



Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 5, 2015 ~ 7:30 P.M.

Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building
John P. Coleman Council Chamber
6550 North High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

City Council

Bonnie D. Michael, President
Robert F. Chosy, President Pro-Tempore
Rachael Dorothy
Scott Myers
David M. Norstrom
Douglas Smith
Michael C. Troper

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, January 5, 2015, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 P.M.

Members Present: Robert F. Chosy, Rachael R. Dorothy, Scott Myers, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper, and Bonnie D. Michael (David Norstrom arrived at 7:35 p.m.)

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistance City Manager Robyn Stewart, City Engineer William Watterson, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Chief of Police James Mosaic, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were five visitors present.

President Michael invited those in attendance to stand and join in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

VISITOR COMMENTS**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **December 1, 2014 – Regular Meeting**
- **December 8, 2014 – Committee of the Whole Meeting**
- **December 15, 2014 – Special Meeting**

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

There being no additional comments, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote to approve the minutes as amended.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED**Resolution No. 01-2015**

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 160 West Wilson Bridge Road and Authorizing Variances (Tom Linzell/M&A Architects).

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION Dr. Chosy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 01-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson shared that the resolution is related to one of the apartment/office building on West Wilson Bridge Road. He asked Mr. Brown to overview this amendment that deals largely with signage.

Mr. Brown commented that the resolution is for an amendment to development plan at 160 West Wilson Bridge Road. The amendment is a variance request for the signage for the proposed building. This building houses both the apartments and the class "A" office space. This request is very similar to the one that members approved in July for building #2.

Mr. Brown shared that at the December 11th meeting of the Municipal Planning Commission, members reviewed changes for signage, pool deck amenities and the amenity deck.

Mr. Brown showed pictures of Building #1 and pointed out the locations of the proposed signage.

Mr. Brown commented that the first sign is approximately 56 square feet that will say "The Heights at Worthington Place". It will be located over the garage entrance on the west side of the building. He added that the building address, "160" will be displayed beside the sign to direct people towards the parking garage.

There is a larger sign proposed on the eastern side of the building and back towards Building #2. The sign will be a little over 247 square feet (He pointed out the brick outline in the building). The sign will again say "The Heights at Worthington Place". The total signage being proposed for the two signs is approximately 304 square feet. The variance is needed because City code only allows for one sign of 100 square feet.

Mr. Brown pointed out that the actual signs will be wall murals that are painted on the brick. The murals will be similar to their apartments on Lane Ave. in Upper Arlington that have "The Lane" painted on the brick building (A rendering of The Lane sign was shown on the overhead). Ms. Michael noted that our signs will run vertical instead of sideways. Mr. Brown agreed.

Mr. Greeson commented that at some point, if the office space leases there may be a request for tenant signs for the offices. Mr. Brown stated that these are the only two signs requested at this time.

Dr. Chosy asked what the recommendation was from the Architectural Review Board (ARB). Mr. Brown replied that the request only went before the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) and they were okay with the signage. He went on to say that the Commission recommended that the size of the address (160) on the eastern elevation be reduced from four feet in height to two feet, which was the size approved for Building #2.

The Commission thought the addresses should match so they approved it for two feet. There was a discussion of longevity and maintenance of the wall murals but he thinks that was satisfactorily addressed by the end of the meeting.

Mr. Myers thinks part of the discussion at MPC around this sign was that this sign looks larger than he thinks they believed it will actually be given the massing of the building. They also looked to the banners at the McConnell Arts Center (MAC). These are very similar in proportion to those banners at the MAC. Dr. Chosy thinks the signs still look pretty big.

Mr. Brown showed a rendering of the sign and stated that it is the view as you face towards the mall and Joseph Banks.

Members discussed the actual locations of the signs and the directions that they face.

Dr. Chosy commented that he personally objects to the size of the sign. He thinks it is quite massive and the request is for three times the allowable amount of sign. Ms. Dorothy agreed with Dr. Chosy. She commented that she actually likes the idea of having murals and public arts in public places. She would be much more okay if this was a public art mural instead of just a sign. She is afraid of opening up the floodgates to more signs like this and billboards in Worthington.

Mr. Myers believes the precedence has already been set because the banners at the MAC are advertisement. They were approved as part of the initial MAC shortly after the initial MAC application. He thinks they are very tasteful and well done and in proportion with the building even though they are very large.

Ms. Dorothy asked if this is the same type of application as the ones at the MAC are temporary signs. Mr. Myers reported that those are not permanently affixed to the building with paint like these signs will be but to the best of his knowledge those signs don't change.

Dr. Chosy thinks we are talking about apples and oranges. This is a commercial building and the sign is simply too massive for this site.

