COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 3, 2006

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

Mrs. Newman: Good evening. I'll open the Community Development Committee meeting for April 3, 2006 at 7:30 p.m.

The first matter on the agenda is the Approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, it'll stand as it is.

The next item is the Approval of the minutes of the regular Community Development Committee meeting held February 21, 2006. Are there any changes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they'll stand as given.

The fourth item is for Discussion, it's an item to Amend 160.02(c) (Department of Development); 160.02(g)(2) (Service Dept. Building Division); 160.05 (A1) "Overtime Eligibility"; and Personnel Policy Manual, Section 4.03. Mayor McPherson. Is he here? He's not here.

Mayor McPherson: Give me just a minute. I was in another meeting out there. Excuse me. I'm sorry. I was in another meeting out in the atrium there for a second. This is a request for various changes within our Chapter 160. After talking with the Safety/Service Director, with the Development Director, with the Building Department Chief Building Inspector, we are recommending that City Council consider amending Chapter 160 to move the Planning Administrator from the Development Department where she is now, or where that position is now, to the Service Department. And after several conversations, we also feel that the position is at a pay grade that's too high for what the job is that that position does. So we're recommending it be classified from a 19 to a 16. Now in order to do that, we've got to request amendment to Chapter 160.05, and the Personnel Policy Manual Section 4.03. And we've included all the documentation for the change. We've included letters from both the previous individual that was employed as a Planning Administrator. The current Planning Administrator who's last day is this Friday, and we're just, we think that's the best way to handle that position, to put it under the Service Department. And that's our recommendation and our request to City Council.

Mrs. Newman: Mayor McPherson, one thing I was concerned about is, is the qualifications of Mr. Brandt to supervise that position? Do you think that we'd lose the benefit of his knowledge and education if this position were moved to some other department?

Mayor McPherson: No. I'm sure that any time Mr. Brandt's help is needed by any of the departments and any of the department heads, he's right there. And he'd be right there whether we move it to the Development, or from the Development to the Service or not. John's always helpful. And no matter what department it's under, if we need his help, he's available.

Mrs. Newman: So he doesn't really have to closely supervise that function?

Mayor McPherson: No.

Mrs. Newman: Alright.

Mayor McPherson: It's a pretty independent position.

Mrs. Newman: Anybody else? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Newman. I don't see any problem with this myself, and I just want to say that I had a discussion with Mr. Hopper and Mrs. Reichard, and I got a good understanding of how the system would work. And I don't see a problem with it. So you have my support for that Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. And I had the opportunity to meet with Chet and Sharon too on the subject. Because I had some problems on it. And I brought it up at the meeting that I don't think the position is needed. I haven't changed my mind on that yet. Also I brought up, I didn't feel that the Assistant Building Inspector was probably needed. Now I have changed my mind on that, meeting with Chet and so forth. And it had been my feeling, and it's still my feeling in some regards, that the job could be handled by the Assistant Building Inspector as far as adding the position and changing the position that we're speaking of. It hasn't been handled right since we've had it. And I'm not one of these guys that's going to sit here and not say it has and all that. Because it hasn't been. I think we all realize that, or most of us realize that. The position is put under the Development Director for a reason. It was put there because people passed and changed our Charter a few years ago when I was Service Director. They felt that the Development Director should be handling the development part of the city and put him on the Planning and Zoning Commission, and put him on the B & Z Commission. And that's why when we created this position, we put the Planning Administrator, which follows the development part of it and works on these commissions that the Development Director serves on and basically is in charge of it. And I know how things operate. Being the Development Director, if we change it to the Service Department, he is not going to oversee the Zoning Officer. We can stand here and talk about it and say what we want but you've got to be realistic about it. The Service Department has enough problems on their hands to start getting involved in the zonings and the B & Z Department and so forth. I think it's something that we should think about, and each of us think about on which is the best way to handle this. Can we save the city 50 or $60,000 by combining the jobs? You've got to look at what's happening in the future. We don't have a Planning and Zoning meeting this coming month. We skip one about every other month because we don't have that many items that come before us any more. We don't have that many zoning items come before us. I realize that we have, as Barb said in her letter, all the things they have to do and how the city should do it and so forth. Possibly she should have stayed here and helped us work on it. I still feel that with the slowing down of permits, and I realize we have to have call backs on them and so forth. I went through all this. And the slowing down of permits, over 1,000 this year, and going to be slowing down of our Building Permits for the next few years because we don't have the ground to do anything, to build the houses on, unless we do a bunch of annexations which I don't see coming in the near future. I think it's time that we start, we've talked, and Mayor, you've talked about a budget crunch and we're going to hold these things down. This is the opportunity to possibly save 60 grand or close to it. It's something I'm thinking about. I'm not saying that I've made my mind up yet on it. But I think there's questions to be answered on why we are doing this. Why are we taking this away from the Development Department? Is it because the job is not being done? The job that should be done? I think it can be done. And I think it can be done if it's handled properly, and possibly the Zoning Officer should move up to the second floor where the Development Director is so that it's closely coordinated. There's more to this I think than just saying, well I think it's time to change this and cut it from a 19 to a 16. Why are we cutting it from 19 to 16? We thought it was an important job when we made it a 19. So I'm still thinking about it. I know we've got weeks to go on this and I think tonight that everybody should kind of think before we jump and say, I support this 100%. I think we should look it over a little bit. And this is no reflection on Chet, nor John, nor Sharon. I just think it's something that City Council needs to look at. If you look at Whitehall, they just eliminated three positions because they have a money crunch like we do. And I think it's time that we look at these things and look them directly in the eye. And that's all I have to say about it.

Mrs. Newman: Alright Mr. Clemens, do you suggest then that we probably should hold this for two weeks?

Mr. Clemens: Well, no. I have no problem moving it on. But I think it's something everybody should be looking at considering the different items on it.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Any more comments from, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Newman, if I could ask, and Mr. Clemens, I have not talked with administration about this. I've just seen it. I did receive a call from Sharon and she wanted to wait to talk until after I had seen what was in the packet. But has anyone responded to you as to why this Planning/Zoning Administrator couldn't function as a duty of the Chief Building Inspector, Assistant Chief if we put someone in that position, or if the Mayor hires someone there? Has anybody given you the answer to why they can't do that?

Mr. Clemens: Other than, it would be more work for that department, certainly. But I don't see that. I mean, that's just my...

Mr. Hills: I think with your point your making, that if the numbers we heard talked about here recently that we've had a 50% drop in inspections over the last year or so, you kind of wonder if we're able to do twice the amount of work we're doing now, why do we need, we ought to be looking, if we have an opening, is it necessary at this present time to fill it? And I guess that's why

I was kind of, I have not had that conversation with them yet. And so, I guess what you're saying is, other than it's more work but it may be just filling back into some of the things that haven't been done.

Mr. Clemens: To be fair, Chet came up with what they intend to do. As our building increases, they intend to put more pressure on our interior, which is good. Our present homes and so forth, and concentrate a lot more, seeing that the inspections, the re-inspections are done that they haven't had time to do and so forth as far as the Building Department's concerned. So I mean, I respect their view on that. And I see that as we do slow down on housing, that we can turn inwards and try to correct some of the problems that we do have interior as far as our houses and so forth are concerned. My problem is, I just haven't seen the job done. And even though the job hasn't been done, I don't feel it's been done, everything has moved along. And I don't know how it's handled as far as zoning and B & Z or out of the B & Z and how it's handled any more, but they're on the committee and they're supposed to go out and look at these places their self. Now whether they do or not, I don't know. But I mean, if you've got these items coming up and they're on you're, that you have to judge and look at them, and where something's going to be and where something's not going to be, that's why you get your agenda. And that's why you go out and you look at them yourself and see what the situation is. I've sat here before Council. I haven't seen anything brought to us on anything as far as planning, our administrator has done as far as what she's recommended and not recommended as far as all of this is concerned. We don't get anything. So it's hard for me to judge really, what goes on. I'm just saying, this has come to a time now when we do have the opportunity to decrease our payroll without adding two positions that some of the duties could be shifted within our organization that we have. I just think it's time to look at it. And I'm not saying that...

Mr. Hills: If we can reduce our payroll without reducing our services to the public, we absolutely ought to be looking at it right now.

Mr. Clemens: That's just something I brought up tonight. And as it goes on, we can talk about it. That's just my feeling at the present time and I can't say how I'll feel about it two weeks from now. But I'm telling you how I feel about it right now.

Mrs. Newman: Any further comments or questions? (No response). Alright then, I suggest that we'll move this on for its first reading. And I'll close the Community Development Committee meeting at 7:43.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Newman, I believe you'll want a second and a vote on that.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Then I'll ask for a second. I so move. Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Those not in favor? (No response). It passes unanimously.

I will close the Community Development Committee meeting at 7:45.

Community Development Committee
- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
April 3, 2006
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 3, 2006

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

Mr. Baxter: And I will open and call to order, the Safety Committee meeting at 7:45.

The second item on the agenda is Approval of the agenda. Are there any changes? (No response). Hearing none, they stand approved.

Approval of the minutes of special Safety Committee meeting held March 20, 2006. Are there any changes or additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

3b is Approval of the minutes of the regular Safety Committee meeting held March 20, 2006. Any changes or updates to those minutes? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Liquor Permit Request, new, Fu Gei Carryout Corporation, dba Sun Tong Luck Tea House & Restaurant, 6517 E. Livingston Ave., Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Do we have someone here to discuss that? I see the Chief standing up. That's somebody special.

Chief Suciu: Chairman Baxter, we did conduct an investigation regarding this transfer and we found nothing that would indicate any reason to oppose it.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. So then, we'll take no action on that. Thank you.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Creation of Residential Building Division. Do we have someone here to discuss that? Another special someone.

Mr. Hopper: Good evening. This request comes before you because approximately a year ago, the Governor signed into, signed a Bill that on May 27 of this year, will become law that the Board of Building Standards now has control over the residential building. In order for Reynoldsburg to continue doing inspections, and approve plans, issue permits, that type of stuff, the Council has to create a Residential Building Department. So we're asking that the Council will recognize the Building Department as a Residential Building Department also. And that will give us an opportunity, once Council approves that, to make application to the Board of Building Standards for certification.

Mr. Baxter: That made full sense to me, actually.

Mr. Hopper: Okay. Great.

Mr. Baxter: With that said though, wherein have questions on this. Are you intending to have specific functions set aside in roles, and responsibilities, and job duties to align it to this new legislation that state has?

