

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

January 16, 2007

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

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

Mr. Baxter called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Baxter: The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. And first off, I'd like to take item number 5 (Discussion, Illegal aliens in the City of Reynoldsburg), and put it on hold for two weeks as we wait for some more information to come back from our Law Director, and from other sources. So I'll have this back on the agenda two weeks from now. Do I need a motion on that, Nancy?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So therefore, I so move we put this on hold for two weeks. Do I have a second? Second from Councilman Shirey. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of January 2, 2007 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). Hearing none, they'll stand as submitted.

The next item on the agenda is discussion of Priestley Drive issues - listed at request of Chairman Baxter as a result of discussion at our regular Council meeting last week. And before we get started, a couple of things I want to make sure we understand, and first off, I welcome all of my neighbors. Thank you for coming tonight and wanting to wish, and give me your understanding and expectations. It's always good to hear from our constituents; especially from my Ward. With that said, I just want to make sure we understand what some of the rules are that we have here tonight so that we can keep the meeting flowing; that you have three minutes for each speaker. And some of the ways you can make that work a little bit quicker for yourself is, if the speaker ahead of you said something that you express as well, just do it ditto. Something like Rush Limbaugh - ditto; same thing that person said. And then give me a little bit more about you know, your personal experience if you could. That way we can keep the meeting moving and hear some of your ideas, suggestions, and some of your expectations. Right off the bat, what I'm going to do first though is, I'm going to take a report from our Service Director Steve DeBolt, and maybe it'll give you some information prior to your conversations and maybe spark some ideas. So Steve, if you'll go ahead, enlighten us, please.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of Council. I wanted to address you today with a report based on the comments that were made by some of the residents on Priestley Drive last week. First of all, to members, the Administration, the Mayor, and Street Department, and members of the staff, we take the concerns to heart because we are concerned about safety. That's my major concern. So we do take these issues seriously. And that's why we wanted to

gather data to make decisions that are needed to be made. To make some changes, we want to be sure those are made based on information that's current and accurate.

Over the past few years in 2003, 2004, and this past week, the Street Department's put down cables which can record both the speed of vehicles along with the volume count of vehicles. And since most of the issues that were brought up were related to both speed and traffic counts, we thought that would be germane to update those figures that we had from two prior reports. And you have a report in front of you that both includes the 2003, 2004, and the 2007 statistics. I just would like to mention that the stats that were done this week were from Thursday, through last week, through today, this morning, through rush hour. We wanted to use at least a 7 day period. But again, with the timing, we went with the amount of numbers that we had. So what I'd like to point out is that when this report was done in 2003, and again in 2004, we found that the speeds in these locations averaged approximately 27 miles per hour. And the bottom line is, the speed limit is 25 miles per hour. And again, we acknowledged that there is speeding in this neighborhood and every neighborhood, but at the same time, you have to look at the percentage of actual speeders that are going at a speed that can be determined to be unsafe, which would probably be well over 30 miles an hour, and a speed that considered to be safe in that area, probably in the 15 to 30 mile an hour range. And when you look at the stats from 2003, it shows that there was a 50% percentile traveling 27 miles per hour. And 97% percentile was traveling up to 35 miles per hour. And then in 2007, this past week, we had a 50% percentile traveling 21 miles per hour and a 95% percentile traveling approximately 29 miles per hour. So what that shows, is that over the course of the past 4 years, and the one 5 day period that we took counts in, the average speed has actually gone down on a daily basis. Not increased during that time frame. In addition, specifically cars going over 25 miles per hour, back in the earlier time frame, ranged up to 65%. And this past week, they were down to just 14% actually going over the speed limit. So that's a pretty dramatic change. And the average speed limit was again, 27 miles per hour back in '03. And this past week _____ miles per hour.

Volume is another issue. Again, Priestley, just a little history on the background that you see here on the map. It's a vastly increasing neighborhood in terms of houses being built over the past 5 years. Not just on Priestley Drive per se, but in the feeder neighborhoods that are surrounding it. So it's reasonable to expect when you have more people moving into an area that you're going to have more population traveling on those routes as well. Again, with households having 1, 2, 3, and 4 cars, folks traveling back and forth to work and such, it's going to be an increase in traffic. And then in 2004 when we had stats based on the total volume of traffic, I'm using a stat from Waggoner and Windrift, which is the first juncture of Priestley Drive, we had an average of 3300 vehicles, 3332 to be exact, on an average basis per day. And that was a total cars of 16,798 for that whole period that we checked in '04. Comparably, this past week, that same stretch of, between Waggoner and Windrift had thirty-five thousand, eighteen hundred cars and a total of 17,445. So there was an increase in total volume during that time frame of both daily and for the total. So there's no doubt, there is increased traffic through Priestley Drive. And you can go down through the other junctures, Dickens, Higgins, and then, just Dickens itself, and you also get some increases. Now, we didn't have current information available on Dickens because something happened to the cables that were laid out. But I'm sure it was somewhat comparable with again, not a little higher than back in 2004. Therefore, there's 1657 vehicles on a daily basis that go through Dickens. And again, Dickens is the north south running lane that connects Priestley with Kingsley. And again, when you have two neighborhoods that are this close

together that are using these main two routes, you're going to have a high level of traffic. And one of the problems is, that when you have a park that's right on the west side of Kingsley, that basically, we couldn't make a thru street because of the park being there. And then Dickens is a basically, a feeder street that you wouldn't normally have if the park wasn't there. So I think you're going to see a very much increase in traffic because of that. Not only folks trying to get between the two neighborhoods north and south of Priestley, whether it be thoroughfare traffic going between Waggoner and Taylor, or just folks wanting to visit friends and family on both sides of Dickens. So I think that accounts for the higher volume of traffic on each side.

But the point is, I think most of the traffic is most likely neighborhood traffic. I don't think it's traffic going necessarily from Waggoner to Taylor. Because you're still going to have to go through a neighborhood. You have to go through stop signs. I think the average motorist would say that they'd probably go down Broad Street and go all the way through Waggoner down to Main. Or probably up through Broad Street heading east and then down Taylor Road to get to a subdivision on the other side of Taylor Road. So that was my first impression, that that was the case. That there might have been a lot of through traffic. And I'm sure there's some. But I don't think it's the majority. So the issue here I think, is between two neighborhoods connected by Kingsley and Priestley through Dickens, and how do we address that?

In comparing the traffic, not only within this neighborhood, we thought we'd compare it to some other neighborhoods as well. And what we did is, compare approximately, and that's in your report as well if you would, but I'll just give you the summary here for now. The average volume was 2300 cars traveling per day, and an average speed of 28 miles per hour in the approximate 9 or 10 other residential neighborhoods that I gave you. So again, the numbers that we show at Priestley are higher in volume, yet approximately the same as they were 4 years ago in miles per hour. But recently, it looks like miles per hour might have gone down over the past week. So 28 miles per hour is just slightly over the speed limit of 25 in most residential neighborhoods. I think it's fair to say that, if cars are traveling in that same miles per hour range in the Priestley area, it seems to be consistent with other neighborhoods in the city.

I guess in conclusion, I'd say that the fact that the speed limit has actually been reduced over the last 4 years in terms of the counts that we've taken, and the fact that the posted speed limit has been actually decreased in terms of the times it's been violated going over 25 miles per hour, 65% in 2003 down to 14% this past week, it appears that the speeding issue might be over rated at this point. Having said that, I would also like to say that the fact that there's been some media attention to the issue, the fact that enforcement and education of any issue tends to make issues brought to light. I think that's part of the process. And that's part of the solution as well. Just because there might have been additional enforcement, whether it had been this week, or media attention, I think that's part of the solution in any of these issues that we have. Making people aware that it is an individual responsibility when you're driving down any street in the city, to maintain your proper pace of speed. And having said that, what we do to regulate that through our police force is important. But the police again, can't be all places at all times. And many neighborhoods have organizations such as block watches, not only for crime, but if there is a neighborhood that they feel that speed might be an issue, maybe a block watch organization can get involved in that. So those are my summaries of the data that we found. And if you have any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them.

Mr. Baxter: Members of committee, do you have any questions? Councilman Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to make a comment. Mr. DeBolt, I think you're doing a fine job in assembling this information for us, and it's been extremely helpful. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you. Our staff's done a good job helping too.

Mr. Baxter: Well first off, I appreciate the work that you've done. I noticed right after the issue came about, we found that we had more enforcement in the neighborhood already. As well as we saw the strips down with the counters on it. So we knew what we were looking at it. The City Administration had jumped right on the problem and was going to at least address it from a point of getting the facts. But you know, if you look at the facts Steve, and I'll be quite honest with you, 168 cars speeding over 5 days is a lot of cars. That's 33 cars a day. And 33 cars flying down your neighborhood, if you only take that half, 15 of them during rush hour on a small strip, even that seems like not a very large number. But to me, living there, seeing those 15 cars fly by my house, that's a problem. And the only way I see that being resolved is, first off, is having that enforcement, especially during the rush hours. I know we need to have our officers all through the city. And I know that. I do know that the one way to solve this problem is having those officers also in our neighborhoods. So I see that happening already. And I thank the Administration. Mayor, thank you. I don't know if you had anything to do with that. But I did see it this week. And thank you so much for having those officers within our neighborhood. But you know something? I'd like to see them on Rosehill. I'd like to see them on Graham Road. I know they are. I want to see them on Slate Ridge. Because I got a call from a person tonight who said Slate Ridge is a race track coming from the high school. And that they actually drag up and down the street. I thought well, okay, that might be a little bit of an exaggeration. But you know, it could happen too. Because I've seen them dragging on my street.. Not on the curve, thank God. But yes, we have that problem throughout the city. And I only see one way to solve this problem, at least throughout the city, is stepped-up enforcement. That's one of the major solutions to this. In addition, we need to have education to our public. It's our neighbors who are speeding. It's not just people coming out of town running through our neighborhoods. It's our neighbors doing it. We need to wake up, everyone, in our neighborhoods and realize there are kids, all of our kids, and we need to slow down as a neighborhood. Not just my neighborhood, Priestley Drive. I live on Windrift. So I have a little small area off of Priestley. But the majority of my house sits across Priestley. And I also see it on Rosehill. Neighbors there and students who are driving through there from the high school. You need to know, there are people living there. Slate Ridge Elementary. One of the complaints I had was the school buses were flying down that street. We need to have a talk with our school and make sure they remind the bus, that it's a safety hazard for them to be speeding as well. Now again, that's all subjection. I'm not saying they're doing it. I'm just saying, these are the reports we're getting from the people who live in those neighborhoods. So we need to step up in many areas. Now that said, are there any other comments from committee or Council? Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: I'd just like to take this opportunity to point out that this was the reason we were asking the citizens of Reynoldsburg to approve our tax issue so we could provide more policemen. You only get what you pay for. And you know, we cannot provide more service than we have the

funds to provide it with.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate your comment and I don't disagree with it. Although I would state, that the problem existed before the request for funds. This problem has been through our city for some time. And we've needed the police officers for some time. Not just this year. We needed them 4 years ago. If I remember Chief Miller coming up here saying, we needed officers back then. So yeah, absolutely. If we had more officers, we'd be able to put more into our neighborhoods to help enforce it. But right now we have to live within our means, just like I do. And we have a problem. And the only way to solve it is taking what we have within our means and get them out there in our neighborhoods. If that means you're going to speed a little bit more on Main Street and you're going to get away with it, okay. I'm not sending the message to go speed on Main Street. What I'm saying is, don't come into my neighborhood, or don't come in your neighborhood. Because there's going to be policemen there. Don't come looking and knocking on my door to see if I'm home to rob it either. Because we're going to have a cop who's going to be in that neighborhood.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: I have a wish list also. But I guess one of the questions that I have is, where are you going to get these police officers? We don't have the funds. We do not have the manpower to have police officers everywhere you just promised. My questions is I guess, where are we going to get these police officers from?

