

MINUTES REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING  
REYNOLDSBURG CITY COUNCIL  
MARCH 26, 2007

President of Council William L. Hills called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Members of Council present: Donna Shirey, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Doug Joseph, Mel Clemens, Antoinette Newman.

The Invocation was given by Mr. Hills. Mr. Hills led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes of the regular Council meeting held March 12, 2007 were approved without objection.

Mr. Clemens moved to remove Item 21, ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: REPLACEMENT OF CHAPTER 1335 "FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION" AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY, and return it to committee. Mr. Stake seconded. The agenda was amended with all voting "Aye".

Community Comments and Requests:

Mr. Wright: My name's Ken Wright; I live on Roselawn Avenue. When Council began to discuss a sex offender law for Reynoldsburg, I suggested that sex offenders should be prohibited from living here, but the prevailing opinion was that such a law would be challenged in court and ultimately found to be unconstitutional. I was also told that no place in America had enacted such a law. It seems there might be more to this story. The March 13, 2007 edition of The Columbus Dispatch, tells of the new sex offender law passed in Upper Arlington, which limits not only where sex offenders may live, but also where they work. The part of this article which really grabbed my attention was toward the end. Now I quote from the paper. "Two states, Alabama and Georgia, and a small number of cities nationwide, currently prohibit offenders from working or living within their boundaries." If the statement I just quoted is true, it means that two entire states, as well as some cities, have gone beyond banning sex offenders from a few designated areas. This statement means, as it says, that sex offenders are completely prohibited from living or working in those states or in those cities. The example set by these states and cities make the Reynoldsburg sex offender law appear anemic. I live on Roselawn Avenue. It is not protected by the Reynoldsburg sex offender law. The same can be said of the streets around it - Browning Drive, Lucks Road, and Aster Avenue are not protected. There are children living on these streets. I encourage City Council to revisit the sex offender issue, and to craft a more effective law. In Reynoldsburg we should have a sex offender law which will truly help protect all of our kids.

And I'd like to show you the front page of The Other Paper, it's a Columbus weekly. This is their front page story right here. It says, "The US Department of Justice says Columbus leads America's big cities in rape. Nobody knows why." Columbus is number one in it. It says, "The Columbus rape rate is 10% higher than Detroit. Twice as many as Houston. Three times as much as Los Angeles, Baltimore, and Seattle. And nearly five times more than New York City." So if there was ever a need in this area, it's now. And if we have the highest sex offender rate, then we should have the toughest laws in America. We need it. So that's what I'm

asking. If Council would please reconsider that. Just give us the toughest law in the country. Thank you.

## Reports:

Presentation by David Kandel, AT&T - - - documentation on file in Clerk of Council's office.

Mr. Kandel: Thank you very much President Hills, members of Council, Mayor, and members of the Administration. My name's David Kandel, Director of External Affairs for AT&T. I'm delighted to be here tonight to share with you an overview of Project Light Speed. I also wanted to introduce two of my colleagues here tonight: Brad Hughes, who will be our technical assistant; and also Colleen Marshall - both from Porter Wright. And they are providing legal assistance for us. And in a word, Project Light Speed is about building capacity for the future. About putting infrastructure in the community of Reynoldsburg to bring it up and surpass the technology that's available today. If you recall, it wasn't so very long ago that we were all connected to the internet via dial up modems. We were running at, if you remember, 28,000 bits of information per second. That grew to 56,000. Members of Council, we're talking now, about the demand for band width becoming exponential. And the need for much faster internet speeds is growing every day. Project Light Speed will provide the infrastructure that is necessary to bring our communities up to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. What is Project Light Speed? What we're going to be doing is connecting 19 million of our households and provide high speed, super high speed internet, which will provide internet protocol television as the first major product. It will be able to provide up to 39 million bits of information per second. It will become the foundation for the future. I want to show you, from a schematic perspective, how we're going to be doing this. Today, we have high speed internet service called DSL. It competes with cable modems. And we have, this is called DSL. Our central office here in Reynoldsburg is connected to fiber, to a terminal. And then copper cables that run to the house. With the current technology, we're able to provide speeds of 1.5 million to 6 million megabits per second. With Project Light Speed, what we do, is we build out the fiber cable and put it out closer to our customers' homes. So we extend that fiber out. We have a lot to begin with. We're now pushing it closer to the customers' homes. So the example of fiber to the neighborhood, would be the central office in Reynoldsburg connecting fiber closer to the home. There is a node, and I will show you a picture of that node, and that takes that laser light, converts it back into electric pulses. And we're able to use the copper that's already in the ground. Already serving everybody's homes. So the benefit here is that we don't have to go and dig up everybody's yard in order to provide these super high speed capabilities. So with this technology here, here, and here, we're going to be able to provide speeds of 15 million to 25 million bits of information per second. In areas that have not been built yet, and those areas that are just fields, and there will be new houses that are developed there, we're going to take that fiber and take it from the central office, and we're going to deliver it directly into the home. Folks, I have been with my company for 28 years. And when I first started, we just began to install fiber optic cable. And when asked if there would ever come a time when we would need to install fiber to the home, when I gave public speeches, I said, of course not. That would never, ever happen. Why would you need so much speed and capacity? Well, I was completely and utterly wrong. With this technology, we're going to be able to derive 20 to 39 million megabits per second.

