

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 26, 2002

Immediately Following Previous Committees or

8:30 PM

Council Committee Rooms

Committee of the Whole

*Robert W. Kelley, Chair
Karen J. Angelou
L. Nicholas Hogan
John McAlister
Debra A. Payne
David B. Thom
Michael O'Brien, ex officio*

Members Absent: Michael O'Brien

Members Present: Debra A. Payne, Robert W. Kelley, John McAlister, L. Nicholas Hogan, Karen J. Angelou and David B. Thom

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES:

Stinchcomb, Franey, Davies, Wetherholt, Isler, Michalec, White, Press.

PENDING LEGISLATION:

ORD-0154-2002

TO ZONE 38.8+/ACRES OF NEWLY ANNEXED PROPERTY AS SF-3 ROD, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL OVERLAY DISTRICT; FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF TAYLOR ROAD IMMEDIATELY EAST OF RICE AVENUE; HOMEWOOD, BY J.C. HANKS, APPLICANT.

JC Hanks stated that they wished to postpone last week so everyone could review the extra materials provided; at meeting last Monday there were some specific comments and concerns on Lot 24 as to size, positioning, and location, as well as some concerns with lots 25 through 29; will open up for specific questions; will be glad to go over again but if you have specific questions can spend time addressing those.

Hogan stated he was down to 3 issues - lot 24, the private road, and 30' preservation zone by Lot 29. Kelley agreed noting that he wanted a public road of at least 22'; cul de sac then becomes a moot point; wanted to see lot 24 changed.

Hanks distributed 2 site plans showing changes for the northern most properties; looked at what we had; thought it was good and reasonable; took what we had; deleted one lot and changed the others to spread out what we had to see how it looked; do have to lose a lot to make it work; gave us 11,500 s.f. to give to other lots; where 24 was is kind of a side yard to 23 and 24; depending on what Council thinks, thought to expand the little tree bulb to come out to allow saving more trees; all lots in cul de sac get a little larger; felt this was an improvement all the way around; in looking at it felt we should go one step further and prepared the second plan; hope you think this is better; appears to be cleaner; eliminates the private nature of the street; is closer to code; lots 26 and 27 are over 18,000 s.f. and this plans allows us to straighten lot 24 out; continue to have some extra room; also have a 30' preservation zone to the north; study and take a look at both of these; feel they address concerns; second plan also eliminates one lot.

Hogan stated he felt either plan worked from a Council standpoint and asked which plan they preferred. Hanks stated they preferred the second plan. Kelley and Hogan agreed.

Angelou asked if there was any change to the cul de sac for lots 29 through 35. Hanks stated there were not. Hogan stated the other advantage to these plans is the 30' preservation zone and the larger lots for 26 and 27.

In response to question from Kelley, Wetherholt stated he did not have a problem with the 22' road; is sufficient for a one side development. Kelley stated he did not have a problem with the court and is glad to see the 30' preservation zone. Thom stated it works out much better with the 22'. Hogan stated this gives the fire trucks a better turnaround. Angelou questioned the 12,690 s.f. lots; do they meet code. Hanks stated they are in excess; 11,000 s.f. is all you need.

White stated she felt it was important to say to Council that with the land we have available, this is probably the last opportunity for a large scale residential development unless we get land annexed; when we discuss the land use plan this is one of the things we will be talking about; provides economic viability and sustainability; new subdivisions keep the market up and helps us in terms of our livability and sustainability within the community; have worked exceedingly hard on this; long before coming to Planning Commission worked on best possible subdivision we could present; is at a price point that the market is demanding and that is the \$200,000 to \$300,000 range; that's where people are looking for new opportunities; Council needs to keep in the back of their minds that we may not have another land opportunity to have a new subdivision.

In response to question from Angelou, Weber stated he did not feel it needed to go back to Planning Commission; don't feel this is a substantial enough change to warrant going back.

Angelou asked if this would be changed to Ambassador versus the Trinity line. Hanks stated that a strong feeling had been expressed for the Ambassador line and are more than willing to commit to that .

Kelley thanked applicant for the time and attention to this matter; have gone back to the drawing board several times.

Recommended for Adoption

ISSUES:

Building Security.