Mr. Baxter: Ron, I would take the ones we have today and put them in the neighborhoods. We don't have nobody out there. We have somebody out there. We have a police force that exists today. And they have a full precinct, or area which they support. I would like to see them spend more of their time in the neighborhoods is what I'm saying. Take what you have and use what you have.

Mr. Stake: Well, I would too. But I don't, I've had several conversations with the Chief, Safety Director, and the Mayor. And I just don't see how we can do that. If you have a way to do that, I wish you would share it with the rest of us so we can do that.

Mr. Baxter: I would say spend 50% of their time in the neighborhood. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Stake: In which neighborhood?

Mr. Baxter: In their neighborhoods that they support. Patrol them. Not sit there and take tickets. Patrol them.

Mr. Stake: Well, I think they do that. And if we're going to enforce the traffic laws on our streets, they are going to have to do radar, and they are going to have to do tickets. They're going to have to write citations to enforce the laws that we have.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly, I agree, and I believe they should do more of that in the neighborhoods. That's my opinion.

Mr. Stake: I also have a question for Mr. DeBolt. Mr. DeBolt, that being said, and the fact that we do not, frankly, we do not have enough Police Officers to do everything that we would like to do. And there's a lot of things I'd like to do also. Do we have the ability to put cameras out on streets like this and to be able to enforce our traffic laws with cameras?

Mr. DeBolt: There is technology available now. Many of the cities around Ohio are using it. And I think the City of Reynoldsburg, we initially looked into it. There's a company called Red Flex that does stoplight photography to catch people that goes through red lights. And that's something that we're considering. They also have the technology to have what they call, a mobile van where they can go out into a neighborhood with a camera that's in a vehicle. For instance, if we wanted to put it along Priestley, it would, the problem is, it would take a man, individual, most likely an officer, to be in that vehicle at the same time. And they would therefore, clock individuals that would be speeding. And it would be documented. And they would be cited. So the technology is out there. We're looking into it again. With the shortage of Police Officers, we're trying to do everything we can to make sure we use the available technology to maintain the safety.

Mr. Stake: I'd appreciate it if you'd keep me up to speed on that. I'm very interested in implementing some of that in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. DeBolt: Will do.

Mr. Stake: Thanks.

Mr. Baxter: And Mr. DeBolt, when you and I spoke about this earlier this week, one of the things we talked about was the cost of having an officer in there. And we also spoke about, is it something that we can do with the Reserve Officer potentially sitting in there? Would that be legal? And potentially with the funds that would be generated from that type of endeavor, actually pay for that officer? Those are the things, that's the type of information I'd be looking for. Can we actually pay for that officer to sit in that vehicle and help enforce?

Mr. DeBolt: There is a possibility to have someone, such as a Reserve that was trained to maintain that type of duty. That's correct. And the funds that would come in from that would actually be a little higher in the speeding zones than they would be for a red light. And that's something that's negotiated with the company.

Mr. Baxter: And then by having that type of equipment or van sitting in the neighborhood, you're able to then have a point in where you can go after a problem. You get a call from neighbors, they can say, we're having speeding problems, you could have that vehicle out there the following day at the time they're telling you to be out there.

Mr. DeBolt: Right. Again, we somewhat use the technology, not to that level right now, when we

have the trailer, the speed trailer where it lets the oncoming motorist know exactly what their speed is, and exactly that if they are actually over the speed limit. So it's more a deterrent. Just the informational for their purposes. But it does not have any enforcement capability. This would have both the education and enforcement and deterrent at the same time.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I realize this is something that pertains to Priestley Drive. That's why we're here tonight. And I understand their problem. But if we're going to bring neighborhoods into it, if you look down here, my neighborhood, Rosehill Road, 423 citations. So we're talking about 18 on Priestley? I know where the problems are. And I've been around long enough to know that we have problems on all of our streets. But one thing we could do, and I've brought this up before, I don't know why we don't send cruisers around when they're not doing anything. A cruiser sitting along the road, I guarantee, people will slow down. Period. We do have cruisers that are sitting over there. I can go over there and count probably 12 right now, 13. And I've brought this up before. I see no reason why we can't have a cruiser sitting there and every once in a while, somebody come and move it. I know there's some neighborhoods that they'll steal the tires off of it if we don't move it within a certain length of time. But there's nothing wrong with doing that. Now the average person sees a cruiser sitting there, I guarantee you, they slow down. They're going to slow down. They don't know whether anybody's in the cruiser or not. Now I keep bringing this up, I don't think it's a big problem to do this. I mean, we do have the cruisers and we do have the personnel to move them. Move them every 2 hours to a certain section or another street. And I guarantee you, that'll slow down. Especially at a prime time in the periods of between 4 and 7 when we do have the most traffic. I would like to see it done. I'll keep bringing it up until it is done.

Mr. DeBolt: It's something that is done in the mid western states where you have a lot of states where they put a car out actually with somebody in a car, that's not a dummy dressed up officer, and they basically use it as a deterrent.

Mr. Clemens: You don't even have to put an officer in it buddy. They see that white cruiser sitting there and they'll slow down. We've got streets. We've got Priestley. We've got Rosehill. We've got different ones we could put a cruiser on. Alternate them different places and put them on Rosehill and others, but I think it's something we ought to look into. It's the easiest way for not having any patrolmen. And it doesn't take long to move them around. We stop, sit around and watch for things to happen. They can be moving those cruisers. I would like to see it done. I do know we have the equipment to do it. And it's not putting any time on the cruisers. It's not burning any gas. And I'd appreciate it if you'd look into it.

Mr. DeBolt: I'll do that. It's the first time it's been brought to my attention since I've been with the city, but I'll look into it and get back to you.

Mr. Clemens: Okay.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Clemens, I do remember talking about that about 3 or 4 years ago when we first

addressed that as a solution. Although on Priestley, I wouldn't have any mirrors on that vehicle.

Mr. Clemens: At least you could keep the tires on there. I don't know about my neighborhood.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Are there any other questions from Council members or committee members before I go ahead and start taking some names here to come up and speak? (No response). Great. Well, number one on the list here, I've got Belinda Guard. If you'd like to come up and give your name and address. (Applause). Let's try to keep the clapping to a minimum please. We don't want to hurt the next person's feelings.

Mrs. Guard: Again guys, I'm not used to this. So be patient with me. I thank you for inviting me to present to the Safety Committee, my concerns in regards to the traffic issue on Priestley Drive. First let me state, yes we have had counters and they're doing speed, but also we've had a Police Officer on our road 24 hours a day, 7 days a week since they have put those out. So as Councilman Clemens has stated, that does slow down the traffic. It's not representative of what we deal with on a daily basis. So you can look at the reports. They've been on our road consistently. So, we do still have a safety issue. Please allow me to address solutions that I have been presented. More of a police presence. Okay. Police Officers patrolling the streets may temporarily slow down the traffic, but as the city has stated, they have limited resources. And once this issue has quieted, the police will no longer patrol on a consistent basis. We have experienced this first hand. Police patrol will not eliminate the huge volume of traffic and accidents that we are experiencing. Over the last few days, we have had a consistent police presence. In this same time period, we still experienced an accident on Sunday, January 14, 2007 at Priestley and Waggoner. It is also my understanding, on this day, there were minimum of 3 traffic violations given. As I stated last Tuesday, Priestley Drive is not wide enough to handle the enormous volume of traffic we're experiencing.

One solution presented to me is for the residents of Priestley Drive to park on one side of the street. This is not a viable solution. Priestley Drive is too curvy, and cars will not be seen. Perfect example, in both incidents, my son's car was hit with no cars parked opposite of him. Another example, is that it will create a more open speed zone. The only speed deterrent is the fact that residents are parking their cars on the street, and we were encouraged to do so by the Mayor. After many years of tolerating, we are demanding a permanent solution.

A viable and permanent solution would be to remove a section of our road at Quarry Park, and place trees in this section. This has been done in the City of Pickerington. Please reference Marie Avenue, located in the Manchester Subdivision. This is providing a low cost option for the city, while eliminating the safety issues before you. Let me state again. Safety must be a priority over convenience. Is this Administration prepared to take responsibility when an individual loses their life? Who has the ultimate responsibility and authority in regards to this issue proposed? Would this be the Mayor, the Safety Director, other city officials, or a combination thereof? Whoever has the ultimate responsibility of the safety issues proven by our development, they must take instant ownership and provide us residents with immediate relief and a permanent and viable solution.

In reference to the core democratic values of American democracy, under the rule of public, or common good, our government is to provide us with general safety, domestic tranquility, and general welfare of the people. But nowhere does it state that citizens have rights

or entitle for their government to provide them with the expectation of convenience. We will not accept anything less from this Administration. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Belinda. Next on the list, I have Todd Stepp. Todd, if you'd come up and leave your name and number. Or your address I should say.

Mr. Stepp: My name's Todd Stepp. I live at 7823 Priestley Drive. The first thing I'd like to say is, Mrs. Newman, you made a comment about us residents back here not passing taxes to do for the city.

Mrs. Newman: No. I didn't direct that comment to you residents.

Mr. Stepp: I know. You directed it to the Council. But, considering we spend 50 to 74 million dollars to make Main Street look pretty, I think we could have used some of that money to address safety issues in this community instead of making a street look pretty so everybody can feel good as they drive down.

Now, on the issue of Priestley Drive, since this all started up probably 4 to 5 years ago, we did have a committee that was called Quarry Park Safety Committee that the Mayor sat on. The past Police Chief, and the past Safety Director, and I think Mr. Baxter also. We've been discussing this for over 4 or 5 years now and nothin' has been done about it. In my residence, my Ford Explorer has been hit. \$800 damage. Five weeks ago, my wife's van was hit unoccupied on the street. Totaled. My company vehicle, I've replaced approximately 5 mirrors on my company vehicle. I've replaced the driver's side on this company vehicle twice because of the traffic, the speed, and the inconsideration of people driving up and down the street. There's something that needs to be done. Either closing Priestley Drive there at the end of our development, or taking Dickerson, closing it, and making that another access to the Quarry Park there. That way you can have parking from both Kingsley and Priestley Drive so people can further utilize that park at a better manner. Something needs to be done. And as you can see, us residents are sick and tired of this City Council and old City Council sitting on their hands and not doing anything about it besides pacifying us, saying we're working on it, we're working on it, we're working on it. Well, after 5 years, are you done workin' on it yet? Obviously not. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Ginny Speich. I believe I'm killing your last name. I apologize. If you'd give your name and your address, please.