I wanted to share with you very quickly, the differences between standard cable TV and

internet protocol TV. We've had cable TV systems around for decades. We all probably have it at home. Today, the cable system has channels. Each color would represent a channel. But all of the channels that the cable companies provide to their customers are running down their network all the time. They're all being delivered to set top boxes. And depending upon which services you have paid for, that set top box will allow you watch certain channels. With switched video, or internet protocol video, nothing is running down the network until you click on your clicker. And then, the channel you want, and only that channel, is delivered to your television. Problem with traditional cable systems, is once those channels, once that pipe is filled up, you cannot add any more channels. With the internet protocol based system, the channels out here are virtually limitless. You are not bound by the size of the pipe that's running along the network. So that's a major difference between a traditional cable system and a switched video system. People ask, well how do you get these signals to the home? We have a very large satellite farm out west where the skies are clear. And there is a fiber network that hooks those huge satellites to a regional hub. That regional hub is in Columbus. Fiber network links to the central office in Reynoldsburg, and then it goes fiber to the node in existing neighborhoods, or fiber to the home. What's amazing about this technology, is it's that little old telephone line that's been serving your homes for decades, that is now able to carry internet protocol television, high speed internet, and your local telephone conversations all going on at the same time. I wanted to show you a picture of the node. This is the device that is the interface between the fiber cable and the copper cable that runs to the house. And I want to give you a perspective of the size of the node here in the next shot. This is, it's called a 52B cabinet. Front side and the side view. This is a standard traffic control box. This is a larger box. But I wanted to tell you, technology is a wonderful thing. Because we have in fact, found a box that is much, much smaller. And this is the one that we're going to be using going forward. This is about 15 inches smaller than the one that you saw. It's a low profile cabinet. And I will tell you that in the vast majority of cases, these cabinets are placed out of sight in back lot lines where utilities are designated. You may have read articles in the paper about front yard placements. I will tell you that that is typically the exception and never the rule. It's our goal to put these in unobscure places.

Mrs. Newman: Are you going to have one of these at every house?

Mr. Kandel: No, and I'm glad you asked that one. Each box will serve between 300 and 500 homes. So it's not like we have to have a whole lot of boxes. They are able to serve quite a number of homes. And here is a map that we tried to give you just a graphic indication as to how many cabinets would be deployed over our 3 year build schedule in the Reynoldsburg vicinity. Each one of those green dots represents where one of the cabinets would be located. And you can see that there's going to be significant coverage throughout the community. So that you will have the technology where you need it.

I want to talk just very briefly about the actual service called U-verse. The technology that we're deploying is called Project Light Speed. The service that we're going to be providing to customers is called U-verse. It will have a rich multi-media program guide, broadcast quality video on demand, fast scrolling and navigation. You're going to be able to see as you're scrolling, you're going to see with another window, what other channels as you scroll down through. You do not have to have a picture in picture television to see that. You'll be able to browse like, you'll be able to share music and photos. And here's where it gets very interesting. In the future, this is not something that's available today, but in the future, we're going to be able to

make it possible for, for example, the Buckeye games were shot in multiple cameras. If they wanted to send us all of those video feeds, we would take those and then make them available to you. So that you could in effect, become the producer. You could decide which camera angle you want to watch that game. Let me tell you where we are operating U-verse. We are in 15 markets ranging from Texas, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Kansas. The benefits to our communities where we're deploying this technology, high definition channels. Today we offer 25 high definition channels in these markets. Whole home digital video recording, interactive applications, parental controls. There'll be multiple product packages. High speed internet will accompany this serve. You'll have more than 300 channels, 45 music channels, a high video on demand library. But the point being tonight, is that this will provide yet another competitive choice for residents of Reynoldsburg. Plus, it will be the foundation for everything that comes next. It's important for the community to have the broad band capabilities that this technology brings.

Brief statement to you on our commitment to our communities that we serve. We will support your traditional oversight and enforcement of your right-of-way ordinance as we build this network, and this is very critical. We will pay the same fees to the cities, comparable to those that are paid by your current cable TV providers. The city will not lose any revenue as a result of our investing in your community. In fact, what we've seen, is cable penetrations, or entertainment penetrations tend to rise a little bit. So there is the potential for increased revenues. We will deliver community programming through public education of government channels that you'll have access to. We'll provide disability access. One example of that would be, the scrolling text at the bottom of the screen for the deaf community. We'll protect subscriber privacy. Deliver programming in secondary languages. We already mentioned parental controls. We will deliver federal, state, and local emergency alerts. And we will provide non-discriminatory access to video programming. I should mention to you that this investment total company is 4.6 billion dollars. That's the total commitment that AT&T has made. It's a 3 year build. And I view my role as to try to bring as much of that capital dollars to Central Ohio as I possibly can. This is where I live. These are the communities that I serve. And we would like to continue to invest in this community, because it is a good market and we would like to provide services here. I will tell you though, that the 19 \_\_\_\_\_ household, which is the total commitment for this first phase is about half of our total customers. As you saw on that one screen with all the green dots, we're going to cover a very healthy portion of Reynoldsburg. However, I cannot at this point, commit to serving 100% of the community. We're going to build as much as we possibly can and invest as much as we can. We want there to be a phase 2 and that is when we will expand. But the point is, that we have an alternative to Project Light Speed in U-verse for those areas that will not have access to it on this first wave of investment. And it is called Home Zone. It will provide very similar features to that of the U-verse. And it will use different technology. It will marry our AT&T dish product, which is satellite product, with our high speed internet. It links those two together and provides you some very significant functionality. That is the presentation. And if you will indulge me if you have time, there is a 3 minute video that I think, that puts it all together.

