SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 7, 2003

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Jim Wade, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher. Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, William Hills, Council President Bradley L. McCloud. Councilman Eric Gilbert was present at 7:36 p.m.

Mr. Clemens: I'll call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:30. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the March 17, 2003 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? If not, they'll stand approved. The next item, approval of the agenda. Does anybody have any additions or deletions to tonight's agenda? If not, it'll stand approved. Next I'd like to ask Mayor McPherson for the report. He requested to give a little report here.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. I just wanted to remind everybody, if you didn't notice when you came in, out in the atrium all of the flags and all of the tartans. Saturday is the Tartan Day in the City of Reynoldsburg. Actually Tartan Day is the 6th but we're celebrating it on the 12th. I hope everybody can come out. It starts at noon and goes to 5. Just about everything. They've got the Celtic dancers. They've got the sheep herding dogs. There'll be vendors there. Scottish type cookies and foods. So a really good time on Saturday and I just wanted to remind everybody that we are going to have it and hope Council members and the public can stop over and see some of the Scottish events that we have. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mayor. The next item, discussion, Liquor Permit Request, new, Wasabi Bar & Grill LLC dba Wasabi Bar & Grill, 6336 E. Livingston Avenue, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. I've got a report from Chief Miller that at the present time, go ahead Chief if you would, I didn't see you. At the present time you have no objection to this. Am I correct?

Chief Miller: I have no objections to this.

Mr. Clemens: So if there's no objection, we'll send this right back with no objections.

The next item is discussion, Liquor Permit Request, TRFO from KZEE Inc. to Zeune Co. Main Street Convenience Store, 7820 E. Main St., Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Chief.

Chief Miller: Mr. Clemens, thank you. We've conducted an investigation into this liquor license transfer. We have no objection. Just so you know, these folks have been in business for a number of years in Reynoldsburg and they're just purchasing the business from an old business partner. They have no plans to change the business. They have an excellent record, a very strict policy about selling to minors and we would recommend that this go through.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. If there's no objections from members of Council, we'll send this with no objection.
The next item is discussion, Liquor Permit Request, new, Kaycleen Inc. To Sam's Mart, 7151 E. Main Street, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Chief.

Chief Miller: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. This address is the current location of Sam's Dry Cleaners next to Our Daily Bread Bakery, and two doors down, it's between the Post Office and Subway Shop. And these folks are looking to, obviously we've had very little in terms of calls for service to that address but they are looking to change their style of business in that location. We can find nothing that would allow us to object to this liquor license and recommend that it move forward. We will monitor it.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Are there any questions for the Chief on this subject? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Excuse me, Chief. This is currently the dry cleaners?

Chief Miller: Yes, sir. Sam's Dry Cleaners.

Mr. Hills: They're going to make it a food and beverage mart? Is that what it's going to be?

Chief Miller: Yes. I'm trying to think of a kind of business that would be similar to it. A small, it's not going to be a drive thru obviously but a small carryout.

Mr. Clemens: 7 Eleven or something like that?

Mr. Hills: And that is right by the Post Office, in between, the Daily Bread.

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Which you have a parking problem with already.

Chief Miller: Yes.

Mr. Hills: I'm not sure that we can do anything other than if we had parking problems before, we're going to have worse parking problems.

Chief Miller: It is a business we will monitor very carefully and part because of its location and see what problems, if any, arise.

Mr. Hills: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Chief Miller? If not, we'll send this back too with no objections.

Chief Miller: Thank you.
Mr. Clemens: The next item on the agenda is Discussion, Status of Salt Storage Building. This was put on the agenda by, requested by Councilman Beougher. Mr. Mussi.

