

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 17, 2006

Members of Community Development Committee present: Antoinette Newman, Doug Joseph, Preston Stearns, Donna Shirey.

Other members of Council present: Ron Stake, Brett Baxter, Mel Clemens, Council President William L. Hills.

Mrs. Newman: I'll call to order, the Community Development Committee meeting at 7:30.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda for this evening. Are there any additions or changes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, it'll stand as written.

The next item is the approval of the regular Community Development Committee meeting held April 3, 2006. Are there any alterations or changes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they'll stand as written.

The fourth item on the agenda is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: CHAPTER 160 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION, SECTION 160.02 "Authorized Positions, Personnel, Classification and Pay Grade" Subsections (c) "Department of Development" and (g) "Service Department" (2) "Building Division"; and SECTION 160.05 "Overtime Eligibility" Subsection (A) "Policy" (1). The first reading was held on April 10. Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: This is part of the request that we'd like to make to remove it from the agenda. We've had some meetings, and we're going to make some changes in the Planning Administrator's job. And we'd like to give that a shot for the next few months. And we're very sure that we're going to be able to address some of the issues, if not all of the issues that we've had in that department. So we would like to request that that be removed from the agenda tonight.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. In that case, I'll move that we remove this from the agenda. Do I have a second?

Mr. Stearns: Question.

Mrs. Newman: Yes?

Mr. Stearns: The Mayor just said that there's going to be changes?

Mayor McPherson: Well, one of the changes, there's been several suggestions that zoning enforcement, and by zoning enforcement, I'm talking about, we need to have somebody follow up on zoning matters as they come from Design Review, or BZBA, or wherever they might come from. So what we're going to implement is a flow of that information. For example, the new Planning Administrator is going to be responsible for going through all the minutes, highlighting anything that needs to be addressed, and then giving that highlighted copy to the Chief Building

Official, who in turn will either look into it himself or will assign it. If it gets to the point where there has to be a citation, then that would have to come from the Compliance Officer. So example, that's just an example of one of the things that we've talked about doing. And of course, one of the other things is, just having the person do a lot more information. We've talked about putting together a brochure, and I just talked to Chet about this just last week, to walk people through step, by step, by step, by step, so that nobody can say they don't know what the procedure is, or what the process is. It will go from day one of coming in and we'll physically hand it to the people, and it will show them what the entire process is. You know, how long it's going to take approximately to go through all the commissions, when you go to the commission. So items like that, we're going to, and that will all flow through the Zoning Administrator and the Development Director's Department.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. As long as you think it's going to make a better situation.

Mayor McPherson: I really think it will. And Mr. Stearns, I think we all agree, that if we're still having problems you know, a few months down the road, we can always bring it back.

Mr. Stearns: Sounds good to me.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Any other questions? (No response). Alright. Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Any not in favor? (No response). So the motion passes.

The fifth item on the agenda is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE "CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL" ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 14-03 PASSED MARCH 10, 2003 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED, SECTION 4.03 "Payroll Deductions", Subsection A. "Policy" 1. It had its first reading on April 10, 2006. And this is related to the previous ordinance.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. And we would like to request the removal of that one also as we go down the road.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Any questions? (No response). Then I move that this ordinance, or proposed ordinance be removed from the agenda. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Any not in favor? (No response). Motion is adopted.

I'll conclude the Community Development Committee meeting at 7:35.

Community Development Committee
April 17, 2006
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 17, 2006

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

Mr. Baxter: And I will call to order, the Safety Committee meeting at 7:35.

The first item is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? (No response). Hearing none, it'll stand approved.

Approval of minutes of the regular Safety Committee meeting held April 3, 2006. And I ask if there are any changes or additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion of Liquor Permit Request, transfer from Armbruster Energy Enterprises LLC Waldemar Wojcik Trustee in Bankruptcy to Convenience Management Services Inc. dba CMSI 3092, 2253 Baltimore Reynoldsburg Rd., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Chief, I see you standing up, so you're ready to go for this one.

Chief Suci: Yes sir, Chairman Baxter. We conducted an investigation with regard to this transfer. CMSI is purchasing all 16 permits that had been owned by Armbruster throughout the State of Ohio. CMSI has no record of any violations with the Ohio Department of Liquor Control, so we have no objections to this transfer.

Mr. Baxter: Great. Thank you so much. Any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Questions from Council? (No response). Thank you very much.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Authorization of contract, Reconstruction of Taylor Road, Contract A, Alternate 2. And who do we have here to discuss that? I believe that's Sharon. Mrs. Reichard. Good evening.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you. Yes. What you have before you is Contract A. I think you will recall, there was Contract A and Contract B. Contract B will be coming before you. It was, I thought we had it in in time, but apparently we didn't, for rejection of bid. Because it was more than 10% over the engineers estimate. This one is with Savco. And I'm here, and Mr. Parkinson's here if you have any questions. This is the reconstruction of Taylor Road South between Main Street and the corporate limits to the south. Something long awaited.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I don't have any questions. This is pretty straight forward. It's a matter of having to re-bid, correct?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Any questions from members of committee? (No response). Just out of curiosity, how much over was it? It wasn't that much, was it?

Mrs. Reichard: 11 or 12%. Wasn't it, Dave?

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

Mr. Baxter: 12 or 13%. Very good, sir.

Mrs. Reichard: As you know, anything 10% or over, we cannot accept. So we need to go out and re-bid that one for the, that's for the sewer.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And so therefore, we would like to have this moved through the process quickly? Back out to bids?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. It would be, as with any contract, when we're accepting a bid, of course I will leave it up to Council to make that decision, but if we could put an emergency on this, it would be helpful so that we can get moving on this project and accept the bid.

Mr. Baxter: If accepted, and find that we do meet the engineers numbers with the new bids coming in, are we still able to have construction this year?

Mrs. Reichard: For the sewer?

Mr. Baxter: Correct.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So we would like to try to get moving on this so that we can begin construction ____
.

Mrs. Reichard: True. And that will be before your next committee meeting. Unless you, because I don't think you added it tonight, right?

Mr. Baxter: No. I did not.

Mrs. Reichard: So it will be before the next committee meeting. And that's to reject the bid and to authorize us to go out for a re-bid.

Mr. Baxter: Go out for a re-bid. Very good. Alright. Any questions from the committee? (No response). Of Council? (No response). Hearing none, I thank you, Sharon.

The next item is a Discussion...

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Frazier: You need to move this one on. This is a contract for A. The one she was talking about is Contract B which comes the next time to reject. But this one is the contract. You want to authorize the contract with Savko. The money's already there. Okay?

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. It's already there. So then I need to move this on to Council for its first reading as an emergency with an amendment to, so do I need to move to add emergency language?

Mrs. Frazier: No. Just send it with it.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. So I would like to then, move that we send this to Council for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thanks Nancy.

