



Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 19, 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, October 19, 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, Service and Engineering Director William Watterson, Director of Building and Planning Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Police James Mosaic, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were approximately eighteen visitors present.

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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Chief Highley – Life Saving Certificate

Chief Highley shared that one of the things that his staff has done for many years is CPR training. This August we had an occasion where an individual had a cardiac arrest and a co-worker began CPR and they are both here tonight.

Chief Highley invited Stephanie Slaton to the podium where he presented her with a Life Saving Certificate. He shared that Ms. Slaton works for Roadrunner and when a co-worker began having a heart attack and Stephanie began CPR. Workers contacted EMS and the victim was transported to the hospital. Her actions made a difference and a very successful outcome was achieved, which is not always the case. Her actions were not only positive for her co-worker but also for our community and the Firefighters who work hard to get people trained. Chief Highley presented her with a plaque for her actions.

Ms. Michael thanked Ms. Slaton for her actions. She added that Ms. Slaton set a good example by telling others that CPR is training that they should have and by not being afraid to use it on someone in need.

Ms. Slaton shared that it was the scariest thing that she has ever had to do. She is thankful that she knew what to do and all of her co-workers have now been trained. It is definitely touching people's lives. She is thankful for the recognition.

VISITOR COMMENTS**CONSENT AGENDA**

Notice to the Public: There will be no separate discussion of Consent Agenda items as they are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be adopted by one motion. If a member of the City Council, staff, or public requests discussion on a particular item, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.

To address City Council regarding an item on Consent Agenda, please submit a fully completed speaker's slip to the Clerk of Council prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Meeting Minutes to Approve:

- 1) September 8, 2015 – Regular Meeting
- 2) September 14, 2015 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
- 3) September 21, 2015 – Regular Meeting

Legislation to Approve/Adopt

- 4) **Resolution No. 47-2015** Amending the Position Description for Director of Service and Engineering.

Policy Item

- 5) **Liquor Permit Request – Transfer** – From Rotolos Pizza Inc to JDK II

End of Consent Agenda

Ms. Dorothy asked that Resolution No. 47-2015 be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Myers asked if anyone was in attendance for the liquor permit request by JDK.

There being none, Mr. Myers said it could stay on the Consent Agenda.

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda after the removal of Resolution No. 47-2015. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously.

Resolution No. 47-2015 Amending the Position Description for Director of Service and Engineering.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to approve Resolution No. 47-2015 as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Ms. Dorothy commented that with the creation of the city's new Bike and Pedestrian Committee and with this opportunity for a new Director of Service and Engineering, she wanted to make sure that under the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities section of the job description that applicants are also familiar with the National Association for City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines, which incorporates Complete Streets and levels for services for transportation other than just cars. Mr. Greeson shared that typically the job description would not be that specific. The profile for this position should be on the street by tomorrow. Staff will ask applicants more detailed questions regarding their knowledge on many topics as part of the screening process. Those questions will likely include sewers and experience with advancing bike and pedestrian initiatives. He added that staff would be glad to look for those things. Ms. Dorothy thanked him. She added that with any form of construction it is nice to incorporate features early in the design work as it is much more cost effective.

Dr. Chosy understands that the candidates do not have to be engineers. He asked if that is correct. Mr. Greeson replied that PE, "Professional Engineer" is a preferred qualification but not necessarily a requirement. That requisite was decided when the Departments were reorganized. We want the best person with the most dynamic and robust set of skills. We thought this might broaden the applicant pool a little bit and that we would consider a really highly qualified, experienced person although they do not have their PE certification. That is not unusual to see in an advertisement on a position like this. If the person we ultimately end up hiring is not a PE, that means we will have to make some adjustments to ensure we still have engineering services available to us.

There being no additional questions or comments, the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 31-2015

Accepting the Amounts and Rates as Determined by the Budget Commission and Authorizing the Necessary Tax Levies and Certifying Them to the County Auditor and Declaring an Emergency.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

MOTION Dr. Chosy made a motion to remove Ordinance No. 31-2015 from the table. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is an item that has been on the agenda three times. It was advertised and then tabled because the information needed to populate the document was not available from the County Auditor. The second time Council adopted it in time for it

to be considered without the emergency language. It was a staff error in that we did not direct council to remove it from the table prior to amending it and then approving it. So, with the abundance of caution and in order to make sure that we adopt tax rates and levies, staff is bringing this back to Council and asking that you reconsider it. It has been removed from the table. It will need amended and adopted by emergency so that we can submit it within the deadlines required by the auditor.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Myers asked for clarification. He asked if Council had already adopted this item. Mr. Greeson agreed that they did. He explained that the item had not be removed from the table prior to the amendment and vote. Mr. Myers concluded that the original adoption was invalid because the item was still on the table. Mrs. Fox agreed.

Mrs. Roberts explained that the ordinance accepts the amounts and rates as determined by the Budget Commission. The rates that were received from the Budget Commission are included in the amended version of Ordinance No. 31-2015 that was presented this evening. This sets our inside and outside millage at the consistent 2.5 mills for a total of 5.0 mills. That is the current rate and has been for some time.

Mrs. Roberts commented that the reason for the emergency is that this ordinance has to be approved prior to October 1st typically but the Franklin County Auditor requested an extension by all entities to November 1st. In order to fit in that timeline that is set by state statute, the emergency clause is needed.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to accept the amendments to Ordinance No. 31-2015 as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 31-2015 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ms. Michael reported that the ordinance needed to be passed by an emergency, which requires a roll call vote. She called for the vote.

The Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 31-2015 (As Amended) as an emergency. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

**The Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 31-2015 (As Amended).
The motion carried by the following vote:**

Ordinance No. 40-2015 Amending Chapter 922 of the Codified Ordinances of the City Regulating Residential On-Site Sewage Disposal Facilities.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported there being 93 on-site sewage disposal systems (septic systems) in the city. City staff works with the Columbus Public Health Department for the regulation of those systems. The city's regulations regarding home sewage treatment systems needs to be updated. He invited Rob Chandler, Assistant to the Service Director to address the topic.

Mr. Chandler reiterated that the changes were made by the Columbus Board of Health in December 2014 to better reflect the Ohio Administrative Code in this area. This new ordinance will bring the city into compliance with those changes. Columbus administers the program and he works with them to make sure everyone is permitted and in compliance. He introduced John Richter and Luke Jacobs from Columbus Public Health. They are the experts who can answer any specific questions.

Mr. Greeson asked that the changes be shared. Mr. Richter shared that the biggest adjustment is that residents must show that their systems are being maintained in the proper manor. That can be done in several ways:

- 1) An "in lieu of" option where residents have an opportunity to prove that they have been maintaining the system in a fashion that is compliant with the code. They include such things as routinely having the tank pumped out, or that their system has been serviced if there are mechanical elements. If residents can prove that has been done, the department will issue a no charge permit.*
- 2) Residents can also pay the Columbus department to provide that service and they will receive an on-site septic permit.*

Mr. Richter stated that homeowners with systems that flow into a leach field will save \$20.00 a year because it is now a five year permit. If Columbus performs the inspection the fee is \$150.00. Those will mechanical systems such as an aerator will cost a little more because there is more to inspect. The permit will be free if the homeowner can prove that they are in compliance. He added that much of the change is about maintenance.

When asked by Ms. Michael how a homeowner demonstrates that they are in compliance with the rules, Mr. Richter replied that owners with systems with mechanical components would have to show proof that the equipment is being serviced and inspected annually.

That may or may not include the tank being pumped out. If the system is operating properly and is properly sized that would only have to be done every five years or so. Non-mechanical systems need proof that the tank has been pumped out.