Mr. Norstrom shared that when the MAC signs were approved the potential was for them to change. They have not changed. As he remembers, part of the justification there was that it was a public building. It was unique and the question was how many art centers would there be in Worthington. This also is a unique building, in a unique location. It is located in an area of the community where signs have changed off and on and are not in compliance, all the time, with the regulations because the Shops has been a unique architectural location. He thinks what we are doing with this is not setting a precedent but we are recognizing that this location is different from any other location in the city.

Dr. Chosy thinks that is a pretty weak argument to break all of the rules. Mr. Myers argued that all of the signage at the Shops, right down to wayfaring signage has been

approved based upon that theory. Dr. Chosy doesn't recall there being a single sign in Worthington Place that is this size. Mr. Myers reported that both of the monument signs, tenant signs for the Shops itself are much larger than this. There are more signs per location of the retail establishments than we typically permit such as wall signs, blade signs, etc. The wayfaring signs are larger in the Shops than we typically permit. So there are many things at the Shops that are very different from what is allowed anywhere else in town with the theory that that is a unique property. That has been the approach of ARB and MPC with the Shops.

Ms. Michael shared that part of it is that this building is located so far back that she thinks you almost need to have something for people to find it. Dr. Chosy disagreed as the building is located on the street. This is the one on Wilson Bridge Road. Mr. Myers disagreed. Ms. Michael stated that this is for the back one.

Tom Linzell, representing MA Architects

Mr. Linzell reported that this signage is for the building on Wilson Bridge Road however the image we are seeing here faces the Shops. It is on the back of the building, on the Shops side of the building. He clarified the location of the signs for Dr. Chosy, who commented that it is better as it is much less visible.

Mr. Norstrom reiterated that the sign can't be seen from Wilson Bridge Road.

When asked by Mr. Smith if the sign would be visible from High St, Mr. Linzell replied that while you can see the top of the building from High St., you will not be able to see the mural.

Mr. Smith asked why you would want the sign if nobody can see it other than people coming in and out of the Shops. Mr. Linzell replied that it is to be part of the Shops village. It is not really meant to be advertisement for the project to the whole public. It is really just part of the ambiance of the Shops entry.

When asked by Dr. Chosy the location of the other sign, Mr. Linzell pointed it out.

Ms. Dorothy asked if they are following the number of colors as they are not requesting a variance for number of colors. Mr. Linzell replied no. There are only two colors, gray and white.

Ms. Michael commented that the red is actually the brick. Mr. Linzell replied yes.

Mr. Brown displayed a slide that showed the brick acted like as a frame around the sign.

Dr. Chosy asked if the other sign had the brick around it. Mr. Linzell replied yes.

When asked by Mr. Smith if the brick outline was real, Mr. Brown replied yes. Mr. Linzell added that the brick outline will be there regardless. It does provide detail to that large wall.

Dr. Chosy asked the location of the "160". Ms. Michael pointed out the location.

Dr. Chosy observed that the numbers are larger than the brick segment on the right. It looks like it goes up over the window and down into the space. He asked if it does. Mr. Linzell replied that it is definitely taller but he doesn't know if it is wider.

Dr. Chosy stated that it is taller and lower. It is below the other sign. He asked if the size of the "160" has been approved. Mr. Brown replied yes.

Mr. Linzell doesn't think the rendering of the "160" is entirely accurate as it seems too big. The reason he says that is because the size of the mural is 3 ft 9" high and then the size of the "160" is 3' 8 3/8" so in reality that "160" would be the same height of the mural.

Dr. Chosy asked if the brick outline is included in the height of the mural. Mr. Linzell replied that the brick outline is not included in the size.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 01-2015 carried by a vote of six (6) to one (1) (Dr. Chosy) by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 01-2015

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from the C-3 District (Institutions and Office), AR-4.5 District (Low Density Apartment Residence) and the R-10 District (Low Density Residence), to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) (634 High Street & 41 East New England Avenue).

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

Ordinance No. 02-2015

Approving the Subdivision of Property at 634 High Street & 41 East New England Avenue, and Approving a Development Agreement (Showe Worthington, LLC).

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

Ordinance No. 03-2015

An Ordinance to Revise the Codified Ordinances by Adopting Current Replacement Pages.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinances in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

Ms. Michael shared that Mr. Greeson wished to talk with council about the some 2015 initiatives that are planned for discussion at Committee-of-the-Whole meetings.

Mr. Greeson noted that the topics include a wide variety of policy issues and initiatives that have come up in recent months. He would also like to request an executive session towards the end of this meeting for the purposes of discussing economic development and real estate.

Mr. Greeson shared that he sent an e-mail out to council members earlier today. The purpose of that e-mail was to prompt some thought. Staff planned to use the Committee of the Whole meeting this month to engage in a bit of planning for kind of the policy agenda for 2015. Members will recall that in December as we were identifying additional issues as part of the budget process, some of those issues require prioritization. We need to think about the best time to sequence some of those issues with other things we were working on. As staff was planning January, we thought that the committee meeting would be a good time to have that conversation. But since the Big 10 beat the SEC, which doesn't happen very often and in this case he was very happy to see it.

