

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 5, 2007

Members of Community Development Committee present: Preston Stearns, Donna Shirey, Antoinette Newman, Doug Joseph.

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Stearns: The second thing on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Is there anything on the agenda that needs to be changed or added? (No response).

Seeing that there are none, then we'll move on to item number 3, the minutes of the February 20, 2007 Community Development Meeting. Are there any corrections or changes to the minutes at this time? (No response). If not, then we will accept those minutes as they have been presented to us.

Item number 4 is a discussion on the YMCA Facility in Reynoldsburg, held first on 2-20-07. You received in your packets, results of the minutes of a meeting that was held on February 27 and it included members of the city, the Mayor, and different other cabinet members and members of Council that were there, along with the representatives from the YMCA itself. And out of that meeting, as you saw, there were many items that came out of there that said, or suggested some things that we needed to do. And of those things that we're working on, I guess you could say in the priority, would be the item of commitment letter, or commitment of approval from the Reynoldsburg City Council before the YMCA can proceed, or to take serious, our efforts to join a residual with them to look into building a YMCA here in the City of Reynoldsburg. And that's the first thing that's going to be coming before us. And that is supposed to be taking place within the next 2 to 3 weeks. Mr. Bickley said that he would have that for us for the City Attorney to review. And then once the City Attorney reviews that letter of intent, then we'll bring it back before the Council here to see if we can get some support there. And then from there, we will be moving forward to try to establish a committee of the community of people in the associations, homeowners, and different, the Chamber of Commerce, and everyone that would have an impact on having a YMCA here in the city. I received a lot of notification that there are people in support of it. So we just want to see how far we can go with that project.

Now one of the things that was really noted from that meeting was, that there's no rush. There's no rush. We don't want to rush anything. We want to make sure, if this is what we want to do, we want to do it and do it right, so that we can have something in the city that would be wholesome for everyone to enjoy no matter what age you are. And I think that's something that this city really needs. So that's where we stand there with the letter of intent.

The other thing that we need to have the committee to work with is a location. There's different locations that have been mentioned, and right now we don't have any idea of where to put it. We have some ideas where we would like to put the YMCA Facility, but we do not know exactly where to put it at this time. So that committee that will be formed at a later date, as soon as we can get the letter of intent to Council taken care of, then we'll be moving in the appointment of the committee. And I'm asking for people in the community if they want to come forward, to

make suggestions on being a part of it. I've asked Council members to present names that they would recommend to do so.

So these are some of the things that we're looking for, to move this project on. The other thing that would be, that the committee would be doing, and that would be to try to find out if we wanted to do all this thing with the YMCA, is to find out the financing. The financing, different ways it could be done. It could be done by sponsors, or people in the community that wanted to donate. But it would probably take a lot of people to do that. But probably the best way would be by the voters to vote it on a levy or some sort of legislation of that nature. So these are some of the things that we need to have before we can come back and present this to Council to say, with the recommendation of Council, this is what we want to do. A lot of questions have to be answered. Once we get all those things down, we can look forward to having a time line as to when we want to get this thing accomplished. So right now, it's not something that (only) I want done; I think it's something that we - as a city - need to have done. And if we could all work together, if we can all come to one accord on an issue like that, I think it'll be a great venture for the City of Reynoldsburg. I think I've talked more than I've ever talked in my life. But any way, is there anybody else that would like to have anything to say on this right now? Any members of Council would like something to say? I'm sorry, members of the committee? Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you, Chairman Stearns. I think having the YMCA, I think it might be a good idea somewhere down the road. But looking at the meeting notes here, you're talking a 10 to 12 million dollar project. And I really feel that right now, where the city is, we need to start looking at other areas of concern meaning, for like the Police Department, or street repair. So I mean, that's how I kind of feel towards it right now.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Does anyone else have any comments?

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Stearns, I have a tendency to agree with Mrs. Shirey. I don't know exactly which pot of money all this would come from, if we could finance the whole thing with a property tax levy?

Mr. Stearns: Well, that's one of the responsibilities that we certainly hope that the committee that will be working to try to make some suggestions towards that. I really don't have the answers right now, but right now, this is like, the YMCA approached the City of Reynoldsburg about doing this. And they said that they would operate it once they get the building constructed and have it up and running and everything. And it would be up to the City of Reynoldsburg however we wanted to come about building and financing this kind of a building. As I say, I don't have the answers to those questions right now, but I think it would be something that we need to go ahead and try to see what is out there and see what kind of suggestions that we can have, or what kind of backing of the city the citizens of Reynoldsburg would have for this. That's the only thing that I'm asking Council right now, is to look at it and review it and see if it's something that's worthy for the city. I mean, for some of the things that could be advantageous for us is the fact that our property values could go up. You know, different things like that that we haven't really gotten into. So these are some of the things that we need to do. And so when that letter returns and there's a majority of Council that feels like we're not into this, then I guess the only other thing to do would be to find another way of, another venture of some sort. But if we don't get the support

of Council which would be number one, because we don't, if the Council doesn't recommend it to the citizens of Reynoldsburg, then I think that would be the end of it. Thank you. Anyone else have any questions? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One idea we may want to look at aggressively going after is perhaps looking to identifying a corporation, or a foundation, or even an individual that would be willing to either buy land or supply land if it's in the city, they own it in the city, and maybe exchange for some type of naming rights. That would be something that would probably go a long way to taking care of a good chunk of it, the dollars involved. Because you see that a lot on, whether it be stadiums and that kind of thing, I don't know what kind of restrictions there would be with the Y on that, but I think that would be a direction to go to take care of a big chunk of that.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you. I agree with you. That would be one way that we could try that, too. So like I said before, everything is on the table right now to get the financing for this. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And personally, I think it would be a great thing if it would come about. And I think you're going in the right direction as far as the committee of citizens really, that are not connected with the city. I'm not impressed with having all the department heads on it and such things as that. I'm interested in the people that, on the outside, on the committee that look into the city problems that we don't see every day. Because I think it should be handled that way. And I think you're moving in the right direction by having people that aren't connected with the city. I'm not interested in the Chamber being on or the business being on it, because they're on all committees. I'm interested in people from the outside that don't come to our meetings probably. That don't associate with the city, but they're well-known in the community, that will look at this from the standpoint of how the public feels. Because that's the important thing, is how our public's going to feel about this situation. Whether they want it or they don't. And that's the feeling that we have to get, is how our citizens feel about this. Because as you say, we're talking about 12, 13 million dollars. And we have to get the backing of the citizens and that's the important thing. And I think a committee, and a larger committee, there's no need having it small, of people that are really interested in the city's improvement on how we do it. I think that would be the important thing. And I'm willing to sit back and watch because I don't think it should be political, and I don't think we should be involved pushing. Because I think everything we've pushed or done, the citizens haven't really voted for it. So I'm interested in the outside feelings of the public. And maybe we'll find out this is the wrong path to go, I don't know. But I think you're moving in the right direction by appointing a committee of interested people.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. I agree with you there. I think that one of the things that as the Chairman of the Community Development Committee, I would just say that my position would be as a facilitator to try to help organize and get this moving. And so that's where I'm trying to be right now, is just trying to get us to come together to form some kind of a committee and move forward in that direction. Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Stearns. The way I understand it, in other communities, what they've done, for instance in Gahanna, they had I think, Ohio State University Hospital contribute a million dollars for a section of that Y for rehabilitation of heart patients and people like that.

And also got other corporate donors to, and several other, even small donors, to put up some money. So you know, you could get a couple of million dollars possibly donated by some corporations and maybe a large hospital in this area that would want to operate a rehabilitation facility there. Also, I think all we're looking to do at this point is to put together a steering committee that would organize a task force that would look into this. But before we did any of that, I think what they're looking for is some type of indication from this Council that we'd be interested in at least exploring those options, and then we go from there. We're not making any commitment. All we're saying is, that we would like to explore the options of putting a YMCA in the City of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Stearns: Very well said. Thank you for those comments. Anyone else? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stearns. My understanding was, that what the YMCA was looking for, was a commitment from the City Council to do just that. Look at what our opportunities are. Not to say we know what the financing is going to be at this moment, or even what the end state will be. But to form a committee and have this Council tell the YMCA we had interest, at least to move forward to find out what our opportunities are. I don't think they're asking us to commit to any type of funds at this point. And I would expect them to come back and tell us, these are your opportunities for funding. If it should be bonding, if it should be going out to the people some way, or part by the city, working with our community and their commerce areas, have them bring dollars in that way. We don't know what the options are at this point. So I think what was being asked of us was saying, do we have a commitment to move forward to take a look at those opportunities? And I think we absolutely have a duty to look at what the opportunities are. And bottom line is, how it's going to be, the citizens are going to make their mind. Do they want it or not? Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Well, with that said....

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stearns: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Joseph: I'm sorry. I wanted to make one additional comment. Looking at the minutes from the meeting, it was suggested somewhat that a centralized location would be the best route. I would like to suggest that, really whether it be the eastern part of the city, central part, or western part, I think it's important to look at where there's available land that's reasonably priced and easy access to the major streets and roads within the city. So something along Main Street or one of the other streets that are getting a lot of traffic, I think those are important factors to incorporate rather than just a park that's already existing to stay in the city where it might be a little bit more difficult to get to. I think that something with visibility on a major street like Main would be something to take a look at. Thank you.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you. Certainly, I hope all those options will be looked into. And I think that they will. But right now, we're just in the beginning stages, and we want to basically, move in the right directions and be positive about everything that we do. And so with that, as I said earlier, the

thing that we're going to have to do next is to wait for the letter of commitment to come from the YMCA, and then for City Attorney Hood to review it, and then get back to us and let us know which way to go. So with that in mind, what I would like to do is to hold this discussion until the time that, for two weeks then. In two weeks we should have that letter before us with review and everything done. And then we can have a really good discussion on that and we can see where we're going at that time. So does anyone else have anything to say? (No response). If not then, I will recommend that we do just that. Hold it for two weeks and then continue discussion at that time.

If nothing else coming before Council at this time, we will close the Community Development Committee at 7:45.

Community Development Committee

March 5, 2007

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

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 5, 2007

Members of Safety Committee present: Brett Baxter, Ron Stake, Antoinette Newman, Donna Shirey.

Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph, Mel Clemens. Council President William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor.

Mr. Baxter: Good evening. I'll open the Safety Committee meeting at 7:45.

Item number 2 is approval of the agenda. I do have a request to add an item. I'll have it added as 9c. And that is discussion of the Graham Road ODOT. And that's coming from Mr.

DeBolt's area. Do I have a second or motion? Second from Mr. Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). The item will be added to the agenda.

Item 3a is approval of the minutes of the February 20, 2007 special Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes, additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item 3b is approval of the minutes of the February 20, 2007 regular Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes or additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4, excuse me, 3b which I just added is Discussion of the Graham Road Resurfacing ODOT Project. And Mr. DeBolt...

