COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG CITY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 6, 2012

Members of Community Development Committee present: Leslie Kelly, Scott A. Barrett, Nathan Burd, Cornelius McGrady III.

Other members of Council present: Mel Clemens, Barth R. Cotner, Chris Long, Council President Doug Joseph.

Mrs. Kelly called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

The agenda was approved.

Minutes of the Community Development Committee meeting of July 5, 2011 were approved without objection.
Minutes of the Community Development Committee meeting of January 3, 2012 were approved without objection.

Discussion: Amend Section 971.08 "Program and Facility Fees and Charges"; and add Section 971.40 "Approval by Council; Director' Powers"- - -Parks and Recreation Director Jason Shamblin said he was asking for a revision to legislation that defines and establishes fees for programs. "We have done a lot of background research; we feel like these increases are fair; we are still lower than the majority, actually with our Youth Sports Programs, I don't know of any other Youth Sports Programs that are less than ours. So, we went through each program and adjusted it; most of them are roughly ten percent. There was one that was our, what we call our Summer Playground Program on page 2; we increased that one a little more. We had heavily subsidized that program before, in the past. That is a six-week program for five hours a day and we felt like we needed to bring that up to a more standard rate. So, the addition of the paragraph in the back; one of our challenges has been in a timely manner, establishing our fees in order to create new programming. And we had a discussion last year, last Fall I believe it was, last Summer, and we discussed about this very item. Since then, we met, the Mayor, myself, the City Attorney and the Auditor and had a discussion and felt like this was an appropriate way to look at addressing those fees in a timely manner, both for our program fees and our facility usage fees. So, I'll be happy to take any questions at this time."

Mrs. Kelly asked if consideration had ever been given to removing the Program and Facility Charges from 971, and making it more of an Administrative function.

Mr. Shamblin: We have, and I think within the past this was not ordained up until, it's been within the past ten years when the previous director was here. We had that discussion at the time when I met with the City Attorney and the Mayor and the Auditor; I think it was Jed's opinion that this was an Administrative function; we felt like this clause was a good way to not completely remove it from City Council's overview, so we did have that discussion at that time.

Mrs. Kelly asked Mr. Hood to share his opinion on the matter.

City Attorney Hood: Jason accurately characterized my opinion; I think that fees are Administrative in nature; I think if you look at the Charter that creates Jason's job title, it says that he will run the department and administrative functions in the department. Jason's correct in that some point in the recent past, the City Council has ordained these fees and the fee increases and changes, for whatever reason I'm not sure, but I believe that Jason's oversight with the Mayor and then the Mayor's responsibility to City Council, creates and has enough checks on the balance of power to do it appropriately. One of the things that Jason and I did talk about a year ago, and once again is reflected in this request, is that if he does something that is so against the wishes of City Council, he must not only notify you of his intention to act, but also you have the ability to then stop him within the thirty-day window. And we tried to be as consistent with the Safety Director's clause, in that when he wants to create new traffic patterns or traffic flow or signage and things like that, he gives you a notice, an intention to act, and if it's something that you do not wish to go ahead with or do not believe is best for the city, or the city's interest, you can object to that and then basically stop the action. So we tried to give Jason and the Mayor some more flexibility as far as setting fees specifically _____ other administrative functions, but also give, do not, like he said, remove Council altogether, but also give you some oversight in dealing with some of the challenges that Jason has.

Mrs. Kelly asked Mr. Shamblin how having the flexibility would help him perform his duties more efficiently.

Mr. Shamblin: I think when we're planning our programming, our brochure as it stands now comes out, it's a six-month calendar, so if you can imagine, we're looking six months in the future and trying to plan appropriately for that, so when you add in our Councilmatic process you add almost three months there that's, we're looking nine months out to try to create new programming, and a lot of times our instructors or the contractors we utilize to do our programs aren't that well organized and aren't ready to work with us then, so this will allow us to add, I think, more in new programming and make it a smoother process for us.

Mrs. Kelly:...Along the lines of adding more programming, can you just share a couple of the things that are new? I know personally there are some exciting new programs that I personally hope to take advantage of with my own child.

