

City of Gahanna

*200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 23, 2002

7:00 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*

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES:

Stinchcomb, Weber, Mitchell, Franey, Mumma, Wetherholt, Murphy, Michalec, White, Isler, Press, Elzey, Estep, Pinson.

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

PENDING LEGISLATION:**ORD-0158-2002**

TO ACCEPT DEED FOR 1.885 ACRES ALONG CLARK STATE ROAD; KNOWN AS RESERVE B OF THE PARK AT HARRISON POND, THE VILLAGES AT ROCKY FORK, SECTION 10, PART 1A; FROM HMI PROPERTIES, LTD

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ORD-0177-2002

TO ZONE 5.943 ACRES OF NEWLY ANNEXED PROPERTY AS L-AR LIMITED OVERLAY APARTMENT RESIDENTIAL; TO REZONE 15.41+/- ACRES AS L-AR, LIMITED OVERLAY APARTMENT RESIDENTIAL; FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON SHAGBARK ROAD; THE STONEHENGE COMPANY, MO DIOUN BY SMITH & HALE, GLEN A. DUGGER, APPLICANT

White stated this zoning was approved several years ago; sold a portion of the limited overlay land to Giant Eagle; Dioun was then able to purchase property from the Lepper's and Sennett's; this zoning is for the initial zoning of the newly annexed property and the rezoning of the balance of the original zoning to conform the limited overlay to the actual site plan. Sherwood stated that the sale of a portion of the property changed the original site; need to do the rezoning as limited overlay was tied to the initial site layout. White stated it is the same type of condo project; just a continuation of the phase 1 area; is a total of approximately 105 units; overall density has not changed. In response to question from Thom, White stated that the ingress and egress was to change to right in and right out after 25 units were occupied; about at that level now.

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ORD-0178-2002

TO REZONE 12.646 ACRES AS SO, SUBURBAN OFFICE; FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1155 EAST JOHNSTOWN ROAD; CITY OF GAHANNA, APPLICANT.

White stated this is for the YMCA project; is a 55,000 s.f. building footprint; we are looking at some of the improvements now; when annexed it was zoned ER; need to rezone to the Suburban Office district to allow this permitted use of a YMCA on that property; just waiting for the rezoning.

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ORD-0179-2002

TO AMEND CHAPTER 147, BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA

Weber stated this issue was discussed in Development Committee two weeks ago; had first reading last week; when Charter change passed knew there would need to be code changes and changes to the rules of procedure; this section of code needed rewritten to en flesh what is in Charter; these are the recommendations made by BZA; they are acceptable; some change in the rules will also happen; fairly standard and they go over procedures and requirements for appeals that are not in Charter and don't belong there.

Hogan stated that the original intent was to set up the BZA where it is primarily a local

board where a small time citizen had a place to go to appeal either an administrative action or Planning Commission call; don't want to turn into a judicial body that average citizen won't understand; want it so that someone with no legal background can appeal. Weber stated there is a reason that these issues have been formalized; we do need to make a record that could file a 2506 appeal; like swearing in witnesses and making a record; still intend that the average person can be heard; is still relatively user friendly; courts are requiring that both Planning Commissions and BZA's formalize some of their procedures; trying to pass muster and still meet demands of court. White stated that the fact we reduced the fee certainly makes it for the resident; from staff standpoint we always indicate more times than not they have right to appeal; always state and indicate how that appeal process works. Hogan stated that he understands that part is working. Thom questioned new testimony heard by BZA; understand Court of Common Pleas must be exactly what comes from BZA; are these changes, or future rules changes, going to address that issue. Weber stated it was discussed; want to reserve the right to hear new information if it is relevant; Chair, with support of other members, can receive new information; spell this out in rules of procedure; more definitive statement in rules. In response to question from Angelou, Weber stated a judge, under ORC 2506, can accept new information and hear additional testimony.

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ORD-0180-2002

TO AMEND CHAPTER 1129, ZONING CERTIFICATES, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA

Sherwood stated that this change came as a recommendation from the Records Commission to Planning Commission for a change in this code; particular section on zoning certificates was written in 1958; is more policy than belonging in code and conflicts with records retention schedule; need to update and remove portions from the code that don't belong.

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ORD-0181-2002

TO AMEND CHAPTER 1169, PROCEDURE FOR AUTHORIZING A CONDITIONAL USE, OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA

White stated that on conditional use contiguous property owners would be notified; before they had not been; biggest change is to notification procedure; other changes are just clean up; was felt that a conditional use is not a permitted use and could have an impact; property owners should be made aware.

