SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 3, 2003

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Jim Wade, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher. Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, William Hills, Eric Gilbert, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Clemens: I'll call the Safety Committee meeting to order at 7:30. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the January 21, 2003 Safety Committee meeting. Do I have any additions or deletions? If not, they'll stand approved.

The next item, discussion, Liquor Permit Request, transfer, from M J Royal Inc., dba Shooters Night Club, to C S C 1365 Inc., dba Shooters Night Club, 1365 Brice Rd., 1st floor only, Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Chief, have you had a chance to look at this?

Chief Miller: Yes, Mr. Clemens. We've conducted an investigation into this and the police department recommends that it move forward as normal.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. The Chief's recommended this move forward as normal. Is there any other discussion? If not, we'll just move this on.

The next item, discussion, liquor permit request, transfer, from JOMSZ Inc., to Brent & Nick LLP, 1371 Hentz Dr., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Chief?

Chief Miller: Mr. Clemens, we've conducted an investigation into this liquor license as well and we recommend that there be no appeal and it move forward as normal.

Mr. Clemens: Alright. The Chief has recommended this move forward as normal. Do I have any discussion on this from the floor? From anybody on the Committee or anybody on Council? If not, we'll just move this forward as normal.

That ends the Safety Committee meeting at 7:32.

Safety Committee
- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
February 3, 2003

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 3, 2003

Members of Service Committee present: Eric Gilbert, William Hills, Ron Stake, Lane Beougher. Other members of Council present: Sarah Cannella, Jim Wade, Mel Clemens, Council President Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Gilbert: I'll call the Service Committee meeting to order at 7:32. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the January 21, 2003 Service Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? None being heard, they will stand as read. Item number 3 is the approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions to the Service agenda this evening? None being heard, the agenda will stand.

Item number 4 is the discussion regarding an amendment, Section 958.02 "Definitions" of Chapter 958 Stormwater Charges and adding a Chapter 960 Storm Water Regulations to the Reynoldsburg Code. This is in conjunction with our efforts to come into compliance with the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Program Requirements. Ms. Keefer or Mr. Parkinson? I have a legislative request to make these changes with the attached proposed legislation that was received in our packets. The members have had a chance to look this over. They'll be no impact in terms of the storm water charges that we currently have. Correct?

Ms. Keefer: That's correct.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. And what, just in terms of impact or changes adding Chapter 960, can you just give us a brief overview what this means in terms of a change to the code and for the city?

Ms. Keefer: Well, what this ordinance does, is it provides a definition of who is going to sign your Storm Water Management Plan that is due to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency on March 10, 2003 and within that Storm Water Management Plan, they're pretty clear that you identify how, whoever the signatory authority is receive that authority. So, it's basically an authorization ordinance.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. And this authorizes the Mayor to be that signatory. Correct?

Ms. Keefer: That's correct. And then the addition of 960 provides for the annual update that is also required as part of the NPDES Phase II program.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. And some of these, anything significant in terms of the changes with the definitions or are these just new terminologies that are being passed down from the federal mandate?

Ms. Keefer: These are pretty standard terminologies and what will happen is this will start your Chapter 960 and then as you add the best management practices over the next 5 years, the definitions will already be in place. So we tried to get as much in place prior to submittal on March 10, 2003 to help the city be as much in compliance as possible.

Mr. Gilbert: And I noticed this was requested as an emergency for the immediate preservation of public safety and further in order to meet the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Storm Water Regulations. That March date that you had mentioned, that's the date where...

Ms. Keefer: That is set. That is set. There are no extensions on the horizon because it came down from the federal government. So we will submit something on March 10. Preferably something signed.

Mr. Gilbert: Right. And it's important to have this in place prior to you submitting that.

Ms. Keefer: Correct.

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

Mr. Hills: Just a question or two. I guess a follow up on your earlier answer. The 3-10 date is established by the US EPA?

Ms. Keefer: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And so what you anticipate sending then is not the detailed plan of where all of the guides and storm water is? But just a statement as we are prepared to comply with the 5 year planning stage or whatever? Is that how that will be? A generalized statement to comply with the due date?

Ms. Keefer: Yes. It's approximately a 20 page document that outlines what the City of Reynoldsburg will do for the next 5 years and contains such things as we will look into entering into an intergovernmental agreement perhaps with another agency to provide the educational requirement. Not that you will, or would, or did, but you would look into it. That kind of information would be included in the packet that goes to the state. It also outlines your existing program so that you get as much credit for what's already in place as possible up front so that they don't come back to you and say, you are not controlling this or that. You have a document that's in with the state that states that you are.

