

SPECIAL SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 6, 2006

Members of Safety Committee present: Brett Baxter, Ron Stake, Doug Joseph, Donna Shirey. Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills. Councilman Mel Clemens was absent.

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Baxter: If Bradley and Sharon would like to come up right off the bat. Chet is actually the one who is working on this but he is on vacation this evening. So I'm sure that we'll be able to get through quite a few areas here tonight. But the goal of this is to introduce the International Property Maintenance Code, correct?

Mrs. Reichard: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: And the intent of these special meetings is to give us an opportunity to discuss them.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So going forward, what I would like to do, and I'm proposing that we meet on a weekly basis, a half hour before the committee or Council meetings. If there's no Council meeting or committee meeting, then we won't meet that week. Does that make sense?

Mrs. Reichard: That makes sense.

Mr. Baxter: And the goal is to continue doing this until we actually dredge through this entire document and dredge through all the updates that we have because there are quite a few here. So that's how we intend to move forward. Does that make sense?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, it does.

Mr. Baxter: Great. So let's go ahead and get started with this. From a management prospective, I would like to definitely like to hear from my committee members. But I'd like to also let the rest of Council know that this is an open forum, so if they have any questions, by all means, just raise your hands and ask. I have no problem with that. Okay. Sharon, let's get started.

Mrs. Reichard: Alright. Thank you, Chairman Baxter, members of Council. We are here tonight to begin the dialogue as it relates to implementing the International Property Maintenance Code, lovingly known as the IPMC. The Building Department has been working on this for some time. This was something that began under Stephen Moore's regime. As we began looking at the code, sort of addressing some of the issues, the frustrations that we've encountered in code compliance and in building inspection throughout the many years, this should tighten up the

code. This is something that we've been looking at for a very long time. And I might also add, was the number one recommendation from the Neighbor Task Force of which there are many members here tonight. And I'm delighted to see that they are here because this is something that they proposed a long time ago and we're finally bringing it to the table. It's unfortunate that it took so long, but as you know, the Building Department is very busy. And so Chet and Bradley have been working on it for many, many, many, many months, and have spent countless hours going through the code. Because as I'm sure most of you are aware, it was not all just packed into one part of the code. There were little snippets of it throughout our ordinances. And what they endeavored to do, and I think did a very good job of, was _____ all that information, correcting all the other pieces of the code, and looking at that. We certainly have had a lot of wealth of experience with all of this in looking at it. First of all, Chet, I should also tell you, Chet is at a meeting of the Ohio Building Officials Association. He dreams that he was on vacation. But he's not on vacation. I think he's like in Canton, or Kenton, or something. You know, Canton, Ohio, one of those, Canton, Ohio, one of those wonderful places in our great state meeting with other Building Officials. So what I've done is, I've asked Bradley to be here tonight because he is the Assistant Chief Building Inspector. And one of the things that's really unique about Bradley, he's been with the city for 22 years. And one of his initial duties when he came here in 1984 was that of code compliance. He is now our, one of our electrical inspectors and he is also the Assistant Chief Building Inspector. So he brings a wealth of knowledge to this and has a passion for seeing that this gets done also. So what I've asked him to do is, to begin to walk us through the process. Tonight is an introduction. We want to save, I think one of the, he's going to give you some history and background of how this got started. Where we came from, and where we hope to go. And then if we have time, we would like to begin by talking about fees which you will find as the second tab in your notebook. Chapter 1389 is the bulk of this code. And that is one of the things that Chet, what we'd really like to do is sort of save that for when he can be with us next week. That's his passion. To really look at that piece of it. But Bradley is fully prepared to answer, he and I both are, prepared to answer any questions you may have. And if we can't answer them, we will seek the information and bring it to you next week. We see this as an evolving process. One that is much like when we talked about the fees, the inspection fees, before, where we took it week, after week, after week, making sure that Council fully understood, and had the opportunity, and the public had the opportunity, to look at and dialogue about what the changes we were asking for and why. So I know the last time we did this process, there were a lot of changes. You made a lot of wonderful suggestions that really fit in with those changes in the code. So of course, obviously we're expecting the same thing this time. So, with that, I'd like to introduce Bradley Butters who will begin to take us through this. And then we will watch our time to make sure we're completed by 7:30. And then certainly try to address any questions you may have. Obviously, I would really like for you to stop us at any point if you don't understand something. Because it can get a little bit involved. And this is not something you deal with day to day and we do. So some times we make some assumptions that you know what we're talking about and you don't. So please feel free to interrupt us at any time. Bradley.

Mr. Baxter: Okay, Sharon. Before you step away, a couple of quick ones here if I could please.

Mrs. Reichard: Sure.

Mr. Baxter: To start off with, we are having this as an open, informal discussion. A forum to give an opportunity to discuss amongst everybody. So the format on how we do that, I really don't have a concern if we do fees today or what tab we do. So I appreciate that, that we'll focus on areas that are best suited for that period, and we'll try to schedule the next ones as the following weeks go on. So my goal is to go after, what do we want to discuss that evening, pick the topics for the following evening, and make sure that we have all the documentation at Council by Friday so that we can get it in their packets and be prepared to talk to it, or discuss it on the following Monday.

Mrs. Reichard: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: So from organizational standpoint, that's how I'd like to manage that. Secondly, I know that there's two major questions we've got to get out of the way right off the bat. Do we have the right documentation in front of us?

Mrs. Reichard: Yes, you do.

Mr. Baxter: Because there's some question about, Nancy, were there some changes in how the book was going to be formatted or what not? Was that resolved?

Mrs. Frazier: It was resolved in the stricken sections. In the International Property Maintenance Code itself, that booklet, Chet tells me, is going to always, if they update that booklet, then there'll be a page of updates with it.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Why you can't get that printed to go over with us, I don't understand. But I'm sure there's an answer. And then the fees are referenced as well. So that's another attachment. So I left that up to Chet to explain as to how we're going to deal with that. Because in the Building Codes, we get books. They're complete books. We adopt them by reference. So there's at least a concern on my part that whatever we have in the room is always the current one.

Mrs. Reichard: Right.

Mrs. Frazier: And we can word it so that that's what we're going to do. But as you're done here, I want everybody to understand that what you've got here has blanks in it. And what's going to go in it, as long as you understand where all the words go, then that's fine. But the stricken section is what you're not _____ get into tonight. Those have been taken care of.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Very good. I just wanted to make sure we understood how we are going to move forward and how we're going to reference the material so there isn't confusion going forward. And the second one is, noticing at the bottom it says '>2003' on the booklet. So I'd like to have you address that right off the bat.

Mrs. Reichard: He'll address that. He'll address that.

Mr. Baxter: So everybody here understands why we're talking about 2003 and what will happen when it changes to 2004 and 2005.

Mrs. Reichard: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: So Bradley, if you could address that first, I think that would be a great introduction to how we move forward.

Mr. Butters: Sure. Thank you very much. Well, it's very similar to most of our codes. Say for instance, the National Electric Code goes through a three year code cycle. And we fully expect this code will do the same thing. So right now, we're under the 2005 National Electric Code, we're in 2006. The next one will be 2008 and that will be adopted January 1 of 2008. So this will, as far as I know, this is going to be also a three year code cycle. So the next one will be the 2006, 2009 like that.

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

Mr. Butters: I guess I have a unique prospective for being with the city for quite a while. Twenty-one, twenty-two years. And back when it was just Dana Miller and I, I got the job by default of code compliance. And I think I'm on pretty firm ground on saying that code compliance has always been difficult for the CBO. No matter who the CBO has been, code compliance has always been very difficult. And it has not always, the task has not always been fully embraced by the Building Department. I see this as our first chance in those 20 some years to achieve a balance in code compliance. We've made a lot of mistakes over the years and we've learned from all of them. We've gone under compliance, we've gone over compliance, and back and forth. We've kind of ping ponged on that continuing of too much enforcement and too little enforcement. And I see this as a wonderful chance to finally achieve some balance. Especially with our two new highly skillful, highly experienced, Code Compliance Officers. So that's one major point I'd like to communicate. As far as the code itself, when I and many previous Code Compliance Officers went out on a complaint, answered a complaint, we do a brief investigation. And then we dove into the City Code to figure out what to do. Is it a violation, is the first question. If it's determined to be a violation, then how are we going to proceed? That has never been clearly mapped out. Just the thickness of the book. You know, the City Ordinance as we have in our office is that thick. So it's pouring through that and trying to find out what is germane to the complaint that we've got. And it has always been extremely cumbersome. Extremely time consuming. Extremely inefficient and extremely confusing. This

is concise. This is small. It's all in one packet. You're not bouncing all over a document that thick. In a document that thick, you're not always sure that you've got everything that's pertinent. Here, there's no question. It's extremely concise. It's extremely compact. In fact, I would suggest that under getting a handle on this book for you folks, I would suggest that generally use the table of contents versus the index. The table of contents is one page. The index is 9 pages. So of course, if you want to do some in depth research, the index is fine. But to get a very, very thorough, very brief overview, the table of contents. This is one of the first big jobs that Chet gave me as his new assistant. And I did pour over both documents for several months. And my job was to decide where there was parallel language in both City Ordinance and IPMC. Where we did find parallel language, we would strike it out of the City Code. If there was no parallel language, we would keep it in the City Code. There were a few places where there was no language in the City Code and it was in here. So of course we gained new language. So we've been very careful not to lose anything that City Council over 20, 30, 40 years has crafted. We're very careful not to lose anything. So I can whole heartedly, fully support this document. I have a few cross references. Say, everything that was in 1389 just briefly, administrative portion is in Chapter 1 of the Property Maintenance Code. Everything that, all the definitions that were in the City Code is Chapter 2 of the Property Maintenance Code. Just a brief, just one example of how the City Code was cumbersome, if you look at the definitions that we have, on the first page, we have dilapidated and, I'm sorry the companion definition. But if you read that carefully, the Code Compliance Officer would almost have to know the appraised value of the property before they could even use that language in an enforcement letter. You know, 5%, or not more than 25%. So it actually, City Code actually used to ham string our Code Compliance Officers. It was far more of an obstacle than it needed to be. So we ended up deleting all the definitions because these definitions are very concise, very thorough. And so I went through both documents like that very thoroughly line by line, sentence by sentence. So this is the result of that work. Are there any questions?

Mr. Baxter: Any questions of committee or Council? (No response). I have a few here. First off, my concerns would be, as you're taking, striking out, or adding new language to existing code based upon this book, would be the existence, or the possibility of adding ambiguity into the code. As one was written with intent, another one was written with a different intent. As you tried to merge those together, I'd be real concerned about that ambiguity that may be brought into the total language as it's completed. So I would ask you, have you looked at it as a total once you've completed for that type of potential confusion or ambiguity that would be introduced?

Mr. Butters: Yeah. Actually, my opinion is that, that very ambiguity has been eliminated. This was of course, an International Code done by, put together by code professionals from all over the world. And it is a document that's been hammered out for many, many years. So it's about as lean and concise as can be. I'm confident that we have eliminated ambiguity rather than introduced it.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Great.

Mrs. Reichard: And I may just follow up on Bradley=s comments. One of the things that we learned from the Health Department when they came out and did a, sort of a ride around with us in our neighborhoods was, made that comment. That it takes out a lot of, I don=t think he used the word >ambiguity= but that=s what he meant in terms of code compliance. For example, right now, we tend to be far more reactive in our code compliance than proactive. The way we=re working with Jim and Rick is to move our Code Compliance Officer=s, is to move them forward so that they can begin to identify those things that the Health Department inspectors when they rode with us, noticed right away. And that had to do with deficits in a particular house. Maybe a house that had been sitting idle. Or even one that where someone lived, but there were code issues as stated in the IPMC. And they would say that to us. You know, if you adopt that code, you can deal with these issues. Some of those issues are the things that are being reported. The problems that are being reported from our community members from some of our community action groups, or neighborhood groups that say, can=t we make this person do something? Whether it=s to paint or you know, then their house is falling in disrepair on the outside, isn=t there something that we can do? This code, this International Property Maintenance Code, gives us the clout to do that. So as we drove around, that=s one of the things that they brought to our attention. So I would agree with Bradley in that it takes a lot of the ambiguity out and gives us a lot more teeth in our code. It gives us the opportunity to address issues that we=ve never been able to address before. And now that we have two, very learned about Code Compliance Officer=s, we are really ahead of the game in getting out and getting that done. So that=s one of the things that=s really exciting about this.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thanks, Sharon.

Mr. Butters: Let me also mention that, not only will it remove ambiguity from the Building Department=s prospective, the enforcement side, it will remove ambiguity in the community. There=ll be a learning process of course. But the community will come to, in the future, the community will come to understand what the rules are and begin to see real consistency.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I do believe that=s one of the challenges we=re going to have, is getting the message out to the community so they understand what the rules are going to be going forward. So that they know what is expected of their community. Mrs. Newman, you had your hand up.

Mrs. Newman: Well, that=s exactly the point I wanted to make. You know, the residents need to be informed of all this. And I just wondered if there was any plan in the hopper to get this information out to them.

Mr. Butters: We are planning on proactive approaches. And Jim and Rick have both talked about this. We have monthly code compliance meetings with the four of us. Chet, and myself, and Jim, and Rick focus on...

Mrs. Newman: Well, that=s great. But the people need to know. And how are they going to find

out about all this?

Mr. Butters: You're absolutely right. In those meetings, we've come up with a proactive plan where we will be doing community education. And we will take certain areas of, we'll divide the city up into areas and focus on one area at a time. And then it really...

Mrs. Newman: Are you planning to go door to door? Or you're not going to use the media or anything like that on a regular basis?

Mr. Butters: Any and all methods and avenues available.

Mrs. Reichard: Well, I also think, if I could just add to that, one of the things that we talked about was doing a mailing. Because this is a very important part of our code. It's a very important part of our community. I think we've been reading lately in the paper about other communities who are suffering from code violations, for lack of a better term, some of the things, especially like with abandoned houses and things that are going on in their community. One of the things that Chet and I talked about was the idea of whether it's a news letter format, or a letter out to the public. But to apprise our citizens of what we are doing. Because someone, you know, if you don't know what the code is, if you don't know how it affects you, if we could pick out some of those key points and let them know, it could go a long way. Plus, we want to embrace the, we're hoping that the, our friends at our local newspapers will embrace this and want to do some things. So we're, there's a lot of things we can do in terms of community education. We can also get the word out through the Mayor's town meeting. I think that's a wonderful vehicle for getting some of this information out and bringing people together. We can also go to neighborhood groups. I know that Chet and Bradley are putting together power point presentation wherein they can go out to some, especially the large groups. You know, like the Huber's, and the Briarcliff's, and the Eastshire's, and the really active community groups that we have, they can go out and present to them. I think it's especially important, it's important in the new neighborhoods, but it's also a very valuable and important, some of our more mature neighborhoods that we have where we have problems with abandoned houses. But we have abandoned houses in our new neighborhoods. So everybody needs this information. And the best way to do it is to reach out to every single vehicle that we can find to get the information out. So yeah, we plan on educating the community as much as possible.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: I wanted to let you know, I had the opportunity to ride with Jim Casteel on Saturday and I really commend them for doing a fantastic job. And in conversation with him, we did come up with a plan, actually he already had a plan in informing the community of the code compliance. And he had something on his computer about a newsletter that we thought of putting in a packet for people who are new in the community. And I think maybe the Chamber might come up with a plan, a welcome packet, so that whenever they come into City Hall, or where they contact the Chamber of Commerce for new people coming into the city, it's a packet

that shows a map of Reynoldsburg plus you know, the code compliance issues. You know, things like that. So I think that would make them aware of what the code compliances are. And I think that would also be helpful for the citizens as well.

Mrs. Reichard: I would agree. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you. Two quick questions. One, have many other communities in Central Ohio implemented this code?

Mr. Butters: Yes. I believe Worthington has, I believe Hilliard has. I'm sorry, I don't have the complete list with me.

Mrs. Reichard: I do.

