

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 7, 2005

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

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

Mr. Beougher: I'll call the Community Development Committee meeting to order at 7:34.

The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the February 7, 2005 committee meeting. Are there any changes to the minutes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

The third item is the approval of the agenda. And I would like to hold item number 5 (Discussion, Questions/Comments, Reynoldsburg Visitors Bureau report of 2-28-05), as Mrs. Hudson cannot be with us tonight. Are there any other changes to the rest of the agenda? It's pretty small. (No response). So, hearing none, there's a motion to amend the agenda. Is there a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All in favor of amending the agenda, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Item number 4, Discussion, Authorization to execute License Agreement allowing Reynoldsburg City School District emergency access across city parkland. This comes from Mr. Underwood. Bill, would you like to speak to this or stand for questions?

Mr. Underwood: Sure.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Do you want to just give us a brief introduction?

Mr. Underwood: Back, I don't know, its probably been a year ago, when the middle school was proposed off Waggoner Road. The city planners, and I think Council, and the school board if you read, as well as our safety forces, including the fire department, the police department, everybody kind of agreed that there should be an emergency ingress/egress to the site. A secondary way to get to it in case there were problems with the front drive. And the city Parks Department really didn't want to give an easement across there so they came up with giving a license. Which is a non-possessory entrance to the land. And the license will allow them to traverse across the strip park that runs under the high wire. The AEP wires that go above it. High tension wires. To get to the building in case of an emergency. And this has gone back and forth. I called the attorney who had prepared it and asked him if I had misunderstood. Back in January he said, no they're going to, the proposal that they had received from our people that they wanted lights, and walk way, and all kinds of things on there. I said, this is an emergency exit. It's not a secondary exit. It's not designed for people to traverse it. And the Mayor agreed, and so we finally got the legal description. The site will be activated. The school will be activated in July. The students in August. I thought it was about time that we got the license in to start the approval process because

they've got to construct this roadway in accordance with the agreement that the parks people have given them. I understand now that our parks people want certain trees and things done but they've still got to construct the roadway. The trees, and plantings, and beautification, all that stuff can come later. But if there's going to be kids there, we need to get the license and get the roadway going. Because the safety issues are paramount, we can pretty it up later. So I thought that better come down and get started through. That's why I put it in.

Mr. Beougher: Alright. Thank you. Are there any questions from members of the committee? (No response). I guess that's just you and me tonight, isn't it?

Mrs. Newman: I guess so.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I do know that there is some over-excavation required and it's going to take some extra work and probably make sense to move this along. I know that the drawings are not finalized.

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

Mr. Beougher: Right. Paul and I looked at the drawings and they're preliminary, as I understand it. There's still a few tweaks that need to happen I think. And as far as trees and so forth, yeah, that can happen later. But we do need to move this forward. Any questions from members of Council? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I have no problem with it but I would like to see the plans. So possibly, the next meeting they could be brought over and we could take a look at them.

Mr. Beougher: Can we get some small sets of plans?

Mr. Underwood: I can get a set and put it on file with the, I think Paul might have a set.

Mr. Walsh: I have a preliminary set which is one of the ones that you _____. But there are some changes from that set that had to be made by EMH&T. I don't know when they'll have those back to us to take a look at. But some of the issues of the sidewalk and the _____.

Mr. Beougher: Alright. There is in the package, just a rough plan drawing showing just the layout of the access. I do know that there's some bad soil that needs to come out. We need that, over excavate about 42 inches, and be a 12 foot asphalt roadway with a couple of feet of gravel shoulder covered with grass. But it would be good to see the drawings. And having them on file probably would be, is that okay, Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. That's fine. We can have it on file in the Clerk's office just so we can take a look at it.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. It's starting to sound more to me like a second entrance. Is that what's happening here? Because when I hear you're putting a roadway, and sidewalks, and beautification, it sounds like a second entrance. And I thought what we were talking about was an emergency entrance which was going to be grass, maybe graveled. You know, this was like a year ago. I know that. So maybe my memory's going a little bit, which I'm sure it is at my age.

Mr. Beougher: No.

Mr. Baxter: But I thought we were talking emergency entrance. Not a whole other second entrance to the school.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Walsh.

Mr. Walsh: Yeah, I can address that for you. The look of this path will be curvy, as you saw on your drawing there. It will look like a bike path. It will act like a bike path. And it will only be used as an emergency access when necessary. I don't have the actual drawings because they're not done. So I don't have a presentation to show you all of the specifics. But it is essentially what you see in the drawing in front of you. The site as it exists right now does have some trees on it, and has some landscaping. Some of those trees have to come out and they'll be replaced. Obviously, not necessarily in the same spot, but in other parts of the park. The sidewalk issue is, there is a sidewalk along Rodebaugh Road. This thing has to cross that sidewalk. So that's a detail that we needed to have completed on the drawings. That wasn't quite done yet. There is also some storm drainage involved with this. There is some slight swails that have to be addressed. And the issue of the landscaping being replaced properly, the beds re-installed so that they look like they did prior to the project. There is some over excavation required because the bad soil's on the site. That will make it look like a bigger construction site than it's actually going to be when it's done. The path is not as wide as you might expect it to be for a roadway access. However, underneath on each side of the path, there is going to be a significant stone base so that in the event a fire truck needs to traverse this path and get to the school, they will be able to go partially off of the pavement and there'll be good firm ground underneath them. There'll be a little bit of grass on top so that again, we don't have a massive gravel berm here. So EMH&T is taking care of all those details. We did meet with them a couple of weeks ago to address these issues. And when they get the final set done, we will have them back and available for you to take a look at.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you, Paul.

Mr. Beougher: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes, Mr. Walsh. The fact that the path would be used for bikers, and walkers, and that kind of thing, would that really present any danger if we're attracting people to be using that path for recreation purposes if a fire truck or a police car does barrel in there? How's that going to be handled? I would think it would attract people to be on the road.

Mr. Walsh: Which is a plus. And quite frankly, the best...

Mrs. Newman: Well I don't think it's a plus if a fire truck is coming down the road.

Mr. Walsh: The vast majority of the use on this is going to be pedestrians and bikes. They're going to be using it to access the school site. It will also be a connector to the eventual proposed path that will connect to the east all the way to Taylor Road along this park. If there is ever a fire truck on this one, I would be like to be there to see it. Because I think it's going to be probably, it probably will never happen. It may well happen. That's why we have to put it in. But it is controlled properly with ballards to keep other vehicles out. And if there's a fire truck coming, he's going to have lights and sirens. And if you know what you're supposed to do, you get off the path and let them go by and then you can continue on. It's not going to be a _____ they're going to be trapped in front of an emergency vehicle and have no where to go. They will have no problem getting out of the way of a fire truck that's...

Mrs. Newman: I'm just concerned about children being on the path and they might be confused and frightened and not get out of the way fast enough.

Mr. Walsh: Well, if they've been taught properly in school that you've got to get out of the way for fire trucks and police cars, then I'm sure they won't have any problem with that. It's pretty wide open. So I truly do not believe that's going to be any kind of an issue at all. And we do have emergency vehicles that traverse our current paths as we speak. The ones that go along Blacklick Creek. And both parks have occasionally had police cars on them and occasionally had an emergency squad on them to address safety issues, or whatever call they happen to be on. So we do have that now and we don't have problems with those kinds of issues.

Mrs. Newman: Well, it's not going to a school either.

Mr. Walsh: No. But it is going through parks which has significant numbers of kids playing in them. And it's not been a problem. And I don't anticipate this would be either.

Mr. Beougher: Any other questions from members of the committee or Council? (No response). Mr. Underwood, this needs to go forward for first reading and take the slow road to passage? Is that correct?

Mr. Underwood: I don't know about a slow road but I think it could take a normal road.

Mr. Beougher: Normal three readings?

Mr. Underwood: Normal three readings and get signed.

Mr. Beougher: Alright. In that case, I would like to make a motion to send this forward to Council on the Consent Agenda for March 14. 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.

And with that I will adjourn Community Development at 7:47.

Community Development Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

March 7, 2005

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 7, 2005

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Brett Baxter, Ron Stake. Councilman Preston Stearns was absent.

Other members of Council present: Eric Gilbert, Antoinette Newman, Lane J. Beougher. Council President William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:47.

The first item on the agenda, approval of the minutes of the February 22, 2005 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item, approval of agenda. I'd like to add as item 3a, a report from the Chairman. Is there anything else going to be added or deleted from the agenda? (No response). If not, it'll stand approved.

What I'd like to bring up, and I've had a lot of complaints about this, and finally I got a complaint from my wife. And when that happens, that's not good. I have to listen to it in the night and in the morning and so forth. It's probably something I should have brought up a long time ago. And it has to do with private parking lots. And I also discussed this with Mr. Hills. We have one across the street, U S Post Office. It's got to be the worst parking lot that I've ever seen. It's got holes in it big enough to fall in. It's a public place where people have to go to. It's not like going to a grocery store or going to a bar or something like that. This is something that the public has to, and does go to. It's in horrendous shape. It is private. But we do have in our ordinance, it says they have to be maintained. And I think it's something that we have to enforce. I don't know how many have been there or not, but I tell you, it's got holes and it's big. I think that it's something that I'd like to ask the Service Director if she'd look into. I don't know whether it's owned by the post office or whether it's privately owned. I think it probably is and I think Mr. Smith probably knows the problem. You're there. It's terrible. The entrances are terrible and the holes are terrible. There's a lot of traffic there and they're jockeying back and forth trying not to hit the big pot holes. So I'd appreciate it Mrs. Reichard if you'd look into it. Where the owner is. Tell him we're dissatisfied with it. It is public access and it is something the public uses for the post office and the other businesses there. And I think it's just something I'd like to see if we could take care of. Thank you.