Mr. Mussi: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Back in 2000, we did come in with a request to build a new facility. We went out and got a bid which was the only bid that we received. I have on my note that it was rejected but I can't see where it was rejected. But I do have a piece of legislation that we approved the Mayor into contract with the coverall type storage building that it was, which was a new facility, which is a fabric type building with an open front where we just dump in. There were some questions with that based on the size of the walls, based on the fabric. When you start having a fabric type building, probably when I say a fabric, something like the dome down there on Broad Street where they have the tennis, where they have the golf course down there. In turn, with that there was also a question that the type of storage building that we wanted there was a problem with the opening of the building. How big we can get it. How wide we can get it to have trucks go in and out on a regular basis without tearing up the front of the building. We in turn then requested to come in to go with the coverall but then we had to come in and request for additional padding because it had to be put on a concrete pad. At that time in 2000, we were told to come back to Council after the first of the year which we did not. The reason why, is I don't know. One of the questions that we had though, I think I could say is that at the time we were talking about a new maintenance facility and where the location the barn was going to go was an issue. Again, the type barn was an issue. We were looking at a 1500 ton barn which for about $100,000 didn't seem kind of, a little bit over priced for the amount of salt that we would have had on hand at the time. To date, we have gone out since we got the legislation, again, went out, looked at some bids, got some quotes in. That has been put on the Capital Improvement. I don't disagree that we need a salt barn but again, in turn when we start looking at the priorities for a maintenance building, a pole barn that we need to house equipment that we just haven't come back in with a request for a salt barn, which we probably should. Just to let you know that, reading the legislation that we have filled up our barn with the current contract that we have with the current price that we have so our barn's full right now. Hoping we don't need it like upstate New York does to get salt.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Mussi?

Mr. Beougher: Yeah. George, the reason I put this on the agenda is our memories are still fresh enough from the snows of last winter that we remember what the problems were. And also if we were going to take action to do something, in order to get something in place and get it filled by this coming winter, we probably ought to start looking at it now. So you're telling us that you have no intention of building anything at this point.

Mr. Mussi: No. I didn't say that. We have gone out, again, we have gone out to review and got three, four estimates on the barn, on the facility. Let me rephrase that. And the coverall type facility with the fabric was one. We've had Dome Corporation of America was another one. I have prices here that I can get to the Council members after if they like. Spring Island Structures was another one. About Storage was another one. And they range again from about $99,000 to $117,000. This does not include the pad though which is an addition. We've got to put a concrete pad to put this building on which is additional cost in putting the storage facility up.

Mr. Beougher: You have problems with the fabric building because of its susceptibility to ripping and damage from....

Mr. Mussi: I do. Especially when you've got dump trucks around. You've got loaders coming in and out. You've got big salt, the salt trucks coming in. They kind of raise their beds up pretty high how they dump. I'm not saying that they haven't been approved by then. The opening was an issue to us too. At that time they couldn't build an opening that wide without reinforced beams and stuff. We've gone out and talked to them since. Things have changed.

Mr. Clemens: Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Well one of the other reasons, if you'll recall at the end of last year, because of the budget situation, we pretty much agreed that for the first quarter of the year we were going to hold off on any Capital projects. I believe about this Friday or the first part of next week we're going to know what the end of the first quarter results were. We've got a ballpark right now and if the dollars permit, George and I've talked about bringing a piece of legislation forward. But pretty much to resemble what we have now, duplicate it. I know one of the questions Lane asked is how many tons we had in the barn that we have now and it's 1,000 ton and if we could get another one very similar to that one and I think that may have been what George had Larry pricing out. We'd have another 100 ton... 100,000 ton and we should at that point not have any additional problems. But again, going on what we've already seen the first three months, I'm sure when we get the end result and the final figures, that we'll probably be bringing legislation forward for the salt barn.

Mr. Clemens: Mayor, my one thought, and I just have one thought, because I know of the cost restraint that we're speaking of, and I do know that I've always pushed for a service building which I know right now is way out in the future.

Mayor McPherson: Way out.

Mr. Clemens: My thought would be in addition to the one we have, to the side, which you'd only be adding on to. In other words you'd only have the top, another side, and the back and a concrete pad, and for another 1,000 ton you'd have two of them hooked together.

Mayor McPherson: That's what I'm talking about. By duplicating it, I'm talking about adding three sides to the one we have and doubling the capacity.

Mr. Clemens: Right. And that should be fairly cheap.

Mr. Mussi: And as the Mayor said, we've been looking at it.
Mayor McPherson: Yeah. We're hoping that once we go out and get some proposals that they'll come in under 100,000.

Mr. Clemens: Right. Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: Just a comment. I think given the circumstances that we made it through what is the worst winter in my adult history memory. What's to say we can't do that again? I mean we're talking one to two hundred thousand dollars for a facility that's going to house salt that we're going to need once every 25 years? That doesn't, is there something wrong with the one we have now?

Mayor McPherson: No. Absolutely not.