Jim Williams stated that our consultant, Jeff Toner, was present to answer questions; first started project after September 11 in looking at how we need to increase security of City Hall, Senior Center and Police Department, keeping mind one of Council's guiding points in that city facilities have to be open to the public; placed that in front of everything we looked at; toured other cities; have been to Reynoldsburg, Hilliard, and other places that have an ongoing effort to improving their facilities; were authorized to go out for bids; we did go out and used consultant to guide us through process; two companies returned bids; low bidder was TAC - Americas/Control Solutions; is on state term contract and it is the state contract price; proposing a system of components made up of security; system proposed is designed and manufactured by industry leader CASI-RUSCO; have a lot of experience in that field; bid this out on a cafeteria style bid - building by building and elements of security we feel are needed; are looking at Oklahoma, water tower, golf course, City Hall complex; base bid was \$110,338 and we put in three alternates; put them in because they were advised but did have some questions; alternate one was the lexan security glass for the windows for tax, water, and receptionist; security glass for reception was broken out in that alternate also; second alternate was a portable magnetometer; dud talk to Magistrate about court days and flow of traffic, positions of the bailiff and security folks and discussed some of our history with people in and out; decided to put the portable magnetometer in as a second alternate with ability to move it around as needed; third alternate was parks restrooms and card reader for the outlying facilities in our parks; have reviewed everything and am back to you with an RCA for \$108,950; we have \$24,308 that is unspent from original appropriation; putting those two together will give us funding necessary for City Hall base, alternate 1 leaving out the alternate for the reception, including alternate 2, and leaving out the alternate for parks restrooms.

In response to question from Angelou, Mitchell stated it would be nice to have; but is easy to cut back and wait until another time; restrooms are not a critical issue; system we

have in place will work; this would be easier but at what cost. In response to question from Kelley on glass protection for reception in Police Department, Franey stated that the radio room has bullet resistant glass; no changes were made to that side of the area when recently renovated.

Stinchcomb stated she had mixed feelings about doing this; want to make sure employees are safe and regret the events that have taken us to this point; did particularly ask that reception desk not be glassed in; however, do have mixed feelings; McClish is out there all alone; on the other hand don't want us to be so unfriendly that you're talking through glass; areas where money is exchanging hands is another matter; asked that those issues be separated out for your consideration. McAlister agreed with Stinchcomb. Hogan stated when you go downtown to Auditor's office or Tax office there is no glass; have counter and people; point is that I don't want to see glass go in; don't want to see anyone get hurt but you take a chance these days just crossing the street; can put yourself in a box so far you have no freedom; tax and water do have money on hand when people pay their bills; people could jump the counter; if it is an issue then put a drop safe in; also could put metal detector at front of door then you don't have a problem because you have secured the entire area. Stinchcomb stated that is the reason for the portable magnetometer; it can be moved as needed. Hogan reiterated that we don't want to take away the possible camaraderie and we don't want to go crawl in a hole; notice that service stations have gotten rid of their protective glass; every business has an upset customer once in a while; tired of excuses for September 11; lot of people are using it to sell products and services; don't think we should put windows in; we do have to protect our employees and have no problems with metal detector; that's especially prudent on court days. Kelley also supported no glass; the problem with the magnetometer is that it has to be manned; does take a person; biggest problem will be court day; that's what concerns me most. Angelou asked if the employees in tax and water have expressed concern. Williams stated this was all done as part of the vulnerability study; both areas do have a metal grill they can pull down and that could be used; that prevents personal injury. Thom asked if there were any other options, other than glass, talked about as far as tax, water and receptionist areas. Williams stated that once the doors are secured you are limited; do currently have metal grills that are lowered when the office is not open in tax and water; only other option is new glass with windows and ports; only two options we saw.

Kelley asked if there was a recommendation. Williams stated that the recommendation would be to go with the base price plus the magnetometer. Hogan stated he agreed; could see eliminating the glass and possibly the parks restrooms. In response to question, Mitchell stated it is not so much a security issue as it is a convenience; people will still have to come in to pick up a temporary card or we will have to mail it to them; not sure it is worth \$10,000. Discussion was held on possibility of setting the restrooms on a timer to be unlocked at certain times; could be done from here; maintain accountability; we don't need for staff.

Angelou stated she was not ready to make any decision; question what the base covers. Tonero stated that initially set out in the base to identify those facilities that would serve the public; also accountability as to who is going in and also give them the ability in the future to interface with payroll and attendance situation; developed a security posture for each of the facilities; can secure main entrance and have the ability to collect time and attendance data; is not designed for foolproof security; this initial phase outlines the backbone for the City to move forward at a pace comfortable for the City; capability to grow that system as you feel the need to. Angelou asked if the fuel area was part of this. Tonero replied that it was. Franey stated that it includes the proximity reader, a panic button but garage doors would need to be further secured; fuel maintenance should be in

the list as a separate facility which includes the pumps and the garage facility; the whole complex is the fuel station; entrance door for personnel is included. In response to question from Angelou, Franey stated the school bus area is not included; they are on their own. Angelou and Hogan reiterated that they would like to look at this further. Franey stated that the idea at the police station for the base system would put electronic locks to secure the first floor so no one can get past first floor; this would give you proximity readers as opposed to push button; this also gives us the security locks at Senior Center and here; also gives the ability for payroll information to Finance; at Oklahoma the base includes perimeter fence and also gives the proximity reader that allows for payroll information back to Finance; that's what you are getting with the base. Tonero stated that you are also getting the employee ID badging system which you currently don't have; provides credentials for city employees; feel that is an important piece for you.

