



Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 16, 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 16, 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 fourteen 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**

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Dr. Chosy.

There being no additions or corrections, the motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael commented that she received a speaker slip on an item that council will only be introducing tonight. She shared that testimony on that item will occur during the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 08-2015

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

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported tonight being the public hearing on a final development plan and variances for the two buildings that are to be known as Linworth Crossing. The Municipal Planning Commission voted on this item on February 12th and recommended approval to the city council. Additionally this development required a certificate of appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board at that same February 12th meeting. He asked Mr. Brown to overview this item.

Mr. Brown restated that before members tonight is a Final Development Plan with variances for setback standards. This item has kind of come full circle for him as his last duty at Franklin County was processing the annexation for this property from Perry Township. Here we are a year and a half later with a final development plan.

At the time of annexation the parcels were re-zoned to the C-2 zoning district, which is our community shopping center district. This proposal is for a new commercial development that is neighborhood retail. It is located in the southwest corner of Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road just north of Linworth Park.

The proposal is for two separate buildings, approximately 20,000 – 21,000 square feet in size. Going from west to east members will see a grade difference of approximately ten feet, which is also one of the main reasons for the buildings being broken into two buildings instead of remaining as one.

Mr. Brown shared that there will be two entrances to the site, one on W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and one on Linworth Rd. For the W. Dublin-Granville Rd. entrance, ODOT approved plans for right-in and right-out only when heading eastbound, and a left-in when heading westbound. There will be a full-access point on Linworth Rd.

Mr. Brown showed the site plan for the development and pointed out the layout of the two buildings, which are located further back on the site to free up parking along W. Dublin-Granville Rd. In preliminary discussions the applicant suggested locating the buildings closer to the roadways in an effort to engage the public. With this project staff realized that with any type of improvements along Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. there would be a need for additional setback and right-of-way. One of the things that will be shared during the conversation with the next ordinance is that we are getting ten feet additional right-of-way along Dublin-Granville and with this proposal we were actually able to use a recommendation from the bike/pedestrian plan to get the applicant to install an eight foot multi-use path along Dublin-Granville and Linworth Roads and actually connecting it up to the entrance of Linworth Park. There will also be an access point in between the two buildings that will have a crosswalk across the parking along the rear property line and connecting to Linworth Park.

Mr. Brown reported that setback variance requests are part of this ordinance. There is a parking encroachment into the fifty foot setback along Dublin-Granville Rd. and along the rear property line towards Linworth Park.

Ms. Michael asked if the additional easement would help with a left hand turn lane east/west eventually at that intersection. Mr. Brown replied yes.

Mr. Brown shared that the existing trees along the southern property line are trying to be incorporated into the new development. Additional trees and a bioswale were added along Dublin-Granville Rd. to handle storm water. Staff has worked with the applicant to add additional crosswalks. Entering the site from the west there will be crosswalks to assist getting up to the buildings.

When asked by Dr. Chosy for additional information on the crosswalks, Mr. Brown explained that staff was afraid that people would walk randomly through the parking lot and interact with vehicles so we asked the applicant to stripe the parking lot and add the islands to assist with a safer path from Dublin-Granville Rd. to the front of the buildings. There is an existing Hackberry tree that the applicant is going to preserve in an island as you enter. Dr. Chosy thanked him for the explanation.

Mr. Brown reported that staff was able to utilize bike and pedestrian plan to encourage the applicant to install an eight foot wide asphalt multi-use path along Dublin-Granville Rd. down to Linworth. He added that the storm water will all be handled by the bioswales along West Dublin-Granville Road and heavily planted and treed.

When asked by Dr. Chosy if the foot path runs along the trees, Mr. Brown replied yes. He showed Dr. Chosy the location of the path and the trees using a diagram of the development.

Mr. Brown shared that throughout the process they interacted with a neighborhood just to the south, Westbrook Place, whose residents expressed an interest in bike and pedestrian connections down to their neighborhood that would provide them with safer access to the UDF, Linworth Crossing, and Linworth Park.

Mr. Brown pointed out the plaza between the two buildings that could possibly be used for a restaurant in the future. He stated that all mechanicals will be screened from Linworth Rd., Dublin-Granville Rd and Linworth Rd.

Mr. Brown added that the development easily matches up with the four recommendations of the bike and pedestrian plan concerning the St.Rt. 161 and Linworth:

- 1) Bike/pedestrian access for safer crossings.
- 2) The multi-use path along St.Rt. 161 providing connections
- 3) Bike and pedestrian safety to Linworth Park
- 4) Hopefully future connections along StRt 161 down to Godown and the dog park as a multi-use path extension

Mr. Brown reiterated that staff is recommending approval of the application and he would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Dorothy asked how many stores could be located in this development. Mr. Brown replied possibly twenty four but it will depend on the square footage of the stores. One store could have two store fronts or a store front and a half so it could completely vary depending on the tenants. Ms. Dorothy shared that she was curious as to what the maximum was. She finds the development exciting.

Mr. Greeson noted that Mr. Gitlitz, the applicant is in attendance if members have any questions for him.

Mr. Myers commented that at one point there was the possibility of putting in a green grocer or a market at the far western edge. He asked if that was still on the table. Mr. Gitlitz replied yes.

Mr. Myers noted the open area concept in the middle as a congregation place and the one down at the other end. This building went through considerable architectural changes as it went through several months in front of ARB and he doesn't know how many different drawings it went through. He thinks it has some really nice features. He likes the atrium and the common area but it is at its heart a strip mall. He thinks ARB was impressed with the landscaping, the bioswale and the trees. They did a very nice job of softening the site with lots of green space. He thinks at the end of the day it is going to be an attractive property, certainly much better than the vacant car lot that we have now.

Mr. Brown pointed out the multiple bike rack locations on the site along with additional benches and planters.

Mr. Myers encouraged members to keep in mind that there are three hundred apartments going in immediately to the west of this development so he thinks this will probably help service those apartments.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she appreciates the attention to detail given in the numerous bike and pedestrian access points throughout the development.

Mr. Troper commented that all of the traffic from StRt 161 into the development is right turn in and then right turn out so all of the traffic that would need to head west on StRt 161 has to go out through Linworth Rd. Mr. Brown replied yes to be able to use the light.

Mr. Troper asked what kind of impact is that going to have on the traffic at this location. Mr. Brown replied that the access point along StRt 161 was reviewed by ODOT and that was the recommendation by them for the right-in, right-out and a left westbound stacking lane that the intersection will adequately be able to handle the westbound movements.

Ms. Michael echoed everyone else. She thinks it is a wonderful and appreciates the green space and walkways. She thinks it will be a wonderful addition to the community.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 08-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 08-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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.)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is similar to a request that members considered quite a while ago to combine the seven parcels into two for the development members just approved. For a variety of reasons members need to re-hear that subdivision and adopt a related development agreement.

Mr. Brown shared that this is a flashback to April of last year. The addition that members will see is the additional ten foot access easement for the recreational path that will run along Linworth Road and St.Rt 161. Staff felt it important to make that part of the actual plat. Everything will remain the same. This also includes a development agreement with the applicant as well as side yard setbacks for the buildings that need to cross property lines. The tax districting makes it an issue to create one parcel so it has to be two parcels of record. Staff recommends approval as did MPC at their February 12th meeting.

Mr. Norstrom asked why the plat wasn't recorded the first time. Mr. Brown replied that the first time he was new and didn't realize that we needed to take the subdivision and the development agreement together. When they began working with the applicant on the development agreement the bike and pedestrian discussion was just underway. They realized that the group wanted an eight foot multi-use path and it needed included on the plat. So since the applicant was working through the development plan, staff wanted to take them hand and hand back to the MPC/ARB and then on to City Council.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 09-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Chosy, Troper, Michael
No 0

Ordinance No. 09-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson commented that staff has a picture of this Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) project. When they do work within the city of Worthington they often seek consent legislation which authorizes them to perform the projects within the municipal limits, particularly in city roads or rights-of-way that may impact us. That is what they are doing here in the case of a fiber optic splicing project along StRt. 310.

Mr. Watterson added that ODOT and the city of Columbus have installed fiber optic cable as part of a number of other projects along the interstate system and this project connects them together. It will be for the operation of video cameras so people can see real time traffic conditions, signage that indicates travel distances between various points along the system, and really any other thing that can use fiber optic capability for communication. The project includes a very small amount of work in Worthington. At the bottom center of the photograph members can see one white square and two white circles. Those indicate one existing and two additional split locations that will be below grade in those locations. It is a very small amount of work but just as a matter of procedure ODOT has requested the consent legislation.

Ms. Dorothy commented that it looks like StRt 315 is in a few too many places. Dr. Chosy agreed. Mr. Watterson explained that the road going from side-to-side in StRt 161. He thinks the StRt 315 symbol happened to fall on StRt 161 also so up and down is StRt 315. This location is just north of the StRt 161 interchange in the northbound side.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 10-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Chosy, Troper, Norstrom, Michael
No 0

Ordinance No. 10-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED**Ordinance No. 11-2015**

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from C-1, Neighborhood Commercial to C-2, Community Commercial (5596 North High Street).

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

Ordinance No. 12-2015

Vacating Street Right-of-Way on the West Side of Linworth Road.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

Ordinance No. 13-2015

Amending Sections 1123.19, 1123.63 and 1127.03(d)(2) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington Defining Child Day Care Center, Nursery School and Preschool, Defining Semipublic Uses and Providing for Consideration of Changes to Conditional Uses.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

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

Mr. Greeson shared that staff member Anne Brown has put out the information via neighborhood network, the city's website, etc. regarding the city seeking applicants for the new Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board. A deadline of April 8th at 5:00 p.m. was provided for submittal of applications. The website contains a fairly detailed amount of information on the subject. That action was pursuant to members' direction and he wanted to share that information.

Ms. Michael asked if someone will reach out to those who have already submitted their names. She knows of a couple that were provided. Mr. Greeson replied that staff will do that as we have collected several names of people who are interested in serving. We will either send them the web link or an application.

Mr. Greeson then shared that members received a drop-in memo in your agenda package that included draft legislation from Mrs. Fox for your review, questions, feedback for regulating bamboo.

Members reported that they did not receive that information. Mr. Greeson reported that they will.

Mr. Greeson commented that he mentioned to members previously that staff has had some conversations with Sharon Township about our existing police dispatch contract. They are in the process of considering contractually moving those services to the sheriff's office. Staff has prepared a memo for this evening and Mrs. Stewart will present on it. Staff has some recommendations but would appreciate members' feedback after the presentation.

Mr. Norstrom recalls that the sheriff's department was going to charge them a very inexpensive charge. He asked how much that was. Mrs. Stewart replied that she believes it was around \$17,000.

Mrs. Stewart shared the following information from her Memorandum:

Finance Director Molly Roberts, Police Chief Jim Mosaic and I have evaluated the fee charged to Sharon Township for police dispatching services. In this analysis, we considered the total cost to operate Worthington's Communication Center and the call volume across all entities supported by the Center. The Center provides dispatching services for Worthington Police, Worthington Fire, Sharon Township Police and Perry Township Police.

The cost of operating the Communications Center was evaluated during the years 2009 through 2014. The costs included in the evaluation were associated with personnel, contracts related to equipment, technology equipment and supplies. The following table shows the last four years of cost data.

	2011	2012	2013	2014
Personal Services	\$ 922,582.07	\$ 919,773.48	\$ 898,332.21	\$ 862,911.17
Supplies & Materials	600.00	600.00	600.00	600.00
Contract Services	165,152.11	163,157.00	169,167.79	194,142.45
Technology Equipment*	9,915.00	2,850.00	2,718.68	105,000.00
Total	\$1,098,249.18	\$ 1,086,380.48	\$ 1,070,818.68	\$1,162,653.62
Total w/o 911 Controller				\$1,057,653.62

* Technology Equipment includes the purchase of the 911 controller in 2014. Given the high cost of this long-life item, we excluded it from the cost allocation described below.

Mrs. Stewart reported that the memo includes two different methodologies however there are other methodologies that Communication Centers across the country use that we didn't look at for this analysis. If members are interested we could evaluate them. For instance, sometimes it is just based on population or assessed valuation. For this analysis, staff looked at activity handled by the Center.

Cost Per Call

In addition to determining the cost of the operation, we also gathered information on call activity in 2014. There were a total of 39,559 calls handled by the Center. Given the cost of operating the Center in 2014, excluding the cost of the controller, and the total number of calls, it cost \$26.89178 per call in 2014. Those costs can be allocated on a per call basis to each entity.

	2014 Calls	Cost for Calls
Worthington Fire	2,557	\$ 68,762.28
Worthington EMS	3,382	90,947.99
Worthington Police	25,777	693,189.36
Sharon Township	3,035	81,616.55
Perry Township	4,579	123,137.45
Total	39,559	\$ 1,057,653.62

Cost Based on Call Time

Another way to evaluate the allocation of cost is to consider the amount of time involving the dispatcher, based on call type. The city of Dublin has conducted an analysis of dispatcher involvement time on various calls. When that time allocation is associated with the cost per minute of Worthington's Center and the calls handled by the center, the 2014 cost per type of call can be determined.

Type of Call	Time per Call	Cost per Call
Fire	30 minutes	\$60.37
EMS	16.25 minutes	32.70
Mutual Aid (Fire & EMS)	6.25 minutes	12.58
Police Calls for Service	5 minutes	10.06
Police Traffic Calls	3 minutes	6.04
Other Police Calls*	1 minute	2.01

* Dublin did not include the Other Police Calls category. We added that category to account for activity that is not captured in any of the other categories.

When this cost per type of call methodology is applied to the various entities, it results in the following allocation:

	Direct Cost for Calls (2014)
Worthington Fire & EMS	\$139,886.06
Worthington Police	120,919.83
Sharon Township	19,166.95
Perry Township	27,602.43
Total	\$307,575.27

As the table shows, the total cost based on time spent per call does not equal the cost to operate the Center. This is due to activities that are not associated with a call for service as well as the Center's capacity to deal with major events and calls that exceed the typical amount of time. In order to fully allocate the cost of the Center to the entities being served, we need to divide the remaining costs (the difference between the cost to operate the Center and the cost shown on the previous table) proportionally to the entities. This division of the remaining costs equates to a factor of 3.44. When these remaining costs are added to the direct cost for calls, we arrive at an allocation of the cost of the Communications Center.

	Direct Cost for Calls	Factor	Total Cost for Calls
Worthington Fire & EMS	\$139,886.06	3.44	\$481,023.71
Worthington Police	120,919.83	3.44	415,804.88
Sharon Township	19,166.95	3.44	65,909.06
Perry Township	27,602.43	3.44	94,915.97
Total	\$307,575.27		\$1,057,653.62

Summary

Under both methodologies, when the total cost of operating Worthington's Communications Center are allocated across the entities served, the cost is actually higher than the current amount charged to Sharon Township (\$26,073.72). When the direct cost for call in 2014 is calculated, using Dublin's methodology for time spent on each call, the cost is lower than the current amount charged Sharon Township. However, the direct costs does not take into account the full costs of operating the Communications Center. Even the "full cost" shown in this memo does not account for costs associated with oversight by the Police Division and costs associated with the City Manager's Office, Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology dedicated to supporting the Center.

Ms. Michael asked what staff is recommending in discussions with Sharon Township. Mr. Greeson replied that at this point staff has not offered any formal proposal. What we have indicated in our conversations is that either we will not lower the existing price

because we think if we do we are significantly subsidizing the operation and we weren't confident that we would be willing to extend that to the additional people that we provide dispatch services to by contract. We may want to recommend that we offer some kind of freeze for a certain period of time on the overall cost. He thinks if we offer a freeze they will likely go. He doesn't think it is a quality of service question but rather a cost question at least that is what has been indicated to him. It really gets down to whether we want to extend the service at a further subsidized rate. If we are willing to do that are we also willing to do that for any other people that we contract with? If we do that we kind of erase the loss. In other words, if we dropped the rate to meet the sheriff's office proposal and we extended a similar methodology to say Perry Township, it would be the equivalent of that reduction for that other contract and it would be the equivalent of losing Sharon anyway. Do we want to discount it to keep them recognizing it's a subsidized rate no matter what.

Mr. Norstrom commented that we don't lose any cost when they leave, correct? Mr. Greeson agreed. We are basically selling them our capacity.

Mr. Myers commented that on the one hand he doesn't like the concept of further subsidizing them and he thinks even the \$26,000 is probably a more than fair rate for them. He certainly would not want Perry Township to press an advantage but on the margin, a \$1.00 from Sharon Township contributes to our revenue a \$1.00. So we have no cost savings by losing them but we have a revenue decrease. So any revenue above zero is beneficial.

Mr. Greeson commented that the issue becomes whether or not we are going to provide that same deal to other parties.

Mr. Norstrom asked what other parties are there besides Perry Township. Mr. Greeson replied just Perry.

Mr. Myers commented that if Perry and Sharon were both to leave then we would see a reduction in costs would we not because we could cut back capacity. Mr. Greeson replied no. Mr. Norstrom noted that we are selling our excess capacity. Mr. Myers added that any money we make on the excess capacity is good money regardless of the amount. Mr. Norstrom agreed.

Chief Mosaic shared that he met with Chief Schwind of Sharon Township and they are very satisfied with our service. It is strictly a dollar and cents issue for them. He thinks they are also considering that the change would mean that the Sheriff's Department will become the primary answering point for their residents for fire calls as well, which would necessitate a transfer for those needing EMS or Fire assistance.

Mr. Myers commented that he can't believe the level of service that they would derive from the County will be as good as the service we provide. Chief Mosaic confirmed that to be his thought. Although the County does offer a quality product they have the capacity to spread that cost among more entities and have a larger volume of calls per services.

They probably handle a half a million calls for service and they've spread it amongst twelve different entities.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the question is why Worthington isn't contracting with the Sheriff's Department. Chief Mosaic replied that we pride ourselves on quality of service.

Mr. Myers shared that he certainly would not want to propose any sort of negotiation strategy or counter-offers or anything like that in public session. He asked for Mr. Greeson's recommendation. He asked if he would allow them to go. Mr. Greeson replied yes. He is not going to recommend a subsidized rate that isn't based on some fair methodology that we could apply to somebody else.

Mr. Norstrom asked if there is any reason for us to suspect that Perry Township will do the same thing. Chief Mosaic replied that he has not had any conversations with Chief Oppenheimer. It is his opinion only that they are also satisfied with the service Worthington provides. He would not foresee them going to the Sheriff's Department.

Dr. Chosy wondered if they would ask for a reduced amount. Chief Mosaic replied that his opinion is that if Sharon is given a reduced rate then Chief Oppenheimer would very quickly follow suit.

Mr. Myers restated that anything we charge them over \$1 is better than what we get if they leave because we are going to pay the same amount whether they are here or not.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom the revenue amount we receive from Perry Township, Mrs. Stewart replied \$46,800 a year. After working through some computations Mr. Norstrom determined that if we offered both Perry and Sharon Township the same reductions in order to match the number from the Sheriff's Department the loss would be about \$27,000, which is exactly the amount we would lose if Sharon decided to leave. He sees it as just a coin toss at that point in time. Mr. Greeson reported that staff reached that same conclusion.

Chief Mosaic shared that the Perry Township contract is based strictly on the cost of an "A" step dispatcher. That was their proposal when they came to us for dispatching services so it did not involve any calculations of calls for service, which made it really difficult to try and correlate a fee that was there for both entities. Mr. Norstrom stated that he understands.

Mr. Norstrom asked if there are any other entities that we could be selling our services to. Chief Mosaic replied not that we've identified at this point.

Mr. Norstrom commented that it looks like in terms of the analysis that 40% of our time is direct and then 60% is indirect. He asked if that is typical. Mrs. Stewart commented that she thinks it varies based on centers. She didn't pull what the rates were for other centers so she can't say. She knows that Dublin utilizes a factor that is less than three.

Chief Mosaic shared that there comes a point when the call volume necessitates adding personnel. Right now with Worthington Police, Perry and Sharon it does not create additional personnel and there is that fine line of at what point do you start increasing staff based on your call volume to those entities. Mr. Norstrom stated there is sort of a minimum staffing you have to have just to cover the period of time. Chief Mosaic agreed.

Dr. Chosy stated that from the standpoint of one of the workers, would eliminating these two really give them a great deal more time. He asked if it is a major difference from how they work day to day. Chief Mosaic replied no. He believes Sharon Township takes about 170 offense reports and maybe 240 accident reports a year. Their traffic stops are much less than Perry Townships traffic stops so the volume of police initiated activity is not that great. He doesn't have a good handle on how many telephone calls staff fields from Township residents that do not result in a call for service.

Ms. Dorothy asked if Sharon and Perry Townships were included when we were looking into combining dispatch services. Chief Mosaic shared that when we were discussing consolidation we were only looking at Worthington numbers. Sharon and Perry would necessitate a separate contract with that consolidation effort.

Mr. Greeson added that radio could also be impacted by this. He asked Chief Mosaic if he wanted to speak to that. Chief Mosaic shared that currently through the CORE system we provide Sharon and Perry access to our radio network but we have never charged Sharon or Perry a direct cost. In order for Sharon Township to go to the County they will have to join the MARC system which will require a fee per radio per month and that is also included in Sharon's cost that they are proposing to their trustees. He thinks that adds about \$3,000 a year onto the cost. We don't separate that out into our analysis, which obviously is quite a hefty fee for the network component. We have seen the economics of scale as we have added more people such as Hilliard to our CORE system.

Mr. Greeson added that the members of CORE owners have various townships, Hilliard – Norwich Township, Dublin – Washington Township and they each provide those radios in as many as they deem appropriate but usually through a dispatch or some other type of communications contract. So we just did it through our dispatch agreement but it wasn't broken out as a separate costs.

Mr. Myers asked what the contract price to Perry was. Mr. Greeson replied \$46,300.

Mr. Norstrom stated that he agrees with what Mr. Myers was saying. If we lose revenue we lose revenue. He thinks it would only be fair, if Perry were to ask that we give them the same rate we are giving Sharon. He thinks we wish Sharon luck and thanks for the business.

Mr. Greeson shared that they are doing a responsible job finding the best deal for their taxpayers. There is no hard feelings.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Dr. Chosy made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss land acquisition. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No 0

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Council recessed at 8:17 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

ADJOURNMENT

Council came out of Executive Session at 8:44 p.m.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

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
6th day of April, 2015.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President