Members laughed and teased Mr. Greeson as they know that he was a big SEC fan during his time in Florida.

Since our local college is going to the National Championship Game, Mr. Greeson wanted to advance some of that work for this evening and have a bit of a planning conversation in the event that council chooses not to meet next week.

2015 Initiatives – Proposed Schedule

<u>Initiatives</u>	<u>Timeframe (Quarter)</u>
* Bike & Ped Committee Creation	1 st Quarter
* OWBA Funding Request	1 st Quarter
* Downtown Mobility Study (confirm scope)	1 st Quarter
* Orientation for Boards & Commissions	March into 2 nd Quarter
* Bamboo	March into 2 nd Quarter
* Wilson Bridge Overlay	2 nd Quarter
* Plan for Ash trees	2 nd Quarter
* Funding Process for Special Groups	2 nd Quarter
* Public Safety Dispatch	2 nd Quarter
* Assess the Need for a Grant Writer	2 nd Quarter
* Wayfinding/Wilson Bridge road Improvements	June into 3 rd Quarter
* Land Use Design Guidelines & Gateway Branding	June into 3 rd Quarter

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| * Evaluate Programs for Retrofitting Older Homes | June into 3 rd Quarter |
| * Volunteer Recognition | 3 rd Quarter |
| * Community Center Cost Recovery/Fee Analysis | 3 rd Quarter |
| * Playground Strategy/Parks Long-term Plan | 4 th Quarter |
| * Housing Stock – Evaluate Existing & Define
“Diverse Housing Goal” | 4 th Quarter |

Ms. Michael asked for clarification on the Proposed Schedule as council may want to make some changes. Mr. Greeson agreed that council may want to prioritize one thing over another. He noted that there are a variety of things imbedded in this Proposed Schedule. Some of the items are issues that members identified in the budget process. Some are longer lead items that members identified in the retreat process. Some of them have been on the list of things that staff has been working on for awhile and they happen to just be making their way to council. This list does not include items that staff knows we will have to react to such as land use applications and some of the ongoing CIP (Capital Improvements Projects) items. Some of these have CIP elements to them but not all of them do. Staff will add to this list. There obviously will be a lot of time given the growth and the development in the community that will be allocated towards dealing with development applications. These are some of the items though that we have had some conversation about that he thought required some thought about when we sequenced them and some conversation with council.

Mr. Smith asked if these are relatively current suggestions. He is looking at a couple of these that may or may not be an issue anymore and some specifically that may be more of an urgent issue then when they were last presented. Mr. Greeson replied that these are the items that staff hasn't taken off of the list. They are on our list to deal with. Mr. Smith noted that they weren't necessarily prioritized either. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that there is some priority to them. For instance, staff knows that council wants to finalize their conversation about the Bike & Ped Committee as opposed to the last item, which was kind of a larger, 30,000 foot level discussion at the retreat that might end up requiring a Comp Plan overhaul and will obviously require a longer thought process. Staff sequenced them in the order in which we thought we could deal with them.

Mr. Myers commented that he generally agrees with the timeline, maybe with a couple of tweaks. He looks at the OWBA Funding Request as part and parcel with the Funding Process for Special Groups. He doesn't see a first quarter urgency for either one of those. He certainly sees an urgency to get the word out in sufficient time before applications would be due for next year but he sees those as part of the same discussion.

Mr. Greeson stated that his reason for sequencing those as different was that: 1) one was tied to the fact that downtown was a priority for the city, and 2) unlike the requests for the special groups that we dealt with in the budget process, we have not reacted to this other request and we need to professionally react to it in some way, 3) we need to give them forum and this would do that. Mr. Greeson commented that the thought was that we could use the discussion regarding how we are going to handle their request as basically

not wasted time. We basically want to build the framework for the next process. But they could be combined or stay split.

While Mr. Myers appreciates what Mr. Greeson is saying about the need to respond to the OWBA, in his world if you miss a deadline you don't get a chance until the deadline comes around again. So he doesn't necessarily have the same sense of urgency to address their request. He also doesn't want to treat them differently than he would the Worthington Chorus or the Historical Society or the MAC. Mr. Greeson commented that the practical implications of that is if council desires, at some point, to provide them funding and therefore increase our activity in downtown by having more hours of a staff person dedicated towards downtown activities, then we will have missed a window to do that. So it really ties back to whether we want to fund them and if we fund them then what do we want them to accomplish because there may be some of those that they will not be able to do without additional money.