Item number 7 is Street lights on Crestview Street. And I received an e-mail a few days ago back, talking about the potential of needs for street lights. So I did go out and take a look at this myself. And I believe Mayor, you've done the same thing. Went out and saw the same thing that I did. And I understand the concerns of the residents, and they were concerned that the lighting may have caused, or made it easier for crime. And myself, I didn't see that. Nor did our administration. Is there anybody else that would like to discuss? (No response). At this point, I don't see to move on any further with this. I don't see an issue. I will go out and talk with the resident and get a little bit clearer on it. But there is no additional crimes in that area or additional calls. Anything that would warrant additional lighting. Any other questions? (No response). Any questions of Council? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Chairman Baxter, there is ample lighting there now, right? Is that correct?

Mr. Baxter: Yes, there is. I actually looked at the plan and saw where all the lights were across the street. And it did appear to me that there was the appropriate lighting on that street. And I even went out there at night to take a look to see if there was any areas that were missing. I didn't see anything that looked like there was a problem myself. That's why I asked the administration to take a look at it because I'm not an engineer. And they came back with the same response saying that they felt that it was safe. They pulled police reports over a period of time to see if there had been any increases, and they didn't see any. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I've checked that before. And I believe it's compared to the older sections in town which is different street lighting than the new sections in town. So it's not as bright. But I don't think there's any way we really can correct it.

Mr. Baxter: No I don't think there is either. And it was no different than any other street that was around that same area.

Mr. Clemens: Right.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? (No response). I would recommend that we keep an eye on it to make sure that if there are any changes that we're aware of those. Mayor, I'm sure your people

are doing a great job keeping an eye on that area. So if we see anything else, then we'll go ahead and address it at that time. In the interim, I will contact the resident again and let them know what we have discussed on this and go out and have a talk with them again, and maybe we can find some more information.

With that said, I'll go ahead and move on to item number 7. And item number 7 is AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING A REQUEST TO THE OHIO BOARD OF BUILDING STANDARDS TO CERTIFY THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG FOR ENFORCEMENT OF THE RESIDENTIAL CODE OF OHIO TO EXERCISE ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY AND ACCEPT AND APPROVE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS, AND MAKE INSPECTIONS. First reading was on 4-10-06. And I believe this one's Chet. Is he here tonight? There he is. Actually Chet, I think we have a couple of them in a row here that has your name on it.

Mr. Hopper: Yes, we do. I don't have anything additional than what we've already previously discussed. And I just ask that this go back to Council for its second reading.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Any questions from Council or committee? (No response). This is pretty straight forward. And there hasn't been any changes, correct?

Mr. Hopper: No.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Then I'll go ahead and move that we send it to Council for its second reading. Second by Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Number 8 is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REPEALING AND REPLACING CHAPTER 1325 1999 OHIO RESIDENTIAL CODE FOR 1, 2, AND 3 FAMILY DWELLINGS. It had its first reading on 4-10-06. And Chet, would you explain why it has 1, 2, and 3 family dwelling on it? Because that was brought up the last time we discussed it and I want to make sure it's clear, why it's separated.

Mr. Hopper: This is the residential code. Anything above a 3 family is considered part of the commercial code. We already regulate that. We're already using the current code. This goes along with the last item, item 7. It just brings us up to date with the current code which is being adopted by the State of Ohio.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. I don't have any additional questions then. This just was to clarify why we had to specify 1, 2, and 3. That was just to recognize it as being not commercial.

Mr. Hopper: That's correct. It's residential.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions from members of committee? (No response). From members of Council? (No response). Hearing none, I will then move that we send this legislation to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second? Councilman Shirey. All in favor? (All

voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thank you.

The last item here is quite lengthy here and I felt bad for our Clerk last week having to read it, but I’ll go ahead and do it again any ways. Number 9 is AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTING THE 2003 EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE, RELATING AND GOVERNING THE CONDITIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL PROPERTY, BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES; BY PROVIDING THE STANDARDS FOR SUPPLIED UTILITIES AND FACILITIES AND OTHER PHYSICAL THINGS AND CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL TO ENSURE THAT STRUCTURES ARE SAFE, SANITARY AND FIT FOR OCCUPATION AND USE; AND THE CONDEMNATION OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES UNFIT FOR HUMAN OCCUPANCY AND USE, AND THE DEMOLITION OF SUCH EXISTING STRUCTURES IN THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG; PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF PERMITS AND COLLECTION OF FEES THEREFORE; REPEALING CHAPTER(S) NO. 1387, 1389, 1391, 1393 OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG. Chet, this is also yours. And we’ve been working on this for some time. And there were some changes that we received in the packet and I wanted to make sure the Council members here have seen those changes. It was pretty much consolidated to try to explain it a little bit better I think.

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. We took out a lot of the amendments that I was trying to make in the ordinance and just presented the Property Maintenance Code itself to get it passed. And I am still working on the additional packet for the changes in the ordinance.

Mr. Baxter: So this is a reminder for the committee and Council that we changed directions. Rather than going after it individually, we decided to go after it in its entirety and then make the changes individually afterwards, correct?

Mr. Hopper: That’s correct.

Mr. Baxter: And I think it’s a better strategy. It gets us moving forward and quicker. Do I have any questions on those changes that you received in your packet this last week from committee? (No response). From Council? (No response). Well, I thought it was well put together Chet myself, and it was very easy for me to understand what you were trying to do and it made good sense to me. So I appreciate your efforts.

Mr. Hopper: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: With that said and no other questions, I am going to request that we send this back to Council for its third and final reading with a recommendation that it is adopted. Do I have a second? Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted “Aye”). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thanks for your help sir.

Mr. Hopper: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Item number 10 is an ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES

OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: CHAPTER 160 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION, SECTION 160.02 “Authorized Positions, Personnel, Classification and Pay Grade” Subsection (f), AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. It had its second reading on 4-10-06. And Mayor, do you want to address this and have discussion on this? Or do we want to have the Chief talk about it? Or who do we want to have a discussion with this?

Mayor McPherson: Well, I guess what we'd like to do is just move it forward of course for its third reading. I think we've talked at length about the need for the Police Officers. And just to reiterate, we're talking about 5 Police Officers. Four on patrol and one in detective. One Sargent, and one full time police dispatcher. And I think in the presentations that we've made, we have shown the need for these. And I'm here to take questions or, Chief, Lieutenant McKinley's here and we'd be glad to answer any questions for you about it.