Mr. Hopper: Actually, all of the inspectors, including myself, have to obtain another certification. Because we hold certification that has more requirements than residential, we are going to be grandfathered in. We do have to make application. We will have to continue with our continued education hours to maintain that additional certification. But we will be able to conduct business as we do right now and have done for many years.

Mr. Baxter: So do you see any changes in your department from a cost perspective?

Mr. Hopper: No.

Mr. Baxter: None what so ever?

Mr. Hopper: No.

Mr. Baxter: Do I have any questions from members of the committee? Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Yes, Mr. Hopper. You said no additional cost. Are we looking at a lot of additional time being diverted from other aspects of your current duties to incorporate this?

Mr. Hopper: The only additional time that we're probably going to see is, because it's now going to be controlled by the state, such as what we do with the commercial code, we collect a 3% fee that on a monthly basis, we have to send out to the Board of Building Standards. With the residential code, they are asking us to collect a 1% fee of our total permits that we collect. So that'll be an additional something that kind of the secretary will handle most of. The administration part of the stuff that I do, actually won't be any different than what I'm doing right now.

Mr. Baxter: Chet, does that mean we're going to increase our fees by 1%?

Mr. Hopper: No.

Mr. Baxter: We're going to eat the cost of that increase?

Mr. Hopper: No. The applicants actually pay that additional 1% fee. It's just once we calculate our fees for whatever the applicant is applying for, we add a 1% on top of that and that's just all figured in to those costs and we sent that 1% on to the state.

Mr. Baxter: Is there a time frame around how long we have to implement this? You said May 20 something it has to be done.
Mr. Hopper: It has to be in place by May 27. We have to be certified by May 27 which is a Friday I think. So we have to have that certification in place so we can continue to enforce that residential, the residential code.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two more quick questions. Who sets the 1%? Is that by state law?

Mr. Hopper: Yes.

Mr. Joseph: And regarding the additional certification, how long does that take?

Mr. Hopper: We are in the process of applying for our certification right now. It's just a matter of, the Board of Building Standards meets on a monthly basis. They will make recommendation to accept our applications and get our certifications to us.

Mr. Joseph: Is that just a matter of paper work? Or does that require additional skilled training or anything?

Mr. Hopper: No. Just paper work. And a fee, of course.

Mr. Baxter: And how many people do you have reaching out for that certification?

Mr. Hopper: There are myself and three inspectors.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So there is a little cost there then obviously.

Mr. Hopper: Yeah.

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

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Chet, has there been any problems in the past, even though you say you've got to be certified? Have you had any kind of encounter with the situation from your department that would make this necessary to be, the certification come about?

Mr. Hopper: If we don't get certified, then we can't do the inspections.

Mr. Stearns: Oh, is that right?

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. Because now it's being handled through the state and it's actually going to be a state law that there is a residential code and you have to have that certification. Up until when this actually becomes law on the 27th, you didn't have to be certified to inspect residential properties. We've always been certified to do commercial. So that's a higher certification than what the residential will be.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Chet, if I could ask, this ordinance we're being asked to pass, was that drafted by the state?

Mr. Hopper: Yes. A copy of it was.

Mr. Hills: Because in the therefore it says, be it ordained the legislative authority City of Reynoldsburg, three quarters of the members elected hereto concurring, we only usually vote, have a majority vote. You may want to take a look at that one. But when you talk about a Residential Building Department, in essence, we have a Building Department that we're asking the state to certify that that Building Department is now capable of inspecting residential dwellings.

Mr. Hopper: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: So we're not out here forming, I keep hearing, we're not forming a new department and going to hire three people for residential?

Mr. Hopper: No.

Mr. Hills: And the state just certifies that the entity within the municipality known as the Building Department is certified to do different types of inspections and the state code was changed to allow those Building Departments effective the end of May of '06 to certify residential if they'd applied for that certification. Correct?

Mr. Hopper: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Yeah. State's do all purpose drafting of documents so it may not quite apply to our situation here. Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, President Hills. And then that would put into my head, you might want to reach out to our Law Director and have him look at the legislation and make sure that it does tweak into Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Hopper: I'll do that.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. One last question. You mentioned, if you don't get the certification, you can't do the inspections. Is there a penalty from the state if for some reason that occurred?

Mr. Hopper: We just will not be allowed to enforce residential codes. Once the state adopted a code, we can't make any changes to it. It's kind of like what we do with commercial side right now.

Mr. Hills: That creates one follow up. But in that the State of Ohio does the residential inspections now, if for some reason you weren't certified, they still have responsibility of doing it, correct? So it's not just residential homes, they're not going to go without inspections. Somebody's still going to inspect them. We're choosing to be a Certified Residential?

Mr. Hopper: Right.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Nobody gets off scot free if this doesn't happen. Somebody still has the duty to inspect?

Mr. Hopper: Right.

Mr. Baxter: Chet, in the past, did we do residential inspections as a city?

Mr. Hopper: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Or did we have the state do it?

Mr. Hopper: No. We do all...

Mr. Baxter: So we're pretty much going to, status quo going to stay the same. Just now, you're going to be certified because of the states requirement.

Mr. Hopper: Yeah. The only inspection that the state does right now is on state owned property in the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Baxter: And would that continue?

Mr. Hopper: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Very good.

Mr. Hopper: We do everything else.
Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? (No response). I assume you want me to move this forward for its first reading.

Mr. Hopper: Please.

Mr. Baxter: So therefore, I move that we move the legislation back to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Councilman Shirey you have the second. All in favor?

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter, a little discussion. I believe you want an emergency on this, don't you?

Mr. Hopper: We were going to go through all the readings and then ask...

Mr. Baxter: And then ask for an emergency at the time. So yes, I should have mentioned that. I apologize.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: This will be effective once approved and signed. So then, motion and second stands. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thank you, Chet.

The next item on discussion is number 6 which is Adopt Residential Code of Ohio for 1, 2, and 3 Family Dwellings. I noticed you remain standing, Chet. So do you want to bring that to our attention?

Mr. Hopper: This is just a follow up to the discussion we just had because the state is now enforcing the Residential Code. We have to enforce the code that they adopt which will be currently is the 2004 Ohio, Residential Code of Ohio. It'll have some additional amendments to that book. I have just started putting those amendments into the 2004 code that I have. And once again, once we're certified, this will be the code that we enforce.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. The question I have is, the one we've worked on with the International Property Maintenance Code, it took some work to get there. Are we looking at the same type of scenario with the state?

Mr. Hopper: No.

Mr. Baxter: Because you mentioned you have some amendments. When should we see those?

Mr. Hopper: There will not be any amendments to this code. Because it's now adopted by the State of Ohio. The state will not allow us to make amendments to that code. We have to enforce it as it's written.

Mr. Baxter: So therefore, what you're asking Council to do is to pass legislation accepting the State of Ohio's as it is?

Mr. Hopper: Yes. That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Any questions? From Council, any questions? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Chet, does this in any way, what is the difference between this and the residential? Say like you have 1, 2, and 3 families here. What's the difference in it and just a regular single-family dwelling?

Mr. Hopper: Once you get above 3 family, it's considered a commercial building. That's why they designate 1, 2, and 3 family. Once you're above 3 family, it requires additional, either fire walls, or sprinklered buildings, that type of stuff. So that's why they make sure that it says 1, 2, or 3 family units.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions from committee or Council? (No response). And I'm making the same assumption, you want me to move this for its first reading?

Mr. Hopper: Please.

Mr. Baxter: So therefore, I so move. Do I have a second? Councilman Joseph. All in favor?

(All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. You might as well stay there because we've got the next one coming up here, Chet.

And that's dealing with number 7, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTING THE 2003 EDITION OF THE INTERNATION PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE. And we've had quite a few discussions on that. And what I'd like to address is, there are a few additional things we spoke about after we moved ahead for the first reading. And I was wondering if you've had any further thoughts on additional language to resolve some of the issues that you saw in pictures that were presented to us.

Mr. Hopper: I'm working on those right now. And those would be more of a change to our ordinance, our current ordinance. And actually started working on those after the last meeting. So you will get an additional packet. I wanted to get this through, get it adopted first and then we'll bring some of the other things back through that we were going to make. And changes with our, as we were going to begin with.

Mr. Baxter: I'm glad to hear you say that. Because I did not want to slow this down to go back and try to add additional language for things that we've been discussing in the committees. So I think that's a great way of going about this is, let's get this passed. And then make it even stronger as we go forward. So I'll be looking forward to that hitting our packet in discussions later on. Do we have any questions on this as it stands from committee? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I'm in favor of moving it on too as quick as we can. But I do anticipate the changes we want to make to be coming back as soon as possible too. Because I think there's some important ones in there that should be, that we're planning on changing.

Mr. Hopper: Once I get the full packet together, I will forward that on.

Mr. Baxter: Do you have a time frame on that, Chet? Next four weeks? Six weeks? What are we looking at before we see something?

Mr. Hopper: Probably at least 3 or 4 weeks with you know, being short staffed again. You know, it's taken me a little longer to be able to research and find out what other municipalities are doing. So I would say within the next 4 weeks.

Mr. Baxter: That sounds fair. I was hoping to see that packet at least prior to passage of this. That would give me a little more confidence, and confidence to our public that we're really serious about it, and I believe we are. Any other questions from Council or committee? Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Chet, I guess I wonder if you're going to get us these changes prior to us passing this, why not just do it all at once instead of having to come back here for another few weeks and go over it again?

Mr. Hopper: That was the first attempt I made and I thought it really muddied the water. That's why we just kind of pulled back and broke it down to just the Property Maintenance Code so it wasn't so confusing because of all the discussions we had. I think there was just a lot of confusion with the amount of paper work that I had passed out to everybody. So pulled back. Just concentrated on the Property Maintenance Code book itself. And like I said, I'm working on those other changes to the ordinance that we want to make. And you know, as soon as I can get those to you I will.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: Any other comments from committee or Council? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I understand the situation and I agree with Ron. It's important with the changes, and that's what we've been discussing. And I agree with what the Chairman said that possibly when we get ready to pass this that the changes will be here because they are changes that, I know the public's going to be interested in. I want to make sure that they make sure that really, because a lot of these changing we want to see accomplished. Maybe that could coincide if there's not that big a hurry.

Mr. Hopper: Well again, I think that a lot of the changes that we discussed were changes in the ordinance that we currently have. And those changes are going to remain in the ordinance because they're kind of different from the Property Maintenance Code. So as I you know, research and make sure I have that complete packet together you know. I think it's just going to make it a little easier for everybody.

