

Safety Committee Meeting Minutes
April 16, 2007

Members of Safety Committee present: Ron Stake, Antoinette Newman, Donna Shirey, Brett Baxter.

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

Meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Stake: Approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? (No response). None being heard, the agenda will stand.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the April 2, 2007 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). Hearing no changes, the minutes will stand as submitted.

And item number 4 is, Discussion, Amendment of Chapter 741 Solicitors. This was brought to us by City Attorney James Hood. Mr. Hood, do you want to come up and explain what you're trying to do here, please?

Mr. Hood: As long as you quit calling me James.

Mr. Stake: I'm just reading what you wrote buddy.

Mr. Hood: I submitted this to the Council, or the committee, at the urging of Chief Suci. Because as the Chapter was written previously, it did not grant him or anyone the authority to deny an applicant Solicitor's Permit. It has come to his attention since he's been here, that some unfavorable people come to our city to try to obtain a Solicitor's Permit and sell different things door to door. Up until, well, after you pass this piece of legislation, it'll give the Safety Director the ability to deny someone a Solicitor's Permit if they fall under the categories that I've written into the ordinance. Basically what this does is, it shifts the burden from the Police Chief to the Safety Director to take the application, give that application to the Police Chief within 5 days. Within those 5 days, the Police Chief will conduct a background check, or his designee will conduct a background check to find out if this person is a convicted felon, or has a misdemeanor that involves what we call Afraud@, or what we call Amoral turpitude@, which is basically, crimes of dishonesty. If they do, that is grounds for the Safety Director to deny a permit to that person. Some other major changes would be that each person who is granted a Solicitor's Permit will have to keep that permit on them when they choose to solicit in our city. I know that there's been issues in the past with someone coming to the door and a citizen asking for that Solicitor's Permit, and the person at the door will say well, my boss has it and he's three blocks down the street. So this will require that each person that wants to solicit in the city, carry

the permit on their person when they go door to door. I'm trying to think of other highlights. We did change the fee. The fee is, well, I should rephrase, the fee remains the same of \$15, but it's \$15 per applicant. So one person cannot apply for more than him or herself. Because the purpose of the fee is to offset any cost that our Police Department or our city incurs in doing the background checks. So I thought it was only fitting that if we do more than one background check, then we should be charging more than one fee. The hours of the solicitation has stayed the same. That was not changed. I know that's a major concern. There is an appeals process should the Safety Director decide to deny a permit. The applicant will be allowed to appeal to the Mayor's Office as long as they file a written appeal with the Mayor's Office within 10 days of the denial. As always, the Safety Director and the Mayor shall have the discretion to waive the permit fee for charitable organizations that he deems fit such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or any schools, or other youth organizations that use fund raising in the city. The Mayor and the Safety Director will have the discretion to waive those fees. I think that I've hit most of the highlights. I will answer any questions that you may have for the committee or the Council of the Whole.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Hood. On youth, are they going to need to go through a background check?

Mr. Hood: I didn't specifically address that. You did raise that issue with me a moment ago. To be quite frank, it wasn't addressed in the last draft, or the last Chapter, the Chapter that exists now. What we did address was, the fee would be waived for those people, for those juveniles. Honestly, I haven't really thought about it. It's something that the Council can discuss if you choose to. But it's something that would be easily remedied if you choose to do that.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. That's the only question I had. Are there any questions or comments from the members of the Safety Committee? Yes. Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I don't particularly like the fact that the Service Director could be overruled by the Mayor. Just maybe on a whim? Or if we would happen to have some kind of a crook for a Mayor, he could say, well you give me \$50 and I'll overrule that. Some how I think that just, I don't like that. I don't know what else could be done.

Mr. Hood: Okay. Well, I guess the only other option we would have is for them to appeal to the Council. I do believe that permitting is an Administration function. Not a legislative function. So I believe that the Administration, or the executive branch should be the branch that deals with this. Also, remember that the Safety Director can only deny a permit for the reasons that I've designated in the ordinance. That if they are a felon, that they've been convicted of a misdemeanor in their past that involves fraud or dishonesty, or they've lied on their application. So they can't willy nilly deny applications for that reason. And I don't believe that the Mayor, whomever that person would be, would either affirm or reverse a denial if they weren't based on those criteria. Another reason, I guess to address the comment further is, the reason I think the Council was taken out of this process years back was because of the time involved. We saw this

also with the fellow from, not Sun Television....

Mr. Baxter: H H Gregg.

Mr. Hood: H H Gregg, thank you. Where he wanted to have a tent sale. And he came in, he tried to get on the agenda, then we had to push it for two, I think it=s one of those situations too where these people want to have a short time line. And I think the city wants to be accommodating to folks who want to sell their wares in the city to kind of, to shorten the bureaucracy, and shorten the time line to get that permit in their hand so they can go sell their wares.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. Then another thing, I don=t like the fact that the hour is until 9 p.m. I go to bed sometimes at 8 or 8:30 and I don=t want anybody pounding on my door at 9:00.

Mr. Hood: Well, as I said, the hours were not changed. That=s not something that we changed. That is identical to the ordinance that stands today. Obviously, the committee and the Council is free to change that if you=d like. But I did not make any changes to that particular portion of the ordinance.

Mrs. Newman: How about you Mel? You go to bed early too, don=t you?

Mr. Clemens: I agree with Mrs. Newman.

Mr. Hood: I=d be happy to redraft it for you if that=s what you would want.