Mr. Mussi: There's nothing wrong with it but I think to say, how are our winters going to be this up and coming year, Mr. Wade, it's going to be hard to surmise what kind of winter we're going to have.

Mr. Wade: Well, I understand that but I'm saying, I remember the blizzard of '77 and I don't remember it being any worse than this winter and we made it through this year and I know we had to do some finagling but for a couple of hundred thousand dollars, that doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

Mr. Clemens: Well Jim, with my thought, and I'm agreeable with you, but my thought is, and as the Mayor said, if we add an addition to it you're only talking about a roof, a side, and a back, and a concrete pad. I can't visualize that coming anywhere costing $100,000 because I would not...

Mr. Wade: If I recall, the cheapest building we got in, in the last bid was a hundred thirty something thousand dollars several years ago and that was without the pad.

Mayor McPherson: I think, Mr. Wade, this time depending on how much money it is to bring the salt barn forward, that's what we need to determine and that's what we're trying to determine right now. I can assure you that if that building's 100,000 or more you're not going to see it on your agenda.

Mr. Wade: Okay.

Mayor McPherson: You're both absolutely right. There should be absolutely no reason for a three sided building with a roof to cost $100,000.

Mr. Wade: Well, I don't know what they cost and I don't know, I'm just doing the math on the scenario of once every 25 years we're likely to have the scenario and maybe we have it two or three years in a row. But we did get by. You guys did a great job of manipulating the system to get the salt that we needed and I don't think that that's going to continue to be that much of a problem, and if it is, it's going to be on a year by year basis. That just seems like an awful lot of money to put up something that might happen....

Mayor McPherson: And we agree, and that's one of the reasons it didn't come forward. One of the other reasons George didn't mention was the finances and that was just so out of line with what we felt it should run. That was another reason we held it.

Mr. Wade: Okay. We'll look at it if it's going to be something cheaper than that.

Mr. Clemens: I think our Street Superintendent, I think he wanted to speak. I think all of you know Larry Ward.

Mr. Ward: I think what you need to have to understand is that we could add onto the existing building but to keep that building full we have to pay an additional $2 a ton to have a man come along with a blower to blow it in to fill it up. The problem we have, not only with this winter but other previous winters, there's only like three or four of those blowers to cover a four or five state area. If we order salt to have a blower to fill the building up, sometimes we have to wait three or four weeks for a delivery. This winter we got all of our salt dumped but we can only fill the building about half way up even if that much. Maybe 40%. The problem I've seen, I've been here almost 19 years now, the problem we're having is getting good deliveries on a basis with when we order it we can get it within a couple of days. Everyone knows the growth that Central Ohio, the State of Ohio, neighboring states are having. They can only mine so many tons of salt per day, per year out of those mines. Everyone is using more and more salt every year. The problem we're having is with getting the deliveries. The building that I wanted to build two years ago, three years ago now would have held 1500 tons. We could get every bit of it dumped, which would save $3,000 just in delivery. We could dump it in there, with that 1500 tons plus the capacity of the building we have now, that would give us enough salt to handle 90% of the winters that we have. We could order it once in the fall, have it delivered, we'd have enough salt to last us all winter. We would not have to go through this hassle of waiting for the deliveries. I see the problem of getting deliveries is just going to get worse and worse even with milder winters. The building we looked at three years ago, the state is now building them. You're seeing them all over the place. I know of no problem with the fabric roof. It is guaranteed for 25 years. Since we already have the plans and drawings for it, that building could be built for about $88,000. It would definitely eliminate a lot of problems. We could continue the service to the citizens. We used 2500 tons of salt this year. We probably could have used, we would have used over 3,000 if we could have got the delivery. But we just couldn't get it delivered. So I really think it's something that is really needed to keep the service up to the citizens, what they have expected over the last 10 years at least. I really urge that we get something going real quick with this. I really believe the citizens need it.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Larry. Any questions?

Mr. Stake: George, I was just wondering how we did years previous to this on salt storage. Have we ran out previous to this year?

Mr. Mussi: No.

Mr. Stake: No.

Mr. Mussi: I'm not saying we didn't get low but we didn't run out.

Mr. Beougher: But we've had to refill.

Mr. Mussi: Oh, yes. I mean, you've got to refill. After several storms you've got to refill.