Mr. Clemens: And maybe that's where I myself, maybe that's where some of us had a misunderstanding on really what the process was and what we were changing I suppose really. Okay. However you feel that you think's right.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: I just wanted to say, I commend you for doing the Property Maintenance Code. I think it's an excellent idea. And I think if we were to dissect the whole code, the Maintenance Code, I think we'd be here forever. So I think by just accepting it and then amending it down the way, I think that's probably the best way to do it. Because I think again, just with the Fire Code, accepting it and then eventually making changes if we had to do that, we'd be here forever. So I commend you for doing it the way you are.

Mr. Hopper: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Well Chet, I'll also state the same thing. The biggest concern is, all of us have it from different backgrounds. And so when you mention a change in the Property Maintenance Code, and you start deep dive into the discussion, each of us are hearing different stories. So it does take some time. It's an arduous activity at best. And so moving the direction you're going, I think is the right way to head. And then we continue to strengthen our codes to try to make it better for all of our citizens.

Mr. Hopper: I would agree.

Mr. Baxter: Any other discussion? (No response). Well I thank the Council members for their input on this and for all the extra meetings that I drove you through to attend. So thank you as well. So with that, I'm going to recommend, or move that we send this to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second? Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thank you, sir.

Number 8 is ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: CHAPTER 160 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION, SECTION 160.02 "Authorized Positions, Personnel, Classification and Pay Grade" Subsection (f), AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE. It had its first reading on 3-27-06. Do we have somebody here to discuss that, Mayor?

Mayor McPherson: Well, there's been no changes since we made the original presentation. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions you may have. But everything remains the same as in the original presentation that we had.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Are there any questions from committee or from Council? (No response). And I agree. I haven't seen any changes either, Mayor. So unless there's some objection, I will then request and submit motion to send this to Council for its second reading.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, was this where Mr. Harris was going to tell us where the money's coming from to do this? Or was this not the place?

Mr. Baxter: Is this the place, Mr. Harris?

Mr. Harris: This is it.

Mr. Baxter: I didn't recognize it for what it was. Please stand forward. Can we have your full name and address, please? Oh, that's right. You work for us.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Chairman Baxter and members of Council. A couple of weeks ago, I had sent everybody a list of some spread sheets and graphs that I had put together and given one to the Mayor as well. And I kind of just wanted to take a minute and go over some of these as we, the slide show here is the same thing. The slides will have basically the same thing that you have in front of you. For those people who are in the audience, they might be able to see some of this as soon as we get it set up here. Basically, this is going to touch on two subjects. Number one is the spending of the Police Department. And the secondly will be the spending in the city in general for the last few years so that we can have a look at where we've been and where we need to go to get things accomplished that need to be accomplished. The first slide is the Police Department expenses from 1995 to 2005. Basically, we went back 11 years and pulled payroll, non-payroll, debt service, and total for the entire Police Department for the years 1995 through 2006. If you see from the ones in front of you which is the same as what we have on here, the Police Department back in 1995 spent about 3 million, two-hundred thousand. It's now up to 7.125 million with the budget in '06. Obviously, this is great expenditures than the growth of the city but there have been issues with the Police Department and the funding that was deemed necessary by the people at the time. But you do need to understand, that's what the Police Department spends at this point. Second is the enforcement payroll for the Police Department for the years 1998 through 2006. You can see the payroll amount, the police and fire fighter pension percent that we pay as employer. There is an employer pickup, the total, and then the dollar increase, and the percent of increase over those years between '98 and 2006. One thing you need to be aware of, of the state as they have with all the state retirement systems, had a commission looking at all of these things to look and see if they're fully funded. Police and fire fighters pension is somewhat under funded and they are asking the state legislature to increase the amount that's being paid in. They would want it to go, the employer part at this point, they're suggesting to go from 19 to 24%. Now at this point, none of us know if that's going to happen. Whether this will have to be something that's negotiated or what. But the potential is out there that we would have to pay an additional increase if they get what they're asking state legislature to do. The increase for the city at this point would be $160,000 a year. But here again, none of us here know what the state is liable to do. And they may do nothing. But it is something that is in the news and being talked about. If you put on a graph, the Police Department expenditures, the year '95 through 2006, you can see this is what the graph shows the increases are. The next part of this is going to get more with the total city and what the revenues and expenditures have been for the last number of years. And the first one is the total revenue. And this is basically the total revenue that comes in that we can spend. This does not include the Enterprise Funds. The utilities are not included in this. This is pretty much just the General Fund money. It's broken up into income tax and other receipts. The other receipts are some money from property taxes. But the biggest majority of it is the Local Government Revenue Fund and the Local Government Revenue Assistance Fund. As you can see, in '98 and '99 and 2000, those percents went up, oh just about 10% a year. And after 2000 they were frozen because of issues with the state government. And so that's basically been pretty stagnate since then. Total receipts in 1998 were ten million four. Total receipts in 2006 are approximately, or projected at 13.8 million. The next one will show the expenditures for the city for the same years, '98 through 2006. We broke this down into operating expenses, debt payment, capital improvements, other transfers that were moved around, and capital equipment which we had in 2001 and 2002. Operating expenses is basically the day to day operations of running the city. That would include things like payroll, office supplies, and all the nuts and bolts types of things that the city will be spending over the years time. Debt payment is just what it would say. This would be the debt payment that comes out of the General Fund to go to pay the bonds that have been issued by the city. Capital improvements are things that were made for infrastructure improvements between '98 and 2006. What's interesting, as you look at this chart, between those years, you can see how operating expenses have continued to rise. Debt payment has continued to rise. Capital improvements have gone down. I think if we look at what's gone on with the city streets, you can see there has not been the funds available to do the street repairs I think everybody would like to see happen. And it shows in here that the money has just not been there to provide that type of service. This is the actual debt service that's being paid. This is a little different from the one on the page before because there was some money early on that came from Permissive Tax to pay for street improvement. That is now off. We've taken this and shown what it is. It's comparison to total revenue. It was 8.93 in '98. It's up to 13.06 in 2006.

If anybody has any questions while I'm going through this, please feel free to ask. If you take the debt service and pluck, yes Mr. Hills. Sorry.

Mr. Hills: You jumped past me. I'm still having trouble with the capital improvements. But if you'll back up to page 5.

Mr. Harris: Okay.

Mr. Hills: If we take, look at comparison between page 4 and page 5, it appears that in '01, '02, '04, and '05, we had expenditures exceeding our revenues, correct?

Mr. Harris: That is correct. And let me just talk a little bit about the revenue. There was a change back in 2001 in some businesses that were located in The Limited property up on the northeast section of the city. And when one of those major ones moved out, you can see there was a major decrease in revenue in 2000. From between 2001 and 2002. Obviously, the problems with the Capital Improvement Fund happened because of the change in the revenue stream from there. Now there was an unusual event in 2003 where there were some things that had been worked on for a long time finally were paid. But then you see in 2004, it went back down to 7 million 8 from 9 million 1. So this was not probably unexpected at the time, but it is just a fact that there was a change up there, revenues to the city did decrease. And it necessitated taking money from somewhere in order to pay, continue to pay salaries and those kind of things. And what was done was, it was taken from the Capital Improvement Funds and a couple of other areas which we'll go into later on. But there was a change in revenue and that's what caused the situation where there wasn't any money to do capital improvements. It just wasn't there.

Mr. Hills: Bottom line, we faced what, it had to be 12%?

Mr. Harris: About a million five.

Mr. Hills: 12, 13% of our annual anticipated revenue stopped.

Mr. Harris: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: And it's not that we had already grown to the point that our operating cost and debt service we're anticipating, were based on those things being there. And so we're where we are today simply because there wasn't new money coming in and there was nowhere it was appropriate at the time and the feelings of the city or Council to cut substantially. And they just haven't picked back up yet.

Mr. Harris: Obviously I wasn't involved with that. But certainly, the revenue stream from that did dry up and it did cause a major decrease in revenue for the city. And the money was not there. The anticipated revenues were not there to pay for things that were deemed necessary for the city. Obviously, keeping the doors open on this building and having a Building Department, and a Clerk of Courts, and a Police Department, and those kind of things are deemed necessary for the city.

Mr. Hills: To provide the services for our citizens.

Mr. Harris: Absolutely. And I think everybody's all in agreement that those are necessary things that the city has to do. But unfortunately, the capital improvements part of this did suffer because the dollars weren't there to support the capital improvements and things to city streets that also, I'm sure people feel are important. And I don't think this is a decision anybody wanted to make. It was forced on the fact that the revenue stream to support it just wasn't there. Any other questions on that?
Mr. Baxter: Just one question.

Mr. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: Dick, now that it has returned back up to, let's say 9 million that you show 2006, because of the fact that we had taken a hit in 2001 and that had sustained itself for a period of time, the reason we have not put money back into Capital Improvements because we have been trying to get caught up from that loss.

Mr. Harris: I would assume. I wasn't here, but I would assume that that's what's happened. The decision was obviously made to continue with the payroll and stuff that were in place. And rightfully so. That they didn't want to make cuts in police and other services. I passed out something that was in the paper today, I don't know if everybody's had a chance to look at it, but the City of Whitehall is just another one of a list of cities who are looking at the same problems we've had and they've made a decision. They've made some cuts and they've also dipped into the Rainy Day Fund. We have not come to that yet but that was a decision how they made how to handle the decrease in revenue. Any other questions up to now? Any time anybody has a question, just please feel free. The debt service went up, if you see that, we went through, I think we went through that one. (Tape Change) And if we track it on it, you can see what it looks like. Total revenue and expenses on page 8. This is the total amount of revenue that came in that was available to spend in those years and the total expenditures for those years. A couple of those that I think are interesting, in years like 2001, that was the year the police building was being built. And rather than borrowing the entire cost of putting the police building on, there was a, Council at the time had made a decision they were going to pay part of that out of the General Fund rather than bond the whole thing. So when you look at that year, it's kind of inflated how expenditures were. Because there was probably a million three, or a million four that came out of the General Fund in order to be put in the Public Safety Building. And since then you can see how the revenue has grown and the expenditures has grown. Now what is interesting, it looks like this year, we're going to be running a short fall of about $380,000. And that does not include the legislation that's ahead of, that's in front of you right now. And you also haven't seen any kind of Street Program come forward which I don't know if the administration is planning or is not planning to do. On page 9, if you look at the revenue and expenses, they're plotted on a graph there so you can see how they have changed over the years since 1998. The other ways that the short fall in those years between 2001 and 2005 were funded, we'll start with Fund 310 which is the General Debt Retirement. And General Debt Retirement from those years, what they did prior to 2001 in the appropriation ordinance every year, money was taken from the unappropriated General Fund and moved into General Debt Retirement to pay the city's debt service. The State Auditor's Office is not real big with things like transfers between funds. So the decision made was just to take money directly from, allocate money from the income tax and move it into General Debt Retirement. We also put some money in there to fund general retirement in 2001. At the end of 2001 there was about a million five in General Debt Retirement. Since then it's been reduced. In '04 it was down to about, at the end of '04, '05 it was down to about 768,000. There's about 540,000 coming out this year. And in '07 it will need to be enhanced to the point where we can pay the debt service out of that fund. Another fund that was created in 2000 was one called Employee Compensated Absences. Employee Compensated Absences are basically, there are some situations with employees with vacation, comp time, and vacation pay that we are obliged to pay the employees. We had set up about $500,000 to pay that in 2001. In '02 there was 153,000 taken out of that fund. '03, 110. 2004, 103,000. And 2005, 140,000. Then that fund was depleted at the end of 2005. The next one is transfer from CIP to the...

