

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2005

Members of Community Development Committee present: Lane J. Beougher, Antoinette Newman, Preston Stearns.

Other members of Council present: Brett Baxter, Eric Gilbert, Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Council President William L. Hills.

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

Mr. Beougher: The second item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the March 7, 2005 committee meeting. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

Item 3 is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or changes to tonight's agenda? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, it will stand as written.

Item number 4, Questions and Comments from the Visitors Bureau report. And Mary, would you like to entertain questions? Come on down. Are you fully recovered from the flu or whatever it was?

Mrs. Hudson: I think I still have a touch, but walking around.

Mr. Beougher: Alright. Well Mary did give a report three weeks ago I believe. And we put this on the agenda so that if anybody had any questions they could be asked at this time. Members of the Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I don't see many questions, Mary. Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: I have a question. Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Hi, Mary.

Mrs. Hudson: Hello, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: I noticed that, and you've been kind enough to provide us a detail of your expenses each year, and your income. And I know that a few years ago we changed the tax structure, or the amount that's provided to the Visitors Bureau from the bed taxes.

Mrs. Hudson: Correct. The percentage.

Mr. Stake: Yes. The percentage. And I was wondering if that was enough to sustain what you're doing.

Mrs. Hudson: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Has that worked out okay?

Mrs. Hudson: Yes. There's a lot of things, I think we're still, for the first year, well it was last, about maybe 13 months ago, when it first came into effect, and we've been very careful. Because for in the very beginning, I think for anyone that knows the history, when the bureau first started out, my salary was the same thing as the budget. So we've really had to struggle and work as hard as we could to make things happen the first, quite a few years. And a lot of times, there were things that we had other businesses that were taking care of things for us. Like other CVB's were doing postage. So we've kind of, you know, we didn't want to take everything as the revenue source started to increase, we did not want to just go out and start you know, doing more advertising and spending everything just because there was a better, you know, a more solid revenue source. So we've been slowly you know, taking over some of the things and doing a little more advertising. I don't know, I was going to remind everyone when I was here last time, I told you about the home town tour that we're doing. And we've been having spots on the radio. We've had a lot of input on 107.9. Advertising costs money. But it's just, it has really been wonderful in the community. And it's those kind of things we're slowly getting into just trying to make sure that we're doing our job but still being fiscally responsible with the flow that's coming in.

Mr. Stake: Sure. And I know that when you came before us previously, you said that you needed the additional money to do marketing and those kind of things. And I have seen some increased marketing. But I guess in the register report that you provided to us, it looks like there's a surplus being accumulated in your checking account.

Mrs. Hudson: As of today in our checking account, there's \$26,000. Now that's the first time that we've ever you know, had what you'd call surplus. But I just attended last week, there was a focus on tourism, a state focus. Tourism is a, it's a risky business. Gas prices going up, we could have three bad months and basically you know, be back to really, really, really having to watch it again. So I, you know, to some businesses that may look like that's a lot. I mean, you know, there's a lot of CVB's that take \$50,000 and put it in CD's. I mean, we're not doing that. We're also not going to rush out and spend it just so there's not something sitting there. But it's probably, it's the first time that we ever have had a carry over. There were many years when there were some bills that we'd have to say you know, can we pay you next month? Or can we give you a little bit now? There's some times we couldn't make payroll. So there is, I would say it's a cushion. And we could spend it. I mean, there's ways, there's a lot more advertising, a lot more things. There's some things with community activities that I'd like to do with Paul Walsh. We've talked about some opportunities. But we're still going to be very frugal with it sitting there. Because like I said, with the tourism, with the gas prices, we could have three bad months. Basically the summer season, 6 months starting with April through October, because most of ours is leisure travel. And that's when our bed receipts are the best. And if you know, the gas prices keep rising, now that could hit us. It could definitely effect what's coming in.

Mr. Stake: What do we have? Three hotels, motels right now?

Mrs. Hudson: Three. Right. The Days' Inn and Suites on Brice Road, Country Inn and Suites, and Fairfield and Suites.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And I'm sure it's a welcome relief to have a surplus in there rather than the way

you've, I know how you've operated in the past.

Mrs. Hudson: Yes, it is. But like I said, you know, we're in a position where we're being very careful. I mean, we're not, just because it's sitting there, we're not going to go out and spend it. Because we do realize that with tourism, with the way things are in the world right now and in the country, you just never know.

Mr. Stake: Things are tough all over.

Mrs. Hudson: Well you know that. Things are tough all over. Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. That's all I had. Mr. Beougher, thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Any one else with questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Well thank you, Councilman Beougher. I know we were talking outside earlier about the advertising and it made me start thinking, how are we tracking the advertising to find out how effective it is so that we can better utilize those dollars? I know you're thinking about that but it would be really nice for the Council to hear how we're tracking it and how we can determine how well it's working.

Mrs. Hudson: That's part of what this focus down at the state level was last week. Tourism, it's very hard to track. Especially, it's been even more difficult in the last couple of years since internet and e-mail has become so popular. Because there's so many requests now that we get through the internet. They ask us things. They'll ask something that's already on our web page, so they can just go to that. So you don't really know. There was a time when we used coupons. People would ask for information. We'd send out a coupon from one of the hotels you know, \$5 off. That was a way that we could track. But it's kind of, there's really pretty much the bed tax receipts is what it is. Whether they're going up or down. And that's seasonal for us because we're basically leisure travel. We do not have a huge facility at this time for conventions. When we had the Lenox Convention Center, we had the opportunity to bring it in. But at this point in time, we do not have that. So most of it is leisure travel which we still get a lot. We get a lot off of the, so much of our traffic comes in spring, summer, and fall with National Trails. I mean, we all know what they do in town. They bring a lot of revenue into the city. So we're trying to find, we really are trying to find a state wide way that we can really track. Because the Division of Travel and Tourism is under the Development Department with the State of Ohio. Travel and tourism is a part of economic development. So we know it brings money in but it's just very difficult to figure out how to track it. If you can think of a way...

Mr. Baxter: With a marketing background, I know we used to put codes on our marketing and then ask the people who would receive those. Such as the hotels, to then mark that down for us and keep that information for us that we could get a feeling for how well our advertising was working. Same thing that you were talking about what the advertisement of the school plays. You know, it was sold out as you told me.

Mrs. Hudson: Right.

Mr. Baxter: So with that being a direct result of advertising, to me that shows an effectiveness. So that would be one of the ways I would suggest is with marketing, is to key code your advertisements and ask the three establishments to track them for us.

Mrs. Hudson: Well there's one big show that we do every year. It's the Heartland Travel Show Case. When we do that we have _____ from all over the country. And when we do that, we actually have a way that we you know, we send out post cards and everyone that, you know we get the people don't call us afterwards. How did you hear about this? Where did you find out about it? So we actually always track Heartland, but it's a bigger thing and it's more you know, it's kind of confined. It's different than a leisure traveler that comes through. But we're always working on that because you want to know what's working and what's not working.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you.

Mrs. Hudson: You're welcome.

Mr. Beougher: Mary, one thing that's not in the packet is Greg's tracking of the web site hits. And one interesting thing that happened is, the Columbus Smoking Ban came into effect was, the restaurant page hits equaled the home page hits. And that has never happened before.

Mrs. Hudson: Reynoldsburg looked very well. Yes.

Mr. Beougher: It's interesting.

Mrs. Hudson: The restaurant _____ in town are not frowning.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions from members of Council? (No response). Thank you very much, Mary. Tony, do you have something?

Mrs. Newman: Well, I did have a question. I notice that the Visitors Bureau deals with the people in a business way. For example, Mr. McTeague, he's on the board. And then we've got insurance from him as well as the gentleman from PC Geek's. Is there some conflict there in any way?

Mrs. Hudson: No. We discussed that with the Auditor's. Because you know, the state, and then we also had you know, contacted Council that we would be audited. And there's no conflict. As a matter of fact, that's most, a lot of the boards on the CVB's, that's where you get either the hospitality people, or that's where you get a lot of them.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Thank you.

Mrs. Hudson: And it adds expertise to our board.

Mr. Beougher: And Mary, correct me if I'm wrong but, aren't Bill and Greg the Chamber representatives?

Mrs. Hudson: Yes. Greg is now. Bill was previously when he was on the board. And he is no longer, I mean, he still represents. But Greg is the official Chamber representative on the board.

Mr. Beougher: And do they have just one? Or do they have two representatives?

Mrs. Hudson: Just one, I mean almost everyone on our board belongs to the, are Chamber members.

Mr. Beougher: Right. Okay.

Mrs. Hudson: But Greg is you know, basically he's named as the liaison, and we wanted to make sure that the information goes back and forth.

Mr. Beougher: Alright. Thank you. Any other question? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Mary, you mentioned the partnership between the tourist and the State Department of Development. Can you elaborate on that a little bit as far as how they partner up?

Mrs. Hudson: Well, like I said, the Division of Travel and Tourism is under the State Development Department. And Bruce Johnson, who we all used to know as a State Representative, heads up the Development Department. And they just, tourism is part of economic development so we're always working with the Development Department trying to get more dollars into tourism for the state. It's strange when people talk about destination and the states. I met with one of the candidates for Governor and said, you know I don't, we need to work to make Ohio a destination state. Ohio is number 6 in the country that brings in tourists. And yet we're like, almost at the bottom rung in the money that we put into it state wide. So it's just working with the legislators and working with the Department of Development and the Governor's Office to bring more money in so it's not left, you know, I can only do regional and you know, state wide. But we need the really, we need the big bucks to really go out and hit everyone in the country and let them know what Ohio has to offer.

Mr. Gilbert: Your report to us indicated you were looking at some additional marketing with some of the funds that you have.

Mrs. Hudson: Right. We're trying to do a lot co-op. Years ago, people that were on the board, know that we really didn't work a lot with Columbus. Columbus was kind of an island in and to itself. And that's how we ended up at one time, forming our Central Ohio Heritage Circle. Because we felt like they were protecting their turf and all the communities around the outer belt were kind of floating on our own. We knew that we needed to get together because our marketing dollars if we pulled them, would be much more effective. Well Columbus has really, they've got new leadership now. Paul Asterford is the Executive Director of the President and CEO of Experience Columbus. He comes from Chicago. He's marvelous. He believes in regional, you all work together. We've formed a couple of more co-op's and marketing co-op's through that.

And he is just really wonderful. And it's the same type of thing. We've got a lot of, I've got a lot of energy. I'm still a one man office. I've got a lot of energy and a lot of ideas, but we don't necessarily have a lot of money. So it's not a percentage. Which you know, you pay to play but you pay percentage wise. But as long as you're a hard worker and a member of the consortium, then you get all the benefits. Columbus, that has been wonderful, marketing the Columbus area regionally.

Mr. Gilbert: Right. I would just ask, maybe if you could build on that at the local level as far as the partnering with the Development Department. And I know you're separate. You have a separate means of revenue through the hotel tax.

Mrs. Hudson: Correct.

Mr. Gilbert: But I know in our General Fund, our general budget for the city, we eliminated about \$7900 in advertising for promotion of business opportunities with the first phase of the Streetscape from the Development Department. And if there's any opportunity for you to meet with Mr. Brandt maybe to look at partnering up to maybe bring that back to life, I would like to know if there's any concepts or ideas that you might be able to...

Mrs. Hudson: Absolutely. And there are, I mean if you look at the Ohio Revised Code where the Visitor Bureau's are set up, there's certain things you're supposed to spend your money on. And marketing, and helping with John, and I think we have done things in the past. So I would be happy to sit down with John and talk about things we could do together.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Mary, how does the City of Reynoldsburg compare with the bed tax as with the City of Columbus? Is it about the same or is there any difference to it at all?

Mrs. Hudson: To the City of Columbus?

Mr. Stearns: Yes.

Mrs. Hudson: The City of Columbus is I think, close to a million dollars.

Mr. Stearns: I mean as far as individual percentage wise, as far as, I guess what I'm saying is, per room. Do you have that statistic at all?

Mrs. Hudson: You mean occupancy, or a percentage of bed tax?

Mr. Stearns: Yes.

Mrs. Hudson: The bed tax?

Mr. Stearns: The percentage of the bed tax.

Mrs. Hudson: Well they have a 6% bed tax. But then they also, at one point in time, there were articles in the paper, I'm sure some of you saw this, where we were rivaled in New York and Columbus for the bed tax. Because they hook on something for the Convention Center, they hook on things for the taxi's for different things. So their bed tax is much higher than ours. At this point in time, we have a 4% bed tax here in Reynoldsburg. And we are the lowest in Franklin County. And we have, I know it's come before you before where people have thought about raising the bed tax. The standard around the outer belt is 6%. And we are still sitting at 4%.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. Hudson: You're welcome.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stearns. Any other questions from members of Council? (No response). Thank you very much, Mary.