Mr. Beougher: As I understand it from Larry, we use typically 2500 tons per year which means we have to fill it up 2 ½ times basically from the initial filling, time and a half. But with the new building it would cover our full years supply.

Mr. Mussi: Hopefully. Depending on the winter.

Mr. Beougher: And even a winter like this we'd have to still scrounge for another 500 tons.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from Mr. Mussi? If not, Mayor, George, we'll wait for you to bring something before us.

Mr. Mussi: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: The next item on the agenda, Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Amending Section 757.03 "Daily Reports To Police" of Chapter 757 Pawnbrokers. It had its second reading 3-24-03. Is there any discussion on this item?

Mr. McCloud: I just had a question Mr. Clemens. There is not a penalty provision on this and I guess I had two questions maybe for the Chief. Has this been a problem getting this information? I assume it is or we wouldn't be here passing more legislation.

Chief Miller: What happened was our single shop attended a seminar and came back and said, I'm not obligated to do this under the current legislation and that was when we compared it to the Ohio Revised Code and we just became concerned.

Mr. McCloud: Okay.

Chief Miller: And it had been submitted voluntarily.

Mr. McCloud: Okay. But there's not a penalty provision here.
Chief Miller: No. The only penalty, well there is, in any ordinance where there is no penalty stipulated, it is a violation as a minor misdemeanor. And then I believe they have a special Occupancy Permit of some sort and so we would be, if there were continued violations we would be back on that issue.

Mr. McCloud: Okay. Thank you, Chief.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Chief Miller and Mr. Underwood on this subject? If not, do I have a motion to move this on for the third reading with a recommendation for passage? Motion by Mr. Stake. Second? Second by Mr. Beougher. This will go to City Council for the third reading with recommendation for passage.

The next item, Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Chapter 505, Animals and Fowl.

Mr. Beougher: Excuse me, Mr. Clemens. You didn't call for a vote.

Mr. Clemens: That would be good to have that vote.

Mr. Beougher: We ought to do that.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. All in favor say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

The next item on the agenda, Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Chapter 505, Animals and Fowl. I've had a request to hold this for four weeks. So this will be held for four weeks and be put on our agenda, I believe around May 5, if I'm not mistaken, Monday, May 5.

With no other items on the Safety Committee, we'll adjourn the Safety Committee at 7:48.

Safety Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
April 7, 2003

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 7, 2003

Members of Service Committee present: Eric Gilbert, William Hills, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher. Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, Jim Wade, Mel Clemens, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:48 p.m. Item number 2 is the approval of the minutes of the March 17, 2003 meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to those minutes? None being heard, they will stand as read. Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. I have one deletion from the agenda this evening and one addition along with three housekeeping matters in Other Legislation with this motion. I'd like to move to table items *1, *2, and *4 from Other Legislation; to add item number 7 to the agenda (Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Signs 1181); and to hold item number *4 for two weeks. Do I have a second? Mr. Beougher with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. I'll just note we'll make item number 7 from Other Legislation item 4a.

The Ordinance 1181, Signs, Section 1181.03 did have its Public Hearing which was held on March 17, 2003. Mrs. Frazier, was this referred to the Planning Commission?

Mrs. Frazier: Planning considered it on the 3rd and they recommend approval.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. And if the members would note this was to offer a more clear definition of semi-public organizations within the context of our new ordinance regarding signs. I believe the item has had its first reading. I would make a motion, first let me ask, are there any questions from members of Service on this item? Other members of Council? None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its second reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is the Ordinance to authorize EMH&T to prepare specifications and advertise for bids for painting of the East Broad Street and Taylor Road water tower. This item has had two readings before Council. Are there any questions or comments from members of Service? Other members of Council? I would make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Hills with the second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

- -

*Other Legislation #1, Ordinance authorizing Mayor to enter into contract for right-of-way cost valuation analysis and appropriating funds therefor.
*#2, Discussion, Administration recommendation for taking of property.
*#4, Ordinance to amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Reynoldsburg adopted by Ordinance No. 131-95 on November 27, 1995 and as subsequently amended - 8450 East Main Street, from R-1 to CC, applicant, Kroger Real Estate by Glen A. Dugger.
*Regular agenda item number 4, Discussion, Residential Zoning Review Committee.
Item number 6 was the Ordinance to accept unrecorded donation and dedication of real property for a sanitary sewer easement, unrecorded deed of easement, general utility easement. This was from Ardmore of Ohio Ltd., an Ohio Limited Liability Company. This item did have two readings before Council. Are there any questions or comments from members of Service? Other members of Council? None being heard, I would make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Mr. Stake with the second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

With that I will adjourn Service at 7:57.

