

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 19, 2004

Members of Community Development present: Lane J. Beougher, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman

Other member of Council present: Council President William L. Hills

Mr. Beougher: I'll call Community Development Committee to order at 7:30. The first thing on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the April 5, 2004 meeting. Are there any corrections or changes to the minutes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted. The next item is the approval of the agenda. Are there any corrections or changes to the agenda tonight? (No response). Seeing none, it will stand as submitted.

Item number 4, Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Chapter 971, Municipal Parks, addition of Subsections (f)(g)(h)(i)(j)(k)(l)(m)(n)(o)(p) and (q) to Section 971.07, Scheduled Events and Activities. This item had its first reading last week and I trust members have had a chance to review it further. Does anyone have any other questions of Mr. Walsh if he's here? He's here? He apparently answered our questions two weeks ago. If no one has any further comments, I'd like to move this forward for its second reading next week. Is there a second? Mrs. Newman with the second. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

The next item on the agenda, Ordinance authorizing Mayor to enter into an agreement with Reynoldsburg Soccer Association for Civic Park concession stand. This item also had its first reading last week. Are there any questions on this? (No response). Okay. Hearing and seeing none, I'd move that we send this forward for its second reading at the Council meeting next week on the 26th. Is there a second? Mr. Clemens with the second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And with that I will adjourn Community Development at 7:32.

Community Development Committee

- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

April 19, 2004

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 19, 2004

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Eric Gilbert, Lane J. Beougher, Antoinette Newman
Other member of Council present: Council President William L. Hills

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:33. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the April 5, 2004 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved. The next item, approval of the agenda. I'd like to move item number 7 (Ordinance authorizing Mayor to enter into maintenance agreement for City of Reynoldsburg's police building security and fire detection systems. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Are there any other additions or deletions? (No response). If not, the agenda will stand approved.

The next item is discussion of Liquor Permit, transfer from Donatos Pizzeria Corp. to Donatos Pizzeria LLC dba Donatos Pizza, 1815 Brice Rd., 1st Fl. & Bsmt., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Is Chief Miller here? Mrs. Reichard?

Mrs. Reichard: No, she's not. We've not had a discussion about this particular issue. (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens. This looks like it's just a transfer _____.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, it is.

Mr. Hills: Since we don't have the Chief here, I think it's an ongoing business from the same location. I may suggest you may want to send it forward for reading and if it's okay we can just return it to the Clerk.

Mr. Clemens: Right.

Mr. Hills: That still makes our 5-3 deadline.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. We'll send it forward for first reading then.

Mr. Hills: So if Sharon can get you a report.

Mr. Clemens: Get a report for Monday night and we can just let it go. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Yes, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: The next item on the agenda, Discussion, Solicitation by American Stroke Association. I had been contacted by the American Stroke Association to have solicitation and

they've sent the information pertaining to it. And when they had requested it to be and it's an ordinance as an emergency and they request an authorization to issue a permit for the American Stroke Association to solicit donations on Saturday, May 1, 2004 from 9 a.m. until 10 p.m. at Brice and Livingston, and on Friday, May 28, 2004 from 2:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. on Main and Brice. Are there any questions pertaining to this?

Mr. Baxter: Just one question. Have you had discussions about having the people who are doing this, are they group insured for solicitations on the street?

Mr. Clemens: No.

Mr. Baxter: That would be something we might want to have that addressed that they are properly insured.

Mr. Clemens: They can address that when they come in and get the permit. I have to call them back and let them know about when it's going to be. Are there any other comments? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion that we send this to Council for first reading as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

The next item on the agenda, Discussion, In-car cameras for the police cruisers. Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Good evening. This request came about because of some aging video type cameras that we have in the police cruisers. I think you will see in your packets that Sargent Baughn provided information on what we've been spending on trying to repair, keep these in-car cameras in repair. Last year it was \$6,390, so far this year 2,189, and whenever these cameras are down, the cruiser is out of service. So they are aging. We're looking at digital in-car cameras. There is also a 5 year comparison cost analysis between the VHD and the DVD type system that we would be using with a cost savings of over \$45,000 over a 5 year period of time. What you see before you this evening was done on a state bid. You have the documentation. The inner-office communication from Sargent Baughn lays out exactly what the cost is per the state bid. And then the backup information from Bobby Smathers gives you the information that Sargent Baughn referred to in his memo with a total price of \$82,200. When we began, when these were put in the budget and I asked the Chief at the time if she would mind removing them from the budget so we could ask for some grant funding from the Ops Criminal Justice Services, their Burn Memorial Grants. This is the time of the year that they have their overage funds and I thought maybe we might be able to tap into them. Not to the extent of the almost \$83,000 but certainly the 35. So this is a grant that's waiting for us rather than us waiting for them. So we have a commitment for the \$35,000 from the Burn Memorial Funds and that grant must be to them by April 30. Also, the \$20,000 transfer from the Asset Forfeiture Fund and \$27,200 in a transfer from Wages and Enforcement. I think most of you know we're down a couple of patrolmen. We're down a couple of Lieutenant's. And we also have one of our officers on military leave. So there is quite an overage in this fund at the time. When I asked about transferring 27,2 from this account, I wanted to be very, very certain that we weren't even getting close. I didn't want us to get to the end of the year and not have enough money in our

wages account and enforcement. So that was looked at very carefully. And in fact, all of these, the 27,2 does meet that criteria. So what this is, is legislation to make those transfers and to give us the acceptance, and also provide the acceptance of the \$35,000 Grant Fund.

Mr. Clemens: When Mrs. Reichard and I had discussed this, and about bringing it to Council and I told her if she could come up with it within the budget, that would be appropriate, and she did. And so that's why it's here this evening. There's no money to be appropriated. That's money that's already in the budget in other accounts. So that's why we're discussing it. Are there any questions for Mrs. Reichard pertaining to this? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Mrs. Reichard, I'm noticing here in some of the documentation we've had quite a lot of repair to car cameras. And I think you stated to me that when we do repair these cameras, that cruiser is out of commission also. Is that correct?

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct. If the camera's out, so is the cruiser. I think we've learned as well as other departments have learned that you must have those cameras on when making arrests and making stops. It is certainly to our advantage. I know just since I've been here, it's probably stopped maybe three major law suits in proving that when we stopped someone we did it in the appropriate manner. One of the things I didn't say that maybe I should is that with these digital cameras, the difference other than the fact that they're more high tech. You don't have any storage with the tapes to contend with which take an enormous amount of room. The microphones, with the VHS, the officer has to remember to turn on the microphone. With these cameras, when the camera comes on the microphone comes on. So it's an automatic which is a nice safety feature.

Mr. Stake: So in an emergency situation the officer may not remember to turn on the microphone but here it would automatically come on.

Mrs. Reichard: That could be. I'd like to think it doesn't happen. It probably doesn't. But this would assure that we would, when the camera comes on, so does the voice recorder.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. I'm noticing that there are two desk top computers. One lap top computer and two internal DVD drives that are part of this and that is to be used for the purpose of being able to read the CD's?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, sir. It is in support of the equipment that we would be using. Yes. The camera. The type of camera equipment we'd be using.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions? Yes, Toni.

Mrs. Newman: Mrs. Reichard, what about the time involved. Do you have any idea when repairs have to be made, or maintenance on average? How long the cruisers would be out of service or out of commission?

Mrs. Reichard: What we're experiencing now, I'm sorry. I don't have that information. I can get it but I don't have it.

Mrs. Newman: Do you just have a rough estimate maybe?

Mrs. Reichard: No. I'm sorry. That was not anything we discussed.

Mrs. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Reichard, just one question if I could, just try to clarify. When you say if the camera's down, the vehicle's out of service. If all of our cameras are down, our vehicles would be on the street. It doesn't make the vehicle inoperative. It's just, the preference is to operate the police vehicle that has the camera. Correct?

Mrs. Reichard: We have been fortunate to date where we've not had them all out. It's just been maybe one or so at a time and we just pull the cruiser. But if we had to have the cruiser for emergency purposes, the cruiser's available.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, sir. It does not effect the functioning of the cruiser itself. That is true.

Mr. Hills: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mrs. Reichard pertaining this subject? (No response). If not, I'd like to have a motion to send this to Council for first reading with an emergency.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, do we need to refer this to the Finance Committee?

Mr. Baxter: There's no appropriation I thought I heard.

Mrs. Reichard: There's no appropriation.

Ms. Smith: Yes, you do.

Mr. Hills: The authority to transfer the funds.