That concludes the formal presentation. I would like to invite Colleen Marshall though, up to just talk about what we're really here for. And that is to ask Council to take some action that will enable us to move forward. Colleen.

Ms. Marshall: He gets all the bells and whistles and I get to come up and talk to you about the

boring, legal aspect of all of this. As he mentioned, we are from Porter Wright, and we kind of work with AT&T to make sure that the city remains whole at the end of all of this. And that all of the contracts and the situation that the city is faced with, leaves the city in the same position they would be in, if they were dealing with any kind of an incumbent cable provider. We want to make sure that at the end of all of this, the city is protected and AT&T is protected. And that's why we've kind of worked with AT&T and come up with a couple of different ways that cities can approach getting Project Light Speed to be up and running within their borders. And one of the ways is, that you would do what we call a repeal and replace. Where you would take your existing cable language, your chapter that deals with cable language, and replace it with an all new chapter. And we would work with, incidentally I went to law school with Jed Hood and he always sat at the back of the room at law school, too. This is a pattern I'm noticing Jed. But we would work with your Law Director Jed, and make this something that you all would be comfortable with and something that he would be comfortable with as well. You could do the repeal and replace. You could do an all new stand-alone agreement. Or you could maybe just alter the language that you have in your existing cable chapter. We've worked with a number of municipalities already here in Central Ohio. And we can tell you that Grove City, New Albany, Worthington, Powell, and Dublin have done the repeal and replace. Hilliard, my home town, has decided to do a stand-alone agreement. We're still negotiating with the City of Columbus. They haven't decided what's best for them. But some, Upper Arlington, Whitehall, and Gahanna have decided to revise their existing agreement. So basically what you could do is, talk with Jed, talk it over with him, decide what you think is something that you would be most comfortable with. He could look at the legal aspects and see what he thinks is most advisable for the city. And we would be so happy to work with you to decide what you think would be best for the City of Reynoldsburg. And if you have any legal questions, that's what Brad and I are here for. We don't get to do the glamorous presentation. We have to come in with a bunch of papers. I brought along incidentally, a copy of the Worthington agreement because I wanted to see that you could have an example of the repeal and replace. The kind of language that municipalities are using.

Mr. Hills: If you could leave a copy of something like that with the Clerk, it would be helpful. Because we are, I think Mr. Hood was the one that set the presentation for tonight. So I think we're hearing this for the first time.

Ms. Marshall: I have a couple of extra copies. I could leave them with you and with the Clerk, and certainly with Jed. But basically, we have an example of what Worthington has done, which is to completely repeal their language, and broaden it to incorporate this kind of a presentation as well as the incumbent cable providers. But we also have a stand-alone agreement that we've tailored for Reynoldsburg that you could look over the language in that and see. And basically, what this agreement would do, is protect you. It would indemnify you the same way that you would have with an incumbent cable provider. It would provide the peg channels. It would make sure that you were getting the same income at the end of the day that you would get from them, a percentage of the gross revenue. Make sure that you're protected in your schools. I know that cable providers, and AT&T would as well, provide services to all of your schools free of charge. They would provide the kinds of services that really, you come to expect when you have a cable operator come in. The difference really, the big difference is, they don't have to come in and rip up everybody's yards. They're going to give you the same kinds of protections with better service. And your city isn't torn apart basically is the way we look at it.

Mr. Hills: We just spent some time tearing apart the city.

Ms. Marshall: I've heard about that. So thank you. But I will leave that with Jed, and as well with Mrs. Frazier.

Mr. Hills: Any questions from anyone on Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills, just a couple of quick questions. The first one, we saw all the little green dots where you would like to put hubs. And each one of those are going to require some type of construction and those type of things. How does that work with AT&T?

Mr. Kandel: There are two ways that replace those. They are either in road right-of-way or in private utility easements. So in the case of road right-of-way, we would work with your Department of Services. We would submit a permit. We would work together with the Administration to make sure that the placement was okay with everybody. Typically, we must locate those cabinets. They are relative close proximity to what is called the cross connect box. In other words, it's a piece of equipment that's already there. It needs to reside closely to that. The good news is, in a community like Reynoldsburg, for the most part, the utility boxes are in back lot lines, they're out of the way. We put them where existing utilities are supposed to be.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you. And I think my second concern, when I look at those boxes and question, well we have to have new ones put out there, that if there are issues with the residents of those things, I'm sure you take the same type of concern for those residents' issues and work with as AT&T has in the past, with your DSL lines and present, correct?

Mr. Kandel: Correct. For example, if there were a situation where, because the cross connect box was placed in a more visible kind of an area, then we would work with the resident, and work with the city to develop a landscaping plan that would really minimize the impact. And if we do heavy landscaping, we can actually pretty much mask those cabinets.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions? (No response). Mayor, any questions?

Mayor McPherson: No.

Mr. Hills: I thank you all very much. And I know you certainly don't want to sit through the whole meeting. So as you're breaking that down, I don't think you're going to disturb Mr. DeBolt, are you?