Mrs. Hudson: Thank you. If I might make a comment, I would like to invite all of you, we have our home town tour. It's going on. We've got all the spots on the radio. And we are promenading it on Friday this week. The 25th. From 6 until 10 at the Hickory House. And 107.9 radio will be there with Hunter and Hagar. And at 9:00 we will be naming a home town hero which is a surprise. But that will kind of finish it off. So if you're up early and want to have coffee, and I don't think we're having ribs. I couldn't talk them into that but probably just a continental breakfast. So if you're up, come on out and join us. We'd appreciate it.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mrs. Hudson: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Item number 5 is the Acceptance of recorded Quit Claim Deed for .295 acres. Mr. Underwood, would you like to introduce this piece to us?

Mr. Underwood: Well, this is finishing off something we started a couple of years ago with the CV Perry development when we traded some land that was on our side of the creek which belonged to them. And we had some land on the other side of the creek and we swapped it. The creek at some point in time had changed course. And part of our park ended up with them, and part of their land ended up with us, and so we swapped it. And then Mr. Perry passed away, then his son passed away, and so this is just finishing up something we started some time ago.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And this comes from Stapleton. So everything looks fine and you want it to pass as a rule suspension on the first reading? Is that correct?

Mr. Underwood: That would be good. I mean it's a done deal. If you want to keep it around for 6 weeks, that's fine too.

Mr. Beougher: I don't know that there's any reason to do that. Is there any resistance to passing it

through as a rule suspension? I mean, it's basically accepting a deed that Mr. Underwood says is a done deal. Any resistance from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Does anybody have any questions? (No response). Members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. I see no reason not to move it along quickly and get it out of our hair, for those of us who have hair. So I would make a motion to send it forward to next Monday's meeting on the 28th for first reading with recommendation from the committee for a rule suspension and adoption. Is there a second? Mrs. Newman with the second. All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item number 6, ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO EXECUTE LICENSE AGREEMENT WITH REYNOLDSBURG CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT REGARDING ACCESS ACROSS CITY PARKLAND. This item had its first reading on the 14th and there has since been some acceleration put on it. There's some interest in getting this done so the schools can bid the project and open the school in August before the kids are ready to come back. So Mr. Underwood, do you want to talk about this or do we want to just go to the attorney's for the school district. I believe Greg Baker is here to represent the school district.

Mr. Baker: Hi. My name is Greg Baker. I'm an attorney with the law firm of Schottenstein, Zox and Dunn and we represent the Reynoldsburg City School District. This project dates actually to last March when the city and the school district met to discuss the Waggoner Road school. Which as you've said, we intend to open in August. At the meeting, it was agreed that emergency access would be provided to the school site in accordance with ODOT specifications. Throughout the course of this project, people have used different terms to describe this access. Secondary access, alternative access. But what it is, it's emergency access only. Emergency vehicular access. Pedestrians are allowed. Bicycles. I think it'll actually link up into your bike path. No parents driving through to drop their kids off to school. We included this access at the request of the city. We wanted to have a plan in case there needed to be some sort of emergency evacuation of the school. So it wasn't required by our code but we agreed with you and we wanted to do it for the safety of the children and the employees. After we met last March, we put together an easement agreement that very day, and we distributed it to the city for review. Mr. Paul Walsh of the Parks and Recreation Department, it was sort of within his province. Because this emergency access crosses through parkland that's owned by the city. So that was appropriate. Interestingly, anything that we wanted to do within that area was subject to review and approval of The Limited. Because they had put deed restrictions on that property before they deeded it to you. And also, AEP had a 100 foot wide easement. So anything that we did also had to be subject to their scrutiny. In late winter, or actually during the course of the winter, we were able to pinpoint with Paul Walsh and our consultant, EMH&T, who is also your consultant, exact location of the access drive. And then we had to coordinate that with AEP and The Limited as well. AEP's concerns about the access, they don't want anything to be too close to the wires overhead. So they always impose restrictions for safety purposes. After the winter, the city, or actually during late winter, the city solicited the input of the neighbors who abutted where this access _____. And the city came back to us with some suggestions. In particular, they wanted to have this second emergency access lit. Interestingly, when we first started negotiating with AEP and The Limited, they both specifically said, we do not want this lit. AEP's concern was, they don't want

lighting that could potentially reduce the span between people on the path and overhead lights. And The Limited, it was just part of their deed restrictions. So when the city came back to us and said, the neighbors want it lit, we were amenable to it, and we went back to AEP and The Limited, and they have reservations about it. But I think we could sell them on it. However, the city subsequently dropped that requirement. So we are pleased that that took place. However, they did want a couple of other things which we are also open to doing. One of which was, having a more detailed landscaping plan. Because where this emergency access ties into the park, there is some landscaping that is existing there that was going to be really removed and we were going to replace it. And then the city had also requested that we plant some trees within the AEP easement to serve as a buffer between this path and the residences. And the school district was again amenable to changing the landscape plan, and planting trees. But having gone through the process of trying to revise this with The Limited and AEP, we knew that AEP would have reservations about planting trees within the easement. It's customary language in these easements that to the extent there are, trees are vegetation, they routinely trim them. And as a safety concern with kids passing through there, I don't know if you want trees planted in an easement, which if you planted trees, it could be a safety issue. But we were amenable to that. So now it brings us to about 6 months before the school is slated to open and it's really crunch time. Everyone has agreed upon the core terms of the emergency access. We have to wrap up finalizing the landscaping plan. And this license agreement as drafted, it specifically provides that our final plans and specifications are subject to the review and approval of the city. And we do have to go back to AEP and The Limited as well and share those with them. So tonight, what we would like you to recommend to Council is to authorize the approval of the city entering into this license agreement on an emergency basis. This is our time line in a nut shell. We can get our engineering plans finalized for the end of March. EMH&T is helping us do that. In April, we would start the bidding process. Prepare bid specs, publish, 4 weeks. That's April. May, we would have to review and award bids and then obtain school board approval. That would give us about 2 months to start our construction and complete it. Assuming that the weather is conducive, we think we could do it before the school opens in August. If you have any questions, I'm happy to field them.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Baker. Are there any questions for Mr. Baker from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher, just to help clarify for some that may not be aware because, Mr. Underwood and I sat in the meeting a year ago when the Mayor was having his surgery and there were two things talked about with the school. One was that if you touched Harvest Moon, you would have access to Harvest Moon. And the second thing was, it would be an emergency access, we would attempt to work emergency access through the parkland. I'm glad you gave me the update on everything that's happened since then. Because one of the questions I had was why we took the scenic route? But that was one of the things that obviously, you have it appears, jumped through every hoop possible. And I guess I want to just clarify, you as an attorney for the school district, the school was paying all of these costs.

Mr. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Hills: And the sad part of that is, I guess whether they be constituents of the city paying city

taxes or paying to the school, it's all the same pot that's going to pay these costs. And if it's taken a year to get here, I'm not a real advocate as you know Mr. Stearns, of emergency legislation. But Mr. Baker, I'd say that everybody's got probably all, if not more, costs that need to be in this thing. And I certainly would be supportive of getting this out of here. Because I'm not sure that I can understand why we've done what we've done to get this far to you.

Mr. Baker: You're right.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Hills. Any other questions?

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to say that I agree with Mr. Hills. And I think we should move this along.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: (Inaudible). My questions go back to, what is it you're asking to get done? Is it including the changes to the, what is it here, the landscaping plan, and with that approved? Or is it before, are you asking us to approve it before we know what that is?

Mr. Beougher: As I understand it, all we're granting is the license to cross the property. And administration is working out the details on the landscaping. And the idea about the landscaping is that whatever was removed will be put back. And at some point in the meeting with the residents, there was the thought that, well if we take out a tree here, maybe we can put it back here, and screen the view of the school. And obviously the neighbors are not happy that there's a two story school in their back yard. But you know, that is what it is.

Mr. Baker: You're right. The answer to your question is, tonight we just want the Council to authorize an emergency legislation authorizing the city to enter into the license. The license agreement specifically provides that the final plans and specs, which will include the landscaping plan that you're asking about, are subject to the city's approval. I think the concerns of the neighbors may have been a function of the mis-communications that have gone along with how this is called an access road. Kids are going to be walking on it. There will be bikes on it. It meanders so it's not conducive to vehicular traffic. It's 12 feet wide. It was designed at significant cost to support a fire truck in the event of an emergency. And that's where we incurred a lot of cost. And the cost to build it is going to be great.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I have no problems moving it on as an emergency. My only problem is, it's an emergency access road and I have not yet figured why it's considered secondary access road.

Mr. Baker: I'm sorry?

Mr. Clemens: It's an emergency access road. That's what we wanted. And I see it's called a secondary access. Which it shouldn't be really.

Mr. Baker: I'm not sure what you're looking at but the intent behind this is emergency access only. Emergency vehicles, fire trucks. There are bollards blocking each end that will have locks on them that are removable by city maintenance crews or a fire truck _____ drive through, it can _____ them over. But if you want me to change any word that says secondary or alternative access, _____ change it to emergency because that's the intent.

Mr. Clemens: I think that's what it should be. That's what it is.

Mr. Baker: It is.

Mr. Clemens: That way, it doesn't give the wrong impression on what it is.

Mr. Beougher: It does say secondary access in the agreement.

Mr. Baker: I'm happy to change it.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And I think the drawings also say secondary access. And I know Mr. Underwood had marked those up and identified that.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher, you could be amending that tonight if you _____ move forward.

Mr. Beougher: I was going to say, we could, everywhere it says secondary, change it to emergency and pass it tonight. And that's the intent is to send it forward to tonight's special meeting and allow the schools to proceed. Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, thank you Mr. Beougher. I really need a better clarification as to really why it took so long to get here and why we have to run it through now as an emergency. Could you explain it one more time for me?

Mr. Baker: Sure. We met last March. The same day, I turned around the draft of the document. Thereafter, we had to work with The Limited. We had to work with AEP. We had to get a field survey of the property. We had to make sure that everyone was okay with the location. There were different _____ of where it would be. You know, it was a straight shot at one point. And then it was recommended that it meander through the park. After we had finally agreed on the location, that allowed us to go to the next step which was preparing engineering plans and specifications. And then once we prepared those, we had to submit them to AEP. For instance, we wanted a grading change. We needed a slight grading change of less than 2 feet. AEP had extreme reservations about changing the grade whatsoever. For the same safety concerns expressed. So doing that required, that took time. AEP, their review process isn't always short. Because they're just as busy as we all are. I had to go through The Limited as well. And they're busy. Another reason why things changed is, initially when we had met with the city, they specifically said that an easement agreement would be appropriate, but then it was determined that they wanted a license agreement instead because that was revokable. So we revised it to turn it into a license agreement. And that was fine. And then once we turned it into a license

agreement, we had to go back to AEP and The Limited again. And then later on, the city wanted some other changes, which were fine again. For instance, if this license agreement ever terminated, the city wanted us to remove the second, the emergency access. And we were fine with that concept. But that required a change to the license agreement. We had to go back to AEP. We had to go back to The Limited. And then on the same token, when it was brought to our attention that the city wanted lighting, I went to The Limited and said, they want lighting. I went to AEP and said they want lighting. AEP and The Limited both said, well we initially granted you this right specifically on the condition that you wouldn't have lighting. So we had to, we worked with AEP. EMH&T met with AEP and got them to agree to it. That was great. The Limited, we got to agree to it. And then it was determined that the lighting wasn't needed. So then we went back to AEP and The Limited and of course, they're okay with it. So we've been cooperating the whole time and it just took time. There are changes. Some of them are natural changes. All of which we've been very amenable to making. Because the purpose of this is to provide emergency access for the school. So that's sort of it in a nut shell.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stearns. Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. So you've done everything you could working with all the entities you had to work with in the meantime for about a year trying to get this worked out. The school is going to open in August. You want to get this out for bid and get this done prior to the school opening and that really is the reason for the emergency at this point. Correct?

Mr. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions, comments, concerns? (No response). Okay. Mr. Baker, let me ask you a question. Would it suffice for us to just simply make the amendment that wherever it says secondary in the agreement, or secondary access in the agreement, you'll change it to emergency access?

Mr. Baker: Absolutely.

Mr. Beougher: And Nancy, can we, do we need to make any changes to the ordinance to make that happen?

Mrs. Frazier: Just to add emergency language.

Mr. Beougher: We can add emergency language. But as far as amending...