Mr. Clemens: Should it go to Finance?

Mr. Hills: In order to transfer the funds.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. We'll send it on to Finance. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: I was making a motion to send this forward to Council next week and refer it to Finance Committee.

Mr. Clemens: As an emergency.

Mr. Beougher: As an emergency.

Mr. Clemens: Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: While you're here, and she has already spoke, just some information, Council doesn't get a lot of information, could you tell us the status of our officers, the hiring, are we in the process, and also the process of the Lieutenant's, what process it's in at the present time. And also the process of our cruisers, our new cruisers, if they're ready to go out on the street?

Mrs. Reichard: I'll start with the cruisers. The cruisers are in their final stages of being put together. All the parts have been ordered and it is being outsourced to get those cruisers on the street. So that should happen shortly. I wish I could give you a date but I can't. I can just say it's going to be very shortly. As far as the officers are concerned, we have, I heard some numbers today and I'm thinking there were like 86 that applied for the patrolman's. There were some that were out of state. But that's in process. They will be going on for their testing. I think in about two weeks. And then the Lieutenant's, we have, that is a resume test. We are in the process. We just finished and worked through with the Civil Service Commission. What those, in putting evaluations on each one of the questions. So we should be at a, I think it is the second week in May that we are, or perhaps the beginning of the third week in May that we are going to start our interviews for the Lieutenant's positions. I wish I had exact dates for you but I don't. But that's very close.

Mr. Clemens: I just wanted to see how it was progressing. Are there any other questions about these two subjects? Thank you, Sharon. I appreciate it.

Mrs. Reichard: Certainly.

Mr. Clemens: Ordinance number 8, Ordinance making appropriation for the widening of State Route 256 at Interstate 70 exit ramps. It had its first reading 4-12-04. We are waiting basically on another suburb and seeing how they handle the situation before we pass it as an emergency. So I'd like to send it on to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second on it? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

That ends the Safety Committee meeting at 7:47.

Safety Committee

- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

April 19, 2004

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 19, 2004

Members of Service Committee present: Eric Gilbert, Lane J. Beougher, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Mel Clemens, Antoinette Newman.

Other member of Council present: Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:47 p.m. The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the April 5, 2004 Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). None being heard, they will stand. Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. I have several changes to the agenda. The first would be to move out of Other Legislation, Item number 3, NPDES Computer Software. Make that item 9a. And to change the order of items for discussion, make item number 6, Development Impact Fees, item number 4 because we do have a speaker here this evening. In regards to that with time restraints

and to move item number 4 to item number 6. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is Development Impact Fees. The members should have received at your desks this evening, a memo from the Development Department. Attached to that memo was a recommendation from EMH&T regarding the scope of services for development of an impact fee program for the city. Mr. Brandt offered his apologies on the timeliness of this and that he just received it this morning. And with that in mind, we had requested that Ms. Keefer who wrote the proposal, be here this evening for any questions. Or actually to give us a presentation of the scope of services and any questions the members might have at this point and entertain any discussion. And Mr. Parkinson is availing himself as well.

Mr. Parkinson: Well, I like it here so I'll lead off. I'm pleased that Kim Keefer, an associate with our firm was able to come tonight. She is the author of the scope of services. I just took credit for it. We have tried to frame them based on the discussions that we've heard here at the table. I will apologize that we weren't prepared for a presentation this evening.

Mr. Gilbert: Let's just call it a discussion.

Mr. Parkinson: Just hit the highlights if we can.

Mr. Gilbert: Sure. Hi, Kim. Go right ahead. I guess we were, the Council's request had revolved out of our Ad Hoc Committee for reviewing our residential zoning. And part of the equation in terms of the impact that residential or any type of development has on our ability to provide services and infrastructure. And Mr. Beougher, Mr. Stake, and Mrs. TenHoeve had written up a recommendation in their study, and we take a look at this and Council was trying to narrow the scope down to the most efficient way to approach this issue. And I noticed in your

proposal, you gave us a, I guess a 5 point approach to doing this. If you could just briefly outline that for us and then it might raise some questions from the members.

Ms. Keefer: Sure. Basically, a synonym for impact fees would be growth pays its own way. And this type of program is in effect in almost every one of the 50 states. It has gone through the court process here in the State of Ohio. And there are two things you need to look for when setting an impact fee. You need to make sure that you are only paying for things that would be, that are effected by new development. In other words, if you are already charging existing residents for something you can't double that up with an impact fee. And you have to have a lot of backup mathematic if you will, to show that you have reached what they call a rational nexus. So this 5 point program here starts with defining the existing levels of service that you now provide. It's a lot of looking at historical data. When do you add facilities for example, in Parks and Rec? When do you decide to add the next cruiser for the Police Department? And those were the two that we were focusing on were Police and Parks and Recreation. Once we define that level of service we can then go back and decide how much a portion of that could be attributed to new development. In other words, for every thousand houses of five hundred homes that come

into Reynoldsburg, do we need another “x” acres of park property? Do we have it now? Do we need to get it? Do we need to fund backstops for softball fields? All of that kind of thing goes into the equation. Once we have all that information and we’re able to define the effect of new development on existing services and what we would have to add to maintain that level of service, we have both the numerator and the denominator of an equation and we will come back to you and say, this is how development impacts Parks and Rec and Police. This is how you would implement this program based on other programs throughout the state and we would give you some examples so that you’re not locked into one. We would make sure that when we provide that to you that it passes the test already set forth in the State of Ohio court system and then we would allow you to make the policy decision as to whether to implement one or not. So we are basically doing the mathematics and the research behind the impact fees, providing you an ordinance, providing you a methodology for implementing it and then you can take up the decision from there. That’s in a nut shell.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Thank you. Does this raise any questions from the members? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Gilbert. Right off the bat it hits me a couple of different ways. And it looks like we’re going to know why and where we need the impact from the impact study where we needed to have the fees. The question I have is more based upon an economic standpoint. Is that also going to be looked at to determine what impact fees we’ll have against economics coming into the city? Will we gain, lose, discourage, encourage? Would it be favorable or unfavorable?

Ms. Keefer: We will give you a range. For example, the impact fees in Reynoldsburg would be “x” dollars. And we would compare that to as many communities that have these in place in Central Ohio and then if we have to branch out even further to find similar communities to give you a feel for where you would fall in the spectrum. But in terms of doing an economic analysis i.e., if you do this will you lose 500 homes a year? No. That is not part of this study.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Other members of Council? Mr. Stake and then Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Hello. Have you done impact fee studies before?

Ms. Keefer: Yes.

Mr. Stake: And for what other communities?

Ms. Keefer: Our staff has done impact fee studies for the City of Lebanon, and we’ve done a lot of impact fee studies for water and sewer. But in terms of other than water and sewer, we’ve done them for the City of Lebanon. We’ve done them for the Disney Development Company when they were de-annexing property in the State of Florida. And we have staff that has been involved in the impact fee studies from an Administrative side, from your side of the fence when they were in other positions.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And it looks like this will cost us roughly \$40,000.

Ms. Keefer: Yes. If you include Task 4.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Task 4 is optional?

Ms. Keefer: Well, Task 4 goes into a lot of creation of the forms. A lot of detail goes into those forms. You may decide that you will implement the impact fee by just attaching it to say, when they come in for a building permit or something like that. In which case you don't need all of those forms. We left that optional until we came up with the numbers associated with those impact fees. And then you can decide if you want all of those application forms or if you are going to implement it a separate way. So we thought we'd give you the opportunity to decide whether you want to spend that last \$7,000 or not.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Just a comment first. In my experience, engineering firms can always be counted on for providing incomprehensible calculations to back anything up. So we're in good hands.

Ms. Keefer: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: The question, and maybe Kim you aren't the right person to ask. Maybe it's the City Attorney. Maybe we need to have somebody else look at it. But we've had a lot of discussion on the impact on schools, and fire districts, and things like that that aren't part of the city family of services. And I know that impact fees in Ohio don't come from enabling legislation. They're based on case law. Are you aware of any communities that do exact impact fees for a school or a fire district that's outside of their scope.

Ms. Keefer: On behalf of the school district or on behalf of the fire district?

Mr. Beougher: Correct.

Ms. Keefer: I am not aware of any. In fact the case law that I've read dealing with impact fees was very specific to home rule and target communities as opposed to the school districts etc.

Mr. Beougher: Right. And my understanding is that school districts, fire districts, townships do not have the ability or at least case law hasn't established.

Ms. Keefer: Seven townships do I think because they're Charter Townships. But yes, you are correct.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. It's limited home rule townships. Okay.

