



**CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION 2017 - JOSEPH BIZJAK  
FRIDAY MAY 12, 2017**

**MEETING: 5:30 PM**

**PLACE: COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM  
7232 E. MAIN STREET, 1ST FLOOR, REYNOLDSBURG, OH 43068**

**Call to Order**

PRESENT: Wallace, Bizjak, Saylor, Johns  
ABSENT: King

**Approval of Agenda**

Agenda stands approved.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Charter Review Commission 2017 – Meeting – May 3, 2017

Minutes stand approved.

**Old Business**

**Proposed Charter Amendments - Competitive Bidding**

Mr. Hood was in attendance and offered to assist with any questions that the Commission has on the process that the City currently has on competitive bidding and the information that has been shared in regards to other communities and their bidding processes. Councilman Cotner was also in attendance to provide Council perspective if requested.

Mr. Hood asked fir there were any questions in regards to the materials provided.

Mr. Saylor stated that he felt that he would like to see something that both the Mayor and Council would be comfortable working with and that it is definitely something that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Hood responded that having a competitive bidding process that makes sense and is adaptable is important.

Ms. Wallace said that she feels that they did like the idea to give the power to the Council to make the decision because it takes so long to make purchases with the current situation.

Mr. Bizjak agreed that it allows for some flexibility. He felt that the Commission was on the same page that granting Council that flexibility was a good idea because at the end of the day, they are accountable to the people.

Mr. Hood responded that it also holds the administration accountable.

Mr. Hood went on to point out that of the examples provided, he was more comfortable with similarities to Hilliard in that there are 2 provisions which are similar to Reynoldsburg broken into 2 paragraphs. They have a purchasing procedure and a competitive bidding procedure that are clear.

Mr. Cotner stated the conversation that the Commission was having was great, the ability to adapt. He said that it can be difficult for departments to get things done and that it isn't about the dollar amount, but the process.

Mr. Johns stated he would support putting the option in Council's hands, but with caution that we try not to move it to the highest limit because there could be a lot of money spent before anyone would notice.

Mr. Hood agreed and added that the intent isn't to change the dollar amount, but the process.

Ms. Wallace stated that this change would carry the City for several decades because things then wouldn't be operating on a 1992 level.

Mr. Hood responded using the rec center as an example. When purchasing recreation equipment, basketball hoops, do we need to go through all of that to purchase them and then over and over to purchase the equipment?

Mr. Johns said things would stay current.

Mr. Bizjak said it would prevent the Charter from having to be amended over and over also.

Mr. Hood said if there is a more general and broad Charter and more detailed ordinances, they still have to abide by that. And if it has to be tweaked they can do that.

Mrs. Beggerow asked the Commission if they wanted to move forward with a suggestion and asked Mr. Hood how, in the past suggestions like these were handled.

Mr. Hood responded that generally the Commission would present their suggestions however he is available to assist. He just requests feedback as to what the Commission would like him to focus on drafting.

Ms. Wallace asked Mr. Hood which was the best example for a starting point.

Mr. Hood said Hilliard was a good moderate place to start because it is a good example of a general Charter provision and a specific ordinance and procedure which is a good way to deal with these issues in his opinion.

Mr. Bizjak said he agreed with that philosophy.

Mr. Hood said he would go through the Hilliard sections and fashion something tailored for the City of Reynoldsburg and present it to the Commission at a later date.

**RESULT:**

**HELD**

**Next: 5/19/2017 5:30 PM**

#### New Business

##### Public Suggestion-McKenzie Charter Section 7.01 Planning Commission

Dr. McKenzie stated that this request does state Planning Commission but does apply to the other Boards in that the Development Director has a non-voting position on those Boards. He said from an ethical standpoint it makes it difficult for him to do his job while avoiding ex-parte communications. He added that the Charter is about ensuring diversity and that the Development Department is now vetting candidates for Boards and Commissions which doesn't protect that diversity.

Mr. Johns asked about last week's meeting regarding raising that number from 5 to 7.

Mr. Bizjak replied he recalled several changes.

##### Public Suggestion-Myers Charter Section 1.02 Form of Government

Mr. Bizjak said the way this reads, it looks like he wants to have another have another Commission or Committee in the Charter to review the possibility of reviewing a Council Manager form of Government. He added that would be adding too many committees and commissions for the purposes of creating committees and commissions.

Mr. Johns said he would like to hear from Mr. Myers and where his initial thoughts are coming from.

Mrs. Beggerow said she would reach out and ask him to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Hood stated that this particular topic comes up at many of the Charter Review sessions.

**RESULT:**

**HELD**

#### Other Business

Questions that had been posed to Jed on the Bonding of the Auditor's position.

Mr. Hood said to the question is it a requirement that our City Auditor be bonded, why is our City Auditor bonded if he is or not, and for what purpose and what requirements need to be met

to be bondable. He continued, there really isn't a requirement in state code or the Charter that requires the City Auditor to be bonded, however, the City's Financial Institutions that are dealt with prefer it because when we handle cash which the Auditor and Tax Administrator (the 2 bonded city members do), it is to prevent fraud. If fraud occurs, it would put the City back in a place prior to the fraud. So it is protection in addition to mistake, error, omission (which the city is also insured for). He stated that the bottom line was that bonding was not necessarily required, but good business practice, the City's business partners want it to occur, it's not expensive, and it is to prevent fraud. He is just unsure of the automatic disqualifiers. One bonding company may have different requirements than another.

Mrs. Beggerow pointed out that in response to the public submission asking for a degree requirement. There is a requirement for a Civil Service person in the Auditor's office to hold a 4 year degree in Finance.

Mr. Hood added that they do not leave when the office changes hands.

Ms. Wallace asked what the protocol would be would be in the case that a person would be elected and the person would not be able to be bonded?

Mr. Hood replied that there did seem to be different requirements between bonding companies because they are insurance companies. But if that were to occur, it would occur, it would create a vacancy, and that vacancy would be filled as per the Charter requirements which in this case, the Mayor makes an appointment with Council confirmation.