



## **Meeting Minutes**

Monday, March 2, 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, March 2, 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, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper, and Bonnie D. Michael

**Member(s) Absent:**

**Also present:** Clerk of Council Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistance City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, 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 eighteen 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**

- **February 9, 2015 – Committee of the Whole Meeting**
- **February 17, 2015 – Regular Meeting**

Ms. Dorothy asked that the word “approved” in the next to the last paragraph on page 03-12 be changed to “improved”.

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

**The motion to approve the minutes as corrected carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION**

*President Michael declared public hearings and voting on legislation previously introduced to be in order.*

**Ordinance No. 07-2015**

Amending Ordinance Nos. 47-2010 And 03-2013;  
Approving And Authorizing The Execution Of An  
Acknowledgement Of Termination Of A

Compensation Agreement; Authorizing The Execution Of A Second Amended Development Agreement; And Providing For Related Authorizations Pursuant To Ohio Revised Code Sections 5709.41, 5709.42, And 5709.43

**The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.**

*Mr. Greeson indicated that staff has been working with the owners of the Shops at Worthington Place as well as the Worthington Schools on changes to the Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) at what we often call The Mall. He asked Mr. Harris to overview the changes.*

*Mr. Harris commented that he will try to distill for council and the audience what is a fairly complex deal and to the basic points that he can get across before presenting the details.*

Staff Recommendations:

Ordinance No. 07-2015 is intended to accomplish the following:

- 1) Authorize City Manager to sign the Acknowledgement of Termination to *eliminate the TIF's existing school compensation agreement*; and
- 2) Amend the TIF to "hold-harmless" the Worthington City Schools (i.e., the Schools are paid of 100 percent of foregone revenues).

Original TIF structured development of the Shops at Worthington Place was still being conceived.

Development now has occurred but the current TIF-related agreements no longer fit the expected property valuations that initially drove the structure of the TIF.

Background:

- Project constitutes the renovation and redevelopment of the existing 150,000 square foot retail facility formerly known as the Worthington Square Mall.
- Late 2010, negotiations commenced for the Shops' purchase.
- Proposed that the Shops be renovated and substantially redeveloped. The sale was completed in late December 2010.
- At the time of the purchase negotiation, City was approached to provide financial assistance.
- Determined that urban redevelopment TIF would provide the best form of assistance (ORC §5709.41).

- In January 2011, City Council approved **Ordinance 47-2010** (the “TIF Ordinance”), creating an *urban redevelopment TIF* exemption of 100 percent of the taxes on the value of improvements made to the Shops, for a 30-year period.
- Development agreement executed between the City and Worthington Square Venture, LLC on January 11, 2011. Structured on a pay-as-you-go basis, with the developer reimbursed as revenues flowed into the TIF fund.
- TIF Ordinance also authorized school compensation agreement among the City, Worthington Square Venture, LLC and the Worthington City Schools, executed January 25, 2011. Set forth how the Schools would be paid for foregone revenue under the TIF exemption.
  - *Schools agreed to be paid lesser amounts from the City and the developer if higher value was created at the Shops.* If the developer grew the Shops’ value by at least \$12.5 million, then the Schools would require only 85 percent of their expected compensation payments. And if the Shops grew in value >\$15.5 million, the schools would require payments of only 80 percent of what they would have expected.
- Critical fact: School Compensation Agreement requires the developer, for any year in which the Shops did *not* grow in value as expected (by \$12.5 million or more), *to pay the Schools as if the Shops had grown by at least \$12.5 million in additional value.*
  - 2014, the developer had completed a substantial number of improvements to the Shops, but no revenues have yet been realized in the TIF fund for this project.

*Dr. Chosy shared that this is the part that bothers him. He asked how there can be that much difference in valuation. They were supposed to be valued at \$16.86 million this year and the value actually dropped from what they paid for it down to \$4,204,300. He asked how that could possibly be that far off. Mr. Harris replied that there are two reasons why. He explained that in 2013, there was an approach of the Franklin County Auditor, specifically the Board of Revision which dictates property evaluation complaints, was approached by both the schools and then responded to by the mall through its external counsel. The sale of the mall set the value of the property to about \$4.3 million but valuation complaints were filed between the schools and the mall ownership as to the proper valuations. As a result of the complaints the valuation was set very low at \$4.2 million. The mall had been trending at something upwards of \$8 million dollars but with the sale price and then these property valuation complaints, the property valuation actually came in about \$4.2 million. That was item one. The second reason is that right after the \$4.2 million amount was set, the properties were further subdivided and the old James Tavern piece and the back end of the parking lot was sold for the apartment development. So what was trending at about \$8 million in value was whittled down to about \$4.3 million with the sale price. There was then further argument down to \$4.2 million. The \$4.2 million value was then subdivided between Crawford*

*Hoyings (the apartments) and the mall. It had a perfect storm of several different issues that happened somewhat concurrently to bring that valuation much, much lower than what we had thought.*

*When asked by Dr. Chosy if the mall ownership received money for the parcels that were sold for the apartments, Mr. Harris agreed that they did. He added that also sold the piece of property that is now First Financial.*

*When asked by Dr. Chosy what happens to that money, Mr. Harris replied that it was always understood between the city, the schools and the ownership of the mall that those two sales would have nothing to do with our TIF. So the developers know that to make their money back they would need to sell parcels that they didn't need like the James Tavern site and the former Dalts Restaurant facility.*

*Mr. Harris explained for Dr. Chosy that there is a market value to property and a tax value. In this case, the county valued all of that land at about \$4.3 million. Dr. Chosy commented that the value went down to \$4.2 when the James Tavern parcel was sold. Mr. Harris agreed. He added that all along things went in the opposite direction from what staff thought the TIF would do. We thought the value would be rising over time and it actually started to drop over time.*

*Dr. Chosy shared that is the essence of his question. He asked how it is possible to be \$12 million dollars wrong in five years. Mr. Harris replied that it is interesting that the external legal counsel for the developer, who in his opinion is one of the best in the state, has said that he has never seen this happen in this way. It is one of those head scratching type of situations where this just usually doesn't happen this way but he thinks a number of elements contributed to a perfect storm so that the valuation went in the opposite direction of what we needed it to for purposes of the TIF.*