Mr. Greeson reported that currently homeowners are paying about \$50.00 a year and they are being physically inspected by Columbus. So this should be less cumbersome. The cost however will be higher (\$150.00) if Columbus does the inspections.

Mr. Norstrom commented that a homeowners would be paying a private company to inspect and certify so they are not necessarily saving money but rather paying it to a different entity. Mr. Richter agreed. He added that they are required to have an annual inspection on mechanical components so either way they are required to have the system serviced.

Mr. Smith asked if all of the properties in Worthington are located west of StRt 315. Mr. Chandler replied that most of the properties are located west of the river but there are a few larger lots around Worthington-Galena Road have leach systems. There are several dotted around town in less concentrated areas east of the river.

Mrs. Fox commented that as part of the ordinance council is adopting and incorporating by reference the Board of Health rules that they have recently adopted that are in compliance with State law. That would in term allow the city to appeal our inspection and grace period sessions because that is part of this whole new system that is coming into play. She knows that these homeowners received some kind of notification of the changes. She thinks that the homeowners probably need to be aware of what these rules and regulations are. She is curious as to whether that is something that staff needs to be doing or something that Columbus will provide. Mr. Chandler reported that it will be done through Columbus Public Health. His contact information will be included in those materials should homeowners have any questions and would like to talk to Worthington directly. Mr. Jacobs reported that the letters are going out at the end of November.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mrs. Fox if we would have to change our rules. Mrs. Fox replied no. Columbus changed theirs and this ordinance incorporates the Columbus Health rules by reference into our ordinance.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 40-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 40-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 41-2015

Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$4,440,000 of Bonds for the Purpose of Currently Refunding a Portion of Bonds Issued in 2005 for the Purpose of Advance Refunding a Portion of Bonds Issued in 2001, and Authorizing and Approving Related Matters.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported that the city issued general obligations bonds in 2001 to help pay for the community center addition and for the development of the police complex. The city has an opportunity to refund those bonds. He shared that by refunding the bonds the city will save almost \$280,000 over the remaining life on those existing bonds. He asked Mrs. Roberts to comment.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom what the remaining life of the bonds is, Mrs. Roberts replied five years, until 2021. She added that the ordinance will need to be amended from what was originally presented as follows:

- 1) There are several areas where the amount needs changed to \$4,600,000 in order to incorporate some of the financing costs associated with the issuance as well as the interest that is due December 1st.*
- 2) In Section 11. – The purchaser language was changed from the original ordinance.*
- 3) In Section 14. – Legal language was added for the placement agent, KeyBanc Capital Markets, Inc.*

Mrs. Roberts shared that this is our first opportunity to refund these bonds. We are currently paying about 3.75% interest. This rate will increase to 4% next year and over the remaining life of the bonds, which again matures on December 1, 2021. We anticipate at least a 2% per year interest rate savings which will calculate to around \$280,000 over the remaining life of the bonds.

Dr. Chosy asked what the new interest rate is. Mrs. Roberts replied that we will not know that information until the bonds are sold.

When asked by Ms. Michael what she estimates the rate to be, Mrs. Roberts replied that she is hoping between 1.50% to 1.70% but that will depend on what the market will bear. We will not know the final interest rate until the bonds are sold which can't occur until twenty days after passage of this legislation.

Mr. Troper asked if the length of the loan will be extended or will it stay the same. Mrs. Roberts replied that we are keeping the same maturity. That falls in line with our debt schedule that was incorporated with our CIP.

Mr. Troper asked if there is any other debt that we can buy down. Mrs. Roberts replied that the only other piece of truly outstanding debt that we have and related to this is the bond anticipation notes at \$1.6M that will come due the middle of January. It has been our intention that as we get further along in our sewer projects that are pending, we would roll those bonds into a larger deal with the sewer notes and other road improvement projects. In conversations with our bond counsel, staff still feels that is the best way to go with the debt issuance.

When asked by Dr. Chosy for some help with understanding the topic, Mrs. Roberts explained that it is similar to re-financing a home mortgage. Dr. Chosy thanked her for the clarification.

Mr. Troper understands we have notes due at various times but we are investing money in Star Ohio so he assumes we are not using that money for the next six months. He asked if we have ever consider not investing in Star Ohio and paying those off now. Mrs. Roberts confirmed that staff has those conversations frequently. It goes back to council's comfort level. What do members want to pay cash for, what do you want to bond and so we look at our cash position and at our debt appetite and evaluate those with conversations.

Mr. Troper stated that he is talking on a lesser scale. If we have a note that is due six months from now and we have "X" million dollars in Star Ohio that is earning 0.79% and the note is at 1% then why don't we just pay it off. He asked if it is worth doing. Will we need that cash in the next six months? Mrs. Roberts again acknowledged that staff does think about it. It goes back to our cash position and determining at what level we want to deteriorate the cash position. She shared that it is harder to generate the revenue to influx the cash than it is to issue the debt at this point.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 41-2015 as presented by Mrs. Roberts. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 41-2015 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 41-2015 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Dr. Chosy shared that he remembers when he first got on council that the CIP had no loans. Ms. Michael remembers that as well.

Ordinance No. 42-2015

Enacting Part Seventeen – Title Two of the Codified Ordinances of the City Regarding Municipal Income Tax.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that members received a briefing on this topic in September. This is the result of House Bill 5, which was passed by the General Assembly and signed into law in December 2014. It requires that all Ohio municipalities modify and update their income tax ordinance to become compliant with this new state law. He asked Mrs. Roberts to comment.

Mrs. Roberts reported that this is a lengthy document that has been reviewed by the Law Director as well as the Regional Income Tax Agency (RITA), which is our third party tax collection agency and their legal counsel as well. As indicated in her memorandum from September, the city is required to adopt this new legislation by December 31, 2015 for the tax year beginning January 1, 2016. The RITA will send out letters/notices to businesses initially and then to all of those impacted by the language in the bill. The withholding filing periods will be modified somewhat so those notices will be going out prior to the end of the year for businesses with withholding accounts. Individual accounts will probably occur in 2017 as this legislation begins to take full force.

Mrs. Roberts added that there will be other pieces of legislation that will need to come to council before the end of the year to re-establish our Tax Appeals Board as there were amendments to that part of the code. But this will be the first start of our continuing ability to enact our income tax ordinances.

Dr. Chosy asked why this was done and what it was supposed to accomplish. Mrs. Roberts replied that the purpose behind the house bill was to provide for municipal income tax uniformity across the state of Ohio.

Dr. Chosy asked Mrs. Roberts what she thinks the impact will be on our city. Mrs. Roberts replied that we hope it will have marginal impacts but we just don't know. The largest impact to us as a municipality is the net loss carry forward. We have never had a net loss carry forward for business entities. This will enact a five year net loss carry over. If a business shows profit in one year and then subsequent losses for the next three, they could use those losses to offset the profits of the initial year. So we have made some very rough calculations and estimate that it could impact us about \$450,000 in lost income tax revenue but those are just projections. The changes will be phased in beginning in 2017.

Ms. Michael asked if the \$450,000 is per year. Mrs. Roberts replied yes. Mr. Greeson pointed out that that amount is not insignificant.

Others agreed.

Ms. Michael shared that council opposed this legislation and Mr. Greeson wrote correspondence to our state representatives that explained our position but to no avail.

Dr. Chosy asked who the net loss carryover helps. Mrs. Roberts replied business entities.

Mr. Troper commented that if the city gives subsidies to businesses that come here based on their projected income and jobs that they plan to create and we are giving them assistance, he asked if that could affect them too. He asked if we will still be required to give them subsidies if they are going to have business losses. Mrs. Roberts explained that venture grants are typically based on payroll. The net loss carry forward would only be on the net profit side of the business so it would not have any impact on the payroll numbers.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 42-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 42-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Mr. Greeson shared that staff is going to overview the 2016-2020 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) that members previously received. The budget schedule has the request for adoption on December 7th. That should provide adequate time for staff to address any questions members may have or make changes. He asked Mrs. Stewart to present the information.