Mr. Hills: And that has been prepared already?

Ms. Keefer: It is in the process of being prepared.

Mr. Hills: Because back in the third page, 960.02 it says, "The Mayor shall prepare or cause to prepare". So he is in essence aware that that is being prepared currently?
Ms. Keefer: It is being prepared currently. Right. Generally speaking, that would just refer to the update. We have had some communities that aren't as far along as Reynoldsburg goes.

Mr. Hills: I think we've actually started this timely because I know the Ohio regs are not in place yet. But it doesn't mean that the feds aren't because they are and 3-10 is the date.

Ms. Keefer: The regulations are not in place. However, the permit program is and that's all that the federal government needs, is the state's permit program in place.

Mr. Hills: One other question. The second whereas on page one, I believe, if we're getting ready to send this forward, appears to be a typo. One, two, three, fourth line, it says "channels or storm drains" in paren. and a colon and then a large I. I believe that's supposed to be a little i.

Ms. Keefer: Yeah, it should be small.

Mr. Hills: Little italics. Okay.

Ms. Keefer: Correct.

Mr. Hills: That's all I have. Thank you. I actually read it.

Mr. Gilbert: My penchant for grammar isn't as tenacious as yours Mr. Hills. I've learned that since being on Council but I appreciate you pointing that out.

Mr. Hills: I just know the rules have not come to JCARR yet but they have been solicited for comments.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hills. Does this raise any other questions from other members of Service? Other members of Council? None being heard, thank you Ms. Keefer. None being heard, I'll make a motion that we forward this to Council with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Mr. Hills with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 5 is discussion, regarding the Pleasant View Heights Sanitary Sewer Improvements Project. This item does come from Councilman Jim Wade. He had asked that I introduce this to the Service Committee agenda, which I was glad to do. This Pleasant View Heights area is within an area known as Ward II, Ward district which Mr. Wade represents and he had put together some information for the members packets under legislative request for a Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project. The members should have received that in your packets Friday. And at this point I will let Mr. Wade introduce this.

Mr. Wade: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. I appreciate you putting this on your committee. Basically this is not new to anybody up here I don't think. This has been in consideration for a long time and the constituents in that area have expressed concern for the sanitary system that they're currently using which most of them are leach beds and, very old leach beds at that. And Mr. Mussi, if you'll help me out I think you're familiar with some of the problems they've had up there? Can you elaborate on that? I know we've had some overflows and some issues up there.

Mr. Mussi: What it is, it's very flat up there. They have had problems over the years. Again, another one of our older areas in the city where the leach beds have been in there for a number of years. And it was part of a four phase project that we had a couple of years ago that this was an area we highlighted to put in the sewers.

Mr. Wade: Right. For those of you who aren't familiar with the old program, what has been removed from this is Wickfield Drive. Wickfield was initially part of the Pleasant View, Senic area that was going to be done but it wasn't, we didn't find it cost effective to do that. EMH&T has provided us with new numbers which were provided in your packet for the portion that will be done and the old portion removed from that. So, I ask that this be considered for adoption.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wade. Under the memo, Sanitary Sewer Improvement No. 787, then the Pleasant View area, the street's indicated as East Broad Street, Pleasant View Drive, and Senic Road for members in the public's benefit. And if the members will recall those that were here, maybe others that weren't that have read up on it, we did implement a sewer policy several years ago that also effected the percentage of dollars that went into the Sewer Capacity Fund to help offset, pay for costs of the five remaining un-sewered established neighborhoods. And I believe that fund currently stands at 1.8 million dollars. That distribution was changed this year, I thank Mr. Whitney, and that money no longer goes in but we were looking at an estimated cost of this project to be approximately $382,257. Does this raise any questions from members of Service? Other members of Council? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Just one question. Jim, I think you did a survey on this. Did you?

Mr. Wade: That's correct. Actually I had surveyed all the areas left in my Ward to be considered and this was the only project that had an overwhelming majority that were in favor of the sanitary sewers. Thank you. I meant to mention that.

Mr. Gilbert: Other members of Council?

Mr. Hills: Mr. Gilbert, the purpose for an emergency? Is there a reason that it's an emergency? Are you thinking about passing this out tonight?

Mr. Gilbert: No. I had talked to Mr. Wade about that this evening and I think it's best that we forward this for a first reading and additional consideration in Committee. The emergency historically is, in my conversation with the Clerk is how we've always concluded the process with the resolution of necessity.