Mr. Norstrom believes the title is wrong. It is an OWBA Funding Request but the bottom line here is Main Street U.S.A., or the Active Development of Downtown or Promotion of Downtown. No group is actively doing that in a coordinated fashion that meets the merchants' needs. The Main Street America initiative has been talked about since Mr. Greeson joined us. So it has been around for a number of years and it has just sat there and has not moved forward. There is a new board now at OWBA. There is a new Executive Director, and there is an active group that wants to move forward with that and basically change what is happening in downtown Worthington. He thinks this is the appropriate time given everything else that is happening in downtown Worthington, to include the ordinances that were just introduced and the fact that last month council approved the Downtown Worthington Incentive District. So by our actions council has already established that downtown is important to us and this is just another step in that process. He understands Mr. Myers approach about deadlines but we have modified budgets for years based on need in the community and the need for moving forward with downtown has not gone away. He thinks that right now there are a number of factors that make this the time to move forward, including the availability of good personnel.

Mr. Greeson recommended that on an ongoing basis, if we deal with this separately to respond in the first quarter, it would really be subject to council's budget and appropriation and probably only be for the one year. Then he would recommend that all of the groups that are really kind of outside of the city function be subject to the same process. He thinks he shares the opinion that we want to treat everybody relatively equal and equitable but the question is whether council wants to just this one time deal with them earlier in the year rather than later because of some of the reasons Mr. Norstrom outlined. That decision is really up to council.

Mr. Myers commented that he has a feeling that if council begins the OWBA discussion in the first quarter, that discussion may very well not be resolved until the second quarter. He just believes that there are many layers to this particular initiative and it may blend in to the next quarter. Mr. Greeson added that it will also inform what kind of information council will want from other groups.

Ms. Michael shared that she is concerned about consensus in the community. However council moves forward on doing things she wants to make sure there is consensus among the different organizations in the community and the people work together for the greater good of our downtown.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Greeson what his proposal is for moving forward on this request. Mr. Greeson thinks staff's approach it is to take some of the models that we are familiar with for grant requests, including our own (the most robust one that we have which is the MAC). In bullet points:

- A request of this size
- A new request
- A request for this purpose
- Determine questions that should be answered related to financials
- 501(3) status
- Boards
- Backgrounds

Mr. Greeson stated that once that information is obtained, it will be provided to council for input on what you would like to see that is additional or different from what staff comes up with. Staff would then request that information from the OWBA over and above what was already submitted. We would then work with them like we do any group to help them get the information together in a format that we think works for council. But that would be the goal. That is why he said that the process will inform the next one because members will have a feel for what level of information you want from these not-for-profit organizations. It may be that we want more from them because of the nature of the request than we do say from the Community Theater that receives a little over \$1,000.

Mr. Myers guesses that that process will put us at least at the end of the first quarter if not a little beyond.

Dr. Chosy stated that we are trying to establish the format for a new unit asking for money. He asked if the current groups will have to change what they submit in the new format. Mr. Greeson acknowledged that OWBA is a new group but he understood the goal was that council would develop a process that all of these organizations would follow. It may require additional information for 2016 then what they submitted for 2015. It also may involve a review process that is structured differently than previous ones. In the case of the OWBA request this year, it is something that council will want to consider as opposed to the process next year because council may choose to delegate some of that review responsibility and that is a policy conversation.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the MAC and the Convention Bureau are different from the Worthington Choir and those kinds of organizations. He can argue that the OWBA is different from those kinds of organizations as well.

Mr. Myers commented that it depends on what you are a member of. If you are a member of the Chorus it is very important to you. Mr. Norstrom clarified that he isn't saying that it's not important but he is saying that the function that it serves is different. The Chorus for example may be fifty people or twenty people. Those groups and the funding for those groups are very small but worthwhile, whereas the Convention Bureau, the MAC, and the OWBA are organizations that impact much more than just the individuals that are involved in them. Ms. Michael thinks the Historical Society is another group that impacts much more than just the individual members of the organization. Mr. Norstrom agreed that that argument could be made.

Ms. Michael believes that members are talking about two groups of funding requests. One is funding for larger groups and one is for the smaller groups. It will be council's decision whether they want to have the exact same procedure for both or if they want to have slightly different procedures because of the size of funding that is being requested by the group and their impact.

Mr. Myers feels that is putting the cart before the horse. He thinks members are going to eventually come to some conclusion on that but that is just all part of the bigger discussion on whether we have the right process in place for funding special groups or do we need to tweak it or overhaul it. Mr. Greeson is probably right in that our discussion on OWBA will provide a great deal of input and thought on how council wants to move forward on all the other groups.

Mr. Norstrom reminded council that they have already taken the steps when they challenged the MAC to basically assume responsibility for most of the art organizations. Mr. Greeson stated that he sees that as an issue that needs to be resolved because he heard that as direction but he also heard for staff to come up with a process to deal with all of these groups so we need to reconcile how we handle it.