Mr. Shamblin: We've added several programs through our Jump Start Sports, which is a company we work with and they have offered some camp type programs, they've worked really well. One of our staff people has put together some programming for us that are American Girl Programs; she came from Licking County where she ran similar programs, so we're pretty excited about that. We are also looking at, and I don't think I've included it in here, in the future, putting together packages for the local scout troops that they can come in and for a nominal fee we can put on a program for them that then they would qualify for a merit badge.

Mrs. Kelly: That's great.

Mr. Shamblin: And I would just say, you know, we've really worked hard in the past year, these fees, you know, across the board will make some impact; you know, our largest programs, our

Youth Sports Programs are sort of the heart of what we do. We've really done a push to try to increase our enrollment in those programs. We've seen probably, across the board, about a twenty-five percent, we're still crunching the numbers for the Annual Report, and our Spring soccer, we are up a hundred kids in that program, so both Fall soccer and Spring we've been able to increase those enrollments. We've utilized our electronic email a lot more this past year and we're utilizing the Facebook page, just trying to remind people and keep it fresh in front of them to sign up for the programs, and it's worked surprisingly well. I wouldn't have believed we would have had that big of an increase, but we have.

Mrs. Kelly: How will the monies generated help our Parks and Rec Program?

Mr. Shamblin: Our department is heavily subsidized of course, and our Recreation budget also when we look at that, it's roughly an $800,000 budget, half of that easily goes to our maintenance, facilities' maintenance; the Recreation end is the other end. We believe with these proposed costs or increases that we'll generate an estimated, about $15,000 additional above what our department has in the past.

Mrs. Kelly said if an additional $15,000 was generated above what had been in the past, then that could allow an additional $15,000 possibly to be freed up in the General Fund to go where there was a need. Mr. Shamblin said that was correct, and that by increasing the enrollment numbers in the largest programs, there would be a considerable impact as well.

Mr. Clemens asked, concerning the stricken items, why soccer had been struck out, softball, the prices on those, etc.

Mr. Shamblin: We tried to simplify the fee structure. Instead of having the individual Youth Sports Programs, we just created, on the second page about half way down, Youth Sports Programs. So that will encompass all of our soccer, basketball, volleyball, baseball and so those fees will be included in there.

Mr. Clemens: Are those additional fees? Have you raised those fees?

Mr. Shamblin: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: It seems....I know of other programs in other cities and those don't seem very high; what did you raise them to?

Mr. Shamblin: Well, we'll look at a ten percent increase across the board for all the ....

Mr. Clemens: You're going to do ten percent for all the youth sports?

Mr. Shamblin replied, "Yes, sir" and further said they had given themselves a range, which gave them a little more flexibility.
Mr. McGrady: So you haven't clearly defined where...it's just a range between A and B.

Mr. Shamblin: Yes.

Mr. McGrady: So once you have those established, will you bring those back to Council?

Mr. Shamblin: This is what will stand as legislation currently.

Mrs. Kelly: No, it is established.

Mr. McGrady: But you have a range 'from'..'to' - so have you, the way I'm reading it, you haven't clearly, maybe I'm misreading, have you clearly defined what the actual increase is?

Mr. Shamblin: A ten percent increase. And that will, depending on the program, from what it was before, we're defining it as a range for ourselves, internally, to work from.

Mrs. Kelly: Let me explain...make sure I'm reading it correctly. So you took, for example, under Youth Sports, you have Soccer Leagues, T-Ball Tykes, Youth T Ball, all of those things. You took all of those and smushed them together under Youth Sports, so Soccer Leagues, let's say, at $30 - they're really going to $33, but that falls in your range of twenty-eight to forty; T-Ball Tykes are going to basically $33, Youth T Ball basically's going to $33, but rather than have them all individually listed out, you smushed all of those up under Youth Sports Programs.

Mr. Shamblin: Yes, and created a range.

Mr. Long: Of your $800,000 budget and $400,000 of it being for maintenance for fields, parks and so forth, with the increase in the fees, and as you mentioned, you have increased participation and enrollment now, what percentage of that $400,000 cost do you feel that you're currently covering with your Youth Programs and your other programs?

Mr. Shamblin: I would hate to speculate an answer at this time.

City Auditor Harris: The Parks and Rec fees over the last three years have gone from about $150,000 a year to about a $120,000 a year for the Rec programs lumped all together; I have a specific breakdown if you want them, so obviously since he hasn't had increases in prices in that time obviously that decrease has come from lesser participation. And I think he's trying to be cognizant of that, but between a hundred and twenty and a hundred and fifty thousand, a ten percent on this would take it back up to 135- 140- of the four hundred thousand as being created through, generated through fees for the Rec programs, and the rest would be subsidized by the General Fund.