Mrs. Frazier: No. Because it just references.

Mr. Beougher: We're not amending the ordinance, we're amending the agreement? Do we need to add a section...

Mrs. Frazier: You can amend it as redrafted today and then include, which refers to that language in the motion that you're making here, and then to include emergency language. That's all you have to do.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Okay. And before we send this forward, I need to make a disclosure. I live in this neighborhood. My son's in 5th grade. He'll be walking on this emergency access to school next year. So I'm not getting any financial benefit out of it other than he doesn't have to ride the bus. Okay. Having said that, I would move to send this forward to tonight's special Council Meeting with the agreement amended to replace the words "secondary access" with "emergency access" and adding emergency language with a recommendation from the committee for passage as an emergency. Did I get everything in? Is there a second? Mrs. Newman with the second. All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). All opposed? (No response). Motion carries. We will hear this at the special Council meeting tonight.

Mr. Baker: Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Beougher: And with that, we will adjourn Community Development at 8:07.

Community Development Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

March 21, 2005

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2005

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

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 8:08.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the March 7, 2005 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

Mr. Beougher: Sorry, Mr. Clemens. We can't hear you over here. The microphone seems to be muffled or something.

Mr. Clemens: Is it muffled?

Mr. Baxter: It's the same thing with him too. His is muffled too.

Mr. Clemens: I know that speaker works. Can you hear me now? Is it still muffled? Can we do it without it?

Mrs. Newman: It sounds better without it.

Mr. Baxter: It's no better either way. There's a problem with the speaker or microphone.

Mr. Clemens: The next item is, Mayor McPherson asked to give a report on the in-car computers. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Clemens. Mel and I were talking last week about the status of the in-car computers. And we agreed that it would probably be nice to just bring Council up to date on where we are. January 19 of this year, the dispatchers and clerks began using the new system. We used them the months of December and part of January for training. We used that initially as a transition phase so that the glitches in the system could be worked out prior to phasing it into the cruisers themselves. We had extensive hands on training with all of the Officers and Sergeant's throughout the month of February to prepare them for the transition of the computers to go into the in-cars. These were installed in the cruisers at the end of February and the beginning of January. So everything at this point is still relatively new. Still working out a lot of the bugs in the laptops and the cruisers. The Sergeant's and the Officers have been using these since about March 14. The transition phase is expected to last through the end of March and the beginning of April. As with any new system, we have incurred some minor glitches with the system which are being addressed. Same as you have with your computer at home. You know, every once in a while you get a flash or something and you've got to re-boot everything. And just some minor things that we're working through. I think that in talking to several of the Officers, that they're already beginning to see the benefits of the in-car computers. Especially with the various reports that they have to turn in. And one of the primary things we've talked about was the function of being able to get record checks from the vehicles. So we will be continuing with this training. It still will be a learning curve for probably the next two or three months. And once it's all integrated and working 100%, I'll try to come back and let everybody know that it is. But everything is going according to schedule. And as I say, it's a new computerized record maintenance system as well as all the records checks and all. And once it's fully implemented and working at 100%, it's going to be a tremendous advantage for Officers to have in the cruisers. I will try and answer any questions that I can, but that's pretty much a summary of where we are. We're still in the training phase and learning phase.

Mr. Clemens: Mayor, is this working now? Still bad?

Mayor McPherson: They're all fuzzy tonight. Every one of them. When you talk it's kind of muddled.

Mr. Baxter: That one is too.

Mr. Clemens: Mayor, how many presently do we have installed? Do you know?

Mayor McPherson: I think we have 12 units. Is that correct?

Lt. Nuesse: Eight of them I believe are installed at this time. We have 12.

Mayor McPherson: Eight in the cruisers at this time.

Mr. Clemens: Are we still going to install one of the vehicles, we were talking about installing one in the Truro Township? (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: One of our laptops?

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I think we have (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: I don't recall that. I'm not sure.

Mr. Clemens: I don't understand a lot. Do they have to take these out at night? Do they interchange? Or do they leave them in the cruisers all the time?

Mayor McPherson: Leave them in. They're mounted. Now they can be taken out. They'll be taken out for repair and things like that.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Well thank you, Mr. Clemens. My question is, if a cruiser goes down, and say already another one is ready to go and it doesn't have one in there, could it be _____ real quickly to go into another cruiser just in case?

Mayor McPherson: Well, yeah. They're on mounts that they can be taken out. They're just not taken out each night. But you know, if you have to get it out for repair or replacement, yeah. It comes right out.

Mr. Stearns: You can interchange it with another if you need to.

Mayor McPherson: You can take them out and interchange them and put new ones in.

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Clemens. Mayor, I know...

Mayor McPherson: That's a technical question. I don't know.

Mr. Baxter: It's not technical. It's more over how you're using the system. It was real good to

hear that they actually are beginning to use this system. Because I was one of the real proponents of this. I thought it would be very valuable. I know we had a cellular connection that we were also part of this. And we were looking at those types of activities. Have we initiated that part of the in-car computers? Were they able to use the cellular features? You had said that they were doing checks already so...

Mayor McPherson: Well, they're all connected cellularly. Yeah. And that has been one of the problems by the way. We have a couple areas, maybe three, I'm not sure, that we're having trouble receiving the cellular signals. And those are some of the things that we're still trying to work out. So the answer to your question is, yes. The cellular part of it is a part of what we're using right now.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And do you have anybody working with you from a firm? Are the original people we bought it from or whatnot, helping us get through these now that we're at this late stage?

Mayor McPherson: The training, they have provided all the training. And any time we need any information, they're there. They want to see this be a success as we do.

Mr. Baxter: So you're happy with this service is what you're saying? Okay. You're happy with your service I think I heard.

Mayor McPherson: At this point, I have not heard one complaint about the service from anybody.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. I see Sharon in the back...

Mayor McPherson: And they were especially appreciative of the training that the company has provided.

Mr. Baxter: Very good.

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: If I could just add on. Sorry, Mayor. One of the things that I think we shouldn't overlook with this new technology is the capability that we are using for our what we call, OIBRS, which is Ohio Incident Base Reporting System. And in case you're not aware, the Office of Criminal Justice Services through the federal grant program, formally called Byrne, and Byrne Memorial Funds, the local law enforcement block grant, etc. Those have been merged together in Washington. And it is going to be far more difficult to obtain that funding. Which we get a lot of for various projects. It will be a lot more difficult to obtain if we do not go on the OIBRS system. And OIBRS as compared to UCR, the Uniform Crime Reports, is it provides far more data. There are far more fields in that data collection system than there are in UCR. And that's what the federal government wants. And so they're really holding our states, throughout the country, really holding our feet to the fire to give them the kind of information that they're looking for. Presently with UCR, we're only looking at the highest crime which is reported. So if there's a rape and a murder, the murder is what they take into their system. With the OIBRS system, the

rape, the murder, the robbery, and everything that goes with it is reported so that they can get better crime stats. So it's very important as we move on to using our in-car computers, that we also have this OIBRS system in place.

Mr. Baxter: Sharon, while you're still up there, if I could ask you one more question. Since you did bring that topic up, one of the things we spoke about back during the initiation of this project was the ability for us in the police cars to call back let's say, license plate tag, and have more information other than what was known to Reynoldsburg. Today, is that what's happening? Or are only our records stored in these data bases that they're getting information from?

Mrs. Reichard: I would have to yield to Lt. Nuesse for that information.

Lt. Nuesse: We are able to get LEADS information rather than just our local information. So yes, that is part of it at this time.

Mr. Baxter: Is that just statewide or just...

Lt. Nuesse: That is statewide as well as national information that we can access.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions (inaudible)? Thank you, Bob.

The next item on the agenda, we had asked Mr. Brandt if he would have a representative from the OPWC here this evening and I want to thank John, Mr. Brandt.

Mr. Brandt: You said this sounds fuzzy tonight. So, I'm fuzzy. Good evening members of Council, committee. The question came up from a number of members recently with respect to our Main Street Project and possible changes in that project with inasmuch as there was concerns over overall funding issues relative to other projects in the city. Just to give you a brief recap, when the city applied for the funding, we asked for basically, from Rosehill Road to the front of City Hall, or between Rosehill and prior to the bridge out here, our application was one of the highest scoring ones in that round. And I believe that might have been (Tape Change) around 18. Thank you. We were awarded 1.9 million and change as well as 650,000 in grant money. The grant obviously, is money to be used in the project and hence, does not incur any additional cost or repayment by the city. The loan obviously, as it implies, a loan. And that 1.9 million would be repaid over the course of 16 years, is the term. One thing, and I didn't see all these documents until about a week ago myself, but Mr. Mascari told me this evening, which is a favorable thing to the project, is that this is interest free. So I think if possibly we're not interested, I might sign up for it because if I could get 1.9 interest free, it might be worth all of us taking a part of it for 16 years. There were questions as to if we did half, if we did one side of the street versus the other side of the street, and so on. So I asked Mr. Mascari, he's the District Representative for the Ohio Public Works Commission, which provides the funding, and the bill payment goes through his office and he coordinates that, to give us an overview of some of these thoughts from his perspective and what it could entail, or what it would entail if in fact there were changes requested

or made in the current application for this project. And as well, what it may, what impact it may have in the event that it's decided not to carry forward with this project for future funding opportunities through the Ohio Public Works Commission. As you know, it goes through the district committee. I think it is District 3 and that's currently headed by the Franklin County Engineer. Lou.

Mr. Mascari: I'm Lou Mascari. I'm with the Ohio Public Works Commission. The Public Works Commission is the state agency that provides grants and loans to local governments around the state for infrastructure improvements. John mentioned that the _____ 18 funding, which was approved in July of 2004 included your Commercial Corridor Phase II Project. The project that we received was approximately a 5 million dollar project that included \$652,000 grant, a 1.9 million dollar, zero interest loan. The balance was local funding. The scope of the project I'm hearing, may be considered for revision by the city. Mr. Brandt called me and asked me to attend and try to answer any questions that you might have regarding Public Works Commission response and role in the event you make, or consider making significant changes. So with that, I'll try to answer any questions that you might have.

(Mr. Clemens called on Mr. Stake)

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Sir, you mentioned that the project that we applied for was 5 million dollars. Now we're looking at 10 million dollars. I don't know if anybody's explained that to you but that's one of the reasons why we're looking at revising the project. So I just wanted to make you aware that we're looking at our cost of being around 10 million right now. I don't know if that had any effect on it at all.

Mr. Mascari: Well I don't know what the revisions are. Our agreement, the contract between the state and the city is project scope specific. We have an agreement with you to help reconstruct Main Street from Rosehill to Blacklick Creek. Street reconstruction, sidewalks, curb, storm drainage, street lighting, three intersection signalizations, and the cost of some of the design. That's the project. If you add onto that....

Mr. Stake: I don't believe, I don't know if we were adding onto it, I thought we were, the price has gone up since we estimated this when it was submitted to you.

Mrs. Newman: I think we added 800 feet, didn't we?

Mayor McPherson: I think the major part of the increase has been an increase in cost. Not in the scope. The cost of the project has escalated over and above what we originally (inaudible). So the 5 million dollar project scope is the same cost (inaudible).

Mr. Stake: And that's our dilemma.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I thought we added 800 feet, 800 linear feet to the scope of this project.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible)...misunderstanding somewhere...

Mayor McPherson: That was for, there's been a misunderstanding on how it was (inaudible).

Basically, that 2.4 million is for the 40% lineal additional feet on Phase II opposed to Phase I. We are not going across the creek, and that is not going to be a part of the project. We didn't add anything to that (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mrs. Newman: In reading the contract, Section 6g would allow us to apply for a supplemental assistance from Ohio Public Works Commission if our cost had gone up due to something beyond our control. And I don't know whether, have they applied for an increase or supplemental increase in this?

Mr. Mascari: As far as I know, the city hasn't requested supplemental funding. I wouldn't be the first stop along that process.

Mrs. Newman: But it would be possible under these circumstances.

Mr. Mascari: It's your prerogative to ask.

Mrs. Newman: Well, has anybody asked?

Mayor McPherson: No one's asked.

Mrs. Newman: Well, why not? If the cost has doubled? Projected cost.

Mayor McPherson: It depends on how much supplemental (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mrs. Newman: As much as we can get.

Mr. Hills: I think the Mayor clarified it but I'm wondering about everybody. Mr. Mascari answered some of our questions tonight, if the project went to Blacklick Creek. Some of the presentations we've had recently show an extension 500 feet this way, 800 feet that way. Some additional. Because the 4200 linear feet, differs between Phase I and Phase II.

Mrs. Newman: 4400.