Ms. Shea: Whitehall, Columbus. Everyone around us has adopted it. Bexley loved it because it covered swimming pools.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Could you come to the mike and let us know your name? Because all you're getting is an inaudible on the tape I'm sure. But thank you for the information.

Ms. Shea: Hi. I'm Mary Shea. And I helped Sharon and Bob McPherson on the group that formed to go through all these. And we did do research. Whitehall, Columbus, all the surrounding communities. In fact, we did research in to see how many Compliance Code Officers they had. According to the population, those vicinities. I did not bring my book with me. But ours was at least a recommendation of two full people here for Reynoldsburg based on the population of Reynoldsburg. But in talking to Hilliard and all the different communities here, we are the last ones to adopt this. Okay? So we did our studies and our homework, and hopefully we can catch you up on where we are already as the citizens from Huber, Briarcliff, and all over Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Baxter: That's great. We appreciate it.

Ms. Shea: Any further questions, ask me because I was there.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I thank you so much. I appreciate all your help.

Mr. Joseph: Follow up?

Mr. Baxter: Please do. We have about 5 more minutes here. So we're not going to get to our agenda unfortunately, but I would say that we will carry it over.

Mrs. Reichard: I think this is healthy dialogue for us to build a foundation.

Mr. Baxter: But this is great. I think one of the issues here is, how is it going to be informed? This form itself is a way to inform the public. What we're doing and why we're doing it.

Mr. Joseph: And my follow up is, do we know if the other communities have had any trouble either in the implementation of the code or compliance?

Mr. Butters: Well, my focus and the job that I was given was to concentrate on the book itself. That was not part of the scope of my research.

Mrs. Reichard: (Inaudible. Speaking at the same time of Mr. Baxter).

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Joseph, I did ask that question also of Chet and he will be getting that information for us. That was one of the questions that I had on one on one with him was, not only who's doing it today, and any operational or executional issues they may have had to try to execute the plan, what were they? And he informed me he had been speaking with Gahanna, and Hilliard, and other communities to get that information. So I'd anticipate that question to be answered by our next meeting. Thank you.

Mrs. Reichard: Right.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. With that said, we're presently looking here at 7:27. So I think we're running here quickly out of time. President Hills.

Mr. Hills: One quick question if I could. This is just for clarification for my own mind. Bradley, do we have any idea of whether this International Property Maintenance Code will conflict, or hopefully compliment the new Ohio Residential Building Code? It was passed a year to two years ago. Has that been interfaced? I know you've interfaced our codes but because we're a certified city, we have, whether we wanted to or not, adopted the Ohio Residential Building Code. Is this going to conflict anywhere going through that? Or is that something you're looking at.

Mr. Butters: Right. That's a great question. And it's a question being asked all over the state. I don't think we really know how it's going to shake out. But I am confident that it won't be too big of a problem. Because traditionally, the building side of it, the Building Code and the Property Maintenance Code are basically, they come together in a Building Department. But they're like two separate jobs.

Mr. Hills: That's what I was trying to clarify.

Mr. Butters: Yeah.

Mr. Hills: This is the code that's regulated after the construction has been completed.

Mr. Butters: Yeah. Now, as close as they get, where they do dove tail, now let me reference Chapter 8 which is >Referenced Standards=. And I'm sure we'll visit this again later but, >Referenced Standards=, the City Code never referenced the National Electric Code, it never referenced the Ohio Heating Code, it never referenced the Ohio Plumbing Code. This document does reference all the Building Codes.

Mr. Hills: But just the international. Just the international document. It doesn't recognize anybody else that's not international.

Mr. Butters: We will be amending this, Chet and I will be amending this so that they will reference the codes that we use in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Hills: The ones that the state have said we must use.

Mr. Butters: Yeah. Right.

Mr. Hills: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills, any other follow up?

Mr. Hills: No. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I'd like to thank everybody for attending tonight. And I look forward to this continued conversation each week as we have our meetings. So as a reminder, it will be at 7:00. The next meeting is scheduled for the 13th at 7. And I would hope at that point we'll go ahead and start with Chapter 1389, the changes, and how they're going to help us. Then maybe we can work into the fees after that. We wanted to get that tonight but I think we had a wonderful discussion on it. So I thank you for that.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you. And just so, I have two pieces of homework here. One is, you want to know if there are problems in other communities in adapting the code. And then secondly, do we anticipate any conflict with the Ohio Residential Code and maybe how some other communities. We can look at some of those issues. We'll get that information to you.

Mr. Baxter: Correct. Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: I have one quick question. Does this make enforcement much better? Is that something that is _____ to be a lot easier to do? In other words, _____. Informing is the

main thing. I just wondered, is enforcement going to be a lot easier?

Mr. Butters: Yeah. Definitely. Number one, the Code Compliance Officer is going to have a consistent document. They're not going to have to start from scratch and research almost every new complaint that comes up. And have a consistent document that's concise and easy to research and easy to find answers. And everybody will be on the same page. Even if we do change Code Compliance Officers, the code will be something that spans change of personnel.

Mrs. Reichard: Clear and concise.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thanks again. I'm going to go ahead, so I don't step on any other meetings coming forward like now, go ahead and close my special Safety Committee meeting, and thank everybody for their attendance.

And that will be at 7:31.

February 6, 2006

-- Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 6, 2006

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

Other members of Council present: Ron Stake, Brett Baxter, Council President William L. Hills. Councilman Mel Clemens was absent.

Mrs. Newman: Ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked that we all rise this evening and observe a moment of silence for the memory of Coretta Scott King who passed away recently.

I'd like to call the Community Development Committee for February 6, 2006 to order at 7:30.

The first matter on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Do we have any changes? (No response). None being seen and heard, it will stand as written.

The next item is the approval of the minutes of December 19, 2005. Are there any changes recommended? (No response). Seeing and hearing none, they'll stand as written.

The next item is the approval of the January 3, 2006 committee minutes. Are there any changes? (No response). None being seen and heard, they'll stand as written.

The next item on our agenda is Discussion for the Authorization of the two year contract to maintain the Streetscape Phase I Corridor Revitalization landscape. The west city limits to 195 feet east of Rosehill Road. Mr. Walsh.

Mr. Walsh: Good evening. Thank you Mrs. Newman, members of Council, Mr. President. Today I'm wearing a purple shirt and a gold tie, and that's a reminder that spring is just around the corner. And because of that, we're going to be seeing a lot of purple and gray hyacinths, and a lot of gold and yellow daffodils among those 22,000 plants on Phase I of the Main Street Corridor Revitalization. Now to keep that looking good, we've brought to you today, a contract request for maintenance of this phase. And I want to run down a few of the items for you. This would be for 2006 and 2007 seasons. It includes mulching of the beds, weed control, fertilization of the plant material as needed, weed control in the brick pavers along the sidewalks, insect control, and pruning. Some additional services may be required if we have to replace plant material such as trees or others. That's not included in this contract but it is something that we would have to do. There is no turf maintenance in this contract. And there also is no irrigation in this contract. We're handling that separately. And also, prevailing wage does not apply to this. We bid this project out once earlier last year, 2005, and the bids did not come back in a way

that were usable for us. So we asked to throw out the bids and re-bid it, which we did at the end of December. We sent out plans and specs to seven companies and we had three good bids come back. Ameriscape Inc. was the low bidder for \$49,200. That=s for two years, or two seasons on this. And that is under the estimated cost that we had anticipated of about \$73,000. There was a question about why did they get, why did they do this at such a low price? And I believe there=s a couple of things involved there. One is, this is not only the second time that they=ve bid on this project, but originally when I first came here a number of years ago, when this project was first getting under way, I had asked Ameriscape to confirm the engineers estimate for maintenance. And we paid them, I believe \$100 to prepare a short report on their estimated cost for maintenance. And they did match up well with the engineer. So I believe this is a good bid from these folks. We did a reference check on them. Current and past customers. They checked out well. The Better Business Bureau has no issues with them either. We do have the necessary funds encumbered in the 2006 budget to make this all happen. And at this time, I=ll be happy to entertain questions.

Mrs. Newman: Any questions, comments? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Newman, yes. Hi Paul, how are you doing tonight?

Mr. Walsh: Alright.

Mr. Baxter: Paul, questions I have is, when you say Streetscape, what section specifically from what point to what point will they be servicing?

Mr. Walsh: This begins at the west boundary of the city approximately, where the sign is in front of the Reynoldsburg Car Care, I believe is the name of it. That=s where the project starts. And it goes all the way to about a hundred and some feet past Rosehill Road. So essentially, it takes them in front of Jolly Pirate, and in front of United Dairy Farmers heading eastbound on Main Street. And of course, that=s where the new construction is commencing for Phase II.

Mr. Baxter: A follow up question if I might? Follow up question would be then, this you said, was a two year contract?

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So then, are we going to have to bid a new contract next year as we=re looking to get through Streetscape II, and have any beautification? Or is that already contracted inside Streetscape II?

Mr. Walsh: That=s already in Streetscape II. The reason is that, the plant material will not be going in until late 2006. So then we have a maintenance contract with the installer for 2007. And then when 2008 comes around, we can bid the whole thing together. Both phases at once for a new maintenance contract.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thank you.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you. My question Paul is, like you said, you're going to merge them together, right?

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Stearns: And that won't be done until 2008 when this present Phase II is completed?

Mr. Walsh: As I understand it, the installation of the landscaping won't happen until late this year.

Mr. Stearns: Okay.

Mr. Walsh: And once that's over, then we have a one year maintenance agreement. Typically, plant material like that has a one year warranty. And just like on Phase I, we had a one year maintenance agreement along with the construction contract. So we didn't have to do that. We didn't have to go out for bid at the end of Phase I. Because we already had a year built into the construction contract for them to maintain that.

Mr. Stearns: I see. Thank you.

Mrs. Newman: Any other questions? Yes, Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Who handled this section of Streetscape in the past years? Because I notice it's been done before. And approximately, what was the cost on it in the past years?

Mr. Walsh: We only did a little bit of it last year. Because the maintenance agreement lasted for part of it into July. And the warranty on the plants lasted until October. So we paid for approximately 3 months of maintenance at the end of last year.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: One last question, I promise. The work that's being done, is this the majority, having the mulch work done? Or what is the actual services that are being rendered? Because I'm thinking this is taking care of the beds and those type of things where the bushes are. And I'm just kind of scratching my head wondering, would it actually be cheaper for the city if we had them plant grass there and let the owners of that property maintain that property.

Mr. Walsh: Well, that's an interesting question, which I think has been discussed before.

However, we had the project the way it is. I don't believe that removing beds and removing plant material would be fiscally sound. We have these things in place. We paid a significant amount of money to get them there. If you're saying, take it out and plant grass and get rid of trees and flower beds, I suppose it could be less expensive. But that's not something I would guess at. I would have to take a look at that.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. I just bring it up because this costs \$70,000 plus to do Streetscape I. And then two years from now it's going to be Streetscape II. Is it around a hundred, a hundred and forty thousand? That's a lot of money to spend for upkeep on a single street. And I think it does make it look pretty. There's not an issue about that. It does look very nice. And they've done a nice job over the last year. Just questioning the expenditure. I think there are better ways of doing it.

Mrs. Newman: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter just got my attention here with some numbers. And \$70,000 for the present contract? Is that what you're saying there?

Mr. Baxter: I'm suggesting, he's saying that this new contract here that we're going to enter into for two years, was it 70,000?

Mrs. Newman: No.

Mr. Walsh: It's \$49,000.

Mr. Baxter: 49,000 over two years.

Mr. Stake: That's for two years, correct?

Mr. Walsh: That's for two years. So it's essentially, 25,000 a year.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I saw 49 too, and I thought I missed something. Thank you.

Mr. Walsh: We had estimated higher.

Mr. Stake: I know. You had engineering estimates on this and you estimated higher. And then what struck me was, and thank you Mrs. Newman, was how low this bid came back. Thank you.

Mrs. Newman: Any other questions, comments? (No response). Alright. With that, I guess I'll move this on to Council for its first reading. I need a second and a vote. Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted Aye). Anyone not in favor? (No response). Motion passes.

And I'll close the Community Development meeting at 7:40.

Community Development Committee

February 6, 2006

-- Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 6, 2006

Members of Safety Committee present: Brett Baxter, Ron Stake, Doug Joseph, Donna Shirey. Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills. Councilman Mel Clemens was absent.

Mr. Baxter: I'll open the Safety Committee meeting at 7:41. And I'll ask for approval of the agenda. Although, I do have a speaker slip here. So I would ask that we change item number 9 (Discussion, Amendment of Chapter 1511 Fire Prevention Code) if I could to I guess 3a, so we can get to that issue right away. We do, I see, have Chief Sharps and many of our fire department here.

Mr. Hills: Just to clarify. You're moving your item 9 to item 3a?

Mr. Baxter: 3a so I can address it right away. Unless that's procedurally okay to do number 9 first and we don't have to move it. Procedurally, I'd just like to do that number first. So do I need a motion for that? So I so move to move item number 9 to 3a. I have a second from Mrs. Newman. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Motion carries.

And with that, I'll go ahead and ask Chief Sharps to come up to the podium and let's discuss the Truro Township Fire Department's Fire Code. The Fire Prevention Code.

Mr. Hills: Do you want to approve your minutes?

Mr. Baxter: Thank you very much for reminding me, President Hills. I guess I do have one more item here that I just jumped right over and I apologize for that. I'm looking to get approval of minutes of the Safety Committee meeting held January 17, 2006 as published. Are there any changes or additions? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as approved.

And I will now then move on to item 3a which is a discussion of the Amendments of Chapter 1511 Fire Prevention Code. Chief Sharps, welcome.

Chief Sharps: Thank you Mr. President, Council members. What I'm here for, this says Truro Township but it's not. It's actually going to be the City of Reynoldsburg's adoption of the Ohio Fire Code which incorporates, and we have representatives from all the Fire Departments here. We have Chief Dale Ingram, and then Fire Prevention Officers Mike Shirey, John Singleton, Jim Holcolm, and Bill Greenwalt from Jefferson, West Licking, and Violet Township. I have not, as I talk with Mr. Baxter, I will have letters eventually from all the Fire Chiefs stating that we are in favor, that we're all in favor of adoption of this Ohio Fire Code. One of the things is, the last time I believe, it's under the Reynoldsburg Code was 1999, was the adoption of the last BOCA Code. Right now, there is no BOCA Code. BOCA is gone. BOCA, as some of the southern Building Officials and that, all joined under this new International Fire Code, which

then Ohio, the State Fire Marshall=s Office Code Enforcement took that International Fire Code and Ohiotized it. So now we have the new Ohio Fire Code. And as we ask for adoption of this, we=d like to adopt it as the Ohio Fire Code or, and current additions so that every two years or three years, whenever they update it, we don=t have to come back and go through this all the time. That=s basically how the code read before, current edition. The new Fire Code does incorporate a lot more into it than what we had before. Not so much as fire=s enforcement goes, but they have put, like when we referenced NFPA for city fireworks, we had the check lists in that. This is incorporated in the Ohio Fire Code now. And it=s just an updated Fire Code that meets today=s needs for the fire service and for the City of Reynoldsburg. If we get into any code questions, I=m going to have to defer to the fire prevention people because they work with it every day. I don=t. Other than that, I don=t know, if you have any questions for me, I=ll try to answer them. If not, I can bring, like I say, the fire prevention people up. But I think this just brings us, with the Ohio Fire Code, the new Ohio Fire Code, it brings it into today=s climate.

Mr. Baxter: Well thank you, Chief Sharps. Do we have any questions? Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. Chief, thank you for the information. Are you going to, or is somebody going to supply us with a copy of the Ohio Fire Code?

Chief Sharps: You have one.

Mr. Stake: Oh, we=ve got one right there. Okay. And I agree. I think we do need to update our Fire Code and it=s certainly something that you folks work with every day. So if we can be on line with the rest of the state, I think that=s a good thing. Thank you.