Ms. Michael understands that we are talking about priorities. We are talking about having two discussions: one discussion is an OWBA discussion and another being the process for special group funding. She asked if she is hearing that correctly. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that the conversation could be split or lumped together. Ms. Michael thinks she is hearing to split it this year but then for the future everyone has to come in together for the budget season. If OWBA comes in, it would come in for a period of time and then they would need to fall in line with budget requests for 2016 with everybody else.

Mr. Greeson shared that the standards and the process for review might be different but the budget timing will drive it. Mr. Norstrom added that we will want to put everybody into the budget process. Ms. Michael agreed.

Mr. Greeson thinks the issue of whether council wants this whole process to be put together before we consider the OWBA funding request or whether we separate that out as he has shown on the Proposed Schedule is one that has merit and staff will certainly follow council's direction.

Dr. Chosy commented that part of the problem here is whether or not council gives the OBA what it asked for in 2015 because we have not done that. Other members agreed. Dr. Chosy stated that is quite different from their request for 2016 which they should match everybody else. Mr. Myers added that we are hoping to provide a framework for how they asked for it and what we are going to want when they do ask in 2016.

Dr. Chosy asked if members are assuming that they can't answer those questions for 2015. Mr. Myers replied no. Members are assuming they can but what we are trying to do is come up with the questions and then decide whether we make those same questions applicable to everybody that asked for money. Are we asking the right questions now? We've kind of given money historically to the same groups every year. Are we giving money to the right groups? In his mind, everything is on the table with regards to special funding.

Ms. Michael asked for comments from other members.

Mr. Troper commented that he agrees with Mr. Norstrom who said that certain groups have a greater impact than the other groups. Council maybe want spend more time looking at groups that have a different impact.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she is happy with the overall proposal. She thinks there are meatier items in the first quarter where we supposedly have more time to dig into them. She is happy with separating these out and to hopefully have some good, robust discussion about them that will hopefully frame the issues for the rest of the year.

Mr. Smith commented that while members were talking he prioritized the list of initiatives and thinks that it is pretty consistent although in his mind there are some that aren't even issues anymore. He asked members if he is wrong about that. He asked if bamboo is still an issue. Mr. Myers and Ms. Dorothy replied that they think so.

Mr. Smith asked about the ongoing issues. He assumes the community center cost recovery will be an ongoing thing for maybe the next year. Mr. Greeson replied that that will really come up as we analyze fees. One of the questions during the budget process was that members wanted a clearer picture of cost versus expense and cost recovery and policies related to cost recovery. That conversation will really need to be tied to your fee analysis, which we do every few years and he thinks we are on sequence to do that. He added that we would time that so if council wanted to adopt adjusted fees they could have the recovery policy discussion with that and put it in place for the 2016 budget.

Dr. Chosy asked if we can add to the list of initiatives. Mr. Greeson replied that we are going to. At some point we will have discussions regarding StRt 161 and discussions regarding alternates for the Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena intersection. So there are going to be things that get added to this list. There are things where the timing is not within the staff's control. He gave the example of development applications where

staff isn't the only entity that is involved in setting the timing. So the list is going to be added to by staff and he thinks it should be added to by the council.

Dr. Chosy said he would like to add an initiative to the list. This year he would like for the city to explore what other similar communities do and come up with some way to react early on to the buying or selling or modifying historical buildings so that we have some feel of what is going on instead of just having something plopped down on us. This would only be for historical buildings and that would include a definition. He thinks we should have some kind of extension of ARB or maybe a committee of some kind to evaluate what we can do with historical buildings. Mr. Greeson commented that in addition to the architectural review regulations which largely deal with the appearance and consistency in quality of the built environment, you are talking about also reviewing some development proposals for whether they appropriately preserve the historic qualities of a building. Dr. Chosy would like to see the involvement a little bit earlier than that. Set up a system when somebody comes up with a historical building that it comes up first early in the system.

Mr. Greeson stated that he is looking at Mr. Brown but he thinks that is something staff could probably evaluate from a regulatory standpoint.

Dr. Chosy added that staff could check to see what other cities are doing in that regard so we don't have to reinvent the wheel.

Mrs. Fox asked if he is talking about when a building like the Lodge comes up for sale. Is that the point that you want a conversation to begin? Dr. Chosy replied that he would like to have it before. Mrs. Fox concluded that he is talking about regulating them in some way. Dr. Chosy replied that "regulating" is a hard word but at least evaluating. He thinks a listing of properties that qualify as historical could be compiled and before anything can be done to those buildings we can have a discussion. Mrs. Fox stated that taking some kind of an inventory in the city of what qualifies. Dr. Chosy agreed.

Mr. Myers sees it almost as a separate ARB category for our inventory of historical properties once we determine what that inventory is. Dr. Chosy agreed. Mr. Myers envisions it almost like a design guideline approach unique to historic buildings. Dr. Chosy agreed so that council isn't just presented with a giant eagle somewhere in a historic part and reacting to the application. He wants them to have to come to the City before they reach that point.