Mrs. Newman: I thought you added that as 9b.

Mr. Baxter: Did I say 9b or 3b.

Mrs. Newman: 9a.

Mr. Hills: 3b's probably the best place to put it.

Mr. Baxter: 3b's probably the best place to put it and I think that's what I was looking to do. So I'll just go ahead and jump right into it now, Mr. DeBolt, if you're okay with that.

Mrs. Newman: Alright.

Mr. DeBolt: Yes, thank you.

Mrs. Newman: 3c.

Mr. Baxter: And I apologize, you were trying to get a hold of me this week to get it added naturally so it was written on the paper and we didn't connect. I'm not sure what happened. But I'm sure, as I told you before, that I never have any problem with adding the city's business to an agenda.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of Council. As you know, we've already approved the paving of Main Street from the bridge out here in front of City Hall to almost out to Taylor Road. And anybody that's driven down here after the recent snow storms, know it needs to be done. So, just let folks know that we are jointly working on that with ODOT to be done this summer. And as well, with Taylor Road closing this past summer for construction for an extended period of time, there was a lot of detours that obviously went down Graham Road. Graham Road is a road that probably is one of the highest traveled roads in the city. It gets about 9,000 cars a day. It took a pretty good beating from the detours over a period of about 5 months and it's in need of repaving as well. We're going to request that we move forward to go ahead and pave Graham Road using our Permissive License Tax monies. And I'm coming forward today, not only to do that, but also to ask that if we're able to, right now our engineers, EMH&T, are ready to go to advertise for bids for the ODOT Project. And if we can include the Graham Road Project

with it, we can get a lot better bid projects, prices. So that's what we're looking to do here tonight.

Mr. Baxter: I thank you. One of the things I had a question on is, when this was on the CIP, was that the only method of funding? The Licensing Tax? Or did we have other areas we were looking to fund that project with?

Mr. DeBolt: Well, that's the main area that we intended. But there are options if the Council chooses.

Mr. Baxter: And we have the funds there in Permissive Tax?

Mr. DeBolt: That's correct. We have ample funds. Not only to cover this project, but others.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So have we taken anything out of the, or off the table for being done this year that would have used those funds?

Mr. DeBolt: No.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. With that said, I think we have made a commitment to those citizens on Graham Road in the past that we were going to get that road repaved. And if this gives us an opportunity to do so and save money at the same time, this is just a win for the city and win for the residents. You know, I don't always get that lucky to get two wins like that. So I don't hear any arguments on it. Councilman Stake, do you have a comment?

Mr. Stake: Yeah. I just have a couple of comments, Chairman Baxter. I think what we're trying to do with this piece of legislation is, this is not the funding part of it. This is just allowing the ability to bid this along with the bidding on Main Street. Main Street money would not be used for this. So when we talk about it in the Finance Committee, the funding of this project, I want people to be clear on that. But all we're doing here is allowing the bidding to be done for Graham Road along with the bidding on Main Street. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Baxter: Right. I just wanted to clarify to address the funding so people realize they weren't coming from the same place. The leftover funds from the Commercial Corridor Project isn't going to be paying for the Graham Road.

Mr. DeBolt: Right. We have 6 streets that that Permissive Tax money is allowed to be used for. This is one of them. It's obviously a major need so we'd like to make that a priority.

Mr. Baxter: Great. And I do appreciate that. And this is just to allow for bidding.

Mr. DeBolt: Correct. That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Any other comments or questions from Council or committee? (No response). Hearing none, I believe I need to send this over to the Finance Committee next.

Correct, Nancy?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes. Actually, it's on there technically...

Mr. Stake: It's already on there.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Very good. So then I'll go ahead and ask that this be put on the agenda for the Finance Committee, if it's okay with the Chairman.

Mr. Stake: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. With that then, I hear nothing else, that's all that needs to be done then.

We'll move on then to item number 4, a Resolution to request a reduction in speed from 45 miles an hour to 35 miles an hour on Graham Road - listed at the request of Chairman Baxter. And one of the things to recognize with Graham Road, excuse me, with Waggoner Road, is you drive past St. Pius and you're heading north, the direction as you come up past Jordan Crossing, you see a 45 mile an hour sign. That area switches back and forth from that point all the way to Broad Street between what's owned by the county and what belongs to the city. So one of the things that we have noticed is, many things have changed over the years in that area. We have more houses actually connect Waggoner Road, have been built and actually have their driveways attaching to Waggoner Road. We have more new developments that have built over the last several years. You see that on Rodebaugh and Firstgate, all are new; same thing with Priestley Road; as well as we have the new schools a little bit further north of there. So what you notice is pretty much has the same type of demographic as you have on Graham Road. And that's 25 mile an hour there. Well, I'm not recommending we go down to 25 mile an hour on Waggoner Road, but I do think we need to reduce it from 45 to 35. And what, I've spoken with Steve and with the Mayor and many other people about this, is all that needs to happen is request from the county to have them take a look at the road and make a determination. They'd have to do a traffic study and determine if that road would warrant a slower speed on it. And I think that's the direction we should head. So with that said, do you have any comments Mr. DeBolt you'd like to address on that?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. As you know, 13 years ago that Council at the same, brought this issue up at the time when Mr. Clemens was Safety Director, and made application to the county to have it done. Basically, it goes to the county, the county then goes to ODOT which is the only authority that can do it on this type of road, county road. And they do a traffic study including formulas and so forth. And if it's close to what the formula needs to be, they usually pass it. Unfortunately, back in '94, '95 that was determined not to be the case that it warranted. So the request was denied. Again, based on the information you just provided, I talked to Michael Meeks with the County Engineer's Office and just in general terms, they think the situation has changed as you've mentioned. They're more than happy to look at that. And as a matter of fact, it would just require a letter, perhaps from myself, to move forward to do that. We wouldn't have to have a resolution from Council as in the past. So I told them that you could probably expect that to be forthcoming. And there's two other issues. If you wanted to bring them up at this time

we could discuss it and include it on the same letter. That includes a potential traffic light at Priestley, and perhaps at Rodebaugh as well. And they would consider those in that order with the understanding that the one at Rodebaugh I guess, was brought up not too long ago and was looked at and was also denied, and Priestley has not been on the list. But they're willing to look at those at the same time and we could move forward with both if the Council so chooses.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And all it takes is a resolution asking the County Engineer's to review those issues, correct?

Mr. DeBolt: Actually, I can do it under my authority to go forth. We did 13 years ago, but technically it doesn't have to be a resolution. Since it was done before, I made that inquiry specifically just in case we had to do it that way because ODOT requests that a lot of times, but the county said a letter would be fine.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Well, I think that's the direction we should head then, don't you?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. I agree.

Mr. Baxter: Not to go any further with Councilmatic action, just allow you to handle it and let the Administration go forward with it.

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: I think that's a great way to head. So I thank you, sir. So with that said, I'll go ahead and table this discussion indefinitely.

Mr. DeBolt: And they did take a while to get back to us before and it was approximately about 7 months, but I don't anticipate it being that long this time around.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Very good. Thank you, Mr. DeBolt. Are there any comments or questions from members of committee? (No response). Council? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. DeBolt, is there any cost to the city for this traffic study? And how long would it take?

Mr. DeBolt: Again, it took 7 months before. I think they had some delays. They apologized last time. They didn't give me a time frame, but I would imagine it would be within a few months tops probably.

Mr. Joseph: Is there any cost to the city for that type of study when we cross it?

Mr. DeBolt: No. No.

Mr. Joseph: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: And if I remember reading the documentation correct Mr. DeBolt, at that time, there was a detour that was going on. And that the county wanted to wait until that project had completed so they got an accurate study. And that's why it took so long.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilwoman Newman, go right ahead and I'll ask Mr. Stake afterwards.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I was just going to point out that Mr. Stake seemed to want to say something.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Well, I just wanted to say I appreciate Mr. DeBolt bringing up the traffic signals at Priestley, and Rodebaugh Road. I know I don't travel Priestley very often, but I do travel Rodebaugh quite often. There's a 4 way intersection there and it gets pretty touchy there at the rush hour times. So I appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. I do agree with you Mr. Stake. I drive the other direction on Waggoner and I see the cars trying to get out. And you just feel for them. And then you don't want any issues with that. So thank you for taking it and running with that one, Mr. DeBolt.

Mr. DeBolt: You're welcome.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. The next item, and I did table that indefinitely. The next item up for discussion is a Liquor Permit Request - (Stock) - X-Hot Inc., dba BW-3, 7076-7082 E. Main St., Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Is there anyone here to speak to that liquor permit request? I see the Chief standing up. Chief.

Chief Suci: Chairman Baxter, we did an investigation into this stock transfer. We find no reason to appeal its application.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. I thank you very much, sir. And then there's no action that needs to be taken on it from the Council side.

Mr. Hills: No action.

Mr. Baxter: That's what I'm saying, there would be no action on this.

Mr. Hills: Return to the Clerk.

Mr. Baxter: Return to the Clerk I guess. Correct? And I will do this, bring up the next item as well. And Chief, if you want to comment on the Discussion, Liquor Permit Request - (Stock) - SMX Enterprises Inc., dba Jillys, 6842-44 E. Main St. & Patio, Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068.

Chief Suci: Yes, Chairman Baxter. We also conducted an investigation into this transfer of stock in this application and find no reason to appeal its application either.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chief. And with that again, I will say that we have no action on this item, or Council take no action on this item and return it to the Clerk.

Item number 7 is a Discussion, Waggoner Road Resurfacing. It was discussed on 2-20-07. Legislation was sent to 2-26-07 Council for a first reading but no legislation was yet needed. Item needs to be referred to Finance Committee for funding. And we have spoken about this project in the last committee meeting and it was discussing the fact that we could save some money, and that the county is willing to pick up quite a bit of that, and the city would have to take the difference. I believe we're looking at about 100,000 plus on that for our funds required.

Mr. DeBolt: Yeah. We're looking at 115,000 approximately.

Mr. Baxter: Correct.

Mr. DeBolt: As a matter of fact, if I could add, it looks like the county's bids will be opened on Thursday for that. And sources tell me that we might be doing very well. Perhaps even lower than that. So hope for the best.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And at the time, I don't think we knew if it had been approved by the county. And you're now saying it has been approved by the county.

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And so with that said, I'll go ahead and ask that this be sent to the Finance Committee for funding. Do I see a second with that? I see Councilman Clemens' hand up, sir.

Mr. Clemens: I just wanted to make it plain, the county's not paying any of ours. We're paying our portion, the county's paying their portion.

Mr. DeBolt: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: That's a very good point. Thank you. So with that said, I'll have this item sent over to Finance Committee for funding. Do I need a second with that? I have a second from Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). The motion carries.