Mr. Clemens: I do think 9:00, sometimes it=s not too bad in the summer, but it=s pretty dark in the winter. And I think the time limit should be less than that. I don=t think people want people knocking on doors after dark really, trying to solicit something.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stearn. The reason I have concern here is, that we=re thinking, sorry Stake, we=re thinking that these are people coming door to door. And I=m like you, I don=t want someone banging on my door at 9:00. But H H Gregg is not going to be knocking on our door. This is encompassing more than just those people that solicit you at your home. These are people who solicit you in the streets. So my concern here would be, it=s a group that=s coming forward saying, I need the ability to solicit in the city to raise funds for the group. For example, the Knights of Columbus, one of the organizations I belong to. Kiwanis, everybody. We all have these types of organizations. And it would be a group that would be a background check done upon. And I got the inference, that each person in that group would have to have a Solicitation Permit. And if I=m looking at 25 brother Knights out soliciting times \$15, that=s a huge cost for a single function. And that=s what I have a problem with, is the ordinance.

Mr. Hood: And once again, just direct your attention to 741.05 that is entitled A Waiver@. A The

permit fee may be waived by the Safety/Service Director for good cause shown.® I believe that most charitable organizations, and Mayor correct me if I'm wrong, but you waive these fees for most charitable organizations, or all charitable organizations, don't you?

Mayor McPherson: All charitable organizations.

Mr. Hood: So, I think that....

Mr. Baxter: So that's a moot point then.

Mr. Hood: Well, I think that the background check could still be conducted but I don't think we would charge the fee.

Mr. Baxter: Right. And you see in this case here, my second side of it is again, your comment to an executive level, being for the purpose of, this is within an Administration function. Although when there's an appeal process, I think there should be another branch of government that is part of that appeal process. So I would be more comfortable with having City Council be appealed to if an applicant has been denied. Now I understand your arguments for _____ are very solid. And it probably would never be overturned by Council if you have a felony, misdemeanor, or whatever it is. But I think it gives an opportunity to take it out of one house and put it to another, and give you a little bit of balance of the government on that. So that's my two points there.

Mr. Hood: I understand. And that's easily remedied too. If the Council would like to have the appellant authority, that's something that we can remedy. That's something that wouldn't take nothin' but a redraft.

Mr. Stake: Before I go to Councilwoman Newman, I know Councilman Joseph had his hand up earlier.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hood, I want to echo what Mrs. Newman and Mr. Baxter has said about taking Council out of the role. I mean, we have other cases where Council is a body that we can come to for the last ditch reversal of issues. We have that with the Zoning Board. If the Zoning Board rejects something, they can come here to Council and we can reverse that. I think it's a good idea to have a larger body involved in some of these processes. I don't know if I'm as concerned about maybe the Mayor being a crook or something. But I do think that the Safety/Service Director obviously works right, very closely with the Mayor. I think it would be good to have somebody that's from a slightly different perspective, taking a look at some of these waiver issues when they're on appeal. And obviously, we're talking about, currently the way the law's written, it's a 2/3 vote. I mean, we're not talking about a simple majority. We're talking about a larger vote than that to reverse. And I don't think there's a problem looking at other people having a say in some of these issues if the Mayor and the Service Director decide they want to deny a permit like that. I'm not opposed to having the Mayor involved in the process. But maybe Council should have a role as well.

Mr. Hood: I understand. And I think that the only word of caution I would bring up is once again, the time line. We all understand how our Council and our committee meetings work, and how the Council rules have been promulgated, when they have to get literature into the Council before, so you guys can be prepared for the committee meeting. And I guess that was my only concern. That=s why I chose to leave it with the Mayor=s Office. Because we could do a quick appeal that wouldn=t be a long and drawn out process. But I understand that. And if there=s a majority of Council that chooses to do that, that=s easily fixed.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I object to handing it over to Council. Because I don=t believe that Council is an Administrative body. I believe it=s a legislative body. And that Council should get involved as little as possible in anything that even smells with Administration. I think that I would withdraw my objection to it being appealed to the Mayor. I don=t see any point in it. Because if the Service Director has denied the application on good grounds, where is the point of the appeal? If the Mayor would just reaffirm that you think.

Mr. Hood: We have to take into consideration of the applicants procedural due process rights. And that=s why I put an appeals process in there. So it wasn=t a unilateral decision by one person or one office.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. That=s fine then.

Mr. Hood: So that=s why I put it in there.

Mrs. Newman: Okay.

Mr. Hood: So there is an appellant right. If we make a mistake, there=s someone else that will make another decision I guess.

Mrs. Newman: Alright.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. I still think it should not be past 8:00 in the evening.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilman Baxter, you had another question?

Mr. Baxter: Just one more comment. With the City of Columbus, when we get our petition from the City of Columbus to do the solicitations from the Knights, we get a single permit and we have to have that with us when we=re soliciting. Not each individual who=s working the area, but a single permit. And that was, I think my point. And my concern was, if we have 25 people

there throughout the day, that=s 25 requests for permits. When in essence, it should be a group in itself and its function as a single permit, which I=d have no argument on even paying the fee if we had to. And then have that there at the site so an Officer who came by could say, yeah, you=re valid for solicitation.

Mr. Hood: That is a change. And the reason I made the change from the existing ordinance is because of issues we=ve had of citizens being concerned that, like I said, someone comes to your door, you ask for a permit, and the permit holder has it three blocks away. The Chief has been notified to that affect that we=ve had calls to the Police Department with that affect. I believe it=s a needed change to make sure that every person who is registered to solicit in our city can prove that to a homeowner upon request if they come to their door. That way you know that that person is signed up with the city.

Mrs. Newman: Well, isn=t that common practice that they are supposed to have an identification so that you know they=ve been ____ by somebody before they come crawling all over your property?

Mr. Hood: As it stands now, that the person who applies, though it could be like a business owner, has to hold the permit. So if the business owner holds the permit and that=s not the person that comes to your door, there=s no requirement now for that person at your door to have the permit with them.

Mrs. Newman: But we are going to have that? Everybody will have a copy.