Policy Item(s)

- **Proposed 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

Presentation Goals

- Review the cash flow projections and the financial forecast for the CIP Fund
- Discuss the City's current and projected debt
- Overview the 2016 projects and equipment
- Highlight projects and equipment for 2017-2020

Definition of Capital Item

1. New construction projects and buildings valued in excess of \$5,000
2. Major equipment and vehicles valued in excess of \$2,500 and with a life expectancy of 5 years or more. Where a number of non-expendable items were in excess of \$2,500, they are included
3. All projects requiring borrowing
4. All land purchases regardless of value
5. All land improvements valued in excess of \$5,000
6. Major equipment valued at \$2,500 or more required to furnish new buildings or other projects
7. Major building improvements that are not routine expenses and that substantially enhance the value of the structure
8. All projects which, while maintenance and/or repair in nature, prolong the life of public facilities

Overview of Proposed CIP

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Total</u>
Projects	\$6,615,100	\$3,843,900	\$ 9,886,500	\$4,563,000	\$2,233,500	\$27,142,000
Equipment	\$1,376,900	\$1,408,500	\$ 1,395,000	\$ 722,500	\$ 361,000	\$ 5,263,900
Total	\$7,992,000	\$5,252,400	\$11,281,500	\$5,285,500	\$2,594,500	\$32,405,000

Mrs. Stewart shared this chart shows the value of the items in the CIP regardless of the funding source. Members will notice higher project costs in 2016 and 2018 than in other years because of the Huntley/Worthington-Galena/East Wilson Bridge Road project, particularly regarding right-of-way and utility relocation. The 2018 costs involve the construction of the intersection, which may carry over into 2019. Staff will be presenting alternatives of that project in an upcoming council meeting. She noted that other causes of the increase in 2016 are the HVAC system investment at the community center, several sewer projects and investments in the Wilson Bridge Road corridor streetscape.

Mrs. Stewart shared that equipment costs in 2019 and 2020 show lower because of being four and five years out. The city typically spends a million dollars in equipment and she anticipates that when we get to 2019 and 2020 staff will have identified additional pieces of equipment that needs to be addressed.

City's Share of Proposed CIP

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total Cost	\$7,992,000	\$5,252,400	\$11,281,500	\$5,285,500	\$2,594,500	\$27,142,000
City Sources	\$6,694,000	\$4,802,400	\$ 5,062,778	\$4,407,500	\$2,169,500	\$23,136,178
% City Share	83.8%	91.4%	44.9%	83.4%	83.6%	71.4%

Mrs. Stewart commented that this information tracks how much investments in the CIP are funded from city sources. It provides a sense of what kind of outside dollars staff have been able to attract into these projects. Most outside funding is for project areas. Members will noticed a significant dip in 2018 that is due to the federal money that we have identified for the Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena intersection project. That is such a high dollar project in that year and most of that is from federal funds so it really impacts the percentage of money that is from the city sources in that year.

Mrs. Stewart shared that city sources include income taxes plus other revenue in the CIP fund. Bonds are counted in this category since the city is using its resources to pay back those bonds. Non-city sources are assessments. Staff anticipates a sewer project that may be constructed by assessment. License tax is another source as well as any state or federal money for projects.

Mr. Norstrom asked if the 2018 money is in the transportation improvement program and were they guaranteed. Mr. Greeson replied yes. It was originally a projection. It may need increased as more design work is done but we have been approved in the five year transportation program to receive attributable funds through MORPC. We will have to keep showing progress though.

Allocation of CIP Project Expenses

Ms. Stewart showed a pie chart that captures the 2016-2020 CIP categories as follows:

- Legal Mandates 13.8%
- Essential for Basic Services 40.8%
- Improvements to Basic Services 36.5%
- Enhancement 6.7%
- Assessment Projects 1.6%
- Previous Project Commitments 0.4%
- Need for Further Review 0.3%

Mrs. Roberts defined the categories that the city uses to identify project expenses.

Expenditure Categories – CIP Fund

Ms. Stewart showed a pie chart that captures the 2016-2020 Proposed CIP categories as follows:

- Projects 37%
- Equipment 21%
- Debt Services 32%
- Administration 10%

Staff has typically tried to keep Projects, Equipment, and Debt Services at a 1/3 each of the CIP funds.

CIP Fund Revenue & Expenditures

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Revenue	\$4,858,787	\$4,930,993	\$5,028,713	\$5,093,387	\$5,195,055
Expenditures	\$4,841,746	\$4,936,044	\$5,045,885	\$4,825,041	\$4,221,584

A graph was shown that tracked this information. Revenue and Expenditures track extremely close until 2019 and 2020 mostly because equipment needs have not yet been determined for those years.

CIP Fund Expenditures

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Projects	\$1,849,016	\$1,685,500	\$1,821,500	\$1,895,000	\$1,658,500
Equipment	\$1,370,150	\$1,408,500	\$1,145,000	\$ 722,500	\$ 361,000
Debt Service	\$1,191,017	\$1,401,850	\$1,630,387	\$1,749,563	\$1,734,946
Administration	\$ 431,563	\$ 440,194	\$ 448,998	\$ 457,978	\$ 467,138

Mrs. Stewart reported that staff had a great deal of difficulty balancing the needs and demands on the CIP with the revenue that is coming in to the CIP. In order to achieve a balance in those numbers, staff has identified a number of projects to be funded by debt. Staff is recommending additional debt service and additional projects funded by debt.

Mr. Myers noted that in the final two years of the CIP the estimates for equipment are very low and Mrs. Stewart has said that will probably change. But that trickles through this entire program tonight and this entire thinking that we are balancing in some ways the out years by underestimating our equipment cost. He asked what her thinking is on underestimating those costs. Mrs. Stewart replied that the city has a new fleet manager

who has actually been taking a very comprehensive look at our fleet. She would anticipate that over the next year or so talk about working on better estimates for four and five years out for equipment. She gave the example of a dump truck and working to estimate the life of such equipment. She noted the CIP Fund Revenue & Expenditures slide and the gap between revenues and expenditures in 2019 and 2020. With expenditures lower, there will be an opportunity to pick up more equipment as we go.

Mr. Myers just wants to make certain that in those out years we don't realize we are wrong in the equipment estimates. Mrs. Stewart replied that she anticipates that when we get to 2019 and 2020 those equipment estimates will be higher but we are not projecting expending all of the revenue that is coming in to those year right now so that will help shrink that gap between revenues and expenditures. Staff will also better refine those revenue projections as we get out to those years because five year, even in expected revenue is taking in many assumptions.

Five Year Forecast – CIP Fund

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Total Revenue	\$4,858,787	\$4,930,993	\$5,028,713	\$5,093,387	\$5,195,055
Total Expenditures	\$4,841,746	\$4,936,044	\$5,045,885	\$4,825,041	\$4,221,584
Fund Balance (FB)	\$4,167,641	\$4,162,590	\$4,145,418	\$4,413,764	\$5,387,235
FB as % of Budget	86.1%	84.3%	82.2%	91.5%	127.6%

Mrs. Stewart pointed out that the Fund Balance is lower than expected revenue and expenditures so the only way to bring those together is to try to build up our fund balance by spending less than is coming in. We are not on target on this slide but staff felt comfortable moving forward with the CIP because the revenue and expenditure lines are almost equal.

