

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

The regular meeting of the Prairie Township Board of Trustees was called to order by the Chairperson Mr. Stormont, with Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Schlosser and Ms. Montag present. Also attending were: Chief Feustel, Mr. Hatmaker, Ms. Swisher and Mr. McAninch. (See attached list).

Mr. Stormont led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board approve the minutes as written for the regular meeting of September 27, 2006. Vote; Aye

Mr. Stormont opened the public hearing for the creation of street light assessment districts in WestPoint Phase II Section II and Young Estates.

Ms. Montag stated she presented to the Board on September 13, 2006 two petitions that were filed with her office for street light districts. Young Estates filed their petition on September 11, 2006 and WestPoint Phase II Section II filed their petition on September 1, 2006. Both petitions met the requirements pursuant to Ohio Revised Code section 515.02 and 515.03. At that time the Board set a public hearing on October 11, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Stormont swore in residents that were giving testimony.

Mr. Stormont asked for testimony in favor of street lights in WestPoint Phase II Section II subdivision.

Ms. Melinda Shoaf stated she circulated the petition in favor of street lights. She is in favor of having the street lights because there have been a lot of break-ins in the neighborhood and the lights are good for people who walk at night.

Mr. Kennedy asked when she was circulating the petition what kind of response did she get. Ms. Shoaf responded that most of the people were in favor of street lights. Most of the people on the cul-de-sacs were not in favor of street lights. She stated they did have the 51% required signatures in favor of street lights.

Ms. Schlosser asked when she was circulating the petition if the residents understood what they were signing. Ms. Shoaf responded that no one read the petition they glanced over it and she said it would cost approximately \$60.00 to \$65.00 per year and a lot of residents did care how much it would cost and others stated they would have to think about it.

Ms. Joyce Carney lives at 8525 Squad Drive, stated she is in favor of street lights because she baby-sits her grandchildren and walks home, a couple of sidewalks are uneven and it would be nice to have streetlights to see where you are walking and for safety reasons too.

Mr. Stormont asked for testimony opposing street lights in WestPoint Phase II Section II subdivision.

Mr. Keith Myers lives on Parade Place, stated when he spoke with Ms. Shoaf in great depth about the petition, asked her specifically how much it was going to cost and her response was "nothing, AEP would install the lights any pay for them". When he moved into the neighborhood he asked M/I Homes about street lights and M/I Homes stated they didn't want street lights because they would have to pay for them. He specifically asked what kind of lights would they be if they did get them, because the lights in Phase I are in disrepair and look horrible. He was told they would be different. He contacted Ms. Montag after he received the certified letter and she stated there would be a cost involved and assessed to the property taxes. And the lights would be the same as Phase I to keep the continuity in the neighborhoods. That is not what was told to him when the petition was circulated. He is not sure if anyone else got misinformation or not. He stated per the Ohio Revised Code you have to

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

have a necessity for the lights. He asked the Board what after 10 years deems it a necessity.

Mr. Stormont responded he has received several complaints of vehicle break-ins in the area. Mr. Myers asked shouldn't that be addressed with the Sheriff's Department. Ms. Schlosser responded that street lights do deter crime. He asked if the crime is any less in the areas that have street lights. He challenges the Board on their decision to determine the necessity of lights when they viewed the area and it was not dark. If there is an issue with crime than why isn't there more Sheriff's patrolling the area? He has lived there for 10 years; he used to see them all the time and does not see them but maybe once a week. He challenges the validity of the petition, since it was passed around with misinformation. Mr. Myers asked if there is damage to the sidewalks after installation who is responsible for the repairs. Mr. McAninch responded the contractor would guarantee their work for a period of time after that it would be the homeowner's responsibility. Mr. Myers asked how the assessment is done. Ms. Montag responded it is divided evenly by the number of parcels in the plat. Mr. Myers asked how much it was going to cost. Ms. Montag responded the costs of the lights is 19 lights times \$15.95 per light equals \$303.05, 45 spans times \$1.10 per span equals \$49.50, 19 lights times .59 fuel charge equals \$11.21, 19 lights conduit is \$3,487.50 divided by 36 months (3 year assessment) equals \$96.87 for a total of \$460.63 per month cost divided by 82 parcels equals \$5.62 per month per parcel. Ms. Montag incorrectly stated the monthly cost of \$11.55 per month for the first three years. Ms. Montag corrected the one time charges for legal ad \$65.00, certified mailing \$380.48 and fiscal officers fee \$41.00 for a total of 486.48 divided by 36 months equals \$13.51 divided by 82 parcels is .165 additional per month per parcel for a total of \$5.79 per month per parcel. Mr. Myers thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Kennedy asked Mr. Zorich with AEP if he was aware of any problems with the conduit under the sidewalks affecting the concrete. Mr. Zorich responded he was not aware of any problems. The conduit is only two inch diameter so it does not displace too much material to be a problem.