Service Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
April 7, 2003

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 7, 2003

Members of Finance Committee present: William Hills, Mel Clemens, Eric Gilbert, Sarah Cannella.
Other members of Council present: Jim Wade, Lane Beougher, Ron Stake, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Hills: I'll call Finance to order at 7:57 and ask for approval of the Finance Committee meeting minutes of March 17, '03. Are there any additions, deletions or changes to these minutes? Seeing and hearing none, they will stand as submitted. Approval of tonight's agenda, I have nothing to add or delete. Does anyone else on Finance have anything they want added? If not, it will stand as submitted.

Moving to item number 4, discussion, Supplemental appropriation for Workers Compensation & Unemployment Funds. Ms. Milam.

Ms. Milam: Yes, thank you Councilman Hills. Before you we have some legislation regarding the General Administration budget. It's projected that there will be a shortfall on two accounts. The Workers Compensation and Unemployment Compensation Accounts. Specifically, in the Workers Comp Account #110.595.5164, it was budgeted in the 2003 budget of $25,000. The new projection for that account is $36,184.41 of the difference being a shortfall of $11,184.41. In the Unemployment Account based on the information that was presented to you, again Account #110.595.5165, $5,000 was budgeted in the 2003 budget. The projection at that time was projected to be $13,856 currently. The difference being $8,856. The difference being a total shortfall of $20,040.41. I have put together a number of information based on previous years of BWC expenses going backwards from the year 2000, projection for this year 2003 and also information on the unemployment expenses last year compared to this year. Currently, the Workers Comp bill which is due May 15, that amount, if we pay the full amount that is due them, we do get a discount of approximately $400. That bill though could be paid in two installments. 45% would be due May 15, and the remaining would be due September 1. If we do that though we do lose the potential for $400 discount. The Gates McDonald portion which is part of that Workers Comp bill, that premium is due July 1. The January and February bills for Unemployment, we have been able to make those payments currently but for based on the amount that we had projected, we would not be able to complete our March payment. Since I did put this information together, we did receive the February bill. At the time I put this together it was projected that we would spend $1,691 for the month of February. We have since received that actual February bill and there was one person that did not file for Unemployment and therefore did reduce that monthly amount that we paid to the amount of $1,405.30 carrying that amount forward that does decrease the amount that we will need in our Unemployment unless that person comes back to file for Unemployment and that is a possibility. They could get a job and then they could go back on Unemployment. If we subtract that amount and we don't project that in that amount, that would reduce the amount by $3,994.20, reducing the overall amount that we would need to a difference of, instead of $20,040, we would only need $16,046.21 total combined with the Unemployment and the Workers Comp. That is the information we have right now. We would like to be able to make some plans, obviously for these bills for the coming months and we're looking for to increase a shortfall on these accounts because of this.

Mr. Hills: Questions? Anyone on Council? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Hills, thank you. Millie, the projections you have here on the Workers Comp, is this what you got from Gates McDonald? That's your third party administrator, the city's third party administrator.

Ms. Milam: Yes. In terms of what we've been paying previously, those are the actual amounts we paid. We have not received the bill yet for Gates McDonald but we're projecting it's going to be around $6,000.

Mr. Stake: Because I notice in 2002 we had a 75% discount. In 2003 we're looking at a 50% discount. Do you know why we're in a 50%? The city's in a group rating program. Correct?

Ms. Milam: Yes. That's the Workers Comp portion. Yes.

Mr. Stake: Yes. That's what I'm talking about.

Ms. Milam: Yes. That's separate from the Gates McDonald.

Mr. Stake: Gates McDonald.

Ms. Milam: Right. The Gates McDonald, they are the third party. They are the administrators of our claims. The actual Workers Comp portion is a separate amount. That's where we get our discounts in terms of they've been very generous in the past in giving us discounts, but it's my understanding that those discounts are not going to be guaranteed for the future.

Mr. Stake: But on the Workers Comp, Gates McDonald is...