*Dr. Chosy understands that the schools will get 100% of the value of the property. Mr. Harris agreed. It is important to point out that nowhere in any of this, either reality or under the arrangement have the schools been left receiving less than what they should have in the normal course of things. The schools to this date, to our understanding, have always been paid exactly what they should have been paid all along. What this does though, it states that from this point forward the developer no longer has the risk of basically having to pay as if the development was worth \$16.8 million dollars. The development team doesn't have that payment to make every year. The schools will be paid at 100% of what they should get as the mall continues to grow in value.*

*Dr. Chosy finds it unbelievably astounding although he doesn't know much about this kind of thing but it is almost unbelievable. Mr. Harris agreed that it is an unusual situation.*

### Current Issue – Basis for Legislative Action

- Developer required to achieve at least \$12.5 million in increased value at the Shops (so that the total value would be at least \$16.86 million). This was to have occurred by tax year 2014.
- City staff learned late last year that the Shop's real property was actually *valued down* during 2014 to only \$4,204,300.
- Why?
  - First, there was a property valuation hearing conducted in 2013 by the Franklin County Board of Revision.
  - Second, the subdivision plat of the Shops' property into two smaller parcels.
- **Highly unlikely** the Shops will achieve a valuation anytime soon by the Franklin County Auditor close to the \$16.86 million.
- As it stands, the developer must pay the Schools each year *as if* that value has been achieved.
- Untenable situation for the developer, as it would be forced to pay the Schools annual amounts far in excess of the Shops' actual value. This was not the outcome intended by the City or the Schools.

### Staff Recommends

- Ordinance No. 07-2015 to amend the Development Agreement and terminate the School Compensation Agreement.
  - Schools to receive all foregone revenue (e.g., 100 percent) during the remaining term of the TIF
  - Frees the developer from making excessive payments to the Schools based on an unrealistic valuation target.

*Dr. Chosy asked if the developer has less money than when they started because of everything that has happened. Mr. Harris thinks it is safe to say that when they came to us in 2010 and said that as part of their purchase from GE Capital they need help from the city to make this work financially, he thinks that they were expecting a certain amount of contribution from this TIF fund. So at this point he thinks their expectations for financial contributions have not been met.*

*Mr. Greeson added that the picture of how that site is developed today is different from the picture they had when the site was first purchased. They made two decisions; one to sell off the bank parcel and the city allowed the subdivision of the apartment parcel, which he assumed was value based from a sales standpoint. So their pro-forma likely looks different because while it may have less TIF revenue in it, it has the sale of these parcels that might not have been originally contemplated.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked if we know where the schools district stands from what they were receiving from property tax prior to the sale versus where they are now. Mr. Harris replied that the district is receiving less today than they were before the mall was purchased. That being said, the schools are fully aware of how this has all transpired. To that point, in February the school board passed a resolution to approve and adopt the same approach staff has presented tonight with the understanding that this venture just did not go the way that everyone thought it would. Mr. Greeson added that eventually the apartment project and office project will hit the rolls as well as the bank improvements and the improvements to the mall. He doesn't think we will know from an auditor's standpoint when the redevelopment will stop there.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that the apartment complex has to be valued now. Mr. Harris reported that in the pre-development stage it was valued at \$84,000 last year. We anticipate that will increase significantly this year.*

*While the question was not directly related to the topic, Dr. Chosy wondered if the mall was in jeopardy of financial collapse. Mr. Harris shared that staff talks to the mall owner a great deal and it is our impression that the mall continues on. Tenants move in and tenants move out but with the 200 apartments coming on-line right next to it and new restaurants he thinks they are fine. He is aware of active leasing conversations with various tenants for the north end of the building. He added that every indication we have of the mall, it's like any investment it will wax and wane but it is proceeding.*

**There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 07-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**No 0**

**Ordinance No. 07-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.**

#### **NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED**

##### **Resolution No. 05-2015**

Assigning to the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation the City's Scope of Services Letter for Renovations to the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building at 752 High Street.

**Introduced by Mr. Myers.**

##### **MOTION**

Dr. Chosy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

*Mr. Greeson shared that the city entered into a modest design contract with The DesignGroup to get a jump start on the improvements we needed to make with the funds from the state grant that council recently approved. Council appropriated \$500,000 and assigned that to the Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) to do numerous improvements to the Kilbourne Building, \$300,000 of which will be reimbursed by the state grant. Staff thinks it is also appropriate to assign the design contract for that work to the CIC as well. He invited Mr. Harris to comment.*

*Mr. Harris shared that the contract with DesignGroup is an \$8,000 engagement that entails the design for the removal of the mezzanine, an ADA compliant access point with an elevator at the front end of the building on the west side, public restrooms on the main floor as well as improvements to the foyer and HVAC systems. That is the level of work that will be covered by the state grant and the extra \$200,000 from City Council.*

*Ms. Michael asked if this is in addition to the \$500,000 budget estimate. Mr. Harris replied that the \$500,000 included this \$8,000 engagement.*

*Mr. Myers commented that he has a question more going forward than this one. The city engaged the services of DesignGroup and now we are going to assign that contract to CIC. He asked if it would be done that way going forward. Mr. Harris replied that staff has looked at the project and sought to put as much of the construction and design work within the CIC because of its abilities. . . Mr. Myers interjected that is his point. When a contractor is hired for that effort, it will be done by the CIC and not the city and then an assignment. Mr. Harris agreed. Mr. Myers added that if the city does it there would be deferent prevailing wage and different things that would be involved. He just wants to make certain this execution and assignment is sort of a one off as this is not the way this project is going to go.*

*Mr. Harris explained that it is something of a cleanup because we wanted to make sure the engagement was signed but now we have to go back and make everything consistent coming out of the CIC.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that whatever terms and conditions came with the state monies, such as potentially prevailing wage, will follow the money. Mr. Myers agreed that it would have to follow even if it was CIC.*

**There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

**Resolution No. 06-2015**

To Establish a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board for the City of Worthington, Ohio, Outlining its Functions and Providing for the Appointment of Members Thereof.

**Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.**

**MOTION** Mr. Troper made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 06-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

*Mr. Greeson commented that council has recently had extensive discussion about exploring the creation of a bike and pedestrian committee. There has been lengthy discussion about the terms of that. Staff took all of the feedback that members provided and attempted to reflect that feedback in the resolution before members tonight. He can approach this one of two ways: (1) walk through it section by section or (2) respond to member's questions and comments.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that council members have never really had the discussion of whether or not we should create this board. There was discussion at one of the meetings and at the last meeting members discussed "if" we have this and we directed staff to develop what they have presented tonight. But the basic underlying question of whether or not there should be a bike and pedestrian committee appointed by city council has not been addressed.*

*Ms. Michael invited comments.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks that discussion is appropriate for members to have. He noted though that at the last meeting there were two clauses where there was fairly clear direction on almost everything in terms of staggered terms, number of members, and how many of them needed to live in the corporate boundaries and things like that. However, there were two clauses that staff drafted because we were directed to draft something but there wasn't necessarily unanimity. Those clauses occur in: (1) Section 3 on term limits and (2) Section 6 that includes a review provision. He wanted to call those out as ones that did not as much unanimity at the last meeting as all of the other issues. Otherwise, he thinks the document generally reflects the will of council. Staff stands ready to address any questions members may have.*

*Ms. Michael knows that Ms. Dorothy has been working very hard on this. She invited her to comment on whether this board is needed by the city or not.*

*Ms. Dorothy thinks that one of the reasons she was elected to council is because of her interest in different mobility options. She thinks that people who walk and bike in Worthington have been a bit unfairly represented. She has seen a significant amount of public input over the last several years on this topic since she has been on council. She thinks an advisory committee will help coordinate better mobility options throughout Worthington and is something that is needed.*

*Ms. Dorothy added that she would like to move to strike Section 3. and would be happy to talk about Section 6. of this resolution.*

*Ms. Michael invited comments from other council members.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked what makes bike and pedestrian more important than any of the other services. As he said at the last meeting, why don't we have a committee that deals with sewers? In terms of public investment and overall budget, what goes into bike and pedestrian now or potentially in the future is not a significant amount compared to other investments that we make. The question becomes, why should bike and pedestrian be elevated to this level simply because we have two members of council who served on a bike and pedestrian committee? As he shared during the previous discussion, the bike and pedestrian committee did exactly what it should have done. Had he served on the committee he would have also advocated for it to be at the highest level it could be because that is the group you represent. He is not sure that is good policy for city council given our scope of looking over everything that goes on in the city.*

*Mr. Smith disagreed. He thinks that is exactly the kind of policy we need. The city has a culture and the cultural landscape has already changed to bike and pedestrian. He thinks this is the direction that was implied during previous conversations. He doesn't see any negatives here. City council will have more of a pulse on the community and more input from folks. Staff will save time therefore city resources.*

*Mr. Norstrom disagreed that staff will save time. Council is devoting staff time to this committee. Mr. Smith commented that the committee will foresee projects in the future that will be related to bike and pedestrian infrastructure and just community outreach. The committee itself will be saving staff time because those projects would have defaulted to city staff if we didn't have this committee.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that city staff will not take a step back because of this committee. Mr. Smith disagreed. Mr. Norstrom stated that they have never done that.*

*Dr. Chosy shared that this topic has come up numerous times in the twenty years that he has served on city council. A little progress gets made and then just seems to die out over time. Given the value of bicycling and walking and having it set up so that it is easier to do is much more prominent in society today than ever before. He thinks this legislation will make it happen and he is quite for it.*

*Mr. Troper commented that he supports establishing the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board. He thinks there is a review clause in the resolution.*

*Mr. Myers stated that he just wants to make sure that members are all on-board with not just establishing the committee as that is superficial. He thinks Mr. Norstrom hits a more important point in that by establishing the committee, council has established a priority. He asked if there is going to be another counter-balancing voice to balance this priority because now we are going to give bicyclist a seat at the table that others don't enjoy. That is fine if that is what council wants to do but by doing that we have said that this now becomes a significant priority for the city to the detriment of potentially other priorities. For example, one of the things that he sees here which has been talked about a great deal was that the number one cause of pedestrian accidents in New York City is cell phones. He needs something in the legislation about bicycle education if he is going*

*to pass this because he comes close to hitting them almost every day. He would also prefer a reversal of Section 6. He would advocate for a sunset provision and not a re-affirmance. Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee aside, he just wants to make sure everybody is on board. The dye has cast. Council is going to go forward with this priority.*

*Ms. Michael shared that she has had a number of years, all the way back to working on the Park Board in 1984 of talking about bicycles and doing things with bicycles and pedestrians and walkways and walkability and the conversation has been going on a long time and we really haven't done that much as a city. When you go to places like Dublin and Westerville and you see the paths that they have and the walkways. . . Mr. Myers commented that uptown Dublin doesn't have a dedicated bikeway. Ms. Michael added that quite a few other parts of Dublin do. Mr. Myers explained that Dublin has new developments that require eight foot paths but Dublin has not committed to bike and pedestrian priorities in their downtown business district and that is what council is doing here. He added that Westerville doesn't have a downtown path either. You can't take a bike down State Street.*

Ms. Michael disagreed. She and Mr. Myers continued to discuss the location of the trail in Westerville.