Mr. Baxter: Dick, can I interrupt real quickly on this?

Mr. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: Where did the 508,000 originally come from?

Mr. Harris: The unappropriated General Fund.

Mr. Baxter: So it was just a, I want to think about this, it's a problem, we want to put away for the future Rainy Day, so therefore, we're putting money into a fund so that as these different occurrences happen with people taking their entitlements, we had money to cover it.

Mr. Harris: Well, yeah. That was what it was basically set up to do. We had an unfunded liability and we funded it. The unfunded liability was like last year when Chief Miller left, she had a number of hours of vacation time, and comp time, and sick time that she had to be paid for. And this was meant so that it didn't adversely affect the budgetary process. Because some of these people, and Bob certainly remembers when people like Dana and Phil left, they had a pretty hefty amount of money that they took with them. And it would throw off the budgetary process by all of a sudden having to give somebody 20 or $30,000 pay out when they retired, you'd give a false number in the budget. So that's what this was basically set up for.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. So therefore, it was being paid for out of the General Fund. And if this happened today, it would then be paid out of the General Fund...

Mr. Harris: It would go against the department's budget. Because that's the only other place we've got to charge it back for.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Harris: We get back to the CIP Fund and this was in '98. It was about 15% of the income tax money that came in that was put over to the CIP Fund. And that happened clear through 2000. In 2001, we took some of the debt that was being paid from the CIP and just moved it into General

Debt Retirement where we still put about 12 or 12 ½% in. And as the problems in 2001 with the change of The Limited's campus came in, reductions had to be made. In fact, in '03 and '04 there was actually nothing put in to the CIP. And in '05, '06, and '07 there's 2% which is not going to get a lot of infrastructure repairs done including streets which do need to be repaired. Some of the items that we do have to look at a short fall as we're looking at revenue enhancements, General Debt Retirement which we talked about earlier. The Police Pension Fund which there's probably going to be some kind of increases that have to be made to compensate for that. It depends on what the state passes and what they're going to want to negotiate at contract time. The projected short fall this year of about 382,000. And on to that, whatever you want to put in for things like Capital Improvements, which we do need to take care of the infrastructure in the city. Any Capital Equipment like trucks and other things that have to be purchased from time to time that can be very costly. Additional Police Officers that you're going to want to fund, and street maintenance. So those are all things that you need to think of as you're looking at how much revenue it's going to do that. Take all of those into consideration. Just not the number of Police Officers we have.

Mr. Baxter: Dick, can I interrupt, please?

Mr. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: On page 10, you showed Fund 310, General Debt Retirement. You're showing projected 2007, 254,808. Okay? 2006 you're showing it's 382,850. Correct?

Mr. Harris: Um hum.

Mr. Baxter: And the question I have is that maybe it's not so much necessary to cover the short fall of that but to find a way in which we can guarantee that there is no short fall each year to try to balance that out.

Mr. Harris: You can do it in a number of ways. You could increase the percentage of the income tax collection that goes in there, or you can collect more taxes to have the same percent come out. Or you can still move money, although they don't like you to do it, from the General Fund over to it just as an extra process the State Auditor's don't particularly like. This has to be addressed. We have to have the money to pay the debt of the city. And at some point in time this is going to have to be addressed. And it's going to have to be addressed next year. Within the next 12 months.

Mr. Baxter: So we have to address the projected short fall for 2006 in the next 12 months? Or within this year?

Mr. Harris: No. There's enough in there to pay. There'll still be 272,000 in that fund at the end of this year. But in '07, there's going to be a short fall at 254,000 there's going to have to be something done with. But we're basically about 450 or $500,000 short of putting enough money in there every year to self sustain that fund.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you.
Mr. Harris: The Mayor kind of touched on this one when he did his presentation. Basically, what we've done here is, we've taken some of the major political subdivisions for the city and gone through their assessed values and how much millage that they are collecting. And as you can see, some of these collect, Westerville collects 11 million 8 in property taxes. We collect 225,000. One of the things with a city like Westerville, they have a Fire Department and most of that excess money goes to pay for a Fire Department. We have Truro Township that takes care of the majority, and the other Fire Department's that we have. But if you look at how much they collect from inside millage, it's considerably more than what we collect in inside millage. And I think it's important to realize that the city on the property tax money, gets virtually nothing.

Mr. Baxter: Dick, is that also true of the other cities?

Mr. Harris: What's that?

Mr. Baxter: The amount they get to keep?

Mr. Harris: What you see in there on that particular spread sheet, that's how much they get. That's what they get. Bexley gets a million nine. Dublin gets 2 million 9. That's what they get. They get to keep it.

Mr. Hills: And the break down is under the allocation in the last column, right?

Mr. Harris: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Of that going in. Actually, the General Fund gets 4.4%.

Mr. Harris: 4.4 mills. 4.4 mills. Police Pension is .95 and the ________ is 2.5 mills. That breaks the millage down as to what they get.

Mr. Hills: Our General Fund gets .4. Four tenths of 1%.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. And Police Pension gets three tenths of 1%.

Mr. Hills: It happens to be the lowest on the page.

Mr. Harris: It does happen to be the lowest on the page in a lot of different scenarios.

Mr. Hills: I'm still waiting for that answer. But I realize you're still researching it.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. Okay. The next one is put on a graph. And that's what, you can see, you can just barely see what Reynoldsburg gets. The next one is the income tax. And this is for the year 2005. And here again, this takes the same communities. It shows their tax rate, what percent credit they give. If you live and work in different places, and what their gross collections are.

Here again, if you look at the gross collections for us versus cities of our size, we get around 9 million. Gahanna gets 14. Grove City gets 15. Hilliard gets 14. So as you can see, we are taking a lot less from our citizenry at this point in income taxes than virtually everybody else around the outer belt. If you put that on a graph, you can see where we're a little bit better on this one. But still not anywhere close to some of the cities who are the same size as we are. If you add the total together, total revenue for property and income taxes, you can see the same political subdivisions. Adding the property taxes to the income taxes. And there again, we're at 9 million 1. And most of the other cities who are the same size as we are, 14, 15, 16 million. So citizens, I don't know if they do appreciate, but they should appreciate the fact that living here is one of the better values in the Central Ohio area. And then the last one on there is, the total revenue from property and income taxes. And you can see that on the graph. We're going to talk about some revenue options that the Mayor has mentioned, and then we're going to go into some specifics about each one. And certainly if you have any questions, we'll be glad to tell you how these are collected. The first one is the property tax increase. The property tax increase would have to go to the ballot. Since property collections run 6 months behind, you would not see any money for 6 months. The amount would not change over time. And what that basically means, you get a revenue estimate from the County Auditor that you're going to put so many mills on, it says it's going to collect so many dollars, and that's all it will ever collect. You could build 5,000 more houses, that's still all you collect off of that. So it does not change. Citizens on fixed incomes would be the most affected by that particular type of tax increase. But the nice thing, payments are very consistent. You get the money every 6 months. You get a thing from the County Auditor. They send you the check. County Treasurer sends you the check. One mill increase in the property tax rate would generate approximately $700,000 in additional income. And one mill increase in property taxes would cost a property owner around $31 per 100,000 in value. So depending on how much you wanted to go up, it's still not a real tough tax increase. Income tax credit reduction. Reducing the credit to 1.25 from the 1.50 would produce approximately one million dollars in additional revenue. Reducing the credit to 1% would produce approximately two million dollars in additional revenue. Income tax credit would not have to go to the ballot. It would affect the greatest number of tax payers. It's around 80% of those people would see a tax increase from this. It would increase the cost of collections. Most of the people who don't give 100% tax credit have a staff of people who do collections. Brenda and I were looking over today, her income tax collections that she gets from RITA. And right now, the group that's under $200, there's 750 names. So if you look at how much that would be when you go over that, you're looking at a situation where we probably have a couple of thousand people a year that we'd have to go out and collect money from. RITA would change our retention from 3% to, it's either 9 or 10%. Now there would be a settlement. And I don't know that it would cost that much. But it is very costly to go out and get those taxes. The other thing about that is, from the experience that RITA has in this, they would say in the first year you will only realize about 60%, 60 or 65% of that. Because people are not used to having to send a check in. Now they will. The other thing is, you don't collect these very much during the year. If you had this take effect January 1 of '07, probably half of the money would come in during '07. The other half would come in during '08. The first four months of '08. But their estimate is, in the first year you only get about 2/3 of the money. The rest of it has to be ____________. Collections on this is a very difficult situation. It would increase as wages increase. As peoples wages increase, you would see an increase in the amount of money that comes into this. The last one is the one that the Mayor did recommend.

It's an income tax rate increase. This does not, would not change the current collection rate. An income tax rate increase from 1.5 to 1.75 would bring in approximately a million five. An increase to 2% would bring in approximately 12 million which would be a 3 million dollar increase. This would have to go to the ballot. It would affect the fewest number of tax payers for a number of reasons. People who live in Reynoldsburg and, or who work in Reynoldsburg, let's say at The Limited campus and live in Columbus would not see a tax increase in that because they're already paying it. It would go, instead of us getting 1 ½%, Columbus getting 2%, we would collect the whole 2%. So they would not see a tax increase either. The other thing you need to realize is, people on fixed incomes, social security, and pension benefits, are not taxable under municipal income tax programs. Would not be _______ collection cost. You would see the collections the quickest. As soon as we do a rate increase, let's say it takes effect January 1, '07, people would be sending money in with the first payroll that they do in '07. So you would see that money right away. You would not have to wait until the following year when people do income taxes in order to start seeing any collections from that. And this will also increase as wages increase. And that is all I have for you tonight. Any questions from anybody that I can answer to help you with your deliberations? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: One question I have is, you say it doesn't affect everybody and you gave examples of The Limited. Who does it affect specifically?