Mr. Cotner asked if there were any programs that were being eliminated either for lack of participation or for just being unsustainable; was there anything that the city was losing.

Mr. Shamblin: No, there are some programs like our Mad Science, we left that on there, we haven't had an enrollment in that program enough to offer the program, I think, in the time that I've been here. We haven't completely removed it, taken off the list, because we think it's a good program, so I think, for the most part, in the previous times we've done this, we've tried to clean it up and only include the ones we're offering. And that's part of, you know, we have seven different art classes listed there so that's you know I'll be honest I don't even know what those original ones were so that's part of the reason why ___ a little bit.

Mr. Burd: Just a clarification - you mentioned that our sports programs will still be considerably less than a lot of similar communities, is that correct?

Mr. Shamblin: Yes.

Mr. Burd: Okay. So I just wanted, for the public's knowledge, even though we're talking about fee increases, that can be scary, we're still going to provide a superior product for less than you'd pay in comparable suburbs?

Mr. Shamblin: Yes.

Mr. Burd: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Shamblin: I have some comparisons; we did look at several of those; we'll just use our baseball fees for a resident, after the Early bird, is $36 and Pickerington's is $65-75 so we are considerably less than a lot of the surrounding areas in fees. Also, a lot of it, there's a big variety in the organizations that offer youth sports in other communities too; so Pickerington, of course, is run by a Youth Association, not through the municipal parks and recreation programs.

Mr. Joseph: What percentage of the participants would you say are non-residents?

Mr. Shamblin: It would just be a guestimate; I would say maybe about a quarter...we could try to pull those numbers together.

Mr. Joseph: My second question would be - how do you determine the higher fee for the non-residents over residents, was there a formula you used for that...

Mr. Shamblin: Yes.

Mr. Joseph: When figuring that out, did you look into the factor that certain rates might discourage participation, or are some of these programs so popular that we could adjust them further to make up for the fact that these are non-residents using city services.

Mr. Shamblin: I think our challenge always is we don't want to increase our fees and cause a big drop-off in enrollment; that doesn't benefit either. I think we were very conscious of that when we did a comparison and looked at what other communities are offering. When we establish, we use a chart to establish the non-resident fee; so if our program fee is anywhere from 10 to 25 dollars, there will be an additional 5 dollars added on that would be considered that non-resident fee. And then, it steps up, depending on how big the cost is, so the next step would be 25 to 50 we would add a 10 dollar increase for non-resident, so it works that way.

Mr. Joseph: Is that in line with what other communities do as well? As far as what percentage over and above ..

Mr. Shamblin: Yes, it's very similar; some use a percentage and some use this type of formula; some communities...we try to look at...to establish our fees, we just try to evaluate what our direct costs to the program are: staffing, supplies, any equipment that we would utilize, and then we would...that would be our base fee. We would then look at charging anywhere from ten to twenty-five percent on top of that to try to offset some of the indirect costs - full time staffing, salaries, and what-not; and then we would, once we have that final number, then that's when we would add in the non-resident fee.

Mrs. Kelly said she would like to separate the two topics: one for the program facility fees and one for Approval by Council; Director's Powers. Mrs. Kelly asked Mr. Shamblin if she understood correctly that he would like an emergency on the fees part so the increases could be enacted prior to the next printing of the program brochure due in early March. Mr. Shamblin said that was correct.

Mrs. Kelly moved to send legislation to Council regarding the requested increases, with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency measure. Mr. Burd seconded. All voted "Aye".

Mrs. Kelly moved to send legislation to Council regarding the addition of Section 971.40 for first reading. Mr. Burd seconded. All voted "Aye".

Discussion: Authorization of extension of Landscape Maintenance Contract - Main Street Corridor- - -Mr. Shamblin explained the request was for a one-year extension of the contract; that Brickman had done a very good job the past two years and he felt it was a very good price for the services; that with some of the uncertainties of the budget in the next year or so, he felt that a one-year extension was appropriate.