Mr. Hills: Unless we've had debates?

Mr. Gilbert: Correct.

Mr. Wade: That is correct. For what it's worth, they are in some need up there from a safety and hygiene consideration.

Mr. Gilbert: Okay. Does that raise any other questions from Council? None being heard, what I would like to do is to forward this to Council for a first reading and ask at that Council meeting that it return to Committee for it's second Committee hearing. Do I have a second on that motion? Mr. Stake with a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. That will take care of Service.

I'll adjourn Service at 7:43 p.m.

Service Committee
- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
February 3, 2003

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 3, 2003

Members of Finance Committee present: William Hills, Mel Clemens, Eric Gilbert, Sarah Cannella.
Other members of Council present: Jim Wade, Lane Beougher, Ron Stake, Council President, Bradley L. McCloud.

Mr. Hills: I'll call Finance to order at 7:43 and ask for approval of the January 21, 2003 minutes. Are there any additions, deletions, or changes? Seeing and hearing none, they'll stand as submitted. Approval of tonight's agenda. You will note on items 5 and 6 that it was added to that “discussion will be held provided documents received Friday, January 31, 2003 by 5:00". They were received at 4:55. The Clerk has spent somewhere between 14 and 16 hours putting them together over the weekend. So we did receive them. They had to be incorporated. There are a number of little things that are still being double checked. There’s also some language that’s being modified in the legislation by the City Attorney and after discussions I’ve had with Council members ahead of time, this will be held, 5 and 6, for two weeks. The Mayor and I have talked about it to be sure that when it is presented, it is presented in the complete form and Nancy has had an opportunity to fully review it and the others to be added. So with that, I’m going to hold items 5 and 6 tonight. I move to amend the agenda holding items 5 and 6 for two weeks. Is there a second on that? Second by Mrs. Cannella. All in favor state aye. (All voted “Aye”). Those will be held.

Moving on to item number 4, is discussion of Compensation for elected officials. And we’ve had, this is the time of year that if there are going to be any changes, they need to be done, I believe Mr. McCloud was able to confirm that today. Correct? There is an ethics opinion out that if you’re going to have any rate changes in the year of election, people being elected and serving office 1-1-04 that those changes should be made before the primary. The filing deadline for the primary this year is 2-20. Therefore, in order to discuss it, talk about it, and get it passed prior to 2-20, tonight’s about the last night we can have discussions on it. So there have been some general discussions. There’s been information that’s passed around and circulated and everyone seems to have some opinions. I’ll be happy to listen to anybody else’s suggestions but what I’ve got in front of me is compensation for the Mayor and we have a proposal that the Mayor’s compensation ends December 31, 2003. And I mean it ends. It stops. There is no compensation for ‘04. So it’s probably appropriate to pay the Mayor something in ‘04. There was also a debate that that not happen but that one didn’t get any votes either. What I have in front of me is the compensation, Section 141.01 for the Mayor. Would be effective January 1, ‘04. The Mayor shall receive a compensation salary of $83,5 for the calendar year ‘04, and each calendar year from ‘05 through ‘07. The salary from the previous year shall be increased by the percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index over the twelve month period that ends on the 30th day of September of the immediately preceding year rounded to the nearest one tenth of a percent. Then item 3, the Consumer Price Index means the Consumer Price Index prepared by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, US city average for urban wage earner and clerical workers or if that index is no longer published, a general available comparable index. Any comments or suggestions from anyone on Council? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. I have one. We’ve all discussed this and I think we all know each other’s opinions and how we feel and so forth. I would like to, and I have my reasons, and I’ve stated them before, as far as the Mayor’s concerned and as far as the City Attorney, the Law Director’s concerned because they are full time employees. And they’re, like our CO’s they do run the city. The Mayor is responsible for the city, for all the employees, for everything that takes part in the city and he has to take the responsibility and what he does right or wrong, it’s his responsibility in how the city operates and that’s how the administration’s supposed to work. The same way with the Law Director. He’s our legal director. A very responsible position. And I think that they ought to be paid accordingly. We do increase our employees. We do increase our non-union plus our union employees. Of course we don’t know what we’re going to increase them next year, what it will be. But since this has to be set over a four year period because we can't change during that time, I think it's important that we treat these two positions with respect and the pay I think they deserve. I would like to put forward the Mayor and the Law Director to start at $83,500 like we had 2004, then increase it $2500 to $86 in 2005, $2500 to $88,500 in 2006, and $2500 to $91,000 in 2007. Now, taking those four years and the two employees together, it's a total of around $25,000 for a four year period. To me that doesn't seem to me like that's outlandish or that's a big increase or an increase that we can't handle over the next four years. Because it's hard to say what their responsibilities will be two years from now or three years from now with the increase of the city and the size and the way we're growing and so forth. I think the responsibilities of the two positions to keep them in a plan with some of our other higher paid employees and keep them where they are somewhat comparable or a little bit above some of them, I think it's important. And I think the job they do is an important position and this is how I would propose it. That's just my proposal. That would be $2500 increase after the first year and like I said the total of it you're talking around $2500 over a four year period for the two full time elected officials. And that's my proposal.