Mr. Harris: It would affect people who live in Reynoldsburg, and work in Reynoldsburg. Or those people who work in Reynoldsburg and live in a town or a city that does not collect income taxes.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Dick, when we started talking about this with the Mayor a few months back, I've been doing a lot of thinking about it. And a couple of things that I wanted to see I guess, or one of our proposals would be where it didn't affect senior citizens on a fixed income. Which I believe our third option does not. And also, give the citizens of Reynoldsburg an opportunity to vote on it themselves. So I guess what I'm saying is that I would be, if I have to be in favor of a tax increase, I would be in favor of option number 3. And you know, you presented here earlier, some information that tells me, and I've been looking at this for the last few years, that we definitely need to start putting some more money into our Street Programs, our Capital Improvement type projects. And in addition to that, provide the funding to increase our safety forces.

Mr. Harris: I don't disagree with that, Ron. And I think one of the things that the numbers I gave you tonight does point out, that there is a real need, because of the problems with the tax collections and the changes at The Limited, and 911 and some other factors, there had to be changes made in some things. And streets obviously are one place that has been short changed. I mean, if you look at what we've been able to do with streets over the last few years, in comparison to what they did before that, the money has not been there to put money in streets like I think all of us would like to see. And that becomes a safety issue driving the streets as well. And I think any type of increase in revenue, there needs to be money, a certain amount of money earmarked for police. I think there needs to be money earmarked for Capital Improvements on streets and any other small things. I think there's a bridge out on Summit Road that needs to be worked on and some other things that are some real safety concerns. And they need to be addressed.

Mr. Stake: Yes. And I think these things, obviously if we have the funding, we will address those issues. We'll take care of those things. And we want to retain the high quality of living I think we have in Reynoldsburg. And maintain our infrastructure, and also maintain the safety of our citizens.

Mr. Harris: No question.

Mr. Stake: I mean, I've been thinking about a tax increase for a while since we started talking about it and obviously, it's not one of my favorite subjects. But you know, I think about the consequences if we don't do something to enhance our revenue.

Mr. Harris: My only thing with bringing this forward is, I think it's very important to know where the money has gone and why it went, it looks to me like why it went there. And what monies we need to put together to maintain our streets, and maintain the quality of life. And this is just an informational thing for everybody here because I think everybody here wants to do the right thing. And I think the more information that you have, the better decision that you can make.

Mr. Stake: I agree. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Stake. And I would just go one further with that if I could, Councilman Clemens. And that is, it's not a matter to me of a tax increase, if you're for or against it. Is it needed? And before we can say it's needed, I think we need to do a little bit of cutting around the house here. I think we need to get down to the meat and get rid of all the fat that we do have. And I'm not saying we have a whole lot of fat. What I'm saying is, there's places that we can do a better job. And I think Councilman Clemens brought up one of the opportunities tonight where we have an opportunity to do a better job.

Mr. Harris: I think when you have to go to the public for additional money, which I think is necessary here, I think you do have to present a total package that you're cleaning house. You're making sure that everything within your house is clean before you go out and ask people to put in more money. And I also think it's important that you go to the ballot with this. I think that whatever you decide to do, I think it's something that people should get a chance to vote on. And they can express their opinion at the polls. And I think that when it comes to safety forces, and streets that they can drive on, I think people will show you that they are willing to support those things.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. But I think they also have to recognize that when you look down the City of Reynoldsburg and say, gee, I just spent 10 million dollars on a street to make it look pretty, and now you're coming at me to spend another .5% in taxes so that I can give you more police, why didn't you spend the money on police in the first places? They are great questions that I think we need to answer, and we just step up and say, look yeah, maybe we made a mistake here. Or maybe we didn't anticipate 911. Or absolutely, do we go out and put the money in our roads? So when I look at a tax increase like this I say, yeah, I'd like to see a tax increase. Why? Because I think we do need to enforce our police. I think we absolutely need to put more policemen out there. But before I want to go down that path, I absolutely want to make sure we look at our own inside house and clean it up too.

Mr. Harris: Well, I don't disagree with what you're saying. I will just say this, I wasn't here over the last 4 years, and I wasn't part of the decisions that were made. And I'm not going to criticize anybody for the decisions that were made. Decisions were made because they were faced with problems and how to keep the things going and to maintain the highest quality of service that they could. And those decisions are what they made. I'm not going to criticize anybody for any kind of decision like that that was made. Because I wasn't here and I didn't see what they saw. So all I can tell you is, here's where we're at today. And this is the situation that we're looking at. And we can't continue to spend more money than we take in. We have things in this city that need improvements. There's no question. We do need additional Police Officers. I think that's been demonstrated. The question for you all is, how do you want to fund it? You can fund it a number of ways. You can take the current budget and cut a million dollars out of it if you want to. You can put in some kind of specific revenue like increasing the license plate tax and have that earmarked for streets. There's a lot of things you can do. But we have to get to the point where we're back on a positive plane where we're spending less money than we're taking in.

Mr. Baxter: There, I do agree with you. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. And I think that, and this has been discussed for a year. It was brought up a year ago. We knew we need our safety forces. And I agree with Mr. Baxter. You have to show the people what they're going to vote on. And it's important, and I agree that they should vote on it. And I think it's something that we have to show the people what they're voting on. It makes a difference whether we want to go for the million and a half or the 3 million. Because I look at it this way, I don't want money floating around. I know we need the money, but 3 million every year, you have to really look back and think of what we're going to do with it. Whether we want to go the 25 or the 50. That's what we have to make a decision on. I'm going to go out and support this, which I certainly will support it for the Police Department and the streets. But that's what it's going to be designated for.

Mr. Harris: I agree.
Mr. Clemens: I'm not going out and supporting something for a million and a half or 3 million dollars that's going to go in the General Fund. And I can tell you that right now. So this is something that I think we have to work on on how we're going to approach it. We all know that we need it. Just how we're going to get it across to the public on what we haven't improved that we intend to improve and what it's for. But, we have to make the decision too if we're going to go this route on this last one. Whether we want to go the million and a half or whether we want to go the 3 million.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Clemens, my point with bringing this up is purely informational for you folks.

You're the ones that are going to have to make the decision, not me. I will do what I have to do to get you the information to make the best decision you can make. But it's your decision to make. How much are you going to want to bring in to spend on things like streets? And how many Police Officers you want to bring in and how we're going to handle the short fall that we have in the current budget. There's a number of ways you can look at it, and it's you folks that are going to be making that decision. I'll certainly do what I can to help.

Mr. Clemens: We've got to be making the decision of when we want to put it on the ballot. It's something that's got to be moved forward. We've discussed it, been discussing it. I think we should discuss it and handle it quickly.

Mrs. Shirey: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you. I think we need to be honest with the citizens and make it quite clear to them that, here we are trying to ask them for a tax increase, a tax credit, whatever, and in doing so, we're asking for a new, for new Police Officers. And safety of the citizens is the utmost importance. You know, if this is going to be an increase to pay off the existing debt that we have already incurred in the city, be honest with them. I mean, you know, don't be hiding anything. I think that's, they need to know this. And I think that you know, no beating around the bush around here. We need to be honest with them. So if we're going to be asking for this, and I know it's already been said, we're going to be generating 3 million in revenue, 1.8 million was supposed to be going to Police Officers, where's the other 2 million going to be going to? Is it going to be going towards the existing debt that has already been incurred from last year from Streetscape and everything else? Or where is the rest of that money? The citizens have a right to know that. And that's where we need to be going towards.

Mr. Harris: I don't disagree with what you're saying. But you have to remember one other thing, you folks have the power to appropriate the money. Nothing gets spent here until you appropriate it.

Mr. Baxter: Well said. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: I think from day one, I've said that the 2 million dollars is going to go to the Police Department. And if there's an extra million dollars that comes in, that clearly should go to the CIP and the Capital Equipment Fund. It's not going to go, as long as I prepare the budget, to paying off existing debt. That's not what it's for. It's to staff our Police Department, and it's to provide us, 3 or 4 years, we put 0% into the CIP. In the last 2 years, we put in 2%. Two percent of our General Fund is not enough to take care of our infrastructure. So I can assure you that should the citizens of the City of Reynoldsburg approve this issue, the 2 million dollars will go to the Police Department for the Police Officers that I've requested, and the other million dollars will go to infrastructure repairs, streets, whatever we have to do to bring our infrastructure back up to date. But I can assure you, you'll never get a budget from me that's going to say pay off existing debt with it.

Mr. Harris: The bottom line is though, the debt's still out there and still has to be paid.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could note, and I agree with what the Mayor's saying. I mean, the funds coming in, whatever the tax increase may be, it's voted on by the public, will certainly be going towards the police area, and CIP, street repairs. And when I hear Bob mention numbers, I don't know where it's 1.8, 1.2, 1.5. We're looking at potentially 3 million dollars a year. And I think we should note, and I've been here a while, and Mr. Clemens remembers, we fought, and fought, and fought to get up to a million dollar street repair program per year. We were able to obtain that for about 2 years. And at that time, you didn't see any pot holes. You didn't see any cracks in the street. We had streets in very good condition. Unfortunately, as some of the dollar things changed, in order to continue to provide services, that Street Program was substantially reduced. So if you go back and look at it, we're already 3 million dollars in the hole on work that we had scheduled to be done.

Mr. Harris: Or more.