The next item is Discussion, Questions and Comments. This has to do with the Reynoldsburg Major Commercial Corridor Streetscape. And we had a report from our Safety/Service Director, Mrs. Reichard. It was a nice report. It gave us the time periods on when different things would happen and I think that keeps us up to date on that. And I think that's something that we should know. I have no problem with the report as far as I'm concerned because it was a report on the time limit and so forth. Are there any other questions for Mrs. Reichard pertaining to the report that she had given last Monday night on Phase II? Yes, Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I have a question. I was under the impression, I think Mrs. Reichard said that we have to break ground by March 15 in order to assure that we get the funds, the grant? Is that true?

Mr. Clemens: Is that correct, Mrs. Reichard?

Mrs. Reichard: No, it's not. March 15, Mrs. Newman, it is by the end of June.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Well, I wondered why that was happening when we weren't even going to let it out for bids until May.

Mrs. Reichard: Oh, yeah. That would be difficult. No. Actually, our time frame for getting the easements is March 15. As you know, we have wall to wall, at least I do, wall to wall meetings. As a matter of fact, that's the reason I was late tonight, in meeting with the Reynoldsburg Condominium Association. We do it at their time. And Marcia Arce has been setting up all of these meetings for us. There's three teams that have been going out. The Mayor leads one, I lead one, and Mr. Brandt leads the other. Now that the Mayor's out of town, I'm doing both his and mine. But it's really wonderful getting out and meeting everybody, and everybody has been very, very receptive to the project so far. So it's just that there's so many. There's only so many hours in a day. But we're endeavoring to have every one at least met, and maybe second meeting by March 15, and certainly signed and wrapped up no later than the third or fourth week in March. We just need to get that done according to the time frame that you'll see in this report.

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Reichard, there is one thing I would request. When the plans are finally finished, I think that they should be presented to Council so we can take a look at them.

Mrs. Reichard: Absolutely.

Mr. Clemens: And give us a little time to look at them, if you would do that please.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. We will...

Mr. Clemens: Before it's bid out or anything. We'd want to take a look at it.

Mrs. Reichard: Yeah. Travis Eifert, the designer, the engineer from on the project is here with us this evening in the event that any of you would have any technical questions about that. (Inaudible. Speaking off mike). This is Travis Eifert from EMH&T.

Mr. Eifert: With the amount of information that we have in this plan, if you'd like we could schedule a time to get you preliminary sets, which you could take an advanced look at it. We have preliminary plans right now. We're trying to finalize those as we're meeting with the property owners. So if that's something that would help, if it's sooner than later, we can do that at your convenience.

Mr. Clemens: I think that would be fine. Okay. We'll get something scheduled then.

Mr. Eifert: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions for Mrs. Reichard? Yes, Brett.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Clemens. Mrs. Reichard, looking at your report, one of the things I had noticed, and it didn't dawn on me until recently that, the end of this project shows it resurfacing in the summer 2007.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Is that correct? Is this going to be a project that runs consistently through that period of time? Or are there going to be periods where we're going to have no work happening? I think my concern is, are we going to have traffic delays from now until 2007? I'm just envisioning what happened last time. Are we going to be there for that total span?

Mrs. Reichard: I can only speak to the last time, and then Travis will speak to this time. The last time, I think what we ran into in some of the delays is, we didn't have the easements. And we got stopped. And not only did it cause problems with the project but it made it longer and more costly. This time we're going to have all the easements out front. But Travis can speak to the agenda.

Mr. Eifert: To address your comment about the length of the duration of the project, we're doing something a little different this phase. We're shifting all the traffic to the south side. The first component to get the duct bank on the north side improvements completed. Then the water line, duct bank, sidewalks, etc. And that, we anticipate carrying through the rest of the year. Now there will be a lag time between basically the winter months and the next construction season. But we anticipate to get all the lanes back open if the water work and the duct work's completed in time. And then we will move over to work on the south side which will be the remainder of next year. Following that, the street is going to be resurfaced by an ODOT resurfacing program. And the reason that is, and it's not included in this current set is because of a cost savings. ODOT pays for 80% of the resurfacing materials if you go through their urban paving program. So we took advantage of that. It is a discomfort to the public but, it's a huge cost savings. And that's why you see the time line as it is.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Eifert: Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from members of Council, committee? (No response). If not, thank you Sharon. Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Travis, if you could clarify something for me. I just heard what you said. I believe Mr. Baxter asked, is it an '05, '06, '07 project? And I think your answer was, yeah probably. But the '07, you said we didn't apply for the paving in this project. Are we saying that the ODOT, the 20% of the ODOT dollars that we have to pay, it will not be in the funds that we're talking about being involved in Phase II or whatever we want to call it? They are not in there?

Mrs. Reichard: They are.

Mr. Hills: They are in there?

Mr. Eifert: I'm sorry if I confused any of them. What we're doing is, we're doing two separate plans. One is for the Streetscape and one is for the resurfacing. And the reason that is, is for ODOT's resurfacing program, they're going to come in after we're completed with the Streetscape portion. So that the curb work, all the work outside the curbs is completed. Because we're going

to need those traffic lanes for construction operations.

Mr. Hills: But the numbers you are going to ask Council to bond do include a completed project which you don't anticipate being completed until '07?

Mr. Eifert: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: The construction season of '07. So _____ answer is yeah, it is a three year project.

Mr. Eifert: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: When you're doing in year of '05, when you're closing the north end and burying the electric lines and whatever, are you also doing the, I know Mr. Underwood doesn't like the Streetscape, but the landscaping part of the north side in '05?

Mr. Eifert: That is what's anticipated. Correct.

Mr. Hills: And then you're doing the south side in '06?

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: And then you're going to pave what you did in '05, and '06, in '07?

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay. That clarifies it for me. I don't know if that will help.

Mr. Baxter: Yeah. Thanks, Bill.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Bill. Thank you.

Mr. Eifert: For clarifications, all lanes of traffic will be open during winter months. We'll go back to the traffic pattern that we see today. The existing conditions.

Mr. Hills: So we are looking at a three year project?

Mr. Eifert: That's correct.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, Discussion, Status of Rosehill Road Project; improvement of Taylor Road south of Main. The Rosehill Road project, I'd like to hold. There's an upcoming meeting with the County Engineer for this discussion, and talk over our problem and see how the situation stands. So I'd like to hold that until the next committee meeting and we should have some answers on that.

Taylor Road south of Main, I've got that on there basically just for one reason. And maybe other committee members have some questions too. And this has to do with Mr. Parkinson probably. And what I'm interested in Dave, and I think I've asked this before and so forth, when do you anticipate the plans being completed?

Mr. Parkinson: We are currently on schedule to complete the plans, middle of May.

Mr. Clemens: Middle of May.

Mr. Parkinson: Middle of May, we should have an 85% complete plan somewhere toward the middle of April. If you're interested we could, as with the other project, distribute the preliminary plans for your review. But our target is the middle of May to complete the plans. We are on schedule for it. The original thought was to bid it out in June to be able to start work in July if the OPWC was successful, which wasn't.

Mr. Clemens: Good. That's what I wondered. When would we be bidding it out and getting it started?

Mr. Parkinson: We would be prepared at the city's direction to advertise in June and have a contractor ready in July.

Mr. Clemens: Good. Good. That's what I was wondering. Are there any other questions for Mr. Parkinson or Mrs. Reichard on this subject? (No response). Thanks, Dave. That was my interest on that.

The next item on the agenda, Discussion, Adding to the 2005 Street Program, crack sealing for Lancaster Avenue from Main Street to the north corporation limits. Who is going to speak on this? Mrs. Reichard. This has to do with Lancaster Avenue?

Mrs. Reichard: Lancaster Avenue. The crack sealing. It might be well for Mr. Parkinson to speak to it if you have questions. But it was brought to my attention that it needs the crack sealing. Otherwise, we could be looking at a major reconstruction of that road in the next year or two, and that would be \$400,000. So this is a way of forestalling the need to get out there and reconstruct the road. Do a complete repaving. It's just a cost benefit. \$60,000 versus \$400,000. It just sounded like the right thing to do.

Mr. Clemens: I have no problem with this. I've looked at Lancaster Avenue and I took the time to do it. I don't see it any different than any other streets being crack sealed. But if it's a necessity this year to spend the \$60,000 rather than next year, I would think that would probably be the thing to do. Who looked at this and said that this is time to do it? Dave, is this the deal?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes. We in the course of doing the estimating for the rest of the program, looked real hard at Lancaster, and it was our recommendation. And we came in and we did push to give this some additional consideration for this year.

Mr. Clemens: Fine. Thank you. Are there any other questions on this subject as far as the crack sealing? Additional \$60,000. Yes, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. What does this in time frame give us by putting the sealant down? Do we have another three years, five years, one year? What's the time frame do we recover by doing this rather than not doing it?

Mr. Parkinson: We believe, and it's more of a fuzzy crystal ball than science, we believe that, if we do not crack seal this year, that the road will need to be milled and paved within a couple of three years. We believe that if we do crack seal this year, then we can probably get five to seven years out of it with proper maintenance and attention. And we think that given the importance of Lancaster Avenue as a major arterial, that it was worth the effort.

Mr. Clemens: Are there any other questions from the committee or from Council? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens, and David while you're there, and I guess I will state, I had asked about it, I noticed on our original plans, Jackson Street was added, and now we're wanting to put this on. And I did send an e-mail up about who added Jackson. And I got an e-mail back. Mrs. Frazier was nice enough to send a reminder that I had already been told. I don't know that I remember that. So Mrs. Reichard, you may have told me that, but if I understand it right, Jackson Street was added at the request of the Mayor. And I guess I would ask first of all... Go ahead Mrs. Reichard, then I'll ask.