Chief Sharps: And I know I was asked if they wanted this to be an emergency, but I don=t really think it needs to be emergency legislation. I think we can just, I=m not that familiar, and it goes through three readings and so forth. It=s kind of hard to say it has to be an emergency when 1999 is the last time.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And just to make note, Nancy does have a copy of the book you brought over in her office. It=s a very large manual. And I don=t know if the Council members here would like a copy of it made, that=s fine. But I would suggest if you want to go through it, stop and see Nancy and she can let you have it for a while to read through it I guess.

Chief Sharps: If you need more, we=ll gladly get you more.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Is it available on the internet somewhere?

Chief Sharps: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Well, if we could just have that link, the address or whatever, I can research on there.

Mr. Hills: It=s through the Board of Building Standards, isn=t it?

Chief Sharps: I=m sorry?

Mr. Hills: The Board of Building Standards? Is that where they publish it off the internet? Because it=s not the international. It=s been Ohiotized.

Chief Sharps: Yeah.

Mr. Hills: That, or the Fire Marshall=s Office.

Mr. Stake: State Fire Marshall. Okay. Thank you.

Chief Sharps: I=m sorry. Yes. Fire Marshall=s Office.

Mr. Baxter: If you could get a hold of Nancy=s office tomorrow.

Chief Sharps: I would suggest you don=t read it late at night though.

Mr. Stake: I may need to.

Chief Sharps: About a page and a half at night.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. So I would ask that if you can work with Nancy and get that link to the Clerk of Council. And that way she can make sure that gets out to each one of us, then we do have a way of getting access to it and not have to fight for the single book. That could save some trees and we=re okay with that. Any other questions? (No response). First off, I=d like to say, thank you Chief for stopping, and all the rest of you for coming down here. I realize this is very large and there=s quite a bit of work here that needs to be done. So if my Council members will take a look at this and if they have any questions, get a hold of me and I can work with the Chief here to answer your questions. I think this is something that needs to happen.

Chief Sharps: And if you can=t get a hold of me you can get a hold of any of the Chief=s of any, Violet, Jefferson, or West Licking, or the fire prevention people and I=m sure they can get you the answer.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Very good. Nancy, do we have legislation prepared for this yet? This points out a discussion form. Have we prepared any type of legislation that can be moved on to Council for a first reading?

Mrs. Frazier: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baxter: Then I will so suggest if I could please. And I=d like to have that...

Mr. Hills: (Inaudible). It=ll all be done for you.

Mr. Baxter: I love how she does that. So I would recommend that we move this on to Council for its first reading.

Mr. Stake: Are you making a motion?

Mr. Baxter: I so move. Yes.

Mr. Stake: I=ll second.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Second by Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted AAye@). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries. And I thank you Chief for stopping by tonight.

Chief Sharps: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Next item on the agenda is a Discussion, item number 4 of Naming alleys. Larry Ward had submitted this. And we have 6 alleys that currently have no names. And that could be a little bit of an issue when we=re trying to send police and fire out to a location if we have no name of it. Correct, Larry?

Mr. Ward: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: And I think that=s your intent here, is to try to get some names on them. So go right ahead.

Mr. Ward: Yes. We have researched this. We have checked with some citizens who have lived here all their lives. Off the County Auditor=s mapping system, all of our maps, and we cannot find anywhere that these had ever been named. So we did talk with the Police Department and they are in support of doing this. Also, in all of these alleys there are some street lights. And when residents call in and say that it=s out, it=s hard for us to give the location to the electric company. So it would just make life simpler for everyone if we (Tape Change). It=s just a suggestion. So if anybody had any better idea, we=re open to it. But we tried to pick something neutral and there wouldn=t be any controversy.

Mr. Baxter: And I=ll make note for my Council members and committee members that the names are Ash Alley, Maple Alley, Cherry Alley, Hickory Alley, Elm Alley, and Buckeye Alley. I like that last one. And you=ll notice with your attachment where these alleys are. So do we have any questions about this from committee? Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you. Are these alleys also going to get signage?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Joseph: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. Larry, didn't we have an Apple Alley? Do we still have an Apple Alley?

Mr. Ward: It's still there. It runs from Main Street south to South Street.

Mrs. Newman: I just didn't see it marked on here. Maybe it isn't.

Mr. Ward: I didn't mark all the existing alleys.

Mrs. Newman: I always liked that name. I hoped you hadn't done away with it.

Mr. Ward: No.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Larry, a question. Historically, we have had some of our alleys that are used more I guess, have been named. But on these 6 new ones you want to name, there's no one obviously, that has an address on that alley. All houses street addresses are on some of the adjoining streets and not the alleys. Correct?

Mr. Ward: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? (No response). Hearing none, I will then recommend that we move this item on to Council for its first reading. I so move. Second by Councilman Joseph. All in favor? (All voted AYe@). Opposed? (No response). Hearing none, motion will carry. And thanks Larry. I appreciate it.

Moving on to the next item. Discussion for Authorization to purchase a cab and chassis and all related equipment. Sub title here, titled salt truck. And Larry, since you're up there, we might as well go ahead and continue with you. First off, I think I would like to bring attention to the committee that, if you look at your attachment that was given on the utility truck equipment legislation, you'll also see the information numbers about the salt truck. I did not see it in the attachment with the salt truck. So I wanted to make sure you were aware that was like that and would be able to find it. It is the second page dated on a memo from Sharon Reichard, Safety/Service Director, Larry Ward, Street, dated January 9, 2006. Subject is legislative request for aerial lift truck. And the next page on it was a discussion of motor vehicles. Title one was 2006 truck cab and chassis and 45 foot lift. And then the next section was 2006 International cab and chassis. Which is what we're talking about here. With that said, I'll bring the committee

up to speed here, as I have gone out to the salt barn to look at this truck, Larry and I. And I thank you Larry, and the Mayor, and the rest of your staff to give us the opportunity to take a look at what the issue was. And so if you want to go ahead and bring the rest of committee up, and Council to speed what had happened, and I'll fill in any blanks if you leave any out.

Mr. Ward: Sure. Mr. Baxter wanted to come out and look at the truck that we are wanting to trade in and replace. We brought in some people from Ace Truck Body to take a look at the existing truck to see if we would be better off to try to fix the existing truck, try to do some updating on it, try to get another 3 to 5 years out of it. We think once we looked at it, there is some rust on the frame at the bed. Dump body would have to be completely replaced. Trying to repair it would be a fiasco. It's just beyond repair. As old as the truck is and the condition that it's in, we just feel that it would be better off to purchase a new truck. The last three trucks, salt trucks we have purchased, we have bought stainless steel beds. They're a little bit higher up front, but then we don't have the expense of trying to take care of the rust every 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Baxter: Larry, thank you. And what I have not seen come across my desk or come in my packet was, there was a quote that they had given you. If you would please submit that to the Clerk of Council so that she can have that in our packets for next week. That would let the rest of Council understand what it would cost to try to repair this vehicle. We had an independent party take a look at the vehicle to see, is there some opportunity to repair it. And I want to make sure the rest of Council has the ability by next week or the week after at the committee meeting to be able to look at that and make their own determinations. One of the things I think you mentioned here, you said the frame was bad. In essence, the frame was fine. It was the sub-frame in which the bed sat on. So the concern here is a safety concern. The truck would be going down the street and the whole bed could fall off the back. That could be a major problem for us. So I do agree with you with this truck that replacement made more sense once we've seen that the motor had some issues with leaking of oil, and one of the pistons was leaking severely. And that would either replace, repair cost would be required for that as well as the bed and the way it actually connected to the truck. It had rusted quite severely. So with that said, I wanted to make sure that we had this last bid for repair of that. And notice that repair did not cover the sub-frame. So we would need another cost if you could so the Council would be able to look at that cost.

Mr. Ward: Sure.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Stake, I saw you raise your hand twice here now.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Larry, what was the cost of the repair of that truck and what was the life going to be if it was repaired on that? I haven't seen that estimate.

Mr. Ward: I believe that was a little bit over 21,000. But that did not include everything. I believe the president of the company and the two sales men, plus the man in charge of the shop area where the guys work on all the trucks, they spent several hours just going over it. They tried

to give an honest opinion as to what it would cost. And then when they came out to the shop, they mentioned that that sub-frame work would have to be sent out to another company. They just don't work on that part of it. So we'll have to call and get an estimate on that.

Mr. Baxter: Their general feeling I believe, if I remember right, was that it would be extremely costly to replace the sub-frame. I don't know what that meant but we would have to go to that same location to get a bid on it I believe.

Mr. Ward: Well, we could call them and get an estimate, and then, if it is over 10,000.

Mr. Stake: The present truck, what's the year of that truck?

Mr. Ward: It's a '93.

Mr. Stake: '93. So it is quite old then. Years and years of salt certainly can do some damage. And you had engine troubles as well on that truck?

Mr. Ward: Not a whole lot. But it's just to that point where if we spend thirty or forty thousand dollars trying to get the rest of the truck ready, the engine could go out at any time. It doesn't have a lot of miles but they're rough miles with the type of work that it does.

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

Mr. Baxter: You're quite welcome. Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Speaking of the miles, how many miles are on that truck? And then my second question is, if they were to do the repairs, I think the question you had was, what would be the life span of the truck left on it?

Mr. Ward: For the repairs on this truck?

Mrs. Shirey: Right.

Mr. Ward: Well, that was one thing Mr. Baxter asked in a meeting we had a couple of weeks ago. They would like to see a warranty but on this type of work, they won't offer a warranty. They will on their workmanship. But as far as how long a new body would stand up to the rust and the elements, there's just no guarantee with this type of equipment.

Mrs. Shirey: And how many miles are on the truck?

Mr. Ward: I believe it's got 25 or 30,000 miles. Let me look here. It's close to 22,000 miles.

Mrs. Shirey: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. You mentioned there=s a lot of rust on the truck. Is that being caused by just the wear or tear? Or is that being caused by salt?

Mr. Ward: Mostly by salt and calcium. The men take real good care of the trucks. And I believe the gentleman from Ace, they were impressed with the condition of our trucks. Even as badly as this one is, they said that they=ve seen trucks just 2 or 3 years old look as bad as this one. And they were impressed with the way that we take care of the equipment.

Mr. Joseph: Are the trucks like, washed out when they=re done being, when they=re out on the street doing the salting? Are they washed out? And is there care done to try to preserve them that way?

Mr. Ward: We do it as often as we can. If we have a snow storm and then we see that no snow is predicted for 4, 5, 6 days, then we=ll go ahead and dump all the salt off and wash them out as best we can. We have a power washer there at the shop. If it looks like we=re going to have snow every 2 or 3 days, just depending on the work load, they may hose them off a little bit or we may just wait until after the next snow storm. The guys take real good care of them and we try to keep them cleaned up. If we have to use the plows and everything, we salt the wheels on those and all the moving parts as best we can. So they really do take good care of them.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions from the committee? (No response). Questions from Council? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Larry, did you give an estimate about the amount of money that=s been spent in the last few years on the repairs?

Mr. Ward: I included that. The total amount we=ve spent on that truck is \$10,700.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions? Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter, if I could just point out. I noticed in the documentation that you provided, in the last couple of years, you=ve had quite a few break downs there where you were repairing and replacing things. So it looks like it=s on its way out.

Mr. Ward: Yes. We did have to have some work done on the fuel injectors on the diesel engine and some other work. As a matter of fact, the week after I printed this report and sent in the legislative request, we had a snow storm in January, and the springs broke on it. So we had to

spend another \$1,000 to have both rear springs replaced.

Mr. Baxter: That actually did make the report believe it or not.

Mr. Ward: Oh, did it?

Mr. Baxter: It=s on there. Yes. And that was just from rust.

Mr. Ward: Rust and wear.

Mr. Baxter: The springs broke right off the truck. So that=s definitely an issue here for safety. Alright, with that said, unless there=s any other questions, I=m going to make a motion, I am making a motion that we move this on to Council for its first reading. And do I need to move this to Finance?

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter, I believe it=s in the budget. So it does not need to go to Finance. Correct, Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: That=s correct.

Mr. Baxter: So then, I=ll just make a recommendation or motion, to move this on to Council for its first reading. I notice you have here that there=s an emergency clause on this for the financial needs of the city government. Do you want to explain that real quick?

Mr. Ward: Well, Friday afternoon I got a call, a few weeks ago they were expecting a price increase in steel on February 1. And now they moved it up. The current prices are good until February 18. So there=s more than likely, there=s going to be between a 5 and 7% increase. That will include the dump body, the tailgate salt spreader, the snow plow, and some of the other parts. So if it=s extended on, we may not have enough money in the budget to order it at that time.

Mr. Baxter: At present, we=re looking at \$91,746 you=re looking to expend out of 260.268.5632, Motor Vehicles Account. Correct?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So are you looking to have it moved on to Council and then passed next week with an emergency?

Mr. Ward: Yes. In order to get the order in. Then we have the problem with all the manufacturers have a different cut off dates for ordering and all that. And in order to get the truck some time this year, it really needs to be passed as an emergency.

Mr. Baxter: And do we have any questions from Council or committee about that? (No response). Hearing none, then I'll go ahead and...

Mr. Hills: I do have one question. Mr. Ward, when you stated that passing it as an emergency, you hope to get it some time this year. What is your anticipated? If this is passed next week and you place the order, you'll probably call them tomorrow assuming this goes forward for passage next week. What are we saying when we anticipate delivery some time this year? How long does it take to put this dump truck together?

Mr. Ward: We'd probably get delivery, I would say, in September. October at the very latest. If it's extended out for the full three readings, there's a possibility that International Truck may cut off the orders, just as other manufacturers do. And it's a possibility that we couldn't even get the truck this year.

Mr. Hills: This is tied in the state contract, right?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: And so when they bid on the state contract, they agree to make a certain number of them. And I have certainly heard of police cruisers getting shut off. And I'm not sure whether the others do or not. When I heard you say we may get it some time this year and we're asking about an emergency, I'm trying to put those two words together. And I'm seeing, I guess the difference between October or November.

Mr. Ward: Once the legislation is passed and we can order the, write the purchase order and order the truck, then it depends on when the salesman calls in to International Truck. It depends on where we are in the order. And a number of things can happen. Especially, like I said, with steel prices increasing and the other parts that go with it is one of the biggest factors.

Mr. Baxter: So if I would, I would be correct stating that it's not really concern about buying the truck and the bed, or excuse me, the truck and the frame, it's more of, the components are going to build the salt truck is at risk.

Mr. Ward: Yeah.

Mrs. Newman: Well, you want to assure your price is what it is.

Mr. Ward: Exactly.

Mr. Baxter: And availability I think is what the point is. They build this truck for us. And there's only so many built a year and you're concerned if we don't get them in in a timely manner, we could be left off that build.

Mr. Ward: And other communities are also putting in orders. And then you also have a back log at the truck body places trying to get everything put together. So it can take, it can take 3 to 4 months to get the cabin chassis in. Then it could take another 3 or 4 months to get all the components put together.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. And I think you've stated that clearly here with the statement of necessity saying to beat the cut off date for ordering the equipment before a price increase goes into effect and the cut off date for some of the equipment is at the end of February. So I think you hit both those points clearly. With that said, I'll pull my previous motion aside and re-state it then, as I move that we send this piece of legislation to Council for its first reading as an emergency. Do I have a second? Councilman Joseph with the second. All in favor? (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Hearing none, motion carries.

I'll now move on to Discussion item number 6 which is Authorization to purchase Aerial Lift Truck. And Larry, this is also your area as well. And if you would like to go ahead and explain what you're doing here with this piece of legislation. What your intent is.

Mr. Ward: Okay. If you would allow me, I have a two page statement that I would like to read that would maybe really explain everything. And then I could take any questions afterwards.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Could I ask you to make a copy of that afterwards and submit it to Council?

