Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 20, 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, April 20, 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, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, Parks and Recreation Director Darren Hurley, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were approximately fifty eight visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 16, 2015 – Regular Meeting

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Ms. Michael reported that the Good Neighbor Award is one of the nicest thing that city council does each year. She would like to adopt both resolutions and then turn the program over to Mr. Coulter to carry through with the awards.

- Good Neighbor Award

Resolution No. 10-2015 To Congratulate Erin Armstrong on Her Recognition as the Recipient of the 2014 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Introduced by Dr. Chosy.
MOTION  Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 10-2015. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 10-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 11-2015  To Congratulate Sandy Byers On Her Recognition as the Recipient of the 2014 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION  Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael thanked the Community Relations Commission (CRC) for all of the time and effort they put in year round and for the time they put in on this wonderful award program. She invited Mr. Coulter forward to make the presentations.

Mr. Coulter confirmed that the Good Neighbor Award is one of the CRC’s most favorite things to do. He thanked President Michael and Council members and shared that they have the privilege of appearing before council several times a year to share about their various activities. It is an event that the CRC has been doing for a number of years that brings forth the neighbors that live out amongst everybody in Worthington and it brings to the front some of the things that they do. They do not get paid or even asked to do these things. They are just things that they do out of the kindness of their heart.

Mr. Coulter introduced members of the Community Relations Commission prior to inviting Erin Armstrong forward. He read Resolution No. 10-2015 in its entirety and presented a certified copy to Ms. Armstrong.

When asked by Ms. Michael if she had anyone she wanted to acknowledge who was here to help her celebrate this occasion, Ms. Armstrong replied no. She shared that her husband is watching their three year old and their neighbor Rebecca Smith, who nominated her was unable to attend.

Mr. Smith shared that as a neighbor of Erin’s he has attended some of the functions and they are quite terrific, especially the princess tea parties.

Mr. Coulter invited Sandy Byers and her sponsor, Nancy Zajano forward. He read Resolution No. 11-2015 in its entirety and presented Ms. Byers with a certified copy of said resolution.
Ms. Byers recognized her granddaughter who was with her this evening, Amanda Fontana from Winchester, Mass., who is in town looking at Ohio State as a potential for next year. She thanked City Council and the Community Relations Commission and Nancy and Mike Zajano for their support.

Ms. Michael thanked Ms. Byers for all that she does.

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

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).

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson commented that this ordinance will rezone the property located at Selby and High St. known as the Sharon Square Shopping Center. He asked Mr. Brown, Planning and Building Director to overview the rezoning request.

Mr. Brown shared that the request is to rezone from the C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial District) to C-2 (Community Commercial District). The property covers the northern portion of Sharon Square Shopping Center. It is a unique situation in that half of the building is located in Columbus with the northern portion located within Worthington. He explained that the request is only for the portion of the center that is in Worthington. The property is located on the south east corner of Selby Blvd. and High St. There is a small portion directly to the east across the alleyway that is currently R-10. That parcel is not part of the rezoning request.

Mr. Brown commented that there is an assortment of zoning throughout the area. There is Worthington zoning to the north, which is St. Michael (S-1, Special), and to the east is the parking lot for Sharon Square which is zoned R-10, Low density residential. Further to the east is Selby apartments. To the south in Columbus is their C-4 zoning district (Regional Scale Commercial, which allows for any commercial use.) To the southeast is R-2, which is a residential district within the jurisdiction of Columbus. The properties directly across the street on the west side of High St. are zoned C-2, Community Commercial, which is what is being recommended today. The type of uses we see across the street in that zoning category is Verizon Wireless, the Vet Clinic and Natalies.

Mr. Brown showed a picture of the shopping center and pointed out where the building crosses the jurisdictional lines. He shared that the businesses situated in the southern portion of the shopping center and located in the city of Columbus includes the state liquor store, the tailor and a computer repair facility.
Mr. Brown clarified for Dr. Chosy the jurisdictional division line from a slide of the property. The portion of the building to the left of the blue mailbox is located in Worthington. From the mailbox to the right of the screen (south) is city of Columbus.

Mr. Brown shared that Collage Salon is opening on the site and held an open house yesterday and again today. Staff has been working with the applicant who is opening this business and would like to open a restaurant directly south of the Salon.

Mr. Greeson explained for Dr. Chosy that the Salon is accommodated under the current zoning but the restaurant is not. The property needs to be rezoned to the C-2 district in order to accommodate the business. The business will be located in a portion of the old Colonial Music space.

Mr. Brown explained that the former Colonial Music space has been divided into two separate business spaces. The Salon is located in the northern part with the restaurant being proposed in the southern part. Dr. Chosy commented that it does not include any of the two story building to the north. Mr. Brown replied no.

Dr. Chosy commented that the legislation would rezone the portion of the building that is located in Worthington and not just where the restaurant is going in. Mr. Brown agreed. He acknowledged having multiple jurisdictions involved makes it a little more confusing.

Mr. Brown stated that the actual sign for the shopping center is located in Columbus. He stated that the proposal for the C-2 or Community Shopping Center District zoning seems more in line with the surrounding land uses and will allow for a restaurant type use to go into that facility. The request went before the Municipal Planning Commission on March 26th and they recommend approval unanimously.

Ms. Dorothy asked when the zoning issue was discovered. She recalls there being a liquor permit request that council didn’t request a hearing on awhile back. Mr. Brown confirmed that being the event that caught staff’s attention.

Ms. Michael asked what kind of food the restaurant will be providing. Mr. Brown believes that it will be an American grill.

Dr. Chosy asked if there would have been any logic to only change the zoning on the southern half of the square and not the northern half. Mr. Brown replied that we typically try to keep zoning to the parcel boundaries.

Dr. Chosy commented that we are not doing anything negative in making the change. Mr. Brown replied no. It actually matches up with the zoning on the west side of High St.

Mr. Norstrom thinks it is an appropriate change.
There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 11-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No  0

Ordinance No. 11-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ms. Michael asked the name of the restaurant. The applicant shared that the restaurant will be called **Over the Counter**. He hopes to be open by fall. It is a classic American grill, affordable family fare. Patrons should be able to get a beer and watch the game.

Members thanked him for sharing and welcomed him to Worthington.

**Ordinance No. 14-2015**

Declaring a Sanitary Sewer Easement over a Portion of the City’s Property Located Within Linworth Park at 6087 Linworth Road.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Watterson reported that the developer of Linworth Crossing is extending a sanitary sewer from the area that is located behind Wendy’s on the east side of Linworth Road, across Linworth Road and along the south property line of their new development. Due to some other utilities in the area they are proposing that they cut across the corner of Linworth Park (northeast corner of the park) for a short distance to make construction of the sewer a little bit easier and in order to miss the utilities. This declaration would grant an easement from Linworth Park to allow the public sewer to exist.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 14-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No  0

Ordinance No. 14-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

**Ordinance No. 15-2015**

Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for An Appropriation from the General Fund Unappropriated Balance.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.
Mr. Greeson shared that this appropriation comes as a result of an insurance settlement that came from a traffic accident where a driver went through a guardrail and a traffic controller. We have had a temporary cabinet and controller operating at StRt 161 and StRt 315. This legislation would appropriate the funds necessary to repair the controller and install a new guardrail.

Ms. Michael commented that this is being paid for by the proceeds of the individual’s insurance. Mr. Greeson agreed that it was.

Dr. Chosy asked if this is a net amount with no loss to the city dollar wise. Mrs. Roberts confirmed that it is no loss to the city. She added that the insurance claim actually paid for a portion of our employee’s wages who were called in for emergency purposes.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 15-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 15-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Request for Funding of Sidewalk Construction on Crandall Drive

Mr. Greeson shared that late last year and early in 2015 staff and Councilmember Smith met with residents on Crandall Drive who expressed an interest in sidewalks. We had conversation about how the city’s codified ordinances work in terms of sidewalk requests, we talked about special assessments, sidewalk construction and ultimately had Mr. Watterson prepare an estimate of potential sidewalk costs. Following those conversations residents of Crandall Drive submitted a letter and petition requesting that the City Council consider full funding of a sidewalk project along that roadway on both sides. Tonight staff has:

1) Scheduled an opportunity for the leadership of those residents to more formally make their request in person.
2) Councilmember Smith has conducted some research on sidewalks that he would like to share.
3) Staff will spend time commenting on the physical aspects of the Crandall Drive sidewalk project (the project estimates, the petition and assessment process that is in our Codified Ordinances, and go over some of the materials members received in their Agenda Package.)
At some point staff will be seeking Council direction on how to proceed.

Mr. Greeson invited Kate Wilson to address Council. She shared that Ms. Wilson is one of the individuals on Crandall Drive who has been exploring this sidewalk matter with staff. He invited her forward to introduce her team and share with council.

Kate Wilson, 267 Crandall Drive
Ms. Wilson shared that she is trying to make the argument that Crandall Drive is the primary artery that serves the proud Wilson Hill neighborhood northeast of downtown Worthington.

She shared a map of the area from StRt 161 to Wilson Bridge Road on the overhead.

Ms. Wilson stated that this map and another map that was included in Council’s packet shows the residential streets that connect into High St. north of Crandall. All of those streets have sidewalks except where Crandall and Worthington-Galena Road connect with High St. She added that Wilson Drive also lacks sidewalks. Residents are here tonight to ask that City Council consider approving a measure to fully fund the installation of sidewalks on both sides of Crandall Drive from the intersection of High St. to the intersection of Northland Drive where sidewalks exist. They understand that Ordinance 905.8 allows for 50% funding via citizen petition. Additionally, Ohio Revised Code, Chapter 729 gives the City the authority to require the construction of sidewalks. The residents feel that this project is of such importance that the City of Worthington should require it only if the City agrees to fund it in full because of pedestrian safety, child safety, accessibility, walkability and development for the benefit of Worthington residents.

Ms. Wilson stated that Crandall Drive is a major residential street in the Wilson Hill neighborhood that has also become a well trafficked thru street. Traffic levels are especially high during morning and early hours as commuters use Crandall to bypass downtown Worthington and students are dropped off and picked up from Wilson Hill Elementary. The street parking is reserved for one side of the street which makes pedestrian travel even more cumbersome. Sidewalks on Crandall would separate pedestrian traffic from vehicle traffic and make for a safer more walkable street for Worthington residents. There are currently twenty six children that live on Crandall Drive between the blocks of High St. and Northland Drive. Nineteen of these children attend or will soon attend Wilson Hill Elementary. Residents would love for our children to walk to school each day but the lack of sidewalks is too much of a concern for many. Sidewalks on Crandall would provide a safe way for the children to walk to school.

Ms. Wilson shared that several residents on Crandall Drive and in the surrounding neighborhoods have special needs or limited mobility. Many have expressed the desire to spend more time outside but feel they are limited to their driveway for fear of entering the street. Sidewalks on Crandall would allow these residents to safely enjoy their neighborhood.
Ms. Wilson commented that the proximity to downtown Worthington is one of her favorite features of the neighborhood, however the added risk and stress of walking the street has led many of the residents to avoid walking downtown. With the current Fresh Thyme Market and a future UMCH property developments on High St. they believe that the desire to walk to local businesses will increase but they also feel that vehicle traffic will increase as well. Sidewalks on Crandall would better connect them to downtown and increase Worthington’s overall walkability. They graciously ask that Council consider their request for sidewalks on Crandall, an initiative project to construct sidewalks and agree to fund it 100%. They feel that this project represents a great opportunity for Worthington.

Sara Zeller, 292 Crandall Dr.
Ms. Zeller shared that she lives on Crandall but just a few houses from Ridgedale. She just wants to speak a little bit to precedent. She knows this is not a small request and there are concerns that if Council constructs a sidewalk on Crandall then others will request sidewalks as well. But to precedence, Ms. Zeller thinks this project can stand alone. She thinks it is enough of a safety issue due to the location with the elementary school within the neighborhood. There is also an issue with the way that the traffic circle is routed during drop-off to the elementary school. Vehicles cannot turn left into the drop-off. Vehicles have to turn right into the drop-off, which means people that may choose to use Schrock Road to get their children to school are routed to come up Crandall. So that increases the traffic during school hours for all pedestrians.

Ms. Zeller reported being very excited about Fresh Thyme. It will be great for the residents and she can’t wait to walk there. But inevitably that will also create more vehicle traffic through the Crandall neighborhood than is there already. There is already a fair amount of traffic by those trying to bypass downtown and getting to StRt 161 but that will increase. She knows that there are possible residential plans for the Methodist property. If that comes through there is a possibility that those children will attend Wilson Hill Elementary. If that is a residential situation and that is where those children end up attending, there will be more traffic. Even if they don’t go there, still more traffic because we now have more people living in the area.

Ms. Zeller shared that they don’t have bus service. Since they live so close to the school it is assumed that they can walk to school. We pay taxes but we don’t have busing. She thinks many of the residents would rather their kids be able to walk but feel very nervous. Crandall also has a corner where there is a two way stop, which she thinks is very dangerous. When approaching Ridgedale and Crandall there is no need to slow down because there is no stop sign until you get to Northland. The lack of a stop sign also causes more people to speed without hesitation.

Ms. Zeller closed by saying that she just wants Council members to consider their project. In and of itself she thinks it is a big safety issue. She loves Worthington and loves to walk around Worthington. She hopes members will consider their request.
Tony Brock, 125 Crandall
Mr. Brock shared that he has lived on Crandall for roughly twenty years. He lived there with his parents from the time he was six years old until he graduated high school. Then he and his wife purchased the house at 125 Crandall in 2012. They loved the area and wanted to come back.

Mr. Brock asked Council members to consider the following list of streets: Caren Avenue, Highland Avenue, Halligan Avenue, Larrimer Avenue, North Street, Stafford Avenue, New England Avenue, South Street and Selby. He then asked what they all have in common. He shared that they are all residential through streets that connect to High Street within approximately one mile of downtown. Something else that they all have in common is sidewalks. Members will notice that Crandall Drive is missing from that list as a street that basically if you go from Larrimer all the way down to North Street there is no place with sidewalks to get back into that neighborhood. He shared that as someone who learned to drive on this street, it is a really dangerous place to walk. Pedestrians really have to be alert and move into the gutter to avoid oncoming cars. Parked cars on the street require pedestrians to weave in and out of motorist views. In the winter months the snow forces them to walk in the middle of the street. These conditions are tricky and inconvenient for adult pedestrians in good health and they are extremely hazardous and prohibitive for young children and people with disabilities.

Mr. Brock shared that he thinks the course of action is clear. The street needs sidewalks. So the next logical question is how we fund this project. Residents looks to City Council for assistance. As members are well aware they have multiple options on how to approach this. Ordinance 905.08 has already been mentioned. They have reached the conclusion that this legislation is inadequate for this project. Even after covering 50% of the cost for sidewalks, they feel that it puts an unfair burden on the residents of this street for a public good that really should have been there from the beginning. He feels that the inherent flaws in the ordinance are made apparent by the fact that it really has never been put into practice. Other issues that they found with it is that many residents are on a fixed income and would be squeezed by the cost of the sidewalk in addition to their property taxes. As a result even many of those who liked the idea of sidewalks are reluctant to commit. Also requiring each block to petition independently for sidewalks under this ordinance leads to division within the neighborhood. Some blocks may have a majority to move forward with the sidewalks while others don’t. They feel a more appropriate source of funding would be to use the provision of the Ohio Revised Code so that the city could cover the full cost of the sidewalks. His wife and he considered moving to and raising their children in several different cities but they chose to come back to Worthington for a variety of reasons. They bought their home with the knowledge that there were no sidewalks but they hoped that that could change someday.

Biru Glynn, 175 Crandall Dr.
Ms. Glynn thinks in addition to the benefits that each resident will receive from having these sidewalks, it really is a part of the overall Worthington high level strategic planning and vision for the community. She noted that the recently established Worthington Bike and Pedestrian Steering Committee, she believes it is now called an
Advisory Board, identified walkability and sidewalks as the key elements for growth in this community. Secondly, active today on the worthington.org website is what is called the Worthington Design Guideline. Under the residential portion of that guideline it specifically states: “where sidewalks do not exist along public streets, they should be added wherever possible.” So she really feels that considering this project would add to the overall strategy planning of the city.

Ms. Glynn commented that she would like to make a couple of points about how to fund the project. She believes the 2015 – 2019 Worthington’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP) estimated the city’s total revenue for 2015 to be $8.5 million dollars. After existing projects, debts, equipment, etc. are purchased and subtracted, she believes the remaining balance equals $4.1 million dollars. Residents respectfully ask that members consider appropriating approximately $500,000 of the remaining $4.1 million to fund this sidewalk project in full.

Ms. Glynn stated that second of all and perhaps more on point, as part of that same CIP, specific funds were allocated for what is called the “Sidewalk Addition Program” and the “Street and Sidewalk Improvements Program”. While she doesn’t know the details of those two programs, she understands that the 2015 budget for the Street and Sidewalk Improvement Program is approximately $775,000 with an additional $900,000 every year from 2016 – 2019. Again, they respectfully ask that members consider having this project as part of that budget.

Ms. Michael shared that the Street and Sidewalk Program covers the paving and repaving of all of the streets within the city of Worthington on an ongoing basis. She shared the process by which streets are selected for the program and detailed the work that is involved. Ms. Glynn thanked Ms. Michael for the information.

Matt Erickson, 278 Crandall Dr.
Mr. Erickson shared that he supports the initiative to improve the safety and sustainability of his neighborhood by installing sidewalks along Crandall Dr. He hopes that council members will sincerely consider the merits of this project and request that council pursue measures to fully fund this initiative in the current year’s capital improvement budget.

Mr. Erickson shared that he and his family are relatively new residents of Worthington having relocated here last October. He believes they came to the city for the same reasons as any of those who have chosen to make Worthington a lifelong home. They sought a sense of community that they did not have. They wanted a place where their daughter can be raised among new friends and a home where safety and security don’t have to be foremost in their minds. His daughter Lucy is currently two and one of her favorite pastimes of late has been to seek out her boundaries and push them to a breaking point which is often his and his wife’s as well. He thinks that among all the boundaries that she will inevitably encounter, neighborhood safety is an easy one to address. In less time than he can imagine she will be walking to Wilson Hill Elementary School. She’ll be walking to High St. to meet friends at the Dairy Queen. She’ll be doing all of the
things that the rest of us did in our childhood without regard and it is his responsibility to see that she can live those carefree days. This project is a fundamental step in that process for his family, for his neighbors, and for the residents of Worthington.

Mr. Erickson told members that he understands that they have a charge to manage the city’s resources in a responsible and fiscally sound manner. He also understands that there is a potential capacity to fund this project within the current year CIP. While he recognizes that fiscal responsibility requires planning for the future for the knowns and the unknowns, he would argue that this need is known and it exists now and that the favorable economic situation that the city finds itself in through in large part to Mr. Greeson’s stewardship, he provided us with what we need to make the right decision.

Mr. Erickson commented that he further recognizes that there may be concerns on Council’s behalf regarding the setting of a precedent in undertaking this project and for that he says, Good. The precedence that will be established is that of this council’s commitment to public safety, to walkability, to neighborhood growth and to the evolution of a city. He thanked members for their time.

Ms. Michael thanked residents for their very well done presentations.

Mr. Norstrom pointed out another member of the audience who wished to address council. Ms. Michael invited him forward.

Dan Sechriest, 362 Crandall Dr.

Mr. Sechriest commented that the previous speakers made many good points as family and children are important. He shared that a week ago his son had a friend over and they were riding scooters in the street. He lost control of the scooter. Fortunately the car saw him coming and slowed down. The neighbor on the corner observed the event and kind of freaked out for a second because there was nothing he could do. Had there been sidewalks there would have been no issue.

Mr. Sechriest shared that Wilson Hill Elementary School is actually the only school that doesn’t have sidewalks going up to it. He noted that Evening Street Elementary has sidewalks coming to it from each direction. If you are coming from Wilson Bridge to Worthingway or Worthington Estates Elementary School, you can take Rieber and that has sidewalks on both sides of the street. In Colonial Hills, from Indianola all the way down to Colonial Hills there are sidewalks. There are sidewalks all the way down to Park. Coming straight in on Greenbrier there are also sidewalks.

Mr. Sechriest commented that Crandall is also one of the fastest driven roads. Given a point that was made earlier, there is a four way that could be a possible stop at the corner of Ridgedale and Crandall. Cars pretty much fly up there at a continual pace at 40 MPH or sometimes 35 MPH. So take that into consideration. He knows budget is important and there can be a good way to fund it and figure out how to make it work.
Scott Campbell, 117 Crandall Dr.
Mr. Campbell commented that he understands his neighbors’ concerns as he has been a resident of Crandall Dr. since 1997. They actually chose their property because it didn’t have a sidewalk. They appreciated the way the landscape looked. They had other opportunities to buy other properties but they liked the one on Crandall and one of the reasons was because of the lack of a sidewalk. They do not have to worry about sidewalks maintaining during the winter and they also just liked the way it looks.

Mr. Campbell shared that they just found out about this effort last week when somebody in their neighborhood decided to distribute a flyer about this meeting so he didn’t really have much of a chance to find out more about it or to prepare a statement. They see this as a very large incursion onto their property. They understand where the sidewalks will need to be located in order to comply with the regulations that were stipulated in the flyer. He noted that several of the neighbors had actually plotted out the sidewalk location with plastic tape to determine its effect on their property. He understands that they have safety concerns. He knows that at least three of the residents who addressed council recently moved to Worthington. They knew there were no sidewalks there. They knew they had children. If they had a safety concern there are other properties in Worthington with sidewalks that they could have chosen. Instead they are asking for sidewalks to be put into our neighborhood where there are no sidewalks. There may be others besides him who would rather not see that happen. He just wanted to let members know that even though the city of Worthington may pay the entire cost of the sidewalks, there may be others who are not interested in having a sidewalk on their property.

Margaret Lawrence, 1153 Northland Rd.
Ms. Lawrence shared that they moved to Worthington in 1982 and they picked this neighborhood because it is an older established neighborhood with many mature trees. She is wondering what is going to happen to those trees in five to ten years after the sidewalks are put in. If they die, who is going to be responsible for removing those trees?

Debby Cooper, 264 Crandall Dr.
Ms. Cooper commented that she has only lived on Crandall Dr. for a couple of years however she has lived in Worthington since 1984. She loves the neighborhood but the lack of sidewalks was a bit of a concern when she bought the property. She understands that that was her choice however some concerns have come to light since her residency. The safety issues are more difficult than she had anticipated. The curves make it difficult to see. She understands the number of children on the street to be twenty six but she has two young grandchildren who are with her about half the time. If the street wasn’t a throughway, if it didn’t go all the way to High St. where there are a number of commercial properties that are expanding rather than contracting, it may not be such a problem but between the school and the commercial properties it is more likely that we will have much more traffic rather than less in the future.

Ms. Cooper shared that the green space is nice and we love our trees but on the other hand we also love our children and our grandchildren and would hate to see them suffer for that. She added that she also loves to walk. As she gets older it would be nice to be
able to walk down to High St. from Crandall. There may be other people on her street who are in her age bracket who would like that ability to walk down the street and hit High St. and be able to go to all of the businesses that are close by so that is a convenience thing. She thinks number one is safety but there are many reasons and property value being one of them to make that street more attractive by adding sidewalks.

Nadine Wise, 147 Crandall Dr.
Ms. Wise commented that she will be brief because others have already shared many of the things that she had prepared tonight. She shared that they are not only here tonight to talk about improving the safety of their neighborhood but they are also here to offer recommendations and how to do so in the most equitable way. They graciously ask that council members consider their requests for sidewalks on Crandall and initiate a project to construct sidewalks for special assessment and to agree to fund it 100%.

Ms. Wise shared that she and her husband bought their home in April 2012. Like many of their newlywed friends they moved to Worthington with intentions to stay forever and their home offers them nearly everything on their checklist. She and her mother did talk to Council member Smith about sidewalks before the ink was even dry on their mortgage. They often stroll downtown on the weekends with their eleven month old son Lewis but unfortunately rushing to High St with their stroller is never a safe or fun site to see. It is an anxious experience and they already dread walking Lewis to school in five years.

Ms. Wise commented that precedence has already been talked about tonight and she agrees with her neighbors on that issue. She added that like many groups and generations before them, they realize that sidewalks are imperative to improving the safety and accessibility of their neighborhood and they believe that it is in the best interest to fully fund the sidewalks. As her family, friends and neighbors continue to make investments to our homes and to the Worthington economy it is her hope that council considers making this important investment to safety and accessibility on Crandall Drive.

Steve Kirk, 253 Crandall Dr.
Mr. Kirk shared that Worthington has long been known for its charm with a historic New England style and a small hometown feel with wide open green spaces in the form of parks and large lots. There is no doubt that we are seeing changes to Old Worthington area commercial properties such as the Fresh Thyme store, the Worthington United Methodist Children’s Home property and more recently discussed condominium/pocket park in the downtown Worthington area. While these conversations have been about commercial areas, we are talking about sidewalks in the residential area of Wilson Hill. Crandall remains a very nice accumulation of custom homes with nice yards, a small neighborhood park and a school. He doesn’t support the sidewalks on Crandall and would like to make the following comments about the residential green space, an initiative called Safe Routes to School and then a couple of comments about the Council’s next steps.
Concerning the residential green space – While it is difficult to get a visual perspective on what this means to each resident, he staked out tape in his front lawn just to see what the proposed sidewalks would look like. The area takes up about 1/3 of his frontage. From the inner edge of the sidewalk to his front door is about 30 feet. That is about twice the length of a vehicle. He would rather not invite the general public any closer to his front door than they are now. Additionally he understands the estimated cost to be between $49 and $50 a linear foot under code section 905.08. For his linear frontage foot of 80 linear feet that is $4,000. He noted from his conversation with the city engineer that overall there are 4903 linear feet included in this project from Worthington-Galena to Northland with a total estimated cost of about $500,000. Considering the eleven feet from the curb on both sides of the street along that 4903 feet, the surface area of the green space is roughly 54,000 feet. To put that in a visual reference and perspective, a football field including the end zones is about 57,600 square feet. As much as we have all been to a football game now we are talking about 95% of that size. So if you remove one of the end zones from the football field that is how much green space this adds up to.

Mr. Watterson also explained that approximately twenty five trees will need to be removed and replaced as will a reasonable amount of the landscaping. In the recent past Worthington experienced unintended consequences when trimming trees to clear the power lines and while he realizes that over time trees and scrubs grow back, he wants to be careful to caution his neighbors that this is clearing our mature trees and foliage, not just trimming.

Safe Routes/Pathways to School initiative – He has read the literature on the saferoutespartnership.org website. He understands the five “E’s” of the safe route to schools and he understands that this is a federal initiative to collaborate with state and local municipalities on a reimbursement basis. Of the five within the engineering section it suggests a wish list of short term and long term improvements. Under the short term suggestions they proposed painting crosswalks, installing sidewalks and other small fixes that are immediate and can be done on a small budget. He understands that Wilson Hill Elementary has approximately 500 students. While there are a handful of students who live on Crandall, these small initiatives may be an appropriate compromise and efforts to add safety on behalf of those students. He believes that in the past residents of Crandall have asked the city to install stop signs at Morning St. and Ridgedale. He also believes that studies have been conducted and these request have been denied citing that they are unnecessary. That indicates to him that apparently our streets are safe without them. That is a pretty broad assumption. He truly believes that safety begins with controlling the traffic. He encouraged the city to conduct additional research towards adding stop sign to these locations. This compromise may be the only investment necessary to keep our kids and other pedestrians safe.

Council’s next steps – He knows that sidewalks were discussed about twenty years ago when council member Troper was his neighbor. He and his son were growing up and they heard these same concerns. Many of our long term neighbors here tonight participated in those conversations. He believes that Crandall actually had more traffic when Worthington Foods was located on Proprietors Road. At the time sidewalks were
not installed but as a compromise city council authorized Wilson Hill Park as well as many other city parks to be refurbished to provide safe places for families to play.

Mr. Kirk commented that for the last twenty six years we have lived here and raised our son here without sidewalks. He is aware that a lot of information has been shared since the December 2014 meeting. Frankly he has seen errors in calculated cost to residents. While he understands there has been a petition presented this evening for consideration under code 905.08, he doesn’t believe the petition has been filed with the city quantifying 51% of the residents, block by block to support the initiative. Therefore, considering the known financial obligations of the city, he respectfully asks council that if they intend to further consider this project, please obtain an updated petition from the residents on Crandall Drive prior to committing any further financial resource.

Julie Reeves, 306 Crandall Dr.
Ms. Reeves reported that much of what she wanted to share has already been shared or she would share the information as well. As a parent of two children who attended Wilson Hill Elementary, her experience walking them to school every morning was a stressful one. She thinks twice in the seven years that her children were students there they came very close to being hit. She thinks that both those times were because drivers were not paying attention or they were distracted. After the second time she had her children walk through the neighbors’ lawns while she walked next to the curb just to keep them safe. What could have been a nice lovely walk turned into kind of a stressful task for her every morning.

Ms. Reeves said that she also recalls what it was like to walk on a winter day with snow piled on the curb and having to walk around the cars parked along the side of the road. It was obviously not safe for us. She can’t tell you how many times she has driven down Crandall and seen little heads pop out from behind cars. These are kids waiting for the traffic to pass so that they can safely walk out into the street. For many years we have been very lucky that there have not been any accidents or any injuries or worse. It is time for us to stop our wishful thinking. It is time for us to think beyond luck and start taking the initiative in terms of helping our kids be safe. She thinks that we have an obligation to provide a safe environment for our families and sidewalks will go a long way in insuring that. She hopes that the city will decide to fully fund this project.

Patricia Farmer, 348 Crandall Dr.
Ms. Farmer commented that the petition request for sidewalks on Crandall implies that all Crandall residents are seeking sidewalks. She has spoken to many neighbors who are not proponents of sidewalks. She believes that the block on which she resides does not have the required 51% support. There are additional blocks on Crandall that do not meet the required 51% required by Ordinance 901.08. This assumption is based on the factual cost of $50 per linear foot and the encroachment of eleven feet from the curb into a property owner’s frontage among other landscaping concerns as members have already heard.
Ms. Farmer pointed out that there has been at best a haphazard approach and misleading information disseminated that has created some divisiveness on this issue. There are questions and answers that have been addressed with the City Engineer and City Law Director that needs to be shared with all of the residents before an informed decision can be made by residents and council.

In addressing the safety concern that has sparked the request for sidewalks, Ms. Farmer stated that aside from the fact that all neighbors share the concern of safety for children, many neighbors here tonight have raised their families walking to the library, to the school, downtown, for ice cream, etc. without incident. Many longtime residents and original homeowners would point out that there has never been a situation involving an accident on Crandall to share with Council. The statistics from the police department indicate that neither an accident nor a citation has been recorded in the last five years for Crandall Dr. This does not mitigate the fact that motorists do not at time disobey the speed limit. Rather than focus on excessive cost of sidewalk construction, she asked that city council consider the installation of a stop sign at Crandall and Ridgedale which she hopes would slow the traffic. She would also like to point out, again that because Wilson Hill was built without sidewalks, as property owners we all made the decision to move into the neighborhood where there were not sidewalks. A number of years ago there was an emphasis to provide a safe place for children to play and ride their bikes and they updated Wilson Hill Park.

Ms. Farmer respectfully asked that the petition be dismissed on the basis of no credible support by all residents.

Mr. Myers shared that there has been no petition presented. There has been a request presented but to the best of his knowledge there has been no petition circulated.

Ms. Michael commented that currently there is a petition signed by residents that stated they would like sidewalks but that is not the official type of petition that would need to be filed in order to follow the city code section.

Mr. Norstrom suggested that the following presentation was not needed. Based on the information that members have been given tonight this is an issue that far exceeds what members have in front of us. He would like to hear from staff regarding safety on this property, on traffic, and on a number of other things other than the options of how we would fund a sidewalk if we were to choose a sidewalk. He thinks there are a number of issues that members need to consider in this.

Mr. Norstrom noted that there is also the issue of whether our sidewalk ordinance is effective since no sidewalks have been built under that ordinance. So there are several different issues that this request by the citizens has raised. He doesn’t feel that members have enough information before them to really get into this issue. He suggested that members delay further discussion.

Ms. Michael asked for comments from other council members.
Ms. Dorothy commented that she feels like this presentation has brought forth that the level of service for bike and pedestrians throughout all of Worthington has been neglected to make sure we have high level service of cars. She thinks Crandall is an important piece of Worthington to provide safe access for other forms of transportation besides bikes and cars. She doesn’t think that sidewalks are necessarily the best solution but there is a room to look into what we can do to improve the safety and connectivity throughout Worthington. She thinks that was one of the reasons why we are going to fill a standing committee for bike and pedestrian and multi-modal opportunities throughout Worthington is to have an ongoing committee looking at these types of issues and looking for significant sources of funding such as Safe Routes to Schools. There is funding every single year for $200,000 to $400,000 per project that gets doled out to municipalities through ODOT for projects similar to this. This is something that we definitely have to look at holistically throughout Worthington.

Ms. Michael asked that the City Engineer or City Manager look at the request for the stop sign because it isn’t cost prohibited and it might be an intermediate stop gap while council considers what is going on. Mr. Greeson commented that staff would start by pulling the previous data and looking at the traffic safety committee’s recommendation as he doesn’t recall the details.

Mr. Myers thinks there are many different things that members need to look at in addition to and as part of a sidewalk project such as stop signs, traffic calming devices, sidewalks, talking to the school about how they are routing their drop-offs, etc.

Mr. Myers shared that he is fresh off of telling a neighborhood group that we could not afford $200,000 and now he is being asked to spend $500,000. He also anticipates that when the Children’s Home plan comes forward he will be asked to spend something that makes even $500,000 look small. He was here when the city had $1,000,000 in our reserve fund and that was kind of a scary time. He would also like information on whether there is some compromise here. Whether one side would work or whether we could construct them in phases. He would like to know what all of the alternatives are.

Mr. Norstrom commented that it reminds him a little bit of the traffic study in downtown where council had discussions and then we targeted the intersection of Stafford and High to be examined. He thinks as Council member Dorothy has indicated, we have some major issues ahead of us in terms of bike and pedestrian ways. At the same time we have residents that have identified a potential problem and potential safety concerns that members are now asking staff to further identify. He doesn’t want to just say that we are going to further study this because he doesn’t think the residents deserve that answer. They deserve a quicker answer.

Dr. Chosy stated he would like a little bit of history of how this ordinance has worked because this has periodically come up over the years. He asked if it has ever been used. Ms. Michael replied that it has never worked.
Ms. Michael commented that she has heard two suggestions. One is that staff do more research and come back while the other was to let the new bike and pedestrian committee review the issue. She asked members to clarify their desired direction.

Ms. Dorothy commented that she would like it to go to the new Bike and Pedestrian Committee and maybe even giving the Bike and Pedestrian Committee lease to work with Engineering to do some piloting program, maybe temporary stuff that might happen to calm traffic.

Mr. Norstrom thinks we need to act faster than the Bike and Pedestrian Committee. It is going to spend time organizing and a few other things. He thinks we can get some information from staff. We may direct it to the Bike and Pedestrian Committee but he thinks we need to take some actions before that.

Mr. Greeson thinks we have had previous requests for stop signs where we’ve used our technology to track speeds and do traffic enforcement and things like that. Typically when we evaluate that we will put a stealth stat, which is computer technology that tracks speeds in the area to monitor both whether people are stopping at the stop sign as well as how fast they are going. He is not sure of the last time that was done in this area. We would have any traffic crash or any incident where there was a report written as a result of a vehicle or bike accident with a pedestrian. He guesses we will not be able to capture those incidents where people had a near experience that didn’t result in a response from a public safety standpoint. The quick thing we can do is just look at our data. But he is not sure what it will tell us.

Ms. Michael shared that having been somebody who has walked this street before she knows first-hand how difficult it is. When she first ran for city council she remembers going door to door and after sharing who she was and why she was there she asked the residents what issues were important to them. A number of residents shared their concern about the street being used as a cut-thru. She was unaware that people did that. After finishing her walk she was able to understand what the residents were talking about.

Ms. Michael added that residents of East New England Ave. also want sidewalks for almost the exact same reasons as the ones shared this evening. So that is another neighborhood that has shared the same sort of thing. She thinks the whole concept of trying to find safety for citizens; we may not be able to do everything for everybody initially but maybe we can find some compromises that might work.

Dr. Chosy commented that it seems to him that this group ought to go ahead and check on that percentage of people per block want sidewalks like the law says. He doesn’t know how much good it will do but it would be nice to have that data.

Ms. Michael pointed out that the residents are asking the city to pay 100% and the ordinance states that it is a 50% assessment. Dr. Chosy stated that might be their choice sometime. It would be nice to have the data whether the blocks have 51% or not just to
have more of a basis. Maybe it will come to the fact that the people have to pay half of
the cost. We need more information.

Mr. Greeson clarified that the procedures of the ordinance state that if the city receives a
petition that includes 51% of the residents then the “service director shall proceed with
installing sidewalks.” So we would be caused to begin designing and implementing a
project if we receive a 51% petition.

Mr. Norstrom commented that this is on a block by block basis. Mr. Greeson agreed.
Mr. Norstrom added that you could build a sidewalk in one block but not in another. Mr.
Greeson again agreed. Mr. Norstrom stated that it goes back to the discussion that
apparently an earlier council or MPC or someone did not put sidewalks in there when
they should have. As many of you know we have been criticized, especially on MPC, for
sidewalks to nowhere and the very reason for that is to prevent problems like this. As for
safety concerns, having directed the safety department at Battelle, everything is safe until
it is not. He always used the Challenger example and he doesn’t know how safe this
street is and we’ll have data on that but all we have to do is have some child hit by a car
and we’ll be wondering why we did not put sidewalks on this street. That is why he said
we need to move relatively quickly to try to figure out what is going on here.

Mr. Smith commented that he agrees with Mr. Norstrom. He has been with the project
since the beginning and he has also been on the Bike and Pedestrian Committee as you
know and seen kind of both angles parallel each other but never really intersecting to the
degree that we’re talking about tonight. He thinks it is valuable because Crandall is
really one of those one off streets in the community. It seems important and one false
move and we do end up with a sidewalk to nowhere. Obviously he has stated his position
on this before and he is in favor of the sidewalk. To that end he did prepare the data. He
took off his council member hat and put on his professional hat from an objective point
because he always likes to know the truth. Where people are standing. What people’s
opinions are and the data show’s. . . he could show the information on the big screen so
everybody knows what we are talking about. Ms. Michael commented that members have
asked for more information from staff.

Dr. Chosy stated that the other possibility is maybe the ordinance needs to be re-written
so that it is not quite so onerous on the property owners. He thinks there are a number of
things we could do.

Mr. Greeson commented that he thinks Mr. Norstrom made a good point when he related
this to Stafford and High. The parallel with Stafford and High is that the data there
doesn’t show anything. There is no data. There has been no people hit by cars there so
there is no data that is going to point to a safety problem there although we know that
when we experience it, it doesn’t feel comfortable. He surmises, not having gone back
and looked at it that this is probably going to be similar because he suspects that had the
data shown that a stop sign met the warrants for a four way stop staff would have
installed one. We likely denied it because they didn’t meet the warrants. Likewise, he is
not sure that there has been significant crash history here. He would be surprised if
there has. That doesn’t mean that these residents don’t have legitimate concerns because they are the ones that experience what it is like to walk and travel and bike and experience the road on a day to day basis. He is cautioning members because he is not sure that our data is going to show much and point to a particular problem that we have to solve. We may be thrown to the situation like we are at Stafford and High where we are evaluating a variety of alternatives that might make it better.

Mr. Myers asked what his alternatives are. Mr. Greeson replied that staff will have to do some engineering analysis to figure out what those might be.

Mr. Myers commented that even if members decided tonight that we are going to build sidewalks it will not get done this year. It will not get done until the next CIP at the very earliest. It would take us at least that long to engineer it and so forth. While he appreciates the fact that we want to move forward, we are not going to get anything done right away even if we decide to go with the sidewalk option. He would like to know if there are other viable options. What are the core concerns and how can members address them and could we do it at least short term cheaper than sidewalks or are sidewalks the only way to do it.

Ms. Michael stated that the other question is it more cost effective with sidewalks or do we do it like a bicycle asphalt kind of thing. Mr. Greeson commented that you mean construct a multi-use trail. Ms. Michael agreed.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Watterson in terms of Mr. Myers comment on construction, forgetting about the dollars, in terms of the process of designing, soliciting, and constructing, he asked what kind of a time period are we looking at. Mr. Watterson replied that he thinks there are two situations if you chose to proceed with sidewalks. If we did a special assessment project under the Ohio Revised Code that would probably be a minimum of two years. The special assessment process itself takes about a year with the requirement of an assessment equalization board and notifications. If council decided to move forward tonight, this would require the services of a consultant to do the design and he would expect that about the earliest we could begin construction would be next spring.

Mr. Tropier would like staff to look into the possibility of a stop sign at Ridgedale and Crandall and Morning and Crandall. He just wanted to make sure that Morning and Crandall was included because he used to live at the corner of that intersection so he is familiar with the concerns of the residents.

Mr. Myers asked if we have ever used traffic calming devices in Worthington. Mr. Watterson replied that we have not. There are no speed bumps on any Worthington public streets. We have not used islands or that type of thing that you see in other cities.

Mr. Myers next asked if it is anything that we have ever considered. Mr. Watterson replied that there were a number considered in the southwest quadrant traffic study such as one-way streets, road closures, chicanes, and many options but none were instituted.
Mr. Myers commented that if anyone has any historical knowledge on why they were rejected he would sure like to know that too if that is possible.

Dr. Chosy commented that if he were in the audience, particularly the people who are for the sidewalk, his concern would be that they are walking out of here and what we are talking about seems kind of nebulous. Who knows when the next thing will happen.

Ms. Michael replied that members need the extra information. We are asking to not take forever to make some decisions. This is what she is hearing is the goal of council.

Mr. Norstrom pointed out that members would also like to thank those folks that came up tonight to bring it to council’s attention. He stated that council will act expeditiously. We most probably will act not as fast as you would like us to act one way or the other but staff will do what they always do and that is excellent staff work to provide council with the information. He is sure members will hear from all of the residents at least one or more times in the process.

Ms. Michael commented that residents can rest assure that when the topic comes back to council they will know so they will be able to come and be part of the presentation. She told them that they won’t be kept in the dark. Members do appreciate the comments on both sides because it is not just one side or another and there are people who have varying views and she really appreciates everybody coming out and expressing their thoughts.

Mr. Greeson added that if anybody has any questions in the interim period please feel free to e-mail or call staff or catch us after the meeting and we would be glad to endeavor to answer your questions to the best of our ability recognizing that we don’t have a solution at this point.

A member of the audience commented that it just seems like why should we move forward and with those of us that don’t think we need sidewalks. She would think members would want to know the 49 or 51% before you spend all of your time researching the issue.

Mr. Myers noted that he thinks it is a little bit like the park that members just considered. Sometimes it comes down to more than just how many people want it one way or the other. It is about determining the right thing to do for the city as a whole. Whatever decision members make some people are not going to be happy. That is just the way all of these decisions work out and he appreciates the civility tonight because what council just went through with the Showe development at times was not civil and he was on the receiving end of some of those comments, not here but at MPC, and he appreciates the civility tonight. He hopes that it continues. He would hate for this issue to divide a neighborhood because that is kind of what makes Worthington, is our neighborhoods.

Ms. Michael added that when we did a sidewalk project on the east side of Evening St. and we were talking about safe routes for kids getting to school and safe routes of
crossing StRt 161 in order to get to school, there were a number of residents who were opposed to having the sidewalks in their yard and the city ultimately made the decision to have the sidewalks put in. One particular gentleman who had a corner lot never walked on the sidewalk because he was so mad that it got put in. So sometimes we take a look at things and consider the greater good and sometimes there are compromises. There is nothing set in stone right now except council has heard you. We have heard concerns on both sides and we are having staff provide us with more information, more direction and more opportunity to determine the best way to go.

One of the neighbors commented that he recognizes that the conversation about sidewalks will take a while. In regards to the four way stop sign, he asked if there is a possibility of a stop sign going in regardless of the data. He asked how long that process would take. Ms. Michael shared that there is a Safety Committee that meets on a regular basis and members have asked for that topic to be discussed at their next Safety Committee meeting.

Mr. Myers commented that data is rational. This group sometimes is irrational. So we could always propose a stop sign even if the data doesn’t support it just to see if it works.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Greeson what the timing would be if it were to go forward. Mr. Greeson replied that it depends on how current members want their data. [tape change] Traffic order of the safety director, which is him. We rely on the committee and often the Uniform Manual on Traffic Control Devices or by council action. So those are the three ways. We could update the data and do the stealth stat and that would probably take us a few weeks. We could pull the information up from a couple of years ago and it probably hasn’t changed much.

Dr. Chosy asked if there are rules even beyond our city that you can’t put a stop sign up when it doesn’t fit the rules because one was put up on Highgate and it was there a few weeks and then removed. He thinks it was removed because it was not at an intersection.

Mrs. Fox replied that there are times when you have to have Warrants to install lights or to add stop signs. That is all based on traffic engineering principles and number of cars and all of the circumstances surrounding the stop signs. But the ways that Mr. Greeson indicated to go about deciding whether to put in a stop sign, council could just decide to do it or the safety director could decide to do it. It may not be the solution. She thinks a lot of times the traffic engineers don’t recommend it because it doesn’t necessarily achieve what you think it might achieve and so they discourage it.

Ms. Michael stated that as part of what we are doing, she thinks she would like to get the stop sign issue looking at first because it is a relatively small issue. She would also like to know what the down side is of making this a four way stop intersection because she thinks council could take an action regarding the stop sign while research and other things are being done at a much larger and more costly level.

Mr. Greeson agreed to pull the old data and share it with members.
Ms. Michael commented that we are doing a two prong approach. We are taking a look at the stop sign first and then the rest of the data. She asked how long it would take to get something together regarding the stop sign. Mr. Greeson replied by council’s next meeting.

Mr. Watterson shared that he doesn’t know when the last warrant study would have been. He added that a warrant study for stop signs at an intersection is different than just measuring vehicle speed. Mr. Greeson pointed out that the effort would take longer than the next meeting.

Dr. Chosy stated that didn’t you say that we could just put it in because we can almost say that the data is not going to show anything. Mr. Greeson replied that he thinks council would want the warrant study.

Mr. Myers commented that it may be counterproductive.

When asked by Ms. Michael how quickly staff will have the information, Mr. Greeson asked to let staff look at it and advise council. He added that staff will need to ascertain about how quickly we can conduct a warrant study because we may ask somebody to do that.

Mr. Watterson asked for clarification on the intersection(s) being discussed. Mr. Greeson replied Crandall and Ridgedale is what he heard. Mr. Watterson asked about Morning.

Several residents talked about Crandall and Ridgedale being the worse intersection.

Another resident asked if residents want a stop sign and the data doesn’t show anything. Ms. Michael interjected that city council can overrule and decide to have one put in. But before we do so, she thinks it is wise for members to get the information and the research and make a decision based on that information.

Mr. Norstrom commented that while his question isn’t related to this area, he asked Mrs. Fox if the city could put a stop sign in on a state route. Mrs. Fox replied the she thinks council would be overruled by that. Mr. Norstrom shared that council can take actions relative to our streets but he just wanted to clarify that for Dr. Chosy.

Dr. Chosy asked Mr. Watterson what a warrant study measures. Mr. Watterson replied that there are a list of warrants (stated reasons for the installation of a stop sign) and there are a number of warrants listed in the Ohio Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. A warrant study reviews the properties in the intersection. That includes traffic, pedestrians, comparisons of traffic, and a number of others. But in a warrant study you review the intersection to see if any of the warrants are met for the installation of a stop sign or a multi-way stop.
Mr. Greeson commented that staff will come up with a timeline and report back to council.

Ms. Michael thanked everyone from coming out. She added that members will keep in touch.

Information Item(s)

- Monthly & Quarterly Financial Report

Ms. Michael invited Mrs. Roberts to share the financial report.

First Quarter 2015
Financial Report

Presentation Overview

- First Quarter 2015 Financial Report Review
  - Fund Summary
  - All Funds
  - General Fund
  - General Fund Financial Activity
  - Revenues
  - Expenditures

First Quarter 2015
Financial Report – All Funds

1/1/2015  Beginning Fund Balances: $20,023,436
          Total Actual Revenue: $8,919,016
          Total Actual Expenditures: $8,909,297
3/31/2015  Fund Balances: $20,033,156

First Quarter 2015
Financial Report – All Funds

- Year to date revenues exceeded expenditures by $9,719 and $399,700 for March.
- Expenditures tracked at 87.8%.
- Revenues for all funds are below 2014 revenues by $1,806,020 and below estimates by $1,236,528.
Mrs. Roberts shared that revenues are below estimates primarily as a result of not receiving the first half property tax distribution from the Franklin County Auditor’s Office. They put in a new software program and they are a little late in distributing those funds.

Mr. Norstrom asked if we know what the figures will be. Mrs. Roberts replied that she doesn’t know what the number is but she can find out.

First Quarter 2015
Financial Report – All Funds

First Quarter 2015
General Fund Summary
1/1/2015 Beginning General Fund Balance: $10,245,729
Total General Fund Revenue: $5,389,368
Total General Fund Expenditures: $5,835,784
3/31/2015 General Fund Balance: $9,799,313
2015 Financial Report
General Fund Summary
- Year to date expenditures exceeded revenues by $446,416.
- March revenues exceeded expenditures by $152,997.
- Expenditures tracked at 83.4%.
- First quarter revenues are below estimates by $1,022,231 and below 2014 year to date revenues by $1,065,318.
• Income tax collections are above year to date 2014 collections by $299,203 or 5.86%.
• Income tax collections are above estimates by $269,414 or 5.24%.

2015 General Fund
First Quarter Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Revenue</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue</th>
<th>Actual Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Income Tax</td>
<td>$ 4,111,661</td>
<td>$ 4,327,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$ 1,300,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td>$ 117,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance Tax</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$ 18,750</td>
<td>$ 30,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$ 65,000</td>
<td>$ 50,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Fire Service</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 41,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Membership</td>
<td>$ 331,250</td>
<td>$ 445,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Transport</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 159,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Revenue</td>
<td>$ 309,938</td>
<td>$ 216,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6,411,599</td>
<td>$ 5,389,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 General Fund
Revenue

March 2015 Year to Date
General Fund Revenue

- Municipal Income Tax: 80.29%
- Property Tax: 2.97%
- Local Government: 0.00%
- Inheritance Tax: 0.00%
- Interest Income: 0.56%
- Fines & Forfeitures: 8.28%
- EMS Transport: 0.77%
- Township Fire Service: 0.94%
- Community Center Membership: 4.02%
- All Other Revenue: 2.18%
Ms. Dorothy asked if there was another slide that shows what the Municipal Income Tax used to be. The 80.29% is a significantly higher proportion of our total revenue now, our Income Tax which is quite volatile as we have found out and we have had to raise it several times over the last fifteen years. Mrs. Roberts agreed. She shared that while she doesn’t have the slide in front of her, she believes that last year it was around 70% but again, this time last year we would have received the property tax distribution so that would have diluted the percentages a little bit.

Mr. Norstrom asked if we still have inside millage left. Mrs. Roberts replied yes we do. She believes it is three mills but she would have to verify that.

**Income Tax Collections**

![Income Tax Collections Graph]

**2015 General Fund First Quarter Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Expenditures</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures</th>
<th>Actual Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Building</td>
<td>$168,920</td>
<td>$149,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$1,739,616</td>
<td>$1,430,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>$1,524,368</td>
<td>$1,323,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$1,119,442</td>
<td>$884,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Operations</td>
<td>$1,386,076</td>
<td>$1,171,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Department</td>
<td>$609,996</td>
<td>$500,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,548,417</td>
<td>$5,460,244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 General Fund Expenditures

March 2015 Year to Date General Fund Expenses

First Quarter 2015 General Fund Revenue to Expenditures

General Fund Cash Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$5,866,2</td>
<td>$5,198,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$5,793,0</td>
<td>$5,806,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,652,7</td>
<td>$5,390,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$6,058,7</td>
<td>$5,524,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$6,305,0</td>
<td>$6,062,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$6,071,0</td>
<td>$6,243,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$6,454,6</td>
<td>$6,192,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5,389,3</td>
<td>$5,835,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose of Report:
– Compiled annually with current and historical fiscal data and information specific to the General Fund.
– Provides various financial trend information which can be utilized for financial evaluations, projections and policy decisions.

City of Worthington
Financial Trend Profile #3

Revenue/Expense Per Capita

Revenue
Expense
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General Fund Major Revenue Sources Totals (Elastic Revenues)
Income Tax, Local Govt, Personal Property Tax
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Estate Tax
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City of Worthington
Financial Trend Profile #5
Mr. Norstrom shared a comment that he has made before but with interest rates as low as they are right now, we should be seriously looking at financing some projects, including $100,000,000, $150,000,000, $200,000,000, $250,000,000, $300,000,000, $350,000,000, $400,000,000, $450,000,000, $500,000,000, $550,000,000, $600,000,000.
things like new pedestrian and sidewalk facilities and we should do that before interest rates start to go up.

Dr. Chosy asked if the interest rates on loans could be modified as interest rates increase or are they set in stone. Mr. Norstrom clarified that he is referring to the general financial climate. The Fed has been holding interest rates very low for a very long period of time and municipal financing is at low interests. Mr. Smith just indicated that Westerville has done this. We could even pledge that inside millage against that potentially to implement some long term, especially bike and pedestrian improvements that we are talking about.

Dr. Chosy commented that if you have a long term debt at a low interest rate and the interest rate goes up in the outside world, he asked if our rate continues to stay low. Mr. Norstrom replied yes.

Mrs. Roberts reported that being part of our evaluation process as we undertake these future capital improvement projects and long term improvement projects.

2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview
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2005 - 2014
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Financial Report Review

Question & Comments

Mrs. Roberts requested a motion for the record that council members has received this report.

MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to acknowledge receipt of the Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom asked if everyone receive the information from Mr. Mandel on Open Checkbook. It looks like he is trying to go around staff to get council’s opinion. Mrs. Roberts shared that she has reached out to the Treasurer’s office but has not yet received a response back on what all this entails. Mr. Norstrom commented that those who attended National Cities conference, Open Checkbook is a form of putting your financial records on the internet. The Treasurer has negotiated a deal with Open Gov which is the company that does this to provide it free to all cities.

Mr. Troper asked Mr. Norstrom if he was in favor of that assuming it is of no cost to the city. Mr. Norstrom shared that he was in favor of it when it was costing.

Mr. Smith commented that he gave a proclamation last week at the Kiwanis Club. Worthington-Linworth was celebrating one hundred years of Kiwanis with forty-five years being in Worthington. They asked that he mention that the Eliminate Program is in full swing on an international level. It eliminates maternal and neonatal tetanus worldwide.

Mr. Smith added that since his presentation was eliminated, if anyone wants to review that and have any questions about it he would be glad to share. Several members indicated that it was not eliminated, just delayed.

Mr. Myers asked if the Municipal League or the city is tracking the fight that is going on between Auditor of State, Dave Yost and the General Assembly over public records. Mr. Greeson replied that staff isn’t but he is sure the Municipal League is.

Mr. Myers added that if Mr. Yost is successful it will create another burden for staff or for our law director so he just wants to make certain that we keep an eye on it. Mrs. Fox replied that she is aware that there is a law firm in town that is hosting him to come in for a luncheon to speak to those issues because they represent many municipalities and they have asked him to come in so that he can hear their side of the story as well.
Mr. Greeson shared that he will be out of town this weekend and Robyn Stewart will be acting City Manager beginning on Friday.

Mr. Lee Brown shared that staff had a conversation on Friday with Brent Crawford with Crawford and Hoying asking to do a tour of building #1, which is the building that fronts West Wilson-Bridge Road. They are looking at doing a tour of the new facility and office space and all of the apartments on May 11th at 3:00 p.m. He will send out an e-mail with the details. He just wanted to give members a heads up.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Board and Commission appointments and labor relations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No 0

Council recessed at 9:30 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to return to open session at 10:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

MOTION

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

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 1st day of June, 2015.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President