Mr. Hills: Whatever, 44, but then the linear difference is 200 feet of Main Street. So Phase II is a little bigger project. Those are some things that need to be clarified from the report that we've received. I'm sure that the Mayor and Sharon will have all those answers in a little bit. But bottom line, the project as originally applied to you is from Rosehill to Blacklick Creek.

Mr. Mascari: Yes.

Mr. Hills: That's what these were based on.

Mr. Mascari: Yes. Those were determined of the application we received which we used to generate the project agreement, which is another way of saying the contract between us and the city.

Mr. Baxter: Yes. I would like to know what is the result if we decide not to go forward, how is that looked upon the city in the future? This contract, say we're unable to go forward the 10 million dollar project. If we decide to reduce the scope. So there's two questions in that. One, if we decide not to at all. Or two, if we decide to reduce the scope as given in the contract, what are our options? And how do those effect the city?

Mr. Mascari: To answer the first part regarding your voluntarily withdrawing the project so that OPWC does not participate. If you were to do that, the money that's been earmarked, the grant loan funds currently earmarked, would return to the District 3 pot and be used for other projects waiting in the wings. And they are waiting. We always have a contingency list because we always have more applications than money available. Second, we don't hold grudges. There wouldn't be any hard feelings if your decision today is different than it was a year and a half ago. That's your business. We welcome you to apply in a future funding round and then go from there.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, very much.

Mr. Mascari: Regarding your other question, there's a process should you decide to significantly reduce the scope of the project. It would require your returning to the District 3 committee with your revisions and have that body again review, evaluate, and score your application. It would be required that you score well enough to receive funding. And that's unpredictable right now. I haven't seen what the changes are and of course, the evaluation would have to take place. There's some risk in that. But there is a process if you want to follow that option.

Mr. Baxter: Just a follow up question if I could. So the risk you're talking about is the potential that we score less than other people that are asking for the same funds. We could lose it entirely and go to those same funds almost as if we elect not to do it at all. That's the risk.

Mr. Mascari: Yes. You could lose it all. This project, when it was originally submitted, competed against some 40 or 50 other applications. And it was, as Mr. Brandt said, very strong. It was the top ranked project coming out of that funding. And it was top ranked because of the scope, the length, the cost, the number of commercial interests effected, the new businesses expected to come in and because of it, all of these variables earned you a boat load of points. If you reduce the scope by half, all of those variables change. That's why we require you to go back and go through the processing.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. And thank you for coming down and talking to us. It's been very informative. The start date for construction on the contract is March 1. And we have to start within 30 days of that. Obviously, we're running up against that wall. What do we need to do in order to request an extension? I assume, Mr. Brandt, could you?

Mr. Brandt: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Beougher: And does that buy us time until, when? What was the date on that, John?

Mr. Brandt: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Beougher: And that's the June date that we keep hearing? Okay. That wasn't reflected in the contract. I was a little confused as to how that had occurred. So, thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions?

Mr. Brandt: If we could, if there is a decision made to modify change, alter the current scope, the last public meeting that would be held of the District 3 Committee is May 6. So any paper work or applications, once a decision is made, must be submitted to Wilma Yoder at MORPC for the District 3 Committee meeting which is on the May 6.

Mr. Clemens said the costs had almost doubled. He said he thought a lot of questions had been answered, and thanked Mr. Mascari for attending.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, could I just ask one more question?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Sir, and you made me think of this, are we under a time constraint on completing this scope of this project? I know we're on a time constraint to begin it, but and for completion.

Mr. Mascari: The start for us at the Public Works, the start date is more critical. And we have received the city's letter requesting the extension to start in June. That's acceptable to us. In fact, that's at this point, a minor issue for us. We're more concerned about whether the scope is in flux and it's going to materialize. With respect to ending, once the project gets under way, your letter indicated it will be completed December of 2006. So that end date was also pushed out. And that's acceptable too.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: A quick question. Is that our actual end date? I thought this was a 3 year project that I'd heard the last time we discussed this. Is that still the case, Mayor?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Baxter: I thought I heard him say the construction of Main Street and I took that as an assumption as repaving was included as part of that. That's why I questioned that.

Mayor McPherson: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So we would be able to fund part of this for 2005? And then go after funding again later in 2006 if we wanted to? And that would still be acceptable to your department? Or does it have to be fully funded and approved at the dollar amount that we've heard 10 million? Or does it have to be approved at the 5 million to meet your requirements?

Mr. Mascari: If you request supplemental funding, it's something that you would have to do and receive before completing the project. Before the construction is completed.

Mr. Baxter: But not started? But complete.

Mr. Mascari: Complete.

Mr. Baxter: Oh, good. So we could actually initiate the action, and then go back again for additional supplemental during the project and try to recover some of the funding as well? Very good, thank you.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Mascari: If the project gets under way and we're involved, and as you approach that target completion date, if additional time is needed, contact us in advance and we'll work with you on an extension. We wouldn't walk away from the project once it's under way.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

The next item is Liquor Permit Request, change of corporate stock ownership, WAM Inc. dba Smokeys, 1714 Century City W., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Lt. Nuesse.

Lt. Nuesse: We have no objections. We had no findings.

Mr. Clemens: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

Lt. Nuesse: We have no objections. There were no findings with this.

Mr. Clemens said the committee would not do anything with it then.

Next item, Discussion, questions and comments, Reynoldsburg Major Commercial Corridors Streetscape Project Phase II report from 2-28-05. Mrs. Reichard. We did discuss this on 3-7-05 and this is _____ and some others that came up. Before we get into all of it, let's clear up the (inaudible). The comment was made about the project being east of the bridge (inaudible) there is additional for that. My understanding is that it's not.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct. It's not. First of all, I want to thank Travis Eifert, for he put together a lot of this. And he's the engineer that's been working on it. A couple of things. Number one, we're going to stop at the bridge. We were looking at options about crossing the bridge. About how would we cross the bridge to finish it off up to Lancaster Avenue, going across the bridge, hooking onto the bridge was incredibly expensive. Going down the bike path is incredibly expensive. We're back to stopping at the bridge. We're going to stop on the west side of the bridge. And so that alone will cut a quarter of a million off of what you've, the 10 million that we've been looking at. I think the other thing that's important to remember, and I was thinking about it when you were talking to Lou Mascari about, that the project has not changed.

When you originally, I don't know, when you originally applied for the OPWC money, whether or not the water line was in there. We have the water line in there. That's \$550,000. That brought it up more. We all know about the AEP costs that have soared. But we're working on that. We're working with AEP to try to bring some of that down.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, but it's still reflected within this 10 million dollar budget. You still see it.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: The other part that inflates this, the 10 million dollar figure in terms of what it's costing us is, the overlay that ODOT has offered to us is from Rosehill Road to the county line on Main Street. Plus, 256 from Main Street to the county line. Now I don't think we can actually, I think we need, you need to look at that and sort of back some of that out of this project. Because if you took 256, if you go beyond Lancaster Avenue, whether you're going out 256 or you're going out Main Street, that really should not reflect what the revitalization area is. Because it's not. But it's something that they have offered to us at 80% funding. So that again is in there. And I think that's caused the price to go up. So there's some extra things in there that, the 550,000 income is being offset on the income side of it. The extra length in the overlay has certainly inflated it. I think there's some things that when you look at the whole package, it's not quite as bad as it looked. The \$250,000 coming down off, not extending the duct bank past the bridge, so that backs it down. So I think what we hit was a high point, the 10.3 was the high point and we're coming down from there.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: I think you might have some unhappy business owners on the south side.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: I think it's important also to note that as we've been working with the property owners and the lessees in the area, the vast majority are excited about this. And they've seen what's going on in Phase I. They know they're going to have some pain, but they also know that we learned from Phase I. We're going to be far more hands on. We've got far more regulations that we're going to put in place. About the north and south side of the street being open, will not be permitted to be opened at the same time. We're going to have better traffic control. There's a variety of things that we're doing to try to alleviate a lot of the headaches that happened in Phase I. But the vast majority of these people are excited. They're excited about what's happening. About what their property's going to look like. About the revitalization of Main Street, and hoping to fill up a lot of those empty store fronts.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Exactly.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens if I could, because there's been a lot of statements about misunderstanding, and this was an outlying presentation that we had on the 28th given by Mrs. Reichard. And unfortunately, we didn't get it until that night. So as I remind everyone, it's awfully difficult to read 2 ½ pages of material while we're hearing the speaker. But to try to clarify where there's been some mis-communication, because I've got my own problems with it, Phase I was 3,777 feet. Phase II is 3,970 feet. For lack of rounding, that's about 200 feet. In the report it talks about 500 feet to Lancaster and 800 feet for AEP crossing at Blacklick for a total of 5,270. In the detail of the report, you refer to the overall length of the project that's about 1,500 longer. That is 800 feet, plus the 500 feet, plus the 200 feet of pavement that was longer than Phase I. Where the mis-communication apparently, or mis-assumption of what it says, we're saying that Phase I was 6.4 and Phase II is going to be the 8.5, and we say in here one thing is, the length is 1.4 times longer than Phase I. And that adds 2.6 million dollars due to length increase. So I mean, if there's some mis-communication, it's in your own work. And if you all can explain that, that would be real good. I'm not sure that, what we don't have right now is, everybody standing here saying, it's going to go down, it's going to go down, it's going to go down. But we have no idea what the new number is.

Mr. Eifert: To address that, as good as we can tonight, is what we broke down is, as you mentioned, the 3,970 feet to the bridge, 500 feet to Lancaster Avenue, and 800 feet for the crossing at AEP, AEP's crossing the creek. And the reason that was, to find a good place to terminate the duct line. When we first looked at it, the bridge, stopping where we're proposing today, is what we intended to do. And then as we looked into it further, we thought that this was a good opportunity to remove all the overhead wires and really get everything cleaned up.

Mr. Hills: But we're not doing that now, right?

Mr. Eifert: We're not doing that now.

Mr. Hills: Okay. So forget about the 500, and forget about the 800.

Mr. Eifert: That's correct. And that's why we put that in there. So I'm sorry if we confused you on that part but that was the reason why we divided it up like that so it could make sense...

Mr. Hills: But that 500 and 800 do make up what you did say in your report, was the 1500. That's 1300 and the 1500 feet in length, correct?

Mr. Eifert: That makes up part of the length adjustment. Correct.

Mr. Hills: So we've got 200 feet more.

Mr. Eifert: Right.

Mr. Hills: And 2.2 plus million dollars more.

Mr. Eifert: Right.

Mr. Hills: Which our statements here have been, gee it's because of the length. But we just took away the length.

Mr. Eifert: Right.

Mr. Hills: So am I to assume, and that always gets us all in trouble, that your net figures are going to come from the 8 ½ down to 6 ½? The two million dollars is coming off? Remind AEP when you're talking to them, we were all without electric for a long time. It's because the utilities are above ground. Not below ground. There's a whole group of people talking to a number of different groups about that. But they ought to be happy to work with us.

Mr. Eifert: We remind them about every other day when we see them.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Eifert: No. That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hills: The money was discussed in here and that's where you talked about the 2.6, correct?

Mr. Eifert: The money is in there. That's correct.

Mr. Hills: The money's in there. So there's not a misunderstanding that the extra length is really caused, was one of the factors that made up the 2.6 million dollars in increased cost.

Mr. Eifert: Right. Correct. That's one of the factors.

Mr. Hills: That's the magic thing about numbers, Mr. Clemens. You can make them say whatever you want.

Mr. Clemens: So it is in there, it does come off?

Mr. Eifert: It is in there and it's going to come off.

Mr. Clemens: It's going to come off of the _____.

Mr. Eifert: It's going to come off of the 10 million.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Eifert: Not the total 2.6 million dollars. There is a portion of that 2.6 _____ that's going to come off (Inaudible).

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Eifert: That's still evolving with AEP.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Travis, your memo states the construction utility cost for the north side of Main Street, you only list the north side, is that 8.2 million. Then you go on to state, this is 2 million less from the estimate of 10.3 to complete the north and south sides. Are we missing the word "south" on that first sentence?

Mr. Eifert: That would probably...

Mr. Gilbert: Is there that big of a cost difference between the north and the...

Mr. Eifert: There is a huge cost difference. Because you have on the north side, you have the duct bank, you have the water line, you have all the pavement removals for the duct bank and water line. So that is where most of the cost is.

Mr. Gilbert: So with the north side being 8.2, what is your estimate for the south side?