Ms. Speich: My name is Ginny Speich. I live on the corner of Priestley and Dickens. There is a stop sign in front of my house. 8075 Priestley Drive is my address. I am a 46 year old resident of Reynoldsburg. I love my home town. And I'm very sorry to see what's happened on Priestley. I only have a few minutes here so I'm just going to briefly tell you my experience on the corner. I bought the house 16 years ago before it was opened up with the new development. I bought it because I bought the property of backing up to the beautiful ravine. Not the house so much as the property was peaceful and quiet. Since it was opened and developed, it's been a drag strip. Not only has it been that, I'm ready to move because I now live in the hood. And I'm sorry to say. I'm not against the police. I'm not against anybody here. But I'm mad. And I don't think that

when you advertise the front page of Priestley Drive and then put strips out, people are ignorant of the fact that there's not going to be a cop on our street monitoring everything we do, and that we people are blamed for being the speeders. Because I stay up late on Friday and Saturday and that's when it all goes down. I've witnessed several accidents. I've called the police and I've timed them. And a lot of times it takes at least 20 minutes and the person got away. And I'm so shook up, I can't get the license plate, but I mean total cars. And I've probably seen five. I had to move my bedroom to the back of the house because I can't sleep because of all the noise of everything that goes down on the weekends on Priestley and Dickens. The stop sign has done no good. I can't get in and out of my driveway. And I've almost been cut off and hit, I can't tell you how many times.

Now as far as the crime goes, I will tell you what's happened here briefly. The side window of my house has been shot out while we've been in the living room with the lights all on by a B B gun. And the window just shattered. In addition to that, my in-laws van was sitting on the side of Dickens and the back window was shot out by a gun and went to a million pieces. I have a Corvette that I now don't have any more and we caught someone at 3 in the morning in the driver's seat stealing the Corvette. We've had a mallard duck hung with a cigarette in its mouth from our basketball rim and the whole yard trashed with bagels. Our truck was set on fire this June. I know a lot of you probably saw it. It sat there for a few days because the fire department had to investigate. The Marshall came out at 3 in the morning and deemed it as arson. Another young lady was driving by that night, it was one of the dry, hot nights of the summer, and the ravine was on fire, people. The trees were burnt up. If this young lady had not drove by, our pile of wood that we burn in our fireplace would have caught on fire with all the dry trees, and we could have had an inferno on Priestley. That was serious. And I've brought pictures to show you the truck. It was a total loss. A total wreck. If you all want to see that, I'll bring that up. I've also witnessed several hits and runs. And I have called the police. And I've even invited them to sit in my driveway if they want to, and it always happens between 2:30 and 3 when the bars close. Probably the VFW and everybody speeds through Priestley to the other side. And just several cars hit. And I can't catch 'em. But if I did, and I got commission for everyone that I catch, I'd live in a mansion in Fort Lauderdale, and not on Priestley. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, very much. Lena Little please. If you'd just give your name and your address please.

Ms. Little: Hi. My name is Lena Little and I live at 7720 Priestley Drive. I'm at the beginning of Indianapolis 500. I'm right at the corner of Priestley and Waggoner. It's gotten so bad with the traffic. We built there in 2000. And presently, we are going to sell our home. We are moving off of Priestley Drive. I just can't tell you what we go through right there on the corner. Yes, he is right. The numbers have went down over the few days that you guys monitored. And it's because in front of my house, I've noticed a police car almost every day. So yeah, the numbers are going to go down. But, once that police car leaves, then it starts up again. I've had them actually turn off of Waggoner, hit Priestley in a standard shift car, and be in third gear by the time they get past the cul de sac. That is ridiculous. We have turned off of Waggoner, we live in the first cul de sac, we turn on a signal to turn into the cul de sac, me and my husband both have almost been sideswiped, people trying to get around us to get out Priestley as fast as they can. It's getting outrageous. The school buses are the same way. We see it all. We hear it all. At the end of

Priestley right there at Waggoner is where they make their final descent, and the screeching, the noise, it's outrageous. We've also had our cars egged. We've been toilet papered. We've went through everything everybody else is going through. And for the taxes that I pay to have that property, and for me to have to go through that, and now I can't even sell my house and recoup the value because of that area, you've got to be kidding me. It's not going to happen. If I can sell, if I can come across enough money to bring that house down into market value which is what I have to do now, I will do it. I will move and kiss Priestley Drive goodbye. Because I'm sick of it. That's all I got to say.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Lauren Lebowitz. I'm sure I killed your last name too. I apologize.

Mrs. Lebowitz: Hi. I'm Lauren Lebowitz. And my husband and I live at 7872 Priestley Drive. Three houses in from you Mr. Baxter, at the corner of Windrift. We just bought and moved onto Priestley Drive last April. And to be honest with you, had I known that I was going to be living on a drag strip, we probably wouldn't have bought there. Again, we bought the house because of where it was located. The pond and the trees in the back, and just really liked it. Mr. Clemens, your comment earlier about when there's police on the street, and I know other people have mentioned this, yeah, in the last week, people have slowed down. I find it hard to believe the statistics that you were saying, it was an average of 28 miles an hour. Because I'll tell you what, I spent a lot of time sitting on my front porch or in my garage because I happen to be a smoker, but I don't smoke in my own house. So I see these cars going up and down, up and down, and they're doing at least 40 miles an hour. On January 6, we had a Police Officer who came and sat in our driveway. No wonder people are slowing down because they see him sitting there. Just this past Sunday though, Sunday morning between 9 a.m. and 10 a.m., I saw him pull over three people and issued a traffic citation on a Sunday morning. Not even a peak time. People are flying down Priestley. A lot of times I'm afraid to step out into the street to my mailbox because people don't slow down. They may go around you, but they don't slow down. Same thing that some other folks have said. You know, having to wait to get in and out of your own driveway. And also, with the strip that you've put down this week, I think you have to take into account the fact that we've had a lot of rain. A lot of heavy rain. Most people I think, slow down anyway when it's raining hard. So I don't know whether we're getting good representation of what the traffic situation really is. It's very disappointing. And like I said, had we known what Priestley Drive was like, we wouldn't have bought there. And I'm asking you as a citizen now of Reynoldsburg, I love the neighbors, I like where we live, I love our house, please do something and don't wait until somebody gets hurt. Thanks.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you so much. And I agree with you, it is a beautiful place and I do love living there myself. Jodie Thompson, please.

Mrs. Thompson: Hi. My name is Jodie Thompson. I live at 7878 Priestley Drive. I wanted to state that my husband and I moved back to Reynoldsburg after being gone for about 15 years. We moved into Reynoldsburg because I loved the schools. I love the neighborhood. I lived here when I was a child and I just couldn't think of any place else to come back to. I love my house but I hate my road. My main concern is the safety of my children. I have two young boys that I don't allow to play out in the front yard. They must always play in the back which is very difficult

when a 7 year old is trying to learn how to ride his bike without training wheels. But it's impossible for me to let him do that for fear that somebody will not stay on the road, which they have done more than once. Since I've started complaining about Priestley Drive back in 2003, 2004 when the traffic studies were originally started, I do believe that the speeding has been reduced. Most of my neighbors will probably disagree with me. And fortunately for me, unfortunately for them, I have never experienced vandalism. So that part of it I can't speak to. I just feel that we need to address the volume issue on that road. If you reduce the volume, it just comes to light that you will also reduce the amount of vandalism, the amount of speeding. Everything else will fall into place if you could just reduce the number of cars that is coming through that road. As Mrs. Guard stated, that road is just not equipped to handle it. Whether it was poor planning from the city, poor planning from M/I, I'm not sure who it was. But if you compare it to Rodebaugh, who is currently opened, or Firstgate, those roads are much wider. They can handle larger volumes of traffic with the cars parked on the road. I'm all for closing Dickens. I don't feel that they should have access to our neighborhood. They didn't have access prior to Priestley being opened. It's been stated before that it would inconvenience the people in those neighborhoods. Why should I be inconvenienced for their convenience? They didn't have access to Waggoner prior to this neighborhood being opened. And I understand the philosophy is to flow traffic through the city easier, quicker, as we all do. We all hate sitting in traffic. But we are not a thoroughfare. We are not a Rosehill. We are not a Lancaster. We are not Brice Road. We are a neighborhood. We should be addressed as a neighborhood, and we should not have this amount of volume coming through this road. If you reduce, get rid of the traffic that's coming through Dickens, from your report of 2004, 1600 cars. How many of those are speeders? How many of those are vandalized? Did any of those set her truck on fire? You know, you don't know. You can't answer that. It would not impede buses. It would not impede trash collection. It would not impede any emergency vehicles needed. There is no reason for that road to be open for those neighborhoods to have access to mine. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Jodie. Thomas Guard. Good evening, Tom.

Mr. Guard: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Nice to see you tonight. Since my wife only had three minutes to present her statement, what I'd like to do is read to you her closing statement if that's okay. If I might add just a little thing at the end for myself if that's permitted.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Go right ahead.

Mr. Guard: What has the residents of Priestley Drive residing within Quarry Park, proven to the City of Reynoldsburg within the last 6 years and notably within the last 7 days regards to this traffic issue? One, we approved beyond a shadow of a doubt, that there is a safety issue that needs to be immediately addressed and resolved. Two, we have proven that the volume of traffic is too excessive for the width of our street. Three, we have proven financial loss. Four, we have proven domestic disturbance. Five, we have proven that this problem has become progressively worse. Six, we have proven incompetent planning when approving our development. Seven, we have proven little or no relief from the city which is being presented with these issues. Eight, we have proven that our community has been disrespected from commuters. Nine, we have proven that we are fearful in our own community. Ten, we have proven that this city can no longer

ignore this problem as a record of fact and has been presented to you for immediate action. Now that we have proven the above, how do we resolve these issues?

It is my recommendation that this administration meets with the residents of Priestley Drive within Quarry Park and agrees to a viable solution. We must, as a community, come to a resolution that we all can agree to. And she says thank you and have a nice evening.

Now for myself, I fly in tankers for the National Guard. And I've been doing this for like 34 years. And with a continuing war on terror, I find myself more and more being called away from home. So I put to _____ if you guys can really help us out. As for me, when I go on the road and stuff, I can't be concentrating on my job, which is flying in tankers over enemy territory, and worrying about my family at home. If they're going to be alright or if I'm going to get a call from the Red Cross or what have you. If you guys can come up with a solution for us, I personally would be really grateful. Especially when I'm overseas doing a job. If you guys can take that in really good consideration, not only for me but for other _____, I'd really appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Guard, thank you for your comments, and your service. Tina, and I'm sorry, I can't read the writing on the last name. I think it's M-R-A-Z. I'm sorry. I couldn't read the last spelling. I'm sorry.