Item number 8 is a Discussion, Code Enforcement. It was asked to be put on the agenda by Councilwoman Newman. We've had some discussion on this in the past. At this point, unless there's any other questions or comments from Council, Committee, I'll ask to open it up for comments. Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Thanks, Mr. Baxter. I'd just like to say that we did notice an increase in the activity. A number of reports that I believe Mr. DeBolt is working on the reporting method. Are you not? Could you address that as far as follow up?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. As you know, you get the Code Enforcement violations noted to you. And we do follow up. But we can also provide follow up at the end of the time. Perhaps a month, on a monthly basis. So I think that would give you an idea of how many were actually resolved, or maybe pending, in a pending status yet to be resolved for one reason or other and explain why in the future. So we can do that for the Council.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I think that's a great way to go, Mr. DeBolt. Because as Council members, we see the activity opened. We see the initial response. And the citations that were left. But then we never know if they've ever been cleared up, if they were closed out. So these seem to be like, they're all open, but we never know when they close. And I think it would be a good thing for your department to be able to say, we opened up, you know, 'x' number, and closed 'x' number in this period. And I think it would show some of the things that people weren't aware that you're actually doing.

Also, I was quite pleased to see all those notices about the snow needing to be cleaned up on Main Street. Because I noticed that, you know, if I'm expected to have mine cleaned off my sidewalks in my little neighborhood, and I've got a huge sidewalk with that corner, and I did absolutely hit it three times during that storm, I think we could get some people out on Main Street to keep that wonderful, beautiful Streetscape that we have looking that way.

Mr. DeBolt: Our Code Compliance Office, they made a determined effort to talk to the businesses along Main Street. This was a challenging storm as you know, with the ice involved. So we did give some leeway to get it done. But main thing is, I think that now that we have the Streetscape Project under way, that it's just reiterating to the businesses that they are responsible. Not only for the sidewalk right in front of their building, but also the sidewalk on the right-of-way that they need to address.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. I appreciate that. With that said, I'm going to, unless there's objection from any committee member or Council, ask that this item be put on hold indefinitely, or tabled. Second from Councilwoman Newman. And I do see discussion being requested for.

Mr. Clemens: Not much of a discussion. I had met with Mr. DeBolt on this. And I agree, we had a big discussion on this. This is a bad time of year, which we all know, to clean up, everything looks dirty, everything looks bad. And so I think we ought to give the Code Compliance, and the Building Department, and Mr. DeBolt a chance. See how Spring breaks, what it brings along and see how we get it cleaned up. And if it's not, I guarantee we'll be back. But I think we owe them the responsibility to let them handle their department and see how it works out.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly.

Mr. DeBolt: I have talked to Mr. Hopper regarding the litter issue and some other ideas how to address that. And with the Community Clean Up coming up here in June, we hope to make the next few months leading up to that, kind of an event, an ongoing clean up for the community.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. I have a motion and a second. All in favor of tabling this issue

indefinitely? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And lastly, and I promise to keep this quick is, at least as quick as I can, is a Discussion on Priestley Drive issues. We've had several Safety Committee meetings, special ones as well as items that have been discussed during the regular committee meetings. And in the last committee meeting, Safety Committee meeting, Mr. DeBolt gave us the city's position on this. And correct me if I misstate you, sir. It's that there is no problem on Priestley Drive in your opinion. That in fact, the number of vehicles is, in the city's opinion, where it needs to be. And that there's no need for any action to be taken. Is that accurate, sir?

Mr. DeBolt: I would say with an amendment, if I could take a few minutes to address it.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly.

Mr. DeBolt: As you know, for the past month and a half, we've spent a lot of time on this issue. And I want to thank the Police Department, the Police Chief, and the Street Department, and the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, staff, and my department. Because we spent a lot of time addressing the issue and the concerns that the residents have. And again, safety is my area of responsibility. So I take that very seriously. And traffic issues such as these are a lot of times best solved through awareness, education, and enforcement. And if I could, I'd just briefly, like to highlight some of the things that I think we've talked about and then come up with what I think is an acceptable solution for hopefully, the majority.

First of all, the issue came to light when some petitions were brought to City Council regarding traffic concerns on Priestley Drive. And we went ahead and reviewed those and also listened to two weeks of concerns raised by residents through this committee. And just briefly, residents commented on excessive speed in the neighborhood, high volume of cars, level of crime in the area, damage to parked cars and mail boxes, difficulty getting out of the driveways. That pretty much was a summary. And then in 2004, this issue was also addressed by the city, and a traffic study was done by our engineering firm. And at that time, the average amount of cars on the street were 4,043 cars with an average speed of about 27 miles per hour. And at that time, there's conclusion of the study that said that Priestley and Dickens Drive demonstrated normal traffic patterns and conditions that fall within accepted range for residential streets. And design features constitute not only sound residential street design, but also functioned as measures that helped to calm traffic within the neighborhood. And that included the width of the street, the curves on the street, and having parking on the street. So 3 years ago it was basically, an acceptable level of volume of traffic at that time. And the speed as well. Then when this issue was brought up here this year, we did a similar study, similar time frame. And the average volume of traffic was 3,347 cars a day, and the speed basically, was an average of 19 to 22 miles per hour based on the two studies we did. And again, out of 35,000 cars in a two week period, there were about 30 to 35, let's see, 500 cars that were going over 30, 35 miles per hour, and another 54 that were over 35 miles per hour. So again, out of 35,000 cars, that's less than 1% that were excessively speeding. That's exactly what we're looking for basically on average. It's 26 miles an hour average in the city, and Priestley had below that. And we even had a Police Officer go out and do a random radar screen at one time. And he even had just less than 26 miles per hour. So it's, the bottom line is, it's comparable to other residential areas in the city.

Therefore, the data would indicate that the situation is better in terms of speed and volume

and is acceptable by traffic engineering standards here over the past three years.

Having said that, comments have been made regarding a number of things on Priestley. I just address briefly regarding crime. In 2006, we compared it to a similar neighborhood collector street, and it saw that it had 50% less crime than the other comparable streets. So I believe Priestley is a good neighborhood to live in, and I don't think that crime is a major issue there. Residential street crashes in 2006, Graham Road was the highest in the city with 27 crashes. But they also get 9800 cars a day on average. Priestley had 8 crashes and they have 3300 cars a day. Retton, another comparable feeder street, got 1300 cars a day, but had almost the same number of crashes as Priestley. Seven. Therefore, it's an appropriate, no accidents are acceptable, but again, it's a comparable level for a ratio compared to volume of cars to number of accidents. So it's not out of line with the other residential streets in the community.

It's been inquired about the width of Priestley Drive. The street was built, and was designed, similar to other neighborhoods such as again, another feeder collector street, such as Retton Drive. It's 27 feet grass to grass, and it's 23 feet pavement to pavement and that's basically consistent throughout that street and that particular location. The street was designed as a neighborhood collector street. It serves that purpose at an acceptable volume level. And we decided not to close any streets to preserve, if for no other reason, the emergency response time in that neighborhood. And I think other places, including Columbus recently in the news, has talked about one of the police precincts, splitting it up to try to preserve emergency response time because they thought it was kind of high. And it's been discussed nationally too. And that's something I think we need to preserve. And I think the only thing we would get out of by closing a street is perhaps pitting the neighborhoods against each other. And just, that would create some other problems in trying to solve a problem that it may not solve. So I don't want to go there.

And the things that, another thing, speed bumps was mentioned. That's a possibility. Some neighborhoods, or some communities are moving against those. Not that I would rule it out. If there was a consistent speed problem there, but I don't think there is right now, but I don't think we're at that level to have to consider it right now. Some other things that I think we could do based on the residents' concerns, I think that targeted police enforcement as resources allow. We have done that. I think that's shown perhaps in some of the lower speed levels when we did the second week of the study. And we'll do that as resources allow through the Police Department. We have had the traffic trailer that was repaired and placed out there. And basically, it tells the residents what their speed is. And again, that's important for the attention part of what I was talking about. If you bring people's attention to the fact that they may be doing a higher speed than what they think they're doing or not paying attention and it's right there in front of them, I think the reasonable, responsible person is going to slow down and pay attention to that. So that's the purpose of speed trailer. And we'll use that in this community and other neighborhoods as needed. We may be getting into some technology where we could potentially use what's called a 'speed van' that does record speed. It does target it using radar and a citation could be issued out of that. If we go to that technology, again, we could use it in this neighborhood or other as deemed necessary. We could also use additional signage as warranted in those areas along Priestley. And not only Priestley, but Kingsley as well. Because I think it's a neighborhood situation and we'll continue to look at that. As you mentioned, we're going to, this came into discussion with Priestley Drive in the intersection of Waggoner being kind of a feeder coming and going there. So we're, as I mentioned earlier in the other report, we're going to go ahead and look at a potential speed reduction there as well as a light at Priestley potentially,

and Waggoner. Plus, when the weather gets better, we'll consider other traffic counts. And if the situation changes from what we've had in the last three years, we'll reconsider it. But at this point, the numbers speak for themselves. We'll consider to monitor the parking. In the last couple of weeks, the Police Department has made a concerted effort to get vehicles that might be parked illegally on the streets. For instance, you can only have a car parked on a street for 48 hours at a time. An inoperable vehicle should only be on the street for 24 hours at a time. And certain vehicles, like most trailers, shouldn't be on the streets at all. There was one recently, this weekend, up on Priestley. We're addressing that. And those type of vehicles in all neighborhoods are being addressed. Including ones that have expired license tags. With the storm that we had, that kind of brought this to light because when you see a car that has snow on it and the snow plows went around it and it hasn't been moved in over a week, that kind of brings your attention to the fact that, and then you check it and it still has not been moved for a week, maybe that's one of those cars that we should deal with. So we'll address that, whether it be on Priestley or other streets throughout the city.

And finally, the community of Priestley does have a neighborhood watch group. And I'll make all the effort to work with them to address whatever individual issues or group issues they may have to continue to monitor this in the future.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. DeBolt. Nice job, your presentation. You can see it was well thought out. You took your time. And one of the things I want, at least our citizens to know in this case here, in the past, these citizens have said to me, we're not getting the attention. No one's paying attention to us. As city, yeah, we come to them time and time again and they're blowing us off. I think your report proves that you didn't do that this time. Not that they all agree with what you said but at least it proves that we have spent some time. The Police Department has, the Street Department, your department's have spent some time on this problem and we know that. And I for one would like to say thank you for at least giving them the opportunity to address the issue, talk about the fact that, you know, there is a problem in this area. And if they haven't convinced you, then maybe some of the things I'll say here next will convince you. But at least we know that you have taken the time to look at this and we appreciate that much. So I thank you sir, and that's coming from me.