Sherwood stated that Council had requested several months ago a review by Planning Commission of all notification procedures; this was as a result of discussion held in Service Committee about the notification on the Library construction at Stygler and US62; as a result of that review by Planning Commission, this is the only change being recommended.

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ORD-0187-2002

TO ACCEPT STREET, STORM, AND WATER IMPROVEMENT NO. 811, AND SANITARY SEWER, IMPROVEMENT NO. 812; AND APPURTENANCES THERETO, IN THE RIVERS EDGE SUBDIVISION, AND TO DECLARE AN EMERGENCY.

In response to question, Wetherholt stated that everything is complete; ready for acceptance.

Recommended for Adoption, Consent

ISSUES - From Mayor's Office:

Shepherd Church of The Nazarene:

Kelley stated he had received a letter from Ohio Ethics Commission; based on information they feel there is a conflict of interest so I will not participate; will turn this portion of the meeting over to Payne to run; do serve in an unpaid position on the school board and this proposal may affect the school.

White stated that the proposal before us has been proposed by Shepherd Church of the Nazarene; basic proposal is that the Church would like to have a land exchange for a certain price between the City and the church; City purchased the Galloway tract which is adjacent to the rear of the Shepherd Church; reason for purchase was to provide a buffer for our south entrance as a noise barrier from I-270 and airport and to protect the tree stand that exists; because the church is expanding both the church and school they would like to purchase 8.4+/- acres from the City; that land would not diminish the total buffer; in turn they would like for the City to buy the land they own along Big Walnut Creek which is floodplain; any time we get the opportunity to buy we do as it helps to protect our greenways; purchase price of the land that the church wants to purchase was \$26,042 per acre; that is what we paid for it 5 years ago; that total cost would be \$218,750; the City in turn would purchase 7 acres at church appraisal price of \$7,500 per acre because it is flood plain; that's in the ball park with what we've paid in the past; city would owe \$52,500; there was a land dedication that should have occurred several years ago when we rezoned 12 acres of the church's property to apartment residential; because we require land dedication of 2.54 acres for park land that particular land dedication is still owed; City Attorney says it is still owed even though they did not build; still have a 150 foot buffer along I-270; will maintain that; would not require church to maintain; if they purchase 8.4 acres from us and we purchase from them the sub total would be \$166,250; still require the 2.54 acre of land dedication; part of the dedication would give us access off Cliffview to flood plain; since they did not, and are not, proposing to do multi family but only add on to church and school, the realization of the impact on the park land has not occurred; believe it is fair that they receive credit; we get land but credit against purchase at \$26,042 per acre or a total of \$66,147; if we apply that credit to the subtotal we then would be looking at a purchase price of \$190,100; only have field surveys at this point but will do final surveys; figure may change slightly based on final survey; that is the proposal for Council's approval; need legislation to authorize the Mayor to do this purchase.

Hogan stated he was having a few problems with the proposal; one is in getting the land and crediting it back; is like you never got it; took an oath of office that we uphold the ordinances; that says we get this park land dedication; possibly a mistake was made by a former employee and we could take some action to get this land; don't think we want to do that; want to do what is fair and reasonable and satisfy the whole thing; appraisal was done that shows the bottom land at \$7,500; same appraiser, picked by the City but paid by church, appraises the City land at \$15,000 an acres; should just make deal as clean as possible - buy 8.4 acres at \$15,000 for a total of \$126,000; sell us 7 acres at \$52,500 and give us the additional 2.5 acres; can support this with a couple of minor changes; eliminate the credit; appraised value for appraised value; bottom line would change to \$73,500 and deed us the 2.5 acres; real clean and easy and workable; one thing would like to see added to this language is they are building a phenomenal church; happens to be entrance to City; don't want to have a beautiful church covered up by weeds and scrub; would like to see church work with Parks Department on that buffer area to get scrub out so it is a wonderful entrance; would like to see that language added somewhere; again, looking at appraisal to appraisal.

Stinchcomb stated that the City Attorney was fairly adamant that we do not improperly

advantage the church; he had problems in selling for less than tax payers paid; felt very strongly that it was important; many church members are also residents; he felt we needed to charge same price that the taxpayers paid; other belief is that it is a rare occurrence where we ask for park land dedication and it is never realized; my justification is that it is unfair for us to demand the church pay for a development that did not occur; usually people develop what they say they will; City Attorney wants it specifically dedicated to meet needs of ordinance; have a hard time charging the church for parkland for a multi family development that did not occur. Hogan stated he was finding it difficult, just like last time we had this discussion, on doing anything other than appraisal for appraisal; asked Weber then if there was any problem in selling at less than what we paid; he had no problem at that time.