Mr. Norstrom wanted to go back to an earlier slide in which Mrs. Stewart stated that 20% administrative is for the cost of collecting the taxes. Mrs. Stewart explained that the administrative expenses are essentially the cost of collecting the income tax revenues that come into the CIP fund. There is a cost for RITA to collect those income taxes for us and we allocate those between the General Fund and the CIP fund based on the percent of where the revenue is going.

Mr. Norstrom commented that it costs \$400,000 a year for \$2M of taxes. Mrs. Roberts reported that administrative costs also includes refunds and the cost of collection. Income tax revenues come in and are split 80% General Fund / 20% CIP. We also split the corresponding expenditures associated with the cost of collections at the same 80/20 split and that captures the 3% RITA collection fee and estimates for income tax revenue refunds.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the refunds would be 17%. Mrs. Roberts replied that the percentage varies but she doesn't have that figure in front of her at this time.

Mr. Norstrom stated that just looking at it, it is \$400,000 of \$2M. Mrs. Stewart reported that the city has over \$4M in revenue coming in. Mr. Norstrom agreed. He noted that it is still 10% which seems like a high administrative cost. It would not be 17% but rather 7% of refunds.

Dr. Chosy added that the CIP used to pay the whole amount of all the tax collections until we separated it a few years ago.

Mrs. Roberts stated that another component of administrative fees is the general liability insurance that is paid from the administrative line in the CIP, which is about \$100,000 expense per year. Dr. Chosy commented that that expense could be split as well.

Debt Information

Current Debt Obligations

- 2005 Refunding Bonds (Police Division & Community Center Improvements)
Maturing 12/01/2021
 - Original Issuance: \$7,185,000
 - Remaining Principal as of 1/1/2016: \$4,440,000
 - Principal Payment Due in 2016: \$680,000
 - Interest Payment Due in 2016: \$174,138 (3.75%)
 - Interest rates vary each year from 3.6% to 4.0% at end of term.

Note: The City is in the process of refunding these bonds in order to take advantage of lower interest rates. The new repayment structure will be finalized once the refunding is completed.

Mrs. Stewart commented that this is our largest outstanding debt currently and at the highest interest rate. This debt is scheduled to be paid off in 2021 and that will certainly help on the debt service side of things. We will see a pinch in our debt service in these next five years because we are still paying off these bonds and as members will see we expect to issue debt on a number of new projects, primarily sewer projects but we also have some building investments that we are proposing for debt.

Other Current Debt Obligations

- OPWC 0% Loan Issued 2/15/2008 – ADA Ramps
 - Original Issuance \$ 156,201
 - Remaining Principal Due as of 1/1/2016: \$93,720.60
 - Annual Payments: \$7,810.06

- Bond Anticipation Note Renewal Issued 01/22/2015
Maturing 01/21/2016 – Ladder Truck Purchase, Davis Estates Waterline Improvement and Community Center Window Replacement Projects.

- Current Issuance: \$1,660,000 at 1.01% interest
- Interest Payment Due in 2016: \$16,766
- Principal Payment: \$100,000

- OPWC 0% Loan Approved in 2013 – Kenyonbrook Sanitary Sewer Improvements
 - Original Issuance \$ 565,395
 - Start Date for Principal Payments: 7/1/2015
 - Annual Payments: \$20,428

Dr. Chosy asked the duration of the loan. Mrs. Roberts replied that it is a 30 year, zero percent loan.

2015 Projects to be Bonded

- Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs - \$250,000
- Basin 6 & 8 Sanitary Sewer Repairs - \$150,000
- Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington Galena Intersection Design - \$600,000

Future Proposed Debt Issuance Projects

- Sewer Projects (2016-2020 Proposed CIP):
 - Northbrook Relief Sewer - \$460,000
 - Central District Sanitary Sewer Improvements - \$500,000
 - Kenyonbrook Sewer Trunk - \$1,180,000
 - North Districts Sanitary Sewer Improvements - \$500,000
 - North Districts Sanitary Sewer Repairs & Lining - \$750,000

- Other Projects (2016-2020 Proposed CIP):
 - Community Center HVAC Improvements - \$900,000
 - Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington Galena Intersection - \$1,891,278
 - Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancements - \$800,000

Mr. Greeson shared the follow comments:

- *The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancements at \$800,000*

Mr. Brown and he will be bringing their consultant's report forward in the next month regarding Wilson Bridge Road and the steering committee that has been working on that has also presented it to the Municipal Planning Commission. What members will see in that report is a long term mid-range/long-range strategy to significantly improve the corridor that is not affordable in this five year CIP in the \$800,000 staff has projected. Staff is trying to determine how we can use the \$800,000 to potentially leverage other grant money, either through MORPC attributable funds, state trail money, ODOT, etc. and how do we use the revenue that will eventually come off of the Heights through the Tax Increment Financing District. Staff tries to determine ways to combine all of those sources strategically in order to accomplish the goals. So when that presentation comes

forward staff would like some input on which items are council's highest priority. Then we will need to mesh that with what items we think we can get grant money for. He asked members to understand that staff is trying to deploy a long term strategy because we will not be able to accomplish everything that is presented with the \$800,000. He just wanted to build a context for that future conversation.

- *The Community Center HVAC Improvements are interesting because it is one of the few projects in here where we should see a long-term corresponding savings in our energy consumption that benefits the operating budget.*

Ms. Dorothy commented that there is a savings on the overall life cycle of that system and the building operations. Mr. Greeson agreed. Staff distributed that report and ultimately we will have to figure out how to procure those improvements but he thinks there was a ten year payback, if he recalls correctly. Mr. Hurley reported there being a few options that all report there being a life savings.

Ms. Dorothy thinks that is something that all directors should be looking into for their own buildings now that they have to pay for the operating costs for their buildings. Mr. Greeson agreed.

Mr. Norstrom asked if the bonds would be issued for ten years. Mr. Greeson replied that staff will have to figure out what is most favorable to us at the time.

Mrs. Stewart continued with her presentation:

- Fire Station Roof Replacement - \$295,000
- Municipal Building Roof Replacement - \$225,000
- Community Center South End Roof Replacement - \$890,000

Mrs. Stewart reported that initially the plan was to pay cash but staff couldn't get the numbers to balance so we are proposing to shift these over to bonding projects.

- Outside CIP, Beyond 2020:
 - West & Industrial District Sanitary Sewer Repairs - \$250,000
 - West & Industrial District Sanitary Sewer Improvements - \$500,000

Recurring Projects & Equipment

- Street & Sidewalk Improvement
- Arterial Street Improvement
- Building Improvement
- Traffic Signal Improvement
- Urban Forestry Restoration
- Security System Improvements
- Police Cruisers & Mobile Data Terminals
- Community Wayfinding

- Small Equipment Replacement
- Computers
- Bike & Pedestrian Improvements

Mrs. Stewart moved on to talk about the 2016 Projects.

2016 Projects (page 12)

Legal Mandates

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| • Northbrook Relief Sewer Phase II | \$460,000 |
| • Central District Sanitary Sewer Improvements | \$500,000 |
| • Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvements (design) | \$141,600 |

Essential for Basic Services

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| • Street & Sidewalk Improvement | \$900,000 |
| • Arterial Improvements (Granville Road, East Corp. to West Corp.) | \$591,600 |
| • Building Improvement Program | \$50,000 |
| • Community Center HVAC Improvements | \$900,000 |
| • Traffic Signal Improvement Program | \$50,000 |
| • Fire Station Roof Replacement (design) | \$35,400 |
| • Community Center Running Track Replacement | \$27,000 |
| • Municipal Building Roof Replacement (design) | \$27,000 |

Ms. Michael noted with the Traffic Signal Improvements that she has received a number of request for audible signals across West Wilson Bridge Road from the Heights. Mr. Greeson confirmed that she was talking about pedestrian signals. He thinks that currently audible signals are only available on High St. Ms. Michael added that they also mentioned the design of the crosswalk. She asked that staff look at that.