First I want to make sure we're all aware of, and I do have two speaker slips here. At least one that wasn't given an opportunity to speak. And that's Jim Rodenmayer, and I will give you the opportunity to speak sir, tonight. One of the things I wanted to make sure that was understood in this area, and I have lived at the corner of Priestley and Windrift since I built my house in '99. And the street was opened, and at first, I know there was many people that were calling the Mayor saying, when is this thing going to open. They couldn't wait for it to open. And I've heard the Mayor tell me that half a dozen times. And I know for a fact that people did that. They were looking forward to be able to get over to Taylor Road School and other things in that area from our area. I'm sure they weren't aware of what was going to happen after that fact though. And when is it the worse time? Spring and summer obviously. When is more people out? More trips being taken. More volume in that street. One of the things to recognize is in the summer and in the spring, we're looking around 4,000 cars. And I don't think that's a stretch to say during that time period, that's an accurate number. We were at 3700 just in the beginning of January when we had that nice weather before it actually really started to snow, and rain, and sleet. With that said, even from your own traffic studies, you are showing 10% of the cars, 14 actually, but I'll take

it down a number. Ten percent. Keep it easy numbers. Were speeding. That's 400 cars in a strip of about 150 yards that are speeding. We're not talking about anywhere but in this little section of Priestley. Our community, which is known as Quarry Park, okay, that's our community. I say ours because I'm part of this problem. I live there. As I stated at the beginning of this thing, I have a bias. So don't expect anything other than a bias answer coming from me. I'm trying to hear both sides of the story so give me some of that credit as well. But 400 cars speeding down that street is a lot of cars every day to speed. In the summer time, you have more people out on the sidewalks. They're in their back yards, their front yards, they're living as every other neighborhood. I heard last year in Columbus, there was a street that people were talking about that had a problem with speeding just like we have, and with volume. And a car drove up in that front yard and it hit a porch where a young child was at and was killed. I don't ever want that to happen in my neighborhood or any other neighborhood in the City of Reynoldsburg. Because you mentioned something lastly. And it was your seventh item that you mentioned. And that is the fact that this isn't just a Priestley issue. It's a Dickens issue. It's a Rodebaugh issue. It is a Kingsley issue. It is a Slate Ridge issue. And one of the things you mentioned as the first thing on your discussion item was targeted police enforcement. And I see the Chief back there and I know he'll nod his head. Police enforcement solves much of the speeding problem. Much of all those other ancillary issues that come about. But we don't have the police force to have cars in the neighborhoods 24/7. It's just not possible. I'd love to bring in 3, 9, 12 officers to have them specifically delegated to cruising the neighborhoods to try to curb this traffic problem. All of our neighborhoods. Just not Priestley. So target police enforcement is a solution to try to reduce the speeding problems. So I do agree with you on that point and you proved it. The city proved it. When target enforcement happened on Priestley, the number of vehicles reduced quickly. The speeding reduced quickly. We also saw a much friendlier neighborhood. Things quieted down. We saw less of the garbage in our front yards. Less of a problem with vehicles taking out mail boxes. Cars being hit on the side and taking off. Those things did reduce. So I agree with your concept that targeted police enforcement is a solution to some of these traffic issues. And we look forward to working with our Chief of Police to get that target enforcement happening. Not just on Priestley but on many of the other streets where I've gotten calls from. Calls from places like on Rosehill who say that they turned it into a drag strip. And I know by the tickets, that the Chief is monitoring that. I have in fact, looked at all the tickets that have been written by the Chief, or not the Chief himself, but the Police Department over the last year. So I can tell you, he is definitely writing tickets on Rosehill. And on Graham Road for that matter.

That said, item number 2 which was a traffic trailer (Tape Change), a definite good reminder. It tells them what speed they're going and it tells them as they slow down when they meet that speed. A speed van you brought up earlier, and we've spoken about this in the committee a couple of times. And I've been very conflicted about it because I know it would help. I hate to say it. You park a van out on the side of the street and nobody knows it's an Officer taking pictures. You're going to get the people that are speeding. You're going to send them a ticket. But the other side of me that says everybody has an opportunity to know that there's an Officer there, and slow down. Should be there, so I'm conflicted on that. I do like Councilman Clemens' answer though. With all those Officer's cars we have sitting in the parking lot, how nice it would be to have sitting at several of these streets that we've spoken about here. Park them there and move them around. They would do a lot more to the community than sitting

in the parking lot if they were parked out on the streets. So Councilman Clemens, I thank you for that comment.

Pitting neighborhoods against each other. That was one of the things that I saw as a rather distasteful part of this whole conversation. Because one thing for sure, we need to solve these problems amongst all our neighborhoods. And the last thing my intent, is to pit the people who live on the opposite side of Dickens, or the people that live north, or excuse me, east of Priestley, against the people that live in Quarry Park. It's not about moving people. You don't want to move from your homes and we don't want to move from our homes. We've made an investment in this city and we plan on staying there and fighting for that investment and fighting for our city. So with that said, I think we need to work as a neighborhood, all of us together, to slow down. Talk to your children. Children, talk to your parents. Remind them, we all live here but we have to slow down. We all live such busy lives and we're always late to that next thing we're going to. If it's your band concert, or if it's getting to Council on time to make the meeting, we all forget to slow down. And we absolutely have to realize that there are people who are impacted when we don't. Priestley is a good barometer of that impact. Because one of the things you spoke about is the size of the street, Mr. DeBolt. And how it's compared to other neighborhood collectors. Well sir, this is not a neighborhood collector. It's functioning as one but it is not. It should not be. Bottom line, it should not be a neighborhood collector. Why?

Mrs. Newman: Was it designed that way?

Mr. Baxter: Ma'am, yes.

Mrs. Newman: Then that's what it is.

Mr. Baxter: Unfortunately, it wasn't implemented correctly. If it would have been 36 feet going all the way through, I would agree with you. It would be a wonderful neighborhood collector. It would be wide enough to be able to _____ the vehicles back and forth and handle that volume. But sir, 4,000 cars a day on a small street that the majority of it winds and turns, is too many vehicles, period. I see it every day. And the reason our residents of Quarry Park came to this Administration, was to help them find a solution to this problem. This isn't the first time. It's not the second time. It's not even the third time residents have called this Administration asking them for help. And each time, these residents have been given one answer or another. Given hope. And then that hope taken away. Told to park their cars on the street, but yet to come back and say that's a danger. We can't give out advice in 2003 to solve the problem in 2007. Say, oops, that was bad advice. But that's what we did in the city. That's what the Administration did. We have to find a solution to the problems and work with our Administration. Our residents have to know they can come to this city and be heard. And not just be heard, but be given viable options. We've heard several of them here tonight we talked about. Specifically, the one that I like, and I spoke to you Mr. DeBolt, and I spoke to our Mayor about, and I thought this would be a solution that would help Priestley, Quarry Park residents, reduce the number of traffic that's flowing during the rush hour. Because anybody who lives on Priestley knows, that's when it's the worst. During rush hours. And the suggestion that came to me from one of the residents was to put a sign up right there at Dickens that says 'no left turn onto Priestley during rush hour'. And to help those people who live on the other side on the Kingsley and Carlyle and

that area, to have no right hand turns onto Dickens. Thereby reducing traffic flow on both sides. Helping both neighborhoods. But yet not pitting those neighborhoods against each other. In fact, what you would be doing would be helping both neighborhoods have access for emergency vehicles. That's very important. You mentioned that Mr. DeBolt. If one of our family members became ill and we're in a hurry to get them to the hospital, I don't see any reason why somebody wouldn't make a right or left hand turn there. They have the access. So I would have it for emergency vehicles or during those periods of times. I think that's a wonderful option. It gives us a great opportunity and it doesn't cost the city a dime. Other than I should say, to cut the signs and take the time to put it out there.

Last thing I wanted to discuss here was some of the facts as we heard. Okay? One of the things that people don't realize is not everybody calls the police when their property is damaged. So what we hear is, there's only been so many incidents happened. I can tell you, I know of one resident who's had his mirror replaced a half a dozen times on his van and hasn't called the police every time. He just replaces the mirror. Other ones who've had their tree removed from their front yard. You know, the nice little trees, the beautiful ones that we put up there to make our neighborhood part of this city, city of respect, looking beautiful. After his third tree, he stopped putting them out there. He didn't report the tree being damaged or being taken out. He just went out and bought another tree and put it back. So I want to make sure that the Administration realizes that when you look at the numbers, and you see these numbers, and you make conclusions from those numbers, you have to realize that not every one of those incidences are being reported. They're doing like we've said. Deal with it and move on. I didn't report my mail box being taken down. But I had a truck drive through my mail box and then through my yard. After hitting my ball hoop, which fell against the side of my truck, you know that big black Titan out front, well look at the stripe going down the side. I didn't report that. I just fixed it myself. I bought a new ball hoop, I bought a new mail box, and I didn't complain to anybody. I just took care of it. So the numbers you look at and you hear about aren't actual. You need to realize that there are people out there who are just dealing with the problem. That said, I've also have been asked to, not so much asked, but pretty much recognized, both from the Administration and from even Council, that this issue can't go on forever. We need to solve this thing. So that's what I'd like to do. I'd like to have our City Attorney, or Law Director, put some legislation together to ask this Council to enact a sign at the corner of Dickens, at the corner of Priestley, asking for a no left hand or no right hand turns - unless I hear from the Administration saying they're willing to do it themselves. Because the citizens have come to the Administration many times. And that's why they're here at Council now. That's why they came to us, the Council members here; because they weren't getting the satisfaction they were needing. So unless Mr. DeBolt, you tell me you're willing to do that, I'm going to ask that we pass some resolution that says that Council asked the Administration to do so.

Mr. DeBolt: Okay. I'd have to say that I would not be willing at this time. Because in a fact, I think that would do what I'm not looking to do. And that's to close the street for a period of time. Although, technically it's not closed, I think it would be somewhat of an unenforceable resolution. Therefore, I couldn't support it unless again, Council chose to do so.

Again, I would have the authority to put up that sign, I'd want to talk to our engineering firm and traffic engineer to discuss it in a little more detail, but initially I would have to decline.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you, sir. And I didn't mean to put you on the spot.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I want to have a conclusion here so that I can move forward with the request.
Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I would just like to say that I have perfect confidence in Mr. DeBolt to handle whatever problems there are there. And this matter has been absolutely talked and discussed to death. Therefore, I would like to move that we move this to Other Legislation. Do we have a second anywhere?

Mr. Baxter: Well, I'm not going to be stonewalled into shutting this thing down Councilwoman Newman. If I have to put it on the agenda each week, I will ma'am.

Mrs. Newman: Well, I made that motion. I made the motion.

Mrs. Shirey: I second.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I will call for a vote as soon as I complete my comments. And after I request the Law Director to put together a piece of legislation. So I will work with him this week to have that taken care of sir; and with that said, I will motion to put this on hold for two weeks.

Mr. Stake: There's already a motion on the floor. That needs to be voted on.

Mr. Baxter: And that motion is contrary to my motion sir. So I would like to....

Mr. Stake: The motion's already on the floor.

Mrs. Newman: I made my motion first. Let's take a vote on it.