Weber stated that his concern is that we deal with the land dedication; need to get our 2.54 acres; whether City does as purchase or credit is negotiable but want it separately accepted to meet code requirement; that's the main point stressed through this; how much money from the church based on this acreage and give and take, Council has a lot of discretion; want 2.54 acres separately accepted; discussion about how appraisals play out is something that Council can discuss. Angelou asked if the City asked for the appraisal. White stated that we gave them several names; church chose this appraiser who also did the appraisal several years ago when we purchased the property; church was willing to pay for that; one of the things we asked about in the appraisal was to find why it was less; is partly because it had no access; part of that 2.54 acres would have provided that Galloway tract better access; as such that devalued the property; that's why it came in at \$15,000. Hogan stated that the rezoning from apartment residential would lower the land value also. Stinchcomb stated that it could improve once it is all combined; appraisal is at pre-development. White stated that our Finance Director also indicated to us in several meetings, and was quite adamant, that we sell it for what we purchased it for; felt that it may appear to be somewhat different than a logical progression in getting the land dedication with the credit; church was, and still is, in agreement; that is the proposal submitted.

Stinchcomb stated it was important to her to retain the 150' buffer; when we voted to purchase the Galloway tract that was a major consideration and this proposal still gives us the buffer we wanted; only concern is that we make sure that we don't strip out the underbrush so it would no longer serve the purpose for what it was intended - to block noise and pollution; we should showcase the church; clearing out the underbrush is not the way to do that; have some concerns with that portion of Hogan's request; that 150' is not for sale.

Angelou stated she was off Council due to retirement when the buffer was discussed; part of the reason for buffer was the fact that they expected it to be multi family; that's no longer true; assume that the buffer is not as necessary; the asking price was \$26,042 per acre; we chose to pay it; my personal mutual funds have substantially gone down; same thing with land speculation; we went into land speculation; it was decided to purchase that land to protect it from being developed in ways we did not want; sometimes prices go down; bought at one of those times when prices were high; now we ask for an appraisal and should sell at that appraisal price of \$15,000 per acre; can not spin this credit thing; would be purchasing something that should be given to us; land has not developed; should have had that within 60 days and did not get the deed in 60 days; is still owed to the City; does not negate the requirement; feel they will agree; now we're going to buy; it just doesn't compute.

McAlister stated he agreed with the Mayor on the underbrush; feel we still need more green; leaves provide more sound absorption; but agree with Hogan on price.

Stinchcomb stated her concern was to follow City Attorney's advice and not advantage the church. McAlister reiterated that the appraised value made sense.

Thom stated he understands what is being said about keeping it as simple as possible; but have an agreement and proposal from the church and in raw numbers they would give us \$100,000; now we're saying sell for \$73,500 and giving away \$25,000; the church has agreed to this price. Hogan stated the reason is to go appraisal to appraisal; can't go with purchasing what they are supposed to give us; buy so much, sell so much and subtract the two. Angelou questioned why we wouldn't be using the appraisal. Thom stated market value is different than appraised value. Stinchcomb stated that county shows land values have increased by 10%. Angelou stated that was residential property and not land locked. Stinchcomb stated the administration's recommendation is before Council; if you choose to sell for less that's your privilege; not so sure selling for less than what we paid is prudent; felt credit for purchase was reasonable; if they owe us 2.54 acres then rescind the zoning ordinance and start back with a different package. Weber stated he didn't disagree that we have to have 2.54 acres; whether you look at one or two appraisal or shifts in market value is up to negotiation; is not all that established; this proposal gets back our purchase price; that's why it has been so difficult; agree that we are supposed to get the 2.54 acres and must have a separate acceptance of the 2.54 acres; what I'm hearing is that because the land was not developed there could be a waiver of the requirement; to waive the value of that particular 2.54 acres; want to make sure land is received; understand Angelou's point that if there is a credit given this is not a gift; these figures are floating around; credit back this amount of money; here is bottom line figure and figure out; hearing that \$26,042 may be too high; what is a fair price; also hearing that \$77,000 may be too low. Stinchcomb reiterated that during negotiations it was paramount in discussions that the church not be advantaged financially because of this deal; am not wedded to a particular figure; want to make sure that the deal is a clean deal. Angelou questioned if it would be an advantage to the church unless we are saying by this ordinance that we are waiving some of the requirement of the zoning; because of changed circumstances. White stated they had worked out parameters; is a land exchange and we will end up with 9.54 acres purchasing 7 acres so we get the 2.54 acres in a different spot; had averaged the credit; because the land was never dedicated; all the documents never identified where the land was to be; how about an average credit; church said if we could get a full credit then that would be in ball park of what we would be willing to pay; credit or cash they still have to give it to us; more land than what we would pay for; are getting bottom land.