Mr. Greg Zorich with AEP stated he put the design together and the cost of the street lights. It is a standard installation and they match the existing fiberglass poles and post top lamps in other areas. As far as the repairs to the existing lights. He was not aware of the light needing repaired. They do have a contractor that will make the repairs. The fiberglass poles is all that AEP offers as a standard. Mr. Myers asked why Dublin and New Albany have different lights. Mr. Zorich responded those are not AEP lights, AEP only supplies the energy to the lights in those areas. Mr. Zorich stated they can get any kind of light they want from another vendor at the property owner's expense and AEP will supply the power to the lights.

Mr. Rich Eberts, 819 Battalion Place, stated he received very incomplete information in regard to costs and what the lights would look like. He is not aware of any big crime problem. He feels the design selection, placement, maintenance and aligning are all very critical in creating a beneficial effect for the community. He feels street lights are a target for vandals, graffiti and unsolicited advertising that people don't remove. The positives might be taking walks in the evening may be a little less concerning. He also feels lighting can aid criminal activity, domestic break-ins occur during daylight, proving lights can aid criminals. Lights can help criminals survey an area and minimize any risk being caught. He does not believe street lights are deterrents. If there is an increase in crime in the community there are alternatives to consider and he would support and work with anyone in the community. He feels people need to make investments in their homes not in an infrastructure that is potentially a bad idea. He and his family have experienced star watching and bat watching at Prairie Oaks night time programs. These are becoming scarce due to light pollution. He is not convinced there is a need or beneficial effect, particularly when there is not a defined way for execution and review. If the community is not going to have input into what is going in the community what good is it. He does not support street lights in his community and feels people need more information to

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

make a better choice. He feels the petition did not provide good information in order for people to make a good choice.

Mr. Lee Shoaf, 8526 Squad Dr. apologized to the residents if they feel they were misinformed about the price. He stated he was given an approximate price of \$6.00 to \$6.50 per month. He feels he should have been told about the additional costs. Ms. Montag apologized; this was her first lighting district and was not aware of the additional costs when they first spoke about lighting districts.

Ms. Schlosser asked Mr. Shoaf how price conscience was the residents when the petition was circulated. Mr. Shoaf responded the residents he spoke with he told them it would be approximately \$60.00 to \$65.00 per year. Ms. Schlosser stated when they drove through the community this evening at dusk, it was pretty dark and there were very few porch lights on.

Mr. Jim Morrison stated he has sold real estate for 19 years in Prairie Township. He stated it is difficult to sell homes to potential buyers if there are no street lights in the community. It also helps improve property values.

Mr. Brian Ranft, 831 Parade Place, stated he just moved in four months ago and lights were not a consideration of him buying his home. They wanted to live outside of the Columbus area and in a rural area. Street lights do not make a community the people make the community. Cost aside, he believes street lights can be ascetically pleasing, the option in front of them are not ascetically pleasing. Something that is a permanent fixture and add to property values should look nice. He feels the decision should be tabled and get more information out to the community before a decision is made.

Mr. Stormont asked for testimony in favor of street lights in Young Estates subdivision.

Mr. David Holdren, 6279 Geyer Drive, he and his wife circulated the petition for street lights. He has experienced five robberies. There has been a surprisingly number of activities of the like in the community. They sent out two mailings to all their neighbors with information and costs for street lights. They also held a meeting at their home that everyone was invited and had a great discussion and the Sheriff's Department attended as well to discuss a block watch. He feels it is refutable that light is valuable to help deter crime. Lights do reduce vulnerability and makes for a safer place to live.

Mr. Bob Kettering, 6359 Youngland Drive, he has seen crime activity in the community. His main concern is the location of the street lights. In past practice, when the township did the handicap sidewalk improvement, he still has a four inch gap between the curb and sod. He does not want a street light in front of his home. He would need to know where the locations of the street lights are going and more information of the type of street lights. Otherwise, he feels the street lights are a good idea.