Mr. Baxter: Fair enough. The motion has been motioned and seconded. All in favor of that motion? (All voted "Yea" except for Mr. Baxter). Opposed? (Mr. Baxter voted "Aye").

Mrs. Newman: You're supposed to say "Nay" aren't you?

Mr. Baxter: Well, I am opposed to it. So "Aye". The motion has carried. And it is to table this motion indefinitely you asked for?

Mrs. Newman: To move it to Other Legislation.

Mr. Baxter: To move it to Other Legislation. Very good. With that said, I just feel very sad that now, not only has the city forsaken its residents, so has this Council. With that, I will close the committee meeting at 8:29. Excuse me sir. You did ask for a chance to speak. Did you not?

Male: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Baxter: Yes sir. You do. Jim Rodenmayer. You may please take the mike please.

Mrs. Newman: Didn't he call him earlier and he didn't come forward?

Mr. Stake: No; he put off...he wanted to make that long speech before he called on the speaker.

Mr. Baxter: I do want to give him the opportunity to speak though.

Mr. Stake: Go right ahead. I'm willing to hear him. Sure.

Mr. Baxter: Go ahead. Jump up on the mike sir and go ahead and speak. Give your name and address for the record. And you did have a request two weeks ago to speak and weren't able to attend.

Mr. Rodenmayer: Yes sir. I was in the hospital. My name is Jim Rodenmayer and I reside at 1020 Ruskin which is on the corner of Priestley and Ruskin. I am the original owner since 1979. My family and I have lived in this city since 1972. Mr. Baxter, I appreciate the fact that you have given me the opportunity to speak even though many of the points that are in here are moot. And it's somewhat of a rehash or some of the things that have already been said here. I pose this question. Are we as residents of the neighborhoods of Reynoldsburg to assume a certain guarantee that those neighborhoods will be peaceful, quiet, and safe areas? Priestley Drive is highly visible to both the front and back of my house. My yard has been violated by cars driving in it. Not once. Not twice. Several times. My property has been vandalized and I have had landscape rocks stolen from my yard. I have a patio room in the rear of my house out of which my wife and I are often driven because of the vehicular noise from Priestley. At night I cannot tell you how many times we have been awakened by loud mufflers, and/or loud audio from passing vehicles. Even with all the doors and windows closed. Twice we have been awakened by loud "accidents". The first was a vehicle slamming into the light pole in front of my house. And the second was a vehicle slamming into a car across the street. Both vehicles were traveling at very high rates of speed. And both drivers sped from the scene. The first driver was never found. The second was quickly apprehended because the vehicle broke down a short way from the "accident". Several years ago, I presented to Mr. Mussi, then Service/Safety Director, three things I thought needed to happen, and some remedies that might be considered when Priestley was opened at Waggoner Road. The three things I thought needed to happen are first, reduce the volume of traffic. Second, slow the traffic down. And third, reduce the noise of the vehicles. Some of the remedies I suggested, you've already heard. So I'm not going to go into those. Stop signs were installed. And that really is all that has happened. I routinely, to this day, in fact I watched out there for several minutes today, I routinely see people run the stop signs at Dickens as if they are not even there. And yes, contrary to what others a couple of meetings ago suggested, at high rates of speed. The bottom line is, that similar thoroughfares or collector streets, or whatever you want to call them, in the city have created deteriorated neighborhoods and loss of property values, and/or they have become commercial strips. Brice, Haft, Retton, Bartlett, Rosehill, Lancaster, Graham, Livingston, and Taylor are all prime examples. I can remember when these streets were simply quiet, safe, two lane neighborhood roads. Now they are all noisy, congested,

and dangerous speed ways. All the analysis and hearings are not corrective in nature unless something is actually done. I realize that the wheels of government move slowly. But I believe your time is fast running out to save Priestley and other neighborhoods. It was 5 years ago that a similar meeting was held right in this room. Many people on Priestley have moved since then. Many new faces live there. But the problem is the same. It is time for you as a Council and Administration to return our peaceful, quiet, and safe neighborhoods to us before they continue to evolve into unsafe areas. Otherwise, no one will want to live in them. Our property values will continue to fall, and we will lose our neighborhoods. I know that two of you are running for Mayor and the decisions you make will be difficult ones. And I hope they will be made in the best interest to save our neighborhoods and not for political expediency. It was stated a couple of meetings ago that Priestley is not that different from other neighborhoods in Reynoldsburg. That statement suggests three things to me. One, that there are those in city government who want to take a do nothing stand and allow our neighborhoods to continue to deteriorate. Number two, it suggests to me that there are those in city government who are unwilling to either admit there's a problem or that they choose to ignore the problem and hope it will go away. But believe me, there is a very real problem. And three, it suggests a willingness to endure an increase in vandalism and crime in our neighborhoods. Some people call these attitudes a by product of bureaucracy. Obviously, with the number of people having attended these meetings, there is a problem that needs to be solved. You are the elected and appointed leaders of our community. However, real leaders solve problems. Politicians tend to run from problems and allow the bureaucracy to take over. It is time to see if we have real leaders or simply politicians that run Reynoldsburg. I am suggesting, as I think many who have been sitting here the past few weeks, that the Council needs to show some intestinal fortitude and to take the necessary steps to insure that our neighborhoods are safe, quiet areas for peaceful living. The laws and ordinances of this city exist for that to happen. Will you demand that they be enforced or will you continue to allow the scofflaws to continue to rule? Thank you for your time.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Rodenmayer. I appreciate your time. Yes, Mr. Clemens. And then Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Clemens: I've just got one thing to say. Would you do me a favor and restate your statement about Council not being effective as far as the public's concerned? Because I believe that Mr. Stearns, Mr. Joseph, and myself are not on your committee and we didn't vote for anything.

Mr. Baxter: I do apologize. I misstated.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: I should have said, committee, not Council. And I retract and restate. Because I do understand that Mr. Joseph and Mr. Clemens all have had great ideas as well as Mr. Stearns. So I do apologize if I offended you. With that, I do....

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Chairman. I had one question.

Mr. Baxter: Oh, I'm sorry. You did have a question Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: For Mr. DeBolt, actually two questions. When you were giving your statement regarding the solutions that we were looking at doing regarding Priestley, you mentioned expanding signage. Could you expand on what you mean by signage?

Mr. DeBolt: Sure. As the gentleman mentioned, three years ago, some additional stop signs were put in. Those were put at the locations at the time that were best deemed to, perhaps have a traffic calming affect to slow up the traffic. One of the instances the residents, I'm sure they probably brought up in the past as well as this year, is that sometimes you have a tough time getting out of your driveway. And by a stop sign could potentially slow up, break up the traffic so people would have a means to get out. Especially during rush hour times. Again, that slows up the traffic. Again, this is a debate among traffic engineers. Does it actually slow the traffic up? They say sometimes, people tend to speed up to catch up to the speed, or to go a little faster to catch up for the time. As the gentleman mentioned, sometimes they don't pay attention at the stop signs. So it's a mixed bag how effective they are. Obviously, it's something that should be respected and they need to be enforced. But at the same time, it's something that we would consider if there was another location. There's two potentially. Again, there's debate how effective it would be. Therefore, I would not commit to putting one in just to put one in unless it would be a location that would be effective. Secondly, same thing with signs in certain straight aways along Kingsley and Priestley that have some straight aways. Not just an area that we have been discussing but in other parts of that neighborhood that might not have a sign just with the speed limit to put those there. Perhaps the 'children playing' sign, something along those lines.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Second question is, why didn't you take a look at the idea that was kicked around about basically banning parking on the street since it's a little narrower than other streets that have that type of traffic going through? Why was that not considered?

Mr. DeBolt: It was considered. It is being considered. Again, it's for the same reason as stop signs. Sometimes there's a two-edged sword. _____ speeding is one of the problems on Priestley that's been acknowledged. One of the easy things to do to limit the amount of damage and people maybe losing a mail box, losing a mirror, would be to create one-sided parking. I was ready to propose that. But again, in talking to a number of traffic engineers, you also increase a likelihood to have speed. So it's a trade-off. Therefore, what I said was, that we would monitor that and I wouldn't have any qualms about doing one-sided parking on the side that would allow parking to go through on the fire hydrant side. So on Priestley, that would be no parking on the south side. So that's something that I would look at in the future. It's just that the times that I've been out there, and I've been out there fairly regularly, I think maybe from the discussion of this topic, and I think the citizens have kind of taken upon themselves, to think for themselves, what can I do maybe to help out? Not just to slow down but maybe to get some cars off the street as well. So I think the volume of cars here in the winter has not been maybe as high as it has been in the past. So we'll see how that looks in the Spring and Summer though.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: And Councilman Stearns. You asked to speak?

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I have a question for Mr. DeBolt. You mentioned something about speed bumps or speed humps, are you really, you're not throwing that out...have you?

Mr. DeBolt: Well again, in talking to traffic engineers, it's something that's been done in a number of areas. Again, this is from documented studies. Some of the people that requested them to be put in areas are the same ones that requested them to be taken out after a period of time because they created other issues that maybe they weren't aware of. For instance, noise. And as the gentleman mentioned, noise is an issue. There's certain types you can get that are perhaps maybe more effective in certain neighborhoods. Like we all think of a speed bump as the one that's maybe 3 or 4 inches high that's very small. They do have a table that you can get up on and that slows down speed. Some of them with a low riding car, they could be potentially damaging. So again, I would say that the pro and con is not clear-cut to make it worthwhile to go through at this point with the information I have on the speeds at this time. Again, if we were, I mentioned at one of the hearings regarding a study that was done at the Tara Hill up in Dublin over a 4 year period. They had looked at a number of options. They had a 38 foot street to work with. They ended up putting in roundabout's. I've got research from both them and other cities that have done things. So I wouldn't put anything on the table, one, if I didn't think it would work in this area and I don't want to give anybody false hope. So I would say that I'm not putting it on the table, because I don't have the evidence that I would think it would work. But to the gentleman that just spoke, I would say, if there's something that, with our traffic engineer's and the other three or four that I've talked to from different communities, if I had a consensus on something that would work in this circumstance, we'd make it happen. And we still will if I find those issues.

Mr. Baxter: And this is a circumstance that is very difficult to solve. That, I think everybody can agree. This is a toughy.

With that, I close the Safety Committee meeting at 8:43, and thank everybody for their time.

Safety Committee

March 5, 2007

-- Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 5, 2007

Members of Service Committee present: Mel Clemens, Doug Joseph, Antoinette Newman, Preston Stearns.

Other members of Council present: Donna Shirey, Ron Stake, Brett Baxter. Council President William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor.

Mr. Clemens: I'd like to call the Service Committee meeting to order at 8:44.

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

The next item is approval of the minutes of the Service Committee meeting held February 5, 2007. Are there any corrections? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.