Mr. McGrady said he needed a little history and since this was an extension, asked what the length of time was for the previous contract. Mr. Shamblin said the contract with Brickman had been for two years that ended in January. Mr. McGrady asked who conducted the landscaping services before. Mr. Shamblin said that before Brickman, there was a company, Rocky Fork who had a contract 2008-2009; and before that it was Ameriscape 2007-2006. Mr. Shamblin said there had been two phases to Streetscape and whoever installed it, maintained it for the first year. Mr. McGrady asked if the landscaping was something the city could handle since there was a Horticulturist. Mr. Shamblin replied that the Horticulturist worked for him in the Parks and Recreation Department; that she took care of all the landscape beds throughout the city that were on city property, all the parks, at city hall, but the challenge was that there were three full time permanent positions in the Parks and Recreation maintenance area and one permanent part time, and then seasonal employees were used during the busiest times; that with the current staffing, they would not be able to supervise that project as it is four miles of landscaping with irrigation; another full time staff person would need to be hired just to supervise that, and then other seasonal staff would be needed to help. Mr. Shamblin said his estimated cost just for the full time staff person would be $45,780 a year, but the numbers were a couple years old. Mr. McGrady asked the classification of that individual. Mr. Shamblin said it would be another Horticulturist. Mr. McGrady asked if it had to be a Horticulturist or could it be Maintenance. Mr. Shamblin said that the contractor having a certified landscape technician was required; someone who either had an Associates or they passed the test; that there was quite a bit of science that went into the work, what with the usage of pesticides, fertilizers, and plant management in general.

Mr. McGrady: So these are businesses on Streetscape, on Main Street?

Mr. Shamblin: Yes, sir.

Mr. McGrady: At any time, has there any consideration been given to say, okay, to the business owner, okay, since 2006 this is what we've been doing, and ask financial participation from them?

Mr. Shamblin: I don't know if I can answer that question.

Mr. Clemens: That's a bad deal.

Mr. Harris: It's been my understanding that when easements were granted for putting those flower beds and walls in that the payment for the easement was that the city would maintain it.

Mr. McGrady: Thank you for the history there.

Mr. Clemens: And that did not come before Council.

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Shamblin, do I understand this contract that you're proposing - it's less money than previous contract?

Mr. Shamblin: Yes, and I don't have those exact numbers; it was considerably less than Rocky Fork's contract which was considerably less than Ameriscape's contract. The one good thing that's happened in the economy is that the competitiveness on these bidding projects has really benefitted us, so they have had to come up with some very creative ways to take care of the maintenance, for example, one way that they utilize, you know, it's a very high-maintenance bunch of landscaping out there with a lot of perennials that have to be cut back, and it's a lot of hand work. What they did was, they would come in this past two years, we worked them in order to try to figure out how to save their cost, they came in at night and used equipment to cut down all the perennials instead of doing it by hand and raking it all out, so instead of having to have twenty people here for multiple hours, they were able to do it much quicker and then blow it all out to sidewalks and vac it up. So they really did a good job trying to find ways to cut their costs in order to provide us a quality service at a fair price.

Mrs. Kelly asked Mr. Shamblin is the funding was contained in the budget; Mr. Shamblin said that was correct.

Monica DeBrock, 7400 Bryden Road: The only question I have is, on the Streetscape, we all have easements in our neighborhoods, we still mow them, we still take care of them. We have right-of-ways, we still maintain them. I think, I know it was a hardship when the businesses put up with the Streetscape and a lot of them suffered, but for five years our community has helped establish a beautiful Streetscape; it has benefitted the businesses, it has benefitted the entire community, and for that I applaud. But, at some point in time, our community - we don't have the cash; and it may be budgeted, but we don't know what we're going to do next year. I'm saying, why are we not saying it is your responsibility as a landowner to maintain the established landscaping. It's not a rocket science; yes, there's ways to cut costs; the Main Street businesses can get together; they can make an association and they can take care of the landscaping, if that's what they want. I'm not sure why, I, as a citizen, am still paying for landscaping on Main Street when it's benefitting the landowners. Their property values have increased. I love it, but at some point in time, are we going to start doing everybody..all the businesses' landscape? I don't think so. And I don't..I think it's time that we somehow look at how we got into the position that we are now still weeding in front of every automobile store on Main Street. So I would...I'd like to see..you know, I want it to be maintained, but established landscaping in businesses - that's part of the city's codes and regulations, so I think it can be expected. If a business wants to change their established landscaping, you basically are going need to come in and get that approved, so why are we not ___ it back. I understand that there was an agreement, but I think it's time to re-look at that agreement. And I think as a community we should be ready to say that's enough; five years of paying for this landscaping .. if we were flush with cash, I'd say do it because it's an amenity for the businesses that I'd love to have, but we aren't in that position so I think we need to..we're raising fees, we're cutting services, I think this is something that we need to look at. It's small, but we gotta start somewhere. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: I've got a comment. I've questioned that for years, but it's my understanding it's a legal agreement and that was done by offices of the city and I'm not sure that maybe 75% of the property owners don't really care, to be honest with you; they wouldn't want to pay it to start with. I mean, I don't think we, you know, I know it doesn't sound right, but I know that's the truth. Am I right or wrong as far as the legal agreement?