Ms. Mraz: I'm Tina Mraz. 7921 Priestley Drive. I'm just east of Brett's corner. And on a real straight stretch there where we do get a lot of speeders. And I was surprised at the statistics you had, but then realizing that the Police Officer had been there, I'm thinking it may not be real accurate. And I was wondering, what is the cost of putting out that car speedy, count the car thingy that you put out? And could we do that again to get a more accurate count? I had another question about speed ridges, or some type of thing that I know has been brought up before and they have said, I thought, the thing that I heard was, they can't plow the streets because of the ridges. But I see them in other places and I'm sure they must plow the streets. I don't know how that works. But these are just some questions that I had. And that the width of our street is like, someone did mention, some of the other streets that are very much thoroughfares, are wider than our street. Today I watched the bus trying to go between two cars parked on the street and it was very close. And then my other question is, we had a survey through our Quarry Park community there about putting gates in and that we would be responsible for all of the street stuff if we put gates up. That we would be responsible for the things that the city would do. That we would have to do those ourselves, like the snow and whatever else that was. And I was just wondering why we as a resident would, just because we had gates up, would we be responsible for the street stuff then? So I just have questions. I don't really have any answers. And I hope you guys can come up with some. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Well, I know I can answer one of those. Steve DeBolt, I believe we still have the counters out on the street. As I came here tonight, I did see them still there. So we are still counting as we go on. And I do recognize that we did have the officers there, and I would expect the speed to be reduced. And I'm surprised that we had 167, if you go with the 10%, not even 14, speeding, knowing there were cops there. Hopefully they got a good number of them. The last one I have here, Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Let me answer one question. I think the lady brought up about gates, a gated community. A gated community is a private community. Those are public streets. You wondered why you would have to take care of them. First place, if it was a gated community, you'd have to buy back the street. The streets are public streets. They're owned by the City of Reynoldsburg. We take care of them. We take care of the right-of-ways. We take care of the lighting. We take care of all of that. A gated community is a community that you pay for your own streets, your own street lighting, you have it all done, and it's a gated community and you take care of it. That's the difference between what it is now and what it could be. And that's the difference between a gated community and a not gated. It's all public now. You can't close off public streets. And we don't do that. If you have a gated community, you put the streets in yourself. You put in your street lighting. You put everything in the right-of-way and you pay for everything that's there. The streets, the lighting. You pay to take care of it. You pay to do whatever has to be done. It's assessed to each property owner. And nobody comes in your gated community. That's the difference between the public streets, public right-of-way, and a gated community.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you for that information Councilman Clemens. I have one remaining yellow slip here. And I believe it's Cathie Dill.

Ms. Dill: Cathie Dill, 7951 Priestley Drive. I feel this is deja vu all over again. I was here on the first meeting, 5 years, 5, 6 years ago, and it was standing room only. The same issues are here tonight. That's frightening. We too decided to stay in this community because of friends, because of our church, because we love the community. Our children graduated from Reynoldsburg. However, things have changed so much. First of all, with all due respect, I understand about your clicker for the, it has a special name, I'm not thinking of it at this point. But what, I don't know that you, I don't know why you put it out when you did. However, it was a holiday weekend. (Tape Change). Knowing full well, if people have Monday off, they are also going to take Friday off because you have this nice long weekend to spend, your kids aren't in school, to spend with your family. So I think we need a more viable, accurate, time frame with that. And I understand why you did it, when you did; however, buses are a problem. What they do, having been in public education, I know exactly what they do, they come down Waggoner. Because then they can make a right turn onto Taylor, and then a right turn off of Main Street. They don't have to do the left turn. Well, this is the end of their shift, and friends, they fly. They do fly. I have a suggestion, because I've seen it work in another community as far as how we could afford another policeman. We have the perfect street ladies and gentlemen. I'm on the straight away right with Tina. Boy they just fly. Someone, and I've offered my driveway many times, sit there with your radar, get that, click it. Then have another policeman down with Mr. Baxter. They can pull those cars off right there on Windrift, won't impact any of the rest of the travelers, and they can just, they've got them, they've got them, dead to rights. You do that for one month, I guarantee, you could pay for two cops. Not just one. Because they fly. Do it coming and going. It would work. It works in other communities. Please don't ignore us. This is a good community. But you've heard, you're losing people and we can't afford that. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Before we start, I think there's something that should be said so everybody understands this. I was here 5 years ago when we went through this. Mr. Baxter as a matter of fact was a speaker for the community.

Mr. Baxter: I was on the other side.

Mr. Clemens: On the other side. And did a good job. And I know a lot of you people were here. I know there was a committee for it. I wasn't here Monday night because of illness in the family, but I was surprised to read in the paper about last Monday night's Council meeting. Because in the last 4 years, I have heard nothing about Priestley Drive. I thought things were going fine. I don't think any other Councilman has heard anything. It hasn't been before Council. We haven't discussed anything. I assumed that everything is working fine until all this came about. So as far as I'm concerned, this is something that if it's been going on, I didn't know about it. And I apologize. So I feel that way. I just want to tell you that. Because I know I don't miss any meetings. And as far as I'm concerned, this is the first really major problem that's come as far as the speeding and so forth. I realize we've had, it's been brought to, speeding on Priestley. Well certainly there's speeding on other streets and we have to accommodate that. And that's been spoken about here. But as far as the theft and as far as all this that the police need to handle and the continuous speeding, no, I haven't heard that that's been that big a problem. I mean, I see how we can correct it, and I think there's been good suggestions tonight. I have no problem with closing Dickens if the Mayor and the Safety Department look at it and feel that's a viable way to do it. To me that seems like the simplest way to do it. And if it doesn't, my fact of the whole thing has always been the safety issue of getting fire trucks, squads in, because we owe it to the people also that live behind you. To get the squads in and get them out. As far as, they could come in Main Street for the other section. Dickens would not hurt that part and I would have no problem with it if the Mayor and the Administration would look into it and thought that was viable, I would have no problem with that. Part of it, there's another thing we could put up, and I've always been opposed to it, and that's street bumps. That does slow people down, believe me. If you put the right type in. I have no problem with that. I've always had a problem with it but if it's a major issue as far as the homeowners in that section of town, I have no problem with doing it and seeing how it's handled. I think we're receptive to these different ideas that's brought forward to us. And I think it's something we'll look into and I know that Mr. Baxter will and I know that I will. Because I was Service Director and I know what the problems are. I've been down that route on all these streets. Because people do not care how they drive. Period. Whether it's your children, my children, or your neighbors, they don't really care. So it's a problem all over Reynoldsburg and I'm willing to help any way I can. But I'm sorry that I didn't know that we had created such a problem. I was hoping that it had been handled. And as far as I was concerned, the major part of it had been. And I want to apologize for that part of it. Now, I'm sorry.

Mrs. Guard: (Inaudible. Speaking off mike).

Mr. Baxter: Would you step up to the mike so that you can be picked up? Because your voice will not be heard on the mike. And if we can keep this down to about 3 minutes, Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah. I talk too long, you know.

Mr. Baxter: I know. You're like I am. We both have a large vocabulary that we like to use often.

Mrs. Guard: I may be wrong, but it's my understanding that you're the legislative body. Correct?

Mr. Clemens: That's correct.

Mr. Baxter: Right.

Mrs. Guard: So what we've been doing, is we have been doing what we are supposed to do. Having meetings with the Mayor. I've personally met with you regarding this issue. I have personally met with our Service Director. I'm sorry, Safety Director. I apologize.

Mr. Baxter: He's both.

Mrs. Guard: Several other citizens have done the same thing. But you know what? Nothing's being done. If one of us at a time are going to individuals within the city, they have ignored it. The reason I brought it to City Council sir, is because they haven't done anything. We have presented these issues. When I talked to several residents, they've all, many of them told me, well I've went to the Safety Director. Our previous Safety Director has met with several of our residents. I know it wasn't you. She did meet with several of our residents. We're going to put speed bumps in. We're going to do something. We're going to close Dickens. She gave us every excuse and did nothing. So we have been to the city. And the only reason we finally came to you sir, is because my son's car was hit twice within three weeks.

Mr. Clemens: I just wanted you to know. I didn't know about all this.

Mrs. Guard: But that's why, honestly, that's why we haven't been back to City Council. We understand the only way to present this is going through the actual city officials. So we're coming to you because we've had enough.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thanks, Mrs. Guard. Appreciate it. And I see Councilman Stearns. You'd like to say something?

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Baxter. I have listened, and there have been some very good ideas here tonight. And I know there are some great concerns by everyone here. And I know we as a city, want to do something about it. But I think that there are some things that we probably ought to start with looking at something like Mr. Clemens said a while ago was about the speed bumps. I think the speed bumps might be a good beginning to help this situation. And if that doesn't work, we can look at other things. Now if the people in the neighborhood are in agreement with it. But that's just one of the things that I'd like to say in support of what you, what problems you have and a solution to the problem that you're having.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, sir.

Male: Can I speak?

Mr. Baxter: And your name is sir?

Mr. Shaffer: Gordon Shaffer. I'm sorry, I was working. I couldn't get here to sign up.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. If you'd step up to the mike and fill out one of these yellow slips here after you're done, and leave it with Nancy Frazier so we have it on record. So if you could give your name and your address please.

Mr. Shaffer: My name is Gordon Shaffer. 7953 Windrift. And I have a letter that was submitted to the management office. And I don't know if you got one but I want it officially given to you so that you do have it. I'm retired military. I lived in Washington, D.C. for 30 years. I lived my life trying to beat the traffic going through cut through streets. I know what it's like. And I also saw every form of implementation. Every form. And I know what worked. And I know what slowed me down. I know what stopped me. I've seen everything. And I've seen nothing happening on Priestley. And had I known, I might not have moved in there. Speed humps is what you're looking for. Not speed bumps. Speed humps are 6 to 8 feet in width. It'll bottom out a car so fast. There are plenty of other things that we could use, but maybe not because of the size of our community. That's one thing. If you want my advice, you know where to find me. And I'll fill out the slip. I have lived it and I've seen what works. Secondly, with the parking on Priestley as it is, so narrow, how many people have ever had to stop and back up to let traffic through? Let me say, the first time an EMS vehicle does not make it, it could be 10 or 30 seconds too late and somebody dies, there's going to be litigation. I can guarantee you that. And it's going to be us that pay for it and the City of Reynoldsburg. Because you can't get through the street sometimes. And that's ridiculous. And like I said, I've seen everything living in a big metropolitan area. And let me say, the speed in Reynoldsburg, I've seen more lawlessness in Reynoldsburg than I have in plenty other places of the United States. And I'm not sure what that's all about. But I'm very surprised by it.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. And I thank you for your comments, sir. Okay. I would like to address one last issue about this. We haven't focused on this point yet and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Safety Director. I know he and I have spoken about it and that is Waggoner Road and exiting Priestley onto Waggoner Road. Not too much problem at 2 a.m. in the morning. Not too big of a problem sometimes at 1 p.m. in the afternoon. But don't try it during rush hour. It is impossible to do so. The only option you have is a right-hand turn. And that's to head right. And guess what we're doing? We're now becoming part of the problem. Because what do I do next? I hang a left on Rodebaugh and now I'm becoming their problem. Twenty-five mile an hour right through that neighborhood. And I'll bet you'll find you've got some pretty good number of citations on Rodebaugh as well. And I'd lay you numbers that they're probably coming from Priestley in our area. Why? Because we don't have an option. We can't get out as a left-hand turn. And that's because of the obvious reasons. To the right, it drops off. You

can't see the traffic coming. It's 45 mile an hour there. To the left, you have them coming from St. Pius area. It's a blind curve. You can't see them coming that way until it's too late. They're speeding up to 45 mile an hour because that's right where it increases. So as you try to pull out, it becomes very difficult. I would recommend Mr. DeBolt, that we get that speed reduced. We have a great argument. Waggoner Road looks identical to Graham Road. We have a school there. We have houses that abut to Waggoner Road. And we have communities attached to that road all up and down the road. And I know we spoke about it and we thought that we might be able to get at least a section of that slowed down. That at least might make it a little bit easier for us to pull out on Waggoner. Second option obviously, is a light. I've heard the repercussions of having a light put at where you live Mr. Stake, over at Rodebaugh. There was discussions of potentially having them there, and Firstgate.

