SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 4, 2005

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

Mr. Clemens: I'll call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:32.

The first item is the approval of the minutes of March 21, 2005 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item is the approval of the agenda. I'd like to put item #6 (OPWC) in Other Legislation, because item number 6 is coming up underneath the Finance Committee meeting. So we'll be discussing item #6 this evening. Are there any comments? (No response). If not, that will stand approved.

The next item, discussion, Liquor Permit request, new, Anne U. Dempsey dba Sun Shine Caatering Two, 7309 E. Livingston Ave., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Lt. Nuesse.

Lt. Nuesse: No objections. We don't recommend any hearing.

Mr. Clemens: No objections?

Lt. Nuesse: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. We'll let this stand as it is and take no action on it. Thank you.

Next item on the agenda, discussion, Issuance of Permit to solicit donations, The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Team in Training. I had a call on this. They would like to take up donations and they had sent us a small reference on what their project is and so forth. I discussed it with them. It seems like a worthy project that they're collecting money for. They'd like to do it on, their choice of date is April 9, and I told them they couldn't do it for then. But their other date was April 23, 2005. And they'd like to do it between the time of 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. at the intersections of Taylor and 256, Brice and Main Street, and Livingston and Brice Road. Are there any discussions as far as this is concerned? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Clemens. My only concern is with the 256. As we discussed on two different occasions, that's a rather busy section of road. Very wide. And sometimes could be considered hectic. And I'd be concerned for those people collecting in that area. Especially if they've never done it before.

Mr. Clemens: On this, I think we've had this before by other organizations. Lt. Nuesse, do you know anything of a past reference as far as this is concerned? Have you been involved on this?

Lt. Nuesse: I know that there have been other organizations that have collected in that area. We haven't had any problems that I'm aware of in the past.

Mr. Clemens: We haven't, you say?

Lt. Nuesse: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: Because this was a concern as far as I was concerned. I know once before, and I know I discussed it with the Chief and, it went ahead. I hadn't heard any more comment back about it. Any other discussion? (No response). To me, this is an item I think one of these days we should change and put under administrative function, if that would be alright with the administration. I don't think this really needs to come to Council. That's why I think maybe I'll get with the Mayor, and maybe we can work up something with Nancy. Do you agree Mayor, that this is something that should be handled by...

Mayor McPherson agreed.

Mr. Clemens: So we'll see how we can handle that. This will have to be passed as an emergency at our next meeting for it to take effect. So I would like to make a motion to send this on to Council for a first reading as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you. I know you don't like to do emergencies, but we never get them really, until it's too late.

Having said that, that ends our Safety Committee meeting for this evening at 7:36.

Safety Committee
April 4, 2005
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 4, 2005

Members of Service Committee present: Eric Gilbert, Antoinette Newman, Brett Baxter.

Other members of Council present: Mel Clemens, Lane J. Beougher, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:37 p.m. The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the March 21 meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they will stand.

Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. I do have a couple of changes to this evening's agenda. Mrs. Frazier, when I spoke with you today, did we need to hold item number 4, or was it just 7 and 8?

Mrs. Frazier: 7, 8 & 9.

Mr. Gilbert: 7, 8 & 9. I'm sorry. I'll make a motion that we hold items 7, (Discussion, Acceptance of Sanitary Sewer Easement, 0.384 acres (Village at Slate Ridge)), 8, (Discussion, General Regulations and Zoning Classification; Chapter 1111 General Regulations; Conservation Development Zoning Category) and 9 (ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED GENERAL WARRANTY DEED (Reserves A and B, Woods at Reynoldsburg, Section 4, Part 2) (Woods at Reynoldsburg, LLC an Ohio Limited Liability Company)). Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is the discussion of the Pleasant View Heights Sanitary Sewer Assessments. Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you, Chairman Gilbert. I think you will note, in your packets, there was extensive information from Franzmann, who is our attorney, our assessment attorney on this particular issue. We have proposed that this go through as an emergency so that we can indeed get the invoices out and get some money back in from the homeowners in that area, back into the fund. All that is explained in Mr. Franzmann's letter.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Does this raise any questions from members of Service? (No response). Other members of Council at this time? (No response). None being heard, this is standard, and I would just make a motion that we forward this to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you, Mrs. Reichard.