Mr. Ward: Of course.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Ward: Sure. The main purpose of the bucket truck is the maintenance and repair of the city street light and traffic light systems. We maintain 1,817 street lights, 146 disconnect boxes, and miles of underground wiring. A street light outage, depending on its nature, can affect from 1 to 50 lights and take from 30 minutes to several days to repair. The last few years, we've been averaging about 400 repairs per year. There are 23 signalized intersections within the city. When reports come in that there is a problem with the traffic light, the bucket truck is dispatched immediately. We are on call 24/7 to respond to any emergency. The current bucket truck is also used daily to mark the underground street light wires as required by state law. The truck is also used in the spring and fall to trim trees. It is also used to trim trees or cut them down after storms. It is also used to put up banners and American flags on street light poles. It is used to repair the parking lot lights at City Hall, Kennedy Park, Senior Citizens Center, and other locations throughout the city. The most important reason we need a new aerial truck is safety. The current truck is not insulated. When working around power lines, this poses a threat to the employees. The bucket on the current truck has a maximum capacity of 300 pounds. The combined weight of the personnel and the pole exceed the capacity on occasions. The size and weight of the lenses and the electronic components of the street lights has increased dramatically

since the purchase of the current truck. This increase in size and weight makes it necessary to run the controls for the lift with one hand. The controls were originally designed to use both hands to operate the lift. The increased size of the lens makes it impossible to put them inside the bucket. Instead, they must be balanced on the top of the rim of the bucket. Although not totally safe, the men have been putting up poles in parts in order to save money. There are 59 poles on State Route 256 and Livingston Avenue that we are unable to work on because of the height and weight of the poles and the limits of our current truck. Another reason we're requesting this purchase is to improve efficiency and productivity. When the current truck was purchased 10 years ago, there were only three different types of street lights. Only two lights are listed in the city's Standard Construction Drawings. The widening of Livingston Avenue and State Route 256 require a taller pole to facilitate the lighting of those streets. With the addition of the Streetscape street lights, we must now stock parts for 8 different types of street lights. The size of the current truck limits the number of parts we can store on it at any given time. This restriction causes personnel to return to the shop to pick up parts. This causes a waste of time and money, and wastes fuel and extra miles to the vehicle. I have here a few advantages of the new truck. It would be insulated to protect the workers up to 46,000 volts. The bucket will have an operator capacity of 350 pounds and will have a winch with a capacity of 800 pounds. The winch will enable the personnel to raise street light poles into position more safely. The aerial lift will give us an additional 15 feet of vertical height, and at least 10 feet in horizontal reach. Using a longer side reach will prevent damage to the truck when trimming trees. This has been a problem with the current truck. Tree limbs have fallen on the truck which has caused some damage. The bucket will be nearly twice the size of the current bucket. This will allow our personnel to put parts inside rather than carrying them 30 feet into the air sitting on the rim of the bucket. Additional storage compartments will allow personnel to carry more, if not all 8 types of parts with them. The personnel would be able to use the storage compartments on the curb side of the truck which makes it safer since they will not have to access parts from the travel lane. There will be an access to the lift and to the bed of the truck from the curb side instead of from the rear of the truck like the current truck we have. This also makes it a much safer operation. Especially when parking in the middle of intersections to work on traffic lights. I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Baxter: Questions from committee? (No response). From Council? Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I just have a comment. After listening to that, I don't see how the committee can recommend anything else other than getting this truck. Just my comment.

Mr. Baxter: Any other comments? Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ward, how frequently do we need to contract out to use someone else's truck to get these posts and lights that we can't access?

Mr. Ward: I looked it up. I think we average maybe 4 or 5 a year. But that's because, really the guys are taking chances and doing it now. When we bought this truck, we had an option at that

time, it was either this size truck that we have now, which is fairly small, or we would have had to went all the way up to the huge trucks like AEP uses. Which those would have been, at that time, was over \$100,000. And we did not need a truck that size at the time.

Mr. Joseph: Is the plan, do you continue using the old truck so you=d have it for smaller projects and the new truck, too?

Mr. Ward: We would like to. We did get a trade in estimate of the current truck of \$10,000. We paid, I think, around 55 or 56,000 for it 10 years ago. We have use for two trucks. Many times, the guys are out working on street lights and someone will call and say the traffic light is out. So we have to pull them off. Many times they=re out of the truck working down in a hole or around the street light and we can=t get a hold of them for a while. But when it comes to a stop sign being down or a traffic light being out, we try to get to it immediately.

Mr. Joseph: Is the old truck starting to have any kind of mechanical problems that=s going to get expensive?

Mr. Ward: No. It=s a Chevrolet. It=s really held up well. We=ve only averaged \$600 a year in repairs. So it=s one of those, it=s more valuable to us than the \$10,000. It really comes in handy.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Larry, you mentioned some incidences where you think the employees are working in unsafe conditions with the present truck. Can you give me a percentage?

Mr. Ward: I=d say guessing, around 20%.

Mr. Stake: Twenty percent of the time you feel that with the present truck they=re working in unsafe conditions in order to get the job done that needs to be done for the citizens here in Reynoldsburg?

Mr. Ward: Yeah.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Ward: It could be more. If you consider those _____ down at Taylor Road Southwest, you=ve got the glass globe. And then you also have the transformer which is huge. And it weighs about 70 or 80 pounds. And so trying to manhandle that on the side of the bucket, which is a little 2 inch lip, and then trying to control the lift also.

Mr. Stake: I think any time one of our employees has to work in unsafe conditions, to me that=s unacceptable.

Mrs. Newman: I agree.

Mr. Stake: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Any other questions of Council? (No response). Committee? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Larry, you said the controls for the lift truck has one hand operation, or it=s supposed to be one hand. And the other hand is supposed to be able to secure the load going up or something like that. Does that create a safety problem as far as maybe the other hand, one hand=s operating the lift and the other hand maybe inadvertently on the rim of the bucket lift or something like that?

Mr. Ward: My men went out and took some pictures and I can also get those to you. But these new lenses are in. The transformers are huge. And there=s just no room to put anything inside the current bucket which is 24 x 24. And they take their time, they try to be careful, but I would hate to see anything happen.

Mr. Baxter: Larry, the questions I=m going to ask you are based upon, it sounds like safety issues inside the bucket. Would it not make more sense to replace the bucket and give them the size bucket that they need to be able to store these globes instead of buying a whole new truck? As you said, this truck is fine. It serves in the city today.

Mr. Ward: It=s all in the hydraulics and the lift arm and all that together. And the thing of it is, currently when a street light pole gets run over, we did the other night down on Taylor Road Southwest, we take the pole out in the current truck and we have to use a rope and tie it onto the top of the pole, and then raise up in the lift. And the other guy=s on the ground trying to get the bolt holes over the anchor bolts. So we=re up in that bucket with a rope trying to pull this up. With the new truck, we would have a winch and a _____ which would handle 800 pounds and would make the operation much more safe.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. With that said, what will be the use for the old truck then?

Mr. Ward: Well, there=s times when it could be used for trimming some smaller trees like around City Hall and into parks. Occasionally with that, we could use even to replace bulbs in the traffic signals. And some times people put signs up a little bit too high for the Code Enforcement Officer, so some times we go out and remove some illegal signs.

Mr. Baxter: Well, this will be an additional truck. What do we do with it? Where are you going to store the old truck or the new truck? And aren=t we going to have maintenance costs that are

going to continue with this truck, and insurance? And aren't we doubling our cost here from a maintenance, and insurance, and liability, and all those other things?

Mr. Ward: Well since the old truck, \$600 a year was not that much. And the largest single cost was back in July. We replaced all six tires. It was \$789. That's been the largest expense in 10 years. So it's been a reliable truck. It just doesn't fit our needs. Total needs. But there's times other departments could use the truck. They ask us to replace bulbs around City Hall on the buildings and things like that. But I think it would receive enough usage that it would be worth keeping.

Mr. Baxter: Where would we store this truck? Is it going to stay outside? Do we have space for it some place?

Mr. Ward: No. The new truck, we're using every square inch of the street barn we can. I believe you saw that. We would keep it inside. Especially, it will be a diesel engine. So we will keep it inside.

Mr. Baxter: It didn't look like you had the room for another truck.

Mr. Ward: Well, we use that center aisle as best as we can. So usually it's full every night. But no, we would keep it inside. And that little green building outside that was the original salt barn, we had a little bit of storage in there for the old truck. It's smaller. No. We wouldn't leave it sitting outside.

Mr. Baxter: I think my last question here is going to be based upon, how long have we been servicing the city with this old truck in these hazardous conditions? And why today, would be the second part of that question, are we now looking to replace it? I was just wondering, when did it become hazardous?

Mr. Ward: I would say several years ago when the developer, cities, whoever, decided to start putting up different street lights other than what's in our specs. Nobody ever asked us. They just do it and then we have to take care of it afterwards. So we did the best we can with what we have. And the men brought it to my attention and really feel that, they're concerned about it. So I felt it's my duty to bring it on to Council.

Mr. Baxter: Well I don't think anybody can question your dedication to the city, the way you keep the streets clean with the plow trucks and the work that you do. I don't think anybody would question that. So I know you've done a great job with that. And if you'll see this as a safety issue, what I'm going to do then is move this to Council and let them make a decision on this. And so what I'm going to ask is that, at least from what I can see here, the aerial truck, what appeared to me was that we have one already. It services the city just as it is today. And you've told me that yourself. It works. Although, you feel that there are safety conditions that are now at 20% of the time, we're putting our citizens at risk. And like Councilman Stake, I

don't see that as something we want to do. Especially if we knowingly do that. So knowingly that we're putting our citizens to that risk, or I'm told that risk, I would have to agree with you. We need to resolve that matter in itself. So I will ask that we move this as an emergency to Council for passage then. Because you need this as an emergency. So I so move that. Do I have a second? Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted Aye). All opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

The next two items that we'll be discussing will be for the Police Department. So item number 7 is Discussion, Authorization to purchase three cruisers. Chief Suci, welcome.

Chief Suci: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Baxter: I hear you need some new police cars.

Chief Suci: Yes, we do.

Mr. Baxter: I think two of these are going to be new and one replacement. Correct?

Chief Suci: Three new cruisers. We're going to trade two in and the other one will be utilized as a School Resource Officer vehicle that would be driven every day during the school year so that we can continue to add one car to our fleet and utilize it. It already has 100,000 miles on it but we'll continue to utilize it in that capacity as a School Resource Officer cruiser.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Great. I understand we have the same situation here as we have with salt trucks. You have a bid you have to meet a certain time frame on and get the quote in to be make the ability to even get the cruisers. Correct?

Chief Suci: That's correct. As President Hills alluded to, there are times, they only make a certain amount of cruisers. The more timely we are in submitting our bid, we're more likely to be guaranteed to get those three cruisers that we want. There is a possibility, if we don't get it in in a timely fashion, we would not get under the bid and receive our cruisers.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. So you are asking for an emergency on this legislation. And this is a budgeted item again. Correct?

Chief Suci: That is correct, sir.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. One question I do have, and I didn't talk to you about this but I probably should have when we met last, we're going to be outfitting obviously, this cruiser. I'm assuming we're going to want to be able to add lap tops and things like that. I haven't seen anything coming down our _____. Do you already have equipment to go with this from that standpoint?

Chief Suci: That was budgeted in to the cruiser package. Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: It was budgeted into the package. So part of this cost also has the outfitting of the lap top and the software and licensing and those type of things.

Chief Suci: I believe the computer itself was in the computer section that Bobby Smathers submitted. But all the plug in=s, and the rack, and the mounts and everything were budgeted in the cruiser line.

Mr. Baxter: I believe that=s the case. This is the first time I=ve seen it actually put together this way. So it was kind of refreshing to see all in one package, everything you need to make the cruiser happen. And once this is received, it=s going to take about how long to have these in service?

Chief Suci: Quite normally, about 3 months once we receive them.

Mr. Baxter: Okay with that said, are there any questions of the committee or of Council? (No response). Any questions of Council? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just one question Chief if I could, and I do, I think this packet is put together very well and very orderly. The two trade in=s that are back on, I think are marked page 230 and 223. One of them is a 2000 Ford which is, 2001 Ford Crown Vic, which I believe the division police fleet on the age of vehicle you listed some. That one I can kind of see because we have four 2001 Crown Vic=s. The other trade in is the 2003 Crown Vic. And we don=t show any of those on this _____ fleet. Is that a typo? Is that another 2001 or 2002?

Chief Suci: It is an >03. And it has in excess of 100,000 miles on it and it was identified by Keith Kundtz as the one that is highly maintenance driven right now.

Mr. Hills: It=s not shown on your age and marked fleet.

Chief Suci: Lt. McKinley put that together, and possibly he just left that out due to the fact that that was one of the ones that was going to be traded out.

Mr. Hills: I just happened to notice that. I didn=t see one on our aged fleet that I thought you :

Chief Suci: I think it=s a typo for >02. I think those >02's should be >03's.

Mr. Hills: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: If we could clarify that for Monday, I think that will make us sure.

Chief Suci: That=s fine.

Mr. Baxter: Let=s get that clarified. I don=t see a problem with what I saw here. I was quite pleased with, it had all the information I needed to make a decision. So I=ll go ahead and ask if there are any other questions from Council. I do think that this is something that needs to happen right away. It is marked as an emergency. Again, for the immediate preservation of public peace, health or safety. Was that what you had marked down here? Yes.

Chief Suci: Yes, sir.

Mr. Baxter: So with that said, I will move that we send this legislation to Council with a recommendation from the Safety Chair for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Councilman Joseph has the second. All in favor? (All voted AYe@). Opposed? (No response). Hearing none, motion carries. Thank you Chief for that one.

I=ll move to the last piece that we have here to discuss. And this is an Authorization to purchase Intermobile Software to upgrade Police computer system. And Chief, I will make a note that it states that we=re just talking about Intermobile Software and I do understand that. But there=s much more to this. There=s much more involved. There=s hardware involved. There=s software involved. There=s licensing involved. And I think just to make my other Council members aware, one of the major benefits we=re going to get from this purchase is, we=ll have a site license rather than a _____ license. Which means today, not all of our lap tops have the ability to communicate in the Police Department. This change has been added. This upgrade is being discussed. _____ resolves that problem. We=ll have a site license then, that as we bring the systems on board, are able to use them, we=ll be able to access the software. So that=s a very large benefit here. The only thing I did have a question, and I didn=t bring this to your attention. I just happened to be reading this here this evening. I notice that you had 50 USB flash drives. So I=ll talk with Bobby about that off line. But I was a little concerned about having USB drives where police officers would bring them back and forth like floppies.

Chief Suci: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: That would concern me because that=s a lot of storage that can be down loaded and lost. It=s a security issue for me to have the flash drives going back and forth between our officers, police cars, and the Police Department. And I would like to find out what he is going to be doing to resolve that security issue. That=s the only issue I have at this point.

Chief Suci: I=m sure he can answer that.

Mr. Baxter: And I would say that=s a minor issue. I think that=s something we can work out prior to Monday=s meeting.

Chief Suci: I=m sure Bobby can answer that. I know one of the discussions we had with regard

to the flash drives was the fact that the LEADS, the program with which we have to run our social numbers, and plates, and stuff, they're moving towards requiring us to go with what they call a dual authentication. And that might have something to do with what Bobby was submitting for with regard to the flash drives. They actually have to enter something twice and authenticate themselves twice getting into the system. And possibly that is...

Mr. Baxter: That may be possibly what he was talking about. Because I saw that in here as well. And it's a block protector software and that would give us that protection. I just don't know if it extends out to the USB drive. So I'll follow up with that and bring that to Monday's meeting to make sure everybody's aware and make sure it's in their packet so they understand what the answer to that is, and I'll work with Bobby to get that done. Other than that, I didn't see any other issues with this. Any questions from the committee? (No response). Any questions from Council? Councilman Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. Chief, the present in car radios, how long have they been in there?

Chief Suci: The in car radios?

Mr. Stearns: I mean computers. I'm sorry.

Chief Suci: The MDT's were put into service, we started implementing that system back in March.

Mr. Stearns: March?

Chief Suci: March of '05.

Mr. Stearns: This is a complete replacement for those? Is that correct?

