COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 19, 2010

Members of Community Development Committee present: Leslie Kelly, Barth R. Cotner, Chris Long, Nathan Burd.

Other members of Council present: Fred Deskins, Jr., Doug Joseph, Mel Clemens, Council President William L. Hills.

Mrs. Kelly: I'll call the Community Development Committee meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Item No. 2 on the agenda is approval of agenda. Are there any questions or changes to the agenda? Seeing none, it will stand as submitted. Item No. 3 is the approval of the minutes; are there any additions or deletions to the minutes of the Community Development Committee meeting held January 4, 2010. If not, they will stand as written.

4. ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH TRURO TOWNSHIP FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING A COMMUNITY GARDEN AT 6305 EAST LIVINGSTON AVENUE- - -second reading January 11, 2010. Are there any questions? Okay, hearing none, I'd like to make a motion to send this to Council for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Mr. Cotner. All in favor vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). And I will close the Community Development Committee Meeting at 7:31 p.m.

Community Development Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

January 19, 2010

(Transcribed - S. Cochran, Ass't. Clk. of Council)

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, January 19, 2010

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Chris Long, Fred Deskins, Jr., Nathan Burd.

Other members of Council present: Leslie Kelly, Doug Joseph, Barth R. Cotner, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I'll call the Safety Committee Meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. First item on the agenda is the approval of agenda. Is there anything anybody would like to add to the agenda or remove? If not, the agenda will stand approved. Next item is approval of the minutes of the January 4, 2010 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? If not, they'll stand approved.

Item No. 4 - Discussion: Liquor Permit Request - New - 1355 Briarcliff LLC, 1355 Briarcliff, Reynoldsburg, OH 43068. We have the Officer here.

Lieutenant McKinley: Yes, I do have that liquor investigation that was conducted and we did not see any reason not to grant that permit.

Mr. Clemens: This is the one that they're going to be working on or remodel it looks like?

Lt. McKinley: Yes, this is the business that's directly behind the Arby's on Main Street. It's actually 1355 Briarcliff, formerly it was the Battalion 8 Bar.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Are there any other questions on this? Yes Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: If I could, that's where my, I was trying to identify exactly where that is. Is the Battalion 8 now closed or are they just taking their license and leaving?

Lt. McKinley: This is a new owner. I don't know if the old existing business is actually closed but this gentleman's applying for the liquor license so he can operate the business. It'll be a different business. It will no longer be Battalion 8.

Mr. Hills: So the owner, if he still has his liquor license, is leaving the premises and that's why this would be a new license rather than a transfer.

Lt. McKinley: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Okay, that's what....

Mr. Clemens: Will this have to have a Special Exception Use Permit?

Mr. Long: Excuse me.

Mr. Clemens: Go ahead.
Mr. Long: I was going to check with Aaron and the element of whether or not the Special Exception Use Permit was issued to Battalion 8 to either the business or the owner. I'm assuming that if it's the owner, then it will have to have it reissued.

Lt. McKinley: I'm not aware of any Special Exception Permit that was applied for or, that's a building and zoning issue, I'm not sure.

Mr. Clemens: I think, Chris, I think this is something we can look into.

Mr. Long: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Clemens: We'll see what's going. I know as far as liquor permit, it's hard to turn any liquor permits down.......

Mr. Long: Yes.

Mr. Clemens: ...when there's no reason to, and if it's all right with Committee then, we'll just let this stand and take no action. With that, that ends the Safety Committee Meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Safety Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
January 19, 2010
(Transcribed - S. Cochran, Ass't. Clk. of Council)

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, January 19, 2010

Members of Service Committee present: Doug Joseph, Nathan Burd, Barth R. Cotner, Chris Long.
Other members of Council present: Fred Deskins, Jr., Leslie Kelly, Mel Clemens, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Joseph: I'll call the Service Committee Meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. The second item on the agenda is approval of agenda. Are there any additions, deletions or changes to the agenda tonight? Seeing none, the agenda will stand as approved.