Item number 5 is a discussion for the Resolution of services available to property proposed for annexation of 123.5 acres in Etna Township, by Summit Place L.P., Maplewood Farms. This is an expedited annexation that was received in the Clerk's office. We have I believe, 20 days from the date of receipt to act on this. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this annexation at this time from members of Service? (No response). Other members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6 is a discussion regarding ordinance to amend Ordinance No. 12-03 regarding our Natural Gas Aggregation plan. I see Mr. Brandt is here this evening in case you might want to comment on this to the members. We did have some information in our packets in regards to this. And I believe the State deadline is April 17, or 15, 18. Give or take a day there. Is there anything you care to add to this, Mr. Brandt?

Mr. Brandt: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert, members of Council. This was one of these issues that came out, from what we were understanding, the Public Utilities Commission had the changes that are in the document you have that are highlighted in yellow, hopefully. Which there was some valuable pieces of change, like the telephone number and things of that nature. And we were told heretofore that the commission had allowed the governmental aggregators a little more time to process these things. But for whatever reason, they have now decided that the gauntlet bell, and time is of the essence, and a letter that was enclosed indicates that. So what would happen in essence is that, if we didn't pass it in a timely manner to meet their time line, which is kind of like what you just discussed on the annexation, they set the time lines, but didn't call anybody and ask them if it works. In this case, the pool of residents that's under the aggregation program, which is close to 5,000, would be kicked off the program and return back to the previous provider.

Mr. Gilbert: Which would be about a 5% difference at this point in terms of their cost.

Mr. Brandt: That's correct. So, that's what it's about. I think you can see, there's what, three or four little changes in there that, that's just the way it is.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay.

Mr. Brandt: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Brandt. So in essence, what we're looking at here is, I need to act in the consumers' interest here in the city, as well as the deadline. Does this raise any questions or comments from members of Service? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Gilbert, thank you. I'm assuming Mr. Brandt then, you're recommending that we pass this legislation as an emergency?

Mr. Brandt: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Other members of Council, questions or comments? (No response). I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

I will adjourn Service at 7:42.

Service Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
April 4, 2005
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 4, 2005

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

Mr. Stake: I'd like to call to order the April 4 Finance Committee meeting.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held March 21, 2005. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. Does anybody have any additions or deletions to the agenda? (No response).

Item number 4 is, Discussion, Amend Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual, and amend Chapter 160 to reflect addition of Assistant City Attorney to Overtime Exempt list. And this was requested by City Attorney, Mr. Underwood. Mr. Underwood, do you have anything to say on this at this time?

Mr. Underwood: Well, the job description stated it was exempt. But Human Resources said that they wanted this changed even more to clarify it so they knew it was exempt. So I put it in to clarify it, even though the job description says it's exempt.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). We do have two items to deal with here. One, is amending the Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual. The other is to amend Chapter 160. So I guess I would make a motion that we send these both forward to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is further discussion, Funding for various projects, Reynoldsburg Major Commercial Corridors Streetscape Project Phase II, S.R. 256, Taylor Road south of Main. We received some information over the weekend in our packets. Mr. Clemens, did you have any questions or comments on this this evening? I know it's a lot of information to digest in a short period of time. And I didn't know if anybody wanted to discuss this this evening or wanted to take some time to review what we had.

Mr. Clemens: You're talking about what we received as far as the Streetscape?

Mr. Stake: Right. You had mentioned in your committee that we were going to discuss this in this committee, so I thought I'd...

Mr. Clemens: I don't see any funding for everything that we talked about. We talked about Taylor Road.