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct. The same day that I got it, I saw you at Council that night. I think it was on February 7 that I told you that the Mayor had indeed added that, had asked to add, had talked to Larry to add it. What's happened is, it's just a small area going down towards the traffic light where the pavement has rippled. And it was not a costly item but one that needed to be taken care of. And that's really the sum and substance of how it got on there and why.

Mr. Hills: I don't remember our discussion but you may have, and maybe we didn't. But David, did you look, as you said, you looked at the others. Have you now looked at Jackson, and you recommend incorporation into the program?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes. We did examine Jackson. We did observe the shoving, as technical as a term as that is. That's what we call it. Shoving. And it's usually found on downhill breaking slopes or acceleration slopes. In this instance, it's both. Now you're stopping as you're coming to Main Street and you're accelerating hard to get into Main Street, and it causes the shoving. It is there. It is in need of attention. And we support the decision to add it.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to ask one more question while you're up Dave. And this reverts back I suppose to the Streetscape. And I realize Lancaster Avenue is an important street because I know we widened it five or six years ago, and it's one of our main thoroughfares. And when we talk about our Street Program, and when we talk about our main thoroughfares, maybe you can tell

me, on the 2007 when the state's going to do the resurfacing, are they going to resurface the part of Route 40 beyond Graham Road? Do you know? Because it's falling apart. It's terrible.

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

Mr. Clemens: Does it go to the city limits?

Mr. Parkinson: Mr. Clemens, we believe it goes to the county line.

Mr. Clemens: To the county line.

Mr. Parkinson: We'll look into that and get you a good answer.

Mr. Clemens: If you would. Because I'll tell you, and I'm sure Larry knows this, Route 40 is in terrible shape beyond Graham Road going east. I mean, it's bad. It's getting to be like it is down in front of City Hall. And I just wondered if that's part of it. If you would find out on that, I'd appreciate it. Are there any other questions for Mr. Parkinson or Mrs. Reichard on this subject? (No response). If not, I'd like to make a motion to send this to Council. We haven't appropriated any money yet for the Street Program as far as the financing part of it. I'd just like to make an agreement I guess, that we add it to the Street Program.

Mrs. Frazier: Yeah. You'd have them add Jackson and Lancaster as presented. And it will come back to you.

Mr. Clemens: Just make a motion that we add to it?

Mrs. Frazier: Yeah.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. I'd like to make a motion that we add Jackson to the Street Program and also, the cracked sealing of Lancaster Avenue. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

The next item on the agenda, An ordinance to amend Chapter 339, Commercial and Heavy Vehicles by adding Section 339.15, Engine And Exhaust Brakes. This had its second reading and it's up to go to Council for its third reading. Do I have any comments on this from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). If not, I'll make a motion that we send this to Council for its third reading and for approval. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

With that I'd like to close the Safety Committee meeting at 8:07.

Safety Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

March 7, 2005

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 7, 2005

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

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

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:07 p.m.

The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the February 22 meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). None being heard, they will stand.

Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions to tonight's agenda? (No response). None being heard, the agenda will stand.

Item number 4 is a discussion regarding the rezoning of 7955 Oak Valley Road from R-3 to CC. Applicant is Hans Gucker, Advanced Civil Design. How you doing Hans? Thanks for coming in. Do you just want to make a presentation to the members of the zoning request?

Mr. Gucker: Yeah. I'm basically going to give a brief synopsis of what we're proposing to do, and kind of go over what our rationale for the development we came up with. And I think everybody's seen the plan that we've submitted, and just answer any questions that anybody might have at this time. We're asking for a rezoning of a 1.7 acre lot at 7955 Oak Valley Road. It's currently owned by Mr. Jim Bates. We've come up with a plan to rezone this to CC from an R-3 district. Mr. Bates has come up with a plan that would offer this property to the use of an office type building and parking lot. The impacts to the surrounding area are relatively minimal. There is an existing house on this 1.7 acre lot that is vacant right now and it's not used for anything, and

doesn't lend itself well to future residential development. We're zoned CC on three sides of the property, and a Special District from the cemetery on the other side of the property. We have residential zoning to the south, and then across Oak Valley Road which we'll be buffering with the landscaping and other aesthetic items. What we're proposing to do is to have approximately 11,000 square foot office use building. The specifics of the office will be in the future. We're not 100% sure as to right now, what type of office. Whether it be medical or basic office use will be used. We have come up with some plans as far as the drainage to be serviced with a detention basin on site to be shared with the Pfeifer Funeral Home that was approved earlier this month. Traffic, we've discussed with EMH&T, the impacts of the traffic. We expect approximately 250 average daily trips to this site. Not enough to warrant any turn lanes of any kind. We're going to have two accesses to this site. Both of them are existing. The first one, on Oak Valley Road up to the existing curb cut. And the other one will be a shared access with the Pfeifer Funeral Home which also will be existing at that time. Utilities, we don't expect any increase in utility usage for this building. Sanitary sewer is actually the density for residential. It's higher than what it would be for commercial use. A construction schedule would be pretty standard for a construction of this size. Approximately four to six months construction. And I think that that is pretty much what we have at this time. I wanted to also bring Al Berthold, who's an architect who's come up with some building schemes and some ideas as far as architectural aesthetics of this property. He'd like to talk to you a little bit about what we have on the idea for what this is supposed to look like and how we can buffer between the residential and the commercial.

Mr. Berthold: In working with Hans on this site layout, I think there were a couple of things that we wanted to be mindful of. First of all, the context in which this site sits with the funeral home up on Main Street. It's primarily brick. Our building is going to be brick. Funeral homes don't have a lot of windows. Office buildings do. So our building is going to have quite a few windows in it. We also wanted to be mindful of those neighbors who are south of us. And so we opted to do a one story building to keep the height of it low. We decided not to follow the lead that the funeral home had done with some relatively tall gables that were brick. Our design shows a hip roof which again, tries to keep the visual of the building down more to the residential scale that is behind us, or beside us. Lastly, we would like to, you can see on the drawing, we basically have two buildings. And we did that intentionally to break up the scale of an 11,000 square foot single unit into two smaller pieces. We further differentiated the buildings by giving the square one more glass than brick. And the other one may be about a 50/50 balance between brick and glass. As Hans mentioned, we don't have any tenants. We don't know who is going to be coming in here. We don't know whether this is going to be a two tenant building, or three tenant building. But we feel with what we're proposing, it gives you some assurances of what we intend to follow through with as we solicit tenants and demise the building into smaller pieces. We have some photographs of the site if you all haven't seen it. I can just pass this around or you can look at it. It shows the relationship of the site to the single family.

Mr. Gucker: I think it's also important to point out that Mr. Bates has approached his neighbors. And I don't believe at this time, there's been any opposition to what we're proposing. I also discussed with Mrs. Reichard, and you Mr. Gilbert about what we're proposing to do. And I think it is a favorable project looked on by the city and I think it will be an added asset to what we have out there right now.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Hans. You had stated in your letter, you were utilizing .7 acres to the west. And that is, is that on the 1.771 acre tract?

Mr. Gucker: No. It is not.

Mr. Gilbert: For utilization of additional detention pond in regards to the storm water?

Mr. Gucker: Yeah. The .7 acre tract is actually a residual piece that was broken out from the sale of the piece to the Pfeifer Funeral Home.

Mr. Gilbert: And that is currently CC?

Mr. Gucker: That is currently CC. Correct.

Mr. Gilbert: And you'll be utilizing that for greenspace...

Mr. Gucker: We'll be utilizing it for green space, detention basin, and some overflow parking in that area. We are proposing to have the parking facing towards the commercial, and not facing towards the residential.

Mr. Gilbert: Gives you some buffering to that section on the other side of Oak Valley. And you're only going to be requesting one ingress/egress?

Mr. Gucker: Correct.

Mr. Gilbert: Because you're going to utilize what the funeral home has further to the west.

Mr. Gucker: There's an access easement on the .7 acre property that is there now that when that property was brought in for a Major Site Plan, that was part of the sale of property that they don't want any, the city doesn't want any more accesses for this small piece. And that was part of the agreement for that set sale.

Mr. Gilbert: And then you're buffering to the south looks to be fairly extensive. How would you describe it to the members?

Mr. Gucker: Well, I guess what we have, what we envision is probably some evergreen type of buffering, a mounding up there next to the residential. We really don't want any, to be able to view that property at all. I don't believe that it's going to be aesthetically unpleasing or anything. It's going to be a very nice addition. But obviously, with the city requirements for landscape buffers, we will comply with that.

Mr. Gilbert: Which, as opposed to what's there currently.

Mr. Gucker: Which is not much.

Mr. Gilbert: Right. And then the, you had indicated that the impact of the storm water adjustments that you'll be making is minimal. And if you could just explain that to the members. Because what we have, we have an issue on Broadwyn that many of the members here have dealt with, and some of that is routed that way, is eventually after it's gone through our storm water detention system at this point. And we have two detention areas already in this particular development to the southwest. And you're adding the third. That helps hold up that runoff and then release, explain to the members how that works.

Mr. Gucker: Right. And one thing that we also do, and we thought would help for this area is to have a master plan of the storm water detention. And that was to utilize what the Pfeifer Funeral Home, of the two owners getting together and coming up with a single basin rather than each piece having its own single basin, than three basins. The smaller a property gets going to individual basins, the greater for possible error and greater for possible storm water runoff system to not work necessarily together, but to hinder or worse than the condition that's already out there. So our plan is to have one basin for this area. We'll be picking up the area from Main Street that encompasses to Oak Valley Road, that encompasses the Pfeifer Funeral Home, our proposed area, and then also some runoff from the cemetery and the Wheelsport property that currently comes across our property. We'll be picking that up, sending it through our basin, and controlling that release to an existing structure that it's on, Oak Valley Road.