The minutes of the Service Committee meeting held January 4, 2010 were approved without objection.

Mr. Joseph: Item No. 4 - Discussion: Code Compliance- - -on 7-6-09 item held; on 7-20-09 item discussed and held; on 9-8-09 item discussed and held- - -9-21-09 - *to be kept on agenda so committee can follow up and see results.* We've had it on a few more times. Most recently, two weeks ago, there was nothing at that point. Does anyone on the Committee have anything on Code Compliance tonight? Otherwise, we'll probably be moving this on to Other Legislation. Anyone on the Committee, anyone on Council? Okay, I'll make a motion we send this to Other Legislation. Seconded by Mr. Burd. All in favor, vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion carries, thank you.

Item 5 - ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT AN APPLICATION FOR ANNEXATION OF .442+/- ACRES IN TRURO TOWNSHIP, COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, STATE OF OHIO, TO THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO (John W. Wall and Elizabeth Hanna)- - -first rdg 1-11-2010. Anyone on the Committee have any questions on this tonight, anyone on Council? Okay, I'll make a motion we send this on to Council for its second reading. Seconded by Mr. Long. All in favor, vote "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Motion carries, thank you. That was our last item.

We did get a note tonight on the residential use item that was in Planning and that will be going on to Council next week for the second reading, and back to Committee, and at that point we'll be discussing that further. And with that, I'll close the Service Committee tonight at 7:35 p.m.

Service Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

January 19, 2010

(Transcribed/S. Cochran, Asst. Clk. of Council)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
January 19, 2010

Members of Finance Committee present: Fred Deskins, Jr., Doug Joseph, Leslie Kelly, Mel Clemens.
Other members of Council present: Barth R. Cotner, Chris Long, Nathan Burd, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Deskins: I'll call to order the Finance Committee Meeting at 7:36 p.m. Next item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. I have two changes this evening to the agenda. I need to remove Item No. 4, at the request of the Council Clerk. This is an appointment by the Mayor instead of the Council so it'll be addressed at a different time. I'd like to add No. 3a. Discussion by the Mayor regarding the 2010 Appropriations. All those in favor of the agenda change please say "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Thank you.

The minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held January 4, 2010 were approved without objection.

Mr. Deskins: Item No. 3a. - Mayor (inaudible) appropriations, please.

Mayor McCloud: Thank you, Chairman Deskins. I have just recently learned that after the budget went through Committee for the third time, a substantive change was made to the budget ordinance, specifically Section 4, and I guess at this point, I didn't see it, and I guess I'd like to know who made the change, who knew about it, and who didn't, and why the Council Rules of Procedure regarding amending legislation weren't followed - specifically, Article 8, Section 9 of the Council Rules of Procedure; and I don't know who can answer that because I don't know who changed it.

Mr. Deskins: Section 4 of the ....

Mayor McCloud: Section 4 of the actual ordinance, the actual Appropriation Ordinance. It has to do with the appropriation of specific funds.

Mr. Deskins: Is there any questions from the Committee?

Mr. Clemens: Yeah, what is it, I mean, I don't what you're talking about. What is it Mayor?

Mayor McCloud: There was a change after, Mr. Clemens in Section 4, the actual ordinance, after it came out of Committee for the third time, there was apparently a last minute change, then Council voted on it and it wasn't highlighted or bolded or, I don't recall any discussion on it and it creates a hardship, if not an impossibility, in some of the things the Police Department needs to do in terms of paying bills and I don't know where it came from.