Mr. Hood: With this ordinance, the way it stands now, yes. That would be a requirement.

Mrs. Newman: That=s fine.

Mr. Stake: Well I did, a couple of weeks ago, I had two people come to my door the same day and neither one had any kind of documentation on them that they had been permitted to solicit. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just a couple of questions. And some of this may be asking for an exclusionary purpose. This 741, Chapter 741, that is strictly door to door solicitation.

Mr. Hood: Yes.

Mr. Hills: So the Charity Newsies, the other people standing out on the corners, they=re applying under another process. They=re not using this to apply to receive donations at the intersection where 256 and Taylor Road=s always a popular place. But this isn=t what it=s....

Mr. Hood: I don=t know the answer to that question. Solicitation on roadways is a different Chapter. But I=m not sure if they are....

Mr. Hills: This isn't really the H H Gregg. They don't go door to door.

Mr. Hood: No. That example.....

Mr. Hills: And this is where I'm concerned. Because I know of one time, what we have wanted, the H H Gregg we said, we needed to get the awning permits, the summer sales, whatever permits. Not having to go through the process. We've also said that the people soliciting contributions shouldn't have to go through the, Charity Newsies shouldn't take 6 weeks to find out whether they're able to or not. And that's for clarification in my own purposes. That we're not, we don't use this section to, with your Kiwanis, be collected at the neighborhood. And I know we do have. And we have a problem that the Administration's certainly aware of. 256 and Taylor. Everybody's soliciting there for some reason or another. Usually without permits. So I think that's one thing we just need some clarification on. It's a different thing. I do see that, now there is only a fee of \$15. Whether it be called the permit fee or the application fee, Administrative fee, correct?

Mr. Hood: Correct. But it's per applicant.

Mr. Hills: We may want to look at 03F. Makes a reference that it could be waived, not be waived unless authority of the Mayor. And then in 05 where we have waived, changing from Mayor to Safety/Service Director.

Mr. Hood: That's a mistake.

Mr. Hills: Yeah. One of those, which I think it's probably Safety/Service.

Mr. Hood: Yes.

Mr. Hills: But the question I have, now I will agree, I guess I'm getting old too, you know, 9:00 to be out knocking out on somebody's door for solicitation purposes, buy this book or sign up for this pizza coupon, that may be a push. That may be a stretch. Families with young kids don't want their doors being knocked on at 9:00. I would have to think, 9:00, again, I'd go along, 9:00 in the summer's a little different than 9:00 in the winter. But I think we ought to look at something that's more of a happy medium there as to when that stops. Because I'm a little hesitant to open the door a whole lot when it's pitch at night and you have no idea you're not anticipating somebody coming by. Something to think about as we walk through this ordinance.

Mr. Hood: And just for clarification sake, I brought up H H Gregg for an illustration of one of the reason I wanted to exclude Council from the process. And secondly, as far as the times, obviously it's upon the Council or the Safety Committee to make a recommendation to the Council. That's not a change. I copied that from the old ordinance. So you can change it to

whatever you choose.

Mr. Hills: But if I could follow up on that. I don't think Council ever wants to get involved unless there's been a denial. So more likely than not, it's not going to happen. They're also not going to hear about it any way. But I think that's where some, there may be some merit to having Council in the processes if things are being denied and we're not even aware they've been applied for. I think once it reaches Council, that even date is probably over that they wanted to do any way. It's just a regrouping.

Mr. Hood: That was one of my concerns.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes Chairman Stake. My question is, getting back to the youth, are the youth now, are they required to have this permit now? They want to go around and solicit for their school projects and things like that?

Mr. Hood: Technically, yes.

Mr. Stearns: They do?

Mr. Hood: Technically, yes.

Mr. Stearns: Okay.

Mr. Hood: I can't tell you that everyone applies for them. But technically, yes. There's no exclusion. There's no difference between a minor or somebody of age in this ordinance. But I can't tell you that they do that. I just tell you technically, yes.

Mr. Stearns: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mayor.

Mr. Stake: Mayor, go ahead.

Mayor McPherson: Just to answer Mr. Stearns' question, we do in fact, an example is like the youth that collect for band and things like that. They do come in. They do get a permit. I do waive that permit fee. So the answer to the question, if they do it the correct way, they do come in, they do get a permit, we do waive the fee, and then they solicit. Same way with the Kiwanis. The way it works now, somebody from the Kiwanis will come in. Somebody from Charity Newsies will come in. They will say what day they want to do it. We give them a copy of the

streets, intersections that they=re allowed to do it on. They=re collections, if they=re street collections. And then again, we typically will waive the fee. And then they do their solicitation. So the answer to your question Councilman Stearns is yes. Even the youth come in and apply. Now in a situation where you know, there=s 25, 35 kids are going to be involved, the question was asked, are we going to run background checks on them? No, we=re not. You know, that=s another reason we could waive the fee. Because we=re not going to run the background checks on high school students, or junior high students, or something like that. And then from our, the Administration=s standpoint, changing the time to 8 or 9:00, or from 9:00 to 8, or 7 or something, we have no problem with that. You know, that=s, they still have from I think, 10:00 in the morning isn=t it?

Mr. Hood: Yes.

Mayor McPherson: Til that time at night. And so, that=s how it operates now and that=s how it would continue to operate. But I can tell you that some of the groups that have come in recently where they have one person applying for the permit and maybe 10 people going to be working under that permit, 1 or 2 or them have been found to be felons. And that=s what this whole ordinance is about. Curtailing. As far as the appeal process goes from the Service Director to the Mayor, it doesn=t matter to me, you know, who does that appeal process. The bottom line is, if the Service Director, Safety Director has denied it, based on one of the reasons that are listed in the ordinance, I can=t image, that whoever does it, is going to change that. You know, you follow the same rules the Service Director does. So you know, I would have no problem with even not having an appeal process. You know, but I think the City Attorney=s probably going to tell you there=s a due process there. And maybe we could make the due process you know, if there=s a problem with doing it with the Mayor that=s coming along, have the Service Director and the appeal be to the City Attorney. You know, which would take it out of the realm of being one elected official ruling on another elected official.