Mr. Ken Maykowski, 6267 Geyer Drive, he is in favor of street lights. It is very dark when you drive down Feder Road and turn into Young Estates.

Mr. Dave Hoffman, 6311 Youngland Drive, he is not for or against the street lights. His concern is the placement of the lights. He has security cameras on his home and the light will affect how his home security cameras work. His concerns are placement, cost and who maintains the lights.

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

Mr. Stormont asked for testimony opposing street lights in Young Estates subdivision.

Mr. Craig Smith, 1208 Youngland Drive, the large lots, sidewalks and no street lights is what attracted him to the community. He is an amateur astronomer and a member of the Columbus Astronomical Society. He gave pictures to the Board displaying light pollution. The street lights go off to the sky creating the light pollution they do not just light the ground. There are communities that pass ordinances to restrict lighting and to use specific lighting to help reduce light pollution. He is very concerned about what kind a legacy they are leaving behind by constantly increasing the light pollution needlessly. The dark sky is a religious experience and no longer exists in central Ohio due to light pollution. His main objection to the street lights in his community is the quality of lights, and how they shine.

Mr. Greg Zorich explained how they install the duplex wire from the transformer to the street light by slicing it into the ground with a machine 24" into the ground. There is no trenching involved.

Ms. Schlosser stated there was 51% of the frontage that have signed the petition. Ms. Schlosser stated the residents that have shown up in opposition seem to be smaller than the residents that have signed the petition.

Ms. Melinda Shoaf stated when she circulated the petition she did not say it was going to be free. She thought she was doing a good thing for the community and she doesn't care anymore if street lights are installed or not.

Mr. Craig Smith would like clarification on the pricing. Ms. Montag stated Efficient Electric gave an updated quote from the initial quote plus the on time charges increased the monthly costs. He doesn't feel the cost was a factor when residents signed the petition.

Mr. Kennedy stated his main concern is the safety and if these lights prevent one child from being hurt or they prevent any crime in the area they are worth it. Mr. Kennedy stated in the WestPoint area there were three residents spoke in favor and three opposing. He received two emails in favor and one oppose. He feels the petitions were circulated with good information and in good faith. There were 45 signatures out of 82. He will make his decision with the majority and in favor of street lights.

Ms. Schlosser stated the residents came to the Board and requested the necessity for street lights. The residents circulated the petition and she is doing what the majority is wanting.

Mr. Keith Myers stated he could go out and get 45 signatures opposing the street lights as well at the next meeting.

Ms. Schlosser stated they have heard all the testimony in favor and in opposition. Ms. Schlosser asked Mr. Myers and Mr. Smith since they stated their opposition for street lights why they didn't rally their neighbors to the meeting. Mr. Myers stated he sent a letter stating the meeting was at 5:30 p.m. Ms. Schlosser stated the special meeting was for the Board to go view the lighting districts and there were only three people here for that meeting. Ms. Schlosser stated the Board is going to look at what the majority of the residents want and her vote is in line with the majority.

Mr. Neil Distlehorst stated he doesn't live in either community he lives in the country where it is dark and he likes it. His question is if 45 people signed the petition and there are 82 parcels he is not sure that there is a majority. The Board should table the issue.

Ms. Schlosser stated she noticed the cul-de-sacs very few residents signed, but a lot of

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

residents signed that lived on the main streets.

Ms. Laura Tobergte, 837 Battalion Place, she feels there is not a valid need for street lights. She doesn't feel her voice or vote is being counted. She doesn't like the looks or maintenance of the lights.

Mr. Ken Maykowski, 6267 Geyer Drive, stated the petitions were circulated; letters were mailed advising of meeting and possibly your taxes increased, this is your time to show. If you didn't show, you lose. He asked to respect the people that did show up.

Mr. Rick Eberts, 819 Battalion Place, he felt there was a true disconnect of what people desire and what was communicated with the petition.

Mr. Stormont closed the public hearing at 8:40 p.m.

Ms. Schlosser asked for a show of hands of resident's in WestPoint Phase II Section II who are in favor of street lights. Two people raised their hands

Ms. Schlosser asked for a show of hands of resident's who oppose street lights. Five people raised their hands.