Mr. Baxter: Okay, Mayor. I appreciate that. And myself, I'm not very comfortable with moving forward with this at this time. And I would like to give it about 2 more weeks if we could, Mayor. Give an opportunity for us to sit down in your office with the Finance Chair, and with other members of the committee, and get a little bit more comfortable around how we're going to fund this and pay for it, what the long term expectations are. At this time, I know we're in need of paying attention to our fiscal responsibilities as a city. And I want to make sure that when we take these steps, they're done with prudence, with forethought, and with complete agreement that it's the direction we wish to go. There is no argument that anybody from this table I believe, that we need Police Officers. I don't think that's ever been any question. There's no question that we do need them. Correct. I used a double negative. I apologize. So with that said, I would like to have a discussion here tonight if we need to. But furthermore, I'd like to put this on hold for two weeks. Give us an opportunity to discuss it a little bit further, and then we'll address it again in committee in two weeks. Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I guess if what you'd like to do is to hold this for two weeks for further discussion, I really don't have a problem with that. I guess we might have a problem with having a Safety Committee meeting with the Mayor. You know, we might be violating some Sunshine Law there. I don't know. I mean, are you inviting the public to that too?

Mr. Baxter: I think that would be a public meeting. Yes.

Mr. Stake: Well, we have the Safety Committee here right now. Why don't, if we're going to discuss things, why not discuss them here in front of everybody since everybody's here already.

Mr. Baxter: I'm okay with that.

Mr. Stake: So I guess I don't see the need for a Special Safety Committee meeting. If you would like to hold it, I can go along with that for two weeks. But I certainly, I believe that this is something we're going to have to do. And I am in favor of it, and I will be voting for it should it come up for a vote. But I do respect the Chair of this committee, and if that's your wish, and the wish of other committee members, other members of Council, I guess I can go along with that.

But I just want to make sure that we're just not stalling things. And I don't want to have an improper meeting either. And I don't know why we'd have to have a separate meeting on this. I mean, we've discussed it a few times and we can discuss it here in front of the public.

Mr. Baxter: And I wouldn't suggest, and I appreciate your comments Councilman Stake. And nor would I suggest that we have any secret meetings. Because the Sunshine Law is definitely more clear on that point. I think the point I'm trying to make is to make sure that we take the steps with prudence and understanding. And at this point, I don't believe I have all the understanding that I need to be clear on how those positions are going to be funded both now and into the future. And I want to make sure that as we present this piece of legislation to the citizens of Reynoldsburg, that they recognize the need, how it's going to be paid for, and how we need the funds in the future. And how we would like to see those paid for as well. And there's the reason why I'd like to take some additional time to get my hands around it. I'm getting conflicting numbers is why I'm hesitant of you asking. And that's my concern. With conflicting numbers with the Mayor giving me numbers, and the Auditor giving me different numbers. I don't have a firm grasp on it and I'm not comfortable moving it forward for that reason.

Mr. Stake: The numbers we're talking about in regards to this legislation Chairman Baxter, are I guess this year \$232,661.

Mr. Baxter: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: So that's the numbers I have. Do you have numbers different from that?

Mr. Baxter: The numbers I'm talking about is the money that we have in the General Fund to be able to pay for the officers. And how that will present a position for us as a city as a deficit spending. And if we have the money put aside for it, then so be it. I just need to get my hands around that to make sure that exists. Thereby being my concern. Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Chairman Baxter, I'm not on your committee but, it was my understanding from the financial information presented by the Mayor, I was fully satisfied that we had sufficient funds to take care of this expenditure this year and next year. And you know, with the high probability of increasing our income in the future. So I don't see the reason to stall and delay on this. I think we need the Police Officers, and we need to move forward on this.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you for your comments, Mrs. Newman. I appreciate that. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: If it's your wishes, then it would be my suggestion that the members of the committee, not as a whole, but individually, meet with Mayor McPherson. I know I have and I know you have. And also with the Chief, and also with our City Auditor, Mr. Harris, if they have any questions within this two week period that you're discussing. And I'm like Ron, I'd like to get it moving. But if it's your wishes that it takes two more weeks, two more weeks is just two more weeks. And if that will satisfy people. But that would be my suggestion. That individually they meet with the Mayor, and with Mr. Harris, and the Chief.

Mr. Baxter: I think that's exactly what my intent was. Maybe not well said, but thank you for clarifying that position Councilman Clemens. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Just one comment. If you'll recall when the Auditor was asked if the money was available, if you look back through the minutes you'll see that he even indicated the money is there. So you know, I guess I would ask Mr. Baxter you know, please give us specifics that you're looking for. Because I think even in our presentation, we showed everyone where the money was, how much was there. We'd be more than happy to do that again. You know, so that's no problem for us.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate that. Thank you, Mayor. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Chairman Baxter, if I could help clarify, and maybe follow up a little bit on Mr. Clemens. It was my understanding that the discussion that you had had with the majority of the members had some questions that needed answered. And certainly, I always encourage any committee, if their questions aren't answered, then it's nice to have them answered before they send it for vote to Council. So if the majority of your committee feels that way, certainly you as Chair can just say, it is going to be held for a couple of weeks. And certainly, if your committee members are opposed to that, they can bring that up. But I mean, either we should discuss it or we're not going to discuss it. I'm not sure which route we're going.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Well I know there are a couple of questions I'd like to get out now if I can so that they're prepared for us in two weeks. And one of those things I'm looking for is, how long does it take to bring the officer on board? When can we expect to have the officers beginning? And I know you and I spoke about this Mayor, and I got some answers on, well if we hired one that was right off the street, totally trained, we could start them, you know, what's that period? So I would like to get my hands around dispatchers, detectives, and officers, from the time the legislation's approved to the time the Police Officers are able to hit the street working for the City of Reynoldsburg, in a cruiser, I'd like to know what that time frame is.

Mayor McPherson: Do you want that tonight?

Mr. Baxter: If you have the answers, that would be great.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. I believe we talked about this. Scott.

Lt. McKinley: We did Mayor, Mr. Baxter. From the time that we would get the authorization, if we get the authorization to hire additional officers, we go through a pretty extensive process which includes testing. We'd have background investigation which could take up to 30 days. The officer candidates, then submit to a truth fair _____ process, interview process. And if we got the authorization today to hire additional personnel, those persons, once hired and trained would be on the street approximately November of this year.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you Lieutenant. Another question I have Mayor is, where did we come up with the number of how many this year of officers we have? We have the funds in the

General Fund to support what we have, like 200,000 plus dollars, why don't we look at satisfying our needs that we have today completely? Rather than it being 4, why not 8 or 10? I looked at your presentation over 3 years. Why are we waiting 3 years to bring them on? Why not now? If the funds are there, and I'm hearing from the Auditor, the funds are there, I'm hearing from you Mayor, the funds are there, why not do this all at one time? Interview them all. Bring them all on now. Why are we waiting 3 years to get to the numbers that we think we need if they're needed today? Lieutenant McKinley.