Mr. Hills: Or more that wasn't done. And so, I don't think that there's an issue of the monies coming in from the tax increase. There are Street Programs, CIP's, and Police, absolutely will go through the funds that ever come in. And it won't be going anywhere else. I do want to try to clarify one thing. And everyone is to be commended on this. Council and administration. We hear and we read at times where there's only going to be one Police Officer hired in 'x' number of years, or two Police Officers, that's a true statement. However, what this Council with the help of administration, or this administration with the help of Council, over that same period of time, we've been able to put 3 or 4 officers who were not on the street, back on the street by hiring civilians to come in and do some of those works. So it's not that the citizens haven't had the uniformed officers, we are trying to get them to where they're doing the most good out on the street in the vehicles. So we did, administration and Council, we realized the issue and tried to deal with them the best fiscal way that we could given the situations we had. Thank you, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Now, this is why I want to get into it when we talk about being honest about things. The Mayor comes out and says we're going to give 2 million a year to the Police Department, and this other. I could hire 10 policemen tomorrow for 600,000. I could buy them each a cruiser for another 150,000. That's $750,000. Now I'm sitting with a million and a quarter left to do, and we're going to do this every year, every year, and every year, and every year? I mean, this is what I'm getting to. Now, are we going to take this 2 million that we're talking about and appropriate it to the Police Department, and then the money that we were going to appropriate, we're going to use for something else? Now this is what I'm trying to get the basis brought down in. I'd hire 10 tomorrow if we had the money. But I know what our 10 policemen would be. Ten policemen would be around $600,000. I could throw the cruisers in. Throw the suits in. I could throw all kind of things in for 2 million a year. And then the next year 2 million and we're going to hire 10

more? Ten years I've hired 100 policemen and I'm still floating around with the money coming out of my ears. This is what I'm talking about, is being honest to the people on what we're going to do. Now, I don't know how we're going to do it. But when I present this to somebody, I want to be honest with them. This is what we need. This is what it's going to cost us every year, and this is where the money's going to go. If we need debt service, we're going to do this. So much a year is going to go for streets. And that's it. I'm not here to build a fund up. I'm going to make that plain to everybody right now. I'm here to supply the safety forces with what they need for the safety of Reynoldsburg. Whether it's 5 policemen or 10 policemen, whatever they need. And I think the people will do it too. Our streets need big improvement. Like Ron Stake said, we all know that. Curbs, gutters are terrible. If it costs us 2 million a year, that's fine. As long as we've got the money to do this. But, I don't want to be sitting there building up a fund too that we're just spending every place else that we can. I want to get the city out of debt and everything like that, but this here is what we're talking about. It's going to be on all the time from now on. So we'll bring this in every year. And so that's what I'm looking at. I'm not looking at just what we're going to bring in the first year. I'm looking at what we're going to bring in the next year, the following year, the following year, the following year. Even though I know the pay goes up and so forth, it doesn't go up that much.
Mr. Harris: Three and a half, four percent.

Mr. Clemens: So I mean, I think these are things that we've got to look at. And that's why I say, they're serious. And I think the sooner the better that we get our Finance Chairman, and maybe the Mayor, you sit down, you guys work this out. And maybe Mr. Hills can come back with something that when we go to the people, that we can look them in the eye and say, we're not getting this money to pay off 17 million dollar street that we put some flowers on and so forth. We're doing this to benefit the city in the future. And I'm ready to go on it when we do this.

Mr. Harris: Let me just make one more statement here before I go back and sit down. And that is, one of the things I think you also need to think about and you need to talk about as this process works its way through, the recommendation from the administration at this point is, that they want to put these officers on right now. You're going to spend additional money from the unappropriated General Fund this year to do that. You're also talking about putting something on the ballot. What do we do about paying these people next year if the levy doesn't pass? And I think it's something everybody needs to think about before we get to the point where we want to do this, we want to do that. We better have a backup plan because if this doesn't pass, I don't have any way to print more money. So we're going to have to find a way to get these folks paid. So I think that needs to be discussed as well.

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Baxter. If I could, I think if Council recalls, I suggested that the backup plan would be that City Council has the authority to go ahead and pass a tax credit reduction. However, that wouldn't be necessary next year because we're sitting right now on over 6 million dollars in unencumbered monies. And so if we had to pay for those Police Officers for next year and perhaps the year after that even, we still have the money. Our increase in our expenditures over revenue has averaged 2.3% since 1998, over what we collect. And that's not a significant amount, but taking in a whole, it averages about a little over 17% since 1998 that we've out spent our revenues. However, the one thing that everybody seems to forget, we have a huge carry over every year. We also have almost 2 million dollars in our Rainy Day Fund. And you'll look and see that some of the paper work that's been passed out to you, some of the other communities have decided, well it's important to us to have a Safety Department that's fully staffed. And they've gone into their Rainy Day Fund. Now would we have to do that? Absolutely not. We're not going to have to go into our Rainy Day Fund. Even if this levy doesn't pass this year. But I think presented the right way, and the people being told the truth as Mr. Clemens said, what that money's going to go to, I feel very strongly that the community is going to support our Police Department. But again, I don't want this doom and gloom to be you know, skewering your decision making. Because it's not doom and gloom. We do have the money. You know, we just, as most communities do, we try not to go down to the very bottom where we don't have any money to spend, because you do have emergencies that come up each year. And again, you know, I don't think I've not told anyone where that money's going to go. It's going to go to funding, I believe it's a total of 14 Police Officers. And I'm going to have to look because we've been talking about this quite a while. And then any extra monies, I have said from day one, I would like to see go to our CIP and our Capital Equipment Programs. And like Mr. Stake said, I believe that we need to put it on the ballot because the people of this city need to say, we're either going to give you the money, or we're not going to give you the money. That's where it belongs. However, you also need to understand, that if it comes down a year or two years from now, and it didn't pass, and we still are short safety forces, then it's up to City Council to step up to the plate and make a decision. So that is the backup plan. That's two backup plans if you will, of which I don't believe either one will have to be used. Because I have all the confidence in the world in the voters of the City of Reynoldsburg. And we are affecting, by this increase, the very smallest majority. I think we've answered the questions that Council's had from day one. And that's, is it going to impact our seniors? Which it won't. If they're on a retirement income, it's not going to affect them. And it's going to let the people of the City of Reynoldsburg decide whether or not they want to increase our safety forces or not. We're only talking one year of hiring these guys. We're not talking about hiring the whole three year program. You know, so we can, you know, we'll hire the one year. And I can assure you that we can find the money to support that one year. You know, then the Council will have a hard decision if it doesn't, if the income tax doesn't pass. Because then next year, that's part two of the plans, and then part three of the plan. So then's when Council will have some really, really tough decisions to make. But again, I feel very confident that the people of the City of Reynoldsburg are going to see what we're going to spend that money for. And I for one am not going to hide anything. I'm going to lay it right on the line. And I've told people from day one what we're going to spend that money for. And you know, I would challenge Mel, if he could hire me 10 Police Officers this year and pay no more than $600,000, God Almighty Mel, send them over. Because we'll gladly hire 10 Police Officers for a total of $600,000.

Mr. Clemens: You tell me what it is per officer when you hire them.

Mayor McPherson: Probably over $100,000 by the time you get all their training in, you get their equipment.

Mr. Clemens: I didn't bring the training part in. I said payroll. We're talking about payroll. Then I said you can start adding these others in. If you hired 10 for 100, that would be only a million.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: But you're not hiring 10. And you're not going to hire 10 in a year.

Mayor McPherson: We're looking to hire 14.

Mr. Clemens: You're not hiring 10 every year for the next, your life time. So that's the part I'm bringing out.

Mayor McPherson: No. I'm hoping to hire 14, not 10.

Mr. Clemens: Not 14 a year is what I'm bringing out, Bob.

Mayor McPherson: I know. Fourteen over 3 years, that's the proposal. You need to read the information I gave to you. It's 14 over 3 years. Not this year.

Mr. Clemens: I read it. I sat right there and listened to you. And they weren't all policemen either.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills.

Mayor McPherson: No. You're right. There are dispatchers in there.

Mr. Clemens: So let's get it corrected when you're talking.

Mayor McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: Gentlemen, I think the point's been made. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just a question. And I'm actually trying to be on the same page of the same book that Bob is. I'm not always agreeing. You and I will never always agree. But that's what makes the checks and balance work.

Mayor McPherson: That's alright.

Mr. Hills: When I hear the unencumbered balance of 6 million dollars, I just can't....

Mayor McPherson: Actually, 7 ½ almost.

Mr. Hills: Well, I just happened to get the fund report that shows unencumbered balance of 1.2 million. In the General Fund.

Mayor McPherson: If you look at your annual report, I think it shows unencumbered of 4 ½ or 4.9

million dollars.

Mr. Harris. 4.2.

Mayor McPherson: 4.2 million dollars. And then you've got a Rainy Day Fund, 1.9 or roughly 2 million dollars.

Mr. Hills: Yeah. I'm showing 6.1 is the whole fund balance.

Mayor McPherson: So you're up over 6 ½ million dollars right there.

Mr. Hills: Okay. But we don't have an unencumbered General Fund balance of 6 million dollars.

Mayor McPherson: No. It's 4.2.

Mr. Hills: I don't even think it's that. We have a fund balance of 4.1 is what the latest report says. There is money there. We are not....

Mayor McPherson: That's what I'm saying. I don't want to hear this chicken little of the sky is falling.

Mr. Hills: I realize that. But if it takes 14 million dollars a year to run the entity, and you've got 4 million in the bank, you can shut down and 2 months later you're closed. So I mean, it's all relative.

Mayor McPherson: And if you'll recall, back in 2000 or 2001, I think we talked, we had 6 ½ million dollars. And in the interim, the past 8, 10 years, we've whittled that down from 6 ½ million to 4.2 million. That's where that 17.5% comes in over that time period. Or roughly 2 ½% per year that we out spend our revenues. Now, are we going to turn that around? In my opinion, we are going to turn it around. You've got to look, we're going to have another 1,000 employees out east of us here. We've got, we've had some jobs tax credits for Dynalab. We've got the Ag Labs which is hiring you know, some pretty high salary type people out there. So this isn't going to show up until 2006 though. Or I mean until 2007. So it's not going to be in this years budget. But I can assure you, next years budget when you project, and we have projected out, you're going to see that the revenue stream is going to increase somewhat. Now is it going to be dramatic? Probably not. But it's still going to show a much more significant increase than we have in the past 4 or 5 years. And that's good. Is it as good as we'd like to see it? I don't think so. I don't think any of us sitting here you know, would like to, we'd like to have more than we can project out. But I think the thing that we all have to look at, you know, start looking on the positive. Let's not look on the negative on everything. Because there is a whole lot of positives going on in the City of Reynoldsburg as far as development, employees, things like this go.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you, Mayor. And Dick, I'm just going to bother you one more time here if I can. And the interest that you've laid out is to make sure we have the information that we need, right?

Mr. Harris: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: And I think the information that our citizens need to know also is, who's impacted by these types of revenue generation tools that we're talking about? And I know you and I spoke about this earlier. And some of the things we spoke about was, 5% of the people who live and/or work within the City of Reynoldsburg are the people who are going to be paying this tax.

Mr. Harris: They're going to be the ones who see the tax increase.

Mr. Baxter: Correct.

Mr. Harris: Other people will see, the people who work in Reynoldsburg and live in another entity that has a 2% credit, they're not going to see their, they're going to give us more money, but they're not going to see their taxes go up. Because they're already paying that other half a percent.