Item 4, Discussion, it's a drainage problem on Mr. Rusk's residence. I've met with Mr. DeBolt on this issue and they have been, he has been active and he's met with the residents on both sides of the issue and they are working on this. Of course, the weather hasn't been, we've had terrible weather as far as when you speak about drainage and as far as what you can do about it. But they are working on a solution and they feel they are very close to it. When the weather breaks, he intends to pursue it. So I would like to, unless there's any questions on this issue, I would like to put it under Other Legislation. I'll make a motion to put it under Other Legislation. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you.

And that ends my Service Committee meeting at 8:45.

Service Committee

March 5, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 5, 2007

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Brett Baxter, Preston Stearns.

Other members of Council present: Doug Joseph, Antoinette Newman, Donna Shirey. Council President William L. Hills was present as Acting Mayor.

Mr. Stake: I'll call to order, the Finance Committee meeting at 8:46. Item number 2 is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? (No response). I just want to note that the two items discussed in the Safety Committee are already on the Finance Committee agenda.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held February 20, 2007. Are there any additions or deletions to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Council appointments to the Housing Council. This is in regards to the Housing Council for the Reynoldsburg Community Reinvestment Area. And there are two openings there. One is, we have somebody who has served in the past. Her term has expired, Linda Winters. And then we have an open position there. And Mr. David Humphreys has agreed to serve on that Commission, and Ms. Winters has agreed to serve another term. This is for a three-year term. Are there any questions or comments in regards to that item? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we appoint Linda Winters and David Humphreys to serve three years on the Housing Council for the Reynoldsburg Community Reinvestment Area. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is Discussion, Authorization to request Permissive Tax monies for the city's portion of repaving of Waggoner Road. And at this time, we did receive a letter from Mr. DeBolt in regards to requesting \$115,000 for the repaving of Waggoner Road. And that would be our portion of the road. And that includes the contingency in there. And the use of Permissive License Tax Funds to pay for the repaving project. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. You know how I feel about the Permissive Tax Fund. We're taking 350,000 out or something like that on the Graham Road, which I have no problem with. And I have no problem with the pavement of Waggoner Road, because I know it needs to be done. The problem I have is using the Permissive Tax Funds, 115,000. We do have another account sitting there for Waggoner Road that was set up three years ago that has around 215,000 in it. I don't understand why we're not using that. It's there for a certain reason which has never been completed. And if it ever is, we could take the money out as needed, out of the CIP or then at the time out of Permissive Tax. Permissive Tax, we can use on other streets. I see no reason to take the Permissive Tax and use it for this if we've got already an account set up with 215,000 in it. So I'd like to, and it's account 410.090.5651. I would like to see it, personally see the money taken out of that account and used for the repaving and save the Permissive Tax Fund for other streets we can use them on, and also for keeping it for Rosehill Road which I'm still hoping that we get, it's still in the mix. I know the Mayor doesn't want to do it and that doesn't bother me in the least because I don't really care whether he wants to do it or not. But I do, and I'm sure Mr. Stearns does, and I'm sure Mrs. Newman does, and we're working on this. It's not a dead dog. When I went along with this \$350,000 for Graham Road....

Mr. Stake: I think that's the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Clemens: I know. But I mean, I agreed on this when we discussed it and it was fine, but I don't intend to keep piecemealing and picking at the other until it gets down to where we can't use it on the project that should have been done years ago, or a portion of it. My only thought is, and everybody else has got their own opinion I'm sure, but we do have the funds sitting there with \$215,000 in it. And I don't understand why that's not being used. It's for Waggoner Road. It's

there. Been there. And if we ever have to come up with it, like I said, then we could use the Permissive Tax Fund or money out of the CIP. That's how I feel about it, using the money out of Permissive Tax when it's already there. It can be used out of this other account.

Mr. Stake: Okay. It's my understanding that we have nine-hundred and some odd thousand, \$934,012.42 as of December 31 in the Permissive Tax Fund.

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Which can be used for about 5 roads, that Waggoner Road is one of. And I think this fund generates about \$100,000 a year in Permissive Tax revenue. So we'd be using a little bit more than what it would generate this year. I am, I guess you haven't talked to me about this, but I am also in favor of improving Rosehill Road, and would be in favor in the future of improving Rosehill Road. But I think at this point, the fund you talked about, I'm somewhat familiar with. And I believe that that money has been appropriated for another project. I don't know how you use that money if it's been appropriated for another project. Maybe the Auditor has an idea how to do that, but I don't know. My understanding of how this works, is if it's been appropriated for another project, you need to leave it in there for that project. And I imagine eventually, we're going to have to pay for that project out of those funds.

Mr. Clemens: The problem is, you said nine-hundred some thousand, we add these two together, it drops it down below 500,000 again. Now there are other streets we can use it on. If the money's there and we can use it on this, if it comes about that we have to come up with this eventually at a certain time, which we may never have to, then we could use Permissive Tax to back it up, or money out of the CIP. There are other streets we can use it on. We're trying to get other things done. If you can use money from a project that's sitting there that's never going to be spent, as far as we know....

Mr. Stake: Well, we could always take that money if we're not going to spend, if we find out we owe that money, we need to pay it. If we don't need to pay that, we can use that towards Rosehill Road in the future. I think we have Waggoner Road at hand right now. And I think we need to let the County Commissioners or somebody know. Mr. DeBolt, do you want to comment on this? Let them know that we're serious about this project so we can go ahead and get it done.

Mr. Clemens: I agree. I agree on that. I have no problem with that. I'm serious about the project. Just where you come up with the money from.

Mr. DeBolt: Okay. I'd like to address two things if I could. One is, when Councilman Joseph inquired earlier about any additional funds, or any monies that we might need to spend on Waggoner for that study, I just wanted to clarify that that was for the study. And if the issues were warranted to have a traffic light there, the funding is not as clear. There's no money involved in us getting the study. But if a traffic light would be required, I haven't got a clear cut answer who would pay for that. And as you know from past issues, the actual expenditure for a stop light, traffic light, could be upwards of \$100,000. So having that, keeping that in mind that there might be other issues on Waggoner Road where we might need other monies for, perhaps another fund

would be appropriate for that. Secondly, with the Permissive Tax again, there's six roads you can use it for. Graham is one of them. Waggoner is one of them. I think it comes down to a matter of priorities. I think we've agreed that Graham Road needs to be done as a priority because of the repairs. I also think that Waggoner came up because of the opportunity for the, they initiated it with the county. And for us not to take that opportunity to go forward would be a problem I think for us at this time. With the amount of money that we could invest to get this job done and not have major engineering costs, I think it would be foolish not to do it. Again, you're talking about the actual, where the money comes from. I think we have to, perhaps hear from the Auditor on how that account is used.

Mr. Clemens: And you're making a point that I don't want to go along with the project, with the funding. I do want to fund the project.

Mr. DeBolt: I understand.

Mr. Clemens: I know it has to be done. So I'm not trying to do away with the funding of the project.

Mr. DeBolt: I'm just trying to point out that there might be other projects on Waggoner Road that that other fund....

Mr. Clemens: And it might snow tomorrow and maybe it'll rain too. We don't know. I think Dick's standing up.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, I'm Chairing this committee. Mr. Hills. Acting Mayor Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could, I just want to clarify. Because I think we're starting to get apples and oranges here. The issue we have is, it appears to me to be, are we going to put forward \$115,000 to resurface Waggoner Road that hasn't been done from Broad to Main? And what Mr. Clemens has brought up, and I think there's agreement that it all needs to be done. Because let me assure you, they're going to do it with or without us. Now how we explain why our section didn't get done to the citizens, becomes real confusing. So I don't think I'm hearing anyone say they don't want to expend the monies. What I am hearing, is there have been some monies which are currently in an account for Waggoner Road. And I think the question was asked, why can't we use those rather than the Permissive Tax Fund, and then it was also prefaced after that, then if those monies would need to be needed, you'd take the Permissive Tax Fund at a later date so you're not depleting the balance. I think Mr. Stake, I think you referred to the Auditor and he's standing there, and I guess what I'd ask for, as whichever role I've got, the Mayor or the President of Council, tell me why I can't use the money in the bank.

Mr. Harris: You can use either one of the accounts to pay for the project. The Waggoner Road project, the 410 Project that Mr. Clemens mentioned has been finished for several years. I was not here when it was started. To the best of my knowledge, that project is paid for, and it is complete. And there's a purchase order open for \$215,000 that could be closed or modified to include whoever the paving is going to be done by in order to pay them. So certainly, that account

can be used, the Permissive Tax Fund, that Mr. Clemens spoke of _____ can be used. There's also a Permissive Tax Fund that we keep on our books that has extra money in it and it could also be used. So there's a number of ways to pay for this project that does not involve getting into additional money from the General Fund. It's just wherever you want to maintain balances for potential projects on Rosehill Road, other street repairs, however you want to use it. The money that is in that 410 account from the CIP would go back to the CIP account. If at some point in time the purchase order gets closed, at that point the project would be done, the purchase order would be closed, it would go back to the CIP. And certainly CIP Funds can be used for any kind of street repair. So to answer your question, any of those funds are a proper usage. And all those funds have substantial money in to which you can use it. It depends on where you want to leave funds for additional projects down the road. And as a number of people have said, there are certainly a number of streets in this town other than Graham and Waggoner Road that need work.

Mr. Stake: How do you be prudent and use money where it's already been appropriated for another purpose?

Mr. Harris: The money was appropriated, as far as I know, the project is done.

Mr. Stake: Let me ask you a question. Have you asked that question? Have you asked them, do we owe this money? Because as far as I know, we have not paid for our portion of that project.

Mr. Harris: I have no idea whether we've paid for that project or not.

Mr. Stake: Well, before you would suggest that we use this money, don't you think we ought to find out?

Mr. Harris: I think if they were going to, if we hadn't paid for it, they would have sent us a bill.

Mr. Stake: Dick, as far as I know, we've paid for projects five, six years later.

Mr. Harris: And we could pay for this one five or six years later.

Mr. Stake: I know. But to take this money when it's been designated for a certain project and use it for something else, to me doesn't seem to be responsible.

Mr. Harris: You're certainly allowed your opinion.

Mr. Stake: Yes, I am. And if we don't owe this money, down the road, we could put this towards Rosehill Road. And as I said earlier, I'm in favor of doing Rosehill Road. And if you have almost a million dollars in the Permissive Tax Fund, to use 115,000 of it for one road, to me does not seem to be irresponsible. It seems to make perfect sense to me. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I agree. But you're not talking about 115,000. You're talking about another 350,000. So you're talking about 465,000. Not 115,000. (Inaudible. Two people speaking at once).

Mr. Stake: I know. But we do not have Rosehill Road on the books right now. And as I said previously, I would be in favor of improving Rosehill Road. But that has not come forward.

Mr. Clemens: And the reason I haven't talked to you about this was, because I didn't know it until I saw it here, where it was coming out. Because we discussed this before. (Inaudible. Two people speaking at once).