Mr. Hills: I think I know where it came from. I think what you're talking about is the Seizure and Forfeiture Funds, who if you go back a number of years, it was put in the legislation through the prior Auditor and I'm not sure of the year that in essence the Seizure Forfeiture Funds no one had to bring any appropriations to Council. They could spend whatever they wanted out of those funds without notifying anybody at all. The Auditor brought that to my attention. I said when was that changed? He said well, it was changed before, it was just been carrying forward. I said, I became aware right as we were approving the insurance package that after the Police Department last year said that they could not buy marked cruisers and they got a grant for it. They turned around and bought three 2009 Hondas out of the Seizure and Forfeiture Fund. I don't know if they told you. Your name wasn't on the purchase order so I don't know if you knew or didn't know but Council certainly had no idea. I have no idea how those cruisers are being used - how those civilian cars are being used, and I think there's an indication they don't plan on buying cruisers this year out of the Seizure and Forfeiture Fund. I realize you stated you think there's some conflicts between what the City Attorney has rendered with his opinion and what else may be out there and I asked Dick, can that just be mov........put back to where it was before, where things had to come forward, and that's what happened.

Mayor McCloud: So you knew.

Mr. Hills: I knew what?

Mayor McCloud: You knew about the change.

Mr. Hills: I knew, I knew, I can't even tell you it was in Section 4.

Mayor McCloud: Okay.

Mr. Hills: I knew there was something in there that had written in approval. The Police Department, your Police Officers, who are paid by taxpayer dollars, who bring in and seize cash, drugs, whatever vehicles, and the Court rules you get to keep part of that because the Prosecuting Attorney of the County gets to keep it and the City who took it gets to keep it but those were obtained through taxpayer dollars. I was never aware that it was just freely being spent until I, when we looked at the insurance package and I found out that it was and I think that was $20,000, $40,000, $63,000 were bought in vehicles last year.

Mayor McCloud: Okay, what I'd like to do is first focus on why the procedure wasn't followed and then we can get to the merits of what, if any, of what change. I guess some of you people voted on this. Mr. Deskins, did you know it was changed?

Mr. Deskins: I didn't know it was changed (inaudible).

Mayor McCloud: Mrs. Kelly, did you know it was changed, Mr. Joseph, Mr. Clemens?

Mr. Joseph: Did not.

Mayor McCloud: You know, Council rules and procedures are pretty clear when it says deletion of existing language shall be shown by lining out the language to be removed.
Mr. Hills: I'm not sure the language is in the first and second readings. I'd have to go back and see. We had so many papers, different papers coming up here, I don't know how anyone would know that for sure.

Mr. Deskins: Mr. Harris, would you like to comment on....

Mr. Harris: That, that was changed, but it was also changed as part of what we discussed during the budget time that with the audit last year, that the State is requiring that there be a budget turned in for all those particular types of things.

One of the, what we thought was a compromise, was not; it was just to take the unexpended balance from the year before and appropriate it. They weren't particularly happy with that either. They think that money should be controlled by Council, not by the Police Department and we discussed both at the time of the audit and the changes would have to be made in order to comply with what the Auditor said.

When the light, when it came to issue that there had been cars, Police had bought cars last year, they certainly took advantage of the situation. Not only that, but with the passage of 44-08, which allowed them to go out and buy those cars without going through competitive bidding, but the discussion we had both privately and publicly concerning the requirements that as part of the Audit last year that the State wanted to see change, does require that the Police Department with those funds as with all their special revenue funds, needs to turn in some kind of budget on what they have to spend that. Council controls the spending of that money and their concern was with Council allowing me to appropriate that money any time that they get it, that Council was unduly giving up their control over the budget by not allowing them to look at things the Police Department wants to buy and so therefore, after discussion, Mr. Hills wanted it changed back to where it was back in 2001.

I did the last one to take that out and have the Police bring in a budget for what they want to spend money for, and the State certainly agrees with that. They think there does need to be a budget done in order for Council to maintain proper control over the appropriation process and therefore have control over how money is spent within the City and that's why I changed that back to what it was in 2001.

Mr. Deskins: I've got a, as we were going through, Mr. Hills said, during the budget process, I've got a number of budget proposals that were submitted and I kept them, I kept every one of them, and I guess probably a good thing I did. Back on December 14th in Section 4 and I'm assuming this is, and correct me if I'm wrong, the verbiage you're talking about Mayor, it says the Police Special Fund, Revenue Fund, 29X and Capital Improvement Project Funds, and then if you go forward to the one that we, the last one we got on December 21st, that language is out of there. Is that what we're talking about?