*Mr. Norstrom pointed out that the details are not important.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that in talking about lessons with cell phones and care like that, this committee could discuss those topics. The resolution sort of implies that those are the kinds of things they should do.*

*Ms. Dorothy acknowledged that discussion being part of the study. She thinks there are other advisory committees that represent aspects of the city that council values such as our Arbor Committee and our Community Relations Committee. Council values their input although we don't necessarily prioritize from what their input is but we definitely consider it and they help us prioritize but we have other committees that influence council without adversely affecting our priorities. She thinks this is something to help organize different divisions/departments within the city to know what is going on. It is not to ensure that new pathways get put down all over. It just helps prioritize what we can do with what we have.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked staff how things like the Arbor Committee are enshrined in our Code. Mr. Greeson replied that the Arbor Committee is not. It is hard to define it as a temporary committee created by the city manager because it is not that anymore but it is not enshrined. Some committees are created by Charter such as Parks and Recreation Commission, Community Relations Commission, the Municipal Planning Commission, and Board of Zoning Appeal. Some are created by codified ordinance and others by resolution. Members may recall in our last discussion that we didn't think it was significant whether this committee was created by resolution or ordinance. Members directed staff to prepare a resolution.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that based on tonight's conversation, it appears that a majority of council favors having a bike and pedestrian committee. So he thinks that question has been answered and members can move forward with discussing the resolution before us.*

*Mr. Myers asked if he could offer several amendments. He acknowledged there being a motion on the table already. He called for the vote.*

**MOTION** Ms. Dorothy made a motion to remove Section 3. Term Limits. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

*Mr. Norstrom thinks term limits should be applied across all City committees and council might as well start with this one. He stated that there is no reason to have members on a committee forever. Term limits are something that is accepted, even in things like our state legislature and he thinks it is important to have a change of leadership. It doesn't mean that people can't come back on the committee but it is important to have that embedded in the structure of the committee.*

*Ms. Dorothy thinks that all board members already serve at council's pleasure and members can remove them or choose not to reappoint them at any time. Mr. Norstrom commented that by history that almost never happens. Members just recently removed someone from a position but that is the first time in maybe fifteen years that anything has happened in terms of removing someone. The last time council removed someone that he knows of was someone that served on the MPC when he served as the Chair.*

*Mr. Myers commented that under the provision in the resolution appointees can serve eighteen out of twenty years. That is a pretty long time.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks from a practical standpoint members would be appointing somebody for nine years and then they would be off for a year but somebody would probably be appointed in that interim timeframe. Mr. Norstrom agreed but added that there would be an opening a year later.*

**There being no additional comments, the vote to remove Section 3. from the legislation passed by a vote of four (Ms. Dorothy, Dr. Chosy, Mr. Smith, Ms. Michael) to three (Mr. Norstrom, Mr. Myers, Mr. Troper).**

*Mr. Myers made the following motion:*

**MOTION** Mr. Myers made a motion to the introductory sentence in Section 4., to read as follows: "The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board duties shall include but not be limited to the following:". The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

**There being no comments, the vote to change the introductory sentence in Section 4. passed unanimously by a voice vote.**

*Mr. Myers made the following motion:*

**MOTION** Mr. Myers made a motion to strike the current Section 6. and insert: “at the end of the third full year of the committee’s existence, the Council shall vote to continue the Bike and Pedestrian Committee.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

*Dr. Chosy thinks that is essentially what it is saying. Mr. Myers disagreed. His motion is an affirmative act by the council. The committee expires without that vote.*

Dr. Chosy, Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Myers continued to debate the language as Dr. Chosy didn’t think a change necessary.

*Mr. Myers stated that his motion offers a sunset provision while the current draft does not.*

*Dr. Chosy believes a sunset provision means that at a certain point it ends. Mr. Myers commented that at the end of three years the bike and pedestrian advisory committee ceases to exist without affirmative vote of the council to continue it. That is the point of this. That may be exactly the language that you read Section 6 to say but he doesn’t. He thinks it continues unless council abolishes it as it is currently written.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked Mrs. Fox if the language, as drafted is sunset or not sunset. Mrs. Fox replied that the language was not drafted as a sunset. That language was drafted for a review to determine whether it should exist. If it was drafted as a sunset provision it would say that at the end of whatever time period it would cease to exist unless council voted to continue its existence.*

*Mr. Myers asked that the language in his motion be changed to what Mrs. Fox shared.*

**MOTION** Mr. Myers made a motion to strike the current Section 6. and insert: “At the end of the third full year of existence, the Bike and Pedestrian Committee shall cease to exist absent an affirmative vote by council.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

*Mr. Greeson clarified that as currently written, there will be a review of the commission.*

*Ms. Dorothy understands that the current legislation asked the commission to provide a written report to council at least annually.*

*Mr. Troper stated that he isn’t clear as to what “three full years of existence” means. Mr. Myers replied that council has to appoint everybody first so they can’t have any existence until they are appointed. We could start the clock at their first meeting or that would not be a full year. He thinks it will actually be about three and a half years.*

*Mr. Troper commented that it would be three full calendar years of existence. Mr. Norstrom stated that it doesn't say calendar years.*

*Mrs. Fox asked what council wants it to be. It can be whatever council wants it to be.*

*Mr. Myers stated that it should be appointment. A year from the first meeting date. Mrs. Fox commented that the first appointments will be made when it is created but then they will be re-appointed in December of every year according to Section 2. Ms. Michael thinks calendar year makes more sense.*

Members debated when to start the appointments.

*Ms. Michael directed members to vote on the current motion and then go back and address the appointment dates.*

*When asked by Ms. Michael if there are any additional comments on the sunset provision, Ms. Dorothy shared that she doesn't support it but she thinks if the Board has a deadline then they will work to the deadline. She thinks they will definitely have reason to accomplish as much as they can with this deadline but she is not for it.*

**There being no additional comments, the motion failed by a vote of two (2) (Myers, Norstrom) to five (5).**

*Ms. Michael asked if there was any discussion around Section 2 about changing the effective dates from December to some other month of the year so council isn't inundated with interviews at the end of each year.*

**MOTION** Mr. Norstrom made a motion to change the language in Section 2 to reflect that the year will start from the first meeting of the Board and the one year terms will be from the "annual meeting" of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

*Ms. Dorothy asked if that is too cumbersome. She suggested the change be to an actual day and month.*