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Hills, I did have some questions. Not for the attorneys, but to more of the people that knew the function features that were going on. I knew you didn't want to hear those questions. So I did have some questions about the function features that they were offering in their presentation. If I could ask a few questions on that? For example, one of the questions I would ask is, what type of offerings are you going to have for the residents of Reynoldsburg? Are

we going to have basic type offerings? Are they going to be bundled with \_\_\_\_\_ over phone? Are they going to be connected with other services as you see happening in the marketplace today? Because for those people who can't afford the full services, cable offerings have those same type of basic offerings. I'm looking to see, I see a program, I don't see anything other than that.

Mr. Kandel: Yes. And that's a good question. That's one that we can't answer fully for you tonight because we won't have the service available actually in the community, probably until very late this year. However, I will tell you, that in your packets, there is a news release that describes in Kansas City, which is the city where we just most recently launched. It talks about the prices. The packages there. That's not necessarily the prices that will occur here. This is a different market. But it will give you a general idea. I will tell you this. When we begin service, we will have zero market share. We will have no customers, and we will have invested hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars. We have got to be competitive in order to win in the marketplace.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I have one other question, sir.

Mr. Hills: One other question. Really? One more question?

Mr. Baxter: Really. Only one other one. Because I'll tie the three that I have into one if I can. Okay? And that's basically, watching your presentation, you spoke about the two different types of connections. One being a copper connection, which is taken from your node into the home. And another one where new builds would go directly fiber into the home. My concern is, Reynoldsburg's been here for a while. We don't have a whole lot of new-builds that can be expected. Therefore, the expectation would be the majority of the homes in Reynoldsburg would be to this copper node. And hence, also the reduced amount of available service that you give them. With that reduced service, are they still able to receive all the offerings from your program?

Mr. Kandel: Because the vast majority of our build is to what we call fiber thin neighborhood, everything that you saw there will be possible through the existing fiber to the node, copper to the home scenario. The U-verse service operates at that level, at that band width level.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I was only concerned that there may be some limited service with those. And concern, that's a majority, I wanted to make sure we were covering all of our residents. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, did you have a question?

Mr. Clemens: It's my understanding this is a presentation?

Mr. Hills: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: It will go to the committee for the discussion. There will be a lot of discussion on it. So this is just a salesmanship deal tonight. So you come back on our committees and we'll go over all of this and I'm sure there will be many questions for you and many from our City

Attorney.

Mr. Hills: It hasn't even reached committee yet, but you're right. I think we're going to review the documents and certainly Mr. Hood will give us some guidance as to where we need to go.

Mr. Kandel: And we'll be happy to come back at any time.

Mr. Clemens: In other words, let's move on.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Kandel, thank you very much and all of you this evening.

-----

Mr. Hills: Moving on to item 9b is Safety/Service Director DeBolt. Presentation of report.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you, President Hills. I don't have technology for you tonight. I was hoping Colleen might let me borrow her teleprompter if that was part of your technology there. We'll try to forge on any way. President Hills, members of Council, and Mr. Mayor. I'm coming before you tonight to update City Council to follow up on the Safety Committee meetings we held in February and March regarding traffic concerns on Priestley Drive. In addition, I'd like to respond to some comments that were made by one of the residents that spoke at the March 12, 2007 Council meeting as well. At the March 5 Safety Committee meeting, I highlighted steps that the Administration would do in response to traffic concerns raised by residents in neighborhoods around Priestley Drive. Some of those have been updated, so I wanted to bring those up to Council's attention. As Police Chief Suci mentioned at a prior Safety Committee meeting, we will continue to use targeted police enforcement in neighborhoods on a rotating basis and include Priestley Drive as one of those targeted neighborhoods. In 2007 we've had over 30 citations issued in the area with most of those being for stop sign violations. I know Councilman Baxter, you had mentioned that concern at a number of the meetings and I think the police records that we've been able to look at here over the past month warranted that's definitely a concern. Especially right on that corner intersection where you're at. So we want to try to do something about that. I talked to our Engineer and our Street Department Superintendent this week as well. Perhaps there's some technology we can use to make that more visible. So we're looking into that. In an effort to increase awareness to travelers, a speed trailer that a lot of the residents had mentioned does seem to help by letting people know that it is a concern in that neighborhood. We'll continue to use that on a periodic basis keeping in mind the fact that we have other neighborhoods we like to use it in as well. The city will demo a, what's called a speed van. I've been talking to a company about potentially utilizing that as part of one of the products they offer. And they're going to be coming in the week of April 9. And that will allow us, if we end up using it, then contracting with them in order to check speeders and find those individuals that were caught using radar. The Street Department has put additional "Children Playing" signs up in that area. And some of the ones that were in a smaller nature, they've enlarged. So we've increased the number and made them bigger.

Franklin County has agreed to conduct traffic warrant studies on Waggoner Road for speed reductions and also look at the potential to have traffic signals put in at Priestley Drive, and the Rodebaugh Road intersections. And again, that's in the works. It will take some time. I hope that would be able to be done in the next few months. It's potential that that could take a

little longer. And it took seven months the last time they did it. Hopefully it won't take that long. Traffic counts were done in January. The response to concerns raised at that time prior to the winter weather coming in. Again, that's the time the issue was brought to our attention. That's the time we put the counts down. Any traffic engineer would probably tell you that's not the best time to do those kind of counts, but based on the residents' concerns, we wanted to try to get the best information we could at the time. And that was really two weeks prior to the harsh weather coming in. So we did get some quality counts. Additional counts will be done in better weather and we'll continue to monitor those traffic issues that have been brought to our attention.