Mr. Stake: I live near there. That is a four-way stop. That's a four-way intersection unlike Priestley. Yes.

Mr. Baxter: It's a four-way intersection. Correct. And unlike Priestley, which is a three-way intersection, I know. I've seen the disaster in that same area. I can't see trying to get out.

Mr. Stake: It's very difficult to get out of there. Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So we need to take a close look at it. It's not just a Priestley issue. I see the same problem you have in your area just driving by it. You can see the cars stacking up on both sides trying to make a left-hand turn. It's very difficult at 45 mile an hour. So I recommend we slow the speed down, and potentially look at some lighting in that area to try to make it a little bit easier for our residents to get in and out of this neighborhood. Okay now, I've given everybody quite a bit of time to talk. So if you'd like to, by all means, go on the web site and give me some more of your information, because we've taken quite a bit of time here tonight on this discussion and I don't want to hold this up any longer for our meeting tonight.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter, if I could just add a suggestion?

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Go right ahead, Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: I think this is a very, very important issue. And I would like to see another hearing on this, a public hearing. Whether the Safety Committee, I'll defer to the President on how that should be handled. But a public hearing where we can get the Priestley Drive residents, other people who are maybe affected by this, in the room and let's talk about this. Of course, in a civil manner and respectful, and see if we can come to a solution that helps everybody.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I think the best way of doing that is recommending that in two weeks when we have our Safety Committee meeting again, let's have a separate Safety Committee meeting at 7:00 that can run for a half an hour, just specifically devoted to this problem. Talking about problems. Talking about solutions and what recommendations that we can get. And I think that would be a right way to go. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: And I agree. But I would like to have the Mayor and the Safety Director, Service Director look into the possibility of Dickens. What the problem would be if there would be any problem.

Mr. Baxter: I'll go one step further. I like the idea of putting a park between. Right across the street of Priestley and see those wonderful trees that are on the left and go all the way across to the right. That would make me really happy. But I know that's stretching it. But I think that would be the best way to go, in my mind.

Mr. DeBolt: I could address that, Mr. Chairman. A couple points. A lot of good things are brought up to that. I just want to point out that this is a give and take process. Just like the legislative process and making decisions on the administrative level or a legislative level. The residents' concerns are well-founded. But at the same time, we have to make public policy based on the facts as we know them, with the information that is accurate. And again, nobody doubts the instances have happened to residents throughout the street. But at the same time, we have to make a decision based on what's good for not just the folks that are here that have had things happened to them, but other neighbors as well, including thoroughfare traffic. But having said that, we have been looking at some issues, and hopefully solutions as well. And some of those include, potentially, speed bumps. I've got some prices on them. And again, whatever we do is going to cost money. One of the first things that was brought up was potentially widening Priestley Drive. And again, that was a design matter at the beginning of the process. And to go back now and to change that, we're talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars which just isn't a practical solution right now. And would that actually solve the problem that we're talking about is another issue. And traffic studies would have to be done just to see if that's even feasible. But having said that, speed bumps are maybe a legitimate solution. We'll even look at Dickens. I mean, Dickens Drive, as I said, 1800 cars a day. That's 1800 cars that would have to be rerouted some other way to their destination. Again, to the residents of Priestley, I know that would be something they'd like to see. But again, once we say we're going to do that, there might be a lot of residents on the other side of Dickens that might have equal concerns. And I think we're obligated to hear them if we want to put that on the table.

Mr. Baxter: And I think a public hearing would give that opportunity.

Mr. Clemens: I agree. That's why the public hearing would be good, I agree.

Mr. Hills: I do agree that there needs to be some more public input. And I think that, same for the administration, they'd like an opportunity to evaluate some that's been said tonight and come back with some suggestions. I want to say something that I'm afraid may upset some people. But I can tell you, as you close Dickens, and I'm at 8175 Priestley, I don't go to Waggoner unless I'm going north to Broad Street. That's the only time I drive that way. I go to Dickens, Crestview, Main Street. And I drive downtown every morning. Downtown Columbus. When I come to City Hall once or twice, however many times a week I'm here, I go Dickens and then down to Main Street. So I can assure you, if you think you have traffic now, you will lose your Kingsley traffic if you close Dickens, but you will now get your Priestley Drive traffic going right on through. Now maybe the numbers aren't the same. But I see my neighbor sitting back there,

Bob. And I know Bob. I think he drives the same way. If you're going to get to Main Street from where I live on Priestley, you go Dickens, Carlyle to Main. You don't go out. If you want to go north to Broad, then you go to Waggoner and turn right. But I can see my neighbor standing there agreeing with me. But we have the speed. We have the speed. We have the food. We have the liquor bottles. We have the noises. We've got the people that, for some reason there's a white van at 3:30 in the morning that likes to argue on the way home with his girlfriend standing out in the middle of the street. And I look to the police. I've called about that. It's not that we haven't raised those issues on other parts of Priestley. But I have talked to the Mayor and I've talked to yourself, and they are there. And I wish I could say they're not going to be there. But it is an issue and I'm very concerned about the Waggoner, the Windrift, to Noyes, to Dickens area. But it is a bigger problem all over the city. And we need to look at some way to address all of those issues. But I do sincerely appreciate everybody's comments here tonight. And I think we need to give the Administration, Safety/Service Director, the Police Department, some time for some input and then certainly see what type of recommendations may be made, or may be possible to consider rather than being made and then have more public input.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Thank you, President Hills. And I do find it rather odd that we're actually blaming our Police Department for slowing it down when we actually wanted the numbers bigger to come here to Council with. Sorry about that, Lieutenant. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Is two weeks long enough for you to be working on this? Or would you rather have more time?

Mayor McPherson: Well, we've been working on it since the last meeting. Give it another couple of weeks, I think we can have the majority of the information that we need. It's just going to be a matter of assimilating that information. And Mr. Hills was quite right when he said, whatever resolution that we come up with for Priestley, probably should be the same resolution we have on our other streets. You know, I think everyone's aware, you've seen the numbers tonight of many of the other streets that have much more serious problems than Priestley. To the point you know, on my own street, we just had a death there. And we've been complaining about that for years. So you know, it's not, you know, it's just a matter of, what do you do? You know, what can a municipality afford to do? You're not talking about just making a correction on Priestley. You're talking about making a correction at every street we have in the city that has the same problem. And I can assure you, there's dozens of them that have the same problem. And you know, the comment was made about the police, they're slowing traffic down. I can assure you that even if the police weren't there, we'd get the same numbers. They weren't there in '04. They weren't there in '03. You know, other than to do their normal job. But you also need to look at, if we have an officer on a shift sitting for 1 hour or 2 hours on Priestley, that means they're not sitting someplace else on one of the other streets. They're not on Firstgate. They're not on Taylor. They're not on other streets that we're having some major problems on; that we're having accidents on; that we're getting reports of people passing in the passing lane. You know so, you know, I don't want to minimize the Priestley issue because it shouldn't be. It's a serious issue. But it is also an issue that we're having citywide. And when you have the limited number of Police Officers we have, that's why we started looking at Red Flex months ago. We tabled that because if you'll remember, there was a Senate Bill that was just passed, I believe was vetoed by

the outgoing Governor. So now we're back on track to start looking at these again. But you know, there was no point of putting up these cameras when we weren't going to be able to enforce it. So it's not as if we're not doing anything. We are. But you know, again, I was not made aware that, you know, there were commitments by the previous Safety Director on what we were going to do. Those discussions then, they never got to me.

Mr. Hills: And also they apparently didn't get to Council.

Mayor McPherson: Apparently they didn't get to Council either. So you know, those are issues, you know, and I'm not going to go back and find out why because it's not really relevant. The relevancy is that there is a problem there just as there is, Graham Road is probably one of the biggest problems we had. And when you looked in there, you look at the speeding violations and you look at the number of accidents. And I don't have them in front of me but wasn't it 30 or 40 accidents there in just one....

Mr. Baxter: You're looking at 27, Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Twenty-seven accidents there in one year. You know, that's a horrible record. That street's probably more narrow than Priestley is. I'd have to go check it. But I'm pretty sure it's more narrow than Priestley.

Mr. Baxter: Take my word on it, it's not.

Mayor McPherson: I don't know.

Mr. Clemens: The problem is....

Mayor McPherson: I'm sorry Mel. But just to summarize, we are looking at this. We're looking at Priestley. We're looking at all the areas. You know, it's not just your Ward. It's Doug's Ward. It's Preston's. It's Mel's. And Mel and I have talked at length about some of the problems that we've had. You know, and Haft Drive is one of the serious areas that we have. You talk about speed, and accidents, and litter, it's horrible over there. The same way, you know, I go out probably every morning and pick up the beer bottles out of my lawn. But I understand that. Because they know where I live. You know, and that's just part of being Mayor. You clean your yard up every morning.

Mr. Baxter: Yeah, but you get to put them away when you're done with them.

Mayor McPherson: I recycle them, Mel, I'm sorry.

Mr. Clemens: And I understand the problems. And I understand the problems throughout the city. And I do know the problem that you're speaking of. But if we can correct the problems on Priestley by speed bumps, or by closing one road, that eliminates one section that we don't have to worry about no more. And what I'm trying to think about is, Graham Road, we forced the problem on Graham Road, the accidents, because we detoured all the traffic off of Taylor. One of

the worst streets, and I brought it up before, in town, is Rosehill, and Haft Drive. And I don't come down here complaining about it because I know the school lets out. And that's where all the school kids go up and down the street. And we do all we can to stop that. I know there's streets all over town that we have our problems with. And as you say, it's going to take time and money to fix them. But if we can fix them one at a time, and if we can get this one fixed the short way and get it out of the way, then we can move onto another one. And I know we can't do them all at once. We don't have the money and we don't have the protection. But I'll leave it up, like I say, to the Administration and see how you present it back.

Mayor McPherson: Well I guess the short answer to your question, in a couple of weeks we could probably have something. Wouldn't you say Steve?