Chief Suci: This is a software replacement. What we're trying to do is, we're trying to eliminate a vendor. The mobile packet cluster is a separate vendor that we're having to deal with to be able to access our LEADS system. EmergiTech, who we bought our reporting system through, has now come out with their own LEADS compliant system. We've had some issues with regard to, of course, the compatibility with the two different vendors being able, the computers themselves maybe giving us, it shows, some times it shows our officers on what we call >ghost runs= because of the compatibility issues. It causes the officer some times to log off at poor times. And what we're hoping is, with the implementation of eliminating this vendor and the compatibility issues between the two different vendors, that all those issues will go away. This program is already LEADS compliant. It's not something that was available when we went and purchased the EmergiTech system at the beginning, so we had to go with this other system. But now, if we can put this in place, it will all be through EmergiTech. And like what Chairman Baxter referred to, one big plus out of this is, I have a number of mobile data terminals

out there in cars that I can't even utilize because we're limited to a number of licenses right now. And for each license you have to pay more money. Well, with this program, with this system, I can put as many MDT's out there as I want. It's a site license. So as we all MDT's, as we add more hardware, it's still a site license. I can utilize all of my capabilities rather than have to go back and get another license, and another license each time we add a piece of equipment.

Mr. Stearns: So this equipment was not available when you purchased it originally?

Chief Suci: That is correct, sir.

Mr. Baxter: Moreover, I think we're talking about _____ case here. That's _____ from the single vendor. Any time you can bring yourself to a single vendor, your issues of support and compatibility, and the risk of not having compatibility is reduced.

Chief Suci: Yeah. When we originally applied for the MDT system, this software's new. It was not available when we went to EmergiTech and went to the MDT system.

Mr. Stearns: So in other words, everything is going to be compatible at this time. We won't have to worry about this happening in another 8 or 10 months of having to do something else. I mean, we're getting everything now that we should have to make this...

Chief Suci: We're just replacing what we have and going with one vendor rather than using two. Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Well I think it's fair to bring to your attention, Councilman Stearns, to the issues of support. And Bobby has been spending numerous hours trying to support the MDT's. And thereby, not being able to spend as much time as he should be taking care of other concerns that the city has. So by moving this direction, I believe we will be giving back some time to Bobby to be able to manage other issues that the city needs to be managing and that we're not getting to at the moment. So just from that standpoint, we're going to add productivity to our Computer Department.

Chief Suci: We hope.

Mr. Baxter: I'll hold you to that.

Chief Suci: That's the plan.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I would just also like to point out that, Chief I believe we are receiving a credit from EmergiTech for a previous purchase on the old stuff.

Chief Suci: That is correct.

Mr. Stake: So we're not completely losing the cost of the old software. We're getting a partial credit for that.

Chief Suci: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just to clarify in my mind, you brought it up and I'm trying to determine, attached to this is a memo to Bobby Smathers and Karen Branscom dated January 31, 2006. Now, whereas I think you had said earlier that it is hard for _____. Well, the legislative request is software, but yet, and there's a lot of numbers in here that just never totaled any way.

Chief Suci: Right.

Mr. Hills: And I'm not sure which columns to add to which. But in that memo, page 2 of the three page memo, does say that it's 5 replacement computers and 5 _____ books. Now, is that in this software package?

Chief Suci: No, sir. This is just for the software.

Mr. Hills: This is a _____ memo saying, here's the other thing we're going to be asking for shortly. They're not part of this.

Chief Suci: Which are budgeted in the computer section, the computer hardware section for the department.

Mr. Hills: Okay. So that then, this is...

Chief Suci: This was a cut and paste that he was trying to _____.

Mr. Hills: Okay. But thank you. Because I was trying to figure out how we were going to 47,000 when we're replacing 10 computers.

Chief Suci: No. This isn't replacing any.

Mr. Hills: This is then, software?

Chief Suci: Software only. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hills: The hardware would only be to operate the software. Not new computers or replacement computers.

Chief Suci: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: I think it's fair to say, I don't think we could get 10 lap tops at 47,000.

Chief Suci: I wish I could.

Mr. Baxter: I might even be willing to get it that cheap.

Mr. Hills: Well, I think you were talking about replacing 10 any way. We should wonder what we got the first time we bought the ten. But I don't think that's a subject matter for tonight.

Mr. Baxter: We'll be here all night on that one. I'll leave that alone. Okay. Any other questions? Councilman Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Mr. Baxter, thank you. It says in here, the grand total for the first year investment is 47,000. Is there going to be additional costs after the first year?

Chief Suci: I'm sure there will be a maintenance contract. Yes.

Mrs. Shirey: And do you know what that is?

Chief Suci: No. I do not.

Mr. Baxter: We spoke about that Chief. And my understanding was that the maintenance contract was not going to go up and it would continue as it exists today.

Chief Suci: That's something I'd have to check with Bobby on. I'm sure he's looked into that. But I'm not sure what the maintenance contract would be through EmergiTech. But again, we'd be back to the one vendor issue. Which I'm sure would be cheaper than having maintenance contracts with two different vendors.

Mr. Baxter: My understanding was, we have the maintenance contract with the software in this purchase. And so therefore, for the next year it wasn't going to be an issue. So therefore, it's a wash.

Chief Suci: Right. We would budget for that in >07.

Mrs. Newman: We have a maintenance contract any way, don't we?

Chief Suci: That's correct.

Mrs. Newman: So that's not going to (Tape Change).

Chief Suci: And the quicker we can get out under that month to month, the more money we're going to save and we can move forward with this project.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. I actually think that there's a better reason for moving forward, and I will recommend that we use that. It's for the immediate safety for our officers as they aren't able to communicate with each other through the software to date. And the holes that they have with this software, and the constant drops that they have, in addition to the games they have to play on the lap tops. I mean games. They have to log in under fictitious users names just to get around the software. So they're playing with the software just to communicate with each other in the vehicles. And I don't think we want our officers having to do that. We want them to be able to communicate immediately so that they have the ability to service our community in a safe manner. And so I would say, that's for the immediate safety of our officers. This software would give them that ability.

Chief Suci: I would agree with that.

Mr. Baxter: So it's not just for financial needs, but also for a safety need. So I'm going to recommend that we move this to Council as an emergency. Do I have a second on this? Councilman Stake. All in favor? (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. And I thank you Chief for your time tonight.

With that, I will go ahead and close the Safety Committee meeting at 8:42.

Safety Committee
January 6, 2006
- - Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
January 6, 2006

Members of Service Committee present: Doug Joseph, Preston Stearns, Donna Shirey.
Councilman Mel Clemens was absent.
Other members of Council present: Antoinette Newman, Ron Stake, Brett Baxter, Council
President William L. Hills.

Mr. Joseph: I=d like to call the Service Committee to order at 8:43.

The next item on the agenda would be approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or corrections? (No response). I=ve got one correction. We=re going to remove item number 7 (Discussion: Waive additional tapping fees for unassessed property for CVS Private Sanitary Sewer Improvement (Skilken D.S., LLC)). So, all in favor? (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

The next item on the agenda, 3a is the approval of the minutes of December 19, 2005 Service Committee meeting. Any changes or corrections? (No response). Seeing none, they stand approved.

3b, Approval of minutes of January 3, 2006 Service Committee meeting. Any changes or corrections? (No response). Seeing none, they stand approved.

Next item, Discussion, Special Exception Use Permit at 7589 E. Main Street; proposed use, sit-down restaurant; applicant, Mr. Scott Beaver. Is Mr. Beaver here? Do you want to come up front? Proceed.

Mr. Beaver: Okay. I didn=t know I was going to speak tonight. John just said, you might just want to be there to see what happens.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Do you want to tell us a little bit about this item?

Mr. Beaver: Sure. This is the site at the corner of Main and Graham that is currently a vacant site. We=re going to be putting a, just under 4,000 square foot retail use there. We=re talking to several proposed tenants at this time. I do not own the piece of property. I have it under contract subject to certain conditions being met. And we=re about to the end of those conditions. This being one of them. And so we basically went in for two Special Use Permits allowing, because of the zoning that=s there now, allowing for a sit down restaurant. And then what was approved was, it allows for a restaurant but it had certain, well actually, that was on the, I take that back,

that was on the drive-thru where they put the limitations. They didn't want any type of a fast food. I won't name, people like McDonald's, I won't say those names. But they didn't want that type of a use there. They didn't mind a strictly pick-up window for a restaurant use. I'm kind of combining these two. But we could have a full drive-thru if it was a bank use. And again, I think that goes to hours of operation, noise levels, that type of thing. So I agreed to those types of items. And then if these two get approved, then we'll continue our marketing efforts with some of the different companies we're talking to. There is nobody specific in place at this time.

Mr. Joseph: On the proposed sit down portion of this, approximately how many, what's the capacity for the restaurant, are you looking at?

Mr. Beaver: Well like I said, it's just under 4,000 square feet. So I don't know what the total number of occupancy. If it's a buffet type of a restaurant, you may get a larger number of people than if it were a steak house. I can't come up with a good example. So throwing out an occupancy number would be difficult at this time. But again, it would not be something where it would be a fast food type of use where you would have a lot of turnover of in and out type for that.

Mr. Joseph: That intersection is a very busy intersection. Have you given much thought to how additional vehicles coming and going from that particular location's going to impact that? Are you looking at trying to get across traffic? Or are you okay with the idea of right hand turns only or anything like that? Is that anything that came up during the discussion?

Mr. Beaver: Yeah. What we did actually, and that was discussed at the meeting, there's a full curb cut on Main Street. And then there's also a full curb cut on Graham. And there'll be, what was requested, and the City Engineer's supposed to look into hours, but what was requested was that there be a sign placed there that limits to right hand turn only onto Graham during certain hours. And I didn't know what hours those were and members of the committee also said they kind of deferred it for the engineer to come up with proposed hours. Whether it will be from 8 to 9:30 and 4:30 to 6 or whatever. But whatever hours makes sense for them.

Mr. Joseph: Has there been any determination on how many different parking slots there would be for the facility?

Mr. Beaver: Yes. And again, I didn't bring any of that with me. But it seems that there are, it was 30 some, I'm sorry, there was about 26, 27 parking spots. It more than met the requirements for retail. If the whole thing went to restaurant, we did get a, and it was approved, a variance for a few parking spaces that we would be shy. Because you have a relatively high parking ratio requirement here for restaurant uses. Again, that would be if the whole thing went as a restaurant. If it went partial restaurant, partial retail, I'd still meet under the existing code.

Mr. Joseph: Any questions of Mr. Beaver by the members of the committee? Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: Thank you. In regards to the traffic with the congestion on Graham Road due to the school being on Graham Road, you said you were going to have certain hours when people can turn right. Are you going to be doing a study to find out what those hours are going to be for them to turn right?

Mr. Beaver: No. That was assigned to the City Engineer to determine what hours would be best. Again, that comes out of whichever committee it was that I was at. This is my third meeting. I think that was the Design Review. I'm sorry. It was the Design Review Committee. And what they did is, they asked the City Engineer to make recommendations as to what hours those should be.

Mrs. Shirey: Okay. There's also an alley right behind that property that you're referring to as far as where you're going to be putting those buildings possibly. Do you think that that's also going to cause a problem as far as people cutting down that alley where there's also a house there?

Mr. Beaver: Actually, the property that this goes on, there's two lots between this and the alley. And there's no, I mean, it's vacant land. So that was brought up. There was a, I'm sorry, I can't remember his name, but the gentleman that owns the house right at the alley was there. And we, before the meeting, had a chance to talk after the meeting, had a chance to talk. And I know what his concerns are. But I think any type of development is going to generate whatever traffic it generates. I don't know that that alley's used. He's concerned because of the alley. And there's a bunch of things that really don't have to do with development per se. I guess his house got hit, or something got hit. And while I can sympathize with that, I'm not sure that there's anything that I can really do to address that.

Mr. Joseph: Any other questions of committee or Council? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I'd just like to know, are we ever going to get a plot, grade, and utility plan for this property? And when will that be so that we actually know what we're looking at here?

Mr. Joseph: I've not seen anything on that. Mr. Clemens did not mention that to me whenever we discussed this. I do not have any information on that.

Mr. Beaver: I assume you're talking about all the things that I turned into the Design Review Committee?

Mr. Joseph: I have not...

Mrs. Newman: And we don't have that to look at.

Mr. Joseph: I've never seen any of that material.

Mr. Hills: If I could help, I do believe, I remember seeing a memo, an attachment from Mr. Brandt that was, I don't know that it was to scale, but it was an outline of the property. How the buildings were going to lay out on that property. And that was probably...

Mrs. Newman: It was just a sketch of, an elevation sketch. Do you mean this?

Mr. Hills: Yes.

Mrs. Newman: Well that doesn't tell you anything.

Mr. Beaver: Of course, for Design Review, I turned in, I mean, it was complete lighting plan. It was a complete plan of the way everything lays out. Where signage is, light poles, all that type of stuff.

Mrs. Newman: Yeah. I think that's something we should see really.

Mr. Joseph: Any other questions? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Joseph. I believe, you've gone, as you said, you've been attending meetings. You've gone through the process, and you went before the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals and discussed three variances with them. Correct?

Mr. Beaver: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: And I believe they granted you the three variances.

Mr. Beaver: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: And I don't recall there being any ANay@ votes. So they were unanimous. I just wanted to point that out for Council. And I know Mr. Brandt's been working with you on this.

Mr. Beaver: Very much so.

Mr. Stake: I didn't know if he had anything else he'd like to add to this. That might help enlighten us a little more.

Mr. Brandt: The fact that you don't have the drawing, we can rectify that. I would have thought perhaps you should have had it. The Zoning Board, as Mr. Beaver already outlined, discussed conditions as far as right turn. We've sent a memo to Mr. Parkinson and asked him to give us some comment at the appropriate time on that. This corner as you're all aware, was involved in the widening of the intersection down there. And hence, it is somewhat of a limited use. My understanding, we're not involved in it. But some relocation of a storm water line on the property that either the city or the property owner's involved in. So it's been a challenge, I

guess you might say, to work with. But Mr. Beaver, I don't know if he brought his sample board with him tonight of the exterior materials. We did suggest that.

Mr. Beaver: You told me, I've got to work early unlike you. You told me that a little late in the day.

Mr. Brandt: You always bring your goods you've got to sell my friend. But he's always been very accommodating and good to work with on other properties he's had within the city. And we have no reason to believe that he won't fulfill his obligations in this case. I think the issue with the back end of the property is somewhat misunderstood in that he's not buying the property that abuts up to the alley. Hence, he will have no access to the alley. And he willingly agreed to the Zoning Board as far as the right turn out within restricted times on Graham Road to comply with those requests. And possibly one of the main reasons he's here as far as the Special Exception goes, it will enable him to provide the opportunity to market the property in a more timely fashion than if he were to try to secure a tenant, than say he has to go back through the process if you will, which commercial tenants in this day and age always have a tendency to be somewhat reluctant or speculative about. Particularly in that a lot of them have tight time lines.

Mr. Joseph: Additional questions for Mr. Beaver? (No response). The Clerk's note is that if we want to proceed with legislation dealing with this Special Exception Use Permit, that that would need to be done by the 13th which is next Monday. Otherwise, it will stand approved. Does anyone on the committee have any feelings on doing that on Council? (No response). Okay. We've got until the 13th if any member of Council decides they would like to move in that direction.

Number 5, again along the same lines. Do you have anything additional to add, Mr. Beaver?

Mr. Beaver: No. I kind of combined the two.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Again, any questions for Mr. Beaver on the second component? (No response). Again, Council has the option of offering legislation by the 13th if additional discussion is necessary.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Joseph, if I could suggest, we may want to ask that whatever was presented of Design Review, if they could get that delivered to Mrs. Frazier so Council would have an opportunity to take a look at it and maybe answer some of those questions that were raised.

Mr. Joseph: If you could do that for us, Nancy, I'd appreciate that. Coordinate that with the other entities.

Mrs. Frazier: Sure.