Hogan reiterated that any good deal is a straight forward deal and based on a consistent set of facts; \$26,000 figure is from an appraisal done in 1994; only \$15,000 for a current appraisal; we purchased land based on an appraisal; why are we not selling based on an appraisal; should buy and sell based on the appraisal; we have paid \$10,000 and \$12,000 for bottom land before; can make any number come out; that's arbitrary almost like picking a number out of a hat; need to look at \$15,000 for this land and \$7,500 for this land and that's fair. Angelou reiterated that to say we are paying for 7 acres and yet providing credit for \$66,147 is saying we are paying for the total 9.4 acres; go back and rescind the ordinance feel I could deal with that better; ultimately have to do what is fair; would rather have \$100,000; would rather have \$166,000 but know that is not affordable; credit brings it to what is affordable for church; why not do by appraisals. White stated we felt we had to bring forward what are the facts; if Council thinks differently than administration and feels comfortable selling off a different portion then we need to look at that; this is no longer going to be multi family but strictly to expand the sanctuary and the school; is a great opportunity for this community; good development and price at this point is debatable; use formula

Angelou questioned item #4 in the terms and conditions listed in memo; not sure that we, as a city, can make that promise; obviously if there is something constructed in 500 year flood plain we would need to look at; is there an agency outside the City that controls and any other governmental requirements; not sure we can promise that;

Jan Elzey, Shepherd Church, stated that FEMA would have to approve any building; they will only approve if City says they accept through their building codes; probably not a problem and is usually approved. Angelou stated we are not in control of FEMA; whether told to you or not FEMA has final say. Elzey stated FEMA will not sign off until City signs off. Weber stated that other governmental entities may sign off but if FEMA says they can't, they can't. Hogan stated it says we won't withhold provided are codes are met; if they meet our requirements, we can't withhold. Payne stated it just covers us.

Hogan stated he would like to see language about buffer but understand that it could be worked out later; hope someone will work on that; have no problem with legislation for selling 8 acres at \$15,000 and church selling us 7 acres at \$7,500; deed 2.54 acres which was due for park land.

Thom stated he understands what we are attempting to do; don't care too much how we get to that but church has agreed to proposal and now looking at getting less money. Angelou stated she can't support a credit for \$66,000; can support an appraisal in black and white for the acreage; can't support the legislation as proposed; were supposed to have the 2.54 acres within 60 days of the zoning and we never received it; land was due after that ordinance went into effect; understand they are willing to give us the 2.54 acres; whether it developed as they thought it would is not relevant; always had park land dedication requirement; would be more comfortable with rescinding that ordinance than this deal. Hogan stated this has been an evolution; agreed to \$130,000 at one point; just trying to make clean and above board so church can't be questioned; appraisal for appraisal; are we advantaging the church. Weber stated not if we have a clear appraisal - whether it is \$26,000 or \$15,000; my problem is that part of the required land dedication; still dealing with shifting sands on what this land is worth; don't know what is worth. Angelou stated most current appraisal is \$15,000. Payne stated she would like to keep it clean; whatever we come up with on price of land. Weber stated he did like Angelou's idea on credit; need to reach a price they can afford; do understand that; how much do you want to pay; that's the bottom line; let's decide how we get to \$100,000; take appraisal and it is less; this is their proposal; feel it is a fair solution.

Hogan stated we could move forward with legislation; could change numbers and not reference credit; can come forward with this proposal; can change on dais; price of the land is the issue and what you agree that price is; knock out the credit and bring forward the legislation.

In response to question, White stated that the land we were to receive was basically a strip of land; there is nothing in the documentation that would show precisely where it was supposed to be; is now delineated on that survey; appraisers vary; some appraisals are not worth the paper; same appraiser came up with \$26,000. Angelou stated that this document before us came from the church; was negotiations between the City and church; perhaps a member of City Council should have been sitting in on this; we were not; don't want to give advantage to the City over the church either; this is not just the church's document.