Mr. DeBolt: Yes. We've already kind of started down that track.

Mayor McPherson: Because we've been working on it now for almost two weeks.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. And seeing the length this meeting has gone tonight, I don't feel comfortable taking that same amount of time away from the rest of the committees that they're looking to get their work done as well. So I would propose that we have a meeting ahead of time at 7:00 focusing on this issue specifically and have a special Safety Committee meeting next Tuesday at 7:00. Do we have time on the schedule for that Nancy?

Mr. Hills: There's time but I suggest, is a half hour going to be enough?

Mr. Baxter: I don't know that. I'm questioning....

Mr. Hills: Why don't you set a special Safety Committee meeting for this issue only, at 6:30?

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I'm okay with that.

Mr. Hills: And that way you have one hour to discuss the issues before you'll adjourn. And then you can address it back in the Safety Committee if there was additional material.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Everybody okay with that from Council who would like to be there? Then I'll go ahead and recommend we do that. Councilman Clemens, do you have a comment?

Mr. Clemens: Well, there's a strong possibility that I can't be here due to illness in my family. But go ahead and have it. If I can be here, I just can't, I can't make that promise at the present time.

Mr. Baxter: I understand. But I have heard your comments and I'll make sure I champion them for you. How's that? Alright. I thank you everybody for this issue. Unless there's any questions or concerns, I'll go ahead and move on to the next issue.

That's item number 6, AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE APPROPRIATION

OF A PORTION OF THE UNSPENT BOND PROCEEDS ON DEPOSIT IN FUND NO. 440 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE CITY'S CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE COST OF IMPROVING MAIN STREET FROM THE BRIDGE OVER BLACKLICK CREEK TO APPROXIMATELY 365 FEET WEST OF TAYLOR ROAD, BY PERFORMING PAVEMENT REPAIRS, INCLUDING PLANE AND RESURFACE PAVEMENT WITH ASPHALT CONCRETE, REPLACING LOOP DETECTORS AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS, AND REPAIRING AND REPLACING CURBS AND RAMPS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Legislation had been recommended for adoption as an emergency on 9-1-07 but was returned to committee for additional language to be incorporated. Okay, with this, I believe this is yours Steve? I thought so. And one of the things that I was supposed to read in here was including planing and resurfacing. I thought we said we weren't going to be doing planing on that portion of it. Is that true?

Mr. DeBolt: It's a mill and fill.

Mr. Baxter: Just a mill and fill. Okay. Because I read that, I was assuming we're going to go do the deep ____ on the street and I thought we said that wasn't going to happen.

Mr. DeBolt: No. That wasn't the plan from the _____.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Very good.

Mr. DeBolt: I would like to add though. A question came up at one of the last meetings regarding the brick sidewalk inlays, what would happen with them. And that is an original contract to preserve those. So they will be protected. Therefore, we won't have to worry about those.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. I know Councilman Clemens, you had some questions on that. Did you get your questions answered?

Mr. Clemens: Right.

Mr. Baxter: Then are you satisfied with the legislation as it stands right now?

Mr. Clemens: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: So then, are there any other questions from committee? (No response). From Council? (No response). Then are you looking for us to move this to Council next week as an emergency and get it passed?

Mr. Hills: I believe this is for the special meeting tonight. We have a Council meeting....

Mr. Baxter: It is for the special meeting tonight. Okay. Very good.

Mr. Hills: In order to meet the time frames established....

Mr. Baxter: I guess President Hills, if I was paying attention to that section of the agenda, I

probably would have known that.

Mr. Hills: That's what I get big bucks for I guess.

Mr. Baxter: I paid attention to my section and missed the rest of it. So I apologize.

Mr. Hills: No problem. It'll be for the special meeting tonight.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Thank you. So with that said, I'll go ahead and recommend that we send it to the special Council meeting after this meeting tonight with a recommendation of adoption as an emergency.

Mr. DeBolt: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Do I have a second on that? Second from Councilman Shirey. All in favor? (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). The motion carries.

The next ordinance is, ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEXUALLY ORIENTED OFFENDER FROM ESTABLISHING RESIDENCE NEAR SCHOOL, LICENSED DAYCARE CENTER, LIBRARY, PUBLICLY OWNED PLAYGROUND OR PARK LAND, THE REYNOLDSBURG SWIM CLUB, AND ANY PRIVATELY OWNED LAND USED AS A YOUTH SPORTS FACILITY. And this had a couple of readings already here and it's ready to go to its third reading. And what I had asked that the committee members do was, take back some of the information that they've had over the last several weeks, I've also summarized some of the points here that I've handed out again tonight that I read into the record last week. And I ask that we consider that this legislation be looked at and sent to Council. And I don't know if you wanted this on the special Council meeting or just the next Council meeting. I don't see any need to push it through.

Mr. Hills: The special Council meeting has been set for issues already. This is not it.

Mr. Baxter: This is not on that. Correct.

Mr. Hills: This will go as its regular reading.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. Then two weeks from now then. Actually one week.

Mr. Hills: Yes. It will be the 22nd.

Mr. Baxter: The 22nd. Thank you President Hills. With that said, does any Council member or committee member want to address any of those add-ons, changes, or would like to make any recommendations?

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Councilman Stake.

Mr. Stake: I would like to recommend that we send the ordinance that our City Attorney drafted, send that forward for a recommendation for adoption.

Mr. Baxter: Is that a motion you're giving?

Mr. Stake: Yes.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. I'm not going to entertain a motion at the moment. I'd like to give an opportunity for people to discuss it before we move on if you don't mind.

Mr. Stake: We always have discussion after a motion so we can discuss it now.

Mr. Baxter: Certainly. Okay. Well, I don't see anybody raising their hand. So I'll go ahead and look for a second. Second from Councilman Newman. And this is an opportunity for us to then discuss this item. Personally, I don't like this legislation as it's been written from the City Attorney. I think it is sound. I don't argue that his abilities, this is sound legislation. It would hold up in court. I just think it doesn't do the job. The job on which we asked it to do, and that's protect our citizens. That's my personal opinion. And therefore, I am going to move it on to Council for an opportunity for the rest of the Council members to vote, but understanding, I'm not going to vote for this. And I'm not going to vote for it because it makes it worse. We're driving the sexual offenders underground by making a move from city to city. That's my personal opinion. Not just mine. Although, if you read about it, you'll find out Sheriff Departments, as well as Marshall Service, as well as District Attorney's, all are saying the same thing. Not all of them obviously. Some believe the other direction. That said, I have a motion and a second on the table.

Mr. Stake: Can I just, in the discussion process, I would like to add that I did some research on this as well. And you know, one of the periodicals that were in support of the Iowa Attorney's Association document was the New York Times. I think we know where they stand. I Googled it. I found a lot of left-leaning organizations in favor of that study. So I know there are a lot of attorneys who are advocates for sex offenders who are in favor of that study. But I think you need to look at the bias involved there.

Mr. Baxter: I think that's a fair comment. I do believe there is bias on both sides of it. Thank you, Mr. Stake. Councilman Joseph.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'm not really interested whether the Iowa study, which was by the County Prosecutors Association in that state that did an in-depth study on this type of legislation in their state - I don't care if it's supported by left wing groups or right wing groups. The bottom line is, and this is the most important fact in their entire study, is that 80 to 90% of sex crimes against children are committed by a relative or acquaintance who has had some prior relationship with the child. And access to the child is not impeded by residency restrictions. Which means, maybe 10% of the sex offenders are really going to be impacted, affected by this

legislation. Ninety percent, up to 90% are still going to be able to do whatever they want. This legislation will not change what they do one bit. And you know, we might pass this thing next week and we might have people say you know, we dealt with the problem, it's time to move on and look at other things. I think that's a disservice to the people of this city when we're saying that we fixed a problem and it only changes about 10% of the problem. And up to 90% of the sex offenders are going to not even be impacted by the ordinance. Additionally, the Iowa County Attorneys Association came up with a list of counter proposals that really would go at the problem a little bit more directly. They recommended protected areas, child-safe zones that sex offenders would be prohibited from entering except in limited and safe circumstances. Such areas would include schools and child care facilities. That would impact that much more directly. The restrictions should cover offenses against children under age 14 rather than minors under 18, getting a little bit more issue-specific on the problem. I think if we pass this ordinance the way it's been drafted, it's not going to change really anything in the city. We'll be joining a lot of the cities that are passing legislation, but it doesn't really do anything about the problem. I think that we should really continue to look at this. Look at passing something that's going to really have some teeth and not something that's just going to say, well we're going to tweak the edges a little bit. Maybe we'll come back and look at it again later. I really don't think that's the direction we should go. We're doing a disservice to the citizens by saying we fixed the problem when we're only talking about 10%. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you for your comment. Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: Yes. First I want to say, I respect Mr. Joseph's comments. And I read the article and I understand what he's speaking of. As far as I'm concerned, it does correct the problem because it moves the sex offenders out of their home and out of town. Now they can move to other sections of town, but it'll move them out of the zones that we're speaking of. That is the only interest I've had in it. I've been interested in it because the other communities have felt that this is a necessity around us and they're passing it. I know that it doesn't correct everything because we can't correct everything. As I said, if it needs to be amended at a later date we can do that. But we're never going to correct the parts that's not in our zoned areas, and we can't even protect the zoned areas because if they drive through, walk through...but we at least are targeting the sex offenders that's been targeted by the State. And they will be forced to move within that district. To me that's a bonus. It's a start and it's a bonus. And that's how I feel about it.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Councilman Clemens. Mayor, I see you raising your hand.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you. Well, I think Mr. Joseph's rationale is a little bit off base. If we can enhance by 10%, the number of sexual offenders that aren't going to have the ability in the City of Reynoldsburg to not ply their wares, then we should do it. We need to also understand that not a single ordinance, and Mr. Clemens just kind of hit on this, there's not a single ordinance here that after a year of review, or 6 months of review, City Council can't bring back to the table and request an amendment. So I look at this as something, we're moving forward, we're taking on this other 10%. I don't want that other 10% to be sitting out there like Mr. Joseph does. Take them out of the loop. You need more work on it, fine. Work on it down the road. But in the meantime, let's pass it. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate your comment. And I'd like to respond to that. Because there are two separate issues here. One is 90% of the offenders, or somebody that they know, has nothing to do with the residency was the comment, so the 10% is not going to be an impact nor is it going to be addressed by this type of legislation. Mostly because it's by people who have not been offended yet for the first time. So therefore, they're still in the community after they leave. That being said, the second side of it was a conversation of, do you want to get rid of those 10%? Actually, this legislation gets rid of all of them that are in those buffer zones regardless of crime. Being it toward a child or toward anybody else. I've heard comments, it doesn't matter if it was toward a child or for anybody else.

Mayor McPherson: All the more reason to pass it.

Mr. Baxter: Then why not go after the other types of crimes then? Let's go after murderers too. Do they get special dispensation in our city? How about the ones that you know, steal your cars? I think this could be a slippery slope is my point. And that's what my concern is. Why pick on one piece, one area of crime where we have a known resident. We have twenty some I believe it is. Twenty-three or twenty-four of which twelve are going to be impacted by this legislation. Right? We are writing legislation for 12 people? There are so many other things we need to be doing a job around here. For 12 people, I think we're wasting a whole hell of a lot of time. And Ron, Mr. Stake, I see your hand up again.