Mr. Eifert: 8.2, so we're looking at 2 million dollars for the north side, oh I'm sorry, 2 million dollars for the south side.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Then when you go on to write, this is 2.81 million dollars less than the estimate of 10.3 to complete the north and south sides of Main Street. So if you take your 8.2 million dollar figure for just the north side, and your 2 million dollar figure for the south side, we're backing up to, close to 10.3.

Mr. Eifert: Right.

Mr. Gilbert: In your words, if I'm reading the memo correctly.

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Gilbert: So there's no net savings based on that paragraph.

Mrs. Reichard: The 8 million dollars and change is to do the north side where all the work's at.

On the south side, you're basically talking about landscaping, and sidewalk, and curb repair, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. Gilbert: Right.

Mrs. Reichard: So it's considerably less than the main amount of the utility work...

Mr. Gilbert: Approximately 2 million.

Mrs. Reichard: Correct.

Mr. Gilbert: Right. So you add that to your estimate of 8.21, and we're looking at 10.2 instead of 10.3.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: But you identify a savings of 2.081 million dollars, less from the estimate of 10.3 to complete the north and south sides of Main Street.

Mrs. Reichard: It was probably just stated wrong. The 2 million is less than the estimate of, you remove that from the 10.3. Because the 10.3 completes the north and south side. So there's only, if you only did the north side, you'd only save 2 million dollars. Perhaps it's stated wrong, but that's the _____.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Ten million dollars. But, this also includes, this does not include some of the things that are evolving right now. And there are some things that are evolving, but we can't give you exact figures on. Number one is, we're not going to cross the creek. So you can automatically take 250 off the 10.3

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: The brick pavers going across the street. Not in the cross walks.

Mayor McPherson: _____ Phase I if you'll recall. _____ just say consistent.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: We had money.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: The cost of doing that is just so cost prohibited, that we just didn't put it in. It's one of those things that if we decide to do it at a later date, we can always come back and do it.

So we didn't consider it to be a necessity as part of this project. Just like Phase I was taken out...
Mr. Clemens: It was taken out because we didn't have the money.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mrs. Reichard: It came in at triple.

Mayor McPherson: It came in three times what the estimate was too.

Mr. Clemens: I can understand, don't get me wrong, I'm just saying it seems strange to me, I drive through every other city I drive through that has a Streetscape (inaudible). If we're going to do the job, I'd like to do the job. If not, (inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Well the paving in 2007, the brick cross walks can't be put in until the new paving's done. We can do it as a separate project, or we can do it as an alternative in this bid. We've talked about that.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. And that wouldn't be part of this.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: And they do it as _____ alternate because they won't pay for it.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: Right. But that would be done in the state bid. Not in this one.

Mr. Baxter: Did we do it with the brick or without the brick?

Mrs. Reichard: Which one?

Mr. Baxter: Did we ask for it with or without the brick? The 2007 paving.

Mrs. Reichard: The first phase?

Mr. Baxter: Two. Phase II.

Mrs. Reichard: In Phase II, we haven't gotten to that yet.

Mr. Baxter: So we haven't talked about that. Okay.

Mrs. Reichard: That's an alternative bid and the state goes _____. You do the repaving before you put the bricks down.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. We're talking about a lot of numbers, a lot of variables here tonight, I was wondering if we could just get back to comparing apples to apples. On the scope of services that was provided to the OPWC, and that was around I guess 5 million dollars is what we estimated it at that time, can you tell me how much that has inflated based on those scope of services?

Mr. Eifert: I can give you some numbers here tonight. First off, we did change the maintenance traffic considerably _____ Phase I as opposed to what we had in the draft. We had increased law enforcement officers. We've adjusted the _____ to pay to accommodate business owners. So there's a huge increase there.

Mr. Stake: Huge, as in how much?

Mr. Eifert: \$300,000 increase. We have some other, we have more businesses in this phase than we had in Phase I. I guess if we're comparing the two _____.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. I guess I don't know why we didn't detail that in our scope of services when we applied for the money. But I guess things we found out in Phase I, I suppose. But I don't know, maybe we need to try and go back to what our scope of services was based on what we applied for.

Mrs. Reichard: It won't get it for us. It won't complete the project.

Mr. Stake: Well, it would get us going.

Mrs. Reichard: Well, for 5 million dollars, if it's for one thing, I think the estimate, I don't know about the application for Phase II, but let's just say AEP was at 600,000, the AEP's a million and a half. I can't go back.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Eifert: That's correct. There's some other items that we...

Mr. Baxter: Could you get that for us and get it to us, please?

Mr. Eifert: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Newman: I just want to mention again, that Section 6g regarding project cost overruns, allows us to apply for supplemental funds in the event of cost overruns that are not our fault. And I would think this AEP thing, the increased cost there, over and above our original estimate, would certainly be something that would come under this section. Why can't we apply for supplemental funding?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: The cost overrun has to occur. That means you have to start the project. Then you can apply for a _____ amount of money based on your cost overrun of the project. We haven't started the project yet, so we can't apply for something with no funds in it.

Mrs. Newman: Well you actually have to incur the cost overrun first?

Mayor McPherson: _____ the cost and then you can apply for the _____.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Stearns: My question is, the scope of services, this includes the brick wall too? Is this all part of it?

Mr. Eifert: That's correct. Yes. This number here that you see, includes that.

Mr. Stearns: Is that broken down as to how much the wall is going to cost?

Mr. Eifert: We can break that out for you.

Mr. Stearns: You can?

Mr. Eifert: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, just to clarify something, Mr. Mascari is still here, Mr. McPherson, you said that we have to have already incurred the cost, I don't believe that's what Mr. Mascari said, and I'm not sure that's what 6g says in here. But until we know what it's going to cost us, we don't know where to start here. Mr. Mascari has done his money and did his grants and his loan based on a project of 5 million dollars. Now we're sitting here now saying the 5 is 10, but it may be 8, and it could be 7. But it is more than what it was originally done, reading 6g, listening to what Mr. Mascari said versus what you said where you had to already show your losses. I think the losses may be shown but what we're trying to get, somebody give us a bottom line. Where are we going here? Because once you decide what it's going to cost, then we've got to sit up here and decide how we're going to pay for it.

Mrs. Reichard: Mr. Hills, it's going to be an evolving process. I think we all know that. And what we've tried to do is to help Council, is to give you some basic, this is the top, 10.3 is the top. But we cannot give you an exact, stand here and give you an exact amount tonight. If we were right, when we're ready, when we have all of the construction drawings finished, we know exactly where we're at, we know exactly what we're going to do, then we can give you an exact cost. What we're trying to do is keep Council up to date on what's going on. And unfortunately, I feel we're confusing you. And that's unfortunate. Because we're trying to give you the information we think you need.

Mr. Hills: Yes, ma'am. When you provide us with information that was not worded properly,

inappropriate, stopping in an area that we weren't even going to, and you expect us to read it and comprehend that, and then now we're changing, yeah, we need to change. We went beyond wherever we were. But let's just all get on the same page and try to bring it together.

Mrs. Reichard: We're working to do that. We are working to do that.

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Mascari, while you're here, could you maybe clarify 6g? Can we apply for supplemental funds now? Just based on the fact that we know the project's going to cost more money?

Mr. Mascari: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike.)

Mayor McPherson: So then if we realize when we get all these numbers put together, that the project is going to be 10 million, not 5 million, we can then apply for supplemental appropriation, or supplemental grant money?

Mr. Mascari: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Baxter: But you risk losing it all.

Mr. Mascari: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mayor McPherson: But it doesn't re-start the process of the initial funding? It won't have any effect on our initial grant?

Mr. Mascari: No.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible). What we'd like you to do is come back, get it all put together if that's what you want to do. Show us what the changes are. (Inaudible). The longer we keep this going _____ figure out if we want to do it. I don't think anybody here is do anything until we know what the project's going to cost. _____ how much money we have to borrow. (Inaudible).

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Whitney had indicated, we're looking at a mid April deadline to make a decision in terms of the bonding. Is that correct, Mr. Whitney?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: So this is March 21. And my point is, and I understand the interest in the paragraph 6g but, your comment, we need to be aware of our application for additional funding is based upon whether or not there's funds available. And here we are faced with the prospect of this level of bonding or assistance, whether it's no interest or not, with the local government fund issue that has

been raised and some of the concerns that Mr. Stake raised several weeks ago, we're wondering whether the General Fund will have funds available to deal with this cost increase. If you factor in the 300,000 that you indicated in regards to additional police assistance, and with the additional businesses, and the 1.6 million with AEP, you're still talking about 3 million dollars in cost increases that have hit us for 200 additional linear feet. I believe that is what Mr. Hills had pointed out. I'm just a layman in terms of this but it just seems a little extreme. And for us to be hit with this at this phase in the project based on the numbers that were presented to us originally, I mean that would seem a little out of sync with inflation or any other normal factors that go into the equations we've used here to make our financial decisions. But now we're faced with the prospect of having a week to make this decision. I would say, you get the numbers to us, not for the next committee meeting but maybe this week. If it requires a special meeting, I think we need more time than one week to ponder that and to factor in some of the other outside circumstances that are effecting our decision we'll have to make on this.

Mr. Hills: Well just suggest, before we have that special meeting (Tape Change).

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: I think we had originally anticipated doing that. (Inaudible).

Mr. Clemens: Try to get it down (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Clemens, if I could. Thank you sir. I know one of the things I've been looking at here, you were right. Sticker shock definitely hit, right off the bat. Ten million. That's a huge thing. My bigger concern is making a 2 million dollar mistake over a 1 million. To me, that's a huge mistake. Whatever way we go, if it's right or wrong, I don't want to be the one saying, well if it is 7 million or 8 million, that's a million dollar mistake either way. I don't think we have that type of funds around the City of Reynoldsburg to say, well for 200 feet, I'll maybe get a million. The point I'm going to make is, \$1,812,000 is what it says here for SBC cost for the north side. That's actually not true, is it? It's for the north and the south side. You're not going to go back to SBC and ask them to do the wiring on the south side. They're going to do it all at one time. Correct?

Mr. Eifert: That's 1.8 million dollars for the utilities.

Mr. Baxter: For SBC to do all the work.

Mr. Eifert: SBC and AEP.

Mrs. Reichard: That's for utilities.

Mr. Baxter: Right. Utility costs. That's for both sides of the road though. Would it not be?

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. So implying that the north side is complete is not actually true. We're

actually doing some of the south side and doing all the electrical at once. What I would like Mr. Clemens, is I'd like to see a break down. What's it going to cost for the duct bank? What's it going to cost for the water line? What's it going to cost for the intersection? If I could see where these incrementals are, then it makes a little bit more sense to say, okay that's a half million here, a million here. I went from 6 million to 8 million. Because I can guarantee you, there's no way 2 million dollars is going to do the south side of this construction. Because if we don't do it, and we wait three years, it'll be 6 million. Guaranteed. They'll process that and then do it at that time. So I think by subtracting what it would cost to do the north, there's not a valid argument to say that's what it is going to cost to do the south. And that's what this statement says at the bottom is, if I subtract \$2,881,000 from the original 10.3, that's the cost of completing the south side. That's not the cost. That's the savings on not doing the south side. And that's the point I'm trying to get at. That's not the cost of the south side. So there's going to be another cost to the south side. Which I guarantee will be more than 2 million. If we do it later.

Mr. Parkinson: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: Okay. That's the implication that I read.

Mr. Parkinson: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So, we're clear on that. Right? The south side is not 2 million. I heard it said a couple of times through here.

Mr. Eifert: There's one thing that you mentioned. That overall cost. That 1.8 million dollars. That's for the utility cost that we've estimated. As Sharon mentioned, we're trying to work on that. We met with SBC today to talk about that. As far as separating the two, they all have to be done at once. Which that's one _____ on the north side.

Mr. Baxter: I made that assumption too. But I don't think I heard that amongst _____ my Councilmen to recognize that there's still being work done on the south side where they're putting it right down the middle. So I think by detailing what we can get done on the north side or the south side, what the costs are, at least in my mind it makes it a lot easier and acceptable to understand why is it 10 million? Or why is it 7 million? Because then it's not a pick and choose. It's a full understanding of what we're getting for that scope of work. Because I was surprised when he mentioned from the state that it was 5 million. That was amazing to me. Because he read the scope of work and to me that was exactly what I thought we were getting.

Mrs. Reichard: So I'm clear here the information you want is the project _____ from Rosehill to the creek. Not north side, south side but the entire project. Is that correct?

Mr. Stake: I'd like to see the new estimate based on the scope of services that was provided to the OPWC. And then anything in addition to that, you can tell me what that costs. But the cost based on the scope of services that was submitted to the OPWC. That's what I'd like to see.

Mr. Baxter: I agree.