*Mr. Greeson suggested May 1<sup>st</sup> or May 31<sup>st</sup>.*

*Mr. Norstrom disagreed.*

*Mr. Smith asked for a point of clarification. He asked how long staff thinks it will take to appoint the initial Board.*

*Mr. Norstrom suggested that members approve the language. We can always come back and amend this by resolution once the Board is formed. But the idea would be that we know what is going forward.*

*Mr. Greeson commented that if council was interested in staggering some of these appointments, members might want to pick a window that works. There could be a batch of appointments in May and a batch in December. Staff can figure out how to make that work.*

*Ms. Michael asked if there is another Board/Commission that has a May date. Mr. Greeson acknowledged that the Community Relations Commission appointments are in May.*

*Mr. Norstrom went back to the question that Mr. Smith asked of how long we think the process will be to form this Board. Mr. Greeson replied that it depends on how long members want to advertise or how they want to solicit applications.*

*Mr. Norstrom offered that following change to his Motion:*

**MOTION** Mr. Norstrom made a motion to change the language in Section 2 to May 31, 2015 instead of December 31. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

*Ms. Michael stated that all of the terms will be changed from December to May. Mr. Norstrom agreed that the terms would be May 31, 2015, May 31, 2016, and May 31, 2017.*

*Ms. Dorothy pointed out that the first appointment would expire May 31, 2015.*

Members agreed that the dates would be May 31, 2016, May 31, 2017, and May 31, 2017.

*Mr. Greeson shared that that gives council a month to advertise, a month to interview and a month to get everything organize before they start.*

**There being no additional comments, the motion carried unanimously.**

*Mr. Norstrom made the following motion:*

**MOTION** Mr. Norstrom made a motion to strike #9 under Section 4. The motion was seconded by Dr. Chosy.

*Mr. Norstrom explained that to his knowledge council doesn't have any of the other boards or commission reporting to them on a regular basis.*

*Mr. Myers commented that council has been talking about how it can better interact with our boards and commissions and he believes that is what this item does. If members strike this, he asked if it would be appropriate to ask them to appear annually. Mr. Norstrom thinks appear as council requests them and not just annual.*

*Mr. Myers stated as long as council follows up on it. He would like to hear from them. He asked when was the last time the Arbor Commission came in front of them but for to testify on behalf of a certain project. Mr. Norstrom said he understands. Mr. Myers reiterated that he would like to hear from them so members know that it is a functioning Board. Mr. Norstrom comments that he has no doubt that members will hear from them.*

*Ms. Dorothy asked for clarification. Members want to strike #9 because we feel that we will receive enough input from other mechanisms. Mr. Myers replied not only that but annual reports sit on shelves. They are a great deal of work to put together and we put them on a shelf.*

*Mrs. Fox offered the following language if members choose to keep the thought about interaction with the Board:*

9. Present when requested a report of the activities of the Advisory Board to City Council.

*Mr. Norstrom doesn't think that it is necessary to include that information in with the forming of committees. Council can ask them to come before us at any time and they can come before us at any time. He added that if council has to put that in a motion then we have something wrong with our structure.*

**There being no additional comments, the motion carried unanimously.**

*Mr. Norstrom shared that one of his pet peeves is getting snow off of sidewalks. If council is going to have a pedestrian committee they should be looking at how to make our community accessible. That would be identifying things like the importance of clearing sidewalks where school kids walk and put some emphasis and make some recommendations to us about how to enforce those laws because right now it is archaic. He asked what the process is for warning people.*

*Mr. Watterson shared that the current ordinance requires that a sidewalk be clear within twelve hours of daylight after the end of the snow event. That can be as long as three days, particularly in December when the days are very short. After that time the city can clear the sidewalk and bill the property owner or occupant as it applies to both property owner and occupant which can be somewhat difficult to determine in some cases. Lastly, it has been the conclusion that they have to be provided notice so that is a third difficulty in determining the address of that owner or occupant and how to serve them by some method that is recordable such as certified mail.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that the determination is not in the code but just an interpretation. Mr. Watterson agreed. Mr. Norstrom stated that he doesn't disagree with that as we are a friendly community but for example yesterday, snow ceased about 4:00 p.m. which means that sidewalks should have been cleared this morning.*

Members pointed out that the twelve hours is of daylight to which Mr. Norstrom acknowledged the correction.

*Mr. Norstrom stated that under the current procedures we would somehow give them a notice, probably by mail, which means another two or three days. Ms. Michael thinks Mr. Norstrom is bringing up a wonderful point. Council may want to look at revising that ordinance. She thinks that might need some revision in order to be able to have some teeth.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that all that he can say is that he suggested the Bike and Pedestrian Board look at that very early in its appointment.*

Several other members agreed with Mr. Norstrom's suggestion.

**There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 06-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

**Resolution No. 07-2015**

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 7029 Huntley Road and Authorizing Variances (The Granite Guy).

**Introduced by Dr. Chosy.**

**MOTION**

Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 07-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

*Mr. Brown explained that the application before members is for an Amendment to Development Plan that includes variances for signage related to 7029 Huntley Road. This parcel is nestled in between Worthington-Galena Road and Huntley Road. This application is only for The Granite Guy although there are five shops in this area of Huntley and Worthington-Galena that sell granite. He noted that staff expects applications from at least one other shop, if not all, in the coming months. Granite Guy went before the Municipal Planning Commission last month and is requesting a variance for a second sign on the rear of the property. Sign #1 actually fronts on Worthington-Galena Road. It is approximately 40 square feet in size and meets code requirements. The applicant has installed a second sign to the rear of the building, facing east towards Huntley Road. Mr. Brown indicated that it is somewhat confusing since the business has frontage on two different roads.*

*Mr. Brown reiterated that the request is for additional signage on the rear of the building. That additional sign surpasses the size permitted by code, which is 100 square feet. The overage will be approximately 34 square feet over what is permitted by code.*

Mr. Brown showed numerous slides in a PowerPoint presentation of the existing sign along Worthington-Galena Road, the access drive that runs along the northern property line going towards Huntley Road.