Mr. Hood: Yeah, and I think it's important to understand that this is not a agreement or an agreement; this is multiple agreements done with each property owner at each individual parcel of land. There wasn't many of us that are in this room that were here when it was done, but at some point, they went through every business owner, every parcel owner, and made a specific agreement to them and part of the consideration in taking property away from that individual, private citizen, private property owner was, we're going to put this nice wall with this nice end-cap and nice signage and beautiful landscaping in between our sidewalk and your property, and as a matter of fact, when we put it in there, we're going to maintain it, we're not going to let it go and be deteriorated after a period of years. I think these discussions are good; I think these discussions are going to have to happen, and probably happen more often because of the financial difficulties we find ourselves in, but I think it's unrealistic to think that we can go back to these property owners after we've made a deal, or struck a bargain, each individual person and say, we really don't have the money here, you need to take care of it. Now, whether or not this venture is worthwhile in spending money on an outside contractor, I think that the Parks and Rec Director Shamblin has made the case that this is a more cost effective way in doing so with a contractor as opposed to an employee. Like I said, I think these discussions are necessary, and I think that they're going to become more necessary with all the budget items that we're going to have to talk about. This one, I don't believe, is a realistic solution to save $15,000; like I said, this was part of the payment that we offered to receive the property rights.

Mrs. Kelly: How long, do you know how long these agreements are in place for...is it the life of the business?

Mr. Hood: Perpetuity. Yes..no, no..not life of the business; perpetuity - forever. And I think it's, I'm sure that it was discussed at the period of time when they decided to do the Streetscape itself, it was a tremendous undertaking, so I have to believe that this particular issue was discussed in some fashion. If you remember, part of the payment was the signage that was relocated for the individual businesses, as well. So there was a host of things that the city came to the table with to create the Streetscape improvement; you know, we made a bargain...we're left with it.

Mrs. Kelly thanked Mr. Hood and moved to send legislation to Council for the first reading. Mr. Barrett seconded. All voted "Aye".

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Community Development Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
February 6, 2012

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG CITY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 6, 2012

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Cornelius McGrady III, Nathan Burd, Scott A. Barrett.

Other members of Council present: Leslie Kelly, Barth R. Cotner, Chris Long, Council President Doug Joseph.

Mr. Clemens called the meeting to order at 8:07 p.m.

The agenda was approved.

Minutes of the Safety Committee meeting of December 19, 2011 were approved without objection.
Minutes of the Safety Committee meeting of January 3, 2012 were approved without objection.

Discussion: Authorization to prepare bid documents and advertise for bids for the 2012 Street Program - Lancaster Avenue, and appropriation of funds- - -Safety/Service Director Jim Miller explained the request and process; and said he was asking for $9,500 for the preparation of the documents and the advertising. Mr. Clemens said that everyone knew there were numerous streets throughout the city that needed repair, but financially the city was not able to do all of them. Mr. Clemens said that Lancaster Avenue was one of the worst and it was appropriate that the city try to take care of it. Mr. Clemens asked if the bus ramps were going to be included, since they looked pretty good. Mr. Miller replied there would be some work to those; the concrete pads would be left in place; some of the pads needed to be repaired in part, some in whole. Mr. McGrady said based on what Mr. Miller saw with the current condition of the city's roads, did he have a projected five-year plan. Mr. Miller said there was a five-year Capital Improvement Plan that was currently being worked on; that the streets on the Street Program were considered maintenance and streets were evaluated every year; that to keep current on maintaining the streets on their optimum life cycle, the city needed to be spending between two and three million dollars a year, but with finances as they were, expenditures were less and the city was not keeping up with the rate of deterioration of the streets. Mr. Harris said one of the reasons Lancaster Avenue was chosen for repair was that monies in the Franklin County Permissive Tax could be used, and those funds could only be used on six or seven streets, and Lancaster Avenue was one of them. Mr. Clemens said the residential streets were probably between eight and ten million dollars behind because they had not been done in the last six or seven years. Mr. Clemens moved to send legislation to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Mr. McGrady seconded. All voted "Aye". Item also referred to Finance Committee for funding.