Mr. Myers added that when Council does its retreats and things like that they kind of come up with a similar set of priorities for the year and it turns out that we don't get to some of those priorities because life gets in the way. Instead of a timeline, the way he would see it is that there are certain things on this list that are priority for him and that are done by the end of the year.

- 1) Bamboo – He wants to have an ordinance by the end of the second quarter that members can vote up or down

- 2) Orientation for Boards & Commissions – Members have all acknowledged that as a priority
- 3) Downtown Mobility Study –
- 4) OWBA Funding Request – Members just discussed
- 5) Bike & Ped – He would to see legislation before Council by the end of the first quarter

Mr. Myers added that after that Council and staff can work to address as many of the remaining initiatives as possible. He the first five items on the list are his top priorities for the year. He thinks items like Wayfinding and Wilson Bridge Road will be addressed as it comes. He added that members probably won't have as much control over the timing of some of those things.

Mr. Greeson commented that staff will be bringing the Wilson Bridge Road overlay (zoning district) to Council. He thinks that is important to get in place.

Mr. Myers doesn't know that that will come at a time when council will control that timing as he thinks either staff or external factors will control that timing. He's just saying that if council doesn't get to anything else on this list this year, he wants to make sure that the first five get done. Those are his priorities for this year. Mr. Greeson sees that as consistent with how staff has sequenced it. Mr. Myers agreed.

Ms. Michael commented that if council is only going to have two meetings in January then the third meeting may be pretty packed with the development proposal. She asked if the objective is to push as many of those items in February and March as possible. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that he doesn't think staff is prepared to have anyone of those top priority items on the agenda next week should council choose to meet. Staff was planning to have this conversation at that time.

Mr. Myers stated that he is assuming that these will all be March agenda items. He also thinks that staff will come up with a proposal as to how it would like to see the Bike & Ped Committee created. Mr. Greeson commented that council will have a matrix to walk through. Mr. Myers stated that he believes that Council will be reviewing much of that information outside of regular meetings. So much of this stuff he thinks will be members' homework more than it will be actual meeting time.

Mr. Greeson thinks that staff will make numerous recommendations for the Boards & Commissions Orientation then have council add things that you want to consider. The council will have to make numerous choices about structural governance issues for the Bike & Ped Committee. He will provide examples and staff will help facilitate. He thinks members will have a great deal of time invested in discussing the OWBA request.

Ms. Michael recalled that council talked about recognizing the members of our Boards & Commissions and thanking them. So when staff lists Volunteer Recognition as an initiative, is that what you were referring to? Mr. Greeson replied yes. Staff would expect to plan an event in that timeframe.

Mr. Norstrom commented that council can study things for a long time but if we have a consensus of what we want to do, we don't have to evaluate all of the different alternatives. We can just start and learn during the process of making changes. He gave the example of bamboo. Mr. Myers indicated that this has been on the table for quite awhile and it doesn't appear to be something that requires significant study. He pointed out that the Community Center Cost Recovery/Fee Analysis will be done by Parks and Recreation Department. Much of what is on this list is not Parks and Recreation so the idea is to spread the work across the staff so we can deal with some of these things even faster. Unlike Mr. Myers, he agrees that the top five are very higher priority but he doesn't think there is any reason we can't do all of them on this list by just saying that council wants them to get done and understanding the pressure that puts on staff.

Mr. Greeson added that if the list is added to, it puts more pressure and some of it may bleed and we will just have to have some honest conversation about priorities as other issues come forward.

Mr. Norstrom commented that having not been at the retreat there are couple of initiatives like "Plan for Ash trees", he doesn't know what that means at this point. Mr. Greeson replied that the initiative actually came out of the budget process when we were talking about the increase for the treatment. There was an entire conversation about treat versus replace and all of that. Mr. Norstrom commented that that topic seems to be a relatively small topic. It is a big issue but he is not sure that it requires much analysis to provide council with the information it needs to make a decision. Mr. Greeson stated that he will remind members that they are looking at the staff that doesn't work in the field. Mr. Norstrom replied that he fully understands.

Mr. Norstrom asked what the thinking was about the initiative to "Assess the Need for a Grant Writer". Mr. Greeson thinks that was a retreat item that was aimed at strategies to seek more revenue sources and whether one could even pay for itself. Mr. Norstrom shared that he has some professional acquaintances that are grant writers. He is sure that we could hire a grant writer to go after a grant for us if we wanted to. Mr. Greeson replied that we do and we do that regularly with RFPs. A good example would be the trail that we constructed. We had a sub-contractor, the design consultant that was a grant writer. So we've taken that approach or we've done it in-house.

Ms. Michael recalls that the question came up of should we be looking at having somebody, whether it is in-house or out of house focus on grant writing. There could be potential value in that there is a lot of grant money out there and we are not getting it. We might have a better chance of getting it with a grant writer but does that work or doesn't it. That was the question. Mr. Greeson stated it is not a hard evaluation. It is just putting it on the list and getting it done.