One of the issues that was brought up by residents was the property damage. And specifically regarding cars and mailboxes. And in reviewing police reports, we wanted to see if there were any patterns there. And that's why it's important for residents when they have an issue like this to basically, make sure they document that, have it documented with the Police Department and file a report. There were four documented incidences of property damage in 2002. And three each for the next three years from 2003, 2004, and 2005. Again, that's not a major amount, but at the same time in this past six month period, we did have a, pretty much a spike in that. We did have six documented incidences in the Priestley neighborhood, specifically right on Priestley. Not the whole neighborhood as we talked about at times in this region for instance, south and north of Dickens. We're talking about specifically on Priestley. Therefore, effective when signs are installed the first week of April, we're going to go ahead and place a parking ban on the south side of Priestley Drive, from Waggoner to Dickens Drive. The situation will be reevaluated in six months. We're putting it on the south side, because that's the fact where the fire hydrants are, and it's also the place that the majority of those incidences of damage have occurred. Also, regarding parking over the past few months, and this is city wide, the police have done a good job. Again, based on initiatives by residents, after the winter, a lot of cars being out in parked areas on streets for extensive periods of time. Some times weeks and months according to residents. So we did some investigation and we found in some of those incidences, it definitely was the case. And the Police Department has done a good job in citing those cars. Again, they can't be there for more than 48 hours on one place, or inoperable in more than 24 hours. We've found more than 41 of those cars, 40 cars in the past three weeks that were in that category, and those have been moved.

And finally, I've met with individual residents and neighborhood groups in the past who have addressed various safety concerns, and I'll continue to do so. I've specifically contacted the President of the Quarry Park Homeowners Association in an effort to attend their next meeting. And I'll again keep a dialogue going with residents in that neighborhood.

Secondly, I'd like to respond to some comments at the last Council meeting that were made by Belinda Guard for purpose of clarification. Since the issue of Priestley Drive has been brought to my attention a few months ago by Ms. Guard, it's not been ignored by this Administration as was stated. We've used extensive human resources of many individuals and have been used in addressing the concerns of Priestley Drive. I've personally spoken to residents, and Mrs. Guard, and the neighborhood, and on the phone, by e-mail and other means. Members of the Street Department have made numerous trips to the neighborhoods over the past few months. Traffic counts have been taken. Statistical data has been gathered. And various traffic engineers have also been consulted. Not just who we hire here through EMH&T, but in other entities of other municipalities for background information. Most importantly, residents were listened to as they spoke at the Safety Committee meetings held over the past two months, in February and March.

And the major who spoke, were not in favor of street closings. That's again, the people that spoke, that came and talked, the majority specifically said that they didn't favor street closings even though they had concerns in that area on a number of items. But the bottom line was, we felt the majority agreed with our position. During the March 5 Safety Committee meeting, in an effort to be responsive at the concerns of residents, I did summarize some of these same efforts to date that we had made at the time for the future, and at the March 5 Safety meeting as well. Due to illness, Ms. Guard was not able to attend that meeting. She also, for whatever reason, chose to leave during my comments at the prior Safety Committee meeting when I asked, when I stated that my intent was not to close any roads at this time based on information we have gathered in the need to preserve emergency response time. My position has not changed. Preserving emergency response time to assist residents in times of need will still be a priority and not be compromised.

Also, no one from the Administration has suggested moving as an option to the Priestley Drive residents. However, the Safety Committee minutes reflect that a resident who testified did suggest that as an option, but that did not come from the Administration.

It should also be noted that 4,000 cars per day was a figure Ms. Guard used as the current figures that are on Priestley Drive. Actually, that was a 2004 figure based on the stats that were done and the studies that were done at that time. The average counts taken in the two week period in 2007 were actually an average of 3300 cars per day. So basically, as I was saying before, the count based on the information we have has gone down; not stayed the same or even gone up, as of January. And as far as speed, again, we took an average speed of 19 to 22 miles per hour this year. Again, it was 27 miles per hour back in '04. Which again, 26 miles per hour was the average speed on residences when we've done these speed studies over a number of years. So that was the average in the city. And again, based on the weather, I would grant the fact that the speed probably isn't 20 miles an hour. It's maybe closer to 25. But again, I think it's in line with the rest of the communities in the city.

It should also be noted that stop signs were installed in the neighborhood in 2004. And Rodebaugh was opened, providing additional east-west road. And again, those were done since the last discussions on this issue a few years ago. Hence, my conclusion from a statistical viewpoint based on the information that we've gathered, that the situation is actually better in terms of average speed and volume of cars and acceptable by traffic engineering standards in both 2004 and January 2007. However, we'll continue to monitor the area for any future trends. I would be happy to discuss these problems and workable solutions with any concerned residents. In conclusion, I'd recommend we keep the streets opened to protect emergency response time, allow residents to use the streets for the purpose they were intended, while using available enforcement resources and technology to provide for traffic calming techniques in areas such as Priestley needing attention. So if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

Mr. Hills: Questions of Mr. DeBolt? Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to comment, Mr. DeBolt, you've done a spectacularly thorough job on this problem, and I just want to congratulate you. And I feel that I'm in agreement with everything you've said as far as any remedial or non-action with this problem. But my congratulations. You've done a splendid job.

Mr. DeBolt: A lot of people have helped out.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: I agree with Toni. Just a couple of questions that I have is, you were talking about the parking on the south side of the streets. How much notice are you going to be giving to the residents, letting them know that there is no longer going to be the parking on there?