Mr. Gilbert: You had uncertainty in terms of the tenants. This relates I guess, to your request for a waiver on one of our items that we find under 1151.02 of our zoning code.

Mr. Gucker: Right. And I don't know that we necessarily need a waiver of that. For General Office, we've indicated that we think we will probably get 250 average daily trips to this site for 11,000 square foot office building. But as you know, in offices, we don't want to, it can be numerous tenants in there. One, you may have a higher traffic volume for let's say, a medical office versus an engineers office that we are in. We don't want to limit the owner too much to the sale of the property and to market his building. He wants it to be open to multi-users, if it were to be a general office type of a use. And I think that, for right now, with kind of the unknown, we've come up with, here's what we think the average is going to be. If it turns out, obviously when we go through, get further on in the planning process, Major Site Plan development will have a better indication as to who the tenants will be for this property. And at that time, I know that the requirement is still there for a traffic impact study. But to use what we know in the future to prepare, I guess a more in depth study.

Mr. Gilbert: How does a traffic impact study effect the property owners marketability of this site?

Mr. Gucker: Well, I guess if he were to, not saying that the board can limit what kind of tenants are going to be in this building, I guess one thing we didn't know is, if this were to be a medical, we didn't want the owner to be beholden to, this is going to be set up for medical offices versus a general office type of use. So we don't want to get too specific as to who are going to be the tenants in this building.

Mr. Gilbert: I guess from our standpoint, Council doesn't want to be beholden to a random figure of 250 trips per day. We make our decision in terms of the zoning, and then all of a sudden its 750 and we've got the residents rolling in here holding us accountable to that. So historically, the Service Committee hasn't granted waivers in terms of traffic impact. I believe the closest we move towards that is when we had a tract of land near Taylor Square that was being purchased by those owners that had encompassed that particular tract in their original traffic study. I don't believe it was the actual (Tape Change). They added on to that particular study since the traffic patterns were so close to that area of land. I guess I'm looking to find some common ground with you in terms of the traffic impact this might have. Particularly since we're moving from R-3 to CC. And I think you have a good proposal, good use of the land. But due to the nature of the proximity of the residential, I think it's important for Council to have a true idea of that impact. I'm not saying it would necessarily have to be prior to us moving this forward to a hearing, but if you would be able to, lack of a better term, worse case scenario, or which would be best case for the property owner, maximum impact that we're looking. Because you are merging an ingress and egress with another property owner in terms of their traffic volume. I just think it would be good for Council to have that information before final passage. So I would just request, and open this up to members of Council for your suggestions. But we would at least have that impact back prior to the date that the public hearing would be set for. If that would be amenable to you and there isn't any objection from the other members, and Mrs. Frazier tells me that's possible.

Mrs. Frazier: You're just talking the impact study on the traffic? Not the other things that they've asked for the waiver.

Mr. Gilbert: On the storm water?

Mrs. Frazier: They have a waiver, a letter to waive items there. Are you referring to all of those or just the traffic?

Mr. Gilbert: Well, my understanding, it was the construction schedule, utility impact, and traffic impact. Correct?

Mrs. Frazier: Right.

Mr. Gilbert: And I guess I'll move on to, I'm just right now speaking specifically to the traffic impact study. Any objections to that from members of Service or other members of Council? (No response). And then on the utility impact studies that we referenced, those are, what's the reasoning behind that request?

Mr. Gucker: The reason we had this request, or the letter for request of waiver for these items was because it was requested by, for us to be on the agenda. I guess in my opinion, I don't think we really need the request for a waiver of these items because I feel that we've pretty much given what the impacts were going to be for this, or what we feel that they're going to be for this property as far as utilities. And the construction schedule, and even...

Mr. Gilbert: In terms of your paragraph for utility impact?

Mr. Gucker: Correct.

Mr. Gilbert: I would note that we did have that paragraph provided with the packet information.

Mr. Gucker: And also with the construction schedule, without knowing who the contractor's going to be and when the project is going to begin, and how long it's going to go before, I guess Council to be rezoned, getting an idea of when we can start, we estimate four to six months of construction time. That doesn't mean approval time, which I understand can be another, a month or two month period. So I don't feel that we really need a waiver of that. And maybe it was more of a request to give some more information on those items. I guess I'm not sure if the Council would like more information on that, or if what we have is adequate.

Mrs. Frazier: When it comes, at least from this side, when it comes to the waiver, the initial packet that was delivered on the 16th of February didn't have some items in there. And when talking to Annique VanKley, I told her that whatever you all didn't want to submit, you had to ask that it be waived because that's what it calls for. It says, 'application will include the following items unless waived by Council'. And then you had to ask for that. So you've asked for it in this letter.

Mr. Gucker: We've asked for it because that was my understanding of what was required to actually get on the agenda.

Mrs. Frazier: Well, it's required for your material.

Mr. Gucker: We previously had submitted the letter that shows the impact.

Mrs. Frazier: You feel that your material has all your answers in it?

Mr. Gucker: Yes, I do. And if the Council would like more information, that's fine with us. We don't have any problem providing that.

Mr. Gilbert: Just for the members benefit and for the public's benefit, I won't take much more of your time here, the code states 'the applicant will include the following items unless waived by Council'. And that includes names and addresses of owners of the property within, contiguous to, and directly across the street from the effected parcel. And did we receive that?

Mrs. Frazier: We have that now.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. And that was I think, when Mrs. Frazier had followed up for the additional information.

Mrs. Frazier: That's right.

Mr. Gilbert: Existing topography at 2 foot contour intervals. I believe we have that.

Mr. Gucker: That's correct.

Mr. Gilbert: Is that on the black and white that we have?

Mr. Gucker: It's on the black and white. Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. Proposed vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns. You've identified those.

Mr. Gucker: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: The location of all existing and proposed structures, which we see with the color rendition and the black and white that has the existing structures. And the proposed assignment of use and subdivision of land including private land and common land. Which I believe that's been outlined. And then preliminary plans of all structure types, which is what we have identified on this map. And deed restrictions and protective covenant.

Mrs. Frazier: I believe in the second submission, Mr. Bates wrote a letter regarding that.

Mr. Gilbert: Schedule of construction I believe, just generally outlined four to six months from date of approval. And traffic impact, utilities impact, and drainage impact study, and such other information as City Council may require. I know in some cases we have utilized similar write ups in terms of the utility impact. And you did identify in your February 15 letter, the future improvements and how you utilize the .7 acre tract to manage your storm water. And I would just ask that our City Engineer take a look at this prior to the hearing just to give Council an idea that that .7 acre tract is large enough to handle from the different properties so we're not looking at undue pressure to be put on the existing detention areas. Just for Council's benefit. Because what I've done in the past, the Council has done, is to incorporate your storm water letter for information into the actual zoning as where the storm water will be routed and how it will be handled. So I'd just ask Mr. Parkinson to take a look at that. Yes, it's noted on the...

Mr. Baxter: On storm water.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. And you can see it on the left, to the left there, that whole parcel is open for green space and detention pond area.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I noticed the basin here. What I was questioning is, during drainage from the funeral home, is the plan on coming across the parking lot into that? Or is there going to be some type of...

Mr. Gilbert: My understanding is, it will be routed through drainage pipe.

Mr. Baxter: Drainage pipes. Okay. I was looking at it and I didn't see that. That's why I was asking. I'm not an architect so I wouldn't know it if it was there. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: I think as far as the utility impact, that is standard what has been written. But, Hans

help me with this, you had indicated a final analysis will be performed when the development plans are prepared.

Mr. Gucker: Right.

Mr. Gilbert: And I guess what we get into here is, if we waive certain items, we set a precedent.

Mr. Gucker: Right. I understand.

Mr. Gilbert: And we've been careful not to do that since the new code was brought into effect in 1999. What is, a final analysis will be performed when the development plans are prepared? Help me with that as to the difference between then and now.

Mr. Gucker: Well, when we get into, and what I guess that would mean, it would mean the type of gas service needed. If it's going to be a two inch medium pressure. What kind of service is needed at the building. Electric, the same capacity. Three phase versus single phase. The other types of, the water usage, if it's going to be a sprinklered building, which I imagine it would be, and the uses, if there's anything specific to this, it would require additional water usage. Such as the funeral home has its room for preparing bodies and what not that requires specific design criteria for gas, and electric, and water, and things to that nature. And that's what I was referring to in that last statement where, if there's anything that's out of the ordinary that's going to be in here, I wouldn't say out of the ordinary but, any specific uses that are going to need an increase of water usage, or sanitary, or gas then, that would be analyzed at that time and done in our design for the site development.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Parkinson. I'm sure we've had instances where the aspects of this have changed from what, in terms of utilities, from what was originally outlined with a utility study or impact. How does the city handle that?

Mr. Parkinson: We review it on a case by case basis. To carry it further, we've had places where existing buildings have changed use. And so it can be examined on a case by case basis. We would like to think that there could be a, there is a vision for this. We don't know that that's what it will be. But there is a vision and we would think that you could do a utility study, or a traffic study based on the vision that you have today. And it may change. And if it does change, then we need to revisit these to see if the assumptions that were made originally, that the utilities or the infrastructure could support the development, still holds.

Mr. Gilbert: Very well. Any questions from members of the committee at this point? (No response). Other members of Council? (No response).

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Yes, Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: Just for because I'm kind of hearing this about half, is this project in conjunction with

the funeral home?

Mr. Gucker: No, it is a separate project.

Mrs. Frazier: Am I hearing you saying that some of these things go with the funeral home? Like the drainage, and the traffic, and all this. This isn't getting like, mixed together is it?