Mr. Hills: I think Mrs. Reichard heard that and I think she'll get it _____ in the morning I would hope.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Thank you. Next item is, Discussion, Authorization for design and advertisement for bids for installation of water main at a location starting from the existing water main at Slate Ridge Elementary and continuing south to the existing water main which ends at the intersection of Taylor Road and Taylor Road SW; and appropriation of funds. Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: That's what it is. This is a request for the design of this. This is on Taylor Road from the school, Slate Ridge School to where Taylor Road turns west. This will give us a, this is available for us to do now since the Slate Ridge School's been put in. And they extended the water line from Slate Ridge up to Taylor Road. So this will tie that loop together. It will eliminate two dead ends and it will make sure that the school has water available from two directions.

Mr. Joseph: Currently, you said there's two dead ends. One extends along the south section toward the Wal Mart?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah.

Mr. Joseph: And then where's the other one going?

Mr. Kipp: One end's at Taylor Road, where Taylor Road turns. The other is at the edge of the, where the school road came out. It's right there. You'll see a fire hydrant there. It would be connecting those two points.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. And it says here that it will improve water quality. Specifically, what's that mean?

Mr. Kipp: That means, that one of the things we test, have to run now are THM's and HA5's, which has to do with chlorine setting in the water. And so this will give us, which it tends to build up on dead ends. And so when you loop the water, obviously you have water circulating which eliminates those dead ends. So that will definitely, and any time you can eliminate a dead end, you get the fresher water flowing through there all the time, will improve water quality.

Mr. Joseph: Is this something that's frequently done throughout the city as we have been doing...

Mr. Kipp: I eliminate dead ends when we find them. We divided the, this is part of a CIP project that's down the road that eventually we'd hoped to tie the line in from Taylor, all the way along Taylor to Palmer. But that hasn't provided itself. That was the, that's the ultimate loop that we want to provide. This will work between time.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Typically, when loops are closed, is it usually done through the Water Fund?

Mr. Kipp: When the city does them. Yeah. We've done them on occasion. When it=s, generally when developments are put in, we make a developer make the loops. In this case, it didn=t work where we could do that. And it=s only available because we had the school run the water line all the way out to Taylor Road.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Questions by the committee? (No response). Council? (No response). Okay. Then I will make a motion that we refer this on to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Stearns. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

The next item on our agenda, Discussion, Authorization to purchase a pickup truck for the Water Department. Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: This is a request to purchase a two wheel drive, extended cab, pickup truck. My proposal is to, we have a 1993 truck that is still green. If you remember that far back when we had green trucks. It=s green and yellow because it=s been used to paint fire hydrants. And it=s pretty much shot at this point due to rust and just use. Before we used it to paint fire hydrants out and run some service, it was our main work truck. So it=s had extensive use. My proposal is to take my truck and switch it to the fire hydrant painters truck and then I would get a new truck. My current truck is 10 years old. It has approximately 32,000 miles on it.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. There=s been a number of, a lot of discussion items on vehicles needing emergency clauses. And you listed an emergency clause here and we previously talked about the time table for some of the other vehicles that the Safety Committee dealt with. It looked like we are looking at late February, early March for placing orders. Am I correct in what we talked about as far as April, is really the time table we=re looking at for making an order for this?

Mr. Kipp: It can have several readings and then an emergency would be fine.

Mr. Joseph: Okay. Because that way if there is any citizen comment, I=d like to definitely provide for that. Any questions by committee or Council for Mr. Kipp? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Joseph. Mark, was this in the budget?

Mr. Kipp: Yes, it was.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Joseph: Additional questions? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: How many trucks Mark, do we have presently like this in your department?

Mr. Kipp: We have one truck that=s not even, it=s no longer used. And then this truck.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. So we only have two trucks and one that=s not being used. That=s the one we=re talking about. The green one? Green and yellow?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah.

Mr. Baxter: And then another truck, correct?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. They=re both green trucks. The other one=s to the point it can=t be used any longer.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And you were going to trade this in? Or junk it?

Mr. Kipp: I=m not sure what I=m going to do with it. If they=ll take it, yeah, I=ll trade it in if they=ll take it. If they won=t, I don=t know what, either, we used to sell them at auction is what we used to do on these trucks. We haven=t had an auction for a while on the vehicles. So if they=ll take it yes, I=ll let them have it.

Mr. Baxter: Your intent is not to keep the old truck is what I=m trying to get at, correct?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. No, I don=t want, if I was going to keep it, I wouldn=t be here.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Additional questions? (No response). Okay. Then I=ll make a motion that we refer this to Council for a first reading with emergency language so we can get a couple of readings in. Is there a second? Mr. Stearns seconds. All in favor, say aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

Mr. Kipp: Thank you.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you very much.

With that, I=ll...

Mr. Stake: Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Yes.

Mr. Stake: I believe that on item number 6, that needed to be referred to the Finance Committee. Is that correct, Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: It needs to go to Finance, Mr. Stake. But as long as it gets to you before they pass

it, he just sent it for first reading.

Mr. Stake: Oh, okay. Okay. I didn=t know if we needed to do that tonight or not.

Mrs. Frazier: You don=t need to do it.

Mr. Joseph: Thank you very much for the clarification.

With that, I=ll close the Service Committee at 9:03.

Service Committee
February 6, 2006
-- -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 6, 2006

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman.
Councilman Mel Clemens was absent.
Other members of Council present: Donna Shirey, Preston Stearns, Doug Joseph, Council
President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: And I will call to order, the Finance Committee at 9:04.

Item number 2 is approval of the agenda. Does anybody have any changes to the agenda?
(No response). I have several. I would like to make as 3a, oh I=m sorry, item number 10, I=d
like to add the legislation, to dispose of the vehicles and create a fund from the Police
Department. Item number 11, the waiving of the tapping fees. And item number 12, the Then
and Now for AEP street light invoice. I don=t believe I need a second on that. All in favor, state
aye. (All voted AAYe@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held January
17, 2006. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they=ll
stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is the Police and Parks and Recreation Impact Fee Study. This was added
to the agenda for discussion purposes on January 17, 2006. And its been held for three weeks.
And I believe we do have Kim Keefer from EMH&T here. And if she can come on up, I believe
she=s the person with all the information for us. We did receive some revised items. A couple
of things I=d like to point out, going back in history, my history any ways here on Council, and I
believe its probably about 3 years ago, 4 years ago now, we had an Ad Hoc Residential Zoning
Committee which I chaired. Mr. Beougher was on there. And also our Planning Administrator
at that time. And one of the things that came out of that was to look at impact fees and how they
would affect the city and new development. From there, Mr. Gilbert, Councilman Gilbert, when
he was here, he had suggested that, and brought this forward to Council, this legislation forward
to Council, to do the impact fee study. So I just want to give us a little historical background on
that. So, Mrs. Keefer, go ahead.

Mrs. Keefer: Thank you. What I'd like to do this evening, is run through about a 10 minute overview in Reynoldsburg specific, presentation with regards to the impact fees. A lot of this information was contained in an envelope that was delivered to the city last Thursday. So it should be in your packets. And then at the end of that presentation, open it up for questions. Because hopefully, we'll hit most of your questions as part of this brief presentation. Typically speaking, when a city provides a service to the community, it incurs one of two types of expenses. They're ongoing expenses like salaries, and gasoline, and maintenance that come up year, after year, after year. And there's long term or one time expenses. Like when you put a piece of pipe in the ground, or you build a building, or you buy land for a park. Now ongoing expenses, just like their name applies, means that a house or a business is going to continually need to use that service. And therefore, there's going to be a continual source of revenue to fund that. Typically, when you're talking about a utility like water and sewer, it's paid for by the user fees. If it's something like paying for a salary, it comes out of the General Fund or other sources of revenue. Their impact on the community is ongoing. Long term or one time expenses however, typically hit once. They impact structures, or pipes, or land only once. You only purchase it once. You don't go back and purchase the land a second time. Those sources of revenues can be collected one time from a new home or business. So that is why we are looking at impact fees today for certain things that the city should be providing, or would like to provide to its citizens. So let's talk a little bit about the new homes and businesses since there were some questions last time with regards to how we came up with those numbers. First of all, you should note that the area that we used in our study matched the Columbus Water and Sewer Service Agreement. Since typically if a business wants to build, or a developer wants to build a home in Reynoldsburg, they really like having water and sewer service. So we matched that area. That's not to say that you couldn't expand that area. But if you go that route, then you need to consider water and sewer in addition to any other impact fees. Additionally, we use the same densities for homes as is currently available in Reynoldsburg. Right now there's about 2.3 dwelling units for every acre in Reynoldsburg, plus or minus. So we applied that to the area that's not developed yet to determine the total number of units that would occur within that Water and Sewer Service Agreement area. We also assumed, that all the way along Main Street, it would be commercial. We would like to attract commercial to Reynoldsburg. There is a real benefit to having those type of things in the city. So on both sides of Main Street, we carry a commercial corridor. Finally, we do fill in the vacant parcels that exist today within Reynoldsburg, except for those that have already been deeded over, for example, for environmental reasons like the Trotter property. The data we use to determine how long it would take to fill up the study area was threefold. One, we looked at the Census Bureau. And the census thinks that Reynoldsburg is growing at about 1.8% per year. That is from 1990 to 2000. The census doesn't reflect anything past 2000. And we had a very good decade from 1990 to 2000. 1.8% per year is 221 residential units. The Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission predicts a growth rate of 2.22% per year. Again, that goes forward through 2005. That's 172 residential units per year. We were advised however, that neither of those are the case right now. That we had significantly less building units, residential building units, in the last 3 years. And so the third item that we've included in the new packet of information is predicting 100 units. So a significantly slower rate of growth. Reflecting that slow down that we've had in the last 4

years, growth could pick up. In which case, 100 units is very conservative. Looking at those growth rates of either 172 residential units or 100 units, you are looking at building out the water and sewer service area anywhere from 31 to 52 years from now. Bear that in mind. We'll need that number as we look at what kind of annual revenue we might generate by imposing impact fees. The calculation itself, when we're trying to determine how much to charge a new home or business, is basically two parts. There's the cost of the improvement itself, and the number of houses or business units that share that new improvement. Now the cost of the improvement is key. Because it can only be things that are going to last for a long time. We don't want to use annual costs because this is not an annual revenue generator. These should be the costs that are incurred by the city. Typically things that last more than 5 years. You should take into account, any help for any kinds of grants you may have. It should be the net cost to you, the city. And it should be inclusive of both hard and soft costs. So if you put a park out there but you need to design it, you can recoup the cost for the design as well as the land and the fields, and everything else that goes into the park. You need to look at the number of houses or businesses that share that improvement. That's the bottom of the fraction. Typically, we express this as a level of service. Expressions for police in terms of level of services are the number of officers you need per house. The number of officers you need per commercial square foot. The calls for service for each home in the community. With parks it's a little different. How many acres of park do you need for each home? How many feet of trail do you need for each home? Unlike the police, parks are only placed against the residential units within the community. Police also serve the interest of the commercial properties as well. Impact fees should be set using your current levels of service. So whatever you have right now for police, that's what we applied to the expanding area. Now you may not agree with that level of service. You may think it's too high or too low. And if you change that, you need to take into account, that portion that increases for the existing residents, need to come from a different fund. In other words, you can't place the impact of raising the level of service solely on new development. Because your existing residents will also get that benefit. Alright, so let's look at some Reynoldsburg specific examples quickly. We can only look at, and we're going to look at police first. We can only look at items that will last longer than 5 years. Well, when you look at the Police Department, there's not too many of those things that police use. Police are police. And their cruisers, which don't typically last 5 years. So the things that a Police Department would need that lasts a long period of time would be the building, wherever it is. Back there. And potentially a new radio system. The reason we included the new radio system within the impact fee report is, the former Chief and I started talking about perhaps purchasing one of those. Could any part of that be covered by the impact fee? That is why it's in the report. Now the building originally cost 7 million dollars, and it was built to house 105 personnel. When it was built, 57% of that space was used by your existing police officers and their support personnel. So we were able to determine how much was left of that 7 million that would be placed on the new personnel to serve the new area. On the radio system, it's not in place currently. But we do have dollar amounts for each officer that would require the radio system. They would not only need the radio that they had, the radio for the car, you would need a radio station, there are towers that you would need. And basically, it comes down to a little bit more than \$46,000 per sworn officer. The portion of that radio system that would serve existing customers would have to come from something other than the impact fees.

So if you chose to do an impact fee that would include the cost of the radio system, you are buying into buying a radio system for the whole community and you would need to find a way to pay for the part that=s for existing residents and businesses in Reynoldsburg. We needed to establish a level of service for your Police Department. And so we looked at calls for service for 2000, 2003, and 2004. Those were the readily available information. And it was pretty consistent. There are 1,000 calls per sworn officer on staff in each of those years. We took that information and we broke it down between residential and commercial so we know how many of those calls went to a business as much as possible, and how many went to a residence. Now the police don=t track those calls quite that way. So we had to make some assumptions based on the number of square foot of commercial space we had and the number of homes. But even when we did that, we came within 5% of factors that reflected 2000, 2003, and 2004. So we think the factors are pretty close to realistic. We also use those numbers, and we determine that moving forward as you build out that area, you are going to need at least 33.11 officers. You=re not going to have .11 officers, but you know what I=m saying. It=s the math thing. So there=s about 33 plus officers that are going to be needed to fill up, to cover the additional area that=s going to be served. And you will need about 9 additional civilian personnel to support those 33 officers. If you add that support personnel and those officers to that building over the next 31 to 52 years, that building will be full. It will have reached its capacity. And that=s reflected in the report. When you look at the number of officers that are dedicated to the residents, the residential portion of that new service area, and you divide through by that number of single family homes, you have how much each of the homes would pay for that portion of the building. And this is where the math starts getting a little tricky if you don=t follow. But the long and short of it is, for \$110, each new home out there puts \$110 in, which goes to pay for that part of that building for the new officer. And those officers would be the officers attributed to residential customers. Similarly, if you took all that commercial space that we=re planning, or projecting, along Main Street, and divided it through by the number of officers to serve those commercial properties, you would find that for every 1,000 square feet of commercial property, and that tends to be the way the equation is expressed, you need about \$366 per thousand square feet. So if you were going to build commercial property, for every 1,000 square feet, a little under \$400. Same type of math was done with the radio system. We know that for each new officer, we need to come up with about \$46,000. And divide that through by the number of homes that are going to be built out there, and it=s about \$60 per home to pay for the portion of the radio system for the new residents. Similarly for the commercial area, it=s just under \$200 per thousand square feet. At those levels annually, over the next 31 to 52 years, you will see somewhere in the neighborhood of 52 to \$91,000 in impact fees coming in for the building portion. And you can see somewhere between 29 and \$49,000 to pay for the radio. So that=s the police side. Now when you look at parks, we can only look at residentials. We don=t care about commercial any more. Because businesses really don=t use the parks. So we attribute that solely to the residences. We had to calculate the existing levels of service. We know how many acres of parks and how many lineal feet of trails Reynoldsburg has now. We also know how large that Senior Center is and we divide it through by the total number of dwelling units within Reynoldsburg. And we found out that for each and every home in Reynoldsburg, it=s so many acres per home, so many feet of trail, so many square feet of Senior Center. We take that same factor and we apply it to building

a new park. Now typically, we'd like a Park Master Plan so someone else estimates the cost of the parks for us. But we didn't have that. So what we did was, we looked at other parks that were recently built within the Central Ohio area and used that to come up with an estimate for how much it costs to build a park. We also included land. We included structures. We looked at the development costs. We looked at trying to get grants. Typically speaking, we're looking at about 25% depending on the type of park. And we also assumed that you would be successful and very aggressive in getting those grants to keep that impact fee down. The total cost per equivalent dwelling unit for each, for example, single family home, would be somewhere between 1,950 and \$2,160 to pay for the parks. And you might think yourself, wow, that's a lot more than the Police Department's getting. But parks inherently have more items that last longer than 5 years. Parks have land. Parks have structures. Parks have equipment and fields. Those all tend to last more than 5 years and can be included in the equation for impact fees. So that's why you can recoup more of that cost on an impact fee for parks. So the conclusion of the report was, the impact fees calculated for residential and for the building only, are lower than what they're paying in Pickerington and Delaware. Now without getting a copy of their report, finding out what they put into their equation, we don't know why that is. They're slightly lower. The police impact fee calculated for commercial for the building only is consistent with Pickerington and Delaware. So we're right, we're pretty close to your surrounding, to other people who have this type of impact fee when it comes to the charge to commercial. And we're a little low when it comes to the residential part of that cost. Similarly, the cost calculated for Parks and Recreation is just slightly higher than that for Pickerington and Delaware, the other ones that have a park impact fee. And that could be a case of Pickerington and Delaware having more succinct numbers for the development of parks. Because they had bigger studies behind them to come up with that cost. It's a lot of numbers. And that's a lot of equations. But I'm hoping that cleared up some of the confusion with the report. Now in your packet, you received a memorandum that showed what changed. You also received a red lined document so you could see what really changed in the report so you didn't have to take two reports and look at them. And then you've got a clean version. The January, 2006 version of the report itself. So, questions?