Mr. Hood: That=s fine.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mayor. See Mr. Hood, what you got yourself into?

Mr. Hood: That=s what happens when you try to help.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Stake. It didn=t seem like it was a real big problem, but I now see what you=re specifically trying to get to. And that makes good sense. But I would recommend that we even take the hours out of the legislation and put it on the application and have it something that could be discussed from the Safety Director. Because if it is a winter time activity, they may not want them out on the street.

Mr. Hood: Well, dawn to dusk is what I was thinking in my head. No one brought it up.

Mr. Baxter: You see, those are very easy things that we could work with. I'd be willing to accept dawn to dusk, those type of things. But you need to think, you also have things like with the, you know, the fireworks and you know, the festival and things like that where people solicit things in the parking areas and whatnot. You know, if you say you can't do it after dark, you're going to be having exceptions. So you might just want to have that as something on a, you know, exception on the form that would allow you to say, for this particular individual, we'll allow it to happen at this point. And that way if they get stopped by the police, they'll have a permit. Just a couple of ideas that I heard that sounded good to me.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Don't give these exceptions. Let's don't give no exceptions. You can be after dark and this guy can't. Let's set a time limit. Like dawn to dusk. _____ dawn to start with. There's nothing wrong with setting a time limit at 8:00 or something like that. This deal of saying, okay, it's going to be dawn to dusk but you can have it until 10:00. Give an exception. I don't want the Mayor giving one like that. I don't want the Service Director giving one. I don't want me giving one like that. There's legitimate times for people to come around and knock on your doors. And I think we have to respect the community. After all, we get hit on the doors through the summer, there's organizations from outside of Reynoldsburg. You talk about the band. You talk about little league. I have little league's from all over Columbus coming by my door and I'm not happy with that. I like to support the Reynoldsburg athletics and little leagues and so forth. But let's set a time limit that we all know what the time limit is. Because maybe I see dusk a little bit different than what the policeman sees it or something like that. I don't want to go by that. I want a regular time limit.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilwoman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you. I'd like to say that I agree with Mr. Clemens and Mrs. Newman. But one thing I'd like to, in my personal opinion, as far as the hours, I'd like to see it more like 7:00. Because regardless of it being winter or summer, people have families. We're looking at the safety of the citizens. And I think 7:00 is pretty much as late as I would like someone to come to my door.

Mr. Hood: 7 p.m.? Well, I guess the way I envision it would be the ordinance would just need to be amended. So the Safety Committee will have to amend it and you can amend it to whatever time you choose.

Mr. Stake: President Hills.

President Hills: As I heard the Mayor bring up about Charity Newsies and others, just a question I think we ought to look at. If Chapter 741 is what we use also for the Charity Newsies, we ought to be changing the wording rather than just door to door, but also the intersections to _____.

Mrs. Frazier: It=s not. It=s not.

Mr. Hood: I wrote that down.

Mr. Hills: That=s what I=m trying to get the answer to.

Mrs. Frazier: It=s not. Chapter 3...350 something, whatever, it=s back in 3 for the street solicitations. This is just door to door.

Mr. Hills: There we go. Discount all my _____.

Mr. Hood: Those are general offense codes. But, okay.

Mr. Stake: Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Baxter, I=ve heard through the grapevine that you like to sleep pretty late on Saturday morning. How would you like it if people came there, yeah, the sun comes up pretty early in the summer time.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, it does.

Mr. Hills: He doesn=t answer his door any way. Right, Brett?

Mr. Baxter: Nor the phone for that matter.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments from members of Council? A lot of good discussion here tonight. A lot of suggestions. What=s the pleasure of the committee? Would we like to go forward and make those changes along the way? Does that sound okay? Okay. Then I=ll make the motion, if there=s no more questions or comments, I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilwoman Shirey. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

I will adjourn the Safety Committee at 7:56.

Safety Committee

April 16, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 16, 2007

Members of Service Committee present: Mel Clemens, Doug Joseph, Antoinette Newman, Preston Stearns.

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

Mr. Clemens: I=d like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:57.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I would like to make a motion to remove item #6 (ORDINANCE MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO PAY FINAL INVOICES REGARDING (1) Widening and Resurfacing S.R. 256 between the Marcus Theater entrance in the south, to a point north of Farmsbury Drive in the north; and (2) Livingston Avenue Bikepath that connects Huber Park to Blacklick Woods), from our agenda. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item is the approval of the minutes of the Service Committee meeting held April 2, 2007. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they=ll stand approved.

The next item on the agenda, Authorization of professional engineering services - Matterhorn Drive Storm Sewer Project, and appropriation of funds. Held 3-19-07. Held 4-2-07. This item, as we said at the last Service Committee meeting, we set up a meeting that was well attended by the Service Director, and myself, President Hills, Mr. Hood, members of the Street Department, our engineer, and members of the Storm Water Department. And we had lengthy discussions. Over 2 hours discussions. As a matter of fact, it=s hard to believe that we didn=t all agree with each other. Had many questions, and many answers, and many that weren=t answered. After much discussion on this really, it was decided, as we left it, and I think we=ll receive the information in our packet for our next meeting from our engineer, it was left that we would apply for a grant that=s just become available for the widening of Rosehill Road, which will be widening the road, and street lighting, and sidewalks and so forth, and a new storm water system. We would like to take a crack at this. That would be a big improvement that we=ve all looked for. And if this would fail, then we would reconsider the project as far as the storm water situation is involved for the property owners. And this is not something, and I want to bring out, this is not something that we=re going to forget about. In other words, we=re not just saying we=re going to apply for this. We=ve done this many times over the last 12 years, and I was part of it telling people we were going to keep getting approved, and approved, and approved, and it never did get approved through the county=s help. It was not our fault that we were not able to do the project. But we do have a, there is a light in the future on this with this new grant that we