Mr. Baxter: Right. And with those people impacted, we heard tonight, that 80% of the people in the City of Reynoldsburg who live in and work, are going to be hit if they have the tax reduction.

Mr. Harris: I think it's 83. But it's a little around 80% is the number.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And what percentage would be hit if we went after a bond and just tried to bond out the money for our Police Department specifically?

Mr. Harris: Do you mean in property tax?

Mr. Baxter: Um hum.

Mr. Harris: Well, you're going to hit, there's about 13,000 single family residences. And each one of them is going to be adversely affected. You're going to see the biggest group getting hurt is going to be senior citizens who, at this point don't pay an income tax, and who would have to pay a property tax. Because they get a homestead exemption, but it's not, they're going to see an increase. So I think that the most number of single families, who you don't want to tax, are going to be affected by the property tax increase in my opinion. I don't know if Bob wants to...

Mr. Baxter: Is that impact the same though to those people who are the 5%? If you're getting an impact, and I think your slide showed 700,000 per millage, correct?

Mr. Harris: Um hum. Per mill.

Mr. Baxter: So that was $35 per $100,000 home. And so you're looking at $35, let's just say if it was a single mill, if you were looking for 700,000 and looking at what Councilman Clemens says you can buy 10 officers for, let's say if we did that, we know we could purchase at least 10 officers for that amount. It would cost a...

Mr. Harris: I don't think you can purchase 10 officers by the time you get uniforms and stuff in. But that's a whole other story.

Mr. Baxter: I know you can't but I'm just using the numbers that have been discussed. But we're talking $35 per person. What would the cost increase be for a person that worked in Reynoldsburg if, of those 5%, how much of that increase are they going to see?

Mr. Harris: They're going to see, depending on what their salary is. They're going to see a 25% increase in what they're paying city tax. If they make $10,000 a year, they're paying us approximately $150. $15. They're paying us $15. If it goes from 1 to 2%, they're going to go from 15 to 20. So, income taxes are generally considered the most fair type of taxes because you're only hitting people who have wages to tax rather than those people who don't necessarily have wages to support them. They're on fixed incomes. And I think those are the people you want to affect the least.

Mr. Baxter: Well I appreciate that. I'm on a fixed income myself and I don't really want to be affected either. But with that said, I want to make sure that we're fair to everybody in the City of Reynoldsburg and let them know what all the options are. And I see this Council focusing on a single option and I don't think that's fair. We need to address all of the options, recognize how it impacts our citizens. Specifically how it impacts them on a dollar per dollar basis and then let them make the decision. And I agree with that as well.

Mr. Harris: That's why I think it has to go to the ballot. I think they're going to tell you whether they're willing to support this or if they're willing not to support it.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Very good. Now I would like to get back to the ordinance here because that's what started this. Unless there's any other questions of Dick? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: I just have a couple of comments, Chairman Baxter. I agree with Councilman Clemens. I don't want to see whatever monies are raised, if we do have some kind of revenue enhancement, used to build a bigger bureaucracy. That's not what I'm looking for. As far as debt payment on Main Street, I don't think we're hiding any of that. We know what that is. I look at the Main Street Corridor Revitalization Project. Does it look better? Absolutely. Is it prettier? Absolutely. But what did we do it for? The reason I voted for that was to revitalize that area in order to bring in businesses and jobs, and contribute back to our tax base. And I think once it's all said and done, that project will pay for itself several times over again. So I just wanted to make those couple of points. And my third point is that, we are not the only community that are looking at revenue enhancements. I believe Westerville is, and other communities may be doing that as well. And we are on the low end on our income tax rate at this time. Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Any other comments on this? (No response). Mayor, with all that said, we're talking about making some changes here with this ordinance. And I assume your position still remains the same. We have the money now to support this, correct?

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: And Mr. Harris has already stated in our last meeting that there is money in the funds to support this piece of legislation.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct also.

Mr. Baxter: The concern here is that we're out spending what we can afford over the next several years. I think that's what our Auditor has stood up here and suggested. So I am going to, with the committees approval, I'm going to recommend that we send this back to Council for a second reading, and we'll allow the Council to make their decisions at that point and we'll move through the process. So with that motion, we move it back to committee for a second reading. Do I have a second? Councilman Stake with the second. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). That motion carries. And thanks to everybody for the great conversation tonight. It's going to be a heated topic. I will recognize that it's not anything that's personal in this case. This is more, everybody trying to do what's right for their city and I really appreciate that. So thank you.

Next ordinance, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG AND THE FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS REGARDING A SUB-GRANT AWARD FROM THE FRANKLIN COUNTY EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY, AND ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS. This has had its second reading on 3-27-06. This is pretty straight forward. Mayor, do you have any additional comments on this? I notice that Sharon's not here tonight.

Mayor McPherson: Just a pretty straight forward intergovernmental agreement. And nothing's changed.

Mr. Baxter: Any questions of Council or committee on this legislation? (No response). Hearing none, (Tape Change)

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO APPLY FOR GRANT FROM FRANKLIN COUNTY TERRORISM ADVISORY TEAM FOR THE FUNDING OF AN EMERGENCY ELECTRICAL GENERATOR FOR THE STREET DEPARTMENT. That had its second reading on 3-27-06. And I'm assuming that we've had no changes on this. We did get some additional information on what the cost is going to be long term on the maintenance. I believe Councilwoman Newman brought that up. So thank you for that question I believe. Did you not?

Mrs. Newman: Inaudible.

Mr. Baxter: Did I? That's possible. Well, I thank you. Unless there's any objections, I'm going to go and recommend we send it back to Council for its third and with a recommendation for adoption. And I have a second from Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted "Aye").

Opposed? (No response). That motion carries.

And with that said, I'm going to gladly end the Safety Committee at 9:09.

Safety Committee
- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
April 3, 2006
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 3, 2006

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 9:10. Right at the tip off for the National Championship Basketball game.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Do I have any additions or deletions? I'd like to add 3a, Other Legislation.

The next item is approval of the minutes of the March 20, 2006 Service Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

3a, Other Legislation. I would like to make a motion to remove item 1, Ordinance to approve Special Exception Use Permit. This has been hanging around here for 5 months or so and I've never heard a word from anybody. And so as far as I'm concerned, we might as well move it off the agenda. Do I have a second on that? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is item 4, Discussion, Rezoning of 8015 East Broad Street, from CC to CS, applicant, Giltz & Associates, Inc. Do we have anybody here representing, Mr. Dugger. Who else is here? Will you please step up and give your name and address and so forth?

Mr. Hodge: My name is David Hodge. I'm an attorney with Smith & Hale at 37 W. Broad Street, Columbus, 43215.

Mr. Clemens: Okay, David. Would you go over this a little bit and explain to us what this involves and what this property is?

Mr. Hodge: Sure. Just for orientation, this property's at the southeast corner of Waggoner Road and East Broad Street. This is the Meijer. This is the Target. This is the Trotter property, The Limited Distribution Center, Waggoner, and East Broad Street. The proposal is a rezoning from the CC and R1 District. There's one property that's currently zoned residential. It's just the category that the property when they're annexed in, they go into the R1. It's just not been zoned. The remainder of the property is currently zoned CC. The proposal is to rezone the ground to the CS, Community Service District. It's mixed retail with restaurants, hardware store, retail shops. We did submit a bubble land plan. The green represents buffer. The orange color here is retail. And the pink color here are some out lots along East Broad Street. The reason that we are requesting the CS District as opposed to the CC is that under the CC, any new restaurant that would come in would require going to the Planning Commission for a Special Exception Permit. With the rezoning, restaurants are permitted uses, and so we wouldn't have to go through that process. The application that we submitted has a development text. It has some use restrictions. I don't know if you've had a chance to take a look at it but there are, essentially we mitigated the increase intensity of the CS, the adult uses, and some of the intense uses are prohibited uses. We submitted some architectural elevations, architectural standards. The majority of the development text, we defer to your code. The architecture is going to be, it's better than what's across the street. It's comparable to the Taylor Square development. We actually used that text when we wrote this text and made those commitments. And I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. Thank you, Mr. Hodge. Are there any questions from the committee for Mr. Hodge at this time? (No response). Members of Council? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Clemens, thank you. I would think it would be a lot more difficult to change zoning than to go through a Special Use Permit program. I don't think it's that terrible. Although, it has had some highlights lately. I don't think it's that terrible of a thing to go through.

Mr. Hodge: Well, it's not that that we're opposed to. It's with every single new restaurant use that would come, they would have to come in separately to use that process. So the property owners would then have to come back here every single time they wanted to have a new restaurant. With this, they wouldn't have to do that. Having said that, we will be going through the zoning process obviously. We will be back before Council. We will be at Planning Commission. And we will go to your Design Review Board on the entirety of the property.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Clemens, thank you. Sir, will there be access via Waggoner Road to this?

Mr. Hodge: We do show one access on Waggoner Road.

Mr. Stake: That's what it looked like to me but I'm not a professional, so I wanted to make sure. And would you be doing any improvements to Waggoner Road in that area?

Mr. Hodge: At this time, there aren't improvements planned for Waggoner Road. No.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Waggoner Road's pretty beat up right around there if anybody's been in that area. Pavements coming up and it's pretty beat up. So I hope you might consider that.

Mr. Hodge: What we said in development text is that access and circulation issues, that we would work with your City Engineer to make a determination of where those are located and exactly what those accesses will be. The other two accesses are on East Broad Street. And we've lined them up with accesses on the north side and to those developments on the north side of East Broad.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, I do want you to seriously consider doing something with Waggoner Road.

Mr. Hodge: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Hodge, as it comes to us, will the entrance access off Waggoner Road, will there be a turn lane coming off? Will you be adding a turn lane? Or are you going to be going directly off what is there at the present time? Or have you worked on it?

Mr. Hodge: They've taken a preliminary look at it. But nothing's been decided. We would...

Mr. Clemens: So in other words, we could probably decide it for you.

Mr. Hodge: We would certainly work with your engineer on that type of decision. Yes, sir.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Clemens, I noticed that we've had that intersection already improved when Meijer's was put in, correct? And they put all the extra lanes in?

Mr. Clemens: I think it was Reynoldsburg and, if I'm not mistaken The Limited went together and did this.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I thought we had already improved that intersection up to that area. Now I know that probably takes a lot more but it got widened and it was improved.

Mr. Clemens: We widened it is what we did.