Mr. Hills: Does anybody have any other comments? I guess, Mel, you're saying that in a form of an amendment because I think that we had, there has been discussion and the Consumer Price Index is sort of like a way of saying, "here you know what you're running for and here's what you're going to get paid and you're certainly going to be compensated about the same way as the Consumer Price Index is going up. It's about as fair and even as we can get in my opinion. And your opinion and my opinion differ. Your opinion and my opinion differed on the starting rate too. Because I think it's fair to say the 83,5 wasn't what you would have liked to have seen for the salary as of 1-1-04.

Mr. Clemens: I can understand that, Bill. And I do take the position, they are elected official but they're full time elected officials. They're not part time like State Legislators, State Senate, things like that, or like Council. They are full time employees of the city and they do have a job to do. If I thought that this is the increase that FOP was going to get the next time around, I might consider something like that but I'm not that, I don't believe things like that. I don't look off into space. I think that this probably will put them in line with probably what possibly our union would get or our other city employees would get in the years to come. We're speaking about a four year period from now and these other positions could increase 3 or 4 percent each year and if the cost index only went up 1% each year, we're falling way behind as far as our full time and elected officials are concerned. And that's what bothers me on the whole thing. I don't think that's a fair assumption. I don't think it's fair to say, you just run for election and what you run for makes no difference. Because it might be that way with City Council. We're part time but we're looking at people that it's a full time position and a full time responsibility and that's the reason I feel a little bit different about it.

Mr. Hills: Mel, you will have to agree that judges within this state are full time positions. Are they not?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Judges within this state are compensated in pay raises on the Consumer Price Index.

Mr. Clemens: And I see what their pay is to start with.

Mr. Hills: Their pay is, depending on which judge there's different levels, yes.

Mr. Clemens: It's quite different.

Mr. Hills: But now if we're going to talk comparisons of pay, and I had kind of hoped we could avoid this but the City Attorney and the Mayor of the City of Reynoldsburg...

Mr. Clemens: I'm not talking about comparisons with the state.

Mr. Hills: I'm not talking about state. I'm talking about the Mayor of this city compared with other surrounding cities. It's certainly not out of line.

Mr. Clemens: I know I've brought this up before, we're talking about Mayors of possibly Groveport, Gahanna, and a few of these. And Gahanna's almost up there and maybe they'll get an increase and maybe they won't. Bexley's higher. Some are lower. But we've got 4 or 5 cities that have, and I've brought this up before, that are our size or a little bit bigger and some are smaller that have City Managers and are making $30,000 more than what our Mayor makes plus a part time Mayor and they're handling the same responsibility. Now, their income may be different and their budgets may be different but the responsibility is still there. And I'm not comparing them. And I've said this before, I don't care what Grove City's Mayor makes or Gahanna's. I think we have to look at the city to what we feel our Mayor and our Law Director to operate this city, the position they're in, what the worth is to them and to the city and to the positions they hold. I don't want to compare them with anybody else.

Mr. Hills: Does anybody else on Council have any other comments or questions? Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert: Mel, we've discussed this in a session and I guess my main concern, I was under the understanding like Mr. Hills that we had a consensus in terms of presenting for discussion the CPI. I guess I don't think we're in a position to be able to pick and choose in terms of what comparisons we can make. In terms of the worth or the quality of an employee, whether it's an elected official or an appointed or hired city employee. To use a comparison to justify changes from one perspective with our non-bargaining unit employees and then to say that a comparison that can be made to give us some range or some idea of what's fair and just compensation for the elected officials isn't something that can be done. I think that part was our credibility in making these decisions. That's where I'm coming from in terms of disagreeing with your approach. I think the $83,500 which was I believe a secondary proposal, I can support that and the CPI seemed to be something that was consistent, so I respect your proposal but I can't support it on those grounds and I'm not sure if this is an amendment to what we have before us in the committee and if we need to...