Ms. Dorothy asked how long the city has had the legal mandates for the sewers. Mr. Watterson estimates that the mandates came down in 2007. The mandate states that the work be completed by 2025.

Mr. Greeson shared that the approach the city is taking regarding the mandates is to divide the community into basins, study each basin, identify projects, and then systematically construct what the studies show, which is what the EPA expects of us.

Ms. Dorothy shared that some municipalities are just now starting the legal mandates. They are just beginning to feel the pain of the lengthy and expensive process.

Improvements to Basic Service

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| • Urban Forestry Restoration | \$7,500 |
| • Security System Improvements | \$60,000 |

- Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington Galena (utilities & ROW) \$1,225,000
- Perry Park Field 1 Improvements \$70,000
- McCord Park & Heischman Park Playground Replacement \$300,000
- Tennis Court & Basketball Court Resurfacing \$137,500
- Community Center North Locker Room Shower Stall Alterations \$16,500
- SR-161 Study from SR-315 to Sawmill Road \$150,000

Mr. Greeson shared that in the last few months staff has had a couple of meetings with the technical staff with a variety of different entities that are interested in the St.Rt 161 corridor. Those groups include the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC), the Franklin County Engineers office, the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) – District 6, the City of Columbus and Perry Township. Perry Township, City of Columbus, and the City of Worthington jointly funded a traffic study that was conducted by MORPC. The purpose of that study was to ascertain the scope of that problem. It was to follow federal guidelines for collecting data, look at current congestion, project land use growth and other population groups in the corridor for over the next thirty years and then model what kind of traffic congestion will result. Then do some cursory analysis on size of improvements needed in order to accommodate some of the congestion that is occurring and is projected to occur.

Dr. Chosy asked what streets are being studied. Mr. Greeson replied St.Rt. 161 from Olentangy River Road to Sawmill.

Mr. Norstrom asked the cost of the entire study. Mr. Greeson replied that this one is estimated at \$600,000. Mr. Norstrom concluded that the city is paying 25% of the cost. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that one of the major intersections is in Worthington and we share the Linworth intersection but Columbus has the largest portion. The MORPC study showed what we all already knew in that Linworth/Olentangy River Road and the railroad are the critical areas. But all of those partners are putting some degree of money in. ODOT has agreed to administer the study but these kind of studies are typically locally funded and then we seek federal funding to do the improvements. So this would be called planning, engineering, and design and what it would result in, he believes, is a much more detailed analysis that included a great deal of public input, look more intensely at environmental impacts, right-of-way impacts, identify alternatives and arrive at a preferred alternative at the end of the process that the various bodies could consider and reach agreement on the improvement(s). Then funding would be sought.

Mr. Norstrom stated that he understands that. He doesn't understand why Worthington is paying 25%. He understands that we have two intersections involved but the real problem is the railroad. Columbus has a lot more interest in this than we have. Mr. Greeson agreed, which is why they are paying more.

Mr. Norstrom added that we are still paying 25%. He asked what Dublin is doing. Mr. Greeson replied that Dublin has no jurisdiction in the area being studied. Mr. Norstrom pointed out that the area impacts Dublin on the other side. Mr. Greeson agreed that they are creating impacts and not necessarily receiving.

Mr. Norstrom shared that he is concerned with Worthington paying 25%. Mr. Greeson wanted to talk about the process that we are anticipating moving forward.

Ms. Michael wanted to make sure that the railroads would be discussed as well as the intersections. The width of the road (how many lanes) might also be a topic. Mr. Greeson thinks they would have to look at everything. The reality is that the last time this corridor was studied was twenty years ago. None of that is valid today. He thinks all of that would have to be looked at again.

Ms. Dorothy thinks the study that was already paid for and received said that none of the alternatives were possible without doing something with that railroad crossing. Mr. Greeson agreed. He shared that the railroad crossing causes the intersection to fail, particularly at Linworth Road. When a train crosses, regardless of how many lanes there are, it blocks the road for a long period of time. He asked Mr. Watterson to comment.

Mr. Watterson reported that ODOT is refining the Scope of Services that they asked the consultants to provide in this study. Staff anticipates having their final draft in the next week or so. They hope to distribute the Scope of Services to consultants in February of next year so that would be the time to look at providing funding.

Ms. Michael asked who is in the cost share. Mr. Greeson replied Columbus, Perry and Worthington. He believes the parties will have to compete for possible MORPC funding. Typically these types of studies are funded locally but since it is a collaborative engagement they might consider it. He doesn't have the split committed to memory but he will get the split as well as find out where there may be additional opportunities to buy that down a little bit.

Mr. Norstrom said he would like to see the split with some factors, such as population. He thinks the intersections hurt us so let's look at population on this corridor say within a mile, north/south. Worthington doesn't have that much interest in anything west of Linworth, which is not where the problem is. Mr. Greeson noted that isn't the location of the problem. One of the things that MORPC studied depicted that most of the problem is east of McVey. He understands what Mr. Norstrom is asking. He shared that staff will try to answer these questions in more detail but he believes we will come back for a presentation in early December.

Mr. Norstrom asked if council has made a commitment yet on the percentage. Mr. Greeson replied only in that he said he would include it in the CIP and present it to council. But he thinks that they are moving forward based on the fact that all of the staff members participating said that they would start weaving it into the budget conversations. So they are becoming more production oriented in terms of drafting Scopes of Services.

Mr. Norstrom asked where are we on getting funds for the improvements in this corridor because at one time it was something like fifteen years out. Mr. Greeson that he doesn't know what improvements all of the communities would agree on. He thinks that is one of

the challenges. This is a big enough corridor that the project may be phased over time. We are at a very interesting place. The split is important but the question is are we prepared to begin seriously studying this corridor. Over a period of eighteen months there would be a great deal of community dialog and ultimately a discussion about a preferred improvement, which if history tells us anything will be hard to arrive at because of the variety of stakeholders, the varied interests, and the variety of uses. Then we would have to seek funding. It is a long road.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the more important issue that was just raised is whether this is an issue the city really wants to undertake. He asked if we really want to have an eighteen month battle on what to do when the major issues and benefits are going to be to Columbus and not us. Mr. Myers said he would modify that statement to say a thirty year battle going back and the first thirty years that he has lived in Worthington this has been a front of the mind conversation and it has had the exact same end every time.

Mr. Greeson commented that he sees a couple of things but ultimately it is an important policy consideration. We know that it is congested. We share responsibility to address that if we want to improve that over time. The area is our city's western gateway. Staff receives complaints from our citizens about it. He senses that we were not an equal partner twenty years ago but he thinks we were attendees at public meetings. He doesn't think we helped fund that study. He believes the city is a major stakeholder, an equal partner, and collaborator on arriving at a consensus preferred solution rather than it being driving by other jurisdictions.

Mr. Myers commented that his only point is that he doesn't think that consensus is possible. Mr. Greeson shared that there is a collaborative spirit around the table.

Mr. Norstrom stated that he understands a collaborative spirit but he doesn't think that we are anywhere close to being an equal partner with ODOT and Columbus. We may be at the table but when those two decide what to do, they will decide what to do. Mr. Greeson commented that ultimately council will have to approve consent legislation that authorizes construction within the city of Worthington.

Ms. Michael added that it will also raise the issue of how many lanes of traffic there should be through the city of Worthington from Linworth to StRt 315, which has been an aged old argument of whether it should be three or five lanes. Mr. Norstrom replied that council knows what that answer is. We have stuck with that answer for years and there is no reason to change that answer or no reason to put a lot of money to a study that might even come up with a change to that answer.