Lt. McKinley: Yes, Chairman Baxter. We've only got 6 training officers. And those personnel are trained to bring new officers on. They go through a 14 week in-car training program. And because of the size of the department and the number of officers that we typically have working each shift, 3 is about the max that we can train at any one time. And by staggering, if we did get the additional officers for this year, we would be able to bring them on in hopefully phases of 3 because of the number of training officers that we have.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, very much.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: If I could clarify, one other thing, because I didn't realize we were going to talk about a 3 or 4 year program into 1 as a possibility, but I think the reference was made, the funds were there. And where I have heard the funds were there was the \$300,000 or \$200,000 in this ordinance was available in funds to pay these people through the end of the year. There's been no reference to the funding for future years. It's when the statement was made, the funds are there. Now if I'm misstating that, somebody let me know. Because we seriously will be talking about the need to increase revenues into the city in order to hire safety personnel and to do Capital and Street Programs that haven't been done for a while. And when I hear statements from here that says, we've got all these funds, that's where the Mayor made a statement that hit the paper that sentence 1 was here, and sentence 7 was down here, and they missed the middle ones. But you put the two together it says, the Mayor says, we don't need it, we've got plenty of money. That's not quite what the Mayor said that night. And I'm afraid that I don't want to create the confusion that I just heard. There certainly is not funding within our funds currently or our projected funds as they are now to continue to pay 5 officers and then go into another program and add more. The monies aren't there folks. I think the articles I've seen, we have over spent, not over spent, we have spent more than we had coming in for the last 5 years. We can't continue to do that and have much of a nest egg. So it is where we all have to seriously look down, and I believe Mr. Stake has that on Council for tonight to begin discussions. I just don't, when I hear, and I'm not being critical, but when I hear something that the press will pick up and say, we don't need any money, we've got all the money, it's very limited. Do we have \$200,000 in our account? Yes we do. Do we have \$300,000 in an account? Yes you do. And you'll be able to pay whatever officers you hire through the end of the year. There's no commitment that you're paying them anything farther on the current monies that I believe, is in this ordinance. I don't know if Mr. Harris wants to chew me out after that statement or not.

Mr. Harris: We're pretty much in agreement on this. My contention was, when I made my presentation, and you've done pretty good in summarizing it, do you have the money to do it this year? Yes you do. The question is, right now we're about 400,000 over this year what we're projected to take in. And now you're talking about 200,000 more and 500,000 for next year. That's going to put us in a serious situation of spending more than we're taking in. Now there's been a lot of talk about revenue enhancements, and I guess tonight there are going to be some discussions about it at Finance Committee. But going forward from this year, there's a real problem in funding these people. And unless there's going to be major cuts in the rest of the city in order to support this, unless you get revenue enhancements passed, the money to continue paying these people is not going to be there without severe cuts in other parts of the city. And that's what everybody needs to understand. And these things about there's so much, this much money in the General Fund, there's this much money in the General Fund, when you get a fund report or you see a CAFR, that is a photograph in time at that point. This money goes up and down over the years as the payroll is put in, money is spent for buying cars, and trucks, and paper, and pens, and all those types of things, that money goes up and down as the year, as revenues come in, revenues go out. But you know, a couple of weeks ago, the last fund report, the General Fund had an unencumbered balance of 1.1 million dollars. So there is not plenty of money here. The city has gone since 1982, without any kind of increase in revenues and they've been squeezed, and squeezed, and squeezed, and there's no money being spent on streets. And so if you're going to go ahead and do this and put these on without not knowing what's going on next year, you need to have a plan in place of what you intend to do. Are you going to keep these officers on? Are you going to hire them and let them go? Are you going to go ahead and pass a tax increase on your own after the voters have said no? These are all things that you guys need to make decisions on. And I don't think you should be in some kind of time table hurry to make that kind of decision.

Mr. Baxter: And I thank you for your comments. And hence, you have reiterated my concern is if, say for example, we bring the officers in in November and a tax increase doesn't go on, are we just going to, what are we going to do then? How are we going to pay these officers next year and the year after? They are going to have to have decisions made, and thereby as I said, I have an uncomfortability here and I want to get comfortable around that to make sure that we're bringing officers on, letting them know they've got a job here in Reynoldsburg. So with that said, I'll leave it open to any other questions or concerns here at the table. Both committee or Council. If not, I've made a recommendation to hold this for two weeks. Do I have a second? Councilman Shirey. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). The motion carries.

With that said, I will now end the Safety Committee meeting at 8:02.

Safety Committee
April 17, 2006
Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 17, 2006

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

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:04.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, it'll stand approved.

The third item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the April 3, 2006 Service Committee meeting. Do I have any change to the committee minutes? Any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item, item number 4, Discussion, Authorization to prepare specifications and advertise for bids, cleaning, televising and root cutting of up to 17,000 lineal feet of sanitary sewer. Mr. Kipp, I understand this is to have the engineers do the plans and specifications so you can bid them out. Is that correct?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. And advertise for the bids.

Mr. Clemens: And advertise too. And also advertise for them.

Mr. Kipp: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: This is something we do every year. It's a continuous item that we do all over the City of Reynoldsburg, and it's really helped our sewer systems. Anybody on the committee have any questions for Mr. Kipp? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kipp, typically what does this cost every year when this is done?

Mr. Kipp: Last year it was approximately \$30,000. Between 25 and \$30,000.

Mr. Joseph: Has it been consistent over the years as far as what it's cost?

Mr. Kipp: It's dropped.

Mr. Clemens: Any other comments or questions? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Questions that I have are dealing with around what we've done over the past. And did we not just purchase a new truck to do the same thing? And why are we not using that and doing this our self? I thought we paid almost 80 or some thousand dollars a few years ago, or a year ago, buy a new truck with all the camera and television stuff on it. Why aren't we doing this?

Mr. Kipp: We do do this. We did buy a new truck. It was 2 years ago, and we do do regular maintenance and cleaning, and we have a whole list of sewers that we clean on a regular basis that's preventive maintenance. Where we know there's problems within the city, that's where we do our concentration of our sewer cleaning with the personnel that we have. This, we started this back in the late 80's, early 90's, and we started to get the old sections of town cleaned, and televised, and root cut, any repairs found. And this pretty much so it brings us to the point now where we've been through, this will finish up all of Huber. We've done all of Briarcliff. We've done all of Brookside. And we're going to, this will finish up Marabar also.

Mr. Baxter: When you say "this", if I could follow up Chairman, this contract will take care of that? Or that's what we've done as a city?

Mr. Kipp: That's what we've done as a city. This contract will finish up Huber. And that's all the sewers under 10 inches, or 10 inches and under. And it will finish Marabar.

Mr. Baxter: So then, this is a supplement to what we do already.

Mr. Kipp: Yes. This supplements what we do.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Other members of the committee? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since this just covers part of the city, what do we typically spend to do the entire city in a given year?

Mr. Kipp: When you say spend, I mean...

Mr. Joseph: What has it cost in the past to do the entire city?

Mr. Kipp: We've never done the entire city.