Mr. DeBolt: Our goal is to go ahead and start the parking ban next week, beginning of April. We're going to make every effort to make sure all those residents are aware of it, household by household if we have to. Through the media obviously, as well.

Mrs. Shirey: Okay. If you were going to continue to monitor the streets as far as the speeding and everything, if there are residents that are parked on that side of the street, are they going to be ticketed as well?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. This would be a parking violation like any other parking violation during the time frame that we're going to look at over the next six months.

Mrs. Shirey: Okay. And I really do agree with you as far as not closing any streets because of the response time for police and fire. That would really affect citizens.

Mr. DeBolt: Now that you mentioned it, if I could add, many of us last week were at the fire station opening, and there was a multi-media display. And I noticed that it mentioned 14 to 15 responses are made a day, just in fire service. And when you think about a community of this size, not including police, I think that that's the overriding concern that I have. Just making sure the safety vehicles can get to the people when they need them as fast as possible. I had a personal experience as well here recently, I was actually, on the weekend, I tried to get up to Priestley Drive on weekends, morning, evenings, to try to get a full comment of what the situation is. A few weeks ago I was up there and happened to be on Priestley Drive, heard something on the police blotter that there was a situation that someone was in need of assistance, and I turned around, because I was just getting to Priestley, and two police cars were already heading down Waggoner Road to assist someone, and there was definitely a situation where individuals were in need of assistance, including Police Officers. Therefore, that kind of struck home to me, the fact that if those Officers happened to be on the other side of Priestley and couldn't have gotten through, it could have been a different scenario where we could have had further injuries. So I think there's a lot of situations, and maybe some of you too, I've had friends that passed away because there wasn't perhaps emergency vehicles there and you wondered where they were. And when we went to the hospital in one particular case and saw how far the hospital was away and that the emergency vehicles had to go through neighborhoods, and it's just a scenario that I wouldn't want any of us to have to deal with. So I think we need to, we're doing the right thing by giving them every opportunity to get the people that are needed.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you. And I appreciate your response time into getting back to those residents. So I think you're doing a great job. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Other questions or comments from Council? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thanks, President Hills. First off, I want to make sure that we're really clear on this one point. Steve, Mr. DeBolt, you have done a great job. You have tried very hard to work with the citizens and I want to commend you for that. And I think the intent that the comment was more based upon, the comment at least of 'you haven't done anything' type of comment was, it was true. Nothing had changed on the street. The comment was 'haven't done anything to fix the problem'. I believe this department, your department, have been working all along to try to come up with some resolution. So I don't think that was fair to say you hadn't done anything. Because I know for a fact, I've been working with you, the citizens have been working with you, the city has been working with the community, trying to find best ways to solve this problem. So I want to make sure that's clear, because I know you have their best interest at heart.

That said, (Tape Change) biggest concerns here, is we keep mixing apples and oranges. And the easiest way to present this is, if you're at home and you smell smoke, you grab the phone, you go outside, and you call the Fire Department. You don't wait until you see fire to call the Fire Department. You do it right away. Priestley Drive is what this keeps coming down to. It's not Priestley Drive. It's Quarry Park. It's a smaller section. Now it's kind of funny how everybody's been talking about Priestley Drive, this big huge road, and everything about the dynamics of it. It's a small community. A very small section of road. Very curvy. It goes up hill, down hill, changes all the way. The traffic study you quoted for 2004 actually states that there's a problem in the way the curves are on that street, and the size of the road at that point. The study points it right out from EHMT. In addition to that, I think there's some positive directions you've outlined here. The first couple of ones you spoke about. Very positive directions. I think that's the right way to go. We know one side of the street parking is a risk. It was the city itself who said, park on the roads. That's what the residents were told in 2004 out of that whole thing. They did that to try to slow traffic down. The risk is, by pushing them to one side we know there's a potential to be increase in speeds. In addition to the fact that my fire comment is, it is winter time. And there's my apples and oranges comment to be validated. You're looking at number of 4,000 in 2004 that was heading into Spring to Summer time. Whereas, these numbers are Winter. And there are only 700 cars difference per day. Therefore, the expectation of the smoke to fire is, when we hit Summer, it's going to be larger than 4,000 cars. And then the issue will have been too late. We have the fire problem. I do appreciate the city saying they're going to continue to monitor it. And I think that's the right way to go.

Mr. DeBolt: If I could address that specifically?

Mr. Baxter: Well, let me finish what my comments are here.

Mr. DeBolt: Sure. Sure.

Mr. Baxter: I do think the right answer is having police enforcement there. We have seen them there and they have done a great job. Our officers have been trying to, not just Priestley, Quarry Park, but I've seen them throughout the city. I think that's a great way to go, because the problem is city wide, not just Priestley or Quarry Park. So having the officers focusing there is a great idea. I'm still conflicted about the van issue. I really am. Because you know, on one hand, they'll be saying yea, it'll fix the problem. We'll get the people that are speeding and stop the problem. On the other hand, it's an invasion of privacy, and rights, and things like that that just bother me. With that, we'll still see where that goes. Okay?

Mr. DeBolt: We'll have discussion on that.