Mr. Harris: That's correct.

Mr. Deskins: Okay, that's........ So, what are we saying here? Did we do something? Did we change some verbiage or language that we didn't use the proper procedure or?

Mr. Harris: The State Auditor's opinion was that verbiage to appropriate that money without Council seeing a budget on how it is to be spent, is contrary to what they think a best practice is. Maybe not necessarily completely illegal under the Ohio Revised Code, but it's certainly something that they are not happy with. They think that Council should and on those special revenue funds, should be looking at what the Police Department wants to spend money on and should approve it forthwith based on the merits of what they want to buy.

Mr. Deskins: I guess the question again is, did we do something wrong, or should we get back to where we were and then fix it right, or?

Mr. Harris: According to the State, we did fix it right.

Mr. Hills: If I could add something.

Mr. Deskins: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Let me, and let me try to see if I can add more substance to this. I was, and I think the Finance Chair previously, or Mr. Clemens, was in the meeting with the Auditors where they went over these points and they were suggesting that it needed to be clarified and handled differently and that was with the Audit review, correct?

Mr. Harris: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Correct, and I remember being in that meeting and I know there'd been some meetings after that where there was discussions implementing those things through the budget and whatever other language was needed and in those meetings, it was you, the City Attorney, the Mayor, myself and I'm not sure who else was in there.

Mr. Harris: Councilman Stake was there.

Mr. Hills: Okay, and so I mean, this wasn't anything that was a hidden document being done. There had been discussion that it was going to be modified under the recommendation of the State...

Mr. Harris: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: .....and I'll be very candid. My statements earlier about when I became aware of how they've been handled, was not found until we reviewed the insurance, the one thing I told everybody to hold was their insurance package that we had, property and casualty, because that showed the purchase of three brand new 2009 vehicles, two Honda Accords and one Odyssey. We had no idea. I think if anything, we ought to be aware. Should we always have to approve it? We certainly have, are in a position we ought to be aware.

So I don't know if that closes for everybody, or is what everybody wants to hear or not, but this will certainly, is a subject matter that had been discussed and planned before I even became aware of the problem, because I think it was, when'd we have that insurance thing? December, third week of December, or something like that when it was reviewed?

Mr. Deskins: Mayor, again, what violation, what are we looking at?

Mayor McCloud: I don't believe, I've reviewed the management letter from the State Auditor's Office. I don't believe it was the State Auditor's intent that every time they, the Police Department, need to spend monies from that specific fund, which is regulated, which is highly-regulated and goes through the City Auditor's Office, that we have to introduce legislation. The Chief has an invoice from the County Prosecutor's Office dated January 11th and it has to do with forfeiture. The County Prosecutor....once they're cut, that's fine, that's the way it works, but it wants it in thirty days. We can't operate that way.

Mr. Harris: The State Auditor's letter does not say you have to bring it in every time. All they said you have to do, is some kind of budget that Council has to approve with account numbers and appropriations; therefore, you don't have to tell them exactly what's it for, but there does have to be something in the budget process that says here's, we appropriate money into these accounts. It doesn't tell them what they have to spend it for, Council can do that if they want to but they have to do just like they do any other General Fund dollars that come in here. There has to be an appropriation put into place in order to spend it.

Mr. Deskins: Mayor again, Section 9, would you please read that for me?

Mayor McCloud: Regarding amending legislation, it's Article 8, Section 9 - it says "deletion of existing language shall be shown by lining out the language to be removed. Amendments to legislation after the first reading before Council shall be made at a Council meeting". I don't know if anything else was changed in this budget and I don't know who else can answer that. Was this the only change that.....

Mr. Hills: I have no idea.

Mayor McCloud: Well, I mean, you knew about this one.