Hogan noted the inclusion of a panic button at the fuel center; is that available at each of the facilities in the base; have they all been given the ability to hit a single device that will notify the police there is some emergency; if one would be available at the front desk of each location that might suffice versus glass. Williams stated the panic buttons are included; the glass was an extra. Tonero stated he understands that the lexan glass is a huge cultural shift; would have been remiss in not providing that alternate; can't say I completely disagree with you; not including does not take away from the overall effectiveness from what we have designed.

Angelou stated she was not ready to move forward; understand the importance of the payroll component; what will the savings be. Isler stated he was not prepared to address that question; can have for you for next committee.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to Committee of the Whole in two weeks.

Phone System:

Franey stated that our consultants, TTG, are here tonight to answer questions; went out to bid on the phone system and a breakdown was included in the Friday report; TTG recommended TIMS with reservations as there were some concerns on the Comdial system; but bid was felt to be technically sound; TIMS was new to the IP world but consultant was willing to take that risk with that system and TIMS; because of the difference in price they reluctantly agreed; when TIMS got the contract eventually found out there would be a delay in being able to deliver Comdial; October was to be the soonest and could not guarantee that; TIMS did not sign the contract knowing that Comdial was heading into financial problems; at that point we suspended the contract; came back to the table with TTG to determine our next step; TIMS immediately hooked up with NEC to be an authorized dealer; asked if they could substitute at the same price; we strongly felt that contaminated the bid so we said no on that issue; TTG looked at all bids and went to next bidder and evaluated Toshiba, NEC and Intertel; Toshiba and NEC did not get a recommendation from our consultant; were concerned with the bid price for Intertel; consideration was given to go to the state bid list and see what prices are in there; they were not required to give us their state bid price in a formal bidding procedure; can get Intertel product from state bid list for \$183,000; formal bid was \$224,000; let TTG expand on their recommendation at this point.

J. Haver stated that the Toshiba is a sound product as a base phone system but for application and utilization felt bed subverted the technical design called for; will not work and allow you to progress; will not allow you to do all the things you asked for. Brad Hayes stated that the system just came out and vendor hasn't worked with it; question coming back to you again with a mish mash of a recommendation and hoping

we have something that will work; have faith in TIMS and if manufacturer had not put them in a bad spot feel it would have worked for you; with this recommendation, we've done it, we have it working, we understand how it works, and it's proven. Haver stated there is not a true over IP on market yet; nothing other than data form; are not interested in moving the city into that platform; the other bidders were relatively close to each other; felt there was leeway to look at the best solution as dollars are close enough to take best solution; decided to do that; looked at difference in bid versus GSA; there was an error and we verified that; they did overbid cabling; we were aware of that; Intertel is on state bid contract; recommend that we throw out public bid and purchase under GSA; the company was the highest bidder in the formal bid but when we take it to state term then you come in as the third bidder out of five. Kelley questioned if there was any problem in following this approach. Franey stated they are requesting legislation to repeal previous ordinance that awarded to TIMS as well as the supplemental; need permission to reject all bids; then need permission to award to Intertel with a supplemental in the amount of \$63,000. In response to question from Angelou on report stating we could pay over 3 years, Franey stated that Isler says that the money has to be appropriated and set aside no matter when we are paying for it. Angelou asked what TIMS has to say. Franey stated she doesn't want to speak for TIMS but think they are very sorry to lose the business as we are very sorry to lose their assistance; does disappoint us; we have suspended the contract signing; TIMS did drag their heels in signing the contract because they knew there was a problem in delivery. Hayes stated they had been watching Comdial all along and TIMS came to us and said we can't get hardware until October; first said they were too busy and then said this is what we want do; had problems with the IP and problems with Comdial and they were picking up NEC; is another ship to sail; problem is you can't do that within your legislation; can't switch contract to another; have to go back to bid or go to state term. Franey reiterated that TTG doesn't recommend the NEC product; even if we went to state bid and looked at NEC that product is not being recommended; TIMS has no experience with NEC; at that point starts spiraling out of control; TIMS has been very upstanding on this; have been totally up front with us. In response to question from Angelou, Haver stated that the Intertel system is in place in Pickerington, Upper Arlington and Westerville.