Ms. Dorothy would like to be at the table to make sure we move everyone through the intersection and not just prioritize vehicular traffic but looking at levels of service for all modes of transportation throughout that intersection and making sure we encompass bikes and pedestrians. It would be good to at least be at the table to make sure that becomes a priority for the citizens of Worthington.

Mr. Greeson stated that staff would have ODOT at a meeting in early December and talk more about the Scope of Services and get some of those questions answered. This is what the CIP is for. It is for council to set its priorities and determine where we want to invest our dollars. He thinks we have an opportunity to begin what he thinks will be a long evaluation of this area of our community but ultimately council will have to decide whether or not to do it.

Mr. Myers commented that he wanted to switch subjects. He shared that when our consultants came into MPC and talked about the Wayfinding package, they were projecting a budget of somewhere around \$350,000. As he reads the CIP, it looks like we will commit \$50,000 a year to that effort. Mrs. Stewart replied that this is actually piggybacking onto a 2015 allocation of \$120,000. Then it is \$50,000 in each year of the CIP to continue to roll out the Wayfinding program beyond 2015 and 2016.

Mr. Brown added that one of the things we saw when it came before MPC and that Council will see soon is that at least with that we are looking at the phases and knowing up front how much money we had to deal with in incoming years. In the original projection it was \$25,000 and after getting realistic numbers Mrs. Stewart went back and increased it to the \$50,000. The first \$120,000 was really to focus on our historic district as a starting point and then work our way out to the outskirts.

Mr. Myers asked how much of the \$120,000 was used for consulting work. Mr. Brown replied none. Mr. Myers concluded that the money is to just be used for signs. Mr. Brown agreed.

Mrs. Stewart continued:

Enhancement/Discretionary

- Community Wayfinding Signage \$50,000
- Wilson Bridge Corridor Enhancements (construction) \$800,000

Mr. Myers asked what the \$800,000 under the Enhancement line item will get us because the Scope that he has seen is probably ten times that amount. Mr. Greeson replied that he is not sure at this point. Mr. Myers commented that it would get us consulting and study dollars and maybe get started on utilities but that is about it. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that it might provide some match for grants. He thinks it is important for us to piece together where we see opportunities for leveraging these dollars in the TIF dollars in order to accomplish things in the near term as opposed to what has to be longer term strategy given our financial resources.

- Bike & Pedestrian Improvements \$100,000
- Community Center Game Room Conversion \$16,000

When asked by Dr. Chosy about the Game Room Conversion, Mr. Hurley shared that staff has had conversations for a while about taking this very prominent but underutilized space much of the time and transforming it into something else, possible for family and

child activities. Staff has been in ongoing discussions with the Parks and Recreation Commission to see if we can come up with something. These funds have actually come from our Revolving Fund, which is revenue dependent so one condition that we put on this idea that is taking some extra time is to come up with an idea that would positively impact either membership or something that would drive revenue to pay for it. We have had some discussions but have not identified that right idea yet. We will continue the discussions.

Mrs. Stewart reported that being the conclusion of the 2016 Projects. She briefly went through the projects for 2017 thru 2020 and highlighted major projects as follows:

2017 Projects (page 16)

Legal Mandates

- Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvement (construction) \$1,038,400
- North Districts Sewer Study \$175,000

Essential for Basic Services

- Street & Sidewalk Improvement \$900,000
- Arterial Improvements (Huntley Road, Granville to Schrock) \$425,000
- Building Improvement Program \$50,000
- Fire Station Roof Replacement \$295,000
- Municipal Building Roof Replacement \$225,000
- Community Center Natatorium Sprinkler Head Replacement \$66,000
- Fire Apparatus Bay Exhaust & Heating System \$126,000
- Upper Rush Run Stream Restoration (study) \$25,000

Improvements to Basic Service

- Urban Forestry Restoration \$7,500
- Perry Park Field 3 Improvements \$80,000
- Perry Park Path Improvement \$150,000
- Community Center Water Slide Refurbishing \$9,500
- Community Center Pool Underwater Lighting Replacement with LEDs \$7,750
- CBD Paver Renovation \$50,000

Mr. Troper asked if the water slide was a safety issue and has it ever been refurbished before. Mr. Hurley replied that it has been done one other time. It needs redone every five to seven years. Over time just waxing it does not do the trick so the surface needs to be refurbished to avoid rough edges. So it is a safety issue.

Enhancement/Discretionary

- Community Wayfinding Signage \$50,000
- Bike & Pedestrian Improvements \$100,000

- Alrojo/Samada Sanitary Sewers (design) \$63,750

Ms. Michael assumes the Alrojo/Samada Sewers are because the sewer work at the Montero subdivision will be completed. Mr. Watterson reported that the sewer has been constructed but has not yet been accepted.

Ms. Michael wondered why the wait until 2017. Mrs. Stewart commented that we have funding in 2017 with construction in 2019 by assessment however she believes the policy is that the city will wait for the residents who want that service to approach us. Because it is an assessment project it is a placeholder at this point pending the interest.

Ms. Michael thinks the residents need to know that the sewer services will be available in the not too distant future. She shared that while campaigning people were asking how soon they could get connected. She suggested a possible neighborhood outreach to inform residents of the availability. Mr. Greeson shared that the project will require rear yard easements in many cases.

Mr. Watterson commented that there are a number of things involved. An assessment project typically takes a full year to go through just the assessment portion of it. It is mostly constructed in the rear yard easement, which is necessary to be able to serve the houses efficiently. The other issue with this project is that there are still some houses that are located in the township. Those things all have to be dealt with and then the residents will have a substantial assessment. Ms. Michael thinks meetings to inform the residents should be held in 2016.

Mr. Norstrom asked the length of construction time for this project. Mr. Watterson replied that construction could be completed in one season. Mr. Norstrom commented that it sounds like it is about a year for design and the assessment process. Mr. Greeson added easement acquisitions as well.

Mr. Norstrom concluded that we are looking at 2017 or 2018 at this point. Mrs. Stewart shared that she thinks the anticipation was that if there was interest expressed, by the time we figured that out we would have design money in 2017 and then you would have to work on the assessment process and that may well take us until 2019 to actually have a construction phase.

Ms. Michael reported there being high interest out there but some that weren't interested.

Mr. Watterson shared that staff have shown the possible sewer layout to several residents in the area already. Ms. Michael again requested a meeting in 2016 with the residents.

2018 Projects (page 18)**Legal Mandates**

- North Districts Sewer Improvements \$500,000

Essential for Basic Services

- Street & Sidewalk Improvement \$900,000
- Arterial Improvements (Huntley Road, Schrock, WG Road to RR) \$190,000
- Building Improvement Program \$50,000
- Traffic Signal Improvement Program \$50,000
- Old Worthington Street Light and Mast Arm Rehabilitation \$250,000
- Community Center South End Roof Replacement (design) \$80,000
- Community Center Window Repl. (community & meeting rooms) \$25,000
- Community Center Fitness Floor Painting \$14,000
- Community Center Parking Lot Reconstruction \$325,000

Improvements to Basic Service

- Urban Forestry Restoration \$7,500
- Security System Improvements \$50,000
- Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington Galena (construction) \$7,200,000

Mrs. Stewart shared that the Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena Road construction project may slip from 2018 to 2019.