have the opportunity to apply for. And the engineer=s are going to have the information to our Service Director. I think he already has it but this came late today. And he will have it in our packet. So we=ll know a little bit more of what we=re talking about at our next Service Committee meeting. I do want to emphasize that this is not something that we=re proposing. And then if it=s not, if we=re not granted this, that we are going to forget about the people or the situation that=s involved with our storm water problems, then we will take other measures. But I think we do owe it to the Administration to follow through on this project, and also give their presentation at our next Service Committee meeting which Mr. DeBolt has kindly said that he would. Are there any questions from Council on this? Yes, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Chairman Clemens, my question is, if this Rosehill Road project gets accepted through the grant, if it doesn=t get accepted through the grant, is this legislation that we are talking about right now, would it have a Plan B to it? Is that going to be Plan B?

Mr. Clemens: This would come back on the agenda.

Mr. Stearns: So we=d have to start all over again.

Mr. Clemens: And we would be discussing what we can do to handle the project. I mean, I can=t at this time say whether this would be the proper way to do it. There was other ideas and so forth. But they wanted to hand, before they came up, the engineer came up with the other ideas on how to handle this project. I have some myself. People had different ideas that was discussed, but we would like to go forward with applying for the grant. But this would not be forgotten. And we should know probably in January whether it would be approved or not. So that would mean that possibly, I hope that the big part of the rainy season would be over, but that maybe the summer would be a little drier. But any how, by the time we got into this in the next intersection, if we did not do well in a grant, that we would put this right back on the agenda and go forward with some type of solutions. And there were other types of solutions discussed at this meeting that we would go forward with some type of solution to handle this project that has been so well needed over the years. On this, I do have a speaker that would like to speak. And it=s Lawrence Miele. Just give your name, address and so forth.

Mr. Miele: Good evening. My name is Lawrence Miele, 1091 Matterhorn. After I spoke before Council, I believe it was in August, after the sanitary sewer backed up on Matterhorn and affected several homes, including my own in the basement, and this is just another kick in the pants now with the storm water. When I first moved into the house, the previous owners had reinforced one of the walls. And there was no visible damage at the time. And this was in early 2001. And in just 6 years, I can tell you that much damage has been done to the house. I sent all the Council members an e-mail on 3-31 with pictures of my house. Of the property and also the basement. I know Mr. Baxter was kind enough to reply. Of course, Mr. Stearns who represents the neighborhood. As well as Mr. Hills read the e-mail, although he did not reply. And some other individuals got the message but did not reply to it. I must ask that if you have that e-mail and have not read it, please open it and look at those pictures so you have an understanding of

what the citizens on Matterhorn are trying to convey to you. It is critical for me personally that I get the basement done this year. And basically what that=s going to involve is, serious reinforcement of the walls. I can tell you, if you look at those pictures, the closet pocket door in my bedroom, and in the master bedroom, will never again close correctly. Because the back wall of the house has basically folded like a piece of paper. If you were to apply pressure, _____, the paper=s shrinking. There=s a bow point. And obviously, that=s what=s happening on the walls. On the back of the house, there=s the bow point, it=s obviously tearing away. And when I close that closet door, the bottom for the most part is flush, and the top of the door is opened this much. And it will never meet again. And that=s just in a few years. It started to get back probably a few years ago. And now obviously, like I said, here in 2007 it=s becoming much worse. I know per the This Week newspaper of April 5 in reference I believe, to the second, the April 2 meeting, Mr. Clemens said he witnessed this flooding on Matterhorn and Rosehill personally. He said he saw a lake. I can guarantee that is a 101% accurate description. Again, if you=re looking at those pictures, I took a picture of my neighbors back yard. It=s two houses down. The back of their back yard which abuts against our properties on Matterhorn, and you=ve got to remember, those properties on Rosehill have those big back yards. Okay. They take out like an acre of land. That water runs from Rosehill all the way down in between all the houses on Matterhorn and into Matterhorn=s sewer. That=s how far that water runs. After heavy rain, I believe we had like 4 inches of rain in 36 hours or something on the 23rd, I cannot let the dog in the back yard for on average, 36 to 48 hours after that. Because for one full day, my water will be full of back, it will be just full of water, and then for one day afterwards, it=s so muddy that I cannot let him back there because I=d have to give him a bath every time. So of course, I don=t mind walking him, but I=m forced to walk him. And after heavy rain, even that=s not that good because all that water is still draining off of Rosehill. And I=ll go walking down Matterhorn, and you=re literally walking through these mini rapids in between each yard. Basically from mine all the way down to, give or take, 1021 we=ll say, give or take. So it=s about 7 houses. Mr. Clemens said he literally saw people sandbagging. That=s ridiculous. I know the grading is horrendous and that doesn=t help the situation any. Matterhorn is lower itself. Not to mention that properties, the back yards on those properties on Matterhorn, the back yards are higher in the front so that just makes the situation that much worse. But I appreciate Mr. Clemens taking the time to come and see for himself. I appreciate Mr. Stearns trying to keep this in front of the Council. Again, I have to stress, if you have that e-mail and haven=t opened it, please look at those pictures so you understand how it looks when it rains. Obviously you go right now, everything looks fine. You think to yourself, oh, what could these people possibly be talking about? Open those pictures and you can understand. A quarter of an inch of rain, I don=t care. That=s fine. An inch of rain, I get really nervous. More than an inch of rain, especially in a short period like on the 23rd where we get 4 inches of rain just under two days, I am so nervous it=s not even funny. I mean, I had to, I got a new sump pump. I got a batter backup. I make sure all that=s in working order. I know it=s going to cost thousands to get the walls reinforced. And that=s just a drop in the bucket as to what the total costs are. Because you think about how when I first moved in, the properties in Briarcliff were going up. And now over the last three years, the property values have gone down. So I=m really taking a hit having to put this much money into reinforcing my foundation. I appreciate your time. If you have any questions, you may ask them

now. Thank you very much.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Thank you. Yes, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Mr. Clemens, may I say one other thing? I would like for the members of Council, the next time we have a pretty good rain like the time you were down there, just ride down there and take a look for yourself and you=ll see exactly what he=s talking about. That=s the best way to see for yourself.