Ms. Schlosser asked for a show of hands of resident's in Young Estates who are in favor of street lights. Six people raised their hands.

Ms. Schlosser asked for a show of hands of resident's who oppose street lights. Three raised their hands.

Mr. Stormont tabled the WestPoint Phase II Section II street lighting district until the next meeting on October 25, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Montag requested the Board to adopt RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY FOR STREETLIGHTING IN THE YOUNG ESTATES SUBDIVISION IN PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO.

Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded the Board to adopt RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY FOR STREETLIGHTING IN THE YOUNG ESTATES SUBDIVISION IN PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO. A roll call resulted as follows: Ms. Schlosser; Aye, Mr. Kennedy; Aye, Mr. Stormont; Aye.

Mr. Kennedy suggested the Board divide the subdivision up in thirds and the Board to talk to the residents and find out what they want.

Ms. Montag requested the Board to adopt RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SIGNING OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT WITH AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER FOR STREET LIGHTING IN THE YOUNG ESTATES SUBDIVISION and authorize Mr. Hatmaker to sign the American Electric Power agreement.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board to adopt RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SIGNING OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT WITH AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER FOR STREET LIGHTING IN THE YOUNG ESTATES SUBDIVISION and authorize Mr. Hatmaker to sign the American Electric Power agreement. A roll call resulted as follows: Ms. Schlosser; Aye, Mr. Kennedy; Aye, Mr. Stormont; Aye.

Ms. Montag requested the Board to adopt RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF LIGHTING THE UNINCORPORATED DISTRICT OF YOUNG ESTATES SUBDIVISION, IN PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO.

Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded the Board to adopt RESOLUTION IN

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

THE MATTER OF LIGHTING THE UNINCORPORATED DISTRICT OF YOUNG ESTATES SUBDIVISION, IN PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO. A roll call resulted as follows: Ms. Schlosser; Aye, Mr. Kennedy; Aye, Mr. Stormont; Aye.

Mr. Stormont opened the public hearing for the consideration of the removal of an unsafe structure at 6611 Hall Road.

Mr. Hatmaker stated on August 21, 2006, Assistant Fire Chief Good sent a letter to the owner of 6611 Hall Road ordering that the structure at the address be demolished or removed. This letter was forwarded via certified mail. He briefed the Board at the August 30, 2006 meeting and at its September 27, 2006 meeting and the Board set this public hearing. The Township may remove the structure at the owner's expense beginning seven days after the date that the structure is declared unsafe. Staff has received three estimates for the removal. 1.) Berkshire Brothers \$5,500.00 2.) Darby Excavation \$6,000.00 and 3.) Loewendick & Sons Inc. \$11,000.00.

Ms. Pattie Hayes stated it was her parent's home and asked if the letter was signed for. Mr. Hatmaker responded yes. Ms. Hayes asked if they were going to take the lowest bid. Ms. Schlosser responded yes. Ms. Hayes asked if the removal only pertained to the house. Mr. Hatmaker responded yes. Ms. Hayes stated there are two large sheds on the property that were not touched by the fire. Ms. Schlosser asked how the property owner was going to secure the buildings so it does not become a nuisance. Ms. Hayes responded the sheds are secured and locked.

Mr. Neil Distlehorst asked about the cars on the property. Ms. Hayes stated the cars are licensed.

Mr. Hatmaker requested the Board to declare 6611 Hall Road an unsafe structure and authorize the removal.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board to declare 6611 Hall Road an unsafe structure and authorize the removal. Vote; Aye.

Mr. Hatmaker requested the Board to approve Berkshire Brothers for \$5,500.00 for the removal of the unsafe structure at 6611 Hall Road.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board to approve Berkshire Brothers for \$5,500.00 for the removal of the unsafe structure at 6611 Hall Road. Vote; Aye.

Mr. Hatmaker requested the Board to authorize the assessment of the removal of the unsafe structure at 6611 Hall Road.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board to authorize the assessment of the removal of the unsafe structure at 6611 Hall Road. Vote; Aye.

Mr. Stormont closed the public hearing.

The Fiscal Officer presented the following items:

Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded the Board approve the following supplemental appropriations. Vote; Aye.

\$1,200.00 from 1000-390-190-0000 to 1000-390-323-0000.

After the Trustees reviewed the pending warrant list, Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded the Board approve the payment of the ADP payroll in the amount

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

of \$105,344.14 and approve payment of the following bills. Vote; Aye. (See pending warrant list).