- CBD Paver Renovation \$50,000
- CBD Holiday Decoration Replacement \$45,000

Enhancement/Discretionary

- Community Wayfinding Signage \$50,000
- Bike & Pedestrian Improvements \$100,000

2019 Projects (page 21)**Previous Project Commitments**

- Hardy Way Sanitary Sewer Relocation \$100,000

Legal Mandates

- North Districts Sewer Repairs & Lining \$750,000

Essential for Basic Services

• Street & Sidewalk Improvement	\$900,000
• Arterial Improvements (High Street, South Corp. to South Street)	\$240,000
• Building Improvement Program	\$50,000
• Upper Rush Run Stream Restoration	\$250,000
• Community Center South End Roof Replacement	\$890,000
• Fuel Dispensing System and Tank Farm Replacement	\$350,000
• Community Center Locker Room Painting	\$9,500
• Community Center South End Door Replacement	\$70,000

Improvements to Basic Service

• Urban Forestry Restoration	\$7,500
• CBD Paver Renovation	\$50,000

Enhancement/Discretionary

• Community Wayfinding Signage	\$50,000
• Bike & Pedestrian Improvements	\$100,000
• Huntley Road Multi-Use Trail	\$300,000

Ms. Michael asked if there are any plans to add trail work from U.S. 23 along Wilson Bridge to Huntley. Mr. Greeson reported there being three opportunities.

- 1) *Wilson Bridge Road plan takes the trail from High St. to the railroad tracks.*
- 2) *Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena intersection project will require us to comply with the federal government's complete streets policy, which means bike/ped.*

Mr. Greeson stated that we will have to take bicycles and pedestrians through that intersection. It will probably go from the railroad tracks to the other railroad tracks on Huntley where the Busch crossing occurs.

- 3) *At the completion of those two projects, we won't be too far from Schrock Road, which is why staff put the item in the CIP for discussion.*

Ms. Michael shared that there might be some Clean Ohio Trails funding available.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she drives this way in her morning commute and she sees multiple people on the road in darkness now because it is dark when she goes to work and she thinks it is a huge safety concern. Currently there are no sidewalks at all on Huntley and no bike path or nothing for walkers and bikers. It is scary passing these people even doing 35 mph in the dark on Huntley. It is a huge safety concern.

Mr. Greeson commented that we can connect all of that and get to the bike lane system on Schrock that connects into the Westerville trail system it will be pretty significant.

Assessment Projects

- Alrojo/Samada Sanitary Sewers \$361,000

Need for Further Review

- Morning/Crandall Storm Sewer Improvement \$85,000

2020 Projects (page 24)

Legal Mandates

- West & Industrial Districts Sewer Study \$175,000

Essential for Basic Services

- Street & Sidewalk Improvement \$900,000
- Arterial Improvements (Wilson Bridge Road, Huntley to High) \$400,000
- Building Improvement Program \$50,000
- Traffic Signal Improvement Program \$50,000
- Community Center Window Replacements (art, pottery & childcare) \$26,000
- Oxford Court/Southwest Additional Sanitary Improvement \$300,000

Improvements to Basic Service

- Urban Forestry Restoration \$7,500
- Security System Improvements \$50,000
- East Granville Road Park Playground Replacement \$175,000

Enhancement/Discretionary

- Bike & Pedestrian Improvements \$100,000

EQUIPMENT

2016 Equipment (page 27)

Parks & Recreation

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Community Center Filtration Pump & Motor Replacement \$26,000
- ¾ Ton Pickup with Plow \$42,000
- Turf Mower \$19,000
- Community Center Fitness Equipment \$90,000
- Parks Minivan \$23,000
- Tractor with Loader \$30,000
- Cushman Cart \$14,000
- Portable Stage Replacement \$8,900
- Community Center Washer/Dryer Replacement \$7,500

- Griswold Town Hall Sound System Replacement \$5,000
- Griswold Tuller Lounge Furniture & Drapery Replacement \$11,000
- Irrigation System Software & Hardware \$10,000

Police

- Police Cruisers (2) \$83,500
- Mobile Data Terminals – Police \$15,000
- Tasers \$5,000
- Police Officer Ballistic Vests \$13,500
- Police Initial Issue Equipment \$19,500
- Printer/Copier \$13,000

Service & Engineering

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- 2 ½ Ton Dump Truck with Plow & Spreader \$165,000
- Suburban Replacement \$31,000
- Medium Duty Plow & Dump Truck \$160,000
- Ford Escape \$31,000
- Vapor Root Machine \$42,000
- Low-Boy Trailer \$8,000
- GIS Database Service, GIS Web Server \$29,000

Mrs. Stewart noted that the biggest problem with the dump trucks is rust due to the various chemicals used for snow and ice control.

Dr. Chosy asked the definition of a vapor root machine. Mrs. Stewart replied that it is equipment used for the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Watterson added that it is a machine that generates a foam herbicide that goes inside the sewer. That herbicide will kill the roots that are actually in the pipe.

Fire

- Firefighter Protective Equipment \$50,000
- Medic Vehicle Replacement \$235,000
- Turnout Gear Washer \$10,000
- Mobile Radios \$14,000
- Auto Extrication Equipment \$20,000
- Medical Decontamination System \$19,000

Administration/Information Technology

- Computer Replacement \$85,000
- Finance Server \$12,000

2017 Equipment (page 31)**Parks & Recreation**

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Community Center Fitness Equipment \$90,000
- Leisure Pool Play Structure \$95,000
- Griswold Copier Replacement \$11,000
- Griswold Fitness Equipment \$17,000
- Pool Filter Sand \$8,500
- Turf Mower with Trailer \$19,000

Police

- Police Cruisers (3) \$125,000
- Mobile Data Terminals – Police \$21,000
- Staff Car \$24,000

Service & Engineering

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Sign Shop Large Format Laser Printer \$30,000
- Service & Engineering Management & Operation System \$50,000
- ½ Ton Pickup \$31,000
- Leaf Vacuum \$60,000
- Bucket Truck \$165,000
- 2 ½ Ton Dump Truck w/ Plow & Spreader \$165,000
- Pickup Truck Replacement \$31,000
- Street Sweeper \$250,000
- Engineering Vehicle \$21,000

Fire

- Firefighter Protective Equipment \$50,000
- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000

Administration/Information Technology

- Computer Replacement \$85,000
- Municipal Building Furniture Replacement \$15,000

2018 Equipment (page 34)**Parks & Recreation**

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Community Center Fitness Equipment \$90,000
- ¾ Ton Pickup \$40,000
- ¾ Ton Pickup \$40,000

- Community Center Copier \$24,000
- Turf Mower \$19,000

Police

- Police Cruisers (3) \$125,000
- Mobile Data Terminals – Police \$21,000
- Furniture – Communication Center \$40,000

Service & Engineering

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- ¾ Ton Pickup \$40,000
- Leaf Vacuum \$60,000
- Wide Area Mower & Trailer \$60,000
- 2 ½ Ton Dump Truck with Plow & Spreader \$168,000

Fire

- Firefighter Protective Equipment \$50,000
- Fire Prevention Tablets \$3,000
- Self Contained Breathing Apparatus \$250,000

Administration/Information Technology

- Computer Replacement \$85,000
- Public Safety Hardware, Servers & Upgrades \$150,000
- Radios \$100,000

2019 Equipment (page 37)**Parks & Recreation**

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Turf Mower \$19,000

Police

- Police Cruisers (2) \$83,500
- Mobile Data Terminals – Police \$15,000

Service & Engineering

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Leaf Vacuum \$60,000

Fire

- Small Equipment Replacement \$5,000
- Medic Vehicle Replacement \$235,000
- SCBA Filling Station \$80,000

Administration/Information Technology

- Computer Replacement \$85,000
- Municipal Building Furniture Replacement \$10,000
- Radios \$100,000

2020 Equipment (page 38)**Parks & Recreation**

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000
- Turf Mower \$19,000
- Community Center Variable Speed Drives \$16,000

Police

- Police Cruisers (3) \$125,000
- Mobile Data Terminals – Police \$21,000
- In Car Video Equipment \$60,000

Service & Engineering

- Small Equipment Replacement \$15,000

Fire

- Small Equipment Replacement \$5,000

Administration/Information Technology

- Computer Replacement \$85,000

Mrs. Stewart concluded her presentation and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Myers stated that he had one request. He thinks Mrs. Stewart reported that we are currently carrying about \$6.7M in debt. Just by his math he thinks we were going to add about \$8.3M in debt over the next five years. He asked if someone could do a table or something for him so that the information could be broken out so that he will know how much debt we are carrying at the end of the five years. As he does it just sitting here, backing out what we are paying on the debt, we will end up five years out about \$11M in debt. Mr. Greeson thinks we will probably need to go out a little bit further than five years so members can see the ones that was refunded tonight that will drop off in 2021. Mr. Myers stated that he is trying to get us to 2021 because to him the real rub is around 2019/2020. Mr. Greeson agreed.

Mr. Myers commented that he is looking at the Wayfinding and the Wilson Bridge Road enhancements and we don't have the money for that because of that pinch point right now. He would just like to see how that plays out.

Mrs. Stewart replied that we have numerous detailed sheets that Mrs. Roberts has developed that we could share.

Mr. Myers and several other members requested the information.

Mrs. Stewart shared that obviously they are projections and assumptions have been made with interest rates and such. She expects that 2018/2019/2020 will be challenging CIP years because we haven't identified everything that we need to do in those years yet but we have that debt commitment.

Mr. Myers added that we haven't identified probably a lot of equipment that will need replaced in those years. He was here in 2010 and he doesn't want to do that again.

Mr. Greeson sees that as a key policy issue. Other members agreed.

Mr. Greeson commented that we have a lot of things that we want to accomplish and we have a lot of obligations that run parallel to those. Mr. Myers stated that much of what we are accomplishing are obligations. The sewers are taking a big hit out of us.

Ms. Michael stated that one topic that she didn't see in the CIP but members might want to think about looking at in some way is the train noise and quiet zones. She doesn't know if there is anything that needs to be done in the funding of that or if there are any federal opportunities. If we could get something with a quiet zone it wouldn't necessarily cost a lot of money but she doesn't know how it all works. She would like to revisit it again as it has been a number of years.

Mr. Norstrom commented that we went down that path and they are \$1M an intersection minimum. Mr. Greeson thinks that we would have to hire somebody to do the studies to evaluate what has to be done and figure out a solution.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Watterson what we tried to do with ODOT. Mr. Watterson replied that we looked at wayside horns. The difficulty was that the current gates are activated at a fixed location. In order to operate the wayside horns correctly they have to have constant warning time activation that accounts for various train speeds.

Mr. Norstrom recalls that we tried for a safety grant and were denied. Mr. Watterson and Ms. Michael agreed.

Mr. Norstrom asked the reason for the denial. Mr. Watterson replied that we did not receive a reason.

Mr. Greeson added that in and of itself was not a quiet zone. Mr. Watterson agreed. That was wayside horns that would be less overall noise but still some location would have as much or more than they had previously. Those would be fixed horns at the crossings rather than fixed horns on the open road. That became a million dollar project.

Ms. Michael commented that in order to have a quiet zone we would have to have a significant upgrade. Mr. Watterson replied that they would require significant highway improvements because the highway has to be constructed so that the gates can't be driven around. So it requires a median in the center of the road, etc. It essentially has to be constructed so that a motorist can't go around it. That interfered with local driveways and other issues. Ms. Michael shared that she has heard a lot about it as she was walking the neighborhoods.

Mr. Troper commented that he would like to see a summary and totals of the community center improvements by year.

Mr. Greeson had several additional announcements:

- 1) The Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena consultant has been selected by Council and is EMH&T. The city will be hosting an open house on that project on November 10th from 5:30 to 7:30 pm at the Worthington Education Center. Council will receive a public briefing at a later date.*
- 2) There is one change to the budget schedule. On November 2nd we will do the Parks budget and the CVB will be moved to November 9th at their request.*
- 3) Lastly, he committed to schedule a meeting with the Crandall Dr. residents regarding sidewalks and tomorrow he plans to send out a notice to all residents of Crandall Dr. addressing two issues:
 - a. One is the proposed change to the city's ordinances*
 - b. General information on how sidewalks work in the city (assessments, etc).**

Mr. Greeson stated that staff will announce that on November 2nd council will be discussing a proposed change to Session 905.08. We will also share that the decision council will make is whether to schedule it for future meetings or that council will be referring it to one of its advisory boards. This will be our vehicle announcing that council will be discussing the issue.

Mr. Greeson added that staff will be announcing a neighborhood meeting on November 18th meeting in the city council chambers where Mr. Watterson, Mrs. Fox and he will answer any and all questions related to sidewalks that people may have. Staff plans to do a presentation on how our code works and how sidewalks get done, etc. The time for that meeting has yet to be determined. He invited members to attend as well.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom commented that on Issue 38, Council has made it clear to the public that we do not support 60 days. We have also gone on record indicating that we have never supported anything that has been discussed regarding the Children's Home. Members have also gone on record saying that we want 30 days. Between now and the time that charter amendment will be voted on, which is November 3rd, he pledges that if we have to, he plans to table any motion dealing with zoning that has significant public concerns so that the public would have 30 days between now and the charter vote to consider

whether or not they want to gather signatures for a referendum. He would encourage his fellow councilmembers to do the same.

Mr. Norstrom explained his proposal in a different way to assist with clarification of his pledge and request.

Ms. Dorothy has a concern in that it takes a lot of time for someone to come to a council meeting and if they are expecting a decision to be made at one meeting and then they have to wait another week, they may not be available. She is concerned about how that would interfere with the process that we already have in place, dragging out the issue and having another week to consider it when members should have all of the information necessary to make a decision when it is presented. She noted that in certain instances members have tabled issues but she is concerned about tabling every single issue.

Mr. Norstrom clarified that he is talking about major changes in zoning in which there is some public concern.

Dr. Chosy asked if they would be able to utilize that time to start getting signatures. Mr. Myers replied no. He doesn't believe that signatures for a referendum could be collected until after the ordinance was pass. Mrs. Fox agreed.

Ms. Dorothy asked if it would help them in any way.

Mr. Myers stated that it would give them time to organize but not time to collect signatures. Most of the time it is the organizational time and not the signature time that is needed. He applauds Mr. Norstrom's suggestion but he really thinks that is a decision that has to be done on an issue by issue basis. He knows he can count on Mr. Norstrom if he thinks it is appropriate to move to table an issue and he thinks at that point he would consider it.

Ms. Michael agreed.

Ms. Dorothy would much rather have it be on a case by case basis and that is how we have been operating since she has been on council.

Mr. Troper agreed with Ms. Dorothy.

Mrs. Fox shared that any time we talk about rezoning, those are all due process requirements so we need to make sure that we follow all of those due process procedures for the property owner. She doesn't know that tabling it for seven days makes a difference but she would have to think through some of the impacts of it. She just wanted to make sure that council is aware that we can't just unilaterally extend those times out without considering some of those due process considerations.

Mr. Norstrom stated that due process can be public participation. Mrs. Fox clarified that she is talking about the due process rights of the property owner. Mr. Norstrom said he

understands that but as we have done on issues for MPC and ARB where we have not thought there was significant public notice, we have tabled the motion and gone to the next meeting. In this situation the same thing would apply if we feel there hasn't been enough significant discussion. We want to listen to the public.

Mrs. Fox commented that she would advise the Boards and Commissions and even Council if that were going to happen to at least have the applicants consent to the tabling for that reason and that usually happens and it takes care of the issue.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Employee Compensation and Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

Council recessed at 9:45 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to return to open session at 10:08 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
7th day of December, 2015.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President