Mr. Stake: Mrs. Keefer, thank you very much. You took some of the questions I think, that we had at the previous committee meeting and incorporated that into your presentation tonight. We appreciate that. Are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Well, not so much questions, but maybe, I think you're right. There was some clarification here. And it seems as if, what's missing here, at least from a police standpoint, is the knowledge of a 5 year requirement that it must last for 5 years. And that's why we make so much, are able to generate so much more from the Parks and Recreation side as we do from the police side. Maybe what we can do is ask our Chief to look at this and determine, maybe better for us. Because there are things out there that we do have. You mentioned radios. But we have radio towers and software that, as you saw tonight, we passed. And I don't know about you, but I'd like to accrue the last 5 years but I don't think we can actually stretch that one. But you see the point I'm making is, maybe what the issue here is, is why we're not seeing the numbers we

anticipated as maybe we haven't done the right study to determine, what are the costs that we have for the Police Department? Because I would say, the weight equipment and the rooms that we have inside that building, the support structure behind it, all should be considered for that study. Maybe we're not looking at completely what we ought to be looking at.

Mrs. Keefer: How much of that was included in the 7 million dollar original cost of the building? That would be my question. And that would be something we could look at definitely. Seven million was the number that was out there for 105 personnel. Anything that you can put in that numerator, in the top of that fraction that's going to last 5 years, obviously will increase that fee.

Mr. Baxter: Well I do believe we're talking about putting in a new fire station, or potentially a police station, or sub-station. I heard Councilman Clemens talking about that. And that would also fit within that equation, would it not?

Mrs. Keefer: It would. Except for, be advised, that when we did the additional homes and the additional businesses for that new area, we came up with the same amount of personnel that can fit in that building. So when you talk about adding a new sub-station for police, you are effectively changing the level of service. And if you're going to change the level of service, part of that has to be born by existing residents, and part of it is born through the impact fee. That's the only caution I would give you. You can't just simply build a new sub-station with impact fees because you're changing the level of service.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter, and Mrs. Keefer, and Chief correct me if I'm wrong, but you've been paying close attention to this I believe as well as the administration, the Mayor and his folks have been looking at this study as well since this came out. And I think there's been some thought given to your questions and your suggestions. So I mean, you're under strict guidelines on what you can include and what you can't include, correct?

Mrs. Keefer: Correct. We are trying very carefully not to put anything in there that will cause this to go to court. So it's called a rational nexus. You need to be able to show that everything in that equation lasts long enough that it is an impact to a new home, and that you are not taking any of the burden off of existing customers. You need to make sure that you can show that with every single item. Otherwise, it gets held up.

Mr. Stake: Are there any more question?

Mr. Baxter: Just one other comment. I was surprised to hear water and sewer, if it's going to be expanded and those type of things. I didn't even think that they're, I'm thinking, we had looked at it from such a focused group, or focused direction, maybe what we should be asking is, what other direction ought we to be looking? I never thought about water and sewer or any other types of potential impact fees that could be levied.

Mr. Stake: If you would please expand on what you had mentioned earlier in regards to that.

Mrs. Keefer: Sure. The Mayor believes, and we agreed with him, that roads can definitely be covered by impact fees. The reason roads wasn't done using the same scenario is, it's going to require a good study. It's going to require a corridor study that does trip generation, and all those things that the traffic people do. We could do it using the same methodology. We aren't sure that it would hold up in court. We would prefer to have the traffic study behind it. We want to lay a very good foundation. On the water and sewer side, there is already an impact charge. Every time you build a home, you do pay a certain amount to the City of Columbus, and a certain amount I believe, to Reynoldsburg for your tap charge.

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

Mrs. Keefer: Capacity fees. There you go. And they're a different name in every neighborhood. And one of the things you would want to look at very holistically is, when you compare yourself to other communities. And you look at your water capacity fee and your sanitary sewer capacity fee. And then any of these other impact fees altogether, how do you stack up against other communities? Are you still able to attract commercial into the community? Because you don't want to do anything to adversely affect that.

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

Mrs. Newman: Yes. I'm confused. Because it seems to me that somebody buys a new house and part of the cost of that house is an impact fee, as soon as they buy that house then the level of service to the rest of the residents would be diminished by the service to this house unless you can immediately provide them with the same level of service. The whole thing seems illogical to me. Because you're taking their money, but you might not necessarily be providing those services to them without diminishing somebody else's service. Is that correct? Unless you're going to build a little teeny fire station and a little police station and serve them. Explain this to me. I don't understand it.

Mrs. Keefer: There is a reasonable assumption that as you add a new home, and as you hit a threshold, that you are going to add, for example, a police officer. So for example, for every 200 homes or whatever it is, you're going to add a police officer. Now, do you add that police officer when the first home is built, or the 200th home is built? That's a decision that you make as a community. But somewhere in there, you're going to be adding an officer.

Mrs. Newman: But what do you do with the money in the meantime until you've actually used it to improve, or make the capital improvements that you said you were going to have to make for these houses? What do you do with that money?

Mrs. Keefer: When you set up these funds, if you were to move forward with the impact fee, you

would be setting up funds which would hold that money just like you hold the money for the water capacity charges.

Mrs. Newman: So it=s like a trust fund. Okay. I get it.

Mrs. Keefer: Now in the case of the police, and in the case of the police here in Reynoldsburg, you could use that money to pay for the building.

Mrs. Newman: Yeah. Because we=ve already got it.

Mrs. Keefer: You=ve already paid for it essentially. And now what you=re doing is, you=ve got a loan payment. You could use a portion of that money to offset that debt service because that=s a done deal. So it works similar.

Mrs. Newman: Okay. I understand.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Newman. Are there any other questions from members of Council in regards to this study? (No response). I guess one of the questions then, I guess I would have is, do we want to go ahead and have them expand this study and include the roads? I don=t know if we need to make that decision this evening but, that=s food for thought.

Mrs. Keefer: Be aware that again, I believe, and we believe, that you=re going to need a different type of number for a road study. You=re going to need something that shows trip generation. Or something that says, we need these roads. This one has to be four lanes. This one needs to be two lanes. You=re going to need a corridor study of that type. We can=t simply say that in Reynoldsburg right now, we have 5 miles of 4 lane road and it serves 30,000 residents, and so now we=re going to add the same amount there. The roads don=t quite work the same way. If you decide to move forward with the road impact fee, you will need to move forward with (Tape Change). Type of study to come up with some of those numbers separate from the way these were generated.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And I believe that is something that, Mayor, correct me if I=m wrong. That=s something you=d like to see?

Mayor McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well, I guess you can go back and find out what that might cost us, the study.

Mrs. Keefer: We can.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Would that be okay with members of the committee and members of Council, for them to do that? And then I guess, I don=t, obviously we need more information so we wouldn=t be sending this forward at this time. Mr. Baxter, did you have another question?

Mr. Baxter: Yes. Would we be able to send this forward at this time to take advantage of those fees for police and for parks? And do we have to do this all as one? Or can we do this in parts and pieces?

Mrs. Keefer: You can do it in parts and pieces. Our current scope of services provides, is already authorized to craft the ordinances required for you to move forward with either a police impact fee, a park and rec impact fee, or both. And you can do the road impact fee at a later time if you desire.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Or any other type that may be necessary. And I'm not out for adding impact fees altogether. What I'm trying to get at is, here's something that the longer we take, the less chance of opportunity that we can start taking and utilizing it. And I think this has been thoroughly discussed like you said, for years now. You were part of it and Councilman Gilbert. It just seems like we can't get this off the road and I think it's such a good thing for us.

Mr. Stake: It hasn't been thoroughly discussed. It's been recommended. This is the first study that we've seen. This is a draft copy. Frankly, I'm not comfortable sending a draft copy forward to Council. I'd like to see a final copy before I recommend it to send this forward to Council. We're talking a couple of weeks maybe. At least for what we have right here. If Council is happy with what they see here, for them to give us a final copy, we're talking about a couple of weeks. And then if we want to do the other piece later on, I don't have a problem with that. But I'm not comfortable sending a draft copy forward.

Mr. Baxter: For a first reading, you're not comfortable you're saying?

Mr. Stake: No. No. I'm not.

Mr. Baxter: Very good.

Mr. Stake: If somebody else wants to make that motion, they're welcome to.

Mr. Baxter: I would like to make that motion that we move it forward. At least for its first reading to keep it moving. Although I respect your movement on this, I think we've sat on it for so long, I'm growing mold on my hair. It's getting hard for me to see this sitting back so long.

Mr. Stake: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: The mold may be growing but I think maybe we're missing some of the points. Mayor, you seem to have a desire to add in some streets into this impact fee. And EMH&T is saying they can do that, correct? This is a draft copy. And I'm not sure the time frame, but I have a feeling, reading in between the lines that if the road development is added in, the impact fee to residential homes will probably substantially change. Am I missing that in this

anticipation when you roll in those _____?

Mrs. Keefer: Road impact fees in other communities have had an affect on that single family home. Yes.

Mr. Hills: And rather than, I think what we=re saying is, this isn=t in final form yet. It is the first time, in fact, it=s been substantially modified since we=ve talked. Apparently, there was the administrative meeting that you had. We had 5 questions and 50 came out of it. Which is all fine, but now we=re still trying to digest some of those. Impact fees, you know, we could say should have been done 4 or 5 years ago. I think that, the one thing I believe, I=m not putting words in Mr. Stake=s mouth but, as you do an impact fee, this certainly is something that, many people come in and anticipate. But I think there is a little thing of, do you do one of them and then 6 months later, do another one? And that=s where I=m not sure that that is the most appropriate way to have laid out your fees. And I don=t know, I haven=t heard a time frame, but I=m not anticipating anything of a great length of time to accomplish the roads. Am I missing something here? We didn=t talk specifics, but.

Mr. Baxter: I=m sorry, Mr. Hills. But I took you just the opposite. I thought this was going to be a very long process to get through the road study.

Mr. Hills: Well, that=s why I guess we=re trying to find out those answers.

Mr. Baxter: And maybe that=s why my frustration here is, I=m seeing a year to longer before that could be done.

Mr. Parkinson: I wouldn=t think it would be a year or two. But it will be a significant effort. There is a lot of get out in the field and count cars, and trucks, and movements and things.

Mr. Hills: We=re talking about building roads where there aren=t any roads now.

Mr. Parkinson: In large part. And we=re talking about improving roads that are there today.

Mr. Hills: It=s just as _____ impact fees, we=re talking about building properties and acreage that we currently do not have in the jurisdiction of rights to build.

Mr. Parkinson: Correct. I guess to get back to answering your question, I think it is a, it=s not something we=re going to get done in a matter of weeks. It=s more like months to address the roadway impact. And back to the issue of the draft, now that I=m standing here, these are the very discussions that we were hoping to engage you in when we prepared the draft. And that=s why it is presented to you as a draft.

Mr. Hills: And that is one of my concerns is that, you are obtaining what we all have been hoping for once the discussions, usually there=ll be some discussions and some thought and some

further discussion. And I'm not sure that sending forward in a draft form is the proper way to start in the full discourse on the discussions. With that said, I don't know if I've clarified anything or just confused everybody.

Mr. Stake: Well, you brought something up for me. And you asked that doing the road study may impact the fee, some of the fees that we have in here. Is that correct?

Mrs. Keefer: It won't change these fees. Because this is a parks fee and a police fee. What it will do, it will allow a road fee.

Mr. Hills: To that same address.

Mrs. Keefer: To that same address.

Mr. Stake: So we could start out charging >x= amount of dollars, and then we do the road study and we would, that fee would change to that address.

Mrs. Keefer: Right. So you could see where a home would need...

Mr. Hills: And those _____, right? Because impact fees can't go backwards.

Mrs. Keefer: Correct.

Mr. Parkinson: Probably on a negative fee. Correct. And it would probably be built on both sides of the aisle. Both the commercial and the residential.

Mrs. Keefer: Both roads do go both ways.

Mr. Stake: And I do have to say that this is a fee that we will be levying on developers and new home owners. I would like plenty of discussion on this, frankly. And so I, again, I'm not in favor of sending this forward at this time. And also, I believe Mr. Clemens would like to be included in these discussions before it's sent forward. And I would certainly respect his wish there.

Mr. Baxter: I understand. Thanks, Ron. I pull back my motion.

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

Mr. Baxter: I was just frustrated. I'm thinking a year down the line. So it wasn't a matter of, I just can't see this sitting another year.

Mr. Stake: It is not my desire to hold things up or make things stall. But if we're going to do it, let's do it right. That would be my desire. And let's include everybody here on Council.

Mr. Parkinson: We will bring back, in two weeks, the proposal for the roadway impact.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. Keefer: Do we go ahead and start preparing the ordinance for Police and Parks and Rec in anticipation of road and have those ordinances prepared since they're already accounted for within our scope of services? Do you want to wait until this report is final, final, final?

Mr. Stake: No. You can start preparing that, and get a draft copy of that as well. And once everybody on Council has had a good opportunity to review this and ask you all the questions that need to be asked, then I will be comfortable with moving on this as a piece of legislation.

Mrs. Keefer: Excellent. Thank you so much.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Before they all leave, are there any other questions from members of Council? (No response). Okay. Thank you. Well then, I will make a motion that we hold this item for two weeks. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 5 is, Discussion, Appointment to Design Review Board. We do have an opening on the Design Review Board coming up. I believe, Stephanie McCloud's term will be ending March 10. And I would just like to put out there, Mrs. Frazier, would you please find out if Mrs. McCloud is interested in serving further? And also, if there's anybody in the public who would be interested in that, in serving on the Design Review Board. That is a Council appointment. And if any members of the Finance Committee or Council have any recommendations, please let me know about those.

Item number 6 is Appropriation to pay Debt Service on Bartlett Road Storm Sewer. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Thank you, Mr. Stake, members of Council. When the Bartlett Road Storm Sewer was passed at the end of last year, there was a private placement done with National City Bank in order to fund that particular project. The appropriation to pay the first years debt was not done in the 2006 budget because the loan was not finished until, and finalized and closed until after the 2006 budget had been finalized and passed by Council. So therefore, I'm asking for \$93,000 to be appropriated from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund and put in the two accounts on here in order to pay the first years Debt Service on that particular project.

Mr. Stake: Okay. What's the time frame on this?

Mr. Harris: No hurry. It doesn't have to be done until...

Mr. Stake: Through the normal channels?

Mr. Harris: Yeah. You just go through the regular three readings. No emergency or anything like that necessary for it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Okay. And you're going to want \$93,072, correct?

Mr. Harris: \$93,072 is correct.

Mr. Stake: From the unappropriated Storm Water Fund and distributed into \$63,000 to account number 740.991.5414. And then \$30,072 to account number 740.991.5424.

Mr. Harris: That's correct. One is the principle on the loan, one's the interest on the loan which we do take care of separately accounting for it.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harris. Then if there's no further questions or comments, I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted Aye). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

And item number 7 is Discussion, Transfer of funds to reflect appropriate expenditures. I guess this is the Mayor's Department and the Development Department.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. Over the last few years, they had been charging some reimbursable expenses like parking and stuff when they go to meetings and general administrative. Mike Turner and I had a meeting on this. We've decided it really should be charged into the individual department rather than to the whole city. So therefore, it was budgeted in the 2006 budget for the General Administrative. And therefore, we'd like to move it into the appropriate accounts so it can be properly accounted for.