Mrs. Newman: When you say the scope of services provided to the Ohio Public Works Commission, do you mean the original one? The 2 million, whatever?

Mr. Stake: No. The 5 million that we have...

Mrs. Newman: Okay. Yeah. Well I'd like to see that compared to what we have today. Like a line item comparison. So we can see where the cost has gone up.

Mr. Stake: Well then they can show us additional items they've added to that. But I want to see how much that has inflated. Maybe we're letting this thing get out of hand. We're adding all these things to it and now...

Mrs. Newman: And we don't know what we're adding.

Mr. Stake: Well, right. So I'd like to see the cost based on what was submitted to OPWC. And then if you want to list out what the costs are for additional items that you've added, that would be fine with me. I think that's what Mrs. Newman wants.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. Mr. Eifert, one of the inflationary issues that my fellow Councilmen may not be aware of, is the increased price of metals in the _____ market. How much of this increase in cost is due to that effect?

Mr. Eifert: I don't have that right here.

Mr. Beougher: But it's significant, is it not?

Mr. Eifert: That is correct. As we notice, this last year we've had a significant increase in the cost. Those are included in the estimate that we prepared. I'll make sure and break that out for you when we _____.

Mr. Hills: And if you start with the OPWC application, we may have _____ this today. We should be able to see that tonight.

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: And I guess that, OPWC was good enough that 2.6 million dollars was granted in loans and grants on a 5 million dollar project. So let's find out what this project is going to cost based on those same numbers that went down there. If they were good enough down there, they ought to be good enough here. Let's just see what they are today.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Item number 8, Discussion, Status of Rosehill Road Project. For those of you that don't know, who may know, _____ had a meeting with the County Engineer. (Inaudible). We went over the Rosehill Road project, the work to be done, and how we could do it and (Inaudible).

Mrs. Reichard: It's my understanding that the OPWC money would be Round 20. I think that's what we're talking about. And that's the final round, isn't it? Before authorization?

Male: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mrs. Reichard: And that would be the same pot you would be asking for more money for Streetscape from. It would be the same money at the same pot of money at the same time you'd be asking for the additional funding for the Phase II. As I understand it from that meeting is that, the county has pledged to help us with our application and sort of take the leadership in that. But we will be the ones applying. Mr. Beidler did though state, I know that Mr. Ringle said, go ahead and apply for it, but he too had a caution. And I think Mr. Beidler stated very clearly, he didn't think we'd get it. But that perhaps we could add Rosehill Road, I think Mr. Parkinson asked them if we could add Rosehill Road to their 5 year time line.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Well Mel, we talked about this earlier this week, or last week. I don't consider Rosehill Road to be a priority at this point. I would rather see that 800 or \$900,000 go to Taylor Road because that's an immediate need. And if you take 800,000 and apply it to that, let's just say we save a million dollars on our Street Fund this year, on our Street Improvement Program, you've got about 2 million dollars and that pretty well would pay for Taylor Road. Right, you won't get Rosehill Road done. But I think we need to look at some of the priorities here of where we're going to go. Just to say we need Rosehill Road, you're right. It's been 7 years at least. I don't think 2 more years is going to hurt it. And we can take that money and use it for Taylor Road. That way we're not going to have to go out and talk about bonding another 2 million dollars or 2 ½ million dollars for Taylor Road.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hills: You're right. Those are Franklin County Permissive Tax dollars.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. But we can use that money on our Street Program, and then use other monies for Taylor Road. It's just a matter of looking at where all the money's coming from. And it's nice to just want to put a project on on Rosehill Road. But what really are you trying to accomplish by doing that? You'll put a few sidewalks in. But you know, in the scope of priorities, is that more important than getting the funding for Taylor Road situated first? You know, we're throwing another project into the mix here that we don't really need.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Are you talking Rosehill Road?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. And you'll get a freeway to the new Wal Mart.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: You know, I don't know that the people along Rosehill Road necessarily want that.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Well, sure. Look at McNaughton Road. It's the same way, but they haven't widened McNaughton Road.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: I understand that. But you know, you gotta, you know, they're still using that road every day and you know again, I think the money can better be spent initially during the next 24 month period on Taylor Road. You know, and to accomplish that, we just have to rearrange where some of this money is going and where it's coming from. So you know, you asked me my opinion. If Council as a body wants us to go ahead and apply for that, obviously we will. But I think it's not in the best interest of the citizens of Reynoldsburg to move forward with Rosehill Road when we have other pressing issues that we've already got in the middle of, and we've got engineering going, and we've made commitments on.

Mr. Clemens: We've always talked about Rosehill Road (inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: We're going to do it. And now that's a priority.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Absolutely. Well, absolutely. You know, if I can avoid bonding that, I don't think we should bond it Mel. Because you know, we just continually borrow money and borrow money, and our debt ratio, the debt that's falling off is not going to be compensated by this additional debt. We're going to start incurring more and more debt. And that's not good for the city.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: You say it was supposed to be done 7 years ago. Who said that?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: No it wasn't.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: Well, but the county's not going to do it is the bottom line.

Mr. Clemens: You're talking about spending money and borrowing money.

Mayor McPherson: You're absolutely right.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: No. No. No. No. I'm telling you right now, that I'm prioritizing what I think our debt service should be.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Sometimes your memory's convenient, Mel.

Mayor McPherson: You don't want to do Streetscape? Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: I brought it in and I thought I had Council going along with me on it but now you're telling me you don't want to go along with it?

Mr. Clemens: You want my opinion?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah.

Mr. Clemens: I already told you. I think these other projects are more important.

Mayor McPherson: Why didn't you vote against it then? Instead of voting for it?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: I thought originally, the Rosehill Road project, in it's current form is new in the sense that it was originally to have been paid for by Franklin County.

Mayor McPherson: Correct.

Mr. Gilbert: So I would say into the mix of this debate in terms of Taylor Road, Streetscape, Rosehill is a rookie in some respects. Now in terms of consideration, I guess it's been under consideration for a longer period of time but the opportunity's been there. And I'll put a comparison of Taylor Road up against Rosehill Road in any category, and...

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: What I'm saying is, that the need is there. But I'm saying, let's not make Taylor

Road the bad guy here. That's the perception I don't want to come out.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mayor McPherson: That's the point I'm trying to make. Taylor Road is a very important project.

Mr. Clemens: We've already taken care of that.

Mayor McPherson: Well, we haven't taken care of it yet.

Mr. Stearns: Mr. Clemens, may I say something? Rosehill Road's in my ward, and I think that Rosehill Road has been needed some time like you said. And I've been wondering, what's been happening with Rosehill all the time that I've been on Council and before I came on Council? And to be, I guess to get the news that it's not going to happen is really a jolt to me and to the other people in the community that have _____. So I'm in agreement with you. I think a priority, I agree with Mr. Clemens that Rosehill has some priorities just as well as Streetscape, Taylor Road, and any other roads that we have here that need to be fixed.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, let me just, as a matter of fact you and I were at the meeting. The Mayor was not. On the Rosehill, Mr. Ringle made a couple of things very very clear. Number one, he did want the project applied for and maybe had to remind Mr. Beidler of that on two or three occasions. And secondarily, Mr. Ringle made it very clear, that communications had been made to this city, three, four, and five years ago, about what was needed to be done. Now Mr. Ringle is a nice gentleman to work with. He couldn't remember how that was made or whom it was made to. And no one representing the city sitting in that building through administration ever had any memories of it or knew about it. But the county did apply twice and was turned down, and they approached the city at that time. And that's these 'they' people. I don't know who was approached that became the "they", but nothing was done. And that's why that project Preston, has sat for a while. It's an administrative oversight of no one applying for the Issue 2 funds. And no one can deny that that's what happened. It's just that we can't, sitting back and hearing the administration come forward and tell us, 'oh they've moved it until next year. They've moved it to next year'. Mr. Clemens, I don't think you'll disagree, Mr. Ringle never had moved it anywhere. Mr. Ringle said, 'apply, I want the city to apply, I will do the application. I will do everything possible'. It just has to be in the name of the city and some how we didn't get that word. Or somebody got the word, but nobody moved it forward. And that's sort of what that meeting was able to bring out. And Mr. Underwood was also sitting in that meeting. And so I think, because I always like to have meetings with our City Attorney. It seems like every meeting we have, we end up being involved. So we might as well get him involved in the front. But there's sort of clarification of what happened at that meeting. Mr. Clemens, do you agree with that as a synopsis?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Thank you.

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Clemens, if I could just add one thing. If you'll recall, and I don't care what Mr. Ringle said, we had a letter of agreement, and nowhere in that letter of agreement did he indicate or anyone else indicate that we had to apply for Issue 2 money. And I don't know who the 'they' are that he talked to but...

Mr. Hills: That letter of agreement was entered into before he applied for the Issue 2 and was turned down.

Mayor McPherson: Before they applied.

Mr. Hills: Absolutely.

Mayor McPherson: Well again, no one told us...

Mr. Hills: The 1994 agreement I believe. Is that not correct, Mr. Clemens?

Mayor McPherson: You would think if we needed to apply for Issue 2, someone would have written us a letter telling us to since we had that written agreement.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Ringle was nice enough who it may or may not have been, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: And you were here I believe Mel, when we did that. Pardon me?

Mr. Hills: He was nice enough not to point out who it may or may not have been. He stood and accepted the blame. We communicated that it may be our fault too. So bottom line is, it just took us over 10 years to find out that something was requested to be done and wasn't done regardless of who's fault it was. The factual situation, it's never come up the way it should have been applied and hasn't been done. So now we've got an issue where we kept being told, it's moved a year, moved a year, moved a year. It didn't move anywhere because it hadn't gone anywhere. That's where we were bottom line. And it was a good meeting.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: I'm a bottom line type of guy. So the bottom line to what I'm hearing is, Streetscape's up there in the prioritization with the Mayor, Taylor Road is prioritized, and although we would like to see Rosehill done, it's not a priority. I think that's the bottom line. Is it not? Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parkinson: Good evening. _____ bi-weekly status report on Taylor Road remains unchanged. We are still on target for mid April _____ completion of the plans at which time we'll submit to the city for their review. Anticipating a prompt response within a couple of

weeks. We anticipate completing the plans by the middle of May and ready to go upon further direction.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Clemens, do we need to talk about funding or anything for this where we could do some work ahead of time?

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: That's what I was looking for. I expect us to discuss it. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens said Items 7 and 8 would be listed under Other Legislation.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Gilbert, before you call Service to order, if you don't mind, and Mrs. Frazier may come unglued here in a minute, we have a lot of students here and I know they need signatures. If the students, if we can go ahead and start Service and if the students will come up one at a time and get a signature so you can get out of here. Because it looks like you may have class starting before we finish. As long as it's not disruptive. Sort of one at a time come up and have somebody sign it. Or I'll leave. In fact, I'm not on committee. I'll come back and sign them.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Safety Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

March 21, 2005

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2005

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

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

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 9:36 p.m.

The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the March 7 meeting. Are there any additions or deletions to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as read.

Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. I have a couple of changes to the agenda. Prior to making those changes, I would ask Mrs. Reichard, Safety/Service Director, in regards to your legislative request on SWACO. I had sent a memo on the 17th of March in regards to that request. The two letters that were included that was from a gentleman named Michael Long, the initial letter dated February 25, '05. "That the deadline for submission of municipal approval or

denial was March 6". Mr. Long also indicated that this deadline cannot be extended. With this being the 21st, I had some concerns with that. However, in the initial letter dated January 3, '05, indicates the deadline is 90 days from the receipt of the SWACO plan. So I just thought that we'd determine that which letter was correct. And if it's the latter, on 1-3-05, then we can add that and move it forward as an emergency.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you. That is correct. Actually, Mary gave me a memo on that this week. This past week. And it just got buried in my work load.

Mr. Gilbert: Well, we will go ahead and add that.

Mrs. Reichard: That would be great. Thank you very much.

Mr. Gilbert: As item 3a, SWACO. Ordinance or resolution? I believe it was a resolution. Very well. Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. Add that as 3a. I indicated to the Clerk, I was looking at setting a special Service Committee meeting for next Monday evening at 6 p.m. if that's an issue for either of the members in regards to topic 5, the interest in time. There was some additional work that I needed to do in regards to the general regulations. There were three items for discussion that I had hoped to move forward in tandem for a Public Hearing. The first item was Chapter 1111, our General Subdivision regulations that had come out of our Residential Zoning Review Committee as recommendation that they be implemented. The second item b, was an inclusion of the General Development Zoning Classification that was requested from the Development Department. And the third was a Conservation Development Zoning Category as a result of some of the issues that we had with our overlays. And some of that information, there's some additional information that I needed to provide for the members. So I would like to leave it to the members discretion if they wanted to consider these items at a special Service Committee meeting next Monday instead of this evening.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Yes, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: I think there is a letter from Mrs. Reichard about requesting a special Council meeting before the Council meeting at 6 p.m. next Monday. I don't know, that was sort of a, let Council let me know if it's needed. I don't know whether you want that still or whether you'll have your information by then.