Discussion: Liquor Permit Request - Transfer - *from* Anne U Dempsey dba Sun Shine Catering Two, bsmt & stor unit & patio & golf course, 7309 E Livingston Av 1st Fl *to* Columbus & Franklin County Metropolitan Park District, 7309 E Livingston Av, Reynoldsburg, OH 43068- - -Chief Suciu said an investigation had been conducted and no reason for a hearing was found. Mr. Clemens said the request would be returned without a request for a hearing.

Meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Safety Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
February 6, 2012

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG CITY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 6, 2012

Members of Service Committee present: Barth R. Cotner, Scott A. Barrett, Leslie Kelly, Cornelius McGrady III.

Other members of Council present: Mel Clemens, Chris Long, Nathan Burd, Council President Doug Joseph.

Mr. Cotner called the meeting to order at 8:19 p.m.

The agenda was approved.

Minutes of the Service Committee meeting of January 3, 2012 were approved without objection.

Discussion: Amend Zoning Code Fees - - -Planning Administrator Matt Hansen said he had taken a look at current fees and evaluated them against other municipalities in the region; that the city's fees were substantially lower than the others; that in looking at the costs to provide services for planning and zoning, he was suggesting an update to the fees. Mr. Hansen referred to the provided summary, and said: "One update that I wanted to do our fee structure was to make it more refined so that it accurately reflects the time that staff is involved in some of the cases, specifically for Design Review Board. Right now it's basically a graded fee where it's $50 plus $10 for every thousand square foot of new construction, but what we're seeing now with some of our buildings that are aging, they're doing updates to the facades, if there's no new construction to that building, it's just a flat $50 fee; however, because of the extensive renovations that are done to the exterior, it takes a lot of staff time to negotiate back and forth with the applicant to get the right product for the community, and that takes a substantial amount of time. But we're only collecting a minimum of $50. So I'd like to revise that to better reflect exterior changes made to buildings so that the staff time could be recouped through the fee."

Mr. Long: You have some items here that we currently weren't charging fees for. Does that mean that we weren't handling that in-house; we were farming that out, such as the Major Site Plan, Minor Site Plans, and so forth.

Mr. Hansen: No, we were doing those all in-house. Those are the refined fees to better target that type of application that's coming through our department. So under the Certificate of Appropriateness, you see the underlined Major Site Plan; the Certificate of Appropriateness for a Major Site Plan would have been $50 plus ten per every thousand square foot of new construction; well, I'm just proposing a flat $400 fee; that's typically what would come out for, say, the construction of a BW3. For the Minor Site Plan, exterior change, that's just a flat $200 fee for those exterior renovations; that's something that we weren't charging before, or differentiating from, and so I wanted to add those in so that we could better recoup that cost.

Mr. Long: You don't show any average fees from other communities. How do other communities currently handle that?

Mr. Hansen: We're unique in that we do a two-step process, with a Certificate of Appropriateness and the Site Plan Review, the BZBA. Most communities just take it through a Site Plan Review, or they do it through a PUD process, a Planned Unit Development process where there's a preliminary and final development plan.

Mr. Cotner said the item would be held for two weeks so Mr. Hansen could prepare the document for the legislation. Mr. Clemens said he thought Mr. Hansen showed a good increase and it was what was being looked for, a way to bring finances into the city, and for Mr. Hansen's department to help pay for itself.

Discussion: Authorization to prepare bid documents and advertise for bids for 2012 Sanitary Sewer Program, and appropriation of funds- - -Safety/Service Director Jim Miller explained the request, noting that in 2009 EMH&T was authorized to do a sanitary sewer evaluation study of the entire city; the purpose of the study was to eliminate inflow and infiltration of storm water into the sanitary sewers; there was a consent agreement between the City of Reynoldsburg, the EPA, and the City of Columbus that we would undertake these improvements once it was determined how much inflow was infiltrating the sanitary sewers; the impetus behind all this was that Columbus was required by the EPA to upgrade all of its waste water treatment plants. Mr. Miller said a ten-year plan was being put into place to address deficiencies, and the request was the beginning of the process. Mrs. Kelly asked Mr. Miller to share what goes into preparing the documents for bidding.