Pastor Eddie Estep, Shepherd Church, stated they would withdraw this proposal and bring another proposal forward; we will clear up the 2.54 acre land dedication; Mayor

has been a formidable negotiator; look forward to continuing that process. Payne stated she has not known of a contract, in her time on Council, that Council has sat in on negotiations. Stinchcomb stated we have a direction from Council; clearly we can go back in good faith and complete negotiations.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to Finance Committee on October 15th.

ISSUES - Carried Over From Previous Committees:

Brookhill Drive Speed Bumps:

Angelou stated this had been discussed in Safety Committee prior; Pinson is here and Safety Director was to be here. Murphy stated an issue came up late this afternoon and Keyes is unable to be here; also note E-mail received from Debra Steffenoff requesting other means of traffic control in that area and that if there is any public discussion she be notified.

Mark Pinson, 146 Brookhill, stated he is making every effort to understand both sides of issue; hopefully we are able to address our concerns; know this is a problem in almost every neighborhood; moved here 1 year ago as we like the location; almost 100% of neighbors have same feelings; they have this plan that they will live here until children are in school and then move on to go to private school or move before children reach high school age; perception is that we don't have a good high school; decision to reach to invest in our house now or make Gahanna flight to West Jefferson or New Albany where people have sidewalks and a more livable community; have a lot of young kids in our neighborhood and it is not only a speed issue but a safety issue; went to every house and results of survey are on our web site at Villages of Gahanna.com; 63% of respondents are for speed bumps; 27 are against and 4 are neutral; 8 houses didn't vote; that is a large number; we don't want speed bumps but feel so strongly that something needs to be done that we are supporting; we actively walk our dogs; very candid that those against it do like to speed, don't have kids, or are not outside that much; majority were specifically for speed bumps; have been in touch with Mayor and know her stance; no speed bumps are there is too much liability; was policy of previous mayor also; want Council to take a stand so we know that you are against any measures at all or recognize the problem on our street and will work to get a solution; very grateful for response by police; there has been a great presence in the last few weeks; have pictures of our street that show the width and the curves; can have 4 cars all the way across; is conducive to speed; there is a hill and an S curve; with parked cars can have a total blind spot all the way down; not everybody speeds; but have seen cars pass each other; all driveways on one side are sloped and that is another hazardous condition to back out; have a 2 year old who likes to throw ball back and forth; can chase 15 to 20 balls out in street when we are playing; feel there are a couple of things that can be done; stop signs were discussed; are enough streets entering that we could have stop signs and make 3 way stops; would have to stop 4 times; would also help people backing out with their blind spots and unsafe feeling; could limit parking on both sides of street. Angelou stated we have limited streets to one side parking before and that is usually not a popular thing to do; leaves street more wide open for speeding also. In response to questions from Angelou, Pinson stated that people cut through the neighborhood so they don't have to make a left on Morse and some to avoid the light at Morse and Cherrybottom. Angelou stated that it is usually localized traffic; is your own neighbors that are speeding. Pinson stated the City of Columbus recently turned down their request for a traffic light at Highmeadow and Morse; more people will cut through as it is harder and more dangerous to make a left turn on Morse; cars fly down our street to Cherrybottom.

Hogan asked Murphy the average speed when the traffic flashers were out there.

Murphy replied he did not know off top of his head; from enforcement perspective speed can be controlled; is highly labor intensive; don't know how many citations were issued; is a chronic problem. Angelou asked if it would be possible to get some sort of court. Kelley stated it is a problem all over the City; do have a problem with speed bumps; also don't believe the street trees are creating a blind spot; every one is supposed to be trimmed up so there is a sight line under the trees. Pinson stated that from 2 houses away can't see his house because the bend is so sharp. Hogan stated when you have teenage drivers they won't slow down for a speed bump and will end up going off road and killing a kid; have ability to keep him out of street but not ability to make him keep control. Kelley stated it is also a problem with plowing. Stinchcomb stated she had spoken with Pinson after corresponding by E-mail; get complaints all the time so know speeding is a problem all over; need to get message out to residents to please just slow down; in my own neighborhood it is the people in the neighborhood who are the ones speeding; all run late and want to make it up on the road; enforcement is the best solution; he did bring in a map and suggested locations for stop signs; gave it to City Engineer to review; we can't use stop signs for traffic control; would have to do a traffic study and meet justifications for stop; Pinson is new to Gahanna; this area is not that different and this street is like a lot of other secondary collectors; Dark Star, Woodmark Run and other collectors were built specifically to be wider; always will have differing opinions; wish there was a magic solution, but there isn't. Pinson asked Council to take a stance. Kelley stated he was against speed bumps; cause more problems; would suggest we do the traffic count to see if stop signs are warranted understanding that you can't use stop signs to control flow of traffic.