Mr. Clemens: No. The point is Bill asked me if anybody else had any other opinions. I'm not making a proposal. I mean I'm making a statement as far as this is concerned. I don't agree with Mr. Hills' proposal. It's that plain. I just wanted to voice my opinion on why and I'll stand by that that's all.

Mr. Hills: Any other comments from anybody else on Finance? Any comments from anyone on Council? I guess it drops it right back to me doesn't it? Well I'm going to say, I'm going to recommend that we send this forward as read, the Mayor at $83,5 with the CPI index for the next three years, following that as I read through it. Is there a second in Finance for that? Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye" except Mr. Clemens). Opposed? (Mr. Clemens voted "Nay"). One opposed, it will go to Council for vote at that proposal.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Hills, sorry to interrupt. Did that incorporate, or did you exclude the Council and President of Council portion of that?

Mr. Hills: We have not, that was Mayor only. We get to do this three more times. As far as Department of Law, 147.03, Compensation, I will note that from the years 2000 to 2003 the Mayor and the City Attorney has both had the same salary and the proposal I have under 147.03, and again coming from previous discussions was effective 1-1-04, "City Attorney shall receive the compensation of salary of $83,500 for the calendar year of '04". And then from the calendar year of '05 through '07 the salary shall be, and again on the same CPI as both 2 and 3 were discussed earlier. Any questions or comments from anyone on Finance on that? Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Same statement as before.

Mr. Hills: I respect that very much. This is certainly, I agree with you Mel that this is a trend. It's a change from what we have historically done. This has been the first time we've made that change. I think that if we look at our, as we deal with our budgeting situation we had last year, and certainly also what we're looking at in the future, things are, they're not dim, the lights aren't closed, but I think we have to be realistic that in the last few years we have expended more monies per year than we have received and we've got to deal with that and I think one way of doing this is an approach of this on, not just the Mayor and City Attorneys salaries but I think we may see this on all salaries as we look at those and see how they're going to do then. Any other questions by anybody else on Finance? Anybody else on Council have a question? If not I'd send forward the compensation as read at the $83,500 with the CPI index for the City Attorney or Department of Law. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Gilbert. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye" except for Mr. Clemens). Opposed? (Mr. Clemens voted "Nay"). It does pass. It will go forward for a vote next week.

Moving to President of Council, 127.01 Compensation. Currently salary of President of Council effective 1-1-03 was $7430 per year. I think after some discussion we had talked about whether to do the CPI's or not on this type of thing. My suggestion here would just be to leave it exactly where it is and let it continue at $7430 and I'll incorporate, also if we're talking, if I can we'll do Council at the same time. The current Council salary is $6556 and we also would have that continue as is knowing that two years from now the Council, individual Council, not President of Council, but Council could be looked at to see how things are, how the CPI is fairing out and could be readjusted at that when the At Large seats are up. Any comments from any one from Council as to put the equity along those lines.

Mr. Gilbert: Just that I'd be supportive of that Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Any questions or concerns? If not then I'd send forward the recommendation of President staying $7430 and through the four year term and Council at the $6556 for the years possibly to be re-evaluated, potentially Council salaries to be re-evaluated at the At-Large term in two years from now.

Mr. Gilbert: So that will be different than what we have in front of us right now?

Mr. Hills: That is different because it had the CPI's going in and as we talked earlier before the meeting whether this way it doesn't do anything until two years. It just holds everything where it is now for the two years. This gives us the time frame to see how these others are following in place, see what happens in our negotiations as we go into next year, see where we are money wise and you adjust two years on Council seats. Go ahead Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: But you can only adjust for the At-Large where the Ward will have to continue at that rate flat the remaining two years.

Mr. Hills: Absolutely. Right. Well, I think we can write in, and I'll ask the legal Mr. Underwood for that. Could the Council position be written in, it shall continue at $6556 for two years and then to be considered?
Mr. Underwood: Absolutely not.

Mr. Hills: Okay. That is on that in term. Then the only Council that could be is the At-Large could be considered. Correct?

Mr. Underwood: Correct.

Mr. Hills: And the At-Large too. And I think if you look back historically we never will have any Council person except when, until you say, no more raises, there won't be a time that Council people have, the At-Large have the same as the Wards simply because it had to stagger going in. And that's why it's where it is now.