Mr. Gucker: No. They're going to be two separate developments and two separate approval processes. One, we've already been in the process, or going through the process right now for the Pfeifer Funeral Home. We have requirements for that. We are, when we're going through this property process of approvals, trying to see what's going to happen in the future, in the plan for that. An instance, with the storm water management. We'd like these two properties to work together. The owners are working out, and have an agreement that they're going to be working out, in place for this basin. So they are two separate developments. Storm water management will be combined with this one basin.

Mrs. Frazier: That's alright. There for a minute, I thought they were kind of getting intermingled. And I couldn't understand how, even if the zoning changed and you have this building, and this building over here, how all these little basins and stuff are going to be governed. I wasn't getting that. Thanks for your explanation.

Mr. Gilbert: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. And I'm assuming you're just going to build the building. You don't have any tenants yet? Is that correct?

Mr. Gucker: Correct.

Mrs. Newman: Then the interior will be finished as you get the tenants to their specifications. Is that true?

Mr. Gucker: Correct.

Mrs. Newman: Now, does the Building Department have to issue an Occupancy Permit for the tenants as they come in for whatever purpose they want?

Mr. Gilbert: Correct.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Thanks.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Question on the funeral home site. And it leads off the sheet and I can't see. Is there an access to Main Street into their parking lot?

Mr. Gucker: Yes, there is.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And I'm going to ask a question that seems obvious to me, and you keep talking about a medical office building. Isn't the potential for that somewhat limited by the proximity to a funeral home and sharing a drive? I mean, it just seems like it might steer some doctors away from it. I don't know.

Mr. Gucker: Well, I'm not sure about that. Maybe when I say medical, it could be a dentist office or anything to that nature.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. But a service oriented office where a client would come in to have something done to them. And why are you doing two separate buildings? What's the concept between the two separate buildings? Is that a phasing issue?

Mr. Berthold: Well, there were two ideas. The first is to break, if you drew the footprint of an 11,000 square foot building, it would be a relatively long building. Not really consistent with the single-family that's across the street. So, even though it costs more to do two separate buildings, it breaks them down into two pieces. The other option is, that the little square one could be a full tenant building. If that was for example, a medical office building, it probably wouldn't have as many windows as the elevation shows. But if it was just an office building, that would probably be the way you would do it.

Mr. Beougher: And it's about 20 feet away for fire separation purposes. Okay. Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Any other questions from members of Service or other members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I'll make this request. What is Council's feelings on the request for the waiver on those three items? From my standpoint, I believe we should have the information prior to the approval of the zoning. However, I do not believe it's a situation where we should hold this until we receive them. I think if we receive the information on or about the date that the public hearing is set for, that would grant the applicant a good bit of time to put that information together at the same time the proposal is moving forward on its normal course as well. Is that acceptable to members of Service? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Gilbert, my major concerns again, are the traffic impact. Because it is a residential area that they're abutting up against. And I'm very sensitive to that. Secondly, the impact study with the drainage. Although, I would be willing to move it forward. I think that I would be hesitant to not have seen those studies prior to the project completed.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I don't know where they got their data but, their letter says that General Office uses of this type can be estimated to generate 250 average daily trips. Where did you pull this number?

Mr. Gucker: I got that from Gary Wilcox, Wilcox Engineering. And talked also with Larry Creed

with EMH&T.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. So you actually have had it evaluated then?

Mr. Gucker: Yes.

Mrs. Newman: So will that be sufficient?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I agree with Mr. Gilbert. I have no problem with your conception. The only problem I have a little bit with this, if you're building a general office building, I can understand how you would not know who your clients are going to be. I can understand if you're building an office building for a client. That's a different position. But if you're coming in and putting in a general office building to lease out, I know it's hard to come up with what your client's going to be. I do believe though, you should follow Mr. Gilbert's instructions as close as possible. But that's the only thing, that's my only thought on general office building. It's hard to say right now who you're going to lease it to. But I'd think you should follow Mr. Gilbert's instructions as close as you can.

Mr. Gucker: Sure.

Mr. Gilbert: And I see where you're coming with that, Mr. Clemens. I would just add in terms of impact, you might have a day where the funeral home is full and you've got your maximum use. Let's use the best case scenario, and that's a pretty full parking lot and you've got ingress and egress on Oak Valley. And I just think that information based on the code is important for Council to have for approval.

Mr. Gucker: Okay.

Mr. Gilbert: So if you could just provide that to us by on or about the date of the public hearing in regards to the construction schedule, the utility impact, and the traffic impact. And then I'll make a motion that we move this forward for its first reading and have a public hearing date set. Second from Mr. Baxter. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you Hans for coming in.

The next item on the agenda is a Discussion, Authorization for engineering services, Blacklick Creek erosion at Huber Bike Path. Mr. Parkinson.

Mr. Parkinson: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. I just wanted to take a brief minute. I have been somewhat silent, which is very uncharacteristic for me, with regards to this issue. And I wanted to let you know what we were doing at EMH&T. We have not forgotten about you, nor this project, nor this need. We have defined what we believe to be a recommended level of improvement that should be undertaken at this time. There are additional improvements that are needed through the corridor that Mr. Clemens asked that we review. And we believe that they can be safely deferred to a later date. That they are not integral or could not, would not be integral

with the improvements that we think need the most immediate attention. They are a separate project. And we are comfortable in suggesting that they be deferred. What has happened is, that we have undertaken an internal peer review if you will, of our approach that we've generated on how to address this. And we've come up with some questions of our own for ourselves. And we are undertaking resolution of those questions internally. And once we come to a consensus among ourselves as to the best recommendation to offer the city on how to proceed, then we will get that for you. We believe we are very close to doing that. So I apologize for coming week after week and promising but, at the moment I feel a little bit like a duck. On the surface, things are calm and quiet, but underneath, we're paddling like heck. We're trying to get you your answer.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Well, I appreciate that explanation, Mr. Parkinson. Just for the members, and for the public's benefit, you might look at that small section where the erosion has taken place and then you see the figure for the \$46,000 to work up these types of things. And I think it's worth breaking down. We're dealing with several different entities here in terms of costs and having approval for us to fix this problem. Correct?

Mr. Parkinson: Absolutely. And that's the problematic issue is the flood way. We are actually in the flood way. And we have to prove to FEMA that what we do does not effect the flood elevation one one-hundredth of a foot. We cannot have any impact increase in the flood elevation. And so there is that core of effort that is magnified and makes this project all that much more difficult. We'd like to say, let's just move the path over here. Well, we don't own over here. So that presents a whole new set of issues to tackle and deal with. And so we've been trying to keep within where we could, the bike path. So it was really, it wasn't a catch 22 per se, but it was sort of like that. And we were darned if we did, and darned if we didn't. That's what we're battling.

Mr. Gilbert: We're looking at at least \$8,000 earmarked for FEMA's permit. Correct?

Mr. Parkinson: Just for their permit. Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: And then another \$3,000 for the LOMR submission?

Mr. Parkinson: A letter of map revision.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. And \$5,000 for the flood plain study, which I'm sure is required to be utilized...

Mr. Parkinson: To support the letter of map revision.

Mr. Gilbert: To support these other things. So that's a big portion of where the cost involved in the initial stages of this are taking place. And is it fair to ask at this point as far as what topics are driving the internal debate? Or, would you rather just...

Mr. Parkinson: The internal debate right now is whether to try to keep the creek where it is with

sheet piling. To create if you will, kind of a false bank adjacent to the bike path. We create enough new dirt if you will, in order to put a fence up and protect the drop, and protect the path users from the drop, versus moving the stream back so that we can lay that bank down, versus coming to you and saying, really the answer is, you've got to bite the bullet and go talk to the property owner and move the bike path. And so we really have three schools of thought that we're trying to weigh carefully and when we make our recommendation to the city as which way we think is the best outcome to pursue.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Any idea on a time frame? Would you like another month, or?

Mr. Parkinson: I'd love one but I'm going to guarantee you that I'll be back in two weeks and we'll have our position on where we would recommend that the city go on this project.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay.

Mr. Parkinson: I'll be ready in two weeks.

Mr. Gilbert: Great. Mr. Baxter, then Mrs. Newman.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. One quick question here, if let's say the last option you said may be potential. We just have to move it. Doesn't that still leave us having to fix it too? We have an erosion problem obviously.

Mr. Parkinson: We have an ability to lay the bank back. And any time you take dirt out, your demonstration to FEMA is far less rigorous. So it's not like we're putting back dirt and making the embankment back, and putting dirt in the creek. We're doing the opposite. We're going to lay the creek back where it's eroding, and armor it, and then that would help it in many regards. And so, that's a much easier _____ fix. But then we've lost our embankment and we can't put our bike path on the slope.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. You were talking about moving dirt around, and then you mentioned armoring it, the bank. What would you armor it with?

Mr. Parkinson: There's a number of items you can use. You can use a geotech style. You can use rock. It just depends on the design. And that's what the designers do when they prepare their plan, is try to determine which is the most cost effective and beneficial.

Mrs. Newman: If it's just dirt, mother nature's going to put the water back where she wants it any way and wash it away again.

Mr. Parkinson: It'll be more than just, right. If you just pile the dirt down, the creek will take it away again. So it needs something in place to help hold it and that's armor. And I don't pretend to understand all the specifics of it. But we'll pick a good one.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Parkinson, is there a, at this point, aside from the permitting cost and the engineering, is there any type of approximate guess in terms of the actual cost of the project? Or could that be part of the internal debate as far as the impact it might have on the table?

Mr. Parkinson: It is. It is actually part of the issue that we've been discussing as to how much of your money do we want to ask you, how much of the tax payer's money do we want to ask you to invest in this improvement? It is substantial. It is a major undertaking to do this.