Mr. Hills: I knew about this one, yeah. I know that, you know, there were a couple positions pulled out of the budget, at your request, and they weren't taken off 160 and I guess they both have been filled so, well being filled, so I don't know if I have an answer to that. I think if I understand and correct me, you've obviously done some looking at this, the distribution between the Prosecutors and the City or he who sees the funds or the property that can be turned to funds, that's a statutory number is it not?

Mayor McCloud: A statutory number.....

Mr. Hills: Of 1/3 or ½ or ......

Mayor McCloud: I think it is.
Mr. Hills: ......and so there's a known given there, so why wouldn't one if the other, if they're looking for an ordinance, why wouldn't it be an ordinance just saying above those seized funds, the Prosecutor is going to get "x" number their percentage upon request, and you still address the situation. You've got the funds that are still accountable to someone other than just what are sitting over in the Police Department and you've got the ability to distribute from those funds through an ordinance that they would be at the statutory amount that the, once you get the release because the Court has to approve and then it has to go through the Appeals process but you can absolutely keep what you've got then the distribution comes up, the Prosecutors get their's for their efforts of prosecution and the Police Department gets their's through the efforts of the Officers that work in the Police Department that are paid by the taxpayers.

Mr. Deskins: Let me ask a question, or just a comment, and see what you guys think. What if we take this back to how it was prior to the amendment, put it back, put the verbiage back in there and then bring it back up before Council and correct it to the way you think it should be. It sounds to me like if that, if I'm hearing what the Mayor is saying, that Section 9, we did something wrong. We didn't change the, we changed the language and it's supposed to be lined out and all that?

Mr. Harris: It should be probably, but the thing, that's not going to put you in compliance with what the State wants. The State wants the Police Department to submit a budget to Council saying we want to spend out of this $100,000, $50,000 in these budget lines. That's what they're looking for.

Mr. Deskins: And what are you proposing?

Mayor McCloud: Let me do this. Let me see if I can touch base with the City Auditor and see if we can come up with a workable solution. I think as much as anything, there are two issues here. First of all, it's just the way this was handled; and then secondly, the substance of the issue and how we're going to move forward. So let me consult with the City Auditor and see if we can reach a compromise that meets the intent of the management letter from the State Auditor's Office and move forward.

Mr. Deskins: Is that satisfactory with everybody? Bill, you got any comments on that?

Mr. Hills: I think there's a way to work around the situation, because there certainly isn't any issues that are, other than this be open and transparent in what we're doing, and the Auditor wants to see it, and we as Council want to see it.

Mr. Deskins: Okay, I'll just leave it alone for now and come back and address it later. Is that all right?

Mayor McCloud: Yeah, just hold it for two weeks, if you would.

Mr. Deskins: Okay, a couple weeks, okay. Okay, next on the agenda this evening is, Item No. 5 - Discussion: Council appointment to the Income Tax Review Board to fill the unexpired term which will end September 24, 2010. They have a vacancy and that vacancy will run through September 24,

2010. Dick, you want to make some comments on this please, on the vacancy at the Income Tax Review Board.

Mr. Harris: Ah, that's a Council appointment, that's not the Auditor's appointment. Oh, the Income Tax Review Board, in case for those, the new Council people who don't know what the, that particular board is, is part of Section 191 of the Code. If there is a situation between a taxpayer and the City, as far as a disagreement over interpretation on a particular ruling by RITA or something with the City Code, they have, this is like an appeals board they can take it to.

Mr. Deskins: Is there anyone that wants to make any comments regarding the appointments? If not, if anyone has an interest, you need to get a letter prepared and sent to the Clerk.

Mr. Hills: Say by February 1 or something like that.

Mr. Deskins: Then I'll go back and address it.