Mr. Miller: I'll start backwards. The advertising costs in the newspaper - we're required by law to advertise in local circulations; we choose *The Daily Reporter* because that is a document that most contractors review and use as an information source of who's selling what projects. We also advertise in *This Week News* and when we advertise with *The Daily Reporter* and *This Week News*, they also put it on their web sites and they also market the projects for us as well. Contractors subscribe to these newspapers, particularly *The Daily Reporter*; *This Week News* doesn't do this, but when a project goes for sale, they, individually send out an email or a fax to each of the contractors for us and helps us get our bids and typically the advertising costs are about 500 bucks. Then we've got costs in prints and copies; a contract book for a project like this will be close to a 120 to 135 pages; mostly text, bid forms, pictures describing the work, you know, such as this, but at a larger scale, and all the requirements of the project such as restoring the yards, the landscaping, what to do if we have to tear down fences to get to the sewers; all that stuff is detailed in the contract documents that we prepare, and so this $1,500 covers that cost; and we have a lot in prints and copies. We will prepare about twenty-five books; the waterline project - we open bids this Friday for that; we've sold close to thirty books, and that project also came with 24 by 36 sheets as well.

Mrs. Kelly: And when you say 'sold those books' - can you define that for me?

Mr. Miller: We receive revenue from a potential bidder; our waterline project for example - we sell those contract documents for $50 apiece. I believe with these sanitary sewer projects, we'll be selling those, I can't recall off the top of my head, I can't remember if it was $35 or $50, but of this money that you're appropriating, we receive money back from the contractors who purchase the books. It is a purchase.

Mr. McGrady: The books that you sell out to them...is that the norm in terms of pricing?

Mr. Miller: Every project is different. When we sold Summit Road, the plan set was close to 140 pages of 24 by 36 inch sheets. We also had a contract book of 8-1/2 by 11 sheets that was close to 200 pages. Again, I don't remember the exact figure, but it was around $220 a set; when we sold Rosehill Road, it was around $250 a set, so we look at the cost of preparing the document and depending on the scope of the project and the number of sheets, are they color, are they black and white, we look at all those things, and we evaluate how much each contract document costs to prepare, and we look at recuperating, you know, I'm asking for $1500 to prepare these documents, you know, I look at what I ask for to prepare, and how much they prepare to cost, and that then helps me determine a sale price, when we actually do advertise the project.

Mr. Cotner moved to send legislation to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency measure. Mr. Cotner said the item would also be referred to Finance for funding. Mrs. Kelly seconded the motion; all voted “Aye”.

Meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Service Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
February 6, 2012

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
REYNOLDSBURG CITY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 6, 2012

Members of Finance Committee present: Chris Long, Nathan Burd, Barth R. Cotner, Mel Clemens, Leslie Kelly.

Other members of Council present: Scott A. Barrett, Cornelius McGrady III, Council President Doug Joseph.

Mr. Long called the meeting to order at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Long moved to amend the agenda by adding two items - (1) funding for Street Program - Lancaster Avenue; and (2) funding for sanitary sewer program. Mr. Burd seconded; all voted “Aye”. Mr. Long said the sanitary sewer program would be Item 8, and the Street Program would be Item 9.

Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting of January 17, 2012 were approved without objection.

Discussion: Resolution in Opposition to State of Ohio taking control of municipal income tax collection- - -City Auditor Dick Harris said the resolution came as a response to a white paper that was issued about a year ago by the Ohio Society of Certified Public Accountants considering a long-standing disagreement they have had with the municipal governments over the collection of taxes. Mr. Harris said a number of cities had already sent things to members of the House and Senate; and read from documentation that had been received by Council with the legislative request. Mr. Harris said the Ohio Tax Administrators and other groups are working with this and have said they are certainly amenable to anything they want to do as far as standardization, as long as it is revenue-neutral. Mr. Harris asked Council to consider passing the resolution. Mr. Burd asked if legislation had been introduced since the packet of material had been received by Council. Mr. Harris said nothing had been written as of this date, but that the Ohio Municipal League and others have said the best time to effect this is *prior* to it being written. Mr. Burd said the topic wasn't just something the Governor could do; that it had to go through the legislature. Mr. Harris said that was correct. Mr. Burd said it seemed like a big concern would be whatever the administrative fee would be that the state could tack on for doing this. Mr. Harris said and even more so is the fact that city income tax collectors are much more aggressive than the state of the federal government. Mr. Long moved to send legislation to Council for the first reading. Mr. Clemens seconded; all voted "Aye".