Ms. Keefer: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Gilbert. One more question.

Mr. Gilbert: Sure. Go right ahead.

Mr. Stake: How long would this impact fee study take?

Ms. Keefer: We were requested to be very expeditious in doing this. And so the time schedule's 8 weeks from notice to proceed. That is assuming that we can access city staff the way we have in the past. They've been very helpful in providing information. So we're assuming that that would continue. And that also assumes that the public meetings that are part of this task are scheduled with enough time for the requisite notification. So one of the first things we would do is start laying in all of those mile stones to meet the 8 week deadline.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Anyone else? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I have no questions other than, since we just received it this evening and I haven't had a chance to read it so I don't really know what it's about. All that it's about. It would have been nicer if we would have had it in our packets over the weekend then we could have read it. I'd like to read it over and see if we have any problems or any discussions on it. And also have the directors look at it. I think it's something we should do but I think it's something that we have to be careful on how we do it and if we spend \$40,000 I think we ought to be able to look it over.

Mr. Gilbert: Sure. My intent was just to have a discussion on the memo this evening of the scope of services and would ask the City Attorney to review it. I know he was copied on this. Any input you might be able to provide Council over the next two weeks. And we would certainly have to look at the funding source for the cost of the study before we move forward. And I appreciate you coming in Ms. Keefer, Mr. Parkinson for the information. And we'll just hold, I'm sorry, Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. I also noticed that the copy is marked draft. So before we pass this I assume there will be some revision. You'll want to finalize some details.

Ms. Keefer: Actually it's marked draft in case the Council decides that they would like things added or deleted based on a review.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So this is ready to go as far as you're concerned. Okay. Thanks.

Ms. Keefer: We believe we could meet the objective with the scope that you have in front of you.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you. We'll hold this item for two weeks for the members to review.

Item number 5 is a Discussion for Acceptance of unrecorded Deed of Easement. And that is from Mrs. Reichard. This is from Ralph and Judith Howle for a temporary construction easement.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. There's a bit of a permanent easement here but primarily it's the temporary work easement. This is the Dysar ditch on Instone that we've been, you've already approved the bidding for the project. This is just to accept the easement from the house.

Mr. Gilbert: We don't have any cost associated with this?

Mrs. Reichard: Just need to pass it through. As soon as it's passed it will be recorded. I'd like to hopefully get it done before we actually begin the work. I would like to see it recorded to Franklin.

Mr. Gilbert: What's our time frame?

Mrs. Reichard: Well, I think the, Mr. Parkinson we discussed today when that will go out for bid?

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

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. Yeah. So we have a few weeks.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. It's marked emergency. Normally something along these lines, health, safety, welfare of the residents. Are there any objections from Council for moving this forward for its first reading with recommendation for adoption as an emergency at this point? (No response). Any questions from members of Service? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a recommendation that we move this forward to Council for its first reading with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6 is the Discussion, Purchase of a backhoe for the Water Department. Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: This request is for authorization to purchase from the state bid of our backhoe. It is in the budget this year and it is funded.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Don't we already have a backhoe?

Mr. Kipp: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Is this an additional one or _____ for that one?

Mr. Kipp: We decided now that the current backhoe is used a great deal by the Recreation Department. And we're going to give the other one to the Recreation Department and then this will be ours.

Mr. Baxter: Is there that much need for a backhoe that both would be needed at the same time? Do we need two of them?

Mr. Kipp: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions from members of Service? (No response). This was put into the fiscal year budget by the Water/Waste Water Department. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Mark, how old is the old backhoe?

Mr. Kipp: I think it's about 10 years.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And Parks and Rec's needs is not as emergent as yours. I mean, you need a reliable piece of machinery that can get out at a moments notice and take care of problems. Correct?

Mr. Kipp: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Is the old one not reliable?

Mr. Kipp: It's still a good backhoe.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Mr. Beougher's comment sounded as if we had a problem with it.

Mr. Kipp: Not yet.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: I usually trade my cars after ten years too, or less.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions from members of Service? (No response). I don't believe this requires an appropriation. Correct me if I'm wrong Ms. Smith since it's already in the budget.

Ms. Smith: No.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Time frame? No request for any emergency? Run through the readings?

Mr. Kipp: Normal readings is fine.

Mr. Gilbert: Great. I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Mr. Baxter with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you, Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Item number 7 is a Resolution concerning services to property proposed for annexation, 3.2 acres from Truro Township to the City of Reynoldsburg. We have received our memos for Resolution of services to be provided. Are there any questions or comments on this item from members of Service? (No response). None being heard, it was brought to my attention that the residents in this particular area have been mandated to attach to our public sewer system. Therefore, there is a time constraint, and without any objections from the members, I would make a recommendation that we move this to Council for its second reading with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Is there a second?

Mr. Baxter: I have a question.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Baxter, yes.

Mr. Baxter: What is the mandate that's being put on this from a time constraint? You said there's a time constraint? What is that time constraint?

Mr. Gilbert: It's under the new annexation law, that is an expedited annexation which creates a shorter time period to be presented to the County Commissioners, is how it's been explained to me. And if I'm wrong, I'm sure Mr. Underwood can correct. There's also environmental impact as far as the determination that had been made that the residents need to go on to a public sewer system.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions? (No response). We have a motion on the floor. Is there a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 8 is an Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances for the city, Chapter 960, Storm Water Regulations, addition of Section 960.03, Illicit Discharge And Obstruction Of The Separate

Storm Sewer System as well as the penalty. I would just note, I had put a memo that we were fortunate enough to receive from Mr. Parkinson this evening. There was some question last week as to the definition of harmful quantity and Mr. Parkinson sets out to try and offer us, I guess a number of interpretations as to how we could define harmful quantity. And if the members would just consider those suggestions. There was no request for any type of emergency language or rule suspension on this and it has only had I believe, it's first reading. So I know you just received the memo today so we'll just consider that over the next two weeks. Are there any questions or comments on this item at this time? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its second reading, and I'll put that on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Mr. Stearns with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 9 is an Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Amending Section 960.01 with Storm Water Regulations. Any questions or comments in regards to this item at this time? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its second reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Mrs. Newman with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 9a is just out of Other Legislation. NPDES Phase 2 Storm Water computer software. And Mr. Ward is here this evening to update us with some additional information. This item was presented to Council back in November and was moved to Other Legislation at that time. Mr. Ward.

Mr. Ward: Good evening. As you said, it was moved to Other Legislation at the time we were discussing the budget last fall. And since the budget process went into March and we finally got all that settled, I'm asking now to bring it out of Other Legislation to discuss it. The quote, I believe Mr. Gilbert passed out this evening, I just received today. So it'll give you some time if you need to read things over. The company that I had talked to that is willing to help us develop the software program is the same company that developed the software program that the Building Department uses, and many cities around Ohio use the same software. On the quote you will see that the first price is what this company will sell it after the software is completely developed. The price to Reynoldsburg which is 50% discount is for the time that I will be working with the company to help debug the software and to get the program going the way we want it. So I'll have some time involved working with them. But it will save us quite a bit of money. This program will be used to keep track of all the different areas of the Storm Water Program that we have to report to the EPA on our annual report. All the inspections that we make to the construction sites and all the public education and outreach, all the employee training we have to do. This program will help us to keep track of all that. And at the end of the year then all we have to do is run the various reports and we'll have all the information which will save us much time rather than trying to keep it all in a file cabinet and then try to go through all the papers at the end of the year.

Mr. Gilbert: Will the Secretary/Assistant be the one utilizing the system? Will the technicians utilize it at some point or who will be using this system the most?

Mr. Ward: I will probably be using it and our Pollution Control Technician will be entering the construction site and illicit discharge information. Probably all three of us. Some of the information, the secretary will be able to enter in. So there will probably be three or four of us that will actually be using it to keep it updated.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Gilbert, a statement was made by Mr. Ward, and I want to just express a concern that I've ran across. Mr. Ward, you indicated that this is the same company that does business, or did the software for the Building Department.

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: And it was nice to know who did the software because Mrs. Reichard and I have had some number of discussions as I was Acting Mayor, that the software that currently is in the Building Department doesn't enable them to provide for me, as a question raised as Acting Mayor, the date of any requests coming in for inspection or services. And I asked on three different occasions and I got the same answer back. So let me assure you if it's the same software that the Building Department has, I don't consider the Building Department's software very complete. I just want to note for the record. Mrs. Reichard knows I'm upset about it. I think it's totally unacceptable for any department here in this city to keep records, and when a question is asked, be told, the person who asks the question be told, we can't tell you when they asked for that. We can tell you when we did it, but we can't tell you when they asked for it. That's a key component that is missing of service being provided to the citizens of this city. And it needs to be addressed. If they did the software, then all I would ask is people look at this very seriously as to how that software is being designed. Because it needs re-designed, and quickly in the Building Department.