Mr. Harris: Generally, it's made up of three people who are not employees of the city. I know one of the people they have had before has been a tax preparer for one of the local tax companies. I have one, and this would be the one for Council. This group has not met for fifteen years. So it's a, we had a couple of cases last year that were, or a couple of years ago, that were potentially going to be heard and they were both settled prior to the hearing so they, even though there was, we got to the point I think, we actually had to send an agenda out on one of them, they have not been heard, so, but we do need by ordinance to have this particular slot filled, the Council slot filled so that if something does arise, we can go ahead and plan a particular, to go through the process and allow people to have this appeal, but it's not something that is, you have enough time if you want to go ahead and ask for people to write in or anybody knows anybody or anything like that. It's not something that there's an imminent meeting or that they meet regularly.

Mr. Deskins: Thank you very much Mr. Harris. Let's shoot for - I'm sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Burd: I was on this Board for the last several years and resigned, having been elected to Council and becoming a City employee. We did meet a couple times just in preparation for some things, like the Auditor said, didn't end up needing us to make any sort of ruling. It doesn't meet often, but it actually is a very important board. It has the potential to make some very important decisions for the city and you get the chance to learn an awful lot about our taxation ordinances, if you're into that sort of thing so, it's a good board to be on, so I would encourage folks to apply if they have an interest in that.

Mr. Deskins: Thank you, Councilman Burd. Okay, let's shoot for the first of February with letters to the Council Clerk. I want to move on to Item No. 6 - Discussion: Then & Now (Service Department). Our Auditor's going to talk about this I think. Got some bills to pay right, Dick?

Mr. Harris: Got some bills to pay, Mr. Deskins. Every year, we, during the year end closing, we require blanket Purchase Orders to be closed up so that we can go ahead and get the end of the year stuff done. What we have here is an AEP bill that was, there was money open, the blanket Purchase Order was closed. This bill came in, it became a Then and Now because it's more than $3,000. These things, what a Then and Now basically is, someone creates a liability and there's not a Purchase Order open. When the Purchase Order's open, I have to sign that says yes, there's money available to pay these things. This just happened to be where they closed them up, it was another opened, they didn't get it opened until after the other one had come in. It's over $3,000. This is something that happens occasionally. It's more of an administrative function than it is like a, we're not asking for an appropriation of money. It's not asking for appropriation money. There was money available. The Purchase Order that this was on, I wanted to pay it on, it's still open and it can still be paid on this. The only thing is, it was opened after the date that the invoice was put on so therefore, I do need Council's authority to do it. If you look at the certificate, it says, Section 5705.41d of the Ohio Revised Code states, 'when a purchase of goods and services made prior to the Auditor's certificate, certification of available funds, (which is me, signing the purchase order), the Auditor shall prepare a certificate saying the funds were available at the time of the purchase and are still available at the time of the receipt of the invoice for such purposes. The Certificate shall be presented to City Council for it's consideration for approval. Resulting legislation shall be passed within thirty days from the receipt of the Auditor's Certificate'. It was $3,410 to AT&T and it was still available as of December 7, 2009. The Purchase Order was opened up on the 10th of December and that was already passed.

Mr. Deskins: You need an emergency on this Dick?

Mr. Harris: It is an emergency in the fact that it is required to be done within thirty days of you receiving this.

Mr. Deskins: Okay. Any questions from Committee, Council? If not, I'll make a motion we send this to Council as an emergency so Dick can pay his bills. Seconded by Mr. Clemens. All those in favor please say "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Thank you.

Item No. 7 - ORDINANCE TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE "INVESTMENT POLICY - CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG" AS RECOMMENDED BY THE TREASURY INVESTMENT BOARD- - -first rdg 1-11-2010. Any questions from the Committee, Council? If not, I'll make a motion that we refer this to Council for its second reading. Seconded by Mrs. Kelly. All those in favor please say "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Thank you.

Item No. 8. - ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING CONTRACT FOR PURCHASE OF SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE FOR CITY AUDITOR, HUMAN RESOURCES, AND WATER DEPARTMENTS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- - -read for the first time 1-11-2010. Is there any questions from the Committee?

Mr. Harris: I'd like to say a couple things about this if I could, Chairman Deskins.