Mr. Joseph: Well, how much of the city do we cover? I mean, I see what we're covering in this particular ordinance but, what areas are not covered? Like newer areas of the city?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. We haven't, like most, since 1980, half of our system is new. So those areas all have 13 foot sections of plastic pipe. They don't require the, they don't have the root problems. These sections here have clay pipe that are about 2 foot in length. So there's like 6 joints where there's now 1 joint or 2 joints. And this is where we typically will get root problems there. And also your older neighborhoods. They have a lot more tree growth and the roots get into the lines and such.

Mr. Joseph: So the areas that are covered in the city, approximately what does that run per year? Again, you said roughly 30,000 for this general area.

Mr. Kipp: I've never broke it down as far as, because we do it with our own personnel and I've never priced it out.

Mr. Joseph: Is it pretty much an ongoing thing throughout the year? Or just through the summer months?

Mr. Kipp: We don't do a lot of the preventative cleaning in the winter. No. Mainly we'll start in the spring and go through the fall.

Mr. Clemens: Other members of the committee? Questions for Mr. Kipp? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Mark, I know this is an ongoing situation that we do every year. Rather than run it, I'd like to send it through as an emergency rather than go the readings on it because it's the same thing that we do, and if members of the committee agree...

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, I believe this is just a motion.

Mr. Clemens: Just a motion?

Mr. Hills: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Then we won't have to worry about that. Alright. I'd like to make a motion that we send this to Council for passage. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, Mark.

Item number 5, ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT AN APPLICATION FOR ANNEXATION OF 79.1+/- ACRES IN ETNA TOWNSHIP, COUNTY OF LICKING, STATE OF OHIO, TO THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO. It had its first reading 4-10-06. Are there any questions pertaining to this application for annexation? Members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to send it to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED DEED OF EASEMENT (sanitary sewer easement) (.478 ac.) FROM THE TRADITIONS AT SLATE RIDGE, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company. It had its second reading 4-10-06. Are there any questions from the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council for its third reading for a motion for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

That'll end the Service Committee meeting at 8:11.

Service Committee

April 17, 2006

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 17, 2006

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

Other members of Council present: Donna Shirey, Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: And I would like to call the Finance Committee to order at 8:12.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda by members of the committee? (No response). I have one change. The Mayor asked me to add this this evening. It's supplemental appropriation for Workers Compensation and Unemployment accounts. I'd like to make that item 3a. I don't believe I need a second on that. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

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

Item 3a is Supplemental appropriation for Workers Compensation and Unemployment accounts. Mayor, would you like to address this please?

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Each year we pay our Workers Compensation account. And during the past several years, we've been very fortunate in that we've received a return of approximately 10 to 20%. And one year as high as 50% on our premium. We got the information in on the cost, probably, oh I'd say late January, early February. And we had already appropriated money to pay the BWC and the Unemployment. And just kind of put it off to the side with the assumption that we would be getting a credit again this year. Well as it turns out, we are not going to get a credit. We are going to get absolutely zero instead of 20 to 50%. As a result of that, we have under appropriated our funds in the budget. I believe you have in front of you, a break down of the various accounts. BWC, the total premium this year is \$105,579.92. We again reiterate, that we are not going to get any rebate or reduction as we have in the past years. We of course, contracted Gates/McDonald as our third party administrator and their premium is

9144 this year. So we've given you a break down by division as to what each individual department is going to owe for the Workers Comp, BWC. You'll see two numbers that say over 5367 and 3394. That was monies that we had, we appropriated too much in that particular account, so we can add that to 16125.53. You come up with the total amount that we're going to need including the \$5,000 for Unemployment. And again, the unemployment, we have one person on unemployment right now and we have another one on unemployment, will be on unemployment very, very shortly. So in order for us to pay our Workers Compensation bill, including our Unemployment, we need an appropriation of \$21,125.53. And if we can get this approved and pay it, I'm trying to think here...

Mr. Stake: Mayor, there is something here that says you need this by, please return program invoice and enrollment fee by April 29.

Mayor McPherson: If we return that by April 29, we end up, well actually they told us May 15, we get a 3.93% credit on our premium. Which in this case would amount to about \$5,000. And that's the reason we put the emergency on it. We would like to have it passed and get it paid in order to get that additional monies back. And that's pretty much where we are.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. The only question I have Mayor is, how do we get caught up in these type of situations where we find this out at the last minute. I see the dates on this so I can see, it is a last minute thing you're being found out on.

Mayor McPherson: Well, they don't send bills.

Mr. Baxter: Well yeah. Is there any way that we can preempt this and get a better understanding with BWC working with either Gates/McDonald or working with BWC to determine increases while they're happening? What we can do to try to reduce those costs?

Mayor McPherson: Well in the past, we've not been at all concerned about it because we've always gotten a substantial amount of money back from them. This is the first year that I can remember, probably in maybe 10 years, that we've been concerned. Because we always appropriate more money than we need. So we just really didn't give it a thought this year until we started getting all of this. And we thought, wow, no reduction, no credit. And so, you know, we can check on how we could find out earlier. But I don't know what BWC's time table is. So I'm sure a lot's going to depend on their time table also. But again, no credit. We need the additional funding and we'd like to get the additional funding prior to May 15 so we can have it paid by May 15 and garner at least the 3.93%.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Chairman Stake, just trying to clarify, and I'm trying to figure, there's three different things we're looking at. The Gates enrollment fee of 9144, is that rolled into each of these amounts that you're asking for from the General Fund, Street Fund, Water Fund? Or are they looking for two separate checks?

Mayor McPherson: It's all rolled in.

Mr. Hills: It's all rolled in. So the 21125.53 pays both BWC and the enrollment fee for Gates.

Mayor McPherson: For Gates/McDonald. Correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Does that answer your question? So Mayor, I guess we ought to go with the April 29, I mean we are going to save some money if we do get this paid in a timely manner, correct?

Mayor McPherson: Correct.

Mr. Stake: Almost 4%. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: One question, Chairman Stake. Because I'm reading the documentation up here and it says, your projected group discount is 50%. Is that the 50% you're talking about Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: No.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

Mayor McPherson: That's what Gates/McDonald claims they have saved us over the year from the cost. The 20 to 50% I was talking about was a rebate if you will, that BWC gives us back. And we'll get none of that this year.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I just wanted to make sure it was clear. Because there's no letters here. I didn't want people to _____ that number.

Mr. Stake: I think in the past there were dividends paid or something, credits given, because investments were doing well and that hasn't been the case recently.

Mayor McPherson: No. We were told it had something to be, it was tied in with this coin gate and all that, and BWC wasn't making the money that they were making. And of course you know, we've all been reading about that every day or too much. But the bottom line is, we're not going to get any rebate this year.

Mr. Stake: So Mayor, you're asking for an additional \$21,125.53, correct? (Tape Change).

Mayor McPherson: \$21,125.53. Correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Appropriate it to these accounts here.

Mayor McPherson: Appropriate it to those various accounts.