Mr. Stake: Right. I don't believe we have any updated funding proposals from the City Auditor at this time. I did speak with Dr. Whitney earlier today. And I met with Mrs. Reichard and folks from EMH&T about some of the information that they gave us. And I guess some of the numbers are still trying to be worked out. Correct, Mrs. Reichard?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. We had another meeting with AEP today and finally got the figures that we were looking for, well that's not true. We got the information we were looking for for the most part. That is still inconclusive at this point. But we think we are far nearer than what we were before. Travis and I will be meeting later this week, on Wednesday of this week to, we call it surgery. But what we're looking at are not only the numbers, but the accounts that could, especially the Enterprise Funds, that may enter into this and how much from each one. As we begin to look at storm water issues. As we look at the cost and the, everything that goes with putting in the new water line. We would like the opportunity to reconfigure some of those issues, meet with Dr. Whitney, and really come back and have a good conversation next week about the funding. I can tell you that the more we work, the better we fine tune the numbers. And I'm not saying they're down as far as we want them but, we are refining them. And we hope to have some better costs for you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. And while you're still there, if I could just comment, I did attend the tail end of the meeting that you had with AEP and found out why they're so expensive. They sent 6 people to the meeting. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. And you plan on fine tuning the cost figures that you gave here? Because you add up the cost figures you get here, you still come out to 10.3 or 10.277.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: For the total project. Because you've got to put back in the construction drawings and the bidding, which throws it back up to the 10.277. So I am, like I said, I'm glad you're working on it, because I am kind of worried about some of these costs that were estimated and what we've got in front of us.

Mrs. Reichard: We do have it under 10 million. Yes, we do have it under 10 million. What you have in front of you is really just the figures that were put into the proposal. And in my memo, it states that what we were looking at, not so much putting in every single cost, but to make it the strongest possible proposal. And of course, we were awarded the 2.6 million in various funds, so we're very happy about that. But the original cost, just off the top of the head estimation, a couple of years ago for Phase II was 6.9 million. So right now what we're doing is, being very realistic. We're dealing with the increase cost, over $888,000 more on the AEP side for which we may not have any control over. But there are just some other issues that are really bubbling to the top as we really hold peoples feet to the fire now that we have pretty firm plans in place. So again, we will have, I think we'll have better news for you on Monday.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. And I tell you what, I realize what the estimate was. I also see the grant application. And to me the grant application was really falsified. When you come up with the grant application, and then it's over double of what your construction plans are right now unless you come down with it. I don't understand what we were doing. And that's what's leading us into kind of a mess that we're talking about.

Mrs. Reichard: But please, let me be very clear, there was no falsification of any grant application. I would hate to see that in the paper.

Mr. Clemens: I don't want to see it in the paper either. But when we start talking about a grant application of what we have and then a complete double of it, and our street hasn't got any longer, our intersections hasn't got any more intersections, we don't have any more driveways, we don't have any more anything. And that's the only thing that's bothering me. And that's why I say, I'll wait until you come back with the explanation. But I want to know why, I'm looking here and, I want to know why our engineering is double. I want to know why we didn't have any construction ______________ and now we've got $80,000 worth. Just things like that.

Mrs. Reichard: All I can say is, we will have firmer figures for you next week.

Mr. Clemens: Just things like that I want to know about.

Mrs. Reichard: Once you apply for the funding, you can add the amenities.

Mr. Clemens: I understand that.

Mrs. Reichard: And the amenities are really what makes it our part we believe, a serious part of the revitalization project to make that a very viable corridor. So we will have more information for you next week.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. That's fine with me.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. Mr. Clemens, any other questions?

Mr. Clemens: No. I'll wait until they come back with figures that somehow tell me something.

Mr. Stake: Did any members of the committee have any questions? (No response). President Hills, I know you had a question then I'll get to the other Council members please.

Mr. Hills: I would like to note, and I asked Mrs. Frazier today to provide all Council members some breakdowns from Streetscape I. I know we're not supposed to call it that any more, but let's say the first phase project. And you'll note there that the expenditures of that were approximately 6.8 million dollars. So I share Mr. Clemens' concern is that, this 10 million compared to 5 million really shocks everybody. We do have 6.8 million dollars in Phase I. I don't know what the numbers are going to be on here but, I think we need to understand why the 5 million was there. I know there are some explanations that come out for at least portions of it. Maybe 400,000 - 500,000. But these numbers were put together in 2003. The numbers we do actually know what it did cost us in Phase I, or roughly 2003, 2004 numbers. So as we, I don't like the adjusting basis. I don't know that it's appropriate but, comparing 5 million and 10 million is somewhat inappropriate. Where certainly, the comparison of 6.8 million to whatever it's going to cost in Phase II, I think there's maybe a closer appropriation knowing that, I think in reading some of the memo's we have what, 200 more feet? 200 more linear feet and one intersection. So with that in mind, I don't know that Mr. Clemens, we're ever going to get down to that 5 million because I don't know where it came from.