Mayor McPherson: I can answer that. It's the Workers Comp Bureau that reduced it from 75 to 50% and they did that across the board on everybody. Not just us. Part of the state crunch and all, and maybe Mr. Hills can add to that but there was, I think we got about 12 or $15,000 last year for going to a meeting. But they even advised us then that it would probably be dropping down to 50%. So we knew last year. We just didn't know when it was going to take effect.

Mr. Stake: I understand the BWC has been giving a credit because they've had favorable returns on their investments previously.

Mayor McPherson: Exactly.
Mr. Stake: But we're also, and so we're talking about apples and oranges and I guess I'm talking about the oranges. I'm talking about the discount that we get by participating in the group rating program through Gates McDonald. When you're showing 50% reduction, that does not reflect the group rating discount?

Ms. Milam: That is the only reduction that we're getting from Workers Comp projected for this year.

Mayor McPherson: The answer to your question is, no that does not reflect the Gates McDonalds discount for using them. That's a separate discount altogether.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Because we're paying $6,000 to Gates McDonald to be the third party administrator on that and I understand we're still paying premiums to the BWC. We're still in the State Fund but we do it by participating in it and in a group rating program we do receive a discount and I guess my question is what is our discount on that portion?

Mayor McPherson: I'd have to ask. I don't know it off of the top of my head. Howard, do you know it off the top? We can find that out for you. I just don't know it off the top of my head Mr. Stake.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade: If I could just add a little clarity to that. I just went through this. This whole scheme with our Workers Comp and a third party administrator and we were, it was pulling teeth with those third party administrators to tell us what our rates really were. And the reason being is I don't think they want you to know what your rates really are because there is a little third party action going on there as well. And it is a very, I guess my advice to us as a table and to the administration is to look deep into it because by the time we got done with our program and switched third party administrators our savings was actually huge when in fact they were getting ready to nearly double our rates. I caution you with the third party administrators and I know Gates is a well-known company but with all the third party administrators a lot of investigation needs to go into that before we just pull the trigger on it because there's a lot of uncertainty of what your rates really are.

Mr. Stake: But you do get a project, well at least a third party administrator gets a projection from the BWC showing what the individual rates are. And then they're able to pass on to you a projection of what the discounted rates are and I guess I'd like to see what that would show in regards to this right here.

Ms. Milam: I'd be happy to present that information to you later. The last time I did talk to BWC regarding our rates they did mention that we had one of the lowest rates based on our claims history. We have not had a lot of claims and that helps in our rating.

Mr. Stake: Well, and that would, if that's correct and our rates are going up like this and if this is due, and I'm not sure if this is due to the, I don't know if we should count the rebate that we get in this scenario, but if our rates are going up because our discount isn't as large with Gates McDonald or the group we're in right now, we should be looking at other groups and other discounts to see if maybe we can get, we may be, if we have good claims history we may be propping up other groups at the expense of our taxpayers. And I don't want to be doing that. I want us to find the most competitive group so that we get the highest discount out there.

Mr. Wade: Again, I'm not sure you fully understand that. They don't, up until 2000 they were actually giving credits and actually rebating checks to show the excess in funds. When they quit doing that they called it a rebate in reduction of premiums. It's not really a rebate. You're not rebated anything. You're getting a discounted rate.

Mr. Stake: You're getting a credit. They're calling it a credit.

Mr. Wade: But they're selling it. The third party administrator is selling it to the Workers Compensation people.

Mr. Stake: Well the TPA's are selling the discount of the group though and there's two different scenario's of the apples and the oranges. There's the group discount and then there's a credit that the BWC was giving which they're not going to give any more. And I'm talking about the discount that we get in the group rating program that we're in. And there's hundreds of them out there and I know under different scenario's that there are, there's different levels and some times they put groups with good claims history in with others that aren't so good to prop those up to get the ones that aren't so good a better rate. I'm not so sure I want to be doing that. I want us to get the best rate out there.

Mr. Hills: If I could, let me add to what the Mayor was saying. The rate that we are going to owe this year, which is based off of your history from '02 is a 50% reduction. The same as it was last year. However, last year they did offer an additional 25% with the Mayor and the Auditor going to their 3 hour safety program because they had too much money in the fund again. Now I think there is discussions going in on the '04 year but that rate may not be at 50%. That's again, in the future. That's not this year. But I do know that the history shows that we had a premium on '01 of about $54,000 of where we actually paid about $13,471 which is you've got in your '02 period which would be based off of your '01 actions. And I think they anticipate our premium that we're looking at now is about $56,000 of which we would only pay 50% which is about the $28,000 and the reason we're asking for 30 is you're paying your Gates McDonald some monies on top of that. And I think that's why you're asking for the total of the 36,000. But certainly if there's some questions that need clarified, we don't have to pass this tonight. Your first payment's due May 15. Right?