Mr. Baxter: One of the things that you stated in the second page. In the first sentence on the comments of Mrs. Guard. You said, "the majority who spoke were not in favor of the street closing." In essence, the majority of the people who spoke from Quarry Park were in the position of closing. Those who did not live in Quarry Park were against it. So let's be clear that we don't taint it that way. I am on the same side of that. I don't want to close the street either. I do think that we need to leave streets open for the safety factor. And I always have said, safety over convenience. And I think everybody here would agree with that. With that said, putting a sign there that says "No Left Hand Turn", or "Right Hand Turn", limiting traffic during rush hours would be a great help to that neighborhood. It doesn't close the street. It leaves it open for safety vehicles and for all other vehicles that for \_\_\_\_\_ or whatnot.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, now you're responding to his report.

Mr. Baxter: I am.

Mr. Hills: I'm not sure that was in that report.

Mr. Baxter: It is absolutely right here. I'm reading it.

Mr. Hills: The statement he made about Priestley Drive, the majority spoke against it, that may be true. Your statement of, you're talking about Quarry Park, you're the one who's saying apples and oranges.

Mr. Baxter: Yes.

Mr. Hills: You're bringing the apples and oranges on the table and talking.....

Mr. Baxter: I'm just commenting. ....Comments says most recently residents solicited that they had spoke at a Safety Committee meeting held on February, that the majority who spoke, are not in favor of street closings. The comment he had made during that was.....

Mr. Hills: That statement isn't incorrect. I mean, that is a correct statement. I think he went back and totaled the people. If the statement he made.....

Mr. Baxter: But his comment was that signs was closing the street during his meeting, during the meeting last time he spoke. And signs don't close the street. Signs are just a sign. It's to \_\_\_\_\_ vehicles.

Mr. Hills: I'll tell you what, finish going through this, because I think you're confusing an issue. He has made a report as to what Administration has researched, done, what their steps have been, and what their recommendations are. This is an Administrative function to deal with. But please go through the report. Because I'm so tired of hearing people say, he didn't let me talk. So finish the report.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate that President Hills. And considering that when the residents felt they couldn't get help, they came to Council. They're getting the help now. I see that. I've already given you credit for what you've done and I appreciate that. And I've said that right up front. And again, the last thing I spoke to you about was the fact that, the speeders. You had 30 already that were pulled over. That's when the Chief.....

Mr. DeBolt: They weren't all speeders. They were mainly stop signs.

Mr. Baxter: Mainly stop signs, which you said, right. And we showed already what we saw with the speeders. So in conclusion, my whole point to this is, I think you're almost there, is what I'm trying to get to. I think we almost have this problem solved. And if we could put a sign up to reduce the volume, which has always been the issue here, the volume, we could slow that volume down during the worst periods. And I thank you so much for your time and your peoples' time. And we look forward to working with the city and the Administration in the future to make this great neighborhood what it used to be - a great neighborhood. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions or comments for Mr. DeBolt? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to thank Steve for the job he's done. And this is not a recommendation to us, don't get it wrong. He can close the streets, and he can put the signs up, and he can put parking on one side of the streets, and that's it. It's my understanding that's what you plan on doing.

Mr. DeBolt: The parking ban; that's correct.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct. Alright. So he's told us what he's going to do. You're going to do it - do it. I don't want to hear no more about it. I mean, I think Council here has heard enough of it, to be honest with you. Let him do his job for six months, then come back and give us a report. I mean, I don't think it's fair for us to keep digging at you, and digging at you, when you're trying to do your job. Let him do his job. I think that's only fair. It's Administration's problem. We're not here to change it. Let us see what he does. Let's see how it works out and then come back and let us know. I know we can't please everybody. You can't please everybody on my street, or Bob's street, or anybody's street. We have problems all over town. You know that and we know it. So let him do his job and I think we've got the right approach. I think he's done a good job on it. Now do your job. That's the only way I look at it.

Mr. DeBolt: You can count on it. I just wanted to briefly respond to Mr. Baxter if I could, that the one option you mentioned with the signs, it wasn't ignored. It was looked into. We talked to the traffic engineers. It just wasn't a viable solution to what we're trying to accomplish with a determination.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake..

Mr. Baxter: Could I get that, a reason why that is? Not viable? Sometime off....not at Council?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. We can talk about it outside.

Mr. Hills: Okay fine. Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, President Hills. Mr. DeBolt, I don't think anybody in the Administration or anybody up here on Council doesn't feel for the residents of Quarry Park who live on Priestley Drive. You know, we've heard about this issue for a long time. And as a matter of fact, things have been done. Stop signs have been put up. Traffic has been reduced somewhat on that street. And speeds have been reduced according to the report you gave. And this is an Administrative responsibility. I don't know why Council would be dealing with this week, after week, after week, other than the fact that Mr. Baxter wants to keep bringing it up. We do have to prioritize our safety services and our safety personnel. To put a "No Left Turn" off of Dickens on to Priestley Drive, I mean, that would be a great sign to put up, but who's going to sit there and enforce that? I mean, you can talk about these pie-in-the-sky things..

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could. I think that's not the recommendation. I hear what you're saying, but I see Mr. Baxter \_\_\_\_\_. Let's try to respond.....

Mr. Stake: I know it's not the recommendation. I'm just trying to put things in perspective, President Hills.

Mr. Hills: And we've got apples and oranges over here trying to get in perspective. I appreciate what you're saying. The issue before us is the report.

Mr. Stake: President Hills, I've listened to Mr. Baxter time, and time, and time again, and I've kept my mouth shut for a long time. I'd like to at least have a few minutes to say a few words if I may. And I'll end it on this. I think as Mr. Clemens said, I think we need to give the Administration time to deal with it. It is in Other Legislation in the Safety Committee. It can be brought back if need be. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: I appreciate the comments. Any other comments?