Mr. Clemens: To make this whole thing fall together, it takes the cooperation of not only Council but the Administration. And like I said, there were many suggestions on how this could be done and what could be done and what the cost would be. And there were discussions of if we would go in there now and do some drainage work and so forth, we may be talking around \$300,000 or more. And it=s brought up, since we can qualify for the grant, would it be feasible now, this time of year, to go in and spend 300,000 or more before we apply for the grant? Because if we would be lucky to get the grant, and believe me, I don=t have a lot of faith in the county, but if we are happy and could get the grant, then the work we did would be for non. It would be the expenditure of that kind of money. Therefore, like I said, it was put that the engineers would bring it to us, to Council to look at and see how we felt about making a decision on whether we want to go through applying for the grant or not even do that and fall back and work up another solution on the project we=re talking about. But like I said, they have brought in their proposal to Mr. DeBolt and we will have it in our packet for our next Service Committee meeting. That way, instead of having Steve discuss it tonight and us not being able to look at, not know really what we=re talking about, why when we get it that=ll give us a chance to look at it and then it=ll be right back on the meeting for our next Service Committee meeting. And we=ll follow through then on how Council feels about which direction they want to go. I feel, and I=ve said this, there will be a direction that we will go to solve the problem. It=s not going to be one of these things that=s going to linger for another 10 years. If we would be turned down on this grant, we might as well figure that Rosehill=s a dead dog as far as being widened for the next 10 or 15 years because every grant we turn in we get turned down on until the city would come up with enough money to do it. So we=re going to have to take and consider how we would do it in the Storm Water Project. But I think we do owe the Administration the time to come to us at the next Service Committee meeting and explain their position on it and see how committee and members of Council feel on it. Are there any other questions for me or anybody? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens, the questions I have for you are, what we=re going to be receiving in our packets, that=s going to give us some idea of cost for the project? Or how big the project is? Because right now, we know there=s something going to be there and what that something=s going to be. Is it going to help us make decisions on something we want to move forward with? Or can we have it put on a CIP Project that we start scheduling this to happen?

Mr. Clemens: Mr. DeBolt, he might give us a little bit of information here.

Mr. DeBolt: Mr. Chairman, as Chairman Clemens mentioned, I just got the proposal today. It=s the proposal for the engineering services for two grants, is what we=re looking for.

Mr. Clemens: It=ll tell how much money we would, the thing on these grants, the more money that the city itself puts in, instead of spending this 300,000 now and maybe the 600,000 from some of the work that we were going to do on Rosehill while we widen it, you put that money together, we put it towards the grant, the more money that we put in the grant the better shot we have of it being approved. So that we can discuss next week too on how Council feels about that and where we could come up with the money. As Mr. Hills has said, why would we want to put all our eggs in one basket? We do have other issues around the city to take care of and I realize that as far as streets are concerned and so forth. But why don=t we give Mr. DeBolt and Mr. Parkinson the opportunity to discuss it next week and see how members of Council feels.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Clemens, I=d just like to state for the record, that as you know, and Mr. Stearns knows, I have been interested in the Rosehill Road project, the improvement for many years. From the time years and years ago when all these plans were unveiled. And I thought great, that=s going to be done. Well, I=ve gotten a lot older since then and it still hasn=t been done.

Mr. Clemens: That=s true.

Mrs. Newman: And I think at the very least, we need some storm sewers addressed, and sidewalks. Because there are places there as I=ve said time and time again, where there isn=t even a shoulder. There=s not room for people to put one foot in front of the other up and down that road. And I see people walking along there all the time. And it=s very, very dangerous. So you know, I=m for anything that would correct that problem.

Mr. Clemens: This grant has to do with blighted community, and also safety. Safety is the big issue as far as this grant is concerned. Because this is a big safety issue. And that will be brought into it. I mean, that is one of the main issues. Not only the storm sewer but the safety issue, in which we=ve discussed many times. So that will be brought into it. The proposal that we finally send in would come before Council and see whether we would approve it any way or not. See if there=s anything we would want to change or add because this may be our last shot at it for a long time. Are there any other questions for Mr. DeBolt? Yes.

Mr. Baxter: One more question for Mr. DeBolt. Are we, or should we anticipate a cost for engineering before the grant is submitted? Or is it the grant first, then engineering, designing cost that would come from EHMT?

Mr. DeBolt: It would be the grant first. The preparation of the grant would be the first cost. And

then the engineering would come thereafter.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: The engineering, and I haven't talked to Dave, I don't know how many times we can do those plans, we did the plans. The plans have been done and have been approved by Franklin County. It just happens that they've never came up with the money to do it. And it's one of our programs. They just kept sending it back. But the plans and design work is done.

Mr. Baxter: Oh good. I didn't know that.

Mr. Clemens: So I would anticipate that part of it should not really, they've already been paid for. I mean, I don't want to pay them twice. So I would hope that we don't get into that. Maybe a little upgrading or something like that. Maybe red street lights or something like that. I don't know. It shouldn't be any problem.