Mr. Stake: Obviously we need an emergency on this. We might as well just go ahead and send it for passage next week as an emergency so we can get this paid on time and everything done on time if there aren't any objections from members of the committee or members of Council. Then I will make a motion that we send this forward, recommendation for passage as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Amend 160.02(a), to change pay grade of Assistant City Attorney from a 17 to 19, and to delete one Assistant City Prosecutor's position. City Attorney, Mr. Hood.

Mr. Hood: Hello, Chairman Stake. Thank you. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This proposed ordinance will consolidate the duties of the Assistant City Prosecutor with the Assistant City Attorney, thereby saving out of my budget, approximately \$25,000 that would be placed back in the General Fund at the end of the year. And hopefully, with a more experienced person in the office that will alleviate the need to hire special counsel so frequently and hopefully reduce that budget for next year. So basically what this does is, it turns two jobs into one job in consolidating their duties. If there's any questions?

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions for Mr. Hood? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. Just one question, Jed. This still will be a full time position, am I correct?

Mr. Hood: Yes, sir.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions, members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. And I applaud you for taking the time to go through your department looking for opportunities here. And this is a great opportunity to produce what we have and get a better opportunity and type of quality person that will help us out here.

Mr. Hood: Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Great job. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Jed, are you looking for an emergency on

this?

Mr. Hood: Chairman, I am asking for an emergency on this. However, I would not ask to waive the readings. I would just like this effective upon the Mayor's signature without waiting the month.

Mr. Stake: So it can go through the three readings.

Mr. Hood: I would ask for the readings because I believe a discussion is appropriate in this matter. However, I would ask it be passed as emergency so it would take effect upon the Mayor's signature.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any other questions or comments for the City Attorney? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Mr. Hood, do you have the person in line who you would appoint for this position now?

Mr. Hood: I have some people in mind. Yes.

Mr. Stearns: And this person does live in the City of Reynoldsburg, right?

Mr. Hood: He does not live in the City of Reynoldsburg at this time. No.

Mr. Stearns: He does not live in the City of Reynoldsburg?

Mr. Hood: No. That's not a job requirement.

Mr. Stearns: Is that right?

Mr. Hood: Yes.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Hood: That's not, it has never been the job requirement of the Assistant City Attorney or the Assistant City Prosecutor.

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

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Just one question, Mr. Hood. And with the reduction of the number of people that you have, are those responsibilities going to become part of the roles and responsibilities of the assistant?

Mr. Hood: Yes, sir. And as well, I will take a more active role than my predecessor and some

other job duties that he was less active in.
Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments? (No response). Okay. None being heard, then I will make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading, and it contained the emergency language. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Revenue Enhancement. This is on the agenda because obviously, some of the discussions we had in the Safety Committee earlier. We need to think about, and the Mayor has brought us three different options he's recommended. The half percent increase in the income tax, and I thought at this time, if we're going to do that, or if we're going to consider putting that on the ballot, we're certainly not going to make May. If we wanted to get something in place for an August ballot, I guess we'd have to get something passed in May. And in November, I don't know, there may be other things on the ballot that may make things a little bit more difficult. So, are there any questions or comments, or anything from members of the committee, Finance Committee at this time? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Questions that I have, is there additional cost to the city to have an August election?

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, do you know how to answer?

Mr. Clemens: I figure it will cost us around \$25,000 in August.

Mr. Baxter: How much, sir?

Mr. Clemens: 25,000. Because we'd have, if we were the only ones on there. Unless somebody else puts it on. And I think it's important we think about it for the next week or two exactly, like Mr. Stake said, exactly what we're going to do and get it moving. The August ballot, the thing about it is, that it would be the only thing on there. We would have the opportunity to I think, to convince the people to come out and vote. The people that are interested in voting are the ones you're going to get to show up. And I think that if we handle it correctly, and go out and do our work, I think that would be the one to have it on. Because if it didn't pass, then we could have it again in November. We could put it back on. We know that the school is going to have something on in November. But I think we stand a better chance personally being on by our self and then have the opportunity to come back again in November and try to get, it gives us two chances. At least we'd have two chances to get it passed before the first of the year and correct the financial problem that you know, that you're having the problem with, and I also have a little bit of a problem with. Not this year but the following years. But I think that gives us the best opportunity. That's only my thought. But I think that we all should think about that. And make our decision within the next couple of weeks or so on how we're going to pursue this. Like Ron says, we have to get it passed.

Mr. Stake: I agree with you. That's why I had it added to the agenda for this evening, so that we

could certainly consider that. I see our City Auditor standing up. He must have something to say.

Mr. Harris: I checked with the Board of Elections on this, and it's 75 days prior to the August 8 election day. So you'd have to have it like, 4:00 May 25. They estimated the cost at 22.5 but they said there may be some slight additional costs because they may have to advertise it more than once in Fairfield, and Licking County, and Franklin County, depending on when they get it. The RITA, the folks at RITA have, if you would like, would be willing to draft the language for the ordinance to put it on the ballot, if you would like them to do it as well. If you decide you want to go in November, it's 75 days prior to the election which puts it some time around the end of August. That would be no cost to the city to put it on the November ballot.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments in regards to this issue from members of the committee or members of Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. The discussion on if we go with August, or if we try to get something after that if it doesn't go forward the first try, by the dates that the Auditor has just given us, it would be a very tight line trying to get that second one passed. So we'd have to be thinking about those type of contingencies now and have that legislation ready to be passed to be able to make the November date. Because you're looking at what, 2 or 3 weeks, Mr. Harris that you would have to get it?

Mr. Harris: Well, you would have to pass it as an emergency afterwards. And you folks are generally gone in August. So the chances are, you would have to come back and have a special meeting in order to pass it.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. That's where I was heading with that. We don't have meetings in August.

Mr. Stake: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: But I do believe that the language, and there is an art to doing the language properly, and RITA does a lot of it. But the language for the tax increase, under the assumption that it did not prevail in August and went back on in November, the language is going to be the same going back on. So it's been written for you. It's just that you pass it again. But does it require an emergency meeting? I can't remember in August we haven't met any way at some time.

Mr. Stake: I guess what I'm hearing is that I'm not hearing anybody talk about the other options. So the half a percent increase is I guess, if we're going to go with something, is what everybody's leaning towards. So I guess we got that part out of the way. And I guess I would be inclined to get it on the ballot in August for the same reason as Mr. Clemens stated. I think you would get people who are supportive to come out and that would be helpful. I think this is something that we need to do and we'll certainly be talking about this more in the future. But if you look at some of the other communities, our revenues are, compared to other communities our size are not what other communities our size have. Go ahead, President Hills.

Mr. Hills: I would like to note, I think you're right. And Mr. Harris made the statement that earlier, it's been 24, 26, what was the number of the years since we've had a tax increase?