Mrs. Reichard: When I talked with Mrs. Frazier, when she questioned me about whether I was requesting a special meeting, that was not my intent. It was not my intent. My intent was that Travis had said that he would have the plans ready for you all to see. And we thought we would do it in an informal, so that you could come in and see and ask questions and it wouldn't take time and prolong an evening meeting. That's what the intent was. But, we discussed it and she recommended we do it at a regular committee meeting. So not to put, but we can do it in either venue is fine with us.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Let me do this. I would like to hold 'a' (Chapter 1111 General Regulations) and 'c' (Conservation Development Zoning Category) for two weeks and go ahead on topic 5 and we'll leave item 'b' (Inclusion of General Development Zoning Classification) in there for consideration this evening. Are there any other additions or deletions to the agenda? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we approve the agenda. Is there a second? Mr. Baxter with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3a is the SWACO Resolution. Mrs. Reichard. And just to note, this was in regards to a request from the Solid Waste Authority of Central Ohio.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. This is their annual plan, or 5 year plan that they request approval of from the communities. I believe your office received it in January, wherein they asked that, as I understand, it was quite a large report. We have been after them to get us a condensed version, and I think you got a couple of page summary that we finally got last week. And that's what's before you tonight. If we do not respond, it is considered a no, that we don't support it. And just in support of SWACO, even though they were late getting this to us, they have been very good to work with as we were setting up our anti-litter program. And as we are going to move in, as a matter of fact, we meet with them again tomorrow to move into an enhanced recycling program. They've really taken the leadership, been very, very helpful. As a matter of fact, we're getting ready now, we're scheduling our litter survey which will be coming up some time in I think, early part of next week. So they've been instrumental in helping us with a lot of things. And so I would just encourage you to support the resolution.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mrs. Reichard. The plan was provided to the Clerk's office in early January to be on file for the public and members review. The legislation I believe, was forwarded in February 25, it was in the members packets for your consideration. Are there any questions or comments from members of Service in regards to this? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I just have one thing to say. I think the suggestion and the procedure involved in calling and reporting your neighbors for any little infraction, seemed a little bit like Nazi Germany, or the Soviet Union to me. I didn't like the idea of agreeing to do that kind of thing. I think a serious thing, yes. But, operating a 24 hour hot line for somebody throwing a piece of paper out of a car, which is what the man from SWACO essentially led me to believe, that's what he meant. That they were almost going to extremes. Not that I don't like a nice, clean, neat, orderly environment. But I think if our zoning were enforced, and our property maintenance codes were enforced, we'd go a long way toward improving the looks of our community.

Mr. Gilbert: I think that was in regards to the litter prevention program. This is an actual Solid Waste Management Plan update in terms of SWACO's handling governance of our solid waste disposal.

Mrs. Newman: Did you read that?

Mr. Gilbert: Yeah.

Mrs. Newman: No, you didn't. I tried to read it.

Mr. Gilbert: And then I believe, your section is noted in the residential section. But your comments are noted and we can address that when we come back in on the litter prevention program. Any other questions or comments from other members of Council? (No response). Mrs. Frazier, can I move this forward to the special meeting this evening?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: Very well. I'll make a motion that we forward the SWACO Resolution in support of the Solid Waste Management plan update to the special Council meeting with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Mr. Baxter with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye" except one Council member). Opposed? (One Council member voted "Nay"). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is a Discussion, Resolution of services for annexation of 29.558 acres of property in Etna Township. Members should have had this information in their packet. We have received letters of resolution of services. This is an expedited annexation which requires action within 20 days of its submission which the members should have noted in the information that was provided. Are there any questions or comments from members of Service in regards to this item? (No response). Other members of Council? (No response). This does require immediate action due to the 20 day time limit provided under Ohio Revised Code. Therefore, I'll make a motion that we forward this to the special Council meeting with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5, Item B. This is an inclusion of the General Development Zoning Classification in the Zoning Code. This comes from the Development Department. Mr. Brandt, thanks for staying with us this evening.

Mr. Brandt: Yes sir, Mr. Gilbert. Thank you. This request was initiated by the fact that when the zoning code was updated several years ago, it's my understanding that the thought was at the time for potentially large annexations that we required 1,000 foot setback from residential districts and things of that nature as outlined in the code. Inasmuch as there were a couple of tracts of land in the city that were already zoned Industrial, this virtually wiped them out from the relative value perspective for development. Because if you had hypothetically, a 20 acre tract and you took 1,000 feet off of each side, you could probably build something about as big as where these chairs are. Hence, negate the value and opportunity for the city. We've worked with the City Attorney on this and Annique, our Zoning and Planning Administrator, and hence, have submitted this. We currently have no applications pending. The properties that would be involved would have to apply for the designation, or rezoning as General Development. Hence, there would be a Public Hearing of that as well at the time if said application should come forward.

Mr. Gilbert: Very well. Does this raise any questions from members of Service? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Do we have any at the moment, that you're aware of that are going to come down that track? Any pieces of property you are looking to...

Mr. Brandt: There are currently two that I'm aware of. They could or could not file. No one's filed anything. There is one up on Lancaster Avenue that I've been led to believe they would possibly file.

Mr. Baxter: Do you have an approach to go down this path is what I'm asking?

Mr. Brandt: No one's filed anything.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: How does this effect other, does this effect any other aspects of our code by reducing the setback?

Mr. Brandt: It basically returns the existing properties that were impacted by the I guess, change in the code to where they were by using an alternate designation.

Mr. Gilbert: Alright. So we're not altering, or adding, or changing any uses?

Mr. Brandt: No, sir.

Mr. Gilbert: Strictly with the setback. Other members of Council, any questions or comments at this time? (No response).

Mr. Brandt: There may be one issue which may need to be addressed relative to the adult section of our code that is designated for the GI district. And maybe Mr. Underwood can address that in a more finite fashion than I can.

Mr. Gilbert: Sure. Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: At the present time, there would be no need to make any changes. There may be a need at a later date depending on whether or not anybody applies, doesn't apply, what happens to the various properties. Right now, as I looked at it and checked everything out, I don't think we need to make any changes. Or we may not need to make any at a later date. It's something we'll have to evaluate each time there's a rezoning.

Mr. Gilbert: Just one quick question. If we're only adjusting in the classification, the setback requirement, how is this a zoning issue for other types of oriented businesses? We're not changing any classification or use.

Mr. Underwood: Some of our things go from front doors, front door, or building to building, and you have to look at all those things to see if you do. And right now, we don't have to make any

changes. If there is a change later on and something is built, we may have to adjust something in our code.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Any other questions from members of Service or Council? (No response). I would just ask the members to note in this particular classification, the uses that are provided for and what's being requested, and to factor that in. This is a change to our zoning, so a Public Hearing will need to be set at the first reading which would be next Monday. I would just make a motion that we forward this to Council for its first reading with recommendation that we set a Public Hearing. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you, Mr. Brandt.

Item number 6 is a discussion regarding the acceptance of the unrecorded General Warranty Deed for Reserves A and B of the Woods at Reynoldsburg, Section 4, Part 2. This item is up for its first reading. Any questions or comments from members of Service? (No response). Other members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its first reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 7. This is for the authorization for engineering services, Blacklick Creek Erosion at Huber Bike Path. Members should have received in your packets, the updated recommendation from EMH&T. I'd like to thank our Clerk's for getting this together and in the packets in a timely manner, late Friday. And Mr. Parkinson, if you'd like to present your recommendation. There are three recommendations that, let's say three options. There's only one recommendation that you presented to us and I appreciate your work on this and I'll turn the floor over to you.

Mr. Parkinson: We rendered our reviews down to three. What we thought to be the three most feasible projects that could be undertaken. We tried to attach some cross figures for your consideration. And tried to also, wrap them in what would almost be intangible. Such as, in one option, we suggest rerouting the bike path away from the creek through the area of erosion. But that leads us down the path of easements which is sometimes a troublesome process to the city. We selected probably the middle option, if you will. Both in terms of cost and in terms of being tangible. The significant aspect of what we have recommended is the elimination of the FEMA permitting. Laying the slopes back from the existing embankment, or existing edge of water flood way so that we can demonstrate that we are not placing fill within the flood way. We are cutting it back and laying it back. It does require the bike path be moved. The city is in possession as we understand, an easement for its bike path. And we would relocate the bike path within that easement. It will snuggle up very tightly to the bingo hall. And we will, during the course of our design, do the surveying and the research necessary to define that line very finely so that we know that we are staying within our area. I can't think of the last time I came before Council and asked for less money. And I was...

Mr. Gilbert: I thought it was a typo.

Mr. Parkinson: I was a little hesitant to do it here, to set a precedence but, the reality is that in the absence of the FEMA permitting, and the diminished efforts required for the study to support an SFHAD for the city, the cost came down significantly.

Mr. Gilbert: 13,000.

Mr. Hills: We appreciate the precedence you have set.

Mr. Baxter: We're going to challenge you again.

Mr. Parkinson: So that's what we've looked at. I'm sure there are many, many other options. We feel that this is a fairly prudent approach to solving our needs with the bike path. It moves the bike path further to the west within our easement area. And in doing so, we can allow the creek to continue to erode its natural pace without threat to our infrastructure or our facilities. And there's no need to run in and shore it up and protect it and all that. We can just do what _____.

Mr. Gilbert: Does this raise any questions from members of Service? (No response). Is there a recommendation? The cost of the actual project was 232,000 estimated cost.

Mr. Parkinson: That's the project cost, which we believe will include the cost of construction, our design fee, then the inspection, and project administration.

Mr. Gilbert: Is there a recommendation as far as how we pay for this?

Mr. Parkinson: No. We don't offer that. Certainly, it is a, shouldn't say certainly. There is a component of the project that we're doing, even at this level, which deal with the eroding stream which would in my opinion, be perfectly appropriate for the Storm Water Utility to address. There are components of the project which are strictly moving the bike path which may or may not be. If it's ancillary to protecting the stream or correcting the stream erosion, then maybe you can't. I'll leave that to people far wiser than I. We have as you know, we the design for the Bartlett Road relief storm sewer. I believe that there's been some discussion of bonding that project when it finally gets designed. It's a potential perhaps of combining two or three storm water type projects into one issue. (Tape Change).

Mr. Gilbert: I guess when you factor in the bike path, it's a multi-department type project in my mind. I guess I have, the priority we set Mr. Clemens _____ in regards to Bartlett and Broadwyn and there's some other areas of improving the lines. We discussed outside of the scope of any type of project to help save money. 232,000 takes a big chunk out of what we have accumulated to this point in the Storm Water Fund. So I would just ask the members to factor that in to your decision in regards to this in terms of the best way to pay for this since it is, we're dealing with the bike path issue and storm water. It's unique in that aspect. We haven't had to look at it from this standpoint before. So any suggestions or comments from members of Council at this point? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: I think obviously, we need to fix the erosion in the bike path issue. So I think with the fact that the engineering's been reduced by \$13,000, I would make a motion at this point without any objections from the members that we forward this to Council. Before I make that motion, this type of a project in terms of the engineering, I guess I should have referenced that in your memo, what's your time frame on getting the engineering work back to us, Dave?

Mr. Parkinson: We'll have 85% plans complete to you in 10 weeks.

Mr. Gilbert: So we're looking at mid to late summer for a project start date to send out bids. Correct?

Mr. Parkinson: I would think. Yes. It actually works quite well from the stream hydrology standpoint with the exception of thunder storms, the stream flows historically the lowest, in the fall. We want to do our work then. They have the least amount of water to deal with.

Mr. Gilbert: Time wise, if it goes its full 6 weeks, we're looking at 30 days from a May adoption. It would be June. What's the committee's preference? We've had this information before us for a number of months. We just received this recommendation. I understand that. But as far as the issue, the problem that we have here, are there any objections to moving this forward as an emergency?

Mrs. Newman: I have no objection.

Mr. Baxter: The question is, how are we going to fund this? Is this going to go over to Finance first? Is that Finance then for funding, and then goes to, it's not appropriated so don't we have to send it to the Finance Chair first to look for appropriation before we can send it for approval?

Mr. Gilbert: No.

Mr. Baxter: Or do we just need to get approval for the design?