Mr. Norstrom wondered if some of our neighboring communities have grant writers. Ms. Michael knows that Westerville does. Mr. Norstrom concluded that we can find out what they are doing fairly easily.

Mr. Norstrom stated the other thing is shared. He wondered if the Westerville position was a full-time job because he doesn't see that as a full-time job.

Several members questioned whether that would work because of the competition.

Mr. Myers commented that the discussion that members are having right now highlights the point that he was trying to make earlier. He doesn't want to get sidetracked. He agrees with Mr. Norstrom that we should be able to get all of these initiatives done by the end of the year but the last thing that he wants to do is have staff going out and researching grant writing before he has a proposal for the OWBA Funding. He wants to make certain there is concrete legislation on his desk by the end of May on all of the first five things before we start worrying about ash trees and those other things that are going to pop up.

Mr. Norstrom stated that his only comment to that Mr. Myers is that it is not one staff that does it all. There are various different parts of the city that would be looking into those things. He agreed with him 100% that if everything stayed in the city manager's office, such as grant writing, it would not be something that we would want to distract from.

Ms. Michael thinks the wayfinding and Wilson Bridge improvements will have to come up because we are talking about how to use the TIF money. Mr. Greeson shared that consultants have been hired and they are working on that. There is also a steering committee that Dr. Chosy is on and it will come. There are other things like that that council will have to deal with on the policy agenda but this is a helpful conversation because some of these things came up out of the retreat and the budget process and staff always has to ask the question.

Ms. Michael thinks another high priority although not in the first quarter is the funding process for special groups. She thinks she heard earlier tonight that members want to have that addressed so the special groups have an idea of what they have to put together when they want to apply for funding. We would want to have a process or whatever it is in place, perhaps before the August break so that people have adequate time to put it together before it needs submitted. Mr. Greeson thinks that is staff's plan.

Ms. Michael thinks the rest of the timing is kind of open on where to go. She thinks staff has some priority and a little bit of direction, at least for the first half of the year. Mr. Greeson commented that he appreciates the feedback. He thinks there was one additional suggestion. It would be helpful to understand whether members want staff to address the "historic" issue that Dr. Chosy brought up.

Ms. Michael and Dr. Chosy replied yes. Mr. Myers stated yes as long as we get the other stuff done. Ms. Dorothy suggested it be added to the bottom of the priority list.

Mr. Smith understands that members have kind of shied away from having these kind of talks at the first and third meeting of the month but he is all for it. Instead of just having

these initiatives brought up at the second meeting, why not space them out at each meeting, especially when the agenda is a little lighter.

Mr. Troper commented that another discussion that he would like to pass on for the city is to check into the establishment of a Worthington Community Foundation. He doesn't know if that is council's responsibility to look into.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom about the purpose of a foundation, Mr. Troper replied to see what other cities do, like the Bexley Community Foundation. Mr. Norstrom reported there being a Worthington Foundation that is managed by the Columbus Foundation.

Dr. Chosy asked what a Foundation does. Mr. Norstrom replied that he has no idea. He just knows that it exists.

Ms. Michael asked who serves on it.

Mr. Troper shared that a foundation is a non-profit organization that supports events that are going on in the community. They raise funds for the community.

Dr. Chosy asked where it raises funds from. Mr. Troper replied from residents or from anyone who loves Worthington and wants to give money to Worthington to help support Worthington causes.

Dr. Chosy asked for a concrete example. Mr. Troper knows that the Bexley Foundation does grants for fireworks or arts. It could be for anything. It could be to purchase historical buildings. Ms. Michael commented that it could be used for development of parks.

Ms. Dorothy thinks it is a great idea to look into having a Worthington Community Foundation and that council knows the people who serve on the board and what they fund around the community. There could be a ton of worthwhile projects that could be funded around Worthington through that mechanism.

Ms. Michael shared that there are some people in the community that she has already talked to who would be interested in putting something like this together. She thinks that it is important. She didn't realize that we had a Worthington Foundation underneath the Columbus Foundation. If people want she could at least see if these volunteers want to check out some of what is out there and be able to get back to us and let us know what some of the thoughts are. While the kids are in school is when they have time to do some of this work.

Dr. Chosy asked who would ultimately control something like this. Ms. Michael replied that the Foundation would have a board. Mr. Troper added that it would be a non-profit board.

Mr. Greeson thinks council could have a role in the board's selection. Mr. Myers added that members could have a role in the Board's selection but we could not. . . Mr. Greeson commented maybe but maybe not.

Dr. Chosy asked what would happen if there is a clash of interest in what they wanted to do versus how we the council and city felt. Ms. Michael replied that it depends on what it is. If it is on private property then council doesn't have anything to say. If it's on city property then they would have to work with council.