Mr. DeBolt: This would be a partnership between the city, the county, and the grants that we're applying for. So we're trying to get our biggest bang from the buck to get the most done for the money so we can get it.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: So we'll look forward to you and Mr. Parkinson next week. Or two weeks from tonight. Are there any other questions? (No response). If not, thank you Steve. With that, we'll hold that and have it return to committee for the next committee meeting.

The next item on the agenda, ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REPLACEMENT OF CHAPTER 1335 AFLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION@ AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Sent to 3-26-07 Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency measure, but returned to committee at time of approval of agenda for further discussion. There were some changes to be made, and also Chet made, and approved by our City Attorney. And I think this is the draft that was changed and sent back to us. Am I correct on that?

Mr. Hopper: What you got on Friday?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. That's correct. I spent a greater part of last week trying to merge the two documents together. If I can just speak on some of this real briefly. The old Chapter 1335 was approved back in >92. The reason that we're coming forward with the changes are a couple of reasons. The first reason is, is that we're getting new flood plain maps. The Licking County maps are going to go into effect on the 2nd of May of this year. Our old maps that we are

currently using are all based out of Franklin County. The flood plain information on those maps does include Licking County. So we've never had to address a Licking County map. So FEMA in conjunction with ODNr is doing some map modernization. They're, again, they've done the Licking County maps. Those go into effect in May. They're currently working on Franklin County maps. So within the next 6 to 9 months we'll have new Franklin County maps with new flood plain, flood way delineations on those. It's topographical maps. It's a lot better maps. I think eventually they'll even be on a web site for us to use off of a web site. So as you can see with the changes that have been passed down from FEMA and ODNr to us, some of the, most of the stuff we already do. We're doing inspections. That was never spelled out in the old Chapter. It is spelled out in this Chapter. We do write notices of violations. We do put certain requirements on the permits that we currently issue. The post construction certifications, if there's buildings being built. One area in particular is the condominiums over off of Palmer Road. A couple of those buildings were in 100 year flood zone. They had to be raised. So we did ask for certification showing the elevations that they were above the flood plain levels. So it just, it kind of enhances what we had in the past. It makes it a little more (Tape Change)... for a developer that's wanting to develop in that has some flood plain on it. It helps, it's more user friendly. I think it spells things out. There's a lot more definitions in this proposal than we've had in the past. You know, there's some other issues with some substantial damage. Stuff we're already charged with doing. It just wasn't ever in the Chapter. And they're asking for that to be in a Chapter so that the people have that information.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Chet. I think you did a good job on this. As you read over it, there's a couple of items. And one of them are small that I wanted to bring up. And one of them is on 1335.07. And it's very minor. But it's on (c). And it's the last sentence on (c). It says, Asuch maps or studies are on file at 7232 East Main Street, City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio.@ I think it ought to state in there where they're at. I mean, I don't want people going in the restroom and things like that thinking we've got maps.

Mr. Hopper: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: I think it should say you know, in your office or wherever you want them.

Mr. Hopper: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: But I think it should state in there.

Mr. Hopper: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: And the other one had to do with the variance procedure and the appeals. I think that's, that is not an item for the Board of Zoning Appeals. I think that appeal should go to Council. I think that's the way it should be handled on something such as this as to a flood control and such things as that. I think the appeals on any of this should go to City Council. And that's on 1335.16.

Mr. Hopper: I think that the old, the old Chapter did talk about it going to the Board of Building and Zoning Appeals. It was item 6 that was crossed out. And again, that was something that came from FEMA. I can check into that and see if they, you know, they would like that.

Mr. Clemens: Maybe other cities do it through the B&Z and so forth. I think something this important that has to do with the flood ways and the flood damage and things like that, I don't think that's, as I read through this I didn't see really anything there that involved basically, the B&Z Commission. I think it's that much. And I think more of it is something that has to do with members of Council really. It's a matter that should be handled by us if there's an appeal.

Mr. Hopper: I can check into that and see.

Mr. Clemens: Check and see if there's a reason if you would.

Mr. Hopper: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Well, you do need this passed as an emergency?

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. It should be passed you know, when the new maps go into effect. You know, that's the other reason for the emergency is that if we don't act on this pretty quickly, we could lose the ability to have the citizens in the community purchase flood insurance.

Mr. Clemens: I personally would like that 1335.16 changed to the appeals go to City Council. I don't know how the rest of the committee feels but I think that's something we're dealing with that has nothing to do with B&Z. And I think it's important enough that this is one thing that this is not holding anybody up. But I think it's one thing that's important enough that it should go before City Council.

Mr. Hopper: Okay. I'll check on that.

Mr. Clemens: How do the other members of the committee or members Council feel about that?

Mr. Baxter: I agree.

Mr. Clemens: If you would please.

Mr. Hopper: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: And you want me to send this on to Council as an emergency?

Mr. Hopper: Please.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions for Chet? (No response). If not, I=d like to send this to Council for an emergency for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you, Chet.

Mr. Hopper: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: You=ll have those changes for us if you would?

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. Do you want me to contact you with the information? Or do you want it for the next meeting?

Mr. Clemens: If they turn us down and say we can=t do it that way you can contact me. If not, we=ll have the changes made that it would be appealed to City Council.

Mr. Hopper: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Variances and such.