Mr. Gilbert: You can forward it to Finance with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency to utilize the money out of the Storm Water Utility Fund.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I thought I heard. Okay. That's what I thought. Fair enough.

Mr. Gilbert: With no objections being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Finance with recommendation for adoption as an emergency, to appropriate \$33,000 from the Storm Water Utility Fund for the revised proposal for professional engineering services, Blacklick Creek Erosion at Huber Bike Path. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: And this is a safety issue just for notice. That's why the emergency. Correct?

Mr. Gilbert: Correct.

Item number 8, Ordinance accepting unrecorded deed of easement. This item has had two readings. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this, members of Service? (No response). Other members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I would like to make a motion that we forward this to Council with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

I will adjourn Service at 10 p.m.

Service Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

March 21, 2005

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2005

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Eric Gilbert, Lane J. Beougher.

Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: I would like to call the March 21 Finance Committee meeting to order at 10:03.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held March 7, 2005. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda other than adding the Bike Path Erosion south of Main, as 3a? (No response). And I would like to make a motion that we add as 3a, the Bike Path Erosion engineering funding. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

3a is the engineering for the Bike Path Erosion south of Main. \$33,000 is required which would come from the Storm Water Utility Fund. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee in regards to this? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Just that this comes from Service with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: We'll probably need the account number.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Do we need the account number now for that?

Mr. Gilbert: Next week.

Mr. Stake: Next week? Okay. Then without hearing any objections, I will make the motion that we...

Mr. Baxter: Just a question. We do have the funds in the account for the legislation, right?

Mr. Stake: Storm Water Utility Fund. I believe there's plenty of money there for that.

Mr. Gilbert: Yeah. It's there.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay then, I will make a motion that we do grant the request for funding as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Legislation authorizing the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio to execute and deliver a Public Hospital Agencies Agreement in connection with the authorization of County of Franklin, Ohio Adjustable Rate Demand Hospital Facilities Revenue Bonds. Mr. Brandt. I see you have a lot of help tonight. I'm glad they stayed around.

Mr. Brandt: These guys are persistent. Thank you, Mr. Stake, members of the committee. This started out some time back, and there was a lot of paper inasmuch as the original thought was that the city would serve as an issuer on a bond package to facilitate or enable the construction of a new facility at Wesley Ridge. Without going into all the boring details of that, the limitations, cost involved, and so on. Inasmuch as the Methodist Elder Care, Mr. Rouse and his folks were able to find the opportunity to issue these notes or bonds through the County of Franklin, it became a necessity for the city to become involved in executing Public Hospital Agencies Agreement. And I will not attempt to go any further with that. They have the experts here and Mr. Rousch, and we'll let them explain it. But I think we're all very happy that Wesley Ridge is here and we're extremely happy to see them expanding their facility _____. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Brandt.

Mr. Rouse: I'm Robert Rouse. I represent Methodist Elder Care Services. We are the parent organization of Wesley Ridge. This financing is the last piece necessary to finish the construction project you may have noticed down 256. Tomorrow morning, we'll put the last piece of steel on

the very top. It's our topping out ceremony. So we're pretty excited about that. The issue before you tonight relatively speaking, might be not as exciting as some of the things you've talked about. We don't have any big cost overruns, we're not late on anything. Dave, I know it's not a competition but, this request actually will cost you less than \$13,000. It doesn't cost you anything at all. We pay all the costs associated with it. We've been _____ the city for any claims that might be made. But whenever a financing of this type is spent in more than one jurisdiction, each jurisdiction has to also authorize that issue. So we're spending some of that money in Franklin County. Franklin County's going to issue it. But we also need to spend actually most of it here in Reynoldsburg. Tonight, Ed Moore, Partner with Bricker & Eckler, is here to answer your questions about the specifics of the issue. Mr. Moore is the, doesn't represent us in this matter, he represents future bond holders. So he can explain more precisely what it is that we're doing. Of course we also have Dan Lavender, whom I think many of you know Elder Care's CFO, and some of our staff here to answer whatever questions you might have. Are there questions?

Mr. Stake: No. I just have a comment. I played golf over at the Blacklick Golf Course recently and saw the structure you're talking about. It's great that you folks are adding on to that. It's a great facility for older folks, and I welcome that.

Mr. Rouse: Thank you. I met with about a dozen of the residents who are moving in. Based on the numbers we have right now, most of the units are reserved, but not all of them, but we've got about 200 residents and families who will have, closer to 300 when we're done and everything's reserved. It was interesting to me how many of them come from Reynoldsburg. We had thought this would be an east side project and it would spill well into the city. But really, 75% of the people who had signed up are within about 5 miles of the city of our facility. So these are people that you know and have lived here a long time and they drove that point home again just this afternoon.

Mr. Stake: I like to see they're taking advantage of that.

Mr. Rouse: You bet.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Any questions or comments? Questions for Mr. Rouse from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council?

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to say that I'm glad to see such a facility in Reynoldsburg and available since I plan to utilize one probably before too much longer.

Mr. Rouse: Well it looks like that would be a while but we'd hope to be ready for it. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Rouse. Sir?

Male: I was here in 1997. That was 8 years ago believe it or not. It seems like it was yesterday. The city helped finance the Assisted Living Facility that are out at 256. As Mr. Brandt said, we have asked the Franklin County Hospital Commission to issue these bonds. This is an extra

territorial finance for them, so we need your permission. We also need for tax reasons, we need to hold a Public Hearing. And that's been schedule for I believe, 7:15 next Wednesday night.

Mrs. Frazier: Monday.

Mr. Moore: You're right. There will be nobody here next Wednesday night. 3-28. That's right. So it'll need to be a Public Hearing held, and then an ordinance adopted authorizing the participating Public Hospital Agency Agreement. We've working in conjunction with your bond council. Bob _____ has incorporated his comments and I believe he's happy with the end product. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, sir. Any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response).

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Moore, is March 10 the last ordinance that we have? Is that the one we're going to use?

Mr. Moore: I don't know. Bob _____ has been working on that and he's at spring break a couple of days here. When do you need that? If it changes, it will only change in one or two words.

Mrs. Frazier: We need it by Friday's packet.

Mr. Moore: By Friday's packet? Okay. We'll either tell you it's great the way it is, which I think is what we're going to tell you, or we'll substitute a page and we'll show you the black lines of whatever we change.

Mr. Hills: And that would be the one that would be subject to the Public Hearing. We've had multiple documents on this one.

Mr. Moore: I apologize. We are working with your counsel on this.

Mr. Hills: It's getting much thinner. The thinner it gets, the better we are. Does that clarify your question, Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Rouse, you'd like an emergency, Mr. Brandt? You'd like an emergency on this?

Mr. Brandt: Yes. Due to the timeliness of their needing to close their bond package and probably pay a few of the bills...

Male: Those steel workers are expecting to get paid.

Mr. Stake: And they make big bucks.

Mr. Brandt: Yeah. And with the complexity the way it got shifted around from starting out, originally a bond issue, then on the local level, you may be aware, there was some basis points the city would have encountered or incurred, which traditionally these deals are passed on to the borrower, that would have ran their cost up. 'They' being Methodist Elder Care. Hence, they went to the, from what I understand, Fairfield and Franklin, and found the availability under the bonding cap at Franklin County. Or we would have probably served as the issuer. in them incurring additional cost merely to satisfy bank qualifications. And in this case, it wouldn't have had an impact on the city either way except this is the way that it ended up and lesser cost for the borrower.

Mr. Rouse: Which makes a lesser cost for the resident. (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Stake: Sure.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, the quicker we pass it, the less paper we're going to see.

Mr. Stake: Just one other question here. Mr. Underwood, you've reviewed everything here? You're aware of what's going on? Are you okay with all this as our City Attorney?

Mr. Underwood: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Stake: Alright, then. Very good. Any problems with the emergency language in regards to this from anybody at the table? (No response). Okay. I think it's a great thing so I'd like to see it go fast as well. Any other questions or comments from anybody at the table?

Mr. Stearns: I'm glad to get a good explanation. All of the paperwork that we've had, it's a little confusing. (Inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Thank you sticking around. I appreciated it. I know it's getting late. So Mrs. Frazier, do we need any action to set that Public Hearing?

Mrs. Frazier: They've already taken the action to do that. And we just send it to Council.

Mr. Hills: But while we're talking about that I would note that we have an Appeal Hearing next week at 7, Public Hearing at 7:15, and Council at 7:30. And we've got the 6:00 maybe.

Mr. Stake: If there's no other questions or comments, then I will make the motion that we send this on to Council for a 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. Thank you.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Amend 143.05(a) (Eligible Securities) of Chapter 143, Department of City Auditor. This does come from the City Attorney. Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: This is actually a fairly minor change. When we were going through our

legislation to change the bank, change our bank accounts and do that type of thing that Howard put in, I happened to notice in our code, in that section it referred to inactive funds. The city has no inactive funds. I just propose that we strike 'inactive funds' from that ordinance. Later on if he wants to redo it and streamline that ordinance even more, that's fine. I thought right now we ought to get the term 'inactive' out of there. I noticed that ordinance was passed in 1983 and maybe when it was done, we didn't realize that maybe definitions in the Ohio Revised Code were different. But 'inactive' is not, we do not have any inactive funds.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Seems like a very simple, minor change. Any objection from the City Auditor?

Mr. Whitney: No.

Mr. Stake: No? Okay. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Alright then, I will make a motion that we send this on for its first reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6 is Discussion, Supplemental appropriation, continue trial preparation, City vs. Friedlinghaus, et. al. Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood: We're getting down to the point now of actively preparing for that trial. There will be a number of depositions to take. Our engineers will be doing some work. They've already done some work for us. There'll be more work to do. We'll have evaluations to do of the defendants. Analysis of the values of the property. And I don't think we're going to have enough in the pot to do all of that. And so I propose that some more be put in there. When it's done, if there's anything left, which there probably will be, it can go back into the General Fund from whence it came. We did a general purchase order. A blanket purchase order will be used for depositions, engineering costs, the analysis of their evaluation of the property, and it will be coming along pretty fast here pretty soon.

Mr. Stake: You mentioned the General Fund. You're asking unused funds go back to the unappropriated CIP Fund. That's not where you're asking for....

Mr. Underwood: Back into there.

Mr. Stake: Okay. That's where you're asking for the funds to come from?

Mr. Underwood: Right. That's what the Auditor's Office gave me.

Mr. Stake: And the Auditor's Office is saying we have enough money in that fund for this?

Mr. Underwood: That's what I was given.

Mr. Stake: And this is in regards to the Graham and Main intersection improvement where we took some property there?

Mr. Underwood: Right. The corner, the Friedlinghaus property. Actually he owns four pieces of property there. We took one. And we deposited the money from the appraisal and that goes to trial in September. And a jury will decide whether or not we paid enough for it, or we didn't pay enough for it.

Mr. Stake: Right. We had this appraised and we deposited the funds based on the appraisal that we received in there to compensate the folks for the property that we took.

Mr. Underwood: Right.

Mr. Stake: And you'd like a rule suspension on this?

Mr. Underwood: Yeah. That would be fine.

Mr. Stake: First reading? Second reading?

Mr. Underwood: Either one. We've got probably about 5,000 left on that purchase order. And that's enough for right now. But there'll be a number of days and it'll be running out and running low and we'll need some more.

Mr. Stake: Any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Any problem with a rule suspension on the first reading to get this out of the way? (No response). This looks like something we need to do. Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: Plus we knew it was coming.

Mr. Stake: Then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council with recommendation for adoption as a rule suspension. 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.

Item number 7 is further discussion of funding in the various projects. We heard about a lot of variables tonight. A lot of different scenarios. I guess we really don't want to get into too much detail now since we don't have any numbers in front of us. So I just did want to open this up though for any questions from anybody in regards to the funding. Members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Yeah. We've really got to nail this down here soon if we're going to go out for a bond in April. I would hope that we're seeing something here pretty concrete, something we can afford.

Mr. Clemens: (Inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Mr. Whitney, I had asked you a question two weeks ago regarding splitting the bonding up toward the part that's going to be completed in 2005 and the part that's going to be completed in 2006. Does that have any impact on anything? Or debt service or our...

Mr. Whitney: Yeah. My recommendation would be not to do that. Since I first worked up figures two months ago, interest rates have increased, on the average 40 basis points. Tomorrow, the Federal Reserve is meeting to push them up again probably I know, 25 basis points. And again, in another 6 weeks they'll do the same thing. Interest rates are going up. They're going up really rapidly. So my recommendation would be, no.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay then, I will just ask if we can hold this for future discussion.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 10:25.

Finance Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
March 21, 2005