Mr. Gilbert: In the limited scope that we're dealing with here?

Mr. Parkinson: Even in the limited scope, it's hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. Gilbert: And I know we have two other projects that are pending that in relation to these funds that would be earmarked through storm water. So I would ask you, in some of your discussions, to revisit the concept we discussed. One of our initial meetings with Bartlett and Broadwyn Drive in terms of bonding through the storm water, which I don't believe it effects our overall bonding capability because we have a special earmarked storm water account that would go to the repayment of that bond. But not limited to just this project, but in terms of the three projects as a whole. If you could just maybe throw that into your discussions and...

Mr. Parkinson: Okay. That's a good idea. That's a very good idea.

Mr. Gilbert: Just a suggestion at this point. And Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: One last question, if I could follow up. How old is this bike path? How long has it been there? And are there any warranties on this?

Mr. Parkinson: The answer to the last question is easy. Afraid not. Mr. Clemens, do you recall when it was? I think it was built in the, I want to say, the late 80's.

Mr. Clemens: I couldn't say. I don't remember.

Male: '88 or '89.

Mr. Parkinson: Somewhere around the late 80's.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay, Mr. Parkinson. I appreciate it. So we'll just hold this for two more weeks. Any other questions or comments from other members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we hold this for two weeks. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 6, Ordinance authorizing Mayor to purchase 2005 GMC Sierra half ton

pickup. This is for our Storm Water Department. It was allocated in our 2005 budget. Are there any questions or comments on this at this point? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that, this item did have its first reading on 2-28, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its second reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. All those in favor, signify by saying...

Mrs. Frazier: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: For the second reading, Larry? For the bid, correct? So we can get on the...

Mr. Ward: Yes. Because we're only going to have a day or two before the cutoff date.

Mr. Gilbert: Very well. I'll amend my motion without any objection from the other members to send this to Council for its second reading with a recommendation for a rule suspension. Do I have a second? Mrs. Newman with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 7 is Ordinance accepting unrecorded deed of easement. This item did have its first reading February 28. Are there any questions or comments at this time from members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its second reading on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a second? Mrs. Newman with the second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 8, Ordinance accepting ten recorded deeds of easement. This item did have its second reading on February 28. Are there any comments from members of Service or other members of Council at this time? (No response). None being heard, and we do not need any type of emergency or rule suspension language on this. We can just go through the regular readings. Very well. I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council for its third reading 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'll adjourn Service at 8:53.

Service Committee

- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

March 7, 2005

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 7, 2005

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

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

Mr. Stake: And I would like to call to order, the March 7 Finance Committee meeting at 8:54.

The second item on the agenda is the approval of minutes of Finance Committee meeting held February 22, 2005. Are there any corrections to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. Anybody have any changes to the agenda? (No response).

Item number 4 is Discussion, Resolution Requesting Ohio General Assembly to continue its history of partnership with Ohio's Local Governments and return funding for Local Government Funds to the permanent law formula. This was provided to us from Mayor McPherson. Does anybody in the administration like to comment on this? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, as Acting Mayor, the Mayor did talk to me before he left. And he had indicated that this had been recommended by the Ohio Municipal League and he would like to see it go forward. I know that there have been some discussions about some modifications I'm sure you may want to go into. But he did ask me just to state that it did come from the Municipal League and he fully supported it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, President Hills. I notice in here, the fourth 'Whereas', the sentence ends 'and would require 2.3 additional mils of property tax or an additional increase of .3% in the city's income tax to replace'. And that just struck me as something we had not talked about. We haven't made up our minds on how we would replace this funding if lost. And I didn't want to send the message that we would be increasing taxes as soon as this, should they cut the local government funds. So my only suggestion in this, I'm supportive of this document except for what I just read. Are there any questions or comments from members of the committee? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I agree with you. I support the document. But I have no intention on the increase, and if we do anything, just increase the budget. We're not passing any taxes.

Mr. Stake: I think there's the opportunity for debate on that down the road. I don't want to send the wrong message at this point. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: That's the fifth 'whereas'. So you're not going to do the fourth and the fifth. You're not going to reduce your budget and increase the taxes. So we're going to _____ the budget. That's the way we do it. So I agree with your amendment.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, as Acting Mayor, I'm not going to oppose it. I don't hear Mr. Whitney saying any reason to oppose it. I think it's a more accurate reflection of what our position would be. So I could say as Acting Mayor, although the Mayor said it's okay, I'm okay with the changes. For what that's worth.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Stake, you want to omit the fourth 'whereas' paragraph?

Mr. Stake: No. Not the whole paragraph. It starts 'Whereas, the local government funds received in 2004 by the City of Reynoldsburg totaled \$1,551,027 which represents 14% of the City of Reynoldsburg General Fund receipts'. And then it says 'and would require 2.3 additional'. That's where I want to strike 'and' to the end of the sentence.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could suggest, after 'receipts' where there's a comma, if we change that to

a semi-colon and leave the 'and' in, that leads you to your next 'Whereas'.

Mr. Stake: Okay. That works for me.

Mr. Hills: Then we're just deleting the last two lines.

Mr. Stake: That's fine with me. Any comments or questions from members of the committee on that? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Anybody else? (No response). I do think we need to send the message to our state legislators that this would be a serious impact on us. We're looking at roughly \$300,000 lost. We're looking at financing some debt here in the future. We could have a swing of a half-million, six-hundred thousand dollars annually here if this 20% reduction hit, and we go ahead and finance what we're going to be talking about next. So, I am hoping and hopeful, that our state legislators won't hit us so hard. But President Hills, and Auditor Whitney, and myself attended a meeting with our State Legislator Larry Flowers and some other folks from Groveport. I guess it's the south, what was that Bill? Do you remember?

Mr. Hills: Southeast.

Mr. Stake: It is a Chamber group that invited townships, villages, and us to a meeting on Saturday. And I've got to tell you, the message I got from Representative Flowers was, that they're seeming pretty adamant about cutting the local government funds.

Mr. Hills: I think the cuts are going to be there. I also noticed at that meeting, we were outnumbered.

Mr. Stake: Yes, we were.

Mr. Hills: We were about the only municipality that had an appearance. And I didn't hear nearly as much sympathy for us as I did for the others.

Mr. Stake: No. Everybody else was happy. There was only 10% for them.

Mr. Hills: I heard the statement made, well municipalities have other ways of raising income. I'm a little concerned coming out of that meeting.

Mr. Stake: Yes. Are there any other questions or comments in regards to this resolution? (No response). None being heard then, I'll make a motion that we send this on to Council for its approval. Do I have a second? With the amendment. Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion?

Mrs. Frazier: (Inaudible).

Mr. Stake: Yes. Send it on to Council as a rule suspension. Would that be okay with everybody here? We need to get this message to them as soon as possible. So that would be good. Okay. Any further discussion? All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 5 on the agenda is Discussion, Funding for various projects, Reynoldsburg Major Commercial Corridors Streetscape Project Phase II; S.R. 256, Taylor Road south of Main. One big one here is our Phase II Street Revitalization Project. Our City Auditor, Howard Whitney was kind enough to get us some information here on paper on what he presented here to us I believe, last week on the overhead. I had a little trouble seeing it, so it's good to get this written down so we can take a look at it. I guess the first thing we need to talk about is the financing of Phase II of the Street Revitalization Project. I guess we, and Mrs. Reichard, maybe you want to comment on this, we originally thought it would be about a 6 million dollar project, six, seven million dollar project. And the cost has risen.

Mrs. Reichard: I think at one point, we talked about, about 7 ½ million. But as we look at it and the project is 40% longer than it is in Phase I, and Phase I was over 6 million dollars, I think it stands to reason that at least 9 million was not unreasonable. Of course, with the increase in cost from some of the utilities, we are still in the talking phase with them. We are going to be meeting, we're going to have a major meeting on Monday. Those costs are still evolving. They could go down to as little as a million dollars or stay at their present one and a half million dollar level. I just don't, we don't have a handle on it yet. We have to wait until AEP comes back with a firmer cost. But again, we are going to, we talked with some of the folks today. We have a meeting scheduled for Monday to go over some of the issues. That's about all I can say at this point. Sorry.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. We're looking to finance on this portion, maybe Dr. Whitney would want to address this 7.2 million.

Mr. Whitney: Yes, 7.2 million. Look on, this is color coded so that, the green page. Bonding for 7.2 million, which is of course debt of other from the previous page, net of other sources of funds. The Issue 2 Grant, the Issue 2 loan, and so forth. The Water Fund contribution, ODOT contribution, net of all those. The basic bottom line here is over in the right hand column in pink. The amount of debt servicing will increase as a result of a 7.2 million dollar bond issue. Given the fact that we do have some other sources of servicing the debt. Notice column 6. Those about eight, nine years of another source of debt servicing funds. We cannot use the TIF Funds from Phase I. However, we can apply more TIF Funds to Phase I. And therefore, release some of our general debt servicing for Phase II. So that's another source of funds. But all in all, the bottom line is over there on the right in pink. And notice that by the year 2012, we cap out on our increase in debt servicing 405,000. That's 9 years down the road and that should be handleable at that time.

Mr. Stake: I guess I'm not so concerned about that many years down the road. I'm worried about the next couple, or three. I guess it'll probably be 3 years before we'd start servicing this debt. So, wouldn't it?

Mr. Whitney: Well, we'll have to start servicing at the end of this year.

Mr. Stake: End of this year? Okay. Mr. Clemens, did you have a question for Dr. Whitney?

Mr. Clemens: Well, I do and I don't. I'm very disappointed on the cost we're talking about. The 10,918,000 to start with. But borrowing the 7,200,000 to me, it puts us in a position as far as I'm concerned, it limits our capability the next few years.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Clemens: Am I correct?