Mr. Beougher: If I may, I had gotten accustomed to what you had written here where you had the first two years being flat and then commencing January 1, 2006 it would be increasing by the CPI. That seemed to make sense to me.

Mr. Hills: First of all, the last two lines of that, that should be new language. That isn't old language. That should have been in all caps. The last two lines.

Mr. Beougher: Right. But I mean, if we're going to in two years adjust the Council salaries within the Ward terms, we're going to have to do it now.

Mr. Hills: You can't do the others. That's what the City Attorney has just said.

Mr. Beougher: Bill, correct me if I'm wrong but we can set a rate that does not increase until the At-Large terms begin and then at that time as long as the language is in there for the Ward seats, it begins increasing by the CPI for both seats. For both sides of the table.

Mr. Underwood: That's correct. You can increase it during the term if you provide prior to the term. And you're providing that two years or ________________ and then you go to a CPI and then the new Council members would be on the CPI. So I think you're alright.

Mr. Hills: Talk to me Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Well, if we don't do it now we're going to have to wait four years instead of two years. That's my point. I mean, I'm not on the Finance Committee so I'll...

Mr. Hills: No, and I appreciate your comments. To have everyone, all Council members at the same.

Mr. Beougher: Right. You know, that was the point of the e-mail that I sent to Mrs Frazier and I think everybody received that in their packet, was basically pointing out how our intent, or the previous Councils intent was perhaps not strictly followed or had some problems with it.
Mr. Hills: I'm still having trouble understanding it.

Mr. Beougher: Well, any way, you know, my point is that both sides of the table should be paid equally. We're all sitting here the same amount of time and I don't want to be paid any more or any less than you guys over there. So I mean, that's just the point of this discussion.

Mr. Gilbert: Does that not equal out though at the end of your term?

Mr. Beougher: No.

Mr. Gilbert: The At-Large Council members are not on the same scale as the Ward members at the end of your current term?

Mr. Hills: Every one on Council would be the same for the next two years.

Mr. Gilbert: Correct. And that was if I remember our discussions when we initiated the last increase, that was to put us on par for I think beyond where we are currently in terms of the rate of compensation which I think if you look at comparisons to other communities we accomplished that. Which is why I supported Mr. Hill's notion to wade in two more additional years before we implemented any type of changes.

Mr. Beougher: Well, but we couldn't implement that change during your term, or during the next Ward seats terms.

Mr. Gilbert: Right.

Mr. Beougher: So there would be a __________________ there.

Mr. Gilbert: You would be ahead of the curve you're complaining about now.

Mr. Hills: The At-Large would be at something different than the Ward, the same as the Ward and then something different than the At-Large the last time there were adjustments made.

Mr. Beougher: Right. I'm fully comfortable with your language here where you leave the current salary alone for three years and then begin basing it on the CPI beginning of the At-Large, the next At-Large terms. That seems to make a whole lot of sense to me.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I'm agreeing with Eric. If you go to the CPI, if you went this year it would be like one percent. 1.3, something like that. If we're going to sit here and worry about making another $80 a year, I'll give you the 80 bucks a year if you need it or something like that. I don't think it's worth it. I don't think Council needs an increase, President of Council needs an increase. I think we're sitting here talking about something that's really not that important. I think we forego an increase, I think we make as much or more than most communities. It is a part time job and I think we're here to do the job and not worry about eighty or a hundred dollar increase, doesn't mean a thing for a year. So, I think we'll just forego any increase for City Council and my hopes would be that whoever is here next time would forego two years from now than increase the City Council and keep it the way it is.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: I'll go with the flow.

Mr. Hills: Any other questions? Comments? I'm not sure I remember what was on the floor now. President of Council will stay at $7430. Council will stay at the $6556 for the commencement of these terms which would mean in two years, At-Large could be looked at again if appropriate and changes made on those seats. And also, I will add at the same time that's when you would consider the Auditor as we discussed earlier. Now's not the best time to be talking about the Auditor. It's two years down the road. They look at those as a block together. Okay. I'll move that forward. Is there a second? Thank you. I'll move that forward as an emergency and I also then would like to reopen both the Mayor and the City Attorney and add emergency language to them also, so as we okay this one, it does go to all four that we're dealing with as emergencies. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. All in favor state aye. (All voted "Aye"). They will go forward next week for approval as an emergency.

With nothing else to come before Council, we'll adjourn at 8:10 p.m.

Finance Committee
- -Susie Smith, Assistant Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
February 3, 2003