Mr. Baxter: If I could, President Hills? I guarantee you less than one minute.

Mr. Hills: Extremely limited.

Mr. Baxter: You're being lenient. Thank you sir and I appreciate it.

Mr. Hills: I'm about, my patience is wearing on my leniency.

Mr. Baxter: And I just want to make sure that I understand the process clearly. When a resident, regardless where they live, comes to the Administration looking for service, and they don't feel they were getting it, they've been told to come to Council for help. That's why Mr. Stake, my residents in my Ward came here...

Mr. Stake: President Hills, are we getting into a debate?

Mr. Hills, with use of the gavel, replied, "No." And further stated: I'll stop that right now. Because I get in the middle of it - we didn't have stuff - and it couldn't go on - and I misquoted....go read the minutes. I made it very clear in the minutes. If somebody wants something on Council, the members must bring that to the committee. You can't just go boom, this is it. It was clear in the minutes.

And I've been accused of not letting people talk here, and not letting them talk there - that is absolutely not true. This is a good example of it. The Administration has brought a report to us tonight on Priestley Drive. They have come up with the recommendations there're going to be. They considered all of the data that was in front of them. They chose to put some in, and others not. We're not going to sit here and debate at, it wasn't going to go in. Because it was your decision to make. Mr. DeBolt, I thank you for the amount of time. Mayor, I thank you for the amount of time that's been spent on this. I also thank everyone on the Administration by saying, we haven't stopped, we're going to continue to monitor. That's the key thing that we have to do to continue to avoid issues and problems coming up within the city. Does anyone else have something to say to Mr. DeBolt's report? Not personal sides, but to his report.

Mr. Baxter: Just thank you, President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. DeBolt, we all thank you.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you.

-----

Mr. Hills announced there would be a Special Council meeting next week following committee meetings, concerning a Resolution of Services Available, for a property on East Broad Street.

-----

Clerk read motion. That the Council of the City of Reynoldsburg does hereby adopt the Resolution of Support Declaring April as "Fair Housing Month".- -Mr. Stearns moved adoption. Mr. Stake seconded. All voted "Aye". Motion passed.

Clerk read motion. That the Safety/Service Director be and is hereby authorized and directed to advertise for bids for the Taylor Road Sanitary Sewer Extension Phase 2 Project.- -Mr. Clemens moved adoption. Mrs. Newman seconded. All voted "Aye". Motion passed.

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 9-1-1 WIRELESS FUND, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE- -Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Safety Committee.

ORDINANCE ACCEPTING UNRECORDED GENERAL WARRANTY DEED FROM THE

KROGER CO., an Ohio corporation (0.180 ac., N.W. Corner of Taylor Rd. & E. Main St.)- -  
-Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Service Committee.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO THE GRAHAM ROAD, FROM PALMER ROAD SOUTH TO BRIDGE STORM WATER STUDY, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE- - -Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Service Committee.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE FRENCH RUN FOOTBRIDGE EROSION PROTECTION PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE- - -Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Service Committee.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE WIND RIVER DRIVE EROSION PROTECTION AT DYSAR DITCH; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE- - -Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Service Committee.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE GLENCREST STORM SEWER OUTLET AND DAWN DRIVE STORM SEWER PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE- - -Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Service Committee.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATING TO THE BARTLETT COURT STORM SEWER OUTLET PROJECT; AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFORE- - -Clerk read ordinance by title for the first reading. Item referred to Service Committee.

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF NOTES IN THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$900,000, IN ANTICIPATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS OF IMPROVING THE MUNICIPAL WATERWORKS SYSTEM BY REPLACING WATER LINES AND ACQUIRING ANY NECESSARY INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES THERETO, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- - -Clerk read Fiscal Officer's Certificate. Clerk read ordinance by title for the third time. Mr. Stake moved adoption. Mr. Joseph seconded. With the roll called, members voted: Mrs. Shirey "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Joseph "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 17-07 adopted.

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF BONDS IN THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$900,000, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS OF IMPROVING THE MUNICIPAL WATERWORKS SYSTEM BY REPLACING WATER LINES AND ACQUIRING ANY NECESSARY INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES THERETO, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- - -Clerk read Fiscal Officer's Certificate. Clerk read ordinance by title for the third time. Mr. Stake moved adoption. Mr. Clemens seconded. With the roll called,

members voted: Mrs. Shirey "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Joseph "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 18-07 adopted.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG AND FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE, CAPITAL CITY LODGE NO. 9 AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- - Clerk read ordinance by title for the one required reading. Mr. Stake moved adoption. Mrs. Shirey seconded. With the roll called, members voted: Mrs. Shirey "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Joseph "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 19-07 adopted.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE BROAD STREET 24" WATER MAIN AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- - Clerk read ordinance by title for the one required reading. Mr. Clemens moved adoption. Mr. Stearns seconded. With the roll called, members voted: Mrs. Shirey "Yea"; Mr. Stake "Yea"; Mr. Stearns "Yea"; Mr. Baxter "Yea"; Mr. Joseph "Yea"; Mr. Clemens "Yea"; Mrs. Newman "Yea". Motion passed; Ordinance No. 20-07 adopted.

Meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

---

William L. Hills, President of Council

---

Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Minutes compiled/S.Lyday, Ass't. Clk. Council)