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

Mr. Hills: July of '82. If you go back and look at some of the other cities, they certainly have had increases since that period of time. Where if you lay it out and look at the communities, we seem to be lagging behind there. I certainly agree with all the Council members who have commented that we must clearly depict how these funds are going to be spent. And I think it can easily be said when we look back, the police force, as we add assuming this year, and into the next year, I think our numbers that are out there are extremely conservative. When you have Police Officers, you have equipment. When you have equipment, you have cars. I'm not sure but what some of the numbers we're looking at. They, probably I think are closer to a million rather than 500,000 in the next year. And I think, as we discuss this, I think that will come out. Secondarily, I think we need to be sure the people understand that the monies in this half percent increase besides safety forces, need to go to a Capital Program within this city. And you heard me comment before, and it's certainly nobody's fault that's up here, Mr. Stake is probably the only person, with the exception of Mel and myself, who has seen a Street Program. And that was his first year on Council. And then he saw how it was done. And then no other years were projected. We had worked hard in this city to reach the point of spending between a million, a million five a year. We have not done that in 5 years now. And our streets are, not unsafe, but they certainly are not what we've been used to as a City of Reynoldsburg. So when you start looking about anticipated incomes coming in, besides getting the 1 to 1 1/2 million dollar program per year back in place, we've got about a 5 to 6 million dollar, not work that hasn't been done, that we need to be flowing in too. So I don't think there is any doubt that the incomes received from any tax increase or any increase, can certainly be dedicated to Capital Projects and safety. And the one thing that is nice about that, you will see that benefit all over town. Because it will be spread throughout the facilities. You'll have more officers on the street. More officers for private services. And more road repair so that we don't run into the problem, or road maintenance so we don't run into the problems we have now. And I just wanted to, kind of put that, I think for those people who are concerned, can it be dedicated, and can it be shown? I think as the numbers come together, you'll see that it absolutely, those monies can be expended that way and justified that way.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills. That's a good point. And I also would like to point out that Council will have the final say on where that money goes. I mean, we approve the budget, so we certainly will have a role in where the money is put. Mr. Clemens, then I have a speaker slip.

Mr. Clemens: The only thing I was going to bring up is that, the 24th will be our Council meeting. The 1st will be our next committee meeting. And I think we should get it decided then. Then it comes back to Council on the 8th and get it passed. Because if we have to have it in May 25, I believe that's what Dick said, it'll give us time to get the ordinance drafted and everything. I mean, I think we should get it passed. At least the 8th or the 15th. So we'd have to get the ordinance drafted as soon as possible so we can make the arrangements if Council decides at your committee meeting the 1st. I think we should decide the 1st what we're going to do and get it

moving.

Mr. Stake: Good point, Mr. Clemens. Thank you. And we certainly can do that. I have a speaker slip from Brandon Wright. Mr. Wright, do you want to speak on special elections?

Mr. Wright: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Just give us your name and address please.

Mr. Wright: My name is Brandon Wright and I live at 1740 on Brice Road. And I've just been listening to the discussions here. And it just seems to me like, if you are going to move and you're trying to show the citizens that you're responsible with their money, I think what the Auditor said is pretty much you need to take into account that if you put it on the November ballot, then you're looking at a zero cost. If you put it on the August ballot, then you're spending \$22,000. Well, there's a couple of things I just have a question about. One would be, just to me, it probably would be best if you're moving the legislation as if you were going to get ready for August, but put it on the November. Because you're not spending money in that regards. And also, people in August, what you'll find is, voter turn out is really low. And that could look, and I'm not opposed against you know, putting the increase on the ballot for people to vote on, I'm all for people having their say. But it just could look a little irresponsible if you're trying to rush this legislation through to get it on the ballot so you can meet August. Where if you notice, school levy's that are on the ballot for August or any other issue, the voter turn out is low. And the people that usually come out to vote are against that issue that is usually on the ballot. So I just wanted to make sure that you guys thought about the financial cost that you'll have as well as what will be advertised in the newspaper. Just rush through Council. Look at how much money they're spending. And just to show more responsibility to the citizens. But that was my concern.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Wright. We'll certainly consider that. I don't quite see it the way you do, but thank you for that. Are there other questions or comments? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes Chairman Stake. And I think you were hitting on the point of where the funds are going to go and that we absolutely want to make sure we know where that is. But I think, before we talk about where funds are going to go and how they're going to be spent, I think we need, and we owe our citizens, a value behind it. And that value being, what the need is. The need is in the Police Department, the need is in the roads, and I think we should prepare that to say, this is what we need and how much it will cost over the period of time, and that's where the funds are going to go. Because if you did read in the newspaper, it appeared as if there was more money coming in than we needed. And I don't think that's true. I believe we truly need those funds, and I think it would be irresponsible of us not to show exactly where that need is. I think we're trying to do that, but I think we need to do a better job at that.

Mr. Stake: Well, I think the police staffing report that we got shows where most of the need is. And then as President Hills pointed out, and I think probably Mr. Clemens has pointed out, and a few other people have pointed out, we haven't done anything with our roads in a few years and we used to spend over a million dollars on roads. So there's plenty of infrastructure needs that we

have as well as safety needs. I know what you're saying. We need to have a plan. We need to be able to make the case. I've been doing that. I've been talking about our safety forces and the need for additional safety forces. When we looked at the statistics, our Police Officers are a lot busier now than they have been for a couple of reasons. I think the direction the Chief is, the new Chief is taking the Police Department in and the fact that they have computers now. And I've had a conversation with the Chief about this and I agree with his philosophy that if we do a good job arresting criminals and writing citations, they'll go somewhere else. And that's what makes a safe community. If criminals are not wanting to come to Reynoldsburg, that's a good thing. Because they feel that they're going to be arrested or something like that. So we certainly can have time to do that. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. To answer to Mr. Wright's question, and I understand, and I understand what he's speaking about on expenditure. Our problem is, it's a safety issue. This is a safety issue. It's not a safety issue for tomorrow, the next day. It's a safety issue we have to take care of. The reason we're speaking about August is because we have to have a back up. If we go ahead and hire these policemen, come the first of the year and we didn't have a back up and we got turned down in November, we're sitting there trying to come up with \$500,000 we don't have. And if we go in August we have a back up of November. We'd come back in the November election if we'd happen to lose and try to get it passed then. Nobody wants to put on 4, 5, 6 policemen and lay them off within 2 months or 3 months or start laying off people around the city. I know that we have some excess money that we could spend. But we can't keep doing that. We're only talking about maybe 200,000 this year. But we're talking about 500 or more thousand next year that we've got to come up with. Plus all of our other expenses. Plus the pay increases for everybody. Our FOP and so forth. And everything goes up. So the plan is to get the people there in August to get it passed and have a back up to come back in November if we don't get it passed. Because I don't want to lay off somebody I just hired. And it is a safety issue. It's important. We've got all types of problems that we have to start correcting as far as our Police Department's concerned. And I think the people will start to realize how serious the situation is in Reynoldsburg, and in Columbus, and in all of our communities. They're all having the same problems. And I think that the people will show up and vote for an issue such as this. And I would be very remorseful to think that they wouldn't. If we go on in November along with the schools and so forth, and probably all the other levy's that'll be on there, we stand a chance of not making it. Then the public has to start making a choice between the school and make a choice between the Police Department and us. We haven't been on in 24 years. And to spend a little bit of money to get on the ballot to get these things passed that we need, I think that's not asking too much. Now if it is something that we've done every 2, 3, or every 5 years and went out and spent this, it would be a different story. But we have not had anything on the ballot in 24 years. And I think the people will understand that and respect that. But I do understand your position on this Mr. Wright. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. I think the responsible thing to do is to put it on the ballot for August myself. Mr. Luzader, do you have something to say?