Mr. Clemens: I expect it to cost more, don't get me wrong. I mean I understand it's longer. I understand we have more intersections. I understand we have more driveway. We have more businesses. And I knew that from the beginning. I'm not stupid. That's why I wanted to know why nobody did, that's all. I'm just asking the questions.

Mr. Hills: I agree. And how did all these things get involved in that 5 million, I don't know there's an answer to that. Thank you, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I just wondered, we didn't have any landscaping in this original grant application estimate. And that's for Phase I we're comparing here? But that was based on just the grant application. Right? These numbers?

Mr. Stake: Mr. Parkinson, or Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Newman: So is that where the other million came up? That we didn't have any landscaping in there?

Mr. Parkinson: The grant application is for the Phase II part of the project and those numbers that you have before you compare, as requested, the grant application issues with the current best estimate that we have based on the design to date. Again, the grant application was prepared for a project that we felt would position the city best to compete at the highest level for the highest amount of success in the Issue 2. We didn't put the whole project in there because the whole project would not have competed as well as the project that was forwarded. And that's why things like the landscaping are not included. There was a reference to the engineering number. Why is it so different? Issue 2 has got very prescribed formula for what is an allowable input into their system for engineering. And the number that was put in the grant application is highest value that you're allowed to put in to their formula. If we would have put a higher value in, reflecting the level of service that the city demands for such project, we would have lost points. So we prepared an application that was the strongest that we could put in and made it successful and secured 2.6 million dollars for you. And that's why there are some of these differences between the grant application and the estimate. The other is... then I'll stop talking.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mrs. Newman, did that help you?

Mrs. Newman: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Dave, thank you very much for the explanation. That's the first time I've heard that and that actually makes a whole lot of sense. And now I think I have a better understanding of why the grant looks the way it does. And we appreciate the efforts you guys go through. The questions I have isn't for you Dave, although the questions are more for Mrs. Reichard. The Main Street, Brice Road Streetscape flow of funds document is what I'm looking at right here. I'm also looking at the secondary document which is labeled "Streetscape I Financial Summary". The question that I have is based in the area of the design and engineering. It states that the design and engineering was $565,750. I also notice on this Main Street, Brice

Road Streetscape flow of funds document that, exact same numbers show start up cost Phase I. Is that stating, or am I making improper reference that we are actually paying for, or asking for funds to pay for that Streetscape I design and engineering, along with start up cost Phase II of 500,000? I see both figures on here and that's why I'm questioning why they're both here.

Mrs. Reichard: I'll have to have Mr. Whitney respond to that.

Mr. Whitney: Knowing that Phase II was forthcoming, in the bonding for Phase I, we included the start up cost for Phase II. At least $500,000 of it. So you have both the repayment of the start up cost for Phase I and the start up cost for Phase II.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So what you're saying, if I may follow up, this document is a Streetscape I document, not a Streetscape II document.

Mr. Whitney: I can't see it but I think you're probably right.

Mr. Baxter: Great. Because the first one was labeled Streetscape I. This one just says Streetscape. So I made the assumption this was for Phase II.

Mr. Whitney: Yeah.