Mr. Whitney: Absolutely.

Mr. Clemens: On major projects.

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: If something would happen and so forth. Plus, borrowing the additional money for Taylor Road. I'm not opposed to the Streetscape. It's good for a good reason. It's good for the commercial part, for the business people. But it is a Streetscape. I mean, that's what it is. Streetscape. It's not a safety issue or something like that. We do have projects that are safety issues. I look at Taylor Road, and I look at possibly...

Mr. Whitney: Taylor Road's on the next page.

Mr. Clemens: I understand that. But I'm saying, I'm looking at Taylor Road. I'm looking at what I consider a safety issue, which is Taylor Road, Rosehill Road. And what else comes up over the next few years? We don't know. To tie us down on that amount of money plus our local government funds might be going down another 300,000 which it looks like it is, it's disappointing to me. And I think it would be disappointing to the residents to know that this type of shape that we're in, really if you come right down to it. Our borrowing power and what we're doing. I revert back, and maybe you can answer a question Howard, because I know that it's not all your fault or anything like that. We had a meeting about 8 months ago, you and I, and Mr. Hills, Mayor McPherson, and I think Mr. Underwood, and at that time we discussed Phase II on how we stood on our borrowing power. And at that time, you made the statement, and I agreed with you when you made it because we were worried about that. The thing to do, that we couldn't basically go over 7 million dollars without hurting our borrowing power in the future. And what we should do is Taylor Road and half of the Phase II. We discussed that and this was your statement that hurt our rating and probably 7 million was as high as we could go. I don't know what's changed since then.

Mr. Whitney: The cost of the project.

Mr. Clemens: Well certainly, the cost of the project has but not the cost of borrowing. Because at that time, you said 7 million was it. Now we're talking about 7.2 plus Taylor Road. Which Taylor Road to me is the important one. Because that's the safety issue I'm talking about. I personally, and I don't speak for anybody else, that's personally my feeling. I don't feel that I can set the residents in a position where we're expending over borrowing because of projects that

might come up in the near future that we need to supply and we can't do it. I'd like to work out some other way to handle it. But at the present time I've looked at this, and I look at our state and local funds that might go down. I'm just not satisfied or happy with it. Don't get me wrong, I'm not pinning this on you, don't get me wrong. I know that the total cost has gone up. This is not the type of cost we were talking about a year or so ago. It's expanded probably 4 million dollars. Close to 4 million dollars on this phase. What we do about it, I don't know. But I know I'm going to do a lot of thinking about it before I do any voting on anything. I just wanted to bring up my feelings on it. And I appreciate the work you did on it.

Mr. Whitney: I can certainly understand your reservations. I had them too.

Mr. Stake: And Mr. Clemens, we talked about the cost of this project a while back, and we talked about maybe doing Phase II, splitting that in half because of the cost of the project. But then the costs were going to be quite a bit lower than they are now. So we thought maybe instead of putting people who drive Main Street through that twice, if we could get it done in one shot, that would be good. But now I don't understand what you're saying. That's why I brought this up.

Mr. Clemens: It's going to be 3 years now. I was only planning on a year to get it done to start with. Now we're talking about 3 years just to get this done. So it could have been done half and half and still only be 3 years.

Mr. Stake: What does this, this debt service that you have on here now, what does that do to our rating? Or does it effect our rating at all?

Mr. Whitney: We won't know until we investigate it. I would say chances are, we're in pretty good shape, and our bond ratings will probably not change would be my best guess. If it does, it'll go down maybe one third of one letter.

Mr. Stake: We would put ourselves in a position where we wouldn't be able to go out and do any more.

Mr. Whitney: I can't answer that question. (Tape Change).

Mr. Stake: From the General Fund. Correct?

Mr. Whitney: Umhum.

Mr. Stake: I think everybody here and this table and everybody out there needs to think long and hard about this, and how much we want to bite off here. I am in favor of improving Main Street. I'm in favor of improving the environment for businesses and people to come and use those businesses. Business is what fuels our fire here. Without the businesses, we don't have the ability to pay back this debt. So I want to make it as pleasant as possible for people who do business on Main Street and for people to go in and use those businesses on Main Street. That's why I'm behind the revitalization project. Any other comments or questions from members of the committee? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: I think there was, Mrs. Reichard you might be able to help me with this, but there was, the reason we ran into some obstacles with breaking Phase II into A and B, was the limit that our other sources of funds, grants, whatnot, were placed on, we would not have been awarded. Was that part of the reason behind looking at...

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. There was question as to whether we were jeopardizing the 2.2 million dollars that Mr. Brandt had raised in both, I think it was either no interest loans or in grants. So it jeopardized that funding. And actually, if we don't break ground before the end of June, we will lose that funding also. And that's a large piece. At this point, the only thing that, the price of the project's not going up, but it can go down slightly. I don't want to, and the sooner it goes out to bid, probably the better the rate we'll get. I guess I would leave that up to Mr. Parkinson to speak to. But, we just don't have our hands around the utilities, are the utilities. And as long as we are required to pay them to down their lines, you can't go get your electricity from anybody else. We're a captive audience. So the best we can do is talk long and hard with them, and that's exactly what we're doing right now. But I don't know where that's going to take us.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Stake.

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

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Reichard, and I agree with the two issue grants that we have, that they are in question. Did anybody find out what the question was? Whether we could or we couldn't?

Mrs. Reichard: You'd have to ask Mr. Brandt that. I apologize. He's the one that handled it and he can be the one to answer that.

Mr. Clemens: This is something that's been discussed and I know it's been brought up before, and all I get is, there's a question. And I've never had the question answered. I agree that if the ground has to be broken by the time period that you say, it can be broken as half of the project instead of the whole project if the grant's still staying.

Mrs. Reichard: I'm sorry, sir. You'll have to ask Mr. Brandt that question. I just don't know.

Mr. Gilbert: I thought we were told.

Mr. Clemens: No, we weren't told. All I get is, there's a question. But nobody's ever answered what the question is.

Mr. Hills: Could I suggest, Mr. Clemens, Mrs. Reichard, can you get with Mr. Brandt and between the two of you, have an answer back to the Clerk that could be distributed?

Mrs. Reichard: Certainly.

Mr. Clemens: In writing. And if you have to contact somebody, I'd like to have it contacted and made, I don't want an opinion back. I want to know whether it can be or can't be.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay. I'll get with Mr. Brandt.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Clemens and Mrs. Reichard. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stake. I think what you're talking about here is breaking up instead of east and west, is north and south. Right? Doing one half of the street one year, which includes the duct bank. And I think the duct bank, or burying the lines was what one of the grants was for. So that grant would not be in jeopardy if we did the north side as Phase I, I think. And I'm not sure what the other grant was for. But Dr. Whitney, let me ask you a question. Does it make sense for us to go out and borrow half the money this year, and then go back out a year later? What does that do to our rating? Does it really save us anything?

Mr. Whitney: Let me give that some thought.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Any other questions from members of the committee?
Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I'm not on the committee but, the funding scheme for the Commercial Corridor Revitalization Phase II includes taking the Rosehill Road money that we've set aside to improve road. Does it not?

Mr. Whitney: No.

Mrs. Newman: It does not? That is left untouched?

Mr. Clemens: No. That is untouched now, but it has been suggested that we use it in the Street Program. But we'll hold up on that until we have the meeting, there is a meeting set up with the County Engineer to see how we stand on that. So it may come out that we need the 900,000 or more for Rosehill, that means we'd have to borrow for our Street Program. That's why I'm trying to bring these issues up that, right at this moment, it could be a few weeks or something, I hate to see us think that all of our money, our borrowing power is going to be eliminated for the next few years, come up with major projects. And there are safety projects that come up. That's my only feeling on it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Mrs. Newman, did you have any other questions?

Mrs. Newman: I just wondered, is there any way the plans could be made less grandiose for the revitalization of Main Street? For example, I would love to have an underground sprinkling system in my yard but I can't afford it. Do we have to have that? Particularly given the plant materials I've seen there. It seems to me that those particular flowers are pretty hearty. I'm not very good about watering my flowers and I've had some of those in my yard and they've seemed to do pretty well. So, do they actually need that kind of tender loving care? And could we save a lot of money, or some money by cutting out that underground sprinkling system? That's one

thing.

Mr. Stake: Does anybody know the answer to that question? (No response). Any others? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Stake. Dr. Whitney, my questions are from a little bit different nature. I know we asked you, how can we do this? And Council comes to you and says, is there a possible way for us to borrow this money? Or how can we raise these funds? But I think the more important question that should be asked to you Dr. Whitney is, should we do this? Should we borrow this money? And does it make for the city at this time to do that? Or would there be a better time to have this type of project initiated? And that's my question to you.

Mr. Whitney: And I've been mulling that over for a long time. And I'm wondering if we can afford not to do it. I guess that's the only response I can come up with. It's going to put us in a, any time you engage in a project of this nature, you are incurring a risk. The basic risk here is that we'd have trouble servicing the debt. So, would I recommend it? Yeah, I'd recommend it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I guess you have to take the difference on whether to take the risk now or let the public worry about the risk a few years later. Is that what your opinion is? You say we're at a risk, you said take the risk now. I don't like any time somebody stands up here and starts telling me, take a risk. I don't like taking risks with public money.

Mr. Whitney: Well I'm saying, any time you make decisions that effect something in the future, there is a risk involved.

Mr. Clemens: Not if you have the borrowing power to support it there isn't.

Mrs. Newman: Well you have to have the income to pay it back to service the debt. I really appreciate Dr. Whitney, your giving us this information. But where does the money come from into the General Fund? Do we have any reason to believe that's going to increase sufficiently to carry this debt load over the years? It's like one side of a picture. We don't have both sides. We've got the expense side but we don't have the incoming side.