We=ll skip item number 6. Move on to item number 7. ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE BARTLETT COURT STORM SEWER OUTLET PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. This was held 4-2-07. I did have the opportunity to meet with Mr. Turley our Foreman, Superintendent of the Storm Water Department, and check these projects out this last week. And we did go over it and check this one out again with Mr. Turley. After looking at it and discussing it with him, I had brought up before I felt it was a project that the Storm Water Department could do with our equipment and so forth. I happened to be wrong on that situation. When you=re wrong, you=ve got to admit you=re wrong. It is a deep situation. It=s a deep ravine. Two men couldn=t handle this project. We have big enormous tiles, the 4 footers that have come loose and slid and so forth. I looked at it before. I thought it was probably not a project that we might not have to do it this time. After looking at it, talking to him and seeing where it=s at, and how to get to it and so forth, I agree. It is a project that, and he felt, Mr. Turley felt it was a project we should do that=s causing us a lot of problems. And I agree with him that I was wrong on my estimate of this. So therefore, are there any questions pertaining to this? (No response). If not, I=d like to send it to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second on it? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Thank you.

ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED GENERAL WARRANTY DEED FROM THE KROGER CO., an Ohio corporation (0.180 ac., N.W. Corner of Taylor Rd. & E. Main St.). It had its second reading 4-9-07. Are there any questions pertaining to this? (No response). If not, I=d like to send it to Council for its third reading. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Next item, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE FRENCH RUN FOOTBRIDGE EROSION PROTECTION PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. It had its second reading 4-9-07. Are there any discussions pertaining to this or any questions? (No response). If not, I=d like to send it to Council for its third reading. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response).

Item number 10, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE WIND RIVER DRIVE EROSION PROTECTION AT DYSAR DITCH; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. It had its second reading 4-9-07. Are there any questions pertaining to this project? (No response). If not, I=d like to send it to Council for its third reading for adoption. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Next item, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE GLENCREST STORM SEWER OUTLET AND DAWN DRIVE STORM SEWER PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. It had its second reading 4-9-07. Are there any questions from the committee or members of Council pertaining to this project? (No response). If not, I=d like to send this to Council for adoption. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

And that will end the Service Committee meeting at 8:30.

Service Committee

April 16, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
April 16, 2007

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Preston Stearns.

Other members of Council present: Brett Baxter, Doug Joseph, Antoinette Newman, Donna Shirey, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: I will call the Finance Committee to order at 8:31.

Item number 2 on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I do have some changes to the agenda. I would like to add as 4b, the paying invoice for State Route 256 that was listed by mistake under the Service Committee earlier. And I would like to remove, at the request of Safety/Service Director, items number 5 (Discussion, Mowing assessments for 2006 to Franklin County), and number 6 (Discussion, Mowing assessments for 2006 to Licking County). Are there any other changes? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held April 2, 2007. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion: Additional Merit Increase - Chapter 160 employees, and appropriation of funds. This came from the Mayor. Mayor, would you like to address this?

Mayor McPherson: This is the additional 1% that we talked about providing for the non-union employees. This is all non-union employees except those that have applied for the Steel Workers. And you should see attached to that, a list of all the employees and the dollar amounts. We'd like to see it move forward as quickly as possible so we can get them up to the total of 3%.

Mr. Stake: Okay. You are asking for emergency on this, correct?

Mayor McPherson: I'd like to have emergency on it so we can get them paid appropriately. And we've asked that it be retroactive to January.

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

Mr. Clemens: I certainly agree with the Mayor with the 1% increase. And by increasing the

employees to the 3% and moving it back retroactive. I just get a bug in me when I read this merit increase. I wish we would not have that in there. It=s not a merit increase. We get into this over, and over, and over again. It=s an increase. It=s a pay increase. But someday let=s do without that.

Mr. Stake: Well, we would need to change our Policy and Procedures Manual I believe.

Mayor McPherson: It=ll be changed in 160. If you=ll recall, we talked about bringing it down some time in this second or third quarter of the year. The change is being recommended to 160. And part of the reason for the wait, we wanted to have our HR Consultant also review them. Make sure that we had everything current. So those will be coming down. And I can assure you Mel, we=ll address the merit issue of that. And I=ve agreed with you on that for a long time. So we=ll address that issue when we bring 160 changes down.

Mr. Clemens: Good enough.

Mr. Stake: Thank you Mayor, Councilman Clemens. Any other questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee or members of Council? (No response). And I believe we would need to appropriate \$30,005 from the unencumbered General Fund and \$12,080 from various other funds, Enterprise Funds for a total of \$42,085. Well, I don=t hear any objections to this. Looks like everybody=s in agreement. So I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for, send this to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item 4b is the Ordinance making Supplemental Appropriation to pay the final invoices regarding the widening and resurfacing of State Route 256. And this had its first reading on April 9, 2007. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee in regards to this? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). None being heard, then I=ll make a motion that we send this forward for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Before I adjourn the Finance Committee, I would like to point something out that, correction, or at least make a correction to the public here. In the April 11 Reynoldsburg News, I was attributed to saying that regarding finances, AStake said, spending is out of control.@ I don=t believe that was me who made that comment. And in fact, I don=t believe spending is out of control. I do know that in 2001 we took a hit of about 2.4 million dollars in tax revenue because some employers left the city. And I know in 2002 we took another million dollar hit. And we=ve been struggling with that ever since. But in 2004 we had a General Fund balance at the beginning of the year of 3.4 million dollars. In 2005 we started the year with the General Fund balance of 3.6 million. 2006, we started the year with 4 million dollars. And this year we started with about 4.6 million dollars. So you know, giving those facts, I don=t know how we

can say spending is under control and I certainly wouldn't say spending is under control. I do know that the Mayor, the Administration had not spent over \$900,000 last year that had been appropriated. And I know Council, everybody here on Council and the Administration worked to try to hold the line on expenses. And so I just wanted to point out that I do not believe spending is out of control. I believe the Administration has done a good job with spending and I believe that City Council has a good job in making good decisions on the appropriations that were made in the previous years.

With that, I'll adjourn the Finance Committee at 8:35.

Finance Committee

April 16, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)