*Mr. Brown shared that the new sign is an 8 x 16 foot sign. MPC applied some conditions and modifications to the sign to reduce the square footage and to match similar signage in the area.*

*Upon viewing a picture of a sign, Dr. Chosy asked if a specific picture was of the requested sign. There isn't one there now. Mr. Brown replied that there is one there now. It was actually installed without a sign permit so what is before council tonight is a request to approve the second sign where one is only permitted and for over the square footage.*

*Ms. Michael asked if the picture is of the first or second sign. Mr. Brown replied that the picture is of the second sign which is located on the rear of the building and faces Huntley Road.*

*Mr. Brown further stated that the current sign is 8' x 16' in size. MPC recommended that the sign be reduced to 6' x 15'4", which will bring it closer to compliance.*

Mr. Brown showed numerous pictures of the property from Huntley Road. He pointed out the considerable distance the Granite Guy sits from Huntley Road and explained that the rear sign actually acts as directional signage on the site to assist customers.

*Mr. Brown showed pictures of the Stone City's sign and commented that staff expects an application from them for updated signage in the coming months.*

*Ms. Dorothy asked if the Stone City signs will require variances. Mr. Brown replied that they will need to apply. Staff is currently going through code enforcement process with both Stone City and Granite Direct. Ms. Dorothy concluded that they both have installed signs without the proper permits. Mr. Brown agreed.*

*Dr. Chosy asked if Granite Guy has three signs. Mr. Myers replied just two.*

*Mr. Brown clarified that the Granite Guy is included on the freestanding sign out front, which is permitted.*

*Dr. Chosy stated there is no other sign out front. The only other sign is the one in the back that we are discussing. Mr. Myers replied no. Mr. Brown explained that the directional sign is located on Huntley Road.*

*Mr. Brown shared that this is an interesting scenario with four or five different granite, stone in the same building and across the street. Stone City, Granite Direct, and then across Worthington-Galena is Granite Plus is going to be going through the code enforcement process to either come into compliance or request to deviate and ultimately*

*come before this body. But tonight the only thing before council is Granite Guy. This will allow them one additional sign on the rear of the building, which will face Huntley Road and be 34 square feet over what is permitted by code.*

*Mr. Myers shared that what he thinks makes this unique and in the interest of full disclosure in December he bought granite from Granite Guy, and the way they found Granite Guy was off of Huntley Road. This building faces both Huntley and Worthington-Galena. It is an unusual location to enter because you can enter it either on Huntley or on Worthington-Galena and the address is Huntley Road. So if he wants to buy granite from Granite Guy, he is going down Huntley Road and he sees Stone City and thinks this isn't right. Where is Granite Guy? As soon as he gets to that drive he can see their sign. To him it is critical to their business, given the fact they have a Huntley Road address and you can't find it without that sign if you are coming in off of Huntley Road.*

*Mr. Brown added that from what staff understands it also helps with granite deliveries. There has actually been granite delivered to the wrong granite rear entrance so they felt that also identifying the granite store at the rear helped with delivery.*

*Ms. Dorothy thanked staff for working with the existing businesses and helping them get into compliance.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that this is an example where the practicality of it doesn't fit the rules but the rules don't work with what they need to have so we ought to be flexible enough to do that.*

**There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 07-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

**Ordinance No. 08-2015**

Authorizing a Final Development Plan for 2233-2299 West Dublin-Granville Road and Authorizing Variances (Dan Cline/Linworth Crossing).

**Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.**

**Ordinance No. 09-2015**

Approving the Subdivision of Property at 2233-2299 West Dublin-Granville Road, Authorizing Variances and Approving a Development Agreement (Linworth Crossing, LLC/Segna Investments Inc.)

**Introduced by Mr. Troper.**

**Ordinance No. 10-2015**

An Ordinance Enacted by the City of Worthington, Hereinafter Referred to as the City, in the Matter of the Stated Described Project (PID Number 99624, FRA-Fiber Splicing – FY15)

**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**

*Mrs. Fox informed council that they received another appeal of the last ARB decision that was granted for the 130 W. Clearview property. It is the same set of circumstances as the last appeal. She will forward the information to members for the next meeting in order for members to have some time to decide whether or not to hear the appeal.*

*Dr. Chosy asked if it is a different appeal or is it the same person. Mrs. Fox replied that it is the same person. When asked by Dr. Chosy if they can make another appeal, Mrs. Fox replied yes, they always have the right to appeal the decision.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that they are appealing a different decision. Mrs. Fox agreed that they are appealing a different decision of ARB. They are appealing the decision that ARB made in response to them moving the house back within all of the variances.*

*Mr. Greeson stated that he had a few items that he wanted to call member's attention to.*

- 1) Letter from a group of residents on Crandall Dr. who are interested in sidewalks.

*Mr. Greeson shared that he, Mr. Smith, Mr. Watterson, and Mrs. Fox met with the residents a couple of weeks ago. There was a previous meeting late last fall that included Mr. Watterson and Mr. Smith that we were talking with them about how the ordinance works with regards to the construction of new sidewalks. It is a petition process. If 50% of the homeowners petition the city then the city covers 50% of the costs that are identified in the code. The residents diligently studied the current ordinances and talked to the group about what it would take to get a sidewalk built on Crandall Dr. They have now formally requested that the city fully fund a sidewalk on Crandall in the Wilson Hill neighborhood. So we have a request for full funding of a sidewalk project on both sides of Crandall that doesn't fully match the procedure in our ordinance and he thinks necessitates a policy discussion and a consideration of the residents' request. Staff will try to frame the issue by providing some education to council on the project itself, the current codified ordinances, some of the challenges with sidewalk projects, some of the issues staff sees with this request and schedule that for a time that works for council and when the residents can be present to present their request and also for members to consider it with good information.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked if this would be appropriate to refer to our Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board. Mr. Greeson thinks it would be although it is not yet up and running. Members can do that if they want to start using the Board in that way because this has issues with funding, priorities, precedent, equity, and fairness.*