Ms. Milam: That's correct. On the Workers Comp.

Mr. Hills: The problem comes down, we certainly, we budgeted for less money, we budgeted for what our actual payments were last year which was not enough at the 50% level because of a 25% rebate. But certainly I'm not opposed, Millie if you could pull together some of the information that Mr. Stake is asking for and we can discuss this again in two weeks just for some clarification. Do we have to appropriate more dollars? Yes we do. But I think that it is a good time to take a look at this to see if, you're bringing up some very good points that need to be looked at from a level of, are we where we need to be within this program.

Mr. Stake: And I don't think there's anything we can do about what we owe May 15. That number's that number. But we do, if things aren't what I'm seeing here I'd be more comfortable seeing what our group rating discount is and what other programs are available to us as well in the public sector and there are two different deals. There's the private sector and the....

Mr. Hills: And that doesn't go so much as to what we're going to have to appropriate for this year because some money's going to come up. It's going to be somewhere between 15 and $20,000 you need in order to make those payments. But since it is right up here on the table we might as well hold it for a couple of weeks and get some of this information in to see if we need to be looking at it differently. Anybody on Finance opposed to holding this for two weeks? Ms. Milam, you don't have a problem holding it for two weeks. So, we appreciate the discussion we've had on it and we'll look for some further information and take action in two weeks and then send it forward as an emergency with some appropriations. Okay?

Moving on to item number 5, is a Vacancy on the Income Tax Review Board. I have received a memo from Brenda. This board was appointed in 1988. It's a three member board. The person that Council appointed, David Humphrey is not interested in reappointment. I understand they have not actually met since 1988. I don't think Brenda's here. However, I did get a memo from Brenda and they would like to try to meet with the board later this year to update on the tax rules and regulations. Much of the function is now done as you know by RITA and therefore, there aren't as many appeals taken because RITA is doing this. But the statute does require that there be a board in place and so we do have an opening. She has indicated that she would like to see someone who does have some tax knowledge, auditing, or tax information background would be nice to round out this board. So, I don't have anybody that I know of right off but I thought if we do have, if anyone publicly does have an interest in serving on Tax Board, there is no compensation with it. It is a voluntary board and from what I can tell does not meet too often. Certainly, if you could get your name to Nancy within the next couple of weeks we'll see if we can get somebody appointed. If somebody of Council knows of somebody that has an interest please contact Nancy within a couple of weeks. Okay? Any comments or questions on it? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Does the President have a recommendation?

Mr. Hills: The President sent me an e-mail saying that he did not have a recommendation and that's why it's on Finance and seeing if somebody does have one and we'll just open it to submit. It came to me as there was no recommendation so I opened it up.

Moving on to item number 6, discussion, Resolution of Support, United States Armed Forces. I think everyone has received a copy of this. Any comments, suggestions? I understand this comes from Mr. Luzader. Is that correct? And I certainly have read it. The net of what the Resolution is saying is endorsing the resolve that the Council of the City of Reynoldsburg to express unequivocal support and appreciation of the community, one, to the President as Commander in Chief for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of military operations in Iraq as part of an ongoing global war on terrorism. Item two, to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom who are carrying out their mission with excellence, patriotism, and bravery, and three, to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom we are providing support and prayers for the loved ones currently engaged in the military operations in Iraq. Any questions or comments from anyone on Finance? Anyone on Council? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Hills, I just would say I'm strongly in favor of this.

Mr. Hills: Does Administration want to add anything or Mr. Luzader, do you want to add anything to it? Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: I think Brett, what he submitted is a very good document.

Mr. Hills: Yes. A very good document. I did not read the totality of it but I did read the essence of the three points so certainly I would send forward with recommendation for adoption a Resolution of Support, the United States Armed Forces. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens, and Mrs. Cannella, and Mr. Gilbert. All three of them. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). We will send that forward. Opposed? (No response). And it does go forward.

I believe that concludes Finance at 8:15.

Finance Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
April 7, 2003