Mr. Stake: Chairman Baxter, thank you. First of all, I think with this legislation, we send a clear message. There are many other communities, many communities who have enacted the same legislation we've been talking about since June. I think we send a clear message that those sex offenders are not welcome if they want to move here, number one. Number two, you know, if we, as the Mayor said, if we can get rid of 10%, that's fine for me. I think this is a step in the right direction. And number three, I would be willing to entertain, I told Mr. Joseph, Councilman Joseph this earlier, I'd be willing to entertain those suggestions that he had. I'd be willing to entertain those down the road. I don't think we need to hold this up any longer. But I'd be willing to entertain those and see if that's something we want to add in the future and have discussion on that. Thank you.

Mr. Baxter: I appreciate your comments. And Councilman Clemens, I did see your hand raised.

Mr. Clemens: And I'll be quick. And I will not sit here and defend a sexual pervert. And you can argue that any way you want. I don't care whether there's a sex crime against, and I said this before, a child or a grandmother. I don't put this in the same class as a murder or a robbery. Those we can deal with. This ordinance has to do with sexual predators, period. The other is not even in this loop. If you want to do something on the others, bring up an ordinance. If this corrects two and gets them out of the city, I'm a happy person. And that's what it's all about. We have to start somewhere. If it comes down the road and there's a better way to do it and there's more amendments to put to it, I'll be the first one to support it. And we have to get it moving. Once we get it moving, if we feel that things that Mr. Joseph brought up or some of the things that you brought up that we can add to it at a later date, I have no problem with that. We'll

discuss them and if it strengthens the ordinance, that's fine. And I think this is the way to get it started and I would support getting it moving.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. And one of the reasons I had an issue with this Councilman Clemens, is that I wanted to focus directly towards those who offend children. By passing this piece of legislation next week, if it passes, there are 12 people that are going to be out of this city. Too late for them. So what you're saying is, let's rush to judgement for 12 people. And that's my concern. There's no hurry to make this happen tomorrow or the next day. I'm a leader, not a follower. Because other cities have passed it, don't mean I need to jump in line, lock, step and pass legislation because other cities think they've done the right thing. I say we take the right amount of time and do it. Although I'm being pressured here by this Council and by Ron Stake and Mr. Clemens to move this piece of legislation forward.

Mr. Stake: We're advocating to move this forward. There's no pressure.

Mr. Baxter: I didn't give the chair to you, sir. And so therefore, with that pressure, I am going to pass it to Council next week for a vote. And if it has a number of votes there, it will be voted.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Baxter, there is a motion and a second. And so you just....

Mr. Baxter: And we're in discussion period. And I wanted to make my comment during that discussion. Thank you. And unless there's any other discussions, I will go ahead and move this forward for a vote.

Mr. Hills: I believe Mr. Stake moved it forward with a second by Newman and it's a vote of Safety. And you can either do it by voice or you can ask to do it....

Mr. Baxter: I'll ask that there be a reading be done.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Frazier, would you mind calling the members of Safety?

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: No.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Aye.

Mrs. Frazier: Mrs. Newman.

Mrs. Newman: Aye.

Mrs. Frazier: Mrs. Shirey.

Mrs. Shirey: No.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: It is a tie vote and I will vote "Aye" and it will go to full Council for a vote next week.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, President Hills. And with that said....

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Frazier: I just want to make clear that your special meeting is going to be at the next committee?

Mr. Baxter: At the next committee meeting. Correct.

Mrs. Frazier: Okay. Then that would be three weeks. There's a fifth Monday this month.

Mr. Baxter: You're right because we have an extra week. You're right.

Mr. Hills: We have, the 29th is the fifth Monday.

Mr. Baxter: And I appreciate it if our papers would get that date out.

Mr. Hills: The first Monday in February.

Mr. Clemens: It's not going to be next Monday?

Mr. Baxter: No. It won't be next Monday. It will be the first Council meeting in February. And we're looking at, what's that, the 5th, Nancy?

Mrs. Frazier: I believe so.

Mr. Baxter: So it's the 5th of February. At 6:30 on the 5th of February.

Mr. Hills: While we're talking Administrative matters, it's as good as any, I believe the Mayor is going to be requesting an Executive Session at 6:30 next week. From 6:30 to 7:30.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you. Because I usually miss the end of the schedule. With that, I'll go ahead and close the Safety Committee at whatever time it is now. 9:00. Thank you all.

Safety Committee

January 16, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday, Ass't. Clerk of Council)

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

January 16, 2007

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

Mr. Stake: And no Service Committee being scheduled, I'll call the Finance Committee to order at 9:01.

The second item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? (No response). I apologize for not speaking with members of the Finance Committee prior to this, but for housekeeping purposes, I'd like to remove in Other Legislation: Police, and

Parks and Recreation Impact Fee Study; and #2, ORDINANCE MAKING TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO CLOSE PROJECT KNOWN AS “PLEASANTVIEW SANITARY SEWER PROJECT”. I believe the Impact Fee Study has been put on the shelf. And I did speak with the Auditor in regards to this. And once he gets the information he needs, he is certainly welcome to bring this back to Council. We’ll put it back on the agenda. So I’ll make a motion that we table those indefinitely. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion?

Mr. Baxter: Did we ever receive a final report other than what we received last time? Is that considered the final report?

Mr. Stake: Yes, it is.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: You’re welcome. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted “Aye” except one). Opposed? (Mr. Baxter voted “Nay”). Motion passes.

Item number 3 is approval of the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held January 2, 2007. Are there any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they’ll stand as submitted.

Item number 4 is the merit increase. Mayor, would you like to address this issue?

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Councilman Stake. This is the Chapter 160 employees. These are all non-union employees. We put into our budget, and are requesting with this ordinance, 2% pay increase for the employees. You will notice also in here that the Steel Workers Union employees are again frozen. So they are not included in this. So as you go through, this is a 2% pay increase for all other non-union and pending union employees.

Mr. Stake: And this was in the budget appropriation we passed prior to the end of the year. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee?

Mr. Baxter: Just one comment.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one comment I would have is, they’ve done a great job Mayor, and I wish we could give them more.

Mayor McPherson: I do, too.

Mr. Baxter: I know it’s in your budget and you’ve really cut your budget to the bare bones this year. And it’s unfortunate, we just don’t have the funds to pay them what I think they’re worth.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Any other comments or questions from members of Council? (No response). And you're asking for emergency legislation on this, correct?

Mayor McPherson: Yes. Correct.

Mr. Stake: Are there any problems with that from members of Council? President Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Stake, if I could note, it is retroactive to 1-1-07. So the longer we go through the readings, the more of a lump sum it's going to be than it is.

Mayor McPherson: And the more difficult it becomes from the Auditor's position to do it.

Mr. Stake: Councilman Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Is there any reason why we don't talk about this in November and have it passed and ready for January? Can we not budget it for the following year in this year's budget so that the following life cycle comes a little bit more smoother and that their increases happen?

Mr. Stake: It was, Councilman Baxter, it was in the budget for this year. It was identified in there. So we could have talked about it at the time if we wanted to.

Mr. Baxter: Well, I'm just suggesting for the next year, and I understand what you're saying Mr. Stake, I'm suggesting.....

Mayor McPherson: What we tend to do Mr. Baxter, we discuss the actual numbers as part of the budget. But then by waiting until January, we're assured that any changes that are going to be made or any, you'll also see in there that there are some of the people that are topped out that are not going to be going up. At that point, we try to make a decision on whether or not to bring the pay grade ordinance forward and change it. And we've decided this year, we just can't do that. So that's the ordinance you have in front of you.

Mr. Baxter: Fair enough. Well, it's not that long of a stretch the way we're doing it now. And even as an emergency, it holds it back. So it's not that bad. So just from a planning perspective, I would think it would be a lot easier to put it in your budget and have it approved in November and December and have it retroactive on the day that they actually see it in January.

Mayor McPherson: Well, one of the things too, we're not really sure on the budget until the budget passes what's going to be in it and what's not going to be in it. And it would be entirely possible that Council would take the stand to take the 2% out which is another reason that we wait until the actual budget's passed to submit it.

Mr. Baxter: Very good. Thanks.

Mr. Stake: Are there any other questions or comments from members of Council? (No response).

None being heard, then I'll send this forward to Council with a recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Baxter. Any further discussion?

Mrs. Frazier: I just ask the Mayor to take a look at the list that's attached, because I think there's a couple of people that might be gone; and the list is usually referenced. So would you just see that we get an updated list?

Mayor McPherson: Okay. I'll get that tomorrow.

Mr. Stake: Duly noted. Thank you, Mrs. Frazier. We do have a motion and a second by Councilman Baxter. All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you. Item number 5 is Discussion of Then and Now, City Hall parking lot. This came from Mr. DeBolt. Mr. DeBolt.

Mr. Hills: I would like to note, Mr. DeBolt inherited this.

Mr. Stake: Yes he did. I'll second that.

Mr. DeBolt: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Mr. President for saying that. I was just going to state that it's appropriate that it's called Then and Now. I wasn't here then, but I'm here now.

Mr. Hills: It makes it yours.

Mr. DeBolt: Bottom line is, as you know, the Street Revitalization Project was a major endeavor for all of you as a city, administration, EMH&T. And over all, I think everybody did a really good job from an objective point of view. Not working with the city and then being with the city and sitting in with a lot of the meetings that had to come about to make the project work. I was very impressed with the teamwork everybody had working together. But having said that, any project you have, there's some bumps in the road along the way. And I think this was one in this project. Bottom line is, when discussions were made with my predecessor and the folks in charge of putting the project together, general contractors and such, agreements were made in terms of tradeoffs for things to be done that needed to be done. This was one of those projects.