Kelley continued that he could not let comment about schools go by; have 5 grandkids that graduated from there; all received scholarships; very proud of the school. Pinson stated his comment was probably an over generalization. Angelou stated her son is a graduate of Gahanna Lincoln and is now attending OSU; am a product of Cleveland public schools; have had no problems graduating from college with honors and having a successful career; is all in what you do; the high school as large as it may be, does produce a good standard of education; they have a high caliber of staff and wonderful programs; they do attempt to make campus as small as it can be.

Payne stated that when her children were growing up they moved to Dark Star; knew it was a collector street; taught my kids to respect traffic and get in and out safely; they are now grown; once neighbors had little children it has become an issue; nobody cared when my kids were little; Chief took my neighbor for a ride along; found that people weren't speeding as much as they thought they were; when people are moving on to a through street they should know traffic is an issue; if it is a concern to them why not choose to live in a cul de sac. Angelou stated we put in S curves so the streets aren't runways where people will pick up speed the longer they stay on the road. Pinson stated it was not an issue of denying or accepting; if you're against then so be it; if you're for it we want something done; can do other things like chokes where the road narrows and speed islands; just like your consideration for these policy changes; won't let it end. Payne stated it should be addressed; the island issue has been tried; the Crossings at McKenna Creek had to have an island; it has come and gone at cost to City. Angelou stated we need an education campaign to address speeding and regarding local traffic. Pinson stated the association now has a web site put up by a local real estate agent; is a much larger medium to work with; this is a serious issue to us; is anyone for working with us. Angelou stated this is how we do things; enforcement is being done and education should be upgraded. Kelley stated the Police Department is working with you; lived on Lincolnshire for 21 years; backed out of my driveway every day into a 25 mph speed zone; wish we had a magical solution. Pinson stated his magical solution is to take steps to get it done; until it happens request you continue with your enforcement.

Stinchcomb stated we are reviewing the information; after City Engineer does warrants we will get back with you. Hogan stated we don't know if there is a problem until we get the counts. Pinson stated he doesn't know if the process is moving forward or not. Kelley stated it is moving forward; someone will be in touch with you regarding the City Engineer's study. After reviewing the photos, Mitchell stated the trees are limbed up; might need a slight trimming at this time of the year but they are limbed up to code specifications; the trees aren't what is causing the problem; will check for possible trimming.

Farmwood Place Bridge/Creek Bed - Dreska Complaint:

Wetherholt stated he has been in touch with Franklin Soil and Water; they have been given all the information; had it about 2 weeks; they are supposed to do some samples and look at watershed and investigate; will bring back to committee when report is received.

Software Purchase - GIS Manager:

Michalec stated he was asking for a motion resolution to purchase software specific to GIS; bare bones to get things going and to put data to use; don't want to close doors; gave a brief overview including a future purchasing schedule; reviewed available software and reasons for choice; explained future peripheral purchases; will then talk about map publishing and other step in distant future is data management; looking at general software information at this point; are a lot of resources; have spent a lot of time investigating other GIS systems around, speaking with other governmental entities and with two industry leaders - Autodesk and ESRI; make two GIS products; Autodesk is based on engineering background; pretty inexpensive; costs were reviewed; any software purchase should include maintenance which must be paid on a yearly basis; is not required but very desired; ESRI is the other product; does have GIS background; very good file formats; can be complex to get it running; more expensive than Autocad; people are willing to pay for it; floating versus single licenses; floating is for multiple use; looking at single use in the beginning; looking for both types of software to start system; ill advised to close doors; from now will be looking at who is making the better tool; are functions for Police that may be better in one format than other; right now am using one engineering license and would like to upgrade that for \$1,400; ArcInfo is \$7,000; totals almost \$9,000 and maintenance is \$2,500; just to get started; one time costs; maintenance costs are yearly; feel it is advisable to pay that; ESRI is located in Gahanna; it is one of their regional offices; they have a policy for donating to their home cities certain software; one catch is maintenance down the road; any software program you get will have that cost also; will also discount on training; this is something I would be buying regardless; our good fortune that they are located here; all surrounding communities have; at least have some of each; feel this is the best way to go.