Mr. Ward: Well I'm not that familiar with their program.

Mr. Hills: I'm not either.

Mr. Ward: Stephen has shown me some of it and I talked with him and Teresa, the secretary and they are very pleased with the company. Their response has been great. The way they explained it to me, at any time that we feel like the program needs updated, all we have to do is contact them and they'll work with us to get the updates in there.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Ward, you've given me the first opportunity to go ahead and address publicly one concern that Mrs. Reichard and I had talked about. And as I mentioned to Council, there were a number of concerns we would talk about when we had the opportunity.

Mr. Ward: Sure.

Mr. Hills: It hadn't really been scheduled, but you just kind of gave me the opening that I had to pitch it right back.

Mr. Ward: That's fine.

Mr. Hills: I'm not saying it's good, bad, right, wrong, and different. But I will tell you this, I find it unacceptable in my position as President of Council, or Council, or Acting Mayor to ask for a date of request and people say they can't give it to you. And I think the same thing is true of any citizen coming off the street. If you're asked to do something, you're asked to check something, it's logged in some how. You got a phone call, you wrote it down, you dated your work order, you dated the fact that you were going to make a work order, computer software is great. But it's not worth anything if it doesn't generate the date back to you, that you need to totally evaluate the program and the services being offered. In the Building Department right now, I have no confidence in the data coming out of there because it doesn't, it says when we did it. It says we went out and did it four or five times, but it doesn't say when it was asked to be done. And there's nothing to compare to there. It's all one sided. I certainly like to defend all of our city employees and say they promptly do everything. But if you can't give me all the equation, I can't defend the issue.

Mr. Ward: I understand.

Mr. Hills: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Ward: If I may? We will not have that in the Storm Water because part of the requirements in our permit to the EPA is that we must come, they want us to come up with, and we told them in our permit that we would have a way of tracking complaints from residents and how those complaints are resolved. And part of that will be when the phone calls come in or the complaints come in, the date and the time and also the date and the time when we take care of the problem. So that's part of the requirements that will be in this software package.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Maybe they could look at the Building Department software and see if they can't get us some of the outputs that we need at the same time. I mean, they're saying they'll update our software any time we ask them to, maybe we should ask. So as Mr. Hills says, prime opportunity to open the door and get some better service from them.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Gilbert, thank you. Being from the industry of software, and at one time even owning my own business in doing just that, developing software for small companies and cities, I have a very good reflection on this. And first off, I have some questions I'd like to get answered if you could. First off, do we already have software on the market that can do the same job without having to redevelop it that's already proven, tested, being used by other cities? So why reinvent the wheel if it already exists? That would be my first question. Second question, I think you hit on already Mr. Beougher, is that with the company that we've dealt with, we already have in,

President of Council has said we've had issues with, my concern would be if we do have issues, do we have a time frame written into that contract, where those issues can be addressed, and updates can be made to the software. Is it a year worth of maintenance we get in addition to the reduction in cost? Is it three years we can make updates to it as we find new additions and requirements coming out of the legislation? I'd want to know those type of pieces of information. How long do we have to keep making those changes? In addition, is it going to require additional hardware and support to be able to run the software? Because again, we may run into more, I need more equipment, I need more memory, I need DVD, I need six lap tops. What is it going to take? I'd also like to know, is the system it runs on, is it going to be a _____ system, a window system? What are the specs? Because at this point, all we see is a software cost and we have no idea what it's going to take. And does our Computer Department actually support whatever it is they're going to be going after? And lastly, I think to Mr. Beougher's comments, if they do have updates available or willing to make change to the Building Department, I by all means think that we should be addressing those and asking what the cost would be to make those updates. So I think this has some real good opportunity here. A, if it exists, go for it. Find the other software that's already out there. If not, they're going to develop it for us and then sell it in addition. I certainly would not think a 50% reduction would be adequate since your time and the city's time's going to be assisting this company in making dollars.

Mr. Beougher: Are you asking for a royalty?

Mr. Baxter: No. But I do think we ought to get a better reduction than 50%.

Mr. Beougher: Maybe we should.

Mr. Baxter: But you know, your time's going to be, as you said, to put this together. And your time's valuable and we pay your time so in my mind that 50% reduction is inadequate. So those are my comments and I thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Sure. And if you could Mr. Baxter, maybe get those questions to Mr. Ward via e-mail.

Mr. Baxter: Yeah. I could shoot you an e-mail with some of the ideas.

Mr. Gilbert: Great. Mr. Clemens. Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Clemens: I have no problem with getting software for your computer system for this project. I don't know whether this is it or not because I know nothing about software. I know nothing about computers. Nothing about any of that stuff (Tape Change). We do have a Computer Department and we are paying computer personnel, and I would think something like this would be handled through them or in compliance with them. So I think you should look into that. Because that's what we do have the department for. I think you need, I know you need the software. Like I say, whether this is it or not I don't know. I'll wait and see what answers we get. But I do think we should, all of our departments should work together and work through when we get into these situations that involve computers or software, hardware, whatever you

want to call it because I don't know what you call it. But it should go through that department or be associated with it. We should get recommendations through them. Because they do buy for us and they do handle these situations and I think you should handle it through them.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions? (No response). I think that used to be an etch-a-sketch department when you were Service Director, wasn't it Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: That's about all I can do with it. That's true. I could erase it real quick, I know that.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Ward, to get some of these questions answered I'm going to hold this for two weeks and allow the members to look this over and for you to get some additional information. But I appreciate you bringing us the new information.

Mr. Ward: I'll be on vacation next week so I'll try to get as much done this week as I can so you'll have it.

Mr. Gilbert: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Ward: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: We'll hold item 9a for two weeks.

Item number 10 is Ordinance approving Final Plat of the Woods at Slate Ridge Section 5 Part 2. As I noted, the question as to the reforestation was answered and documentation was provided that that has been underway and the only reason it stopped was due to seasonal considerations. With the winter, the developer had assured me they were starting that back up again this spring. Are there any questions or comments from members of Council on this item at this time? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its second reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 11 is the Ordinance authorizing EMH&T to prepare specifications and advertise for bids for our annual cleaning, televising, and root cutting of up to 15,000 feet of sanitary sewer. Are there any questions or comments on this? (No response). As I noted at the last discussion, this is an annual maintenance of our sewer lines by the Water/Waste Water Department. Without any other questions or comments being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes, and I'll adjourn Service at 8:20 p.m..

Service Committee

- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

April 19, 2004
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 19, 2004

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens, Lane J. Beougher.

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

Mr. Stake: I'd like to call the Finance Committee to order at 8:21 p.m. The first item of business on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. I have an addition and I'd like to hold some things. I'd like to add the transfer of funds, 3a would be the transfer of funds for the in-car cameras of the police cruisers. And I'd like to hold item #10 (Discussion, Adoption of the C.I.P.) and item #13 (Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio: Section 160.03 "Salary Schedule" Subsections (a) and (b) of Chapter 160, Employee Compensation). Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye").

Let me back up here. I'd like to ask for any, are there any changes to the minutes of the Finance Committee of April 5, 2004? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as read, or as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Authorization of contract for the audit of the city's telecommunication services. Oh I'm sorry, 3a. Yes. 3a is the transfer of funds, acceptance of the Grant and to transfer \$27,200 from account number 110.111.5113 to account number 110.111.5639. And is there any questions or comments on this, Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: No. This comes from recommendations from the Safety Committee.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Any questions or comments from any members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. I would make a motion that we do transfer those funds. Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion passes.

Mrs. Reichard: Chairman Stake, which one was that on? Was that on the in-car cameras?

Mr. Stake: In-car cameras.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. Good.

Mr. Stake: Did you have anything else you wanted to add on that, Mrs. Reichard?