Mr. Deskins: Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Harris: Just as a reminder and to go over what, this was something that was not just picked out by me. There was a group of people, including Mr. Kipp and Janet Switalski, who is the Supervisor in the Water Department, and my Accounting Manager, and the HR Department was also involved with this, as was the IT Department. We started out by actually looking at things from about 15 or 20 different people. We got down to 10, then we got down to 5.

The main reasons we decided to go with this legislation are, we can do a lot more things with this as far as eliminating paper, but more importantly, the Water Department, as they look to having to go to monthly water bills because of the collections problems in there, does not have the ability, without this particular system.

The other two systems we looked at would still require processing to be done by keypunch. When you go from 4,000 bills a month to 12,000 bills month, you can't keypunch that with three people, two of which are spending most of their time on collection problems. So that was one of the main things.

This also does a lot of things for the HR Department, allows them to do reports for EEOC and other things, FMLA, tracking all that, which they have not had the ability up to this point to do, other than manually, which becomes very cumbersome.

My department will be picking up additional work with Accounts Payable on this. We think we have the ability to do that. It will also alleviate a lot of paperwork from the second floor. It will alleviate me sending out as many checks. Many of these payables will now be done through an electronic fund transfer. Right now, check fraud's about a $12 Billion a year problem nationwide. When you start sending out checks to the City of Columbus, for 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, $700,000, I watch real close to make sure those get cashed and get cashed in a timely manner to who they're supposed to go to. So there's a lot of security reasons.

Also, other than that, with things like time, with putting time cards in, that will be....we won't have any more paper purchase orders, so I like also that our Disaster Recovery Plan, this fits in with what the State wants for a Disaster Recovery Plan. This is an Internet system that we would be able to continue processing if we were to have a disaster befall the building and blow everything up. We keep tape, the daily tapes here, monthly tapes are kept at a bank offsite in a safety deposit box for maximum security. We thought about using the State proven method. Just put them all in a laptop computer and throw it in the back of somebody's car on a Friday night and let them get stolen but we thought that probably wasn't a real good idea.

So the State has approved that type of thing for Disaster Recovery Plans so there was a number of reasons we did this.

The other two systems we looked at were not Windows system. They were not an Internet-based system. We would have probably spent $250,000 or more to upgrade the system we had and then two or three years from now, have to go back through and again do another one, which would have cost another $250,000.

So this is the system that was chosen by the Committee, along with myself, and I talked with many of you, talked about some of the questions you've had. If you have any more questions, I'll certainly be glad to answer those and I'll ask if anyone has any questions now, I'll be glad to talk about them here.

Mr. Deskins: Thank you, Mr. Harris. Are there any questions from the Committee, Council? Any Council members got any questions? Thank you very much. I'll make a motion that we move this to Council with recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Seconded by Mr. Joseph. All those in favor please say "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Thank you, Dick.

Item No. 9 - AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF BONDS IN THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $475,000, FOR THE PAYING THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING AND INSTALLING COMPUTER SYSTEMS AND RELATED EQUIPMENT AND SOFTWARE, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES THERETO, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY- - -read for the first time 1-11-2010. Again, are there any questions from the Committee, Council? If not, I'll make a motion we refer this to Council as an emergency with recommendation for adoption. Seconded by Mr. Clemens. All those in favor please say "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response).

Item No. 10 - ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ADMINISTRATIVE REIMBURSEMENT BY WATER AND SEWER FUNDS TO THE GENERAL FUND AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 22-04- - -second reading January 11, 2010. Questions, comments from Committee, Council? If not I'll make a motion we refer this to Council with recommendation for adoption as emergency. Seconded by Mr. Joseph. All those in favor please say "Aye". (All voted "Aye") Opposed. (No response). Thank you very much and I will close the Finance Committee at 8:10 p.m.

Finance Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

January 19, 2010

(Transcribed/S. Cochran, Asst. Clk. of Council)