McAlister asked if 3 years from now, a new system would be compatible. Michalec stated he had lately been talking to public safety about their applications for fire department and police; all with shape files; their basis is on a shape file; can't predict the future; think it is one of the industry standards. Payne stated that in order to woo you away from another vendor a new company will make your data useful; also believe it will be the standard; feel that a couple of years from now since ESRI is so big, it shouldn't be a problem. Michalec stated that the software is not the most important thing; comes back to standard of garbage in, garbage out; requesting authorization to spend \$2,100 of already appropriated for upgrading the AutoDesk; will also accept the donation of the ESRI product. Payne stated that they were satisfied in Communications & Technology Committee two weeks ago.

RECOMMENDATION: Motion Resolution, consent agenda.

Building Security:

Isler stated he had spoken with Kronos; badges will work 100% with this proposed system; will be no problem with using those; they gave me a revised proposal; if you're using the reader coming in the front door here everybody coming in would have to use; on this type of building that won't happen; to rely only on that he would not recommend it; Police Department is another issue; everyone is going into one area and it would record everyone coming in and out; would do away with the keypad and would have to use the cards; original proposal was \$99,000; this is \$60,000 maximum and would vary slightly depending on how it works and where we want them; maintenance of \$5,000 would be phased in; wouldn't want to start with all; would start with one area and work out kinks and then add on; probably look at the fuel station and the garage areas. In response to question from Hogan, Franey stated that at the police station people would still be able to get into the lobby area; could not get past the lobby without using the card; for City Hall we have one in for exterior door; some internally also; have one where employees would be using but doors are still open to the public; first people coming in would read. In response to question from Angelou, Isler stated the system would read times going in and out and feed it through to the payroll system and format it for the managers; they can look at time in and count; no more manual time clocks that work and don't work; ultimately looking at same card can feed all the way for time recording and adapted to be used as a fuel card. Franey stated we are not choosing to do that option as fuel cards need to stay with the vehicle.

In response to question, Franey stated that the security portion is \$108,000; the finance portion is on top of that; \$100,000 gives you the base proximity readers, some intrusion device and base security at all Gahanna facilities - Oklahoma, fuel site, golf course, water tower and this compound; two options were given on the glass that were discounted; portable magnetometer for \$4,344 and was also an option for the parks restrooms to be able to be locked and unlocked remotely for \$9,379. Stinchcomb stated her recommendation had been the base package and portable magnetometer. In response to question from Angelou, Isler stated that the \$60,000 is a maximum figure; can eliminate \$2,100 if everyone uses one entry; software would still be needed regardless; my portion would be in appropriations for next year. Franey stated base in \$110,338 with an additional \$4,388; have \$24,308 in our account so a supplemental would be needed in the neighborhood of \$90,000. Hogan stated he is not saying this is not necessary; will need to start looking at cuts somewhere; have had huge supplementals. Kelley stated he understands we need a certain amount of security; are to comparing apples to oranges; is this the top of the line. Stinchcomb stated that General Williams says this is the base package. Hogan stated that from a purely security standpoint, understand having a portable magnetometer on court days, but why do we need security at the golf course; fuel station is a totally unmanned system understand some security is needed; where have we had problems. Franey stated that brought up some of the sites was the desire to have payroll information; that is what causes this at some of the remote locations; fuel site is very limited; Oklahoma site each building has one but most important out there is that it has 2 devices that go on gates for perimeter security; when you get into golf course it is to send back payroll data; Senior Center is included; Police is obvious but that is a minimum amount; simply block all access except that to the first floor; will be nothing on the second floor; have to get past that first line; here in addition to card reader for payroll it doesn't block access; internally one at basement door; has a piece in it that is tied with the emergency siren so it automatically unlocks that basement door; right now basement is locked; a person has to be charged with the task to go unlock that basement door for those who don't have access; is a system asking for trouble; even had complaints from employees; people can't get down there and it is the employee lunch room and supply room. In response to

question from Payne, Franey stated that the security system has some pretty robust software.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to next Finance Committee.

ISSUES - From Engineering:

Eastgate, Phase II:

Wetherholt stated this had been brought to committee in August and recommended for legislation; pulled that legislation at the last minute as numbers did not compute; have spent the time since then reviewing with Isler; is detailed in August 9 report; have been working since then to figure out what costs are for Eastgate Phase II; along with report submitted a tabulation of where we are with Eastgate today; knew from the original budget in beginning of 2000 that Phase II would be due at some point; decided to do in this manner several years ago instead of bonding; borrowed from general fund to prepay the TIF and tax increment financing pays it back over a period of time; actual request is in two parts; small discrepancy on what Pizzuti has given us on Taylor Road at Eastgate; need \$553,750 for the Eastgate portion as a supplemental appropriation which will go into the TIF account and is supposed to get paid back; all based on value of land going up and of land being developed; spent the past month studying; was brought forward on August 9 and withdrew it because numbers weren't working; Pizzuti was coming back with different numbers; weren't satisfied with way we were reporting; would like to start this and bring back to committee if you wish to discuss further. Angelou stated that the tenants will pay this back. White stated the project is not finished; there are no tenants until it is completed.