Mr. Baxter: So now I understand why it's there. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.
Mr. Clemens: To get back to what Mr. Baxter brought up, about the explanation from Mr. Parkinson, that's fine and I understand what he said too. And that's why I like to get on the grant application that was made, on why some of these things were held down. Because I look at street paving and parking lot modification, we turned in an estimate of 184,000. Now it's 838,000. So these are the kind of things I like to know. Concrete, sidewalks, bricks, trips, ramps, 432. Now it's 733. I just, street lighting, traffic signals and connect, 375. Now it's 610. These are the kinds of things I want brought back and explained. Contract mobilization, maintenance of traffic, 254. Now it's 620,000. Just some of these things here I'd like to have explained to me when you come back. That's the only thing right now. And I realize it's going to cost more than it did on Phase I. But I want to know what. If we could secure money by going after Issue 2 money by these grants, I'd like to throw in Rosehill Road about $300,000. Then we'll pay a million and a half for it. If you can do that and get your money, that sounds fine to me if this is the way you handle it. Then that's the way we handle things. I just want to know because I've had people ask me and they read about all this and they want to know, why is the difference. And I tell them it's going to be more and I think we all understand it's going to be more but I just want to know why. But I'll wait until they come back.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I think there's some things, and ask some questions, and hopefully by the next committee meeting, we'll have those answers. So, any other questions or comments from members of Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Stake, just one follow up question. Since we did have start up costs for Phase II of $500,000, did we obtain those funds, and are they being used for that purpose today? (Tape Change). Because when I look at the total figures, like we're under budget by $15,000, does that mean we spent the 500,000 for Phase II? And that's reflected in that 15,000? Because I'm looking for the 500,000. I don't see it in Streetscape I funding. If it was obtained, where did it go?

Mr. Stake: Dr. Whitney, do you want to address that?

Mr. Whitney: It went into Phase II.

Mr. Baxter: Great answer. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay then, if we'll just hold this until the next committee meeting if there's no objections that's what we'll do.

Item number 6 is ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Subsection (a) of Section 143.05 "Eligible Securities" OF CHAPTER 143 <u>Department of City Auditor</u>. This was brought to us by the City Attorney. And Mr. Underwood, I imagine you got the memo. Any questions there? And did you want to address that?

Mr. Underwood: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike). One classification is active funds. One classification is interim funds. And one classification is inactive funds. The City Investment Policy which was adopted by City Council has active funds and inactive funds. Our interim funds are anything up to 2 years. Under our investment policy, the Auditor can invest up to 12 months without Treasury Investment Board approval. To go to 2 years, anything over 2 years is an inactive fund, and that takes Councilmatic approval to designate an inactive investment, and we have no inactive investment. The ordinance that I wanted the word "inactive" deleted from is so that ordinance would be somewhat in accordance with our City Investment Policy that was also enacted by Council. Take the word "inactive" out of that. We have no inactive funds and if we have an inactive investment, Council will have to enact an ordinance ________________ or whatever it is, if it's an inactive investment for two years or five years or whatever time frame it is. That will have to be brought to Council. That ordinance was adopted prior to our investment policy I believe. I think it was probably an oversight and the word was left in there is the only thing I can think of. The investment policy is what we've been living by and follow the Treasury Investment Board. Right now, the Auditor, to go past 12 months, needs the ____ Treasury Investment Board, the Investment Board can only go to two years, period. Anything beyond that has to come to you. That's also in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code.

Mr. Stake: Since "inactive" is referenced in our Charter, does that pose a problem?

Mr. Underwood: No. Because _________ inactive, our Charter is consistent with the Ohio Revised Code. But to do inactive, Council has to declare the funds inactive.

Mr. Hills: Because it's over the two years?

Mr. Underwood: Correct. We've never had the funds to go inactive. Franklin County Commissioners can have millions of dollars they've invested inactive. They've got a lot of money that's inactive funds. We have never had that kind of money that we could say we're not going to need this money for 10 years or whatever amount of time. Two years is about as far as we're going to ever get.

Mr. Hills: So from a layman's point of view, the word "inactive" is a governmental agency that has enough money that they can go sit them aside somewhere for a number of years knowing they're not going to need those monies to develop a community or to maintain a community.

Mr. Underwood: Right.

Mr. Hills: And they need to come under the Ohio Revised Code status of inactive.

Mr. Underwood: Inactive. If a government's got that much money, they should give it back to the services.

Mr. Hills: Rebates of taxes would be nice.
Mr. Stake: Makes sense to me. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Thank you, Mr. Underwood.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to say, that's a good idea.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Newman. Alright then, I will make a motion that we send this on for its second reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Before I adjourn, I don't think I announced the time that we started the meeting. I think it was about 7:42 that we began the meeting, and I will adjourn the meeting, the Finance Committee meeting at 8:04.

Finance Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
April 4, 2005
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)