Mr. Smith commented that historically he thinks community foundations receive a good portion of government funding so in this sense it would be the city of Worthington gives "x" of dollars to the Worthington Foundation. If we don't like what they do then we don't give them the money.

Ms. Michael stated that Gahanna and some of the others are out there doing their own private fundraising and the money is coming in privately. They are trying to do things like park development so they are raising money for specific things.

Mr. Norstrom shared that anything like this is going to create a problem within the community because there are only so many dollars that are available for giving. If we set up a foundation like this, his guess is that some of the existing organizations are not going to be receiving the money they are getting today. The other side is to look at what we aren't getting done in the community. We have Rotary that has built things in our parks. The MAC is providing a lot of art programming. What is it that we really think the Foundation would do? It is not going to be able to generate new money.

Ms. Michael added that sometimes Foundations will do things like let people donate money to plant a tree in a park as a memorial or that kind of thing. We already have that process available in Worthington through parks.

Dr. Chosy just sees, at some point, a clash of egos and a big problem.

Mr. Norstrom stated that one thing members could ask staff to do is find out about what the Worthington Foundation is. Mr. Greeson agreed to do that.

Mr. Myers commented that there are a lot of items on the list and he hates to keep adding a whole bunch of new things. We are not going to get all of this stuff done. We never do.

Mr. Greeson stated that he thinks staff has a strong record of accomplishments in the city. Mr. Myers stated that he is not diminishing our record of accomplishments. What he is saying is that we have yet to have a year where we hit 100%. Mr. Greeson replied that we have ambitious lists, for sure.

Mr. Norstrom said he had a question about the law that was passed by the state legislature regarding taxes. He asked if we will be impacted by that passage. Mr. Greeson acknowledged that the city will be impacted in a myriad of ways in terms of

administrative burden, and particularly in terms of the net operating loss carryover, which has been authorized and will be phased in over time. But nevertheless it will impact us in many ways. Staff has previously done some memoranda to council on that subject. We will dust them off and update them and get them distributed to members. He added that the city opposed that bill like almost all municipalities, particularly those in central Ohio, as almost none allow a net operating loss carry forward.

Ms. Michael commented that the city estimated that the carryover could cost the city around \$400,000 a year. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that the number was based on an analysis of what it would have been had that rule been in place for the last five years. Mr. Norstrom said he looks forward to receiving the memoranda as he is not informed enough on the topic and was asked about it. All he could say was that the city opposed it.

Mr. Greeson shared that it is complicated. If any members wish more information, Finance Director Molly Roberts and Scott Bartter are very effective in explaining how all of this will work.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to cancel the meeting for next week.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

There being no comments, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Greeson shared that he had a couple of other items that he would like to present.

- * Open house on January 8th (Thursday) for the Elijah Glen Center that is opening at the Step by Step Campus

Ms. Michael asked if there will a particular program at a certain time or is it just an open house between noon and 7:00 p.m. Mr. Greeson replied that he doesn't know but he will find that out. Ms. Michael said she would like to know.

- * Community Relations Commission is planning a Worthington Neighborhood Forum for January 10th beginning at 9:30 at the Griswold Center. They are working to engage our neighborhood leaders in conversation with the CRC and keep them up to date on the CRC's activities.

When asked by Dr. Chosy if that information could be e-mailed to council members Mr. Greeson replied that he will do that.

- * Community Center Beam update

Mr. Hurley reported that we are on track to be able to reopening the community center leisure pool next Monday. The wood has all been removed and replaced on the beam. They were in the process of applying the stain for the cosmetic part of the process today. Staff plans to have the scaffolding removed over night on Tuesday and Wednesday this week. There will be an inspection Thursday morning of the Diamond Bright, which is the

layer that covers the pool. We have not seen any signs of issue but that was one concern that the weight of the scaffolding and the pressure could crack that in places so we are optimistic that will go well but there is an inspection planned for Thursday morning. If that goes as we think it will, which will be well, then we will have the pool turned over to us late in the day Thursday to begin filling and heating the water and obtaining our chemicals which would put us on track for the planned restart for lessons and programming on Monday.

Mr. Hurley shared that the other item that is ongoing is the installation of the windows over the leisure pool which we also want to have done before we re-open. That is on target to happen this week although the weather could be a factor. If all goes as scheduled this week, the pool will be open a week from today but there are still a few hurdles to clear for that to happen.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Myers thanked staff for having coffee available at the last MPC meeting. He would strongly suggest there be coffee on the dais for the January 20th meeting of council as the meeting could go long.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss real estate and economic development. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 7 Norstrom, Smith, Myers, Chosy, Troper, Dorothy, and Michael

No 0

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Council recessed at 8:48 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

ADJOURNMENT

Council came out of Executive Session at 9:20 p.m.

MOTION Dr. Norstrom made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
2nd day of February, 2015.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President