White stated the City is doing an industrial project; did one back in 1979 and it is paying itself off and City has recaptured funds; knew this was a long term payoff of 30 years to pay ourselves back; whether or not the development will be able to pay City back and interest that will continue to accrue is all subject to the economy; hoped things would be better in that area; attended ground breaking ceremony today for Governors announcement of a new frontier program; much more competitive; is in the 10 year development stage; protecting our future and is part of sustainability; that's where we are. Hogan asked how close we are; could we have a 3 quarter year update; how much carryover did we start with; how much in supplementals; revenue and expenses for the year. Isler stated that was sent out in E-mail format last week; last year was a very good year and we far exceeded our plan for last year; when comparing to last year we are down 8%.

RECOMMENDATION: 1st reading, back to Finance Committee.

ISSUES - From Director of Development:

CVB Director:

White introduced Karen Eylon, the new CVB Director. Eylon stated it was a pleasure to attending; really excited about what Gahanna has to offer to stakeholders - residents, visitors - including credible schools; first official day was September 3; working towards getting bricks and mortars done; great things on the horizon; thank you for the vision that this community has with Creekside and with forming the CVB; moved here from upstate New York 3 years ago; have been in tourism industry for 15 years; worked for two CVB's in Dayton and Cincinnati and the Corning Glass Museum in New York; also served on a CVB Board in that area; most of our family is in Dayton; is a fantastic board to work for and with; they have been serving for about 2 years to bring this to this point;

high level of commitment; have vision to get it this far; hope to get to know each and every one of you; come visit us at 116 Mill Street; hope to be operational the first week of October; just prior to coming here had own business doing consulting in tourism and marketing; this community is a moving and shaking community doing incredible things.

Holiday Lights:

White stated the proposal before you is requesting \$8,000 for additional lights for this year; labor will be in house; Mitchell has said he has staff that can provide the labor; asking for some lights and additional decorations for Holiday Lights to allow us to light up trees in median entry feature as they approach bridge and to light up the arch area; also talked about trying to light up all the trees on Mill Street or at least every other; parade participants have also said there are not enough lights on High Street; have not included High Street in this year; looking for bigger and better each year; not asking to add tremendous amount but enough for visibility and greater aesthetics to what we are trying to do; fixtures would be maintained by Parks Department; that's our proposal. Hogan stated he did not have a problem with this request; don't have to add each year. Kelley stated he sat in on meetings when this was initially discussed; proposal is for the 14 crab apple trees; also we put lights down on the creek and why aren't we lighting up Mill Street since that is the parade route; can support this. McAlister asked if this was for the holiday season only. White replied that it was. Kelley stated we don't have to have new or add every year; just a new attraction now and then; this is something that CVB and Blue Ribbon Committee could work towards.

RECOMMENDATION: 1st reading, no reading to come back to committee, 2nd reading, consent agenda.

ISSUES - From Clerk of Council:

Board Appointments:

Sherwood stated that a review of resumes submitted last year was done; all viable candidates not receiving an appointment at that time were interested in Planning Commission; vacancies at this point are for Landscape Board and Cable Advisory Board. Clerk was requested to advertise these positions.

Sewer Contract:

Hogan stated he had asked that this item be added to the agenda; several things have happened since we authorized the Mayor to sign the agreement; Hall delayed getting it signed for several reasons and Mayor has never signed; now feel that contract may need to be changed; would like to bring forward the idea of legislation to repeal the ordinance authorizing the Mayor to enter into agreement and then discuss in next committee. Stinchcomb stated they are in negotiations with Columbus. Thom asked if it will change. Angelou stated she assumed it had been signed; read in paper that it had not been. Payne questioned if it would hurt negotiations. White stated she felt it would send a message; message being that we are in a position that we could push the envelope; take what your action is and utilize that; can say that Council is thinking about repealing and starting all over; can say it is being considered.

Hogan requested an ordinance for the October 7 meeting and can request a waiver of second reading at that time.

RECOMMENDATION: 1st reading, regular agenda.

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