Discussion: Appropriation - Law Enforcement Fund - - - Mayor McCloud said, "When our Police Department is part of a criminal case that involves a forfeiture, in this case, cash, there's a specific case number attached to the legislative request attachment, a portion of that is billed to us, actually invoiced to us to go back to the County Prosecutor's Office. The Interim Budget that is currently in place does not have legal authorization for us to spend out of this account, so the original legislative request was simply legal authorization to pay this invoice. I spoke to the City Auditor and he was helpful, so I wrote that down on my calendar, so I would always remember that. And Dick's recommendation was because we don't know when these things are coming, there's another one in the pipeline, these things just show up, these criminal cases can take years; and then the invoice just shows up, and they want it in thirty days. Rather than do this piece-meal, every single purchase order still goes through the checks and balances of the Auditor's office, but at this point, I would request that the 963.25 cent figure that you have in front of you be amended to just $20,000 and that'll get us at a minimum, through the first quarter of the year when we can have the permanent budget in place. Because, again, these things come in; we don't know when they're coming in; we don't know how much they're going to be for; and everything, it is processed ultimately through the City Auditor's office.

Mr. Long: These funds are received through forfeitures and are restricted...

Mayor McCloud: There are precious few things that these funds can be used for.

Mrs. Kelly: I just want to clarify; the 20,000 you're talking about is not out of the General Fund; it's out of this special money...

Mayor McCloud: That is correct. Those uses are restricted to purely law enforcement purposes.

Mr. Long moved to amend the requested amount to $20,000; Mrs. Kelly seconded. All members voted “Aye”. Mr. Long moved to send legislation to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency measure. Mr. Burd seconded; all voted “Aye”.

Discussion: Council appointment to Design Review Board to fill unexpired term that ends December 2014- - -on 12-5-2011 item held for two weeks; on 12-19-2011 item held until first committee meeting in January. On January 3, 2012 item held two weeks. *On January 17, 2012 item held until next committee meeting.*- - -Mr. Long said Council had received from a couple individuals, letters of interest. Mr. Long said he had had the opportunity to meet and speak with one of them, and asked if anyone else had spoken with any of the interested individuals.

Mr. McGrady: Yes, I spoke with Pat Zollars.

Mr. Clemens: I did too.

Mr. Long: I spoke with Marshall Spalding and I believe that his background in management and the overall aspect of being able to sit down and work through an issue as far as the Design Review, plus the fact that he is retired and would have the time to devote to projects the Design Review Board is working with...I’m going to introduce a motion that we appoint Marshall Spalding to the unexpired term on the Design Review Board. Second by Councilman Burd.

Mr. Long asked that the roll be called. With the roll called, members of the Finance Committee voted: Mr. Long “Yea”; Mr. Burd “Yea”; Mr. Cotner “Yea”; Mr. Clemens “Yea”; Mrs. Kelly “Yea”. Motion passed. Mr. Long moved to send motion to Council with recommendation for adoption. Mrs. Kelly seconded. All voted “Aye”.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH DONALD J. SCHONHARDT & ASSOCIATES, INC. FOR MANAGEMENT CONSULTING SERVICES- - -first read 1-23-2012. Mr. Harris said the contract had been in existence since the early nineties, and he would like to have it continue. Mr. Long moved to send ordinance to Council for the second reading; Mrs. Kelly seconded. All voted “Aye”.

Funding for sanitary sewer program- - -Mr. Long moved to send the legislation with funding to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency measure. Mrs. Kelly seconded. All voted “Aye”.

Funding for street program - Lancaster Avenue - - - Mr. Long moved to send the legislation with funding to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency measure. Mr. Clemens seconded. All voted “Aye”.

Meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Finance Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
February 6, 2012