris: That's correct. So we would need to have this, this needs to be delivered to the Board of Election prior to 4:00 May 25. And I will personally take it down as soon as Council passes the legislation and the Mayor signs it.

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

Mr. Baxter: I think there's only one other one that we need to, a comment that we need to make Chairman Stake. And that is the fact that the city has tried to reduce cost as well. We saw that just recently with our Attorney's Office. And I think the Mayor continues to look at his budget and look at areas where we can save money. So I think that message also needs to be out to the public. That is not just, we need additional funds. But we still continue to pull that belt. We still go back and look at what we're spending and try to reduce those costs. And that's a message that needs to get out as well.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mr. Baxter for pointing that out. Are there any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Okay. Then I guess the first thing we need to do here is make a motion that we send this resolution on to Council with a recommendation for passage at the next Council meeting, and I will make that motion. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And then I guess the next item here is, we need to, if you look at the second page of the ordinance, and we just want to send that on for its first reading.

Mr. Harris: Absolutely. It will need to be read so that it actually is an ordinance that exists prior to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. Hills: So the scheduling of our agenda, I think it has to be before the resolution on the agenda for clarity.

Mr. Harris: Absolutely. That's correct.

Mr. Stake: I hope Nancy remembers that. I'm sure she will. And I also would like to point out that, Dick, I appreciate you working on this, Brenda, Nancy, and anybody else who helped out here. You did it very quickly. I appreciate that. That being said then, I will make a motion that we send this on for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. (Tape Change). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Finance Committee
May 1, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)