*Ms. Michael commented that her question following that same line in that should we also evaluate whether this should be sidewalks or whether we should increase bike trails. We removed the sidewalk on Wilson Bridge Road and installed the bike trail and she is seeing a significant heavier usage. When you are talking about safety of children walking to school, bike trails work as well as a sidewalk. We should be evaluating which would be better.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that they are asking the city to build it but aren't the rules that it has to be paid by their taxes. Mr. Greeson agreed that they have to pay half of the cost.*

*Ms. Michael is aware that they understand how the ordinance reads but they are asking council to voluntarily choose to fund it fully.*

*Mr. Troper thinks you can let them know on the letter this is how he feels, we have wide council support for the construction of sidewalks on Crandall but the main dissenting opinion is due to cost, as they say in their letter. He doesn't know why council would need to hear them. Mr. Greeson replied that is up to council.*

*Mr. Smith shared that being a part of the conversation from the beginning he thinks the reason it is coming to council in this way is really kind of an above and beyond Bike / Pedestrian committee type of conversation. Valuable in the committee for them to be a part of that conversation and even give recommendations but there are other issues that Mr. Greeson just mentioned. This is such a big project that it is important for council to be educated first and foremost.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked if we are talking about money because that sounds like the issue. Mr. Smith acknowledged that one of the issues is money. Mr. Norstrom agreed that members love sidewalks.*

*Mr. Troper shared that if you read their letter, one of their main dissenting opinions is the cost and that is exactly what he said.*

*Dr. Chosy pointed out that we already have rules about that.*

*Mr. Smith agreed. He added that another reason it would come before council is because there are a couple of alternative compromises that they would be willing to discuss with us that we might actually be willing to consider due to the cost. He thinks that is something that they would want to educate council on.*

*Mr. Greeson stated that he may be speaking out of turn a bit but there are procedures which include special assessments and there are procedures under our code that govern*

*those. There are also procedures for that under state law that we could use that differ a little bit from our code. Council has the flexibility of applying either procedure.*

*Mr. Norstrom stated that special assessments being applying it to more than just the street but to the neighborhood or something like that. Mr. Greeson agreed. In the state law generally you have to pay 2% plus the cost of intersections but it doesn't preclude you from paying more than 50%. While our code has the payback of individual property owners, assessment has to be paid back in five years while state law allows for the pay back to extend to ten years. There are some policy judgments that need to be made in relationship to whether you would apply state law to this request or whether you would use the codified ordinances or whether you would honor their request or some variation thereof.*

*Mr. Myers thinks he heard Mr. Greeson say that as it stands right now, we don't have a compliant request in front of us. Mr. Greeson clarified that council doesn't have a request using the procedures of one section of the ordinance. Council just has a letter from residents making a request of members. They are not invoking the procedure under the ordinances which would then require the city to move forward with that process.*

*Mr. Smith shared that the neighborhood committee is interested in doing that but they wanted to defer to members and our opinions as a council first before they go that direction, which they are prepared to do.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that they are prepared to follow the ordinance. Mr. Smith agreed.*

*When asked by Ms. Michael if they are prepared to follow the 50% ordinance Mr. Smith agreed that they are prepared based on . . . Mr. Norstrom interjected that they are prepared to get the petition, go to a vote and then. . . Mr. Smith commented based on our suggestion.*

*Mr. Greeson clarified that it is not a vote. If they get 50% then the city shall install the sidewalks.*

*Mr. Smith thinks because it is such a large and unique process and because the Bike and Pedestrian committee is still on training wheels, it is valuable as least for council to hear what they have to say. That would be his position.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks that at a minimum it is important for all of us to become familiar with code requirements if we are going to promote the construction of sidewalks.*

*Dr. Chosy stated that we have procedures in place. He doesn't understand why we have to talk to people to change them. That bothers him.*

*Mr. Smith shared that their argument might be that the procedures currently aren't effective and they have never been applied. Dr. Chosy disagreed. We have applied them on Evening St.*

*Mr. Greeson doesn't think that Evening St. was under the amended ordinance. Mr. Watterson shared that Evening St. was done by special assessment following the Ohio Revised Code and that project predated the 51% ordinance that was later passed. He added that the 51% ordinance was passed and codified but there have been no sidewalks built under that ordinance.*

*When asked by Dr. Chosy if the 51% are the number of people who need to sign the petition, Mr. Watterson clarified that 51% is the number of people within a block that have to sign the petition.*

*Mr. Norstrom understands that we normally don't have people coming to council to say they want sidewalks. Council would like to say put sidewalks in and they say no.*

*Mr. Greeson explained that staff will probably draft some memorandum to summarize the issue in more detail. He wanted to not sit on this any longer. He wanted to get it to council so that members are aware of it.*

*Mr. Troper asked if their request is for the city to fully fund it. Mr. Greeson replied yes. He will work with Ms. Michael to schedule the discussion at an appropriate time if that is the council's desire.*

*Mr. Smith believes their expectation is not to get a yes on fully funding at this point but at least to have a yes for us to hear what they have to say in person.*

## 2) Information Item – Economic Development Marketing

*Mr. Greeson shared that staff has a modest amount of money that we budget each year for economic development marketing. We have used that in a variety of ways in recent years. He wanted to call members' attention to a memorandum that Mr. Harris drafted regarding a Sponsored Speaker Series that we have embarked upon with the Worthington Chamber. Our goal is to create opportunities for business leaders and executives from around our region to discover Worthington by coming here and learning about economic development. It is an effort we want to try this year in partnership with our business organization and we are excited about launching this. There are numerous dates that we have tentatively identified and some tentative topics as well that are listed on page 2.*

## 3) Bike/Pedestrian

*Mr. Greeson reported that he sent out an e-mail a couple of weeks ago that shared the public feedback and some information on the trail mitigation question that we considered with the StRt 315/I-270 construction project. As members will recall during that construction project they will be closing the trail north of the Olentangy parklands. We*