Mr. Stake: Well, I do think that being Chairman of the Finance Committee, if you have another idea on how to fund this project, it would be nice if you had spoke to me about it.

Mr. Clemens: I just gave you the idea. If you don't want to do it, don't do it.

Mr. Stake: I don't want to do it. I think it's perfectly reasonable to use the Permissive Tax money for Waggoner Road.

Mr. Clemens: I just want it to be known, for the public to know, the money's there for their streets as far as Permissive Tax is concerned. We could spend money out of another project fund that's completed, but we're not doing it. We're spending the money that we could use on the other streets for Permissive Tax. And that's the way I look at it.

Mr. Stake: I respect your view on this, Mr. Clemens. And I respect you. You know that. I have a lot of respect for you. But I guess I have a problem with using monies that have been designated for another purpose, for this. And until we find out whether we owe this money or not, I would not be in favor of that.

Mr. Clemens: And I will support it, when it comes around to a vote, because it does need to be done. Even though I don't agree with where the funds are coming from.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, Chairman Stake. It doesn't really matter to me where the funds come from. And I'm in agreement with the fact that Waggoner Road needs to be repaved. And also Rosehill needs to be repaved too. Rosehill Road has been on the agenda for some time. It seems like it keeps getting put further back on the burner. So as far as I'm concerned, as long as we keep in mind that the Rosehill Road work needs to be done, then I can go along with wherever the money comes from. It doesn't matter to me. I just want to make sure that Rosehill Road has not been forgotten.

Mr. Stake: And I agree. I've heard talk about doing Rosehill Road and some of the problems in the past. And I know there's a story behind that which I don't think we need to get into tonight. But anybody who drives up and down Rosehill Road knows it needs to be done. Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. Thanks for allowing me to speak, Mr. Stake. Even though I'm not on your committee. I'm concerned, for one thing, as you know, there's some people walking up and down

Rosehill Road that need a sidewalk or some place to walk. In places there are no sidewalks or even room to walk, but we'll let that go for now. What I don't understand is why, if this money has been appropriated, nobody really knows whether we owe it or not? That doesn't make much sense to me.

Mr. Stake: Well, we have not received a bill for this portion and nobody's willing to ask. Because I guess they don't want them to know the....

Mrs. Newman: Well, what is it for? (Inaudible. Several people speaking at once).

Mr. Stake: It's for the improvement of intersection of Waggoner and Rodebaugh. It was for the improvement of the intersection of Rodebaugh and Waggoner. It was our portion.

Mrs. Newman: From whom are we supposed to get this bill?

Mr. Stake: I believe Franklin County.

Mrs. Newman: Well then I understand why it's been so long. Alright. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: If I could help on that Mr. Stake, I believe there were multiple donors into that project. And I don't know what the bidding even came in. I don't know the track record. And I know that Steve doesn't, I don't think he knows either. There is a likelihood that it has been paid for from the funds that were raised. There were some developers that put in some money. The city put in some money, and the county put in some money.

Mr. Stake: And if that's the case, let's consider this money available for Rosehill Road.

Mrs. Newman: Well, hallelujah, but somebody's got to find out.

Mr. Hills: I think we do need the answer. (Inaudible. Two people speaking at once).

Mr. Stake: If somebody wants me to make the call, I'll make the call.

Mrs. Newman: Well, somebody has to.

Mr. Stake: Mr. DeBolt.

Mr. DeBolt: Mr. Chairman, I think we need to get to the bottom of this, and I'll explain why. I'm currently looking at a bill that we got at the beginning of January from ODOT on a similar project that we had a section done over on 256. And out of the blue, four years later, this bill shows up for \$50,000. And I'm working with ODOT trying to, and I talked to them today as part of the follow-up, and they said well, we have a hundred projects around the state, we've had a backlog in getting to them. Well, the county's not as big as the state, but they have a backlog, but I think before we do anything with that money, we need to get to the bottom of it. And between myself and Mr. Harris, I think we can do that in the near future.

Mr. Stake: Well, and correct me if I'm wrong. This money has been appropriated for something, wouldn't we need some kind of legislation to unappropriate the money? Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So we can cross that bridge when we come to it. And as I said, I would certainly be in favor, if we don't owe this money, and putting it towards Rosehill Road. Are there any other questions or comments? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Chairman Stake. And you and I at least think the same way on this one. Mostly because of the fact, if it is paid for and that account does end up to have some money left over, then that could be used as part of Rosehill. Whereas the Permissive Tax, we don't have that same opportunity.

Mr. Stake: Is Rosehill one of the roads we could use Permissive, yes?

Mr. DeBolt: I believe it is. Yeah. The major corridors. Yeah.

Mr. Baxter: But one thing's for sure, it's not encumbered. We know that money's available right now. And that's the point I'm trying to make. So we can get Waggoner Road and Graham Road done without concerns of having spending money that may already be earmarked to another project. And it would take some time to determine if it has already fully been paid. So I think we all agree it needs to be done. This gives us an opportunity to get it done. And they're moving ahead now, so I think we need to move forward with this quickly. So I agree with you. I think we should look at the Permissive Tax. And if that money does become available, and the other accounts are in the other account in that matter, then it could be used to other projects and then it'll come up at that time. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Are there any more questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we, and this is requested as an emergency, correct? There's a County Commission meeting, Mr. DeBolt, that we need to....

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. We'd like to let the Commissioners know that we're committed to making the project happen on our end in the partnership.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Yes, Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: I have two or three questions.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mrs. Frazier: Dick, in that Rodebaugh Project, did that money come out of CIP, or did it come

from another fund into CIP and then was...?

Mr. Harris: CIP.

Mrs. Frazier: And then that little funky Permissive Tax Fund? The other one? How much money's in that one?

Mr. Harris: The money that we keep on our book?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Harris: Around 200,000 right now, unencumbered.

Mr. Hills: That's not too funky is it?

Mrs. Frazier: Well, it's a good amount of funk.

Mr. Stake: Would that be available for Rosehill Road?

Mr. Harris: It's available for whatever you want to use it for.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. DeBolt, is this where you said we didn't need to have any legislation as long as Council's aware of you're going to ask for the money, you could just send a letter? Is that what you said? Or do you want a resolution?

Mr. Harris: You can, I think what Mr. DeBolt was actually just looking for from Council was, the direction to allow him to apply for, with the engineer's office for it, to use the money on that project.

Mr. DeBolt: I think there was an application attached with the legislation that that's what we would send forward, the letter.

Mrs. Frazier: But you said, years ago, we had legislation, but now you don't need it. Is that right?

Mr. DeBolt: That's correct. Well actually, that was for a different project. That was for the traffic study. That legislation, the resolution before.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay. But you still need it on this? And the next one?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Stake: So you need legislation authorizing you to apply to the Franklin County Engineer for the use of the Permissive Tax Fund in the amount of \$115,000?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could add, we definitely need some legislation on that because there was a time a few years ago, where one got it without the legislation. And I think Council was very upset when they found out about it at the time.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Hills: This is the direction the Franklin County released these dollars that you are currently holding for on a Councilmatic vote rather than just somebody's whim.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Did that raise any other questions or comments from members of Council?

Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one question. Are we intending to send two separate letters for the request of releasing those funds for Graham Road, and a separate letter for Waggoner Road? Or are you looking to have us do those as one request? Because that implied that when I'm reading the letter here.

Mr. Stake: I believe we need two. We're going to deal with Graham Road on the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Baxter: I see the letters has them put together.

Mr. DeBolt: Yes, it does. We put together at the time, and I was thinking we could do it that way. But I think it's best if you do it separately. Usually that's the best scenario. I'd separate them.

Mr. Baxter: I don't mind it either way. I just want to be aware that the letter came to us that I'm reading, has them together and that's why I'm asking.

Mr. Stake: And thank you for bringing that up. I appreciate that. Are there any other questions or comments? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we authorize the Service Director to make application with the Franklin County Engineer for the use of Permissive License Tax Fund in the amount of 115,000 to pay for the city's portion of Waggoner Road Repaving Project as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is Discussion, Authorization to request Permissive Tax monies for repaving (Tape Change). I'll make a motion that we authorize the Service Director to make application with the Franklin County Engineer for the use of Permissive License Tax Fund in the amount of \$330,000 to pay for the Graham Road Repaving Project as an

emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 7 is the Discussion, Appointments to Charter Review Commission. I want to thank everybody who submitted letters of interest on that. We did receive 9 letters of interest, which I think is pretty good. I just want to let everybody know that we do need 5 people to serve on the Charter Review Commission. We can have no more than 2 from one political party. Are there any questions, recommendations, anybody on the Finance Committee would like to discuss this? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Yes, thank you Chairman Stake. I was under the impression, and I guess I was asked, to find 2 Democrats. Well, I did find 2 Democrats but I only see one on the list. Is there a, and I understand, I read the Charter and it did say not to exceed two. And in past practices, I've always thought it was 2 Democrats, 2 Republicans, and 1 Independent.

Mr. Stake: Well, we did receive, so everybody knows what Councilman Stearns is talking about, we did receive a letter, a memo, from Clerk of Council Nancy Frazier in regards to the President of Council sitting down there as Mayor tonight, recommendations for Charter Review Commission. And let me just let everybody know who he recommended: Nathan Burd, Leslie Kelly, Don Hallows, Thomas Drabick and Norman Brusk.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if you'd like, I'd be happy to explain my review of those nine as to why I felt this was the most appropriate from what we had to work with.

Mr. Stake: Please do.

Mr. Hills: All very competent people. There was no question about that. I think that there was a desire to have as many people who are new to the game, have not been involved. And if you look at the first four picks, they are that way. Nathan Burd, Leslie Kelly neither serve on any committees, nor have done anything in the city. They're both Republicans. Then I went to Mr. Hallows who was an Independent who submitted, who is not on any Commissions or Boards, nor has sat on Charter Review before. And I went to Mr. Drabick who is a Democrat. That left it with 4, now you're saying, do you have another I, or do you have another D? And I looked at it and I said, we have 4 people that are brand new to this system. And I looked, okay, I've got a Democrat who has served on the Charter Review Commission once before. I have two other people who have not served before. And Mr. Brusk has not served on Charter Review but he does sit on BZA. And I look back at 4 new people, having sat a number of years ago on the Charter Review Commission, I look back and said, we've got 4 brand new people, and I said, you know, it wouldn't hurt to have somebody that understands how the city works, because many of these other people don't. And so that's where, from the selections I had left of the 3 individuals, I thought Mr. Brusk would be the most to round out the board to bring a little bit of, as the discussions get started, he may be able to say, now wait a minute, the city normally does this, and the city normally does that, because of his prior experience, and his current experience. And that's why I made the recommendation I did. They're all very competent and qualified. I did try to avoid additional

second service in the Charter Review.