Mr. Luzader: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Stake. I know I didn't fill out a speaker slip, so I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I know you asked Council if anybody else would like to

approach the issue of possibly reducing the income tax credit. And I know nobody spoke up on that. I myself, I've been a resident in this city for over 40 years, and I don't have an opposition to increase in the income tax. Like I said, we haven't gone back to the voters for 24 years. But I do believe that if you increase the income tax credit along with increasing the income tax, it is not fair to the residents that work here and live here. If I understood the Mayor's proposal correctly a few weeks ago, and also what was in the paper, 83% of the residents that live in the City of Reynoldsburg don't pay \$1 in income tax to the City of Reynoldsburg. So therefore, you're asking 17% of the residents to shoulder the responsibility to increase the services that are enjoyed by 100% of the residents. And I don't think that's fair. I myself would like to see the city possibly go for a quarter percent increase and a quarter percent reduction in the credit. And I'd just like somebody to think about that. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. I've thought about it and I imagine everybody here has probably thought about that as well. Are there any other questions or comments? Mayor, did you have something?

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Stake. I think that, I've had the opportunity over the past few weeks to talk to several Council members. We've talked at length about whether the August date would be best or the November date would be best. I know Mr. Hills and I had a long conversation about it. And my initial recommendation to City Council was to go in November. I have rethought that and I think that probably the August date would give us a much better opportunity to let the citizens of the City of Reynoldsburg know about it. It would be the only issue on the ballot. And they can come out and show their support for the Safety Department. So I too think that we need this forward in to August. I'm one of those optimists. I don't think we're going to have to worry about November because I really believe that the citizens of the City of Reynoldsburg recognize the fact that we need these Police Officers and will come out and support the income tax increase. The second thing, if we wait until November, we have no idea what's going to be on that ballot for sure. Now we know there are going to be some issues on there possibly with the schools, possibly with the county. We're going to probably see COTA on looking for additional money. So there's going to be a lot of things on that people are going to have to really think about. And I really think by going in August, we give our residents the opportunity to only think about that one issue. And so I strongly support the August issue, the August ballot. And the second thing is, we've talked about where is the money going to go. I have said from day one, and I think you just reiterated, that Council has the final say on where this money goes. But I can assure you that as Mayor, the next two budgets that you're going to get, that will be for the safety forces. And the other revenue that's going to be generated by this will be for Capital Improvements Projects and Capital Equipment purchases. That's the only thing that I plan to bring to City Council with that additional money. And I'm sure Council probably has the same philosophy. We need to do the infrastructure and the roads. And we had zero dollars going into the CIP for what, 3 or 4 years. We had 2% of our General Fund going into that for the last 2 years. You can't keep your streets up with that kind of money going into them. So let there be no mistake, when you get the budget, and assuming that it's passed in August by our residents, that will be how I'll be presenting that budget to City Council. Safety forces, Capital Improvement, and Capital Equipment.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Are there any other questions or comments from the table here? (No response). Then if there aren't any others, I guess I'd like to hold this for two weeks. I'll make a motion we hold this for two weeks. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6, Discussion, Police, and Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Study, added January 17, 2006 meeting agenda. And it held for three weeks. Item was held on 2-6-06. Held again on 2-21-06. And held 3-13-06. And held again 3-20-06 for four weeks. I believe this is the fourth week. And I don't think we have anything new on this, do we? We did get a letter from the Building Industry Association with some questions that needed to be addressed. We're still waiting for those. I believe Mr. Parkinson is working on those. If you can get those by the next committee meeting to us, that would help. Okay. And there was something else that, Mayor, did you have an opportunity to talk to the gentleman about the other options that we may have in place of doing Impact Fees?

Mayor McPherson: No. We just haven't gotten together yet to talk about them.

Mr. Stake: Why don't we, if you could, maybe you and I can talk this week. And if we could get him to come before the committee for a few minutes and maybe answer some questions, and tell us about the other options we may have that would be a good time. Everybody can be here and get all the questions answered at that time.

Mayor McPherson: I think it will be very good for everyone to hear what he has to say.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to hear that. Because I think with the Impact Fee, the way it came out financially in my part, because I was for this for the reason for the safety program and so forth, it didn't materialize and pan out the way I wanted it to. Because I thought we were going to come up with a large sum of money over the years for our safety forces and so forth. I'd like to hear another way we can do it. Now we're talking about putting something on the ballot which may change the whole situation as far as Impact Fee is concerned.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, I think that vote has sailed already in the position we are with the city. And the opportunity for making the funds that would really be something that would be usable for the city has already been missed. So I personally don't think that there's any further discussion on it. Unless we're trying to plan to move it forward, I don't see us going anywhere with it. There's no real funds generated from it. So I would like to note, is there opportunity to make money on this or not, for the city? And if there's not, I think we should put it aside.

Mr. Stake: Well I don't know if there's opportunity to make money. There may be opportunity if there's significant annexations that brings in development. There may be an opportunity to fund

some of those to save some costs on the development. But I'm not ready to make the decision to throw this away yet. I'm still waiting to hear what the answers are on the questions submitted by the Building Industry Association, and also the other opportunities that we may have in place of this. And for that reason, I'd like to keep this on the agenda for at least two more weeks.

Mr. Baxter: So follow up Chairman Stake. My understanding is the cost to go toward additional Impact Fees would be again, something we'd have to look at. We paid \$40,000 for the study that we did receive. If we move forward with roads and any other type of Impact Fee, we're going to have to again, have costs with that. And if we're not going to use the study and we're not going to move forward with it, I would not be in favor of spending the money on something we're just going to throw away again.

Mr. Stake: Well I don't believe that we're moving forward on an Impact Fee Study for roads. I think we already decided a few meetings ago that we weren't going to do that.

Mr. Baxter: That must have been the one I missed then. Okay.

Mr. Stake: Are there any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Then, if I could hold this for two more weeks. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I'll adjourn the Finance Committee at 8:50.

Finance Committee

April 17, 2006

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)