*had to sign a letter to that affect and there is some mitigation. They were required as part of their federal process to also take public feedback on that and they received a number of public comments and were considering additional mitigation measures. He understands that the District 6 Deputy Director Ferzan Ahmed followed bikers that included Ms. Dorothy and toured the area as part of their outreach process. Staff recently met with them, although we have nothing in writing at this point other than the information he already distributed but he wanted to have Mr. Watterson overview that discussion and then staff will share with members any materials that come back from them. He noted that one of the mitigation measures suggested by the cycling community and it is not the first time he has heard it was the installation of scuppers on the bridge. He explained that scuppers are holes in the bridge that allows the water to drain on the side of the Wilson Bridge Road bridge. Those scuppers have been difficult or dangerous to cyclists because of the way the bar inside of them runs. Those cross bars has already been welded into the scuppers to make them safer and more manageable for cyclists. So that effort has already occurred. He asked Mr. Watterson to overview the additional conversations.*

*Mr. Watterson shared that the alternative detour that ODOT and Columbus are looking at along with Worthington is to add bicycle lanes to Wilson Bridge Road from the fishing access entrance west to Olentangy River Road. There is currently a bike boulevard on Linworth Road east that is the road that goes north from the Olentangy / Wilson Bridge Road intersection. That comes out near the elementary school near I-270. From there it will include various forms of bike lanes and sharrows and he believes there are some pavement improvements required near the I-270 bridge and will take the route into the Worthington Hills neighborhood and return to Clubview Blvd. and be able to cross St.Rt. 315 and get back to the general location of the current north terminus of the bikeway. The Worthington portion would be to build the bike lanes along Wilson Bridge Road. Staff has done some preliminary work with that and believes we can add a limited amount of pavement to the shoulders that are currently there and have five foot lanes on the roadway portion. The bridge would require that the lanes be narrowed and the bike lanes would be four feet wide. So they would only be narrow for the distance across the bridge with the scuppers already repaired.*

*Mr. Greeson interjected that what that means is the travel lanes for vehicles across the bridge would be narrowed to allow for a wider area for the bicycles on each side. Staff thinks that between the fishing access and the bridge we wouldn't necessarily need to shrink the travel lane, although we could. We actually feel like we could keep the travel lane width and add pavement to the shoulder.*

*Mr. Watterson added that by adding a limited amount of pavement that gives a full five foot bike lane and it doesn't place the bikes next to a narrow travel lane. It also doesn't require attempting to erase the striping and re-striping which often doesn't work very well. He shared that they also looked at a crossing closer to the bridge. It would be down where the roadway comes off the bridge and descends and then goes back up to the park entrance. They looked at an alternative for access at that point but it was going to require a crossing of the roadway by the bikes in an area that didn't have good sight*

*distances. He thinks the conclusion of the staff of Columbus, ODOT and Worthington was that it was better to have the one crossing point at the current park intersection rather than create an additional one at another location.*

*Ms. Michael thinks that is pretty important. She hopes our newspaper reporter can meet with Mr. Watterson after the meeting to get the details. Mr. Greeson isn't sure we are to the point of details. We are articulating to council what the discussions have been. We are going to have to understand what Columbus is agreeing to and what they are willing to do and what ODOT is willing to pay for and then what we might be expected to pay for if anything.*

*Mr. Norstrom thought the point of mitigation was for ODOT to pay for it. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that there are limits to that.*

*Ms. Michael asked how much we are looking at spending. Mr. Watterson replied that he is not prepared to provide an estimate at this point. Ms. Michael shared that at some point she thinks members would like to hear that. Mr. Watterson agreed to provide the information.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that these would be temporary but at the same time permanent. Mr. Watterson thinks the work in Worthington should be permanent. That would also create an opportunity to continue the Olentangy River Road bike path from Troon Trail all the way up. So there would be a good reason to make it permanent.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks if staff recommends expenditure of city funds, whether through the street program or through other dollars in the CIP, it is because we view it as a permanent improvement that is beneficial to our bikeway system.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks this may come fairly quickly. He apologized for springing it on members but there are really not many pictures or details to show yet. He just wanted to make sure staff verbally conveyed what is being discussed.*

*Ms. Dorothy shared that one of her concerns having ridden that path before Wilson Bridge in Worthington is 35 mph for vehicular traffic but she knows from running, biking, and driving down that way that many times cars go faster because the lanes are twelve feet. She would like to make sure that is considered to reduce that lane width just to try to get cars to drive a little bit slower and more in line with the posted speed limit to try to make it safer for those who bike or run along Wilson Bridge Road. She appreciates all of the coordination and effort on everyone's behalf, from the different departments here in Worthington and then the different municipalities, Columbus and ODOT and looking into this mitigation for the closure. She appreciates all the hard work.*

*Mr. Greeson thanked Ms. Dorothy. He thinks there was a group of residents that rode the route with ODOT. He added that there was a gentleman that did a very detailed proposal to ODOT that actually served as a good foundation for all of the conversations.*

*He thinks the lane width discussion is whether to shrink the lanes which may slow traffic down.*

*Mr. Norstrom asked if narrow lanes reduce speeds. Mr. Watterson replied that he is really not prepared to answer that question. He would have to do some research.*

*Mr. Greeson shared that staff thinks we could add pavement that also provides some distance on the side of the road. We are also looking at what degree of work can we accomplish before they start the project in August.*

*Mr. Watterson explained that August is the date they are planning to award the contract and then the question would be when the contractor would plan to close the bikeway.*

*Ms. Michael stated that council will be receiving additional information on this subject. Mr. Greeson agreed. He just wanted council to know that it will be coming.*

## **REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

*Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Greeson if the questionnaire has gone out to the Old Worthington Business Association. Mr. Greeson replied no. Staff will have it out this week.*

## **OTHER**

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**MOTION** Mr. Myers made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss land acquisition and labor relations. The motion was seconded by Dr. Chosy.

### **The motion carried by the following voice vote:**

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

**No 0**

### **The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

Council recessed at 9:05 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Council came out of Executive Session at 10:27 p.m.

**MOTION** Mr. 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  
6<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2015.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael

Council President