Mrs. Reichard: No.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Next item on the agenda is the Authorization of contract for the audit of the city's telecommunication services. Mrs. Reichard, would you like to address that?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, I would. Always in our attempt to not only find money within the budget to use rather than asking for appropriation, we are always looking for ways of saving money. And when Andy McGillicuddy, who is a local resident, spoke to the Chief and got her attention and in relationship to our telecommunication systems just at the police department. She in turn asked me if I would be interested in having an audit for either just the telecommunication systems which include our phones, our cell phones, everything that's a part of that. And then perhaps if we find this very fruitful, move into our electric, and gas, etc. We met with Andy and Chip Chapman who are here this evening to answer any questions you may have and to sort of make a mini-presentation about this system. I was quite impressed with, I know they've been on the news a few times where they've been talking about the findings and some monies, rather large sums in some systems. And when I look at the numerous telecommunication systems that we use, the different carriers, the different phones, the different everything, you know, even if we could just bring it all together it would be helpful to me. You know, in terms of what this costs, it's a finders fee. There's no outlay in the beginning. If they save funds for us, then they reap a certain percentage of those funds. So what I'd like to do at this time then if I may, introduce you to Andy McGillicuddy and Chip Chapman and ask them to come forward and explain this to you and then we'll attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Chapman: Alright. Good evening. We prepared a presentation. I don't know if you had a chance to take a look at that. But primarily what we do is actually twofold. It's an audit of the existing bills, services, going back in the past. In viewing, looking for refunds, service credits, looking for errors, mistakes. Most of those are human errors, mistakes that happen between what you've contracted for, what happens at the phone companies or the service providers, and then actually what you get billed for. And we find that there are probably 8 out of 10 bills that we look at have those type of occurrences. Some of them are very small. Some of them are very large. We have an ability to go back on average I would say 2 years. There are some things that were by contract that are limited to 90 days, 6 months that we can go back in the past. But we'll try to go back and find as far back as we can. We've taken some items back 4 or 5 years to receive refunds, credits, sometimes on tax issues, tariffing issues, billing issues, etc. Then we do what's called an optimization. We take a look at your services with your current service providers and we do a, basically an analysis on your current uses to make sure you're on the right service plans with these particular service providers. Even if you're in the middle of a contract, we take a look at those to insure that you're in the best program suited for the types of services that you need for the city. And then ultimately we do also what's called a peer review. An analysis of other organizations whether that be government, schools, private industries that are using the same carrier, similar volumes and usage patterns, and make an analysis of the fact, or whether or not you're being charged a better rate, a higher rate, etc., and we will bring that back to your attention and use that as leverage to renegotiate with those carriers to get better rates. That's basically what the program is. It's pretty straight forward. It takes very little of the city's time particularly on the telecommunications side. We ask for one month of the most current months of billing to start our analysis. Fortunately all of the telecommunication providers keep very good records on line. As we said, usually they're not very accurate when we go to audit them but they do have that information available to us on line. So there's really not a lot of research and work that the staff has to do as far as pulling that information together for us. Then it takes us about 30 to 60 days to

do our analysis. We come back, present a report, and from that report we show the refunds, credits that we'll be going after. We take on that responsibility. Drafting letters, issuing those, and then following up on implementation. And only once the city receives their savings do we then issue a bill for our portion of that savings, or our contingency fee as the director put it. And then we will make recommendations as far as moving forward and it will be the city's choice to ask us to implement those or not. It's totally up to the city to make a decision in that regard. And that's really it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So you're paid two ways? You would get 50% of the refunds and credits on past expenses?

Mr. Chapman: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: And then there would be a 60/40 split of A and B, implemented expense reduction recommendations.

Mr. Chapman: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: You're getting the 40?

Mr. Chapman: We're getting 40.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Chapman: The city's getting _____. On commercial accounts, just for your knowledge, typically our agreements are 50/50 on both sides. But we felt in essence of the government, and we do the same thing for some non-profit organizations as go the other direction.

Mr. Stake: And they need to be implemented expense reductions.

Mr. Chapman: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: We don't implement them, there's no fee.

Mr. Chapman: That's correct. And just to clarify, those are only things we bring to the table. If someone else brings an idea to the table and you implement it, obviously we don't expect to get paid on it. We expect to get paid on the knowledge and the value we bring to the table. And again, we continue to monitor that and it's actual. It's based on actual and not some forecasted number on a month to month or in your case it might be on a quarterly basis, we would be evaluating that and showing you and documenting those savings.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Is there any up front money required or anything like that?

Mr. Chapman: No.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions from members of the committee? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Mr. Chapman, I notice on your client list you've got hospitals, library districts, and school districts. Have you done any work for any city's? And the reason for my question is, I'm curious if we as a city are legally and able to provide your fees in this manner.

Mr. Chapman: Okay. I can't answer to that question specifically.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. It might be one for the City Attorney.

Mr. Chapman: We have not done any government agencies in this particular matter. We have done work for government agencies in the past in regards to consulting, doing analysis and audits typically as a consultant fee. A fixed fee type of arrangement. But under a contingency model we have not. And quite frankly, one of the reasons that we don't do that is there are a lot of commercial accounts that we go after and service and since, we don't have to go through this process I guess is the other thing. This is a little more challenging type process to go through.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions from members of the committee? (No response).
Members of Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Stake. The first question I would have is, from the moment that you're given a go, what is your duration time that you start your analysis and complete it?

Mr. Chapman: It really depends on how quickly the carriers, we ask for a what's called a _____ agency which gives us authorization to pull the city's records from the various service providers. It's a very limited letter of agency by the way. But it takes us about 30 to 60 days and I would tend more toward the 60 days.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I don't see a copy of the contract. Mr. Underwood, have you read the contract? I don't believe we have a copy of the contract. Mr. Underwood, have you seen the contract? The actual contract?

Mr. Underwood: I have seen the materials. I don't know if it's the final contract. At least proposal materials.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Chapman: We have a copy here.

Mrs. Reichard: That's the response memo that we got from Mr. Underwood (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Stake: Mr. Underwood, you did have a draft copy of the contract?

Mr. Underwood: The draft. I have not seen a final.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, would you folks, Mrs. Reichard, would you mind if Mr. Underwood has an opportunity to review the actual contract?

Mrs. Reichard: Oh, I thought everybody had that.

Mr. Stake: I don't have any problem with this. I mean it looks like a good idea to me.

Mr. Reichard: Okay. Under the agreement, this is for, how long of a period of time, Chip?

Mr. Chapman: Inaudible.

Mrs. Reichard: It's for 2 years. Again, if you will see Mr. Underwood's comments that he thought we should establish a separate account for this not only to pay _____ but to receive the savings and then to pay out the funds. So what I can do is, attach this, I'll give this, apparently this is the same contract that Mr. Underwood had before. So it will be just considered a final. We'll pass that back to him again. Make sure we get any final comments or anything that we need from him.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. And Council need to get a copy of the actual itself. We didn't even get a rough draft of the contract.

Mrs. Reichard: Sorry. That's my fault.

Mr. Stake: That's okay.

Mrs. Reichard: I overlooked that. I gave it to him and then it didn't get in your packets.

Mr. Stake: Members of the committee, would it be okay if we held this for 2 weeks so that we can get the contract reviewed by our City Attorney and have it in our hands as well? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stake. I do notice in the City Attorney's comments, he mentioned some seed money so there may be an appropriation in order.

Mr. Underwood: When I reviewed the, if the draft of what you have is the same as what I reviewed, I don't have any problem with it.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Underwood: I was unclear whether or not we would actually receive the money in-house and then be able to pay their fees out of that or whether the timing would be that we would have to pay some fees prior to actually receiving the funds.

Mr. Stake: I believe they stated previously that we wouldn't need any up front money or seed

money as you refer to.

Mr. Chapman: Actually no up front money, but as we go through the process going forward, if we were to implement certain changes, all of those would always, our bill would always come after you've already received your savings. So we would always be in arrears.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mrs. Reichard: So would we need a rotary type account? Mr. Auditor? To be set up _____
.

Mr. Whitney: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So we'll revisit this in two weeks and again, I don't see a problem with it if there's no objection from members of the committee. I think we'd feel more comfortable if we did actually have a copy of the contract before we...

Mrs. Reichard: Absolutely. Rather do it slow and right.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. And it looks like we're going to get the money either way if there's money available.

Mrs. Reichard: So I'll get a contract to you tomorrow.

Mr. Stake: Very good. So we'll hold this for two weeks.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you very much.

Mr. Stake: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thanks gentlemen.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Let's see if I can go on without messing this up any more. Item number 5 is Discussion to Amend the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 6.06, Workplace Violence. Ms. Milam, would you like to address this?

Ms. Milam: Thank you, Councilman Stake. What you have before you is legislation to revise Section 6.06 of the Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual. In anticipation of the concealed carry legislation that was passed recently, I contacted our City Attorney to determine if there was any changes that should be made to our Workplace Violence Policy. He did provide some changes which I have been incorporating. They are minor in nature. It would be a revision to page 2, Section 1(e) of the policy. The new language would read as follows: "Use or possession of a weapon with or without a Concealed Carry Permit on city property, in city buildings, in city

vehicles, in city controlled sites or areas associated with is prohibited except as required in the line of duty i.e. law enforcement personnel”. That is the only changes we’re making to this particular policy and we’re looking to make it adopted at your leisure.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And that is the language suggested by the City Attorney, Mr. Underwood. Correct?

Ms. Milam: Yes, it is.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Underwood if I could, oh he’s not here. Ms. Milam, maybe you can answer this question. Would this apply to our city parks?

Ms. Milam: No. This issue just deals with the building itself. The issues of the parks I don’t believe is addressed.

Mr. Stake: Just city buildings?

Ms. Milam: Yes. In terms of...

Mr. Stake: Okay. It says, “on city property and city buildings”.

Ms. Milam: Yes, on city property.

Mr. Hills: On city property, may think you can _____ the parks, but House Bill 12 specifically excludes that. You cannot go in and implement that local municipalities until it’s tested further in court, you can’t challenge the park holding in House Bill 12. Now I think what we’re doing here is repeating what the statute says. The statute says even if you are conceal and carry permit wise, you cannot enter this city building, exception being weapon for law enforcement.

Ms. Milam: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: And what we’re doing is taking what existing law currently says, and you’re just putting it into a policy in one sentence. I don’t guess there’s any flaw with that but I believe that when it comes to a city excluding its parks I think Mayor Coleman had a real problem with that too, and Representative _____. And as of right now, I wouldn’t post your parks because you’re probably not going to win. That doesn’t mean there won’t be some changes.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: This is only in relation to employees though, right? I mean, can’t we tell our employees that they can’t carry a gun while they’re on duty unless they’re a sworn officer? I mean, it seems reasonable to me.

Ms. Milam: Right. The policy would be applying to our employees. If there’s something

relative to visitors and things like that, that would be relative to signs that would be posted...

Mr. Beougher: Right. And this has no bearing on that.

Ms. Milam: I don't believe so.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher, I think the city's been known to tell its employees a lot of things.

Mr. Beougher: True.

Mr. Hills: Let's put it this way, as President of Council, I'm not going to request my other Council people not to carry in the park. Now, if the Mayor would choose to do that, the Mayor chooses to do that. I'm not sure it goes in a policy.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Beougher, Mr. Hills. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. Well it looks like a prudent thing we need to do here. So I would recommend that we send this on for its first reading. We can do a three reading with this.

Ms. Milam: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I make a motion we send this on for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Ms. Milam: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Item number 6 is Discussion, County Land Bank Advisory Committees. I received some information from Franklin County Treasurer Richard Cordray in regards to two committees that are being set up and we need to make appointments to those committees. So I was looking for recommendations from President Hills.

Mr. Hills: And Mr. Stake, I did have a conversation with the Mayor today. He was unable to be here tonight. He would like this held for a couple of weeks because he does have some thoughts that he'd like to further discuss and come forward with some recommendations.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, President Hills. Then we will hold this if that's okay with the committee, we'll hold this for two weeks. I don't hear any objections so we'll hold it for two weeks. Thank you.

Item number 7 is Discussion, Change in City of Reynoldsburg Investment Policy, Treasury Investment Board. Mr. Whitney. I believe what you'd like to do Mr. Whitney, is have the opportunity to invest some funds beyond 2 years up to 5 years. Correct?

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Stake: Would you like to explain to us what this is all about?

Mr. Whitney: Do you want my 1 hour lecture or my...

Mr. Stake: Well give us the condensed version please.

Mr. Clemens: Quickly.

Mr. Whitney: I think Mr. Clemens would like that. Okay. We are foregoing an opportunity to generate more income on our account balances especially in the low interest rate environment that we've been in. Being restricted, I gave you a hand out back on the 25th, at least I gave some of you, the handout back on the 25th of September. The rest of you, the three new Council members received it I believe 2 weeks ago. And I gave you some updated information about yields. What they are now, or at least what they are about a month ago, in a supplement. We have, what I tried to establish in here is that we have significant stable funds. And for us, one of the major considerations in investing is to make sure you have the liquidity to pay the bills when they come in. And we do. We do. Go to the, what I've got here is Exhibit 3 in the September 25th version. I did a calculation. I _____ the model which I call implied volatility of our funds balances. And simply stated, the difference between the high and the low in the fund balances over a course of a 2 year period, that as a percentage of the low balance, I use that as kind of an implied volatility measure. Anything with a ration under 1 is a very stable fund. And we really have no consideration as far as liquidity is concerned. Those funds are there. So I took the 4 most stable funds, you can see on the next page which has that funny colored bluish-green heading and I said, okay well we've got over 5 million dollars in those three funds which are extremely stable. One of them won't be quite as stable here now that we've given away some money over the next three months in the Solid Waste Fund. But still are very stable. So I'm suggesting that we take, this is approximately, roughly 25% of our overall fund balances. So I'm suggesting that we take this 25% of our fund balances and allow me to invest those in maturities up to 5 years. I provided you with three yield curves that show you what yields are at a point in time. One yield curve is our, which I guess is the third yield curve Exhibit 2, the yield curve over our current investment horizon of 2 years. Notice that in all cases they are at least mildly upward sloping which is significant. Then I also did a 5 year yield curve. These are at 6 different points in time. The current, well the current one back then, back in September were the diamonds which you can hardly make out because they coincide very closely with the May '03. Any ways, they are upward sloping meaning simply that at these six different points in time, you could generate a higher yield with the longer maturities. This is even further evident by looking at, I put a 20 year yield curve here, _____ 20 yield curve which I call Exhibit 1. And you notice that in the first 5 years of the maturity curve say, from the 2003 to 2008, the yield curve's especially upward sloping, especially steep, suggesting that we will be rewarded, you are rewarded for going out longer. The problem is of course, right now interest rates are very low and I would be a fool to invest for 5 years right now. However, I would like this in place so that when interest rates do get up and that might be 6 months, it might be a year, it might be 2 years, I don't know. Investment decisions are made on a variety of variables. One of which is current interest rates. Right now interest rates are very low. A second variable is expected interest rates. And these yield curves

being upward sloping suggest that the investing community expect interest rates to go up. The condition of the economy, well the economy is starting to pick up. The economy has picked up and I'm sure that all of us good type people are very happy about that. And the expansion of the economy will tend to cause interest rates to go up. In the Federal Reserve, which is probably the major determinate of interest rates is going to, as the economy starts to heat up, is going to continue to let interest rates rise so the economy doesn't overheat. So we're talking perhaps down a year, maybe 2 years down the road, when it very well might be wise to start going significantly longer. If we had had this in January of 2001, our investment income would have been significantly more than it is right now. At that point in time, interest rates were high. We were just starting into a recession and the Federal Reserve announced, the Federal Reserve announces every 6 weeks what it's going to do. And they announced that they were in fact going to push interest rates down. At that point in time, we should have been going out as long as we could for as much as we could. And at this point in time, it's kind of a no brainer but, so any ways, based on this basic type of information, I would like to see us go, or allow us, allow me with the approval of the Treasury Investment Board. You notice on my first page here the proposed change in the Investment Policy, I'm asking that the Auditor be authorized to invest up to 25% of our fund balances in treasuries, agencies, the other things in which we tend to buy. For any individual investment with a maturity excess of 2 years, the Auditor must obtain prior approval of the Treasury Investment Board. So it will be a one person kind of decision. There are checks and balances in here. And this change would apply only to the city's inactive deposits which I talked about earlier. Basically, those almost translate into the stable funds that I referenced. So that's what I'd like.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Whitney, I believe not all of us on Council have the information that I have in front of me that you have in front of you. I think I asked you to get that to us.

Mr. Whitney: They do. Everybody does.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I know I've seen charts that you are holding up there before. So it may not have been in the last one.

Mr. Hills: This would have been an item dated October 1, 2003. About a 6 page packet.

Mr. Whitney: I gave Susie the package 2 weeks ago for the _____.

Mr. Hills: The charts are April 6.

Mr. Baxter: I saw the April 6 charts. If there's something in October, I haven't seen that.

Mr. Hills: The one that was moved to Other Legislation was dated October 1, 2003. And that's the one I think you're referring to right now as the qualifiers on the...