Mr. Stake: And I appreciate that. And I agree with the fact that you were looking for some new people. I think it's always good to get new people involved in our government process here and I certainly appreciate that, and understand your logic behind that. City Attorney Hood, do you have something you'd like to add?

Mr. Hood: Thank you, Chairman Stake. Just for clarification sake, the Charter requires that no more than two members of a political party be appointed to the Charter Review Commission. Not that it requires two of each party, and then one Independent. So the Council does have that discretion. But just for clarification sake, I did want you to know that the Charter requires no more than two.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And it was my hope, and I didn't know it was going to come out like this, that nobody that had served previously on any Charter Commission would be involved. Because I think that we do need new people in these positions. We do have two good attorneys that's going to be on there. And I think it's good for the city to bring in additional people that haven't served on these committees. Like I said, I didn't know it until I read who had been picked. I see no problem with it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. So I guess that's a vote of confidence for the slate presented by President Hills. Any other questions or comments? Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake, I as well saw the list come back and forth. And I was quite pleased to see the number of people who had interest. It was amazing to see the number of people that had asked to be a part of this. So I know the decision was very tough. And not realizing the direction you were heading was to try to find new blood into the process. Wow, what a great idea. That's exactly what we need. Some fresh ideas. So I commend you on your decision in the direction you've gone.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: I just want to follow up on that. If I had known that was the way we were going to go, I would not have gone out and done any soliciting myself. So it was like, I did get some comments from the Mayor about finding some Democrats and other people that have said something about it. Because this was always the impression that I was left with, there would be 2 Democrats, 2 Republicans, and an Independent. And had I known that, I would have stopped at the one person. Because I hate to talk to someone about there's a position, or there's some commission that you should apply for if you'd like to, and it's a good possibility that you would get it. You know, but had I known that, I would not have said anything to Mrs. Burrus about it.

Mr. Stake: Well, and you know, I encouraged you to get some Democrats to put letters of interest in. And I guess the only thing that, and President Hills' logic there was to find somebody who had

not served on Charter Review previously and I believe Ms. Burrus has. Correct?

Mr. Stearns: I understand that. But if that had been made known to me...

Mr. Stake: Well, I don't know.

Mr. Hills: I think there are 9 people that have certainly shown an interest and I think they're all qualified at what they were doing.

Mr. Stearns: I have no problem with that.

Mr. Hills: So it's not on an individual type thing. There are 4 people. Not just Ms. Burrus who aren't going to sit on it.

Mr. Stake: Well, that's correct.

Mr. Stearns: I agree. I agree. But the point of it is....

Mr. Hills: The Charter doesn't allow us to have over 5 or we could put all 9 on.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Yes, Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: I think a couple of commissions back, and I think you and I spoke about this the other day, remember when we had the one gentleman who couldn't serve? So we picked another one from the same party I think and replaced him with that. So it's not, they may not get appointed initially, but if for some reason the Democrat stepped aside or couldn't serve, then you have one in the wings. It doesn't hurt to have more than just one. So you know, it might be a little bit of a misunderstanding, but it could turn out down the road that they might be considered for something else.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments in regards to this item? (No response). I just want to point out time line for Charter Review is as follows: Of course, the General Election's going to be November 6, 2007. The ballot language must be received, must be to the Board of Elections 60 days prior, which would be September 7. And since Council recesses during the month of August, and Council has to take action on the Charter Review Commissions suggestions, the Finance Committee should have all suggestions for review to begin July 1. Review can be by Committee of the Whole. The City Attorney should have all suggestions for review by June 1 as a month is needed for the review. Therefore, the Commission should be finished with its proposals by the end of May. So that being said, I have no problem with the names presented by President Hills, and I will make a motion that we appoint Nathan Burd, Leslie Kelly, Don Hallows, Thomas Drabick and Norman Brusk to serve on the Charter Review Commission. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 8 is Discussion, Council appointment to the Income Tax Board of Review. We've had one individual express an interest in serving on this. I was informed by the Auditor earlier this week, or last week, I'm sorry, that there will be an issue that will come before this Income Tax Board of Review. So time is of the essence. And Brandon Wright has expressed an interest in serving on this board. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we appoint Brandon Wright to the Income Tax Board of Review. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. And thank you, Mr. Wright.

Item number 9 is AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF NOTES IN THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$800,000, IN ANTICIPATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS OF IMPROVING THE MUNICIPAL WATERWORKS SYSTEM BY REPLACING WATER LINES AND ACQUIRING ANY NECESSARY INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES THERETO, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. This was read for the first time on February 26. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Mr. Stake. I had sent everybody a note and a revised ordinance this week. There was a couple of problems on the project. Number one, Ordinance 55-06 requires the Water Fund to be repaid for the engineering which is going to be between 100 and 120,000. And then the bids that were opened on the 28th came in about 80 to 100,000 higher than what the engineers estimates were. So with that in mind, after talking with Mr. Kipp and Mr. Parkinson, the amount of money needed is going to be close to a million, eight. So those will go up to \$900,000 each. Mr. Kipp was hoping to have the bids and the contracts and stuff, ready for Council to look at starting tonight, but there was some problems with the bid documents that has delayed that a couple of weeks. This was done in this unusual fashion because there's two parts of this financing on this. We will be doing the project, and then the City of Columbus will be reimbursing 50% of the cost. That is where the notes come in. The notes will be used, the payoff on the notes will be from the reimbursement from the City of Columbus Water Department. The bond part of this, Mr. Kipp, and I, and Mr. Turner are going to get together and see how they want to, we want to put this into the water, whether they were going to take the 5 year or 10 year bond issuance on it. But this is all going to pay for the 24" water line that will be run from Waggoner Road to just east of Taylor Road to the current site for the second water tower to be built. If there's any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions for Mr. Harris? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. It's my understanding, since we're going to increase it, it's my understanding that the bids did come in. They were all over the estimate. But they were under the 10%.

Mr. Harris: That's correct. They were under the 10%.

Mr. Clemens: It's an eligible bid.

Mr. Harris: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: Even though it was over the estimate and we have to increase the price. It was under the 10%?

Mr. Harris: That's correct. There was actually 3 bids under what, one of them I guess, there's some kind of legal issue with the way it was bid or something and that's why we're not able to present the actual bids starting tonight which was I think, was their original plan.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions for Mr. Harris from members of Council? Councilwoman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to know, City of Columbus is going to repay us the money to pay off the notes, right?

Mr. Harris: Correct.

Mrs. Newman: Will interest accrue on those notes?

Mr. Harris: Yes. And they will not pay the interest. We will pay the interest.

Mrs. Newman: So if they drag their feet on paying the notes, then the interest keeps on?

Mr. Harris: Well that's why, if you look at what we did with this, the notes are not going to be closed until some time in June. We'll have the money to start the project from the bond money which will be done the first part, between the first 15 days of April provided everything is passed by Council. Then the notes will be done June 15, which should give them ample time to get the project done and get Columbus to repay that. If not, we can always talk to them, not paying their water bill and we'll withhold that until they get us paid. But we feel pretty confident with the City of Columbus that they can get the notes paid by June 15 of '08.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Stake: Any other questions for the Auditor? (No response). Dick, the only change we're going to make, and that is changing the 800 to 900, correct?

Mr. Harris: Yes. The rest of it's exactly the same.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And you still want to go through the three reading process, just have the emergency language on it?

Mr. Harris: Yeah. And there's no reason to have it done, the only reason we need the emergency

language is, by the time they get that done, we want to be able, don't have to wait the 30 days to get the bonds closed. We did actually have the opening. We did an RFP on this and the interest rates actually came in better than what we anticipated.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Chairman Stake. Richard, I'm looking at the payment cycle coming back. When do we, once you issue it and the funds are received, when do we first have to begin paying back the bond?

Mr. Harris: The bond will be paid back starting in December of '07.

Mr. Baxter: '07. Okay.

Mr. Harris: And then the notes will be due, they'll be semi-annual payments on the bonds. Be December and June just like we do on most of the rest of our debt service. So this would fit into that. The money for this is all being paid for out of the Water Fund. And this was included when we did the pro forma with the rates and stuff, and this was one of the projects that was figured in for repayment.

Mr. Baxter: And we have the funds in the Water Fund to cover the first couple of payments until we get repaid from Columbus?

Mr. Harris: Well there's no payments on the notes until, it's due at the end. It's due at the end.

Mr. Baxter: At the end. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any other questions or comments? (No response). Then I'll make a motion that we send this item forward for its second reading amending it to reflect the 900,000 instead of 800,000. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Thank you. And there's a second part of this.

Item number 10 is AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF BONDS IN THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$800,000, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS OF IMPROVING THE MUNICIPAL WATERWORKS SYSTEM BY REPLACING WATER LINES AND ACQUIRING ANY NECESSARY INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES THERETO, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. And this you'd also like to amend to....

Mr. Harris: To go from 8 to 900,000.

Mr. Stake: 900,000. Are there any questions or comments for the Auditor from anybody up here? (No response). Okay. Then I'll make a motion that we send this item forward for its second reading with the amended 900,000. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens.

Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you, Mr. Harris.

Item number 11 is ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE "CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL" ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 14-03 PASSED MARCH 10, 2003 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED, SECTION 3.08 Transfer, Subsection A. It had its second reading on the 26th of February. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this item from members of Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). None being heard, then I will make a motion we send this item forward for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Stearns. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 12 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACT WITH DUBLIN MANAGEMENT GROUP LIMITED FOR HUMAN RESOURCE CONSULTING SERVICES. It had its second reading on the 26th of February, 2007. Are there any questions or comments in regards to this item from members of Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). None being heard, I'll make a motion that we send this item forward for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 13 is a RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE REVISED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO FOR THE YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2011. It had its second reading on 2-26-07. This will need to be amended to incorporate the updates provided by Mr. Parkinson of EMH&T. And basically, I believe, and Mr. Parkinson, correct me if I'm wrong, really the only change here is the Graham Road Project, the mill and fill, \$330,000. Correct?

Mr. Parkinson: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Then, am I able Mrs. Frazier, to make a motion to send this forward for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption reflecting the amended information here?

Mrs. Frazier: You send it forward as an amended document, then you will formally amend it at the Council table.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, that's what I'm going to do then. Then I will, Councilman Clemens, I'm sorry.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I'll support the amendment because I look at this as a wish list. And there's a bunch of things on there that I wouldn't want the public to think we're actually going to do. But I know you have to think ahead. And you have to have something to make that big book that thick

or I don't know what we'd do. I can't hardly carry it. But any how, I know it needs to be adopted, so I'll support it.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Then I make a motion to send this forward for its third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Before I adjourn, I would like to note that Charter Review and Income Tax will be done at the next Council meeting. Those will be Motions to be approved at the next Council meeting. People to serve on both Charter Review and the Income Tax Board of Review. Thank you.

I'll adjourn at 9:29.

Finance Committee

March 5, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday)