City Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, June 1, 2015 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

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

Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

If you have questions regarding this agenda please contact the Clerk of Council at 614-786-7347. This agenda and amendments that may be made to it can be found at www.worthington.org
CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

VISITOR COMMENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1) April 20, 2015 – Regular Meeting
2) May 4, 2015 – Special Meeting
3) May 4, 2015 – Joint Meeting

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

4) Ordinance No. 18-2015

Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the 2015 Street Improvement Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 616-15)

Introduced May 18, 2015
P.H. June 1, 2015

5) Ordinance No. 19-2015

An Ordinance Enacted by the City of Worthington, Franklin County, Ohio, in the Matter of the Stated Described Project, (FRA-161-8.67, PID 96305).

Introduced May 18, 2015
P.H. June 1, 2015

6) Ordinance No. 20-2015

Approving the Removal of Two Silver Maple Trees from the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green and the Construction of a Concrete Entranceway to the Elevator Planned for the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building.

Introduced May 18, 2015
P.H. June 1, 2015
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

7) Resolution No. 27-2015
Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 7029 Huntley Road and Authorizing Variances (Stone City LLC).

8) Resolution No. 28-2015
Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 500 West Wilson Bridge Road and Authorizing Variance (Lynda Gildea).

9) Resolution No. 29-2015
Authorizing Participation in Ohio Department of Transportation Cooperative Purchasing Program.

10) Ordinance No. 21-2015
Enacting Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Regulate the Growth of Running Bamboo.

11) Ordinance No. 22-2015
Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund Unappropriated Balance for Salt and Ice Control and the Economic Development Fund Unappropriated Balance for Economic Development Incentive Program Funding.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

12) Authorization to Advertise for Bids – Basins 6 & 8 Sewer Lining

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT
City Manager Report to City Council for the Meeting of Monday, June 1, 2015

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1) April 20, 2015 – Regular Meeting
2) May 4, 2015 – Special Meeting
3) May 4, 2015 – Joint Meeting

Recommendation: Approval of Minutes as Presented

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

4) Ordinance No. 18-2015 – Appropriation – 2015 Street Improvement Program

This Ordinance provides an appropriation in the Capital Improvements Fund for the annual street improvement program. The Ordinance was introduced without a contractor and amount pending the results of the bid process. Bids are scheduled to be opened on May 29, 2015; staff will report the results at the public hearing. The Ordinance needs to be amended to insert the name of the contractor and the amount of the project.

Recommendation: Approval of Ordinance as Amended

5) Ordinance No. 19-2015 – Consent – Resurfacing of SR-161

The Ohio Department of Transportation plans to resurface SR-161 from Olentangy River Road to Worthington’s East Corporation Limit (just west of the CSX railroad overpass) next year. In preparation for this project, they have requested consent legislation from the City of Worthington. This Ordinance provides consent and describes the City’s responsibilities which include the City’s share of the cost (estimated at $127,000), compliance with State and Federal regulations, and adequate maintenance upon completion of the project. Attached is a letter from the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) that includes the request and information about the project.

Recommendation: Approval of Ordinance as Presented
6) Ordinance No. 20-2015 – Tree Removal & Concrete Installation/Repair – Village Green

The Worthington Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) has contracted with MAC Construction for renovations to the Kilbourne Building at 752 High Street. As part of this renovation, an elevator is scheduled to be installed to provide ADA access to the building. The exterior entrance to the elevator and the concrete pad that will serve as the entranceway to the elevator access are in close proximity to an American Red Maple tree and the tree’s root system. The tree’s roots will be greatly impacted by the installation of the ADA access. Additionally, there is a second American Red Maple tree in front of the building. The root systems of the two trees are abutting the foundation of the building, which has the potential to cause damage to the building in the future. Given this concern about the roots and the need to remove one of the trees for the ADA access to the building, both trees are proposed for removal. The City/CIC intends to develop a new landscaping plan for the building, which will propose new plant materials to be installed around the building.

The two trees as well as part of the concrete walkway to the ADA access are located within the Village Green Drive right-of-way. The City’s Charter defines the Village Green as including the right of way of the Village Green Drives. This Ordinance authorizes the removal of the two trees and the installation of the concrete sidewalk extension for the ADA access. These modifications to the Village Green require an affirmative vote of six-sevenths of the members of Council.

At the City Council meeting where this Ordinance was introduced, the trees were identified as Silver Maples. Since that meeting, one of the City’s arborists has evaluated the trees and corrected the identification. They are actually American Red Maples. He noted the location of these trees is not a good one so removal and replacement somewhere else is a good option.

Recommendation: Approval of Ordinance as Amended

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

7) Resolution No. 27-2015 – Amendment to Development Plan – 7029 Huntley Road

This Ordinance approves an amendment to the Final Development Plan for 7029 Huntley Road to include the installation of wall-mounted signage and grants a variance to permit two wall-mounted signs on the building and to allow the signage to exceed the maximum area of 100 square feet. This property has frontage on both Huntley Road and Worthington Galena Road. The Ordinance allows the applicant, Stone City, to have a sign on both the east (near the storefront) and west (above the loading dock) sides of the building. Additional information is provided in the attached memorandum from the Director of Planning & Building and the application.

Recommendation: Introduction and Approval as Presented
8) Resolution No. 28-2015 – Amendment to Development Plan – 500 West Wilson Bridge Road

This Ordinance approves an amendment to the Final Development Plan for 500 West Wilson Bridge Road and grants a variance to reduce the required setback along the freeway. The Ohio Department of Transportation needs additional property for the interchange improvement for I-270 and SR-315 which will result in the existing building and its cooling tower being located closer to the property line than is allowed by Worthington Code. The Municipal Planning Commission reviewed this item on May 14, 2015 and unanimously recommended approval. Additional information is provided in the attached memorandum from the Director of Planning & Building and the application.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval as Presented

9) Resolution No. 29-2015 – Participation in Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) Salt Bid

ODOT has a cooperative purchasing program for road salt open to Ohio municipalities. The City has participated in the South West Ohio Purchasers for Government (SWOP4G) for the purchase of road salt for many years. Last year, the City was limited to a maximum amount that resulted in the need for the City to use the spot purchase market to obtain enough salt for the winter, which was more expensive. Staff recommends the City Council approve this Resolution to allow the City to participate in both SWOP4G and the ODOT program. Attached is a memorandum from the City Engineer that provides additional information. The memorandum also contains information for the supplemental appropriation Ordinance included later on this agenda.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval as Presented

10) Ordinance No. 21-2015 – Regulation of the Growth of Running Bamboo

On May 4, 2015, the City Council discussed draft legislation regarding the regulation of running bamboo. During that discussion, Council requested changes and asked those changes to be incorporated into an Ordinance that is brought forward for introduction and public hearing. Attached is a memorandum from the Law Director regarding this Ordinance. A relined version of the Ordinance is also attached.

**Recommendation:** Introduction for Public Hearing on June 15, 2015

11) Ordinance No. 22-2015 – Supplemental Appropriation

This Ordinance appropriates in the General Fund $140,000 for the purchase of road salt and ice control materials and $85,000 for supplemental pay for members of the Fire Division in connection with the recently approved collective bargaining agreement with
the IAFF. It also appropriates $10,000 in the Economic Development Fund for building improvement incentives.

Road salt was very expensive this past winter and the City’s supply has been depleted. Additional salt and de-icing materials need to be purchased to prepare for the upcoming winter and the City’s previously allocated funding was already expended for salt earlier this year. This appropriation will provide funding for the purchase.

The building improvement incentives line item in the Economic Development Fund supports the ReCAP program. The City has engaged the Neighborhood Design Center (NDC) to provide design services for businesses preparing an application for ReCAP funding. The services of the NDC have succeeded in elevating the impact of the funded projects by encouraging more effective use of funds to create aesthetic exterior improvements. The budget for the NDC services has been expended, thus additional funding is needed to continue to provide the service. The City’s ReCAP program received a $10,000 grant from American Electric Power in 2014 and those funds have not yet been appropriated. Staff recommends they be appropriated for the purpose of funding NDC services for additional ReCAP applications.


REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

12) Authorization to Advertise for Bids – Basins 6 & 8 Sewer Lining

The Southeast Sewer Shed Study and Master Plan identified sections of sanitary sewers to be lined. Staff requests authorization to advertise for bids for the project, which is estimated to be within the $150,000 allocated for the project in the 2015 Capital Improvements Program. Attached is a memorandum from the City Engineer that provides additional information.

Recommendation: Motion Granting Approval to Advertise for Bids

EXECUTIVE SESSION
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Chosy, Troper, Norstrom, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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.)
4) 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. Myer’s 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. Troper 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 Revenue to Expenditures 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: 0.77%
- Inheritance Tax: 0.56%
- Interest Income: 0.94%
- Fines & Forfeitures: 2.18%
- EMS Transport: 0.00%
- Community Center Membership: 4.02%
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Quarter Income Tax Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue: $0
Expense: $0

Revenue: $500
Expense: $500

Revenue: $1,000
Expense: $1,000

Revenue: $1,500
Expense: $1,500

Revenue: $2,000
Expense: $2,000

Revenue: $2,500
Expense: $2,500
2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

City of Worthington
Financial Trend Profile #10

Net Operating Revenue/Expense

City of Worthington
Major Revenue Sources
Ten Year Average Collection Totals
2005 - 2014

- Income Tax: 66.2%
- Property Tax: 15.2%
- Interest: 0.4%
- Local Gov't: 2.7%
- Personal Property: 1.3%
- Fines & Forfeits: 9.7%
- Inheritance Tax: 1.0%
- Other Revenues: 3.6%
2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

City of Worthington
Financial Trend Profile #15

General Fund Major Revenue Sources Totals (Elastic Revenues)
Income Tax, Local Govt, Personal Property Tax

2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

City of Worthington
Income Tax Revenue

City of Worthington
Meeting 11-32
2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

City of Worthington
Financial Trend Profile #13

![Graph of Estate Tax Collections from 2005 to 2014]

2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

City of Worthington
Financial Trend Profile #5

![Graph of Property Tax Collections from 2005 to 2014]

City of Worthington
Meeting 11-33
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...
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
2014 Comprehensive Financial Report Overview

City of Worthington
Budget vs Actual Revenue
Ten Year History
2005 - 2014

City of Worthington
Budget vs Actual Expenditures
Ten Year History
2005 - 2014
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.

Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 1st day of June, 2015.

Council President
Special Meeting
Minutes
Monday, May 4, 2015 ~ 6:00 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 Special Session on Monday, May 4, 2015, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Bonnie Michael called the meeting to order at or about 6:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert F. Chosy, Rachael R. Dorothy, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper, and Bonnie D. Michael

Also present: City Clerk

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Ms. Michael reported the need for an Executive Session to interview for Boards and Commission.

MOTION Mr. Troper moved that council meet in executive Session to interview for Boards and Commissions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Council recessed at 6:00 p.m.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to reconvene into open session at 7:10 P.M. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom. The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 7:10 P.M.
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance:

Worthington City Council met in Joint Session on Monday, May 4, 2015, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of City Hall, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 P.M.

City Council Members Present: Robert F. Chosy, Rachael R. Dorothy, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper, and Bonnie D. Michael

Sharon Township Trustees Present: John Oberle, Phillip Smith and Lori Gerald

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, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Director of Service and Engineering William Watterson, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Chief of Police James Mosic, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were fifteen visitors present.

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

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Ms. Michael acknowledged there being a revised Resolution No. 12-2015 at members places this evening. She reported the difference between the two is the statement that the City of Worthington is entirely within Sharon Township. That statement is not correct. It should read that the City of Worthington is primarily within Sharon Township

Resolution No. 12-2015

Levying Tax for the Maintenance of Union Cemetery dba Walnut Grove and Flint Road Cemetery for the Tax Collection Year 2016.

Introduced by Mr. Oberle.

Motion

A motion was made by Dr. Chosy to adopt Resolution No. 12-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mr. Greeson welcomed the Sharon Township Trustees to the meeting. He believes Mr. Chapman may have a few remarks. He welcomed him to the podium.

Mr. Chapman shared that he chairs the Trustees for the Flint and Walnut Grove Cemeteries. The Trustees are here once again to ask for a continuance of the one half of one mill for 2016.
Mr. Chapman shared a PowerPoint presentation. He commented that the trustees are pleased to be a part of the Worthington Library’s Worthington Memory. The cemeteries are now fully integrated into the program. He encouraged members to check out the program which is designed to provide information on individuals who are buried in the cemeteries. The file may contain a picture of the individual, a picture of the headstone and/or a copy of the obituary. The program shows the plats at the Flint cemetery. A plat can be selected and the burial information associated with that plat obtained. He sees that as a great thing for the city.

Mr. Chapman shared that last year staff did an extensive assessment of all the trees in Walnut Grove and Flint cemeteries. Those trees that had a hazard rating of 9 or 10 were removed. The trees that were rated 7 or 8 will be addressed this year. Members of the advisory committee will go out and reassess each tree before determining the best method for taking care of it.

Mr. Chapman shared that the Flint Cremation Niche and Prairie Scattering Garden are now available for use. Several of the niches were sold last year. Ultimately the scattering garden will be as a prairie and will be a great place for folks to scatter if they choose.

Mr. Chapman commented that for the first time the Meditation garden will have a place for natural cremation burials. Natural burials are often called “Green burials”. The remains does not have to be in a container to be placed in the ground at that location, which will always remain a very green space. For those who wish to have the name of the person someplace, it can be inscribed on the back of the memorial.

Mr. Chapman then invited all council members and trustees to the Memorial Day service that is held each year at Walnut Grove cemetery after the parade. The main purpose of the service is to honor our service personnel from all of the wars they have been in. He shared that Dr. Chosy was instrumental in getting the location of the service straightened up and looking nice. While he doesn’t know the exact year the Memorial Day services began, he believes we are approaching 100 years for the event. For many years the Memorial Day parade ended at the Memorial Day service. We have had some marvelous speakers at the service over the years. Lately the parade has ended further north on High St. and the crowd has not been as great. He again encouraged members to attend the service.

Mr. Chapman thanked everyone for all of the support for both cemeteries. Again they are asking for a continuation of one half of one mill.

Ms. Michael thanked the Board as well as the cemetery staff for all of their efforts on these two beautiful cemeteries.

Mr. Chapman added that Tom Kayati begins badgering the Board in February so he can begin grooming the cemeteries beautifully for Memorial Day. So it is not something that just kind of happens. It is something that is very much on purpose and Mr. Kayati deserves much of the credit due to his persistence.
Ms. Dorothy asked how much does one half of one mill equate to. Ms. Russell replied that it fluctuates but the cemetery receives around $320,000. The funds are received from all residences of Sharon Township.

Ms. Michael read Resolution No. 12-2015 in its entirety.

Dr. Chosy shared that he has served on the Board of Trustees as Council’s representative for many years. Nobody seems to know about these people but they are good and the things that are being done at the cemeteries are remarkable. The volunteers work tirelessly for no money. It is a gem hidden away. They do a wonderful job.

There being no additional comments, the motion carried unanimously and Resolution No. 12-2015 is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

OTHER

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Ms. Gerard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Chosy.

The motion to adjourn carried unanimously.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

____________________________________
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 1st day of June, 2015.

________________________________
President of Council
ORDINANCE NO. 18-2015

Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the 2015 Street Improvement Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 616-15)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8150.533344 the sum of _______________________ to pay the cost of the 2015 Street Improvement Program and all related expenses (Project 616-15).

SECTION 2. That the City Manager be and hereby is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with firm of ______________________________ for the provision of the aforementioned services.

SECTION 3. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 4. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

_________________________________
President of Council

Attest:  

______________________________
Clerk of Council

Introduced May 18, 2015

P.H. June 1, 2015
ORDINANCE NO. 19-2015

An Ordinance Enacted by the City of Worthington, Franklin County, Ohio, in the Matter of the Stated Described Project, (FRA-161-8.67, PID 96305).

WHEREAS, the State has identified the need for the described project to improve SR-161 from Olentangy River Road to Worthington East Corporation Limit (ECL) (just west of CSX RR overpass).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That it is declared to be in the public interest that the consent of Worthington City Council be and such consent is hereby given to the Director of Transportation to complete the above described project.

SECTION 2. The Worthington City Council shall cooperate with the Director of Transportation in the above described project as follows:

The City hereby agrees to cooperate with the Director of Transportation of the State of Ohio in the planning, design and construction of the identified highway improvement project and grants consent to the Ohio Department of Transportation for its development and construction of the project in accordance with plans, specifications and estimates as approved by the Director;

The Ohio Department of Transportation shall assume and bear one hundred percent (100%) of the necessary costs of the State’s highway improvements project; the City’s share of the cost for the pavement surface treatment is estimated to be $127,000.

The City agrees to assume and bear one hundred percent (100%) of the total cost of those features requested by the City which are not necessary for the improvement as determined by the State and Federal Highway Administration.

SECTION 3. All right-of-way within the City which is required for the described project will be acquired and/or made available in accordance with current State and Federal regulations. Right-of-way costs include eligible utility costs. It is further agreed that all utility accommodations, relocation and reimbursement will comply with the current provisions of 23 CFR 645 and the ODOT Utilities Manual.
ORDINANCE NO. 19-2015

SECTION 4. Upon completion of said project, and unless otherwise agreed, the City shall: (1) provide adequate maintenance for the project in accordance with all applicable state and federal law, including, but not limited to, Title 23, U.S.C., Section 116; (2) provide ample financial resources, as necessary, for the maintenance of the project; (3) maintain the right-of-way, keeping it free of obstructions; and, (4) hold said right-of-way inviolate for public highway purposes.

SECTION 5. That the City Manager is hereby directed on behalf of the City to enter into contracts with the Director of Transportation necessary to complete the above described project.

SECTION 6. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

___________________________
Introduced May 18, 2015
P.H. June 1, 2015

___________________________
Clerk of Council
April 10, 2015

William W. Watterson, P.E.
Director, Service & Engineering
City of Worthington
380 Highland Avenue
Worthington, OH 43085

RE: Preliminary Participatory Legislation
FRA-161-8.67, Urban Paving Project
PID 96305

Dear William:

The Ohio Department of Transportation intends to resurface SR161 from Olentangy River Road to Worthington ECL (just west of CSX RR overpass). This project falls under our urban paving policy. The ODOT Urban Paving Initiative requires that the local municipality contribute 20% of the total cost of the surface treatment for the portion of the project within its corporation limits. Additionally, the local is required to contribute 100% of the cost of non-surface related items such as curbs, gutters, utility relocation expenses, and partial-and full-depth pavement repairs. Based upon initial cost estimates, the preliminary projection for the City’s contribution for this project is estimated to be $127,000 at this point. This does not include any 100% City items such as pavement repair. Note that this is a preliminary figure and will change. Once final plans are developed and quantity splits are determined, the City of Worthington will be invoiced for its share of the project costs approximately six weeks before the project’s scheduled sale. The sale is tentatively scheduled for summer 2016.

Enclosed is preliminary participatory legislation that is to be executed by the City. After your review and approval, please forward the legislation to Council for their necessary action. When executed, please return two signed and certified copies with original signatures to this office for further processing.

Additional information on the project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Engineering:</th>
<th>District Six Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way:</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction:</td>
<td>ODOT / Worthington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Worthington to pay 20% of construction for urban paving portion plus 100% items within Worthington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Construction Cost:</td>
<td>$780,000. For entire project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to assure that project development proceeds in a timely manner, the enclosed legislation will need to be fully executed and returned to this office at your earliest convenience. If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 740-833-8183 or via E-mail at rebecca.wagner@dot.state.oh.us.

Respectfully,

Rebecca L. Wagner, P. E.

Attachments*

C: B.J. Moore, Legislation File*
ORDINANCE NO. 20-2015
(As Amended)

Approving the Removal of Two Armstrong Red Maple Trees from the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green and the Construction of a Concrete Entranceway to the Elevator Planned for the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building.

WHEREAS, Section 12.03(a) of the Charter of the City of Worthington requires approval of six members of Worthington City Council to construct, install, erect or place a permanent structure on the Village Green; and

WHEREAS, Section 12.03(b) of the Charter of the City of Worthington provides that the removal of living trees in excess of five (5) inches in diameter measured three (3) feet above the ground from the Worthington Village Green shall require the approval of six members of Worthington City Council; and,

WHEREAS, two Armstrong Red Maple trees are located within the Village Green Drive right-of-way between Village Green Drive and the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the plans for the renovation of the Kilbourne Building (the “Project”) pursuant to a contract administered by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation (the “CIC”), an elevator is scheduled to be installed for ADA access into the Building in close proximity to one of the trees and the tree’s root system; and

WHEREAS, the root system of both trees are abutting the foundation of the Building, with the potential to cause damage to the Building in the future; and,

WHEREAS, the construction plans for the elevator require a concrete extension of the sidewalk to be installed to serve as the entranceway to the elevator access, over a small portion of grass that currently exists.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio, six-sevenths of the members elected thereto herein concurring:

SECTION 1. That the CIC be and hereby is authorized to direct the contractor for the Project to proceed with the removal of the two Armstrong Red Maple trees located on the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green as depicted on the attached drawing identified as “Attachment A”.

SECTION 2. That a concrete extension of the sidewalk along the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green be permitted to be constructed to allow for access to the proposed elevator planned to be installed in the Building in accordance with the construction drawings for the Project in the location more specifically shown on “Attachment B”.


ORDINANCE NO. 20-2015
(As Amended)

SECTION 3. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed_______________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_____________________________
Introduce May 18, 2015
P.H. June 1, 2015

_____________________________
Clerk of Council
ORDINANCE NO. 20-2015

Approving the Removal of Two Silver Maple Trees from the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green and the Construction of a Concrete Entranceway to the Elevator Planned for the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building.

WHEREAS, Section 12.03(a) of the Charter of the City of Worthington requires approval of six members of Worthington City Council to construct, install, erect or place a permanent structure on the Village Green; and

WHEREAS, Section 12.03(b) of the Charter of the City of Worthington provides that the removal of living trees in excess of five (5) inches in diameter measured three (3) feet above the ground from the Worthington Village Green shall require the approval of six members of Worthington City Council; and,

WHEREAS, two Silver Maple Trees are located within the Village Green Drive right-of-way between Village Green Drive and the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the plans for the renovation of the Kilbourne Building (the “Project”) pursuant to a contract administered by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation (the “CIC”), an elevator is scheduled to be installed for ADA access into the Building in close proximity to one of the trees and the tree’s root system; and

WHEREAS, the root system of both trees are abutting the foundation of the Building, with the potential to cause damage to the Building in the future; and,

WHEREAS, the construction plans for the elevator require a concrete extension of the sidewalk to be installed to serve as the entranceway to the elevator access, over a small portion of grass that currently exists.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio, six-sevenths of the members elected thereto herein concurring:

SECTION 1. That the CIC be and hereby is authorized to direct the contractor for the Project to proceed with the removal of the two Silver Maple trees located on the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green as depicted on the attached drawing identified as “Attachment A”.

SECTION 2. That a concrete extension of the sidewalk along the Northeast Quadrant of the Village Green be permitted to be constructed to allow for access to the proposed elevator planned to be installed in the Building in accordance with the construction drawings for the Project in the location more specifically shown on “Attachment B”.


ORDINANCE NO. 20-2015

SECTION 3. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

______________________________
Clerk of Council

________________________________
Introduced May 18, 2015
P.H. June 1, 2015
RESOLUTION NO. 27-2015

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 7029 Huntley Road and Authorizing Variances (Stone City LLC).

WHEREAS, The Granite Guy has submitted a request for an amendment to the Final Development Plan for 7029 Huntley Road; and,

WHEREAS, Sections 1175.02(f) and 1107.01 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington provide that when an applicant wishes to change, adjust or rearrange buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights or yards, following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, the proposal has received a complete and thorough review by the Municipal Planning Commission on May 14, 2015 and approval has been recommended by the Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the amendment to the approved Final Development Plan to install wall-mounted signage at 7029 Huntley Road as per Case No. ADP 03-15, Drawings No. ADP 03-15 dated May 14, 2015 attached hereto as Exhibit “A” be approved.

SECTION 2. That there be and hereby are granted variances from Code Section 1170.05(a) and 1170.05(b) to permit two wall-mounted signs on a building and to allow for the signage to exceed the maximum area of 100 square feet per business on a building.

SECTION 3. That the Clerk of Council be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted

__________________________
President of Council

Attest:

__________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
FROM: R. Lee Brown, Director
DATE: May 21, 2015
SUBJECT: Resolution for Amendment to Development Plan and Variances – 7029 Huntley Road (Stone City LLC) (ADP 03-15)

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:
This property has frontage on both Huntley Rd. and Worthington Galena Rd. The applicant’s storefront is located at the east end of the building, along Huntley Rd., with the loading dock in the rear facing west. Another business selling a similar product (The Granite Guy) is located at the west end of the building facing Worthington Galena Rd., with a loading dock facing east. Approval was granted earlier this year for The Granite Guy to have two signs, one near the storefront and one above the loading dock. Approval of this application would allow Stone City to keep two signs, one near the storefront and one above the loading dock.

Project Details:
1. Stone City’s signs are 16’ wide x 4’ high, with black lettering on a white background.
2. Variances for excess sign size and number of wall signs would be necessary to keep the existing signs.
3. Permits were not obtained for the signs, but an application has now been received.

Land Use Plans:
Development Plan Amendment Ordinance
If an amendment does not conflict with the character or integrity of the development, but an additional variance is required, the approval must be by City Council.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan
An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in
the region. Because of the age and types of uses located here, this compact area is experiencing significant change and has the opportunity to reinvent itself. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.

**Recommendations:**
Staff recommends *approval* of the application, feeling the applicant has shown that two signs are warranted for the business.

On May 14, 2015 the Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and recommended *approval* to City Council on an Amendment to Development Plan.
Amendment to Development Plan Application

1. Property Location 7029 Huntley Rd. Suite A Columbus OH 43229
2. Present Use & Proposed Use Present Use
3. Present & Proposed Zoning Present
4. Applicant Stone City LLC
   Address 7029 Huntley Rd. Suite A Columbus OH 43229
   Phone (614) 430 9063
5. Property Owner DTZ
   Address 325 John H. McConnell Boulevard Suite 450 Columbus OH 43215
   Phone (614) 827-1910
6. Project Description Second sign at the back
7. Variances Requested

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME:

The information contained in this application and in all attachments is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I further acknowledge that I have familiarized myself with all applicable sections of the Worthington Codified Ordinances and will comply with all applicable regulations.

[Signature]
Applicant

[Signature]
Property Owner

MPC Approval Date:

City Council Approval Date:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hughies Event Production Services</td>
<td>7034 Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood Properties LTD</td>
<td>1383 E. 17th St.</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>44114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Electric Supply</td>
<td>7057 Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Galena LLC</td>
<td>68 S. Fourth St.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Bearings LLC</td>
<td>7060 Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntley Road Holding LLC</td>
<td>500 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Power Labs</td>
<td>7020-A Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV-XI Huntley Road LTD</td>
<td>Scott Beaver: PO Box 2235</td>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCON International Inc.</td>
<td>7000 Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Guy</td>
<td>7029 Huntley Rd., Suite A</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Tile</td>
<td>7029-B Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Sealant Supply Co.</td>
<td>6999-N Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger</td>
<td>6999-A Huntley Rd.</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6969 Worth-Galena LLC</td>
<td>6969 Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Heating &amp; Cooling</td>
<td>6969-A Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Services, Inc.</td>
<td>6969-D Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Services</td>
<td>6969-G Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Builders &amp; Contractors</td>
<td>6969-H Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs On You</td>
<td>6969-J Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsepower Automotive Services</td>
<td>6969-L Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's Repair Service</td>
<td>6969-N Worthington-Galena Rd.</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK &amp; M Real Estate LLC</td>
<td>PO Box 12783</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To whom it may concern.

The reason for getting the second sign at the back of the warehouse (7029 Huntley Rd. Suite A Columbus, OH 43229) is that we need the second sign to show the customer pickup and the stone delivery for the granite slabs to the right store. There is more than one granite fabricator in this building. That will give more direction to everyone.

The second reason, there is a lot of big truck with trailer always park in front of our back door. We need the second sign to let the truck driver know this loading desk belong to stone city.

Your sincerely

Zuo Ding Gao
Business owner
April 24, 2015
7029 Huntley Rd. Suite A
To whom it may concern:

The sign company information

The sign is made by the company called "Custom Sign Center"
Their information is

400 N Wilson Rd.
Columbus, OH 43204

Customsigncenter.com
(614) 279-6035

The dimension of the sign is 16 foot long by 4 foot height
Background color: White
Text color: Black
RESOLUTION NO. 28-2015

Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 500 West Wilson Bridge Road and Authorizing Variance (Lynda Gildea).

WHEREAS, Lynda Gildea has submitted a request for an amendment to the Final Development Plan for 500 West Wilson Bridge Road; and,

WHEREAS, Sections 1175.02(f) and 1107.01 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington provide that when an applicant wishes to change, adjust or rearrange buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights or yards, following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, the proposal has received a complete and thorough review by the Municipal Planning Commission on May 14, 2015 and approval has been recommended by the Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the amendment to the approved Final Development Plan to reduce the required setback at 500 West Wilson Bridge Road as per Case No. ADP 04-15, Drawings No. ADP 04-15 dated May 14, 2015 attached hereto as Exhibit “A” be approved.

SECTION 2. That there be and hereby are granted a variance from Code Section 1149.07(a) to reduce the required setback of buildings and accessory buildings along a freeway and expressway that will not meet the required 50-feet.

SECTION 3. That the Clerk of Council be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted ____________________

________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

________________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

FROM: R. Lee Brown, Director

DATE: May 26, 2015

SUBJECT: Resolution for Amendment to Development Plan and Variances – 500 West Wilson Bridge Road (Lynda Gildea) (ADP 04-15)

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:
This 7-acre property is at the west end of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor, adjacent to the Olentangy Parklands, and is part of the Officescape development. When the building was constructed in the late 1970’s, it exceeded the Code requirement for distance from the property line to the building. A cooling tower was also constructed closer.

With the interchange improvement for I-270 and SR 315, ODOT needs additional property for the flyover ramp from SR 315 south to I-270 east. The acquisition would create a situation where the existing building and its cooling tower are closer to the property line than is allowed by the Worthington Code.

Project Details:
1. The required setback of buildings along freeways is 50’. The building is 60’ from the existing property line; the cooling tower is 20’ from the existing property line.
2. With the acquisition, the building would be 22.9’ from the right-of-way line; the cooling tower would be 10’ from the right-of-way line.
3. The roadway would be about 46’ from the northwest corner of the building.

Land Use Plans:
Development Plan Amendment Ordinance
If an amendment does not conflict with the character or integrity of the development, but an additional variance is required, the approval must be by the City Council.
Recommendations:
Staff feels *approval* of the application should be recommended to the City Council to accommodate the improvements to the interchange.

On May 14, 2015 the Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and unanimously recommended *approval* to City Council on an Amendment to Development Plan.
Amendment to Development Plan Application

1. Property Location  500 Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, OH 43085
2. Present Use & Proposed Use  Class B Office Building/Highway improvement
3. Present & Proposed Zoning  C-3
4. Applicant  Lynda K. Gildea
   Address  2600 Corporate Exchange Dr. Suite 175, Columbus, Ohio 43231
   Phone  614-882-4142
5. Property Owner  IS-CAN Ohio, LP
   Address  2600 Corporate Exchange Dr. Suite 175, Columbus, Ohio 43231
   Phone  614-882-4142
6. Project Description  Construction of flyover ramp to alleviate traffic congestion at Highway 315 & I-270 intersection
7. Variances Requested  Rear yard setback

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME:

The information contained in this application and in all attachments is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I further acknowledge that I have familiarized myself with all applicable sections of the Worthington Codified Ordinances and will comply with all applicable regulations.

Applicant (Signature)  Lynda Gildea  4-21-15  Date
Property Owner (Signature)  4-23-15  Date

MPC Approval Date:  
City Council Approval Date:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abutting Property Owners List for</th>
<th>500 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana &amp; Lia Vibberts</td>
<td>467 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Hutton &amp; Denise Edwards</td>
<td>462 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &amp; Jacquelyn Temple</td>
<td>452 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleta Sunico</td>
<td>444 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald &amp; Kelley Heffernan</td>
<td>434 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan &amp; Amanda Popa</td>
<td>424 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian &amp; Robyn Stewart</td>
<td>414 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden &amp; Judy Marshall</td>
<td>404 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine &amp; Oscar Gonzalez</td>
<td>394 Hinsdale Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wichtman</td>
<td>7080 Lansdowne St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander &amp; Norah Pope</td>
<td>7086 Lansdowne St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnell &amp; Shannon Thompson</td>
<td>7092 Lansdowne St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabir &amp; Lakshmi Dutta</td>
<td>7100 Rieber St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, Oh 43085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplemental Responses
to
Amendment to Development Plan Application

1. **Property Location.** A 7.007 net-acre site improved with a multi-tenant office building. The property address is 500 W. Wilson Bridge Road, Worthington, Franklin County, Ohio 43085.


4. **Applicant.** Lynda K. Gildea, Senior Vice President and Regional Manager
Paradigm Properties of Ohio
2600 Corporate Exchange Dr., Suite 175
Columbus, Ohio 43231
Fax- 614-523-3342
Office- 614-882-4142
Cell-614-205-7114

5. **Property Owner.** IS-CAN OHIO, LP, an Ohio Limited Partnership
2600 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 175
Columbus, Ohio 43231
614-882-4142

6. **Project Description.** The subject property is affected by a fee simple and a temporary acquisition related to the North Side Fix project to alleviate traffic congestion related to the Interstate 270, U.S. Highway 23, and State Highway 315 corridor. Construction of a flyover ramp from southbound Highway 315 to eastbound Interstate 270 impacts the property. The project, FRA-23-22.23, affects the property with one permanent take and one temporary easement.
RESOLUTION NO. 29-2015

Authorizing Participation in Ohio Department of Transportation Cooperative Purchasing Program.

WHEREAS, Section 5513.01 (B) provides the opportunity for Counties, Townships, Municipal Corporations, Conservancy Districts, Township Park Districts, Park Districts created under Chapter 1545 of the Revised Code, Port Authorities, Regional Transit Authorities, Regional Airport Authorities, Regional Water and Sewer Districts, County Transit Boards, State Universities or Colleges to participate in contracts of the Ohio Department of Transportation for the purchase of machinery, material, supplies or other articles.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the City Manager requests authority in the name of the City of Worthington to participate in the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) Summer (418-16) and/or Winter (018-16) contracts for road salt.

SECTION 2. That the City Manager is authorized to agree in the name of the City of Worthington to be bound by all terms and conditions as the Director of Transportation prescribes.

SECTION 3. That the City Manager is authorized to agree in the name of the City of Worthington to directly pay vendors, under each such contract of ODOT in which the City of Worthington participates, for items it receives pursuant to the contract.

SECTION 4. That the City of Worthington agrees to be responsible for resolving all claims or disputes arising out of its participation in the cooperative purchasing program under Section 5513.01(B) of the Ohio Revised Code. The City of Worthington agrees to waive any claims, actions, expenses, or other damages arising out of its participation in the cooperative purchasing program which the City of Worthington may have or claim to have against ODOT or its employees, unless such liability is the result of negligence on the part of ODOT or its employees.

SECTION 5. That the Clerk of Council be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted ________________________

_______________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_______________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager  
From: William W. Watterson, City Engineer  
Subject: Snow and ice control material  
Date: May 26, 2015  

During the 2014/2015 winter season the Department of Service and Engineering utilized 2038 tons of rock salt and 8637 gallons of liquid de-icing chemicals to treat the City’s public streets and parking lots. During the season salt was of limited availability and was purchased through the South West Ohio Purchasers for Government (SWOP4G) consortium for $112.50 per ton and when that supply was depleted, purchased on the spot market for up to $140.00 per ton. At this time the 2015 appropriation of $160,000.00 for snow and ice control materials has been depleted. The materials currently on hand include 600 tons of rock salt, 42 bags of sidewalk de-icing chemicals and no liquid de-icing chemicals.

Salt and de-icing chemical usage in the October to December period varies greatly from year to year. Recently usage ranged from 3 tons/0 gallons in 2011 to 811 tons/2669 gallons in 2013. In light of the uncertainty of the salt supply I recommend purchasing sufficient salt this summer to reach the capacity of the salt storage dome and sufficient liquid chemicals to last into early 2016. Based on estimated prices I recommend that Council appropriate a supplemental appropriation of $140,000.00 to fund the purchase. The anticipated purchase would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price/Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock salt</td>
<td>1100 tons</td>
<td>$120.00/ton</td>
<td>$132,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid chemicals</td>
<td>4000 gal.</td>
<td>$1.60/gal.</td>
<td>$6400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk deicer</td>
<td>120 bags</td>
<td>$12.00/bag</td>
<td>$1440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$139,840.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more than ten years the City has participated in the South West Ohio Purchasers for Government (SWOP4G) purchasing consortium. While our experience has been favorable the 2014 bid Worthington was limited to a maximum of 475 tons for the season, prompting the need for spot purchases from other suppliers to maintain the supply until the end of the season. The Ohio Department of Transportation also has a cooperative purchasing program open to Ohio municipalities. With the availability of rock salt remaining questionable, I recommend that the City participate in the ODOT program as an alternate along with SWOP4G. Participation in the ODOT program requires a resolution from the political subdivision. I recommend that Council pass the authorization legislation to allow participation in the ODOT program to provide an additional competitive bidding opportunity for the future.
ORDINANCE NO. 21-2015

Enacting Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Regulate the Growth of Running Bamboo.

WHEREAS, the growing of running bamboo, if not controlled and/or contained, results in a rapid spreading and infestation of bamboo plants through its root system and underground rhizomes; and

WHEREAS, the growth of the bamboo plants may cause serious damage to structures and plant materials located in the path of the underground root system; and

WHEREAS, property owners adjacent to parcels that contain bamboo cite difficulty and expense in attempts to keep unwanted running bamboo from extending onto their yards and spreading; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to preserve and protect private and public property from the damaging spread of bamboo, protect indigenous plant materials from the invasive spread of bamboo, and maintain the general welfare of the residents of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City is enacted to read as follows:

1180.08 GROWTH OF BAMBOO.

(a) Definitions. As used in this chapter, certain terms are defined as follows:

(1) “Bamboo” means any tropical or semi-tropical grasses classified as “running bamboo” with monopodial (leptomorph) rhizome (root) systems which typically send off the rhizomes far away from the plant.
(2) “Bamboo Owner” means any property owner or resident who has planted and/or grows Bamboo, or who maintains Bamboo on the property, or who permits Bamboo to grow or remain on the property even if the Bamboo has spread from an adjoining property. Any property owner or resident at whose property Bamboo is found will be considered a Bamboo Owner, except any property owner or resident who:
   (i) Did not plant or grow or cause Bamboo to be planted or grown on his or her property; and
   (ii) Has provided satisfactory proof to the City that, within a reasonable period of time after discovering the encroachment
of Bamboo onto the property from an adjoining or neighboring property, advised the owner of such property, by delivery of a written notice, of an objection to the encroachment of the Bamboo and a request for the Bamboo to be removed; and
(iii) Has initiated steps for the removal of the Bamboo from the property.

(b) Applicability. For purposes of this Section 1180.08, Bamboo found growing upon property shall constitute presumptive evidence that the Bamboo was planted and/or grown by and with the consent of the owner upon whose property the Bamboo is growing. If the Bamboo is found to have encroached, spread, invaded or intruded upon any property other than the property on which it was planted, including public property and right-of-way, it shall be presumed that the Bamboo is “running bamboo” as defined herein, and subject to the provisions of this Section 1180.08.

(c) Duty to Confine. All Bamboo Owners must confine Bamboo in a manner that will prevent the Bamboo from encroaching, spreading, invading or intruding onto any other private or public property or right-of-way, and shall be required to take any such reasonable measure to do so, including but not limited to the installation of a properly constructed and maintained underground physical barrier system. A Bamboo Owner who fails to confine Bamboo to the Bamboo Owner’s property shall be subject to the penalty provisions of Section 1180.08(g) herein.

(d) Property Owners Affected by Bamboo. In the event that a property owner notifies a Bamboo Owner that Bamboo is encroaching, spreading, invading or intruding upon such property owner’s property, as required under Section 1180.08(a)(2)(ii), such notifying property owner shall give consent to the Bamboo Owner for the Bamboo Owner to enter such notifying property owner’s property in order that the Bamboo Owner may remove the Bamboo thereon. Failure to give consent shall hold the notifying property owner responsible for the removal of the encroaching Bamboo at such property owner’s cost. Consent hereunder shall also be deemed to be consent given to a contractor that the Bamboo Owner may hire for the removal of the Bamboo, and to the City or the City’s contractor should that become necessary. Neither the Bamboo Owner, the City, or a contractor hired on behalf of the Bamboo Owner or the City to remove Bamboo from a neighboring property, shall be liable for incidental damages caused by the removal of the Bamboo.
(e) Failure to Confine. In the event Bamboo growing on a Bamboo Owner’s property encroaches or grows onto an adjoining or neighboring property, and the Bamboo Owner fails to remove the Bamboo, or fails to cause it to be removed following a request to do so by the affected adjoining property owner within ten (10) days from the date of the request, the affected adjoining property owner shall notify the Director of Service and Engineering of such encroachment. The Director shall be provided satisfactory proof from the affected adjoining neighbor that the Bamboo Owner was notified of the encroachment and had the requisite number of days to remove the Bamboo. The Director shall confirm the presence of the encroaching Bamboo and shall notify the Bamboo Owner in writing of such encroachment, which notice shall:

1. Specify the nature and location of the violation;
2. Provide notice of the requirement to remove all portions of the Bamboo plant from the affected adjoining property within ten (10) days from the date of the notice; and
3. State that the failure to comply with the notice and order may hold the Bamboo Owner liable to the City for the cost of removal, any fines that may be imposed pursuant to Section 1180.08(g), and the City’s cost to install a barrier system as may be permitted under Section 1180.08(i).

The Director’s notice shall be sent to the Bamboo Owner by certified mail, return receipt requested.

(f) Appeal. If a Bamboo Owner believes that the determination of the Director of Service and Engineering that he or she is in violation of the provisions of this Section 1180.08 is in error, then that determination may be appealed to the City Manager within five (5) days of receipt of the notice to remove the Bamboo issued pursuant to subsection (e) hereof, by the filing of a written notice of appeal. The Bamboo Owner shall have the opportunity to present relevant evidence to the City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, with or without legal counsel. A record of the hearing shall be kept, including without limitation all documentary evidence presented together with a record of the testimony offered by any witnesses, whose testimony shall be duly sworn. The decision of the City Manager, or designee, shall be rendered at the hearing and mailed to the person to whom the original notice was served by regular and certified mail, within five (5) days of the date of the decision.

At the hearing, the City Manager, or designee, may: (i) direct the Bamboo Owner to remove the encroaching Bamboo within ten (10) days of the receipt of the appeal decision; (ii) order the Bamboo to be removed, order
ORDINANCE NO. 21-2015

the installation of a physical barrier system (for subsequent violations), or order both, either with City crews or by contracting with a third party, in which case the Bamboo Owner will be charged with the cost of such work ordered to be done, plus a 25% administrative fee as set forth in subsection (j) hereof; or (iii) grant the appeal and reverse the Director’s order.

(g) Penalty. Any Bamboo Owner, whether a person, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, that is found to have failed to remove Bamboo when noticed to do so under Section 1180.08(e) shall be fined $100.00 per day for each day that the Bamboo remains after the expiration of the 10-day notice period given by the Director of Service and Engineering. This penalty shall be vacated only if the Bamboo Owner is found not to be responsible for the Bamboo removal as a result of an appeal determination. A penalty shall be stayed from the date the matter is appealed to the date the appeal is decided. All penalty amounts not paid when due may result in the City pursuing collection through the court, which amounts sought shall include all unpaid fines plus the cost of collection.

(h) City Removal of Bamboo. If the Bamboo Owner fails to remove the Bamboo as directed in the notice sent pursuant to subsection (f) or as a result of an order to do so by the City Manager at the appeal hearing, the Director of Service and Engineering shall cause the Bamboo to be removed and destroyed, and may employ the necessary labor and equipment to perform such task, together with any cleanup work required, within appropriations previously made by Council. The City shall not be liable to an owner of property affected by Bamboo for damages caused as a result of the Bamboo removal.

(i) Installation of a Physical Barrier System by City. Successive violations of this Ordinance may result in the City determining, at the City’s discretion, to enter upon the land of the Bamboo Owner and install a physical barrier system designed to contain the Bamboo and prevent its encroachment to adjoining properties. The cost of the installation of the barrier system shall be charged to the Bamboo Owner as provided in subsection (j) herein. The City shall not be liable to a Bamboo Owner for damages caused as a result of the barrier system installation.

(j) Statement of Cost to Owner. When the Director of Service and Engineering causes Bamboo to be removed as provided in subsection (h) above, or when the City installs a physical barrier system as provided in subsection (i) above, a statement of the cost thereof shall be mailed to the Bamboo Owner by certified mail, return receipt requested. If the certified mail is returned or refused, then such statement may be sent by ordinary
mail, or personal service by posting at the subject property if the Bamboo Owner is the occupant thereof, by any means that assures and documents delivery. Such statement of cost shall include the following costs of the City:

(1) Labor and materials.
(2) Transportation of equipment.
(3) Equipment rental.

The minimum fee to be charged shall be twenty-five dollars ($25.00) per hour. A 25% administrative fee shall be charged on the total amount of the costs of removal.

(k) Cost Payment; Unpaid Costs a Lien. The Bamboo Owner shall pay such amounts as are charged in accordance with subsection (j) hereof to the City Clerk within thirty days after receipt of the statement of costs. Any payment so received shall be restored to the appropriation from which the cost was paid. If the fee is not paid when due, the Director of Finance shall certify to the County Auditor the proceedings taken under this section, together with a statement of the charges for services as listed in subsection (j) hereof and a legal description of the premises. Such amounts shall be entered upon the tax duplicate and shall be a lien upon such lands from the date of entry, and shall be collected as other taxes and returned to the City General Fund as provided by Ohio Revised Code Section 731.54. These costs shall be separate from any fine that may be imposed as a penalty under subsection (g) hereof.

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of the Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center, and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_______________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson

FROM: Pam Fox

DATE: May 21, 2015

SUBJECT: Proposed Ordinance Regulating the Growth of Running Bamboo

At the May 4th City Council meeting, I presented a draft ordinance to Council on the regulation of running bamboo. Council requested some changes during that discussion and asked for those to be made before the ordinance is introduced.

Attached is a clean revised Ordinance as well as a redlined version showing those changes made since Council last saw the draft.

The most notable changes in the revised version are the addition of a section that gives the City the right to enter upon the bamboo owner’s property and install a physical barrier system in instances where there has been more than one violation. I also added a designee provision to the appeal section that would give you the ability appoint someone else to handle the appeal hearings. There were also comments about the options available to the City in determining an appeal as well as providing for the fines to be stayed during an appeal. Those changes have been made.

I included some indemnity provisions to the City for damages that may occur as a result of the City having to remove Bamboo or install a barrier system.

Because of the distance that bamboo can travel, and because of the rapid growth of the vegetation, the ordinary time periods that we may give property owners to correct property maintenance violations have to be shortened, and I have tried to do that while maintaining their due process rights.

In general, I continue to believe that this type of enforcement could be burdensome to the City and in large part involves the City in matters that are better left to resolve between private...
properties much like storm water drainage issues and overhanging trees. However, while it is expected that a bamboo owner will take the necessary steps to prevent encroachment to neighboring properties, we understand that not all do. We may want to consider some type of community outreach to inform bamboo owners and bamboo neighbors of these expectations. I have drafted this legislation based on similar legislation found in other parts of the country. I have not contacted anyone involved with the discussions before Council last year.

Please let me know if you want any other information to be presented with this legislation.
ORDINANCE NO. xx-2015

Enacting Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Regulate the Growth of Running Bamboo.

WHEREAS, the growing of running bamboo, if not controlled and/or contained, results in a rapid spreading and infestation of bamboo plants through its root system and underground rhizomes; and

WHEREAS, the growth of the bamboo plants may cause serious damage to structures and plant materials located in the path of the underground root system; and

WHEREAS, property owners adjacent to parcels that contain bamboo cite difficulty and expense in attempts to keep unwanted running bamboo from extending onto their yards and spreading; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to preserve and protect private and public property from the damaging spread of bamboo, protect indigenous plant materials from the invasive spread of bamboo, and maintain the general welfare of the residents of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

Section 1. That Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City is enacted to read as follows:

1180.08 GROWTH OF BAMBOO.

(a) Definitions. As used in this chapter, certain terms are defined as follows:

(1) “Bamboo” means any tropical or semi-tropical grasses classified as “running bamboo” with monopodial (leptomorph) rhizome (root) systems which typically send off the rhizomes far away from the plant.
(2) “Bamboo Owner” means any property owner or resident who has planted and/or grows Bamboo, or who maintains Bamboo on the property, or who permits Bamboo to grow or remain on the property even if the Bamboo has spread from an adjoining property. Any property owner or resident at whose property Bamboo is found will be considered a Bamboo Owner, except any property owner or resident who:
(i) Did not plant or grow or cause Bamboo to be planted or grown on his or her property; and 
(ii) Has provided satisfactory proof to the City that, within a reasonable period of time after discovering the encroachment of Bamboo onto the property from an adjoining or neighboring property, advised the owner of such property, by delivery of a written notice, of an objection to the encroachment of the Bamboo and a request for the Bamboo to be removed; and 
(iii) Has initiated steps for the removal of the Bamboo from the property.

(b) Applicability. For purposes of this Section 1180.08, Bamboo found growing upon property shall constitute presumptive evidence that the Bamboo was planted and/or grown by and with the consent of the owner upon whose property the Bamboo is growing. If the Bamboo is found to have encroached, spread, invaded or intruded upon any property other than the property on which it was planted, including public property and right-of-way, it shall be presumed that the Bamboo is “running bamboo” as defined herein, and subject to the provisions of this Section 1180.08.

(c) Duty to Confine. All Bamboo Owners must confine Bamboo in a manner that will prevent the Bamboo from encroaching, spreading, invading or intruding onto any other private or public property or right-of-way, and shall be required to take any such reasonable measure to do so, including but not limited to the installation of a properly constructed and maintained underground physical barrier system. A Bamboo Owner who fails to confine Bamboo to the Bamboo Owner’s property shall be subject to the penalty provisions of Section 1180.08(g) herein.

(d) Property Owners Affected by Bamboo. In the event that a property owner notifies a Bamboo Owner that Bamboo is encroaching, spreading, invading or intruding upon such property owner’s property, as required under Section 1180.08(a)(2)(ii), such notifying property owner shall give consent to the Bamboo Owner for the Bamboo Owner to enter such notifying property owner’s property in order that the Bamboo Owner may remove the Bamboo thereon. Failure to give consent shall hold the notifying property owner responsible for the removal of the encroaching Bamboo at such property owner’s cost. Consent hereunder shall also be deemed to be consent given to a contractor that the Bamboo Owner may hire for the removal of the Bamboo, and to the City or the City’s contractor should that become necessary. Neither the Bamboo Owner, the City, or a contractor hired on behalf of the Bamboo Owner or the City to remove Bamboo from a neighboring property, shall be liable for incidental damages caused by the removal of the Bamboo.
(e) Failure to Confine. In the event Bamboo growing on a Bamboo Owner’s property encroaches or grows onto an adjoining or neighboring property, and the Bamboo Owner fails to remove the Bamboo, or fails to cause it to be removed following a request to do so by the affected adjoining property owner within ten (10) days from the date of the request, the affected adjoining property owner shall notify the Director of Service and Engineering of such encroachment. The Director shall be provided satisfactory proof from the affected adjoining neighbor that the Bamboo Owner was notified of the encroachment and had the requisite number of days to remove the Bamboo. The Director shall confirm the presence of the encroaching Bamboo and shall notify the Bamboo Owner in writing of such encroachment, which notice shall:

1. Specify the nature and location of the violation;
2. Provide notice of the requirement to remove all portions of the Bamboo plant from the affected adjoining property within ten (10) days from the date of the notice; and
3. State that the failure to comply with the notice and order may hold the Bamboo Owner liable to the City for the cost of removal, any fines that may be imposed pursuant to Section 1180.08(g), and the City’s cost to install a barrier system as may be permitted under Section 1180.08(i).

The Director’s notice shall be sent to the Bamboo Owner by certified mail, return receipt requested.

(f) Appeal. If a Bamboo Owner believes that the determination of the Director of Service and Engineering that he or she is in violation of the provisions of this Section 1180.08 is in error, then that determination may be appealed to the City Manager within five (5) days of receipt of the notice to remove the Bamboo issued pursuant to subsection (e) hereof, by the filing of a written notice of appeal. The Bamboo Owner shall have the opportunity to present relevant evidence to the City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, with or without legal counsel. A record of the hearing shall be kept, including without limitation all documentary evidence presented together with a record of the testimony offered by any witnesses, whose testimony shall be duly sworn. The decision of the City Manager, or designee, shall be rendered at the hearing and mailed to the person to whom the original notice was served by regular and certified mail, within five (5) days of the date of the decision.

At the hearing, the City Manager, or designee, may: (i) direct the Bamboo Owner to remove the encroaching Bamboo within ten (10) days of the receipt of the appeal decision; (ii) order the Bamboo to be removed, order the installation of a physical barrier system (for subsequent violations), or order both, either with City crews or by contracting with a third party, in
which case the Bamboo Owner will be charged with the cost of such work ordered to be done, plus a 25% administrative fee as set forth in subsection (j) hereof; or (iii) grant the appeal and reverse the Director’s order.

(g) Penalty. Any Bamboo Owner, whether a person, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, that is found to have failed to remove Bamboo when noticed to do so under Section 1180.08(e) shall be fined $100.00 per day for each day that the Bamboo remains after the expiration of the 10-day notice period given by the Director of Service and Engineering. This penalty shall be vacated only if the Bamboo Owner is found not to be responsible for the Bamboo removal as a result of an appeal determination. A penalty shall be stayed from the date the matter is appealed to the date the appeal is decided. All penalty amounts not paid when due may result in the City pursuing collection through the court, which amounts sought shall include all unpaid fines plus the cost of collection.

(h) City Removal of Bamboo. If the Bamboo Owner fails to remove the Bamboo as directed in the notice sent pursuant to subsection (f) or as a result of an order to do so by the City Manager at the appeal hearing, the Director of Service and Engineering shall cause the Bamboo to be removed and destroyed, and may employ the necessary labor and equipment to perform such task, together with any cleanup work required, within appropriations previously made by Council. The City shall not be liable to an owner of property affected by Bamboo for damages caused as a result of the Bamboo removal.

(i) Installation of a Physical Barrier System by City. Successive violations of this Ordinance may result in the City determining, at the City’s discretion, to enter upon the land of the Bamboo Owner and install a physical barrier system designed to contain the Bamboo and prevent its encroachment to adjoining properties. The cost of the installation of the barrier system shall be charged to the Bamboo Owner as provided in subsection (j) herein. The City shall not be liable to a Bamboo Owner for damages caused as a result of the barrier system installation.

(j) Statement of Cost to Owner. When the Director of Service and Engineering causes Bamboo to be removed as provided in subsection (h) above, or when the City installs a physical barrier system as provided in subsection (i) above, a statement of the cost thereof shall be mailed to the Bamboo Owner by certified mail, return receipt requested. If the certified mail is returned or refused, then such statement may be sent by ordinary mail, or personal service by posting at the subject property if the Bamboo Owner is the occupant thereof, by any means that assures and documents delivery. Such statement of cost shall include the following costs of the City:
(1) Labor and materials.
(2) Transportation of equipment.
(3) Equipment rental.

The minimum fee to be charged shall be twenty-five dollars ($25.00) per hour. A 25% administrative fee shall be charged on the total amount of the costs of removal.

(k) Cost Payment; Unpaid Costs a Lien. The Bamboo Owner shall pay such amounts as are charged in accordance with subsection (j) hereof to the City Clerk within thirty days after receipt of the statement of costs. Any payment so received shall be restored to the appropriation from which the cost was paid. If the fee is not paid when due, the Director of Finance shall certify to the County Auditor the proceedings taken under this section, together with a statement of the charges for services as listed in subsection (j) hereof and a legal description of the premises. Such amounts shall be entered upon the tax duplicate and shall be a lien upon such lands from the date of entry, and shall be collected as other taxes and returned to the City General Fund as provided by Ohio Revised Code Section 731.54. These costs shall be separate from any fine that may be imposed as a penalty under subsection (g) hereof.

Section 2. That notice of passage of the Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center, and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

Attest: ____________________________________________

President of Council

Introduced: P.H.

Effective

Clerk of Council
ORDINANCE NO. xx-20142015

Enacting Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Regulate the Growth of Running Bamboo.

WHEREAS, the growing of running bamboo, if not controlled and/or contained, results in a rapid spreading and infestation of bamboo plants through its root system and underground rhizomes; and

WHEREAS, the growth of the bamboo plants may cause serious damage to structures and plant materials located in the path of the underground root system; and

WHEREAS, property owners adjacent to parcels that contain bamboo cite difficulty and expense in attempts to keep unwanted running bamboo from extending onto their yards and spreading; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to preserve and protect private and public property from the damaging spread of bamboo, protect indigenous plant materials from the invasive spread of bamboo, and maintain the general welfare of the residents of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

Section 1. That Section 1180.08 of the Codified Ordinances of the City is enacted to read as follows:

1180.08 GROWTH OF BAMBOO.

(a) Definitions. As used in this chapter, certain terms are defined as follows:

(1) “Bamboo” means any tropical or semi-tropical grasses classified as “running bamboo” with monopodial (leptomorph) rhizome (root) systems which typically send off the rhizomes far away from the plant.
(2) “Bamboo Owner” means any property owner or resident who has planted and/or grows Bamboo, or who maintains Bamboo on the property, or who permits Bamboo to grow or remain on the property even if the Bamboo has spread from an adjoining property. Any property owner or resident at whose property Bamboo is found will be considered a Bamboo Owner, except any property owner or resident who:
   (i) Did not plant or grow or cause Bamboo to be planted or grown on his or her property; and
(ii) Has provided satisfactory proof to the City that, within a reasonable period of time after discovering the encroachment of Bamboo onto the property from an adjoining or neighboring property, advised the owner of such property, by delivery of a written notice, of an objection to the encroachment of the Bamboo and a request for the Bamboo to be removed; and

(iii) Has initiated steps for the removal of the Bamboo from the property, including remedies at law.

(b) Applicability. For purposes of this Section 1180.08, Bamboo found growing upon property shall constitute presumptive evidence that the Bamboo was planted and/or grown by and with the consent of the owner upon whose property the Bamboo is growing. If the Bamboo is found to have encroached, spread, invaded or intruded upon any property other than the property on which it was planted, including public property and right-of-way, it shall be presumed that the Bamboo is “running bamboo” as defined herein, and subject to the provisions of this Section 1180.08.

(c) Notification. Within 120 days after the effective date of this Section, each Bamboo Owner shall notify the City in writing that Bamboo is present on his or her property.

(d) Duty to Confine. All Bamboo Owners must confine Bamboo in a manner that will prevent the Bamboo from encroaching, spreading, invading or intruding onto any other private or public property or right-of-way, and shall be required to take any such reasonable measure to do so, including but not limited to the installation of a properly constructed and maintained underground physical barrier system. A Bamboo Owner who fails to confine Bamboo to the Bamboo Owner’s property shall be subject to the penalty provisions of Section 1180.08(h) herein.

(ed) Property Owners Affected by Bamboo. In the event that a property owner notifies a Bamboo Owner that Bamboo is encroaching, spreading, invading or intruding upon such property owner’s property, as required under Section 1180.08(a)(2)(ii), such notifying property owner shall give consent to the Bamboo Owner for the Bamboo Owner to enter such notifying property owner’s property in order that the Bamboo Owner may remove the Bamboo thereon. Failure to give consent shall hold the notifying property owner responsible for the removal of the encroaching Bamboo at such property owner’s cost. Consent hereunder shall also be deemed to be consent given to a contractor that the Bamboo Owner may hire for the removal of the Bamboo, and to the City or the City’s contractor should that become necessary. Neither the Bamboo Owner, the City, or a contractor hired on behalf of the Bamboo Owner or the City to remove
Bamboo from a neighboring property, shall be liable for incidental damages caused by the removal of the Bamboo.

(fe) Failure to Confine. In the event Bamboo growing on a Bamboo Owner’s property encroaches or grows onto an adjoining or neighboring property, and the Bamboo Owner fails to remove the Bamboo, or fails to cause it to be removed following a request to do so by the affected adjoining property owner within ten (10) days from the date of the request, the affected adjoining property owner shall notify the Director of Service and Engineering of such encroachment. The Director shall be provided satisfactory proof from the affected adjoining neighbor that the Bamboo Owner was notified of the encroachment and had the requisite number of days to remove the Bamboo. The Director shall confirm the presence of the encroaching Bamboo and shall notify the Bamboo Owner in writing of such encroachment, which notice shall:

1. Specify the nature and location of the violation;
2. Provide notice of the requirement to remove all portions of the Bamboo plant from the affected adjoining property within ten (10) days from the date of the notice; and
3. State that the failure to comply with the notice and order may hold the Bamboo Owner liable to the City for the cost of removal, in addition to any fines that may be imposed pursuant to Section 1180.08(hg), and the City’s cost to install a barrier system as may be permitted under Section 1180.08(i).

(g) The Director’s notice shall be sent to the Bamboo Owner by certified mail, return receipt requested.

(f) Appeal. If a Bamboo Owner believes that the determination of the Director of Service and Engineering that he or she is in violation of the provisions of this Section 1180.08 is in error, then that determination may be appealed to the City Manager within five (5) days of receipt of the notice to remove the Bamboo issued pursuant to subsection (fe) hereof, by the filing of a written notice of appeal. The Bamboo Owner shall have the opportunity to present relevant evidence to the City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, with or without legal counsel. A record of the hearing shall be kept, including without limitation all documentary evidence presented together with a record of the testimony offered by any witnesses, whose testimony shall be duly sworn. The decision of the City Manager, or designee, shall be rendered at the hearing and mailed to the person to whom the original notice was served by regular and certified mail, within five (5) days of the date of the decision.

At the hearing, the City Manager, or designee, may: (i) direct the Bamboo Owner to remove the encroaching Bamboo within ten (10) days of the
receipt of the appeal decision. Alternatively, the City Manager may: (ii) order the Bamboo to be removed by the City, order the installation of a physical barrier system (for subsequent violations), or order both, either with City crews or by contracting with a third party to have it removed, in which case the Bamboo Owner will be charged with the cost of removal such work ordered to be done, plus a 25% administrative fee as set forth in subsection (j) hereof; or (iii) grant the appeal and reverse the Director’s order.

(hg) Penalty. Any Bamboo Owner, whether a person, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, that is found to have failed to remove Bamboo when noticed to do so under Section 1180.08(f) shall be fined $100.00 per day for each day that the Bamboo remains after the expiration of the 10-day notice period given by the Director of Service and Engineering. This penalty shall be vacated only if the Bamboo Owner is found not to be responsible for the Bamboo removal as a result of an appeal determination. A penalty shall be stayed from the date the matter is appealed to the date the appeal is decided. All penalty amounts not paid when due may result in the City pursuing collection through the court, which amounts sought shall include all unpaid fines plus the cost of collection.

(ih) City Removal of Bamboo. If the Bamboo Owner fails to remove the Bamboo as directed in the notice sent pursuant to subsection (f) or as a result of an order to do so by the City Manager at the appeal hearing, the Director of Service and Engineering shall cause the Bamboo to be removed and destroyed, and may employ the necessary labor and equipment to perform such task, together with any cleanup work required, within appropriations previously made by Council. The City shall not be liable to an owner of property affected by Bamboo for damages caused as a result of the Bamboo removal.

(ij) Installation of a Physical Barrier System by City. Successive violations of this Ordinance may result in the City determining, at the City’s discretion, to enter upon the land of the Bamboo Owner and install a physical barrier system designed to contain the Bamboo and prevent its encroachment to adjoining properties. The cost of the installation of the barrier system shall be charged to the Bamboo Owner as provided in subsection (j) herein. The City shall not be liable to a Bamboo Owner for damages caused as a result of the barrier system installation.

(j) Statement of Cost to Owner. When the Director of Service and Engineering causes Bamboo to be removed as provided in subsection (h) above, or when the City installs a physical barrier system as provided in subsection (i) above, a statement of the cost thereof shall be mailed to the Bamboo Owner by certified mail, return receipt requested. If the certified mail is returned or refused, then such statement may be sent by ordinary
mail, or personal service by posting at the subject property if the Bamboo Owner is the occupant thereof, by any means that assures and documents delivery. Such statement of cost shall include the following costs of the City:

(1) Labor and materials.
(2) Transportation of equipment.
(3) Equipment rental.

The minimum fee to be charged shall be twenty-five dollars ($25.00) per hour. A 25% administrative fee shall be charged on the total amount of the costs of removal.

(k) Cost Payment; Unpaid Costs a Lien. The Bamboo Owner shall pay such fees as are charged in accordance with subsection (j) hereof to the City Clerk within thirty days after receipt of the statement of costs. Any payment so received shall be restored to the appropriation from which the cost was paid. If the fee is not paid when due, the Director of Finance shall certify to the County Auditor the proceedings taken under this section, together with a statement of the charges for services as listed in subsection (j) hereof and a legal description of the premises. Such amounts shall be entered upon the tax duplicate and shall be a lien upon such lands from the date of entry, and shall be collected as other taxes and returned to the City General Fund as provided by Ohio Revised Code Section 731.54. These costs shall be separate from any fine that may be imposed as a penalty under subsection (hg) hereof.

Section 2. That notice of passage of the Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center, and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:
_______________________________  P.H.
Clerk of Council    Effective
ORDINANCE NO. 22-2015

Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund Unappropriated Balance for Salt and Ice Control and the Economic Development Fund Unappropriated Balance for Economic Development Incentive Program Funding.

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the General Fund unappropriated balance to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.3050.521016</td>
<td>Salt/Ice Control – Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.6070.511170</td>
<td>Supplemental Pay – Fire Operations</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Fund Total** $225,000.00

**Economic Development Fund #219**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219.1919.540650</td>
<td>Building Improvement Incentives</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Development Fund Total** $10,000.00

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

___________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

___________________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

From: William W. Watterson, City Engineer

Subject: Sanitary Sewer Basins 6 & 8 Repair and Lining, Project Number 568-11

Date: May 26, 2015

Attached is a plan of proposed lining improvements to sections of sanitary sewers in the southeast sewer shed. Deficiencies in these sections were identified as part of work performed by EMH&T as part of the Southeast Sewer Shed Study and Master Plan. The work includes lining 4270 lineal feet of 8 inch vitrified clay sewers and the restoration of 90 6 inch residential services. The estimated cost of the work is $143,640.00. The Five-Year CIP included a budget of $150,000.00 for the project.

I recommend that we request approval from City council to advertise for bids for the project. With approval at the June 1, 2015 meeting, project can move forward in accordance with the attached administrative schedule for completion in October of this year.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please advise.
**SANITARY SEWER BASINS 6 & 8 REPAIR AND LINING**  
Project Number 568-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility ID.</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-0033:06-0032</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0032:06-0031</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0031:06-0030</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0030:06-0029</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0029:06-0028</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0028:06-0027</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0027:06-0020</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0024:06-0024</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0024:06-0023</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0023:06-0022</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0022:06-0021</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0021:06-0020</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-0020:06-0019</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>4270</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Administrative Schedule

## Sanitary Sewer Basins 6 & 8 Repair and Lining

### Project Number 568-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2015</td>
<td>Discuss project &amp; request permission to advertise for bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Advertise for bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 2015</td>
<td>Introduce legislation to fund construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2015</td>
<td>Bid opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 2015</td>
<td>Award construction contract (effective July 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August thru</td>
<td>Construction period (90 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>