Mr. Stake: Okay. That makes sense to me. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: What account are you, are you going to create a new account? Or what account are you actually going to put that into?

Mr. Harris: The accounts are listed on here. 110.522.5322 is the Mayor's reimbursable account. And 110.580.5322 is the Development Departments account.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Harris: There's no additional appropriation needed here. We're just moving,

unappropriating money from General Administrative and moving it into correct accounts.

Mr. Stake: So it can be tracked properly?

Mr. Harris: That=s correct. And here again, no emergency or anything on this, Ron.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions or comments? (No response). Okay then. What we would be doing here is moving \$1,000 from account number 110.595.5390 and distribute \$500 of that into account number 110.522.5322, the Mayor=s Reimbursement. And 500 into account number 110.580.5322, Development Reimbursement. And I=ll make a motion that we send that on to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted AAYe@). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 8 is Discussion, Then and now, Columbus Water bill. And this came from Mark Kipp. Mark, you=re still here?

Mr. Kipp: Both 8 and 9 are, one=s a water bill. The other=s a sewer bill. This is the same money that I appropriated in December. But I did not have anything on it that it needed to be a Then and Now. And so we=ve submitted legislation to allow us to pay that money that was appropriated.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And basically, a Then and Now, Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris, if you want to just give us the Reader=s Digest version.

Mr. Harris: Reader=s Digest condensed version. A Then and Now is created when an expense has been brought to the city, or by an invoice date, and there=s not either an appropriation or there=s not been a purchase order turned in to encumber the money prior to the date of the invoice. Both these invoices have a November, I think it=s November 15 date, the invoice date. The money wasn=t passed until 12-19. So therefore, there was no money appropriated at that time. And there was also no purchase order turned in to encumber the money. So therefore, it=s a Then and Now.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And the Auditor=s Certificate of Then and Now certifies that the funds are available, basically.

Mr. Harris: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: And this is something we did previously. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Are those funds from 2005 that are available? Or 2006?

Mr. Harris: It=s the additional appropriation that was done on 12-19-05.

Mr. Baxter: That was passed by Council?

Mr. Harris: That appropriation=s still in place. And therefore, can be used for this. And that=s where, they turned in the purchase order. However, the purchase order was dated after the date of the invoice.

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

Mr. Stake: Okay. I=d just like to point out that it=s \$258,505.81 for the third quarter water bill. And this would be paid from available funds in account number 710.735.5378. Correct, Mr. Kipp?

Mr. Kipp: Correct.

Mr. Stake: Are there any other questions, comments? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send, you are looking for emergency language on this, correct? So we don=t get hit with a late fee?

Mr. Kipp: They=re very nice to us. They don=t charge us late fees but I think they would like to be paid in a more timely manner. Yes.

Mr. Stake: And we have discussed this before. We did appropriate the money and all that good stuff. Are there any comments on the emergency language here from members of Council? (No response). Then I would like to move this forward to Council with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And we have another one of these Then and Now=s for the sewer bill. Mr. Kipp. Item number 9.

Mr. Kipp: It=s the same, exactly the same thing with the sewer bill.

Mr. Stake: Are there any questions or comments in regards to this? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Will this always be a Then and Now every year?

Mr. Kipp: No. This was...

Mr. Baxter: This is the abnormality.

Mr. Kipp: This is only the, since I=ve been here, this is only the second time that I=ve ever had

to come back and get money to pay the water and sewer bills. Generally I estimated adequately. This was just a dry year. I waited until I got the actual bills from them to determine how much money to request. So that=s why it=s, I just should have had Then and Now language at that time.

Mr. Stake: And you=re looking for emergency on this as well so we can get that bill paid which is kind of late. And this would be \$241,362.82 payable to Columbus City Treasurer, the October sewer invoice. And they would come from available funds in account number 720.736.5378. Any further questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send this forward with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

And item number 10 is legislation to dispose of vehicles and create a fund. This comes from Chief of Police, Dave Suciu. Chief, go right ahead.

Chief Suciu: We are asking Councils permission to establish this fund that would allow us to sell some of our unused, or unservicable vehicles that we have in our unmarked fleet. The Columbus Police auction, their vehicle auction sales, and that those monies would in turn, be put into a special fund that we can go out and purchase servicable, unmarked use cars.

Mr. Stake: Okay. It sounds pretty simple to me. I guess one question I would have though is, when this money comes in and it goes into that fund, would you need to come back to us to be able to go buy those other vehicles?

Chief Suciu: I don=t believe we have to if it=s under \$10,000. Is that correct?

Mr. Harris: Any time you=re going to spend money, Council has to have an appropriation to cover the expense.

Chief Suciu: Okay.

Mr. Harris: You still have to come back to Council and get the money appropriated.

Mrs. Frazier: Can=t we write that in the ordinance Richard, that they can do that?

Mr. Harris: You can if you want to. But there has to be an appropriation in place before they can spend the money.

Mrs. Frazier: I understand that.

Mr. Stake: Chief, do you have a dollar amount in mind tonight?

Chief Suciu: A dollar amount for...

Mr. Stake: What you think you might get. Unless you want to, would you rather come back next time?

Chief Suci: I know we're going to get more money putting these out for auction rather than trading them in. And that's the reason we want to go down this, do it this way. In the past, I guess we've traded in vehicles. And of course, you get very little for trades. We were trying to go the CPD auction to maximize some of the stuff that we have. As far as the dollar amount, I could probably get back with you on that. But I don't, I guess it would be, I don't know what we're going to get.

Mayor McPherson: Chairman Stake. Most of these are the older, worn out vehicles that if for example, if you saw that Mercedes that we had, it was all tore up. We may get 2,000. We may get 1500 out of it. All of the cars that we take to these auctions, you're going to be lucky if you get \$2,000 for them. Because they are just flat wore out. They've been used in undercover activities. And so you know, what we'd like to see is, you know, if we get 2,000, if we get 3,000, put it into an account like we do our forfeiture account, have the money appropriated, we can go out and buy another 3 or \$5,000 vehicle that we could use for undercover. That's the purpose of this fund. To just allow us to keep this flow of old junker, or not junker, but older vehicles going.

Chief Suci: We haven't replaced an unmarked vehicle in our fleet since 2002.

Mr. Stake: And I can appreciate that. And I don't have a problem with it. I just, Mrs. Frazier's suggestion that we include maybe an appropriation in with this.

Mayor McPherson: And I would agree with that.

Mr. Stake: If Council is comfortable with that.

Mayor McPherson: Is there a way to appropriate just making an in and out account or some sort? I don't know. Mr. Hills, you've been around as long as me. But I don't recall how we do those.

Mr. Hills: I'm not sure. I think with the seizure account, maybe when it was sent up, it authorized for the municipal funds. I think the appropriation stated, as Mr. Harris brought up, is certainly one thing that we can, certainly been told, any time that you're going to expend money, you need the appropriation. One of the purposes of that is to be sure that this gets back into the administrative side. But one of the purposes of that is there's some paper trail to document your spending appropriation from this fund to purchase a vehicle. But secondarily, then you're taking the old vehicles off of your insurance policy. If you don't have that piece of paper that you catch up with, you'll look a few years later and realize you've been paying for premiums on cars that you sold at an auction a long time ago for that year. So I mean, there is a purpose to let the paper

catch up with all _____.

Chief Suci: Certainly.

Mr. Hills: Mayor, I don't know that I can give you an answer other than on the seizure. I don't know that that account ever came to us. But if it didn't, I think it's because it was specifically written that way.

Mayor McPherson: Well, we can look into it. But that's the purpose of it. And you know, a lot of these cars too, we can buy at auction. But you know, you have to have the money appropriated before you go to the auction because they require you pay at the auction too. But we can save probably 40 to 50% by going to an auction and buying at some of the auctions. Now state auction might be exempt. We'd still have to have an appropriation to even go to a state auction. So maybe we can work with Nancy and work out the details.

Mr. Stake: Yeah. I was just thinking that if you knew what the value of the vehicles might be at the auction, you want to come back and add it to the legislation here we can do that all at once. I don't know. No?

Mrs. Frazier: I think that what I know of the forfeiture funds that are set up now, the questions I asked the Auditor when I heard that they wanted to do this, and I think there's enough language that it can be covered and notification given when it comes to the insurance, the fixed asset list, and the ability to do this. Because the appropriation ordinance gives them the ability to spend the money out of the funds. And Auditor is shaking his head and I'll note that in the minutes. And I think once you see it written on paper, it'll cover your concerns. And then if you don't think it's right, you can do it differently. But it should be able to give them the ability, as long as they don't go over \$10,000, and the Auditor's made aware, and they still would have to turn in like a purchase order. But then everybody's covered. So I think I've got the angles. Just most of them are still in my head.

Mr. Hills: If the Auditor's aware, and also Council becomes aware that there is that expenditure.

Mrs. Frazier: Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Harris, did you have anything to add?

Mr. Harris: I'll work with Nancy on how the, because it's done in the appropriation ordinance every year. Whatever money goes into that fund is automatically, Council automatically approves the appropriation. I'm not certainly against it and I think it's a good way for them to get vehicles. And I'll be glad to work with Mrs. Frazier so we get the same language in there. And then, as going forward, we'll just put it in the appropriation ordinance just like we do the other ones.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could ask Mr. Harris. We'd like to do those in something other than a Then and Now, right?

Mr. Harris: Well, we can work out a way to do that as well.

Mr. Stake: Okay. And Chief, you're looking to get the I guess, to that auction March 25. That gives us a little bit of time.

Chief Suci: Correct.

Mr. Stake: But you are looking for emergency legislation in order to meet that deadline, correct?

Chief Suci: If we can get them to the March auction that would be great. Yes.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Any concerns by members of Council on the emergency portion of this, or any other portion of this?

Mr. Hills: One question, Mr. Stake. What is going to the auction is not currently being used today?

Chief Suci: That is correct, sir.

Mr. Hills: And not just today, this week.

Chief Suci: It hasn't been used in a lengthy period.

Mr. Hills: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Do we have a list of vehicles that are going to be added to this? All I have is this single piece of paper. So it doesn't tell me what's _____.

Chief Suci: I know that we're looking at the two training motorcycles, the Camaro, which has over, is a '92 that's got over 100,000 miles on it specifically. Those three vehicles off the top of my head that we're looking at sending to the auction immediately.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: We do have a little bit of time on this and we're going to get some other things worked out here. So I will make a motion, if there aren't any other questions or concerns, I will make a motion that we send this forward for its first reading with emergency language included, and you'll get back with us on the additional information. You'll work that out with the Auditor and the Clerk of Council. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further

discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake, can I, just for my clarification, are you sending that, so that if you get the information, you'll pass it as an emergency? Or do you intend for it to go longer?

Mr. Stake: Well, it depends on how long it takes. I'm comfortable passing it Monday night if the rest of the Council is comfortable with that. As long as we have the information that we need.

Mrs. Frazier: I just wanted to know where to put it.

Mr. Stake: I just didn't know how long that would take.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay.

Mr. Stake: I did note that there was a March 25th auction coming up. And I think we do have a little bit of time, not a whole lot.

Mrs. Frazier: Well, I was just going to put it in first readings if you're going to continue it. But if it's got emergency language, it would go into effect whenever you would pass it. So I need to know where you wanted it.

Mr. Stake: Mrs. Frazier, if you have everything that we need by Monday, that's fine with me. If not, I think if it went longer than that, just as long as we get it done by the 25th. I think we have enough time, don't we?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Stake: If it does take a second reading and pass at that time.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Item number 11 is the waiving, Ordinance to waive additional tapping fees.
Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: This is a request to waive the tapping fees as required by Section 941.13 "Additional Tapping Fees For Unassessed Property". And this would be solely for the CVS Private Sanitary Sewer Improvement #815. And I've attached the documents where the developer has waived their right to claim at any additional, or reimbursement for the construction of that line. And we don't feel we should charge those residents along there the cost that the developer's already paid.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Kipp. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). And this would just go the normal route? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Can you clarify my mind? What are we waiving? The somebody else=s fee? Not CVS?

Mr. Kipp: We=re waiving, on this we would charge them a front footage fee. The additional tap in fee.

Mr. Hills: Them, is who?

Mr. Kipp: Those along the CVS sanitary sewer where it was put in coming up Taylor Road. So this is not a capacity fee. Where a line is put in that belongs to the city...

Mr. Hills: Which was put in by a private developer.

Mr. Kipp: Right. If we put it in, there are additional, this ordinance applies. Or if it becomes our line. And it wasn=t put in for the, this was put in for the CVS sewer itself. The CVS store. And when it becomes ours, we would have to charge them that fee. That=s why we come to you to ask that it be waived.

Mr. Hills: Is this the first time we=ve ever done one of these?

Mr. Kipp: This is the first time we=ve done one on a, this has never come up quite like this before. So in this circumstance, the answer would be yes.

Mr. Hills: And you=ve been here longer than me.

Mr. Kipp: Yes.

Mr. Hills: The terminology was a little _____, Mr. Stake. That=s why I was hoping to get a little clarification in my mind while we were doing it.

Mr. Stake: Did you get everything clarified?

Mr. Hills: I think I got enough clarified that I know how to ask more questions once I think about it.

Mr. Stake: Well, this is going to have a few readings. So if you need to ask more questions, you certainly may.

Mr. Hills: There=s not being _____. We have that now. I just appreciate _____.

Mr. Kipp: If you have any questions, feel free to call me.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Stearns, did you have a question?

Mr. Stearns: I'll just call him.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I'll just pipe in. Because I know, we've done not this particular thing before but there's been other types of ways that we've eliminated our fees for other types of sewer projects as well. Just not in this manner.

Mr. Kipp: Correct.

Mr. Baxter: So this isn't the first time that we've had to work with our residents to try to reduce the cost when need be.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Are there any questions or comments from members of Finance or members of Council? (No response). Not hearing any, then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And we have another one of them Then and Now's which is item #12. And this would be authorization to pay a Then and Now for American Electric Power street light invoice. Mrs. Reichard, this is yours.

Mrs. Reichard: Yes. This one is a little bit different than Mark's. This bill came in on December 22. There was not enough money in the account to pay it. And it was thought by those who handle this in my department that it could be paid out of the following years. It could be paid out of the '06 fund. And of course, it cannot for all the reasons that you heard Mr. Harris speak to earlier. So we need, and unfortunately, we need an emergency one on this one too so that we can pay the bill.

Mr. Stake: And you did call me last week in regards to this. And we spoke about this as well as the other Then and Now's.

Mrs. Reichard: It's certainly been a good lesson for all of us that we need to have a much more critical eye and make sure things like this don't happen again. Because it is prevented. So we just need to keep our eye on that.

Mr. Stake: And it is in the amount of \$4,796.30 for the final 2005 street light bill. Invoice date

was 12-22-05 from funds available in account number 110.448.5302. And there=s a request for an emergency on this. Are there any questions or comments? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one question. That same account shows that in the end of the month of December, 2005, that there was \$3,337.94 adjusted to the budget. So it sounds as if we had the money in there but then we=ve moved it elsewhere. Can you comment on that, Mrs. Reichard?

Mrs. Reichard: No I=m sorry. I cannot. I just know that there were some, as you get down towards the end of the year and you need money and whatever bill comes in first, the staff member did not realize it was going to be this high and thought that there would be enough money. Obviously, there was not.

Mr. Stake: I think Mr. Harris can comment on it. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: There was a little bit of money left in that account. There was still some money left in that group of accounts, but there was no purchase order turned in to encumber the money. So therefore, it was a Then and Now.

Mr. Stake: Did that help you, Mr. Baxter?

Mr. Baxter: Yes sir, it does. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Are there any other questions, or comments, or concerns in regards to this being an emergency? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send this on to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mrs. Newman. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted AAye@). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 10:06.

Finance Committee

February 6, 2006

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