1. Ms. Montag requested the Board to approve reducing the Fifth Third Sweep Account by \$113.60 plus interest and transfer to the Fifth Third Money Market account.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board to approve reducing the Fifth Third Sweep Account by \$113.60 plus interest and transfer to the Fifth Third Money Market account. Vote; Aye.

2. Ms. Montag presented to the Board a new liquor permit for Maize Mart, LLC, d.b.a. Speedy Mart at 4736 Sullivant Avenue. The Board requested no hearing.

Ms. Connie Swisher, Zoning Inspector, addressed the Board with the following Zoning Department matters:

1. Ms. Swisher presented to the Board a letter from the Zoning Commission requesting support of the Big Darby Accord and Town Center Master Plan.

Mr. Tracy Hatmaker, Administrator, addressed the Board with the following Administrative matters:

1. Mr. Hatmaker requested the Board to declare 6241 Alkire Road and 267 Postle Blvd nuisance properties and to be mowed on or after October 12, 2006.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board to declare 6241 Alkire Road and 267 Postle Blvd nuisance properties and to be mowed on or after October 12, 2006. Vote; Aye.

2. Mr. Hatmaker requested the Board to declare 488 Lombard Road a nuisance property and to have the trash and debris removed on or after October 18, 2006.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded Board to declare 488 Lombard Road a nuisance property and to have the trash and debris removed on or after October 18, 2006. Vote; Aye.

3. Mr. Hatmaker requested the Board to authorize the chair to sign a letter of support for an \$800,000.00 grant for assisting the Big Darby Accord.

Mr. Kennedy moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded the Board to authorize the chair to sign a letter of support for an \$800,000.00 grant for assisting the Big Darby Accord. Vote; Aye.

4. Mr. Hatmaker updated the Board on the Senior Center. Candidate's night is October 13, 2006 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Lunch & Learn in November and December relating to Medicare part B. The Craft Bazaar is November 11, 2006 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. There are 232 members, 166 township residents, 66 non residents.

Old Business:

New Business:

Public Comment:

Announcements:

PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES

23 MAPLE DRIVE REGULAR MEETING/OCTOBER 11, 2006

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board recess in to executive session at 9:30 p.m. pursuant to Ohio Revised Code section 121.22(G) to consider the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion, or compensation of a public employee. A roll call resulted as follows: Ms. Schlosser; Aye, Mr. Kennedy; Aye, Mr. Stormont; Aye.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded the Board reconvene the regular meeting at 9:55 p.m. pursuant to Ohio Revised Code section 121.22(G) to consider the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion, or compensation of a public employee. A roll call resulted as follows: Ms. Schlosser; Aye, Mr. Kennedy; Aye, Mr. Stormont; Aye.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded to give Ms. Dana Scott her twelve month pay increase from \$14.70 per hour to \$15.44 per hour effective payroll starting on October 4, 2006 and retroactive from January 1, 2006. Vote; Aye.

Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded to give the Administrator, Fire Chief, Assistant Fire Chief, Zoning Inspector and Road Superintendent a three percent (3%) pay increase effective payroll starting on October 4, 2006 and retroactive from January 1, 2006. Vote; Aye.

Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded to give the Fire Department Dispatchers a three percent (3%) pay increase effective payroll starting October 4, 2006. The step rates are new hires; \$12.92, 6 months, \$13.61, 12 months; \$14.10, 24 months; \$14.84, 36 months; \$15.63. Ms. Nancy Hunter increase to \$17.78 per hour effective October 4, 2006. Vote; Aye.

Mr. Stormont moved, Ms. Schlosser seconded to give the Zoning Field Inspector, Zoning Clerk and Administrative Assistant a three percent (3%) pay increase effective payroll starting October 4, 2006. The step rates are new hires; \$14.42, 6 months; \$15.14, 12 months; \$15.90, 24 months; \$16.70, 36 months; \$17.53.

Mr. Stormont moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded to give the Road and Cemetery Department a two percent (2%) pay increase from the current pay scale effective October 4, 2006. Step 1 - \$13.26, Step 2 - \$14.94, Step 3 - \$15.48, Step 4 - \$17.92 and Step 5 - \$20.93. Vote; Aye.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Chairperson

Fiscal Officer