Mr. Baxter: And turn lanes were put in. So I wouldn't think that that would need to be redone again. But I do believe what Councilman Stake is talking about, if you go a little bit more south of that, it could use some work in there. And it would be very difficult I think for anybody to get in and out of any entrance way in that area. Especially since I live on that road and I travel it often, I know how difficult that section can be. So I think some engineering review of that area is in place.

Mr. Hodge: And we will certainly take a look at it. We definitely want people to be able to get into the center.

Mr. Baxter: Absolutely. Alright. Thank you.
Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: You asked my question about the turn lane.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mr. Hodge at this present time? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: One other question. There's a light there on Broad Street that you're going to be abutting up to. I think I saw on your diagram there. I was looking at it. I just couldn't tell if that's where the light is today.

Mr. Hodge: At Broad?

Mr. Baxter: The light there and up further to the east there's another light there, correct?

Mr. Hills: Your two accesses on to Broad Street, you said they were at the intersections.

Mr. Hodge: Right. This is Meijer Drive that goes up into the Meijer Center. And this is Cedar.

Mr. Baxter: I think the next one down is the one that has the street light on it?

Mr. Hills: And both of those are lighted intersections.

Mr. Hodge: I'm not sure.

Mr. Baxter: The first one I thought. Just the first one. Okay. I thought there was one that was lighted. Just a question, are there any thoughts of putting additionals in?

Mr. Hodge: The first.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from the committee or from Council? (No response). What I'd like to do is, to move this on to Council for the first reading and ask President Hills to set a Public Hearing at that time. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

Mr. Hodge: Thank you all very much.

Mr. Clemens: Item number 5, Discussion, Proposed annexation of 79.1 acres between Refugee Road and State Route 40, Etna Twp., applicant, Harrison Smith (Harvey), approved by Licking

County Commissioners on January 9, 2006, received by Clerk of Council on January 3, 2006. Can go to committee to begin acceptance process on April 3, 2006. Do we have anybody here representing this? Mr. Dugger.
Mr. Dugger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman Clemens. My name's Glen Dugger. I'm an attorney, 37 West Broad Street. I represent the agent for the petitioners, Harrison Smith. And we would request that this property be accepted for annexation in the City of Reynoldsburg. It's within the City of Reynoldsburg's sewer contract area with the City of Columbus. And has been through the hearing process at the county and now we'd like to have it go through the hearing process here at the city for acceptance of that annexation. That's as brief as I can make it to get you to the basketball game.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any questions for Mr. Dugger? Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one question. And that was, are we coming with new roads? Or are these coming with the old roads?

Mr. Dugger: Actually, the question you asked previously, I think that, I don't want to regurgitate old history but, Mr. Clemens and I have been fixing old township roads for a long time. The part of the road that you refer to on Waggoner, I believe is still in Jefferson Township. And that's, as many of you know, one of the problems with that whole area has been some historic township ownerships. The city in December, approved a Tax Increment Financing agreement for the properties immediately north of this. One of the things that was contained within that agreement was to take a look at part of the road component. And I think this would, it'll obviously dove tail with that as well. So how they're going to get fixed, I don't know. But we have a history of the developers and the city working that out over time. Taylor Road looks like a pretty good road now. When Mr. Clemens, the Mayor, and I started working that in 1990, it didn't look very good at all. It's a pretty good looking street now and our expectation is, over time Summit Road will hopefully have some of those same characteristics.

Mr. Baxter: Well, thank you so much. It was a somewhat half hearted question. But the intent was the same reason.

Mr. Dugger: And obviously, the issue is, as the city extends, we want the city to look like a city and not look like some beaten up part of a township. That's your desire, that's our desire.

Mr. Baxter: That's our desire too. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. My question, what is the proposed use of that land?

Mr. Dugger: Well, that's a good question. The most likely use would be some sort of single family residential, but we haven't had very significant discussions with the city as to what it would be. If I had to guess Mr. Stearns, that's probably, or if you held a gun to my head and made me file the zoning tomorrow, that's probably what I'd file. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from the committee or members of Council on this item? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council for the first reading. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye").

Item number 6, ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED DEED OF EASEMENT (sanitary sewer easement) (.478 ac.) FROM THE TRADITIONS AT SLATE RIDGE, LLC an Ohio limited liability company (Preferred Real Estate Investments, LLC). First reading, 3-27-06. Are there any questions of this from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council for its second reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye").

Item number 7, ORDINANCE MAKING APPROPRIATION FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL. It had its second reading on 3-27-06. What I'd like to do is add this as an emergency and send it to Council as an emergency. Do I have any questions from Council? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Clemens. I am opposed to any emergency legislation on this. I'm opposed to this whole procedure and everything. I just wanted to know, I still don't know why we really have to have this in the first place. And I think probably the best thing to do right now is to cut our losses and stop the whole thing. Because right now, the time is running out, I mean the time is running and it's costing the city money as we consider this legislation. I don't see any reason to go any further with it myself.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Any other comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I'd like to make a motion to send this to Council as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye" except one). Opposed? (One voted "Nay"). Alright. This goes to Council for the third reading.

Item number 8, ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED DEED OF EASEMENT (sanitary sewer easement) (1.002 AC.) FROM MURPHY DEVELOPMENT COMPANY/TAYLOR CHASE LLC. Second reading 3-27-06. Do I have any questions on this subject from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'd like to send this to Council with a recommendation for passage on the third reading. Do I have a second on this? Second by Mr. Joseph. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Item number 9, ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED DEED OF EASEMENT (storm sewer easement) (.630 ac.) FROM MURPHY DEVELOPMENT COMPANY/TAYLOR CHASE LLC. It had its second reading 3-27-06. Are there any questions from the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I'd like to send this to Council. I'll make a motion to send this to Council for the third reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

That would end the Service Committee meeting at 9:26.

- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
April 3, 2006 (Transcribed - Susie Smith)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 3, 2006

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

Mr. Stake: And I would like to call to order, the April 3 Finance Committee meeting at 9:27.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to that agenda by members of the committee? (No response). I have a change. I've been asked by the City Auditor to add, and I'll add as 3a, Repealing of the Bond Ordinance and issuing of another Bond Ordinance. I don't believe I need a second on that. 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 March 20, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item 3a is the Repeal of the Bond Ordinance that we passed last week. Ordinance No. 26-06. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Mr. Stake. After talking with Mr. Franzmann, the bond counsel for the city who's been bond counsel for a number of years, he wanted to make a small change on page 4 which says, "the December 1 payment date". There may not be a December 1 payment date in the year '06 on these bonds as part of the front loading. So therefore, he wants to change that to just be "As determined by the Auditor in the Certificate of Award". And that's the only change to the ordinance.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I have one question. With the recent rate hike announcements and the change in position of the fed, do you see this as something worth going forward as your yield still showing an inverse yield?

Mr. Harris: It is still showing, in fact, the fed rate change last week makes the yield curve even more. It goes back to being inverted. Long term rates, which would be the end result of this, have not really moved significantly. Therefore, the actual increase in the short term rates may help us as far as when we create the escrow for this account in order to pay off the current 1999 and 2000 bond issue. So the numbers that I received on Friday still show, between the two issues, about $505,000 savings.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you, Dick.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And Mr. Harris, you would like an emergency on this?

Mr. Harris: Yeah. We still need to, we finished the POS. In fact, we got a copy of it from Mr. Franzmann today and we would still like to look at selling these somewhere end of April, first of May. So we would need the emergency on it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any objections to that from members of Council? (No response). Okay. Then I will make a motion that we send this forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you, Mr. Harris.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Resolution of Support for Reynoldsburg School Levy. I was asked by the Reynoldsburg City Schools Business Manager Ron Strussion to add this to the committee agenda for this evening. And I don't think we have anybody from the city schools here. So I'll give it my best shot. But I believe it's a permanent, it's support for a 5 year, 2 mill permanent improvement levy renewal. This isn't anything new. This is just a renewal of a levy that's been in place. And of course, keeping our schools strong keeps our property values up. And I am very much in favor of that. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just want to let you know that I as well support it with kids in the Reynoldsburg schools. They every day, need as much of our support as they can give them. And I'm all for anything that we can do, even resolution or what not, to help out our city schools.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). This will be on the ballot May 2. And I don't believe we need any emergency language or anything. We just make a motion to send this forward. Right, President Hills?

Mr. Hills: Correct. I believe this is one reading.

Mr. Stake: One reading deal. Okay. Are there any more questions or comments then? (No response). None being heard, then I'll make a motion that we send this forward to Council at the next Council meeting with recommendation for adoption from the Finance Committee. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, item #5, Discussion, Appropriation to Reimburse CRV - XII Main Street Ltd. (For cost of relocation of storm sewer). Some members of Council may not have been here at the time this started, but this has to do with our widening of Main and Graham and some of the issues that were involved in that at the taking of that property. And this is something that has been worked out between the City Attorney's Office and the attorney for these folks. And we are being asked to appropriate $76,639.38 from the unappropriated Storm Water Utility Fund to account number 740.105.5659 to reimburse CRV - XII Main Street Ltd. And are there any questions from members of the committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: With that agreement, I believe we're also going to have some improvements in sewer in the future, are we not? I believe there is some sewer work that was underneath that property that's going to be repaired and may make some lives easier in that property area around there. So I think there's a lot of plus for us that this _____________.

Mr. Stake: Well, that is correct. And there will be a retail center in there which will bring in tax revenue from the jobs that it creates. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this item? (No response). There is an emergency being requested. Mr. Underwood was the City Attorney at the time. He's requested emergency on this to finalize the settlement of land appropriation law suit and expedite construction of the shops on Main Street. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). None being heard, then I will make a motion that we send this forward with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. 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.

And item number 6 is Discussion, Appointment to Design Review Board to fill unexpired term. This was held on 3-6 and 3-20-06. And we did get some letters of interest. I am going to recommend Mr. Tom Eller. Mr. Eller has lived in Reynoldsburg for about 35 years. He's currently retired so I don't think there'll be any work conflicts with him serving on the board. And I know some times with not having enough people at the meetings, there are some issues with some folks who come to these board meetings and want to get things passed. So I am happy to recommend Mr. Eller. I believe Mr. Eller is here this evening. Mr. Eller, do you have anything you'd like to say at this time?

Mr. Eller: I'd be happy to serve if that's what works out. I'll do a good job for you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And I appreciate your interest in serving the citizens of Reynoldsburg. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). None being heard, then I'll make a motion that we appoint Mr. Eller to fill the unexpired term. Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 9:34.

Finance Committee
- - -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
April 3, 2006
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)