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: Whatever he handed out in the fall was copied to the new people after they were elected. And Mrs. Newman got hers a little later. Inside the file it will say when everybody got whatever they have. Whatever he refers to as September 25 and some of those other packets like September 23 or something. But basically it's the same documentation. What he passed out a couple of weeks ago was the same stuff as last fall except for the September 25 document.

Mr. Hills: As long as everybody's got it so we've all got the same stuff to read.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, we get a lot of paper. Sometimes it's difficult to know which is which.

Mr. Hills: Sometimes they look all alike.

Mr. Baxter: But I noticed his was in color.

Mr. Whitney: Are they all color coordinated?

Mr. Hills: At times. I'm glad you don't have a pie chart.

Mr. Whitney: Next time, Bill.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Whitney, you're assuming I guess that our future City Auditor's will be adept at investing money.

Mr. Whitney: I have been working with and training Mike Turner and Peggy to handle this.

Mr. Stake: Okay. But you sit on the Treasury Investment Board as well as the City Attorney and the Mayor. They don't sit on that Treasury Investment Board.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct. They oftentimes come.

Mr. Stake: And I would think the Treasury Investment Board maybe looks to you for these kinds of .

Mr. Whitney: Yes, they do.

Mr. Stake: Any questions, comments from members of the committee? (No response).
Members of Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Stake, thank you. I usually raise my hand right when you say committee and I realize I'm not on that committee. So I apologize. First question I'd have, and I think what you've done is some good work but in my mind there are two points that you brought up. One, 25% of what we have in the funds, and secondly the fact that liquidity were two decision points that you brought up. And liquidity with a 5 year bond is what I think you were talking about, or 5

year investment, is that going to lock us into that 5 years and then those funds be unavailable to us? Or is there penalties greater than what we would make if we stayed where we are at.

Mr. Whitney: These are all marketable securities.

Mr. Baxter: Okay.

Mr. Whitney: So that if we absolutely, if we get in that kind of trouble, we're in deep. But any time that we need cash we can just simply sell in the market.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I'd hate to say that we'd have a bounce back recession. I'm looking forward to that great work ethic that we have in America and _____ the economy grow. But in the event that we did invest it and then turn around and need those funds again, I'd hate to see those locked.

Mr. Whitney: And also, it would only be a maximum of 25%. The rest of the portfolio would be laddered. Like I try to keep it laddered at this point. It's kind of difficult and everything you get is _____. And for the barring institutions it's quite natural.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Whitney, is this a recommendation that you have or a recommendation that you and the Treasury Investment Board has?

Mr. Whitney: We have talked about it. We haven't taken an official vote on it. But I was under the impression that there was some reasonable support.

Mr. Stake: When is your next meeting?

Mr. Whitney: Next week.

Mr. Stake: Next week?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: But as you say, you're not ready to invest anything at these rates for 5 years.

Mr. Whitney: I would be a fool.

Mr. Beougher: So there's no rush on this.

Mr. Whitney: No.

Mr. Beougher: And in response to Mr. Baxter's question, substantial penalty for early withdraw, right?

Mr. Whitney: No.

Mr. Beougher: We would sell it (inaudible).

Mr. Whitney: No. These are marketable securities.

Mr. Beougher: Which you would sell at a discount.

Mr. Whitney: It depends upon what rates do. You can actually gain. If rates go down you can gain. If rates go up you can lose.

Mr. Baxter: The price is based upon shield.

Mr. Stake: I think what I'd be worried about is somebody making the investment and then rates going up and then we lose.

Mr. Whitney: Well as we go a longer term, the yield curves you see here, let's let the elbow be longer term rates. And right now the shorter term rates are lower. As rates go up, long term rates will go up also but not as much as short term rates. Eventually as we hit the peak of the next cycle, we'll probably find, we could find short term rates to be a little bit higher than the long term rates. Well when that happens, it is with expectation that the rates are going to go back down. So there's a _____ effect of the yield curves. Does that help?

Mr. Stake: It helps me. Again my fear is maybe the next City Auditor doesn't have the education and the knowledge that you have in this.

Mr. Whitney: I can understand that. But I'm training Mike and assuming that they'll be around, Mike and Peggy.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I guess what I'd like to do with this item is to hold it for two weeks so that you can discuss it in your Treasury Investment Board and come back with I guess a recommendation, not recommendation on what to do here. If that would be okay with the rest of the committee. Council?

Mr. Whitney: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Is that going to be a recommendation from the Treasury Board or a recommendation from the Auditor? I think we already have a recommendation from the Auditor to do so. Him coming back for the board, isn't that just the same thing? He and the board are the same somewhat. All we would have is an additional from the board saying, I recommend as well. Is that going to

help us make a decision if the board suggests it versus our own Auditor? Would we make a different decision if they were different?

Mr. Stake: I guess it's each Council members opinion whether it helps their decision or not. But since we do have a Treasury Investment Board, I would feel more comfortable seeing what their opinion would be. The board itself. So we'll hold this for two weeks. Thank you, Mr. Whitney.

Mr. Whitney: Sounds good.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Next item on the agenda is Discussion, Amend 4.091 of the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, Compensatory Time, Senior Police Management. I believe Mrs. Reichard would address this for us today since the Chief is not here this evening.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you, Mr. Stake. As we discussed earlier, this is the legislation that we were putting forth to not only look back but move forward in terms of working out of class for the Lieutenants. And when they were working in the, when they were working on behalf of the Chief when the Chief was out of town, the thing that came up at our last committee meeting was because this is a 160 employee issue, that we look at other similar circumstances in other departments for parody sake. I think that needs a longer, leaner look. So what I'd like to ask is that if we could move forward with this legislation, well with something similar to this to clean up the past from 2001, I'm sorry, January 1, 2003 through whatever time is necessary. Say the first quarter of this year. We don't have any Lieutenant's right now so we don't have to worry about the issue and it does give us a little bit of time to really look at this and look at all parts of 160 in other departments to see if there's any other area that we would like to add to this, if you would like to add to it. But we do need to clean up what's been done which was left out when we switched from 165 to 160. Am I making myself clear? I hope so.

Mr. Stake: I understand.

Mrs. Reichard: Good.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Have these officers been paid or are we going back?

Mrs. Reichard: The Lieutenant's were. Yes. Yes, sir. They were paid at the Chief's rate even though it was not in the chapter.

Mr. Clemens: Even though it was not there, they were paid.

Mrs. Reichard: Even though it wasn't there. That's true because...

Mr. Clemens: That's kind of uncommon isn't it?

Mrs. Reichard: Yeah. Well apparently it was just an oversight or there was some reason why it was not transferred from 165 to 160 and since I wasn't here I can't tell you what it is.

Mr. Clemens: I understand that. But the ordinance, it wasn't there. So they shouldn't have been paid.

Mrs. Reichard: Correct.

Mr. Clemens: I'm just curious on how they got paid is all.

Mrs. Reichard: Because until one evening when you brought up working out of class, and I asked Ms. Milam where that was at in 160 and it was the following day she came back and told me, bingo it's not there. The Chief, anyone involved in that Chapter and the revision of it was unaware, appeared to be unaware that it had been removed. So now we need to clean it up.

Mr. Clemens: As we discussed it last time, I don't feel it should be paid at the present Chief's wages and I don't think it should be paid at the beginning. I think they should probably be paid in the middle wage of the Chief when they take over. I don't feel that we should make that jump from Lieutenant's pay to the Chief's pay. I mean, that's a big jump. And we want to pay them at the beginning but I think medium grade in the middle or somewhere that they should be compensated. I mean, that's my feeling on it.

Mrs. Reichard: Well I think there are some different feelings about this. Certainly one of those feelings is whether it's a Lieutenant, an Assistant Chief, an Assistant Superintendent, whatever it is, folks usually in those positions are what we consider in training to take over as the Chief or the Superintendent or whatever, and we all have to pay our dues in terms of our training. And that so there's a feeling that you don't even need to do that. So that's another piece to the equation that you need to think about. That's the reason I asked that this just stand as a clean up. We can change the verbiage to reflect what was done January 1, 2003 through the first quarter of this year. As I said, there are no Lieutenant's in place right now. So this doesn't effect anyone and then we could move forward with new legislation if the Council so deems and look at all of those issues. Especially the ones that you bring up, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: That's fine with me.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Hills.