Hogan questioned if we could get a release from TIMS so we don't get sued. Franey stated the contract has never been signed.

McAlister stated he felt we should go with our consultants recommendation. Hogan and Angelou agreed that we should look at the recommendation with the state term contract.

Franey stated that she hated to ask for more but emergency is an absolute necessity and am asking for a wavier of second reading; TTG has been moving forward in the process before knowing this would happen; we now have our T1 lines and our point to point; in addition we have those bills; we have double dial tone; that is not TTG's fault; they were not informed by TIMS until the work was underway.

In response to question from Kelley, Sherwood stated she would need to verify with Weber, but either two or three pieces of legislation would be needed.

RECOMMENDATION: 1st reading with waiver of second, consent agenda, for all legislation Weber feels is required.

Street Lights:

Davies distributed a 2 page summary on street lights; suggestion had been made by Mayor that we look at a pilot project area; decided to look at Imperial Rise since we have received petitions from over 70%; also in Murphy's report of July 18 it was one of

his top areas to look at; asked Jess Howard to give us a cost estimate to light intersections only; also decided to look at cul de sacs based on Council's wish; is a total of 17 lights; quote in your packet comes out to \$72,000 for all 17 lights; this would be on a metal pole not a green decorative; would be \$500 to \$1,000 more per light for the decorative; metal poles are already in the neighborhood.

Hogan questioned third paragraph of summary which talks about going from wooden to green decorative. Davies stated this refers only to something that could be done once the entire City is lit. Hogan stated if green decorative is now the standard why wouldn't we use that. Davies stated the neighborhood already has metal poles. Hogan stated if we are doing this for safety reasons then we need to look at what we do; green decoratives do not give out as much light as the metal; have metal pole beside by home and green decorative on next street. In response to question, Davies stated there has been no consideration in the last several years to using the metal poles.

Davies continued that second page of summary states that if all wooden poles were replaced the cost would be over \$1.1 million; would vary depending on engineering required; some would need switched from overhead wiring to underground; there are 105 unlit intersections; would cost approximately \$500,000 to light these intersections with the green decorative; the total cost to light the balance of the city with green decorative and replace all wooden poles with green decorative would be over \$1.6 million. In response to question from Hogan, Clerk stated the green decorative poles are an administrative policy; is not in code; will check code and verify statement.

McAlister stated that at a cost of \$408 a year for 17 wooden poles to light the unlit areas we could pay for them for 150 years at what it will cost for the metal poles. Davies agreed; maintenance on the metal poles is not included in these costs; we maintain the metal poles and AEP maintains the wooden poles.

Davies asked for Council feedback. McAlister asked if the City has put up any poles to date on cul de sacs; is there any state law. Franey stated that wooden poles at intersections have been done occasionally; included cul de sacs in this because Council had expressed an interest in this neighborhood; wish to talk to township about possibility of supplying one due to proximity of cemetery. Kelley stated that neighbors do not want wooden poles; want intersections lit for safety purposes as well as cul de sacs backing up to cemetery. Hogan stated that recommendation came forward with legislation for 17 lights on metal poles; appreciate the recommendations; believe this is a case by case basis because of the cemetery; we are not lighting the entire neighborhood; have no problem with this. Davies stated to light this neighborhood would take 17 lights; did not include one additional as we wish to discuss with the township their participation for one back by the cemetery. Hogan stated that before this is done would like to do a neighborhood request and not count on the petition; contact all the homeowners and see if there is anyone who doesn't want this done; especially someone would be directly affected. Stinchcomb stated they wished to proceed with this as a pilot project; this is a change in policy; may discover we can't do it; all utility easements will have to be donated; did talk about a possibility of sending a letter to all property owners so everyone understands exactly what will happen. Kelley questioned if we needed permission if we were only doing the intersections; we already own the right of way; if everybody doesn't want a light because it's going to shine in windows, etc. can understand notifying them. Angelou agreed that if we are responsible for intersections we may not need easements. Hogan reiterated he did not want to pay for any right of way. Kelley stated the only place that might happen would be in a cul de sac. Davies stated these prices were rough estimates; can bring forward again; possibly can go out for bids to get exact pricing; see if we are in the ball park.

RECOMMENDATION: Motion resolution authorizing going out for bids.

ISOBEL L. SHERWOOD, CMC, Clerk of Council, reporting.