As you know, there are a number of pavement projects other than just the streets that have been done on the project, including the post office. I think another one was one of the strip malls. Kroger's, and the strip malls across the street. Any time one of these projects is done, you have to have a place to put equipment in order to get a project accomplished. It just doesn't sit out in the street and you can't put it in a parking lot where there's going to be folks that are coming and going for business each day. It was determined that the contractors would use the area, general contractors, between City Hall and the adjoining business just to the west of us, to store equipment to put their trailer on. And in discussions in that time frame, it was also decided with my predecessor that one of the things that would be an accommodation made to the city for the use of that property was to create a parking lot there that would be paved. Again, at the time, the discussions were, I believe for use of the public since it was adjoining to Main Street, and any one in the vicinity including folks at City Hall most likely. Having said that, it came to light here once the work was engineered and completed, that that wasn't going to pass muster with one, the Bond

Counsel, and two, the Auditor, based on the fact it wasn't determined that it wasn't going to be an addendum to the project so to speak. Having said that, the parking lot's here. It will still serve a useful purpose. We do have to pay for it, but we can't pay for it (Tape Change). That could have been invoiced to us. But the agreement was to have this parking lot built. Therefore, that was making up for some of those costs. So in a nut shell, that's why we're here today, and I'll answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. DeBolt. Are there any questions from members of the Finance Committee for Mr. DeBolt? Councilman Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I thank Steve for your first Then and Now. I think you did a great job of beating around the bush, really. I've been down this route. You get a whiplash on something like this really. I don't really have a problem with the parking lot. Don't get me wrong. Because I think the public could use it. I have a problem with being a project and not coming to Council for approval, appropriation of funds, before it was even started. And I realize that's not your fault. It's not the Mayor's fault. The problem I have is, and this could have been done and paid for, this could have been paid for last year, and I don't know why we didn't take care of this before the first of the year, and take care of it now. Because an additional appropriation, I already made the statement, I'm not voting for any additional appropriation for additional money. I wish we could have taken care of it. We all knew about it. It's not something that wasn't there. It's not something that we didn't know that we didn't approve or anything like that. We knew it had to be a Then and Now. And like I said, the parking lot, it might be a good idea. I see it being used and I have no problem with it now. It's just the way it's been handled and it's the way it's been operated. The money that's going to be appropriated, is that in the budget now? Or is this an additional appropriation to pay it?

Mr. Stake: It will be coming out of the CIP Funds. It's not out of the General Fund I don't believe.

Mr. Clemens: It's not going to be an additional increase to the budget?

Mayor McPherson: Just to kind of give you an explanation as for why it didn't come to you last year, we got our numbers on December 22. And I don't know if you've got those in front of you, but if you look at the dates, we got the numbers on that December 22. And at the point, you know, we had an assumption along the whole time this was going on that this was going to be an expense of the Revitalization Project just like all the other parking lots were. We were advised that it wasn't going to be a part of that. And it really, it took until December 22 to get all the numbers in on it. And that's why it's coming to you as a Then and Now. Well, it would have been a Then and Now even back in December. But from December 22 on, there's no way we could have got it to you last year. And it comes to you, and I'm not sure the fund it's, 410.108.5659. That's our CIP Fund. So it would be coming from the unappropriated CIP Fund money.

Mr. Stake: I did see other hands up. Mr. Clemens, if, Councilman Stearns, did you have something?

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Thank you. I just, Mr. Clemens asked some of the questions that I had in mind also. But just one of them I'd like to know is, what's the best access to that? Because I could use it tonight when I pulled in here. Parking spaces over here were taken.

Mr. DeBolt: Across from Haft?

Mr. Stearns: Yes. Okay. Turning that way. How many parking spaces do we have there?

Mr. DeBolt: I believe there's twenty-four.

Mr. Stake: We can use additional parking on Main Street. Councilman Baxter, did you have something?

Mr. Baxter: Yes, Councilman Stake. And Steve, I know you're the messenger. And it's usually that guy who gets shot. But that's one of the best soft shoes I've seen from somebody who wasn't responsible for an issue in a long time. It's almost as if it was coached. And that's a nice job, I might add. Personally, we had a lot of work done along that street. And I'm sure there was a lot of this and that going on with the Service Director saying you know, you do this, you do that, and you help us here, you help us there. I'm sure there was a lot of that going on. And this seems to have fallen out from all of that. And I'm sure the thought was, we were going to get that parking lot as part of everything else we were getting. I totally believe that. That makes total sense to me. It's just, okay, why there?

Mr. DeBolt: Why there? The parking lot?

Mr. Baxter: Couldn't we have done some improvement on the parking lot right out here?

Mr. Stake: Because they had their equipment parked there.

Mayor McPherson: That's where they stored their equipment. They agreed to make it right where they put their equipment.

Mr. DeBolt: Because once they left, it would have been in such condition any way that something would have to be done whether it just be plant the grass again. I assume there was grass there before.

Mr. Baxter: Well, there was grass there before. I mean, our standard policy is mulch, isn't it?

Mr. Clemens: Being the part I don't understand, all their equipment and everything was up at Kroger's. I don't understand why you even bothered beside the Municipal Building, why it couldn't have been up there.

Mr. DeBolt: Their trailer was out here.

Mr. Clemens: I know but it couldn't have been.....

Mayor McPherson: Well, even up there, they went way outside of what they were allowed to be in. And they used in between us for their construction trailer, their meetings, and oddball equipment and stuff like that. Well, we all drove by and saw all the crap that they had there.

Mr. Clemens: And I have no problem with it. But the only problem I have is, it was done and you're not even sure Council wanted to do it. That's the part.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, if I could add. I did sit in on some meetings on this. And I think there was some assumption by some folks that there were some parking lots that were paved with the Main Street funding. And I thought that maybe, I think some folks thought that maybe that was part of the process there as well.

Mr. Clemens: It wasn't in the plans or anything. I'm not criticizing the parking lot.

Mayor McPherson: No. It was not in the plans. Just like some of the other parking lot repairs and things that we did, they were not in the plans. We had to go out and we had to bid them later and the work was done on them. It just so happens that this particular lot, we were advised by the Bond Counsel and the City Auditor, that it wasn't eligible for these funds. And let me tell you folks, if we're looking to throw arrows or anything at anybody, it's my fault because I should have checked on these agreements. And I insisted that a lot of these agreements be in writing. And then we went to look for the writing and they weren't there.

Mr. DeBolt: I can assure Council that in these similar situations in the future, that both the Mayor, Council, and legal counsel be well aware of any such _____.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. DeBolt. President Hills, did you have something?

Mr. Hills: Just to note, and I think it needs to be in, and I believe you mentioned, that is a public parking lot to anyone.

Mayor McPherson: Public parking lot. That's correct.

Mr. Hills: It is now?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. We had originally planned to put a little boardwalk across there to get to the sidewalk so you can walk to the light. But when we found out that we were paying for it, we stopped everything and you got what you got. We didn't finish it.

Mr. Hills: And if I understand, any....

Mayor McPherson: And it's not going to be finished either. I'm telling you that right now because we don't have the money for it.

Mr. Hills: Many of the other repavings of other peoples lots were because the construction company used it and staged it, and they had to bring it back to shape. And the same thing was

here.

Mr. DeBolt: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Now I'm old enough around here that I remember that was going to be the ingress/egress to the Police Department years ago. But I would note, and you say you got them in December, and just for clarification, all the invoices we have attached here are in January. But I believe everyone had to reissue their invoices and their billing in that it had to be taken out of anything that was against Streetscape.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: That's why you're seeing January invoices attached to these. It's work that was probably done in October, November, and December.

Mayor McPherson: Right. And we got the summary December 22 I think. But the actual bills, they had to sort it out and get it out of the project bills and then send them in to us.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I see the City Auditor back there. Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. Just a couple of things for an explanation. The repairs that were done to the Kroger and other parking lots were done as a result of damage that was being done, and repairs that were necessitated from the damage. Therefore, that was covered in the purpose clause for the bond issuance. The reason this was not because they're, any time you go to borrow money, just like if you go to the bank and borrow money, you have to tell them what you're going to do with it. This was written very specifically as most bond ordinances are. There was nothing in it concerning a municipal parking lot. And our Bond Counsel, after reviewing this, was not of the opinion that it did fit into the appurtenances. Therefore, that's what caused this to come to Council. So if there's some question as to why the other parking lots were done and this one wasn't, this was a new construction. The other ones were repairs caused by the damage. Many times it was done by equipment to get in and put in walls and other things.

Mr. Stake: And I did sit in on the meeting that you attended, the Mayor and some other folks, and I did hear the Bond Counsel say that, and I'm in agreement with that. So I mean, that's why we're here today with the money coming from the CIP Fund. Are there any other questions or comments? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: I just have one remaining one if I may. And that's based upon the engineering. Does this pay for engineering and all of the work?

Mr. DeBolt: It's included. It's \$4800 for the engineering.....

Mr. Baxter: Did that cover us underneath all the zoning and everything else? Because this came out of nowhere. And I want to make sure that we as a government, don't have our, broken our own zoning laws. You know, we have our ingress and egress in the right place. We don't have

ourselves too close to the sidewalks or the streets. We're not parking....

Mayor McPherson: It was engineered.

Mr. Baxter: You're the man. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: And I would like to point out that the request is for \$29,324.85 from CIP Fund number 410.108.5659. And frankly, I mean, I don't see, I mean other than stiffing everybody who has an invoice in here, Councilman Clemens, I respect what you had to say earlier in the year, but I certainly would hope you'd be supportive of this. Otherwise, it's probably going to cost us some more money in litigation costs.

Mr. Clemens: You know, I had no problem with the parking lot. It's the way it was handled. And I understand why it was handled that way, but we all know that when we get the engineers involved in getting estimates and so forth and we do a project, it comes to Council to see whether Council wants to do the project or not, and we okay the appropriation of the money. And I just want to know why. And I really knew why. But I want to see Steve sweat a little bit. He did a good job.

Mr. Stake: Well, and I will add, I mean, I think Steve, Mr. DeBolt will attest to this, we had a conversation today about submitting things to Council this year in a timely fashion early enough so that we know what we need to do, and avoid as much emergency legislation as possible.

Mr. DeBolt: Yeah. We have some long-range projects that we want to make happen for the betterment of the city. And we understand that we're not the only ones that, just by us passing them to make those happen. For example, is ODOT. They need plenty of notice to do what they need to do and it's our commitment.

Mr. Stake: And we recognize that there's also going to be emergency situations. We're going to need to deal with those. But I think you and I are both in agreement that that is going to be, at least with the Finance Committee, and I would hope with the rest of Council, that that is going to be the process that we're going to use this year.

Mr. DeBolt: That's correct. Yes, sir.

Mr. Stake: Thank you very much. Okay. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we appropriate \$29,324.85 to pay the invoices for engineering service and construction cost of the City Hall parking lot and declaring an emergency. The funds shall be paid from CIP Fund number 410.108.5659. And do I have a second? Second by Councilman Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, please state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes. Thank you.

Item number 6 is an ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING E.M.H.&T. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES AND ADVERTISE FOR BIDS REGARDING

ODOT 2008 URBAN PAVING PROJECT (East Main Street Curb and Ramp Replacement; area from the bridge over Blacklick Creek (west of Lancaster Avenue) to approximately, and we're going to change this from 910 to 365 feet west of Taylor Road in Licking County); APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. This legislation had been recommended for adoption as an emergency measure 1-9-07 but was returned to committee for amended language to be incorporated. The incorporated amended language would be in the first paragraph changing the approximately "910 feet west to 365 feet west". And then in Section 1, the bold at the end - "and also in accordance with the letter from ODOT District 6 dated January 9, 2007, that changes the eastern project limit from 910 feet west of Taylor Road to 365 feet west of Taylor Road". Are there any questions or comments from members of the Finance Committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I believe this is an ordinance that needs to go to the special Council meeting after this Finance Committee meeting. So I'll make a motion that we send this on for recommendation for adoption to the special Council meeting. Recommendation for adoption as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Councilman Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

And I will adjourn the Finance Committee at 9:21.

Finance Committee

January 16, 2007

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Lyday, Ass't. Clerk of Council)