Mrs. Hills: Mrs. Reichard, let me try to clarify something. The piece of legislation in front of us now doesn't have anything to do with anyone other than Lieutenant's being upgraded to Chief's. That's what's on this paper.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: The discussions we're having about the assistant a, b, c positions moving up and upgraded is something that came along as a side line discussion. It would seem to me that the piece we have in front of us through some sort of administrative error, whatever is a two item piece. Number one, we paid people at an upgraded rate that were Lieutenant's to be Acting Chief for a period of time from 1-1-03 up until a memo went out saying don't do that any more.

Mrs. Reichard: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: Regardless of how that was upgraded, I'm not sure that the best thing to do is go back and either pay them more or have them pay back the city. What you're after is a piece of legislation that authorized the authority to go ahead and pay them at that rate making what we historically have done appropriate by legislation. And then number two, we're asking for a piece of legislation that makes a determination when a Lieutenant is upgraded to Acting Chief, what rate of pay will he have? And I looked at both beginning rate and the senior rate of Lieutenant's and/or Chiefs and the differential is 13.4% or something roughly along those lines. Certainly I think one thing we may want to consider is when they are upgraded and under what other standards it is that they must follow in order to be the Acting Chief which is over 16 hours or whatever the guides are, that we just look at that as a percentage increase. And it seem that that may be the cleanest way whether that be 13%, 14%, 15%. But certainly I think that there are two totally separate issues from the non-Lieutenant upgraded to Acting Chief than there is with all other assistant positions. Because we're testing under the Assistant Police Chief.

Mrs. Reichard: The first two pieces that you discussed, one concerning cleaning up what we have done for the last, what we did for the fifteen months without authority, to clean that up and make that legal. And just leave it at that so we can get that in place, move on with that legislation. The second piece would be a different piece of legislation that would give us, afford us time.

Mr. Hills: The second piece is the piece that's in front of us now. The one that raises some rate by something to pay as an Acting Chief. Unless we do them both in one piece and I'm not sure that .

Mrs. Reichard: That's why I'm asking that you separate. That you only do the past. We only make the past legitimate. And for the future, we do that in a separate piece of legislation.

Mr. Hills: I don't have a problem doing the separate piece of legislation as long as that part's dealt with now. I think members of Council have made it pretty clear that, I think there's a feeling that a Lieutenant who's filling in under the guidelines for the Chief as an Acting Chief, there should be some compensation pay. It historically has been done. At least that's the feeling I got from my discussions with Council. That we had done it in the past and we wanted to continue to do it. If that's not, then I guess we opened it all up. But I think we're putting apples and oranges together.

Mr. Stake: I think tonight you just want to deal with the clean up of what was done in the past. Correct?

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct. Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: I basically sitting here came to the same conclusion of Mr. Hills. I don't know that I want to say great minds think alike but the percentage between the ranges seem to be an appropriate solution rather than paying an entry level Lieutenant at the Senior Chief's salary rate, I mean hourly rate. That percentage between the ranges seems to be the appropriate number way to multiply it. I mean, we need a whole lot more information on what was paid to whom and when to get to that first piece of legislation.

Mr. Stake: Clean up piece?

Mr. Beougher: Clean up piece.

Mr. Hills: I'd ask for the City (Tape Change).

Mr. Underwood: All you have to do is put a blessing on it.

Mr. Hills: It was paid under the schedule we were following at the time.

Mr. Underwood: That's right.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I make a motion that we do that and get it over with.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Do I have a second?

Mr. Clemens: Since it's been done, it's over with.

Mr. Gilbert: Are we correcting the, this is just a clean up as far as correcting the language. The mid range, that will be in the second piece?

Mr. Clemens: This is just a clean up. The second piece will come later. This is just the first piece to clean up the language to take care of what's happened.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll second Mr. Clemens' motion.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Baxter, did you have anything?

Mr. Baxter: No, I don't.

Mr. Stake: Okay. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is Discussion, Clarification and evaluation of Smoking

Policy. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. After the last meetings discussion and the Mayor's discussion on what he feels should be put back in and so forth, I would like to read the Smoking Policy that I would like to propose. Number 1, General, The City of Reynoldsburg is dedicated to providing an environment that is healthy, safe, and comfortable for all of its employees, customers, and visitors. It has been determined by the U S Environmental Protection Agency that the environmental tobacco smoke creates significant health and risk in the work place. The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health recommends that all available preventive measures should be used to minimize occupational exposure to ETS. The City of Reynoldsburg wishes to establish and maintain the most effective and healthful environment possible. In order to accomplish this objective, the city has adopted a policy of the use of tobacco which has been developed in the consideration of the following points: A. Safety to all visitors and employees. B. Individual rights of all persons concerned. And C. Compliance with Ohio Revised Code 3791.031 on Smoking in Public Places of Public Assembly. 2. Employees and Visitors. The use of tobacco products is banned in every municipal building or structure except in designated areas as follows: The front of the municipal entrance on the south side. The steps on the east side of the police department and the rear of the police department on the west side, and any other areas designated by the Mayor. 3. This policy is in effect 24 hours a day 7 days a week. 4. Employees who violate this policy will be subject to progressive discipline. All violations of this policy are minor misdemeanors. That's it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are you making a motion?

Mr. Clemens: I'm making a motion.

Mr. Stake: Do we have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Discussion? (No response). Members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Ms. Smith: Mr. Stake, could we include this with the ordinance for the Work Place Violence one? Combine them both because they're both amending the Policy and Procedures Manual.

Mr. Stake: It works for me. I don't know procedurally how we do that at this point.

Mr. Hills: Let the Clerk do it.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: Nancy will work it out.

Mr. Stake: The Clerk will write that up that way. I believe Mr. Underwood had something to say.

Mr. Underwood: Yeah. The proposed policy still has one of the same evils in it. We go on to say how bad smoking is and then we ban the use of all tobacco products. All tobacco products are not

smoking. If you want to ban the use of all tobacco products, that's fine. But put in there the evils of the other tobacco products.

Mr. Clemens: I proposed it as a motion and the motion has been passed.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Next on the agenda is Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Chapter 971, Municipal Parks, addition of Section 971.08, Program and Facility Fees and Charges. This was read for the first time on 4-12-04. Do we have any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay then, I recommend this be sent forward for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Can this go on the Consent Agenda?

Mr. Gilbert: It certainly can, Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: And I regret not putting my two items on the Consent Agenda. So maybe I'll make that motion to amend the agenda next Monday to put it on there too and we'll be done in 5 minutes.

Mr. Stake: Okay then. I guess we need to amend the motion here, don't we? To place it on the Consent Agenda. We have a second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion passes.

Item number 12 is An ordinance declaring improvements to certain parcels of real property to be a public purpose, describing the public infrastructure improvements to be made directly benefitting those parcels, requiring the owners of those parcels to make service payments in lieu of taxes; establishing a municipal public improvement tax increment equivalent fund for the deposit of such service payments; approving and authorizing a form of tax increment financing agreement and declaring an emergency. I believe this has been read two other times. And Mr. Brandt is here to address this I guess.

Mr. Brandt: Yes sir, Mr. Stake. Thank you. There have been a couple of minor changes. One of which is with respect to the original drawings that were provided at the onset. It was to be a 58,000 square foot store with an out parcel and possibly a gas service station. As things went on that was changed recently. They're going to build a 66,000 square foot store. There will be no out parcel for a hamburger stand or something of that nature on the site. And we wanted the drawings that they had submitted to the city and to various departments to match the documents that would ultimately be filed with respect to the project. And there was some minor changes in the language. In the documents as you can well imagine, it took a good bit of time getting this through their corporate offices with an organization that big and as complicated as this has been out there between ODOT and our EPA and all the other parties involved. We could hopefully have the drawings to submit with the documents here on hand now and we've contacted them last Thursday or Friday and they said they would have the revised drawings in the size that we need for

inclusion with the documents hopefully in the next day or two. And they would be forwarded to all of you with your packet on Friday for processing next Monday night. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. So Mr. Brandt would like this to be sent on for a third reading as an emergency. Is there any problem from members of the committee? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Just a question. Mr. Brandt, I noticed on the top of the agreement it says, drafted October 7, 2003 for discussion purposes only. Are you also forwarding a finalized agreement?

Mr. Brandt: Yes, sir. Right. There were just some minor changes that were more between, with respect to some prevailing wage issues that were included. They were covered under our other agreement as well but based on the advice of counsel they thought it should be included in this document.

Mr. Beougher: It's always something. Thank you.

Mr. Brandt: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Any further questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay then I will make a motion we send this on to Council for its third reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. And we'll adjourn the Finance Committee at 9:16.

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
April 19, 2004