Mr. Whitney: Well, let's just talk about a few of those things. We do have the potential for losing the local government funds. Part of it. Like \$270,000, something like that. That might be temporary, that might be permanent. We do have the Ag Lab's opening up to get us some tax money. We'll have an increase in tax revenue from The Limited complex.

Mrs. Newman: I'm aware of that but we have no way really, right now, of evaluating that, do we?

Mr. Whitney: That's correct.

Mrs. Newman: Or do we? Projecting the income from that.

Mr. Whitney: We can't get a total handle on it but we can do some estimating.

Mrs. Newman: Alright. Thanks.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, Mr. Whitney, when you say you do recommend going forward, we're talking about the Revitalization Project, right?

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: Because there's one thing I think we all need to keep in mind. If you look at Mr. Whitney's last sheet, we had the revitalization project, we have Taylor Road, we have other items. It's 9.6 million. We take a Street Program with 1 ½ million, we're up to 11 million dollars bond needs to be done. Not a 7.2. So as we look at these numbers, I'm not saying they're good, bad, or indifferent, but our issue is not just needing the money to do the Major Corridor Project Phase II. Whatever Mr. Underwood likes it called. That's not where it stops.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: We have other monies. We have other commitments. We have other plans that we've said to be done. So we're not talking about 7 million dollar bond issue. Reality is, we're talking about 11 million dollar bond issue. So as you're putting the numbers together as how we're going to pay those, you may want to do it on the total.

Mr. Whitney: Well, I've got everything here except for the Street Program. I was assuming that we were going to be using other funds for the Street Program. I have to make some assumptions when I do this.

Mr. Hills: I don't disagree. But I guess, I wouldn't want the public or any one up here to think that our obligation on doing something on our streets in this city for the next two or three years is only 7 million dollars. It's not. And to start those projects would mean we have to bond the totality of the project which makes us up closer to the 11 million than it does the 7 million.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Hills, I think this last sheet on Dr. Whitney's handout here says it projects our total borrowing at 9 million 6. Is that not correct?

Mr. Whitney: But that doesn't include the Street Program.

Mrs. Newman: Oh, it does not?

Mr. Hills: That's what takes it to the eleven.

Mr. Stake: Right. If the members will look at the pages that we have. Next we have on there the

Taylor Road reconstruction and he's got in that pink column, the additional debt servicing from the General Fund. Which doesn't seem like much compared to Main Street.

Mr. Whitney: That's assuming we can TIF the condo project that _____.

Mr. Stake: Well, and I'd like to point out that we're looking there to have a good portion of that service from a TIF.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Gilbert: Regarding, are we still on Main Street?

Mr. Stake: No. On Taylor Road reconstruction.

Mr. Gilbert: Can I just add one final question in regards to Main Street?

Mr. Stake: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: We've had our engineers doing a great deal of work on Phase II. Is that correct? Did we appropriate money for you to do that work?

Mr. Whitney: Yes.

Mr. Gilbert: And I don't recall the exact figure, but how much money have we appropriated for Phase II for the engineering?

Mr. Whitney: \$595,000.

Mr. Gilbert: So, \$600,000 give or take. And I have the same reservations that the other members have shared here this evening. And I guess having been here when the initial presentations were made in regards, not only to the impact and the benefits that this would have to the community, but also the actual cost. I think initially we had seven phases that stretched out to Taylor Road. Am I correct, Mr. Parkinson?

Mr. Parkinson: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: And I think we've scaled that back to maybe 4, which includes Brice Road. And I would just caution us at the same time that we use as much prudence as we can in terms of how to finance this that would not make that a step backwards in the money we've already invested. And the progress that we have made to these commercial corridors is a large part of the reason we're looking at some of these limitations that we face today is because we did not utilize our dirt as wisely as we could have over the past 18 years. And now we're facing some of the consequences of that. From my standpoint, I see the revitalization project and Streetscape as a way to help turn that tide. As Mr. Stake has pointed out, to enhance commerce and customer access to businesses. Because the underlying advantage of the Streetscape, at least from the way I've read the

presentations that have been made to us, isn't necessarily the brick and the mortar, it's the standards and the guidelines that help add the value to the brick and the mortar. Which then enhances the value of the business, and ultimately the revenues with which the city will derive from that. So I would just ask as we consider some of the concerns that Mr. Clemens has raised, we also balance that with the benefits that we're going to receive from this. And as Council has in the past, I'm sure we'll make the prudent and appropriate choice. That's just something I wanted to interject into the conversation this evening. Thank you, Mr. Stake.

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

Mr. Clemens: I do want to say, I'm not opposed to the Streetscape. I know it's principle. But possibly, I guess I take the residents tax value first. I know what the principle is. The part of the cost that we've endured in, we've got 600,000 almost in engineering. And that's good. Whether we do the whole thing or don't do the whole thing, we have the engineering. And we've paid for that. So that's an immaterial part of it. Because it can be cut in half. Whatever we want to do. And we have paid for that. So we are a step ahead. I'm for the Streetscape program. Maybe not all phases because I see what's happening right now. I think it's something that can be done over the years. I can see now that financially we're not stable as far as that's concerned. But I think our income that we were talking about on our possible projects that's been coming in, the State Health Department building, and The Limited, and so forth, that's all to come. And Kroger's. That's all to come. We don't know what it's going to bring us and what it's not going to bring us. So I don't rely heavily on that. I don't know about the 300,000 we're going to lose. So these are things I think we all should think about. And I agree with Eric. It's a principle in the Streetscape. It's there for a reason and it's a good reason. But I think there's a lot of things that should be taken into consideration. Thank you Howard for your help.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions on Phase II, Main Street Revitalization? (No response). How about Taylor Road? (No response). Any questions or comments on that? (No response). I/70 and 256?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Stake, is there a concept yet from the administration in regards to funding the construction of our portion of Taylor Road? And I know you're not, you're the Auditor. Mrs. Reichard has left. I'm sure there has been some preliminary discussions. I don't necessarily know that the bonding is the only option.

Mr. Stake: On his sheet here, he's got cost, 2 million dollars, permissive tax would be 90,000. And a bond issue of 1.9 million.

Mr. Whitney: Much of that would be serviced with TIF Funds assuming that project goes...

Mr. Stake: Potential TIF Fund. Yes.

Mr. Hills: But that still means you bond it. You just use your TIF dollars to pay your bond as the principal becomes due.

Mr. Gilbert: If I can interject. I don't mean we're looking at much of a return on the type of a residential TIF for at least 5 years.

Mr. Whitney: That, I can't respond.

Mr. Gilbert: And just the figures that we saw with the, because that's integrated into the overlay text. But unfortunately, that doesn't mean much these days. So I don't know about counting on residential TIF being implemented. But I know there were other, there's a TIF to the north end of Taylor in regards to Kroger improvements.

Mr. Whitney: That is going to service the debt from the intersection.

Mr. Gilbert: I understand that. One of my questions at the time, and this isn't a question to you Howard but, I had asked Mr. Brandt when he brought that forward if there was the option of expanding that. If we put different TIF's in place in the same particular area, that tends to ruffle the feathers with our friends in the school district. I think we need to be sensitive in terms of the impact that the TIF's have on them at the same time. And there's ways to do that. And we've had cooperative efforts with them before. I don't necessarily think we should put all of our eggs in the residential TIF basket in terms of financing a bond. I think there's one that's been started to the north. And I know its financing those improvements. But there's other business that's coming in to the north end of Taylor Road. And you look at other communities and the obligation for the developer in terms of public infrastructure in comparison to what our guidelines have been in the past is fairly, there's a big difference. And so I would just ask that you throw that into consideration and maybe pass it on to Mrs. Reichard and probably look at that. And I know it's difficult. We are not receiving a great deal of cooperation from Etna Township in regards to that. Which has been well documented here.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions, comments on Taylor Road? (No response). How about State Route 256/I-70 project? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: A general question on that 490,000. It's just a half million. We're not talking much money now when we're talking 10 or 11 million. But these are all projects reimbursing the CIP.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: So we're going to go bond a half million dollars to put money in the CIP so we can spend it on other projects.

Mr. Whitney: Well, that was the initial, when we did these projects, that was the initial thought. It doesn't have to be.

Mr. Hills: Just looking at this, these are all reimbursement factors.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: What you're saying is, we have paid EMH&T \$295,000 to do the plans on Taylor Road.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: We have paid engineering for Phase II. I think that's the other 95 above the half million we took out of bond one.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: So we need to put it back in. And the 256/70 project, somebody's going to pay the \$100,000 on that one.

Mr. Whitney: Well, we paid more than that. But according to Chris Frazmann, that's about all we could get back.

Mr. Hills: So this is actually reimbursing our CIP account for monies we have taken out of there for those specific projects.

Mr. Whitney: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: There's a valid expenditure from the CIP, and now we're going to borrow money to put that back in so we can pay somebody else something. Or use more funds out of the CIP.

Mr. Whitney: That is correct.

Mr. Hills: On another project that benefits our citizens.

Mr. Whitney: The thought at the time was, there would be about \$500,000 for the Street Program for next year.

Mr. Hills: We haven't had that \$500,000 for the Street Program since we said we were going to have it. We haven't had one less than a million in 10 years.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other comments or questions in regards to this funding of these projects? (No response). I don't expect to do anything with this tonight. I just put it on the agenda so we could start discussing it and see where Council was at on this. And like I said earlier, if everybody would just think long and hard about this, I'm sure we'll have plenty of time to discuss this in the future.

So I will adjourn the Finance Committee meeting at 9:36.

Finance Committee
- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
March 7, 2005

