Meeting Minutes

Monday, November 2, 2015 ~ 6:30 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, November 2, 2015, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 6:30 PM.

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: None

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 and Chief of Police James Mosic.

There was one visitor present at the start of the meeting. Approximately 50 visitors had arrived by 7:30 PM.

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

Policy Item

Operating Budget Workshop and Public Hearing

Ms. Michael introduced the budget workshops for the evening. Mr. Greeson asked Mrs. Stewart to provide the presentation for the Departments of Administration, Personnel, Finance and Law. Mrs. Stewart presented the following slides:

Core Services
Legislative & Clerk: City Council, Community Relations, WIFA
Mayor’s Court: Adjudicates misdemeanor cases
Administration: City Manager, City Clerk, Public Information
Economic Development: Formerly Development Services
Personnel: Health insurance, benefits, recruitment, testing, labor relations, discipline, performance evaluations
Information Technology: Computer systems, telephones and other electronic equipment
Finance: Accounting, financial management, budgeting, audit reporting, risk management, investments, income tax collections
Law Department: Legal services and advice, prosecutor

Slides were shown of the Organizational Charts for Administration, Finance and Law. There were no changes.
Mrs. Stewart noted that since City Council was aware of most of the 2015 objectives at the time they occurred, so she skipped over those items and highlighted the 2016 objectives.

Legislative & Clerk: Accomplishments & Objectives

2015
- Renovations to the Kilbourne Building & lease agreement with Sweet Carrot
- Financial incentives for the redevelopment of 350 W. Wilson Bridge Road
- Collective bargaining agreement with the IAFF
- Assistance for the redevelopment of 6600 N. High Street
- Established the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board
- Authorized five Re-CAP projects
- Approved redevelopment of the Masonic Lodge property
- Hosted delegation from Sayama, Japan
- Celebrated opening of Fresh Thyme Farmers Market store

2016
- Continue to strengthen and enhance community relations and awareness
- Conduct a City Council retreat to identify goals and priorities for next two years
- Sustain the efforts of the Community Relations Commission
- Continue to focus on the City’s Key Performance Areas

Legislative & Clerk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$12,681</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>12,683</td>
<td>13,748</td>
<td>13,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>12,817</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>23,119</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,048</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,248</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs. Stewart mentioned the 2015 budget for the first time had items such as employee benefit costs and utilities charged to each department, which explains why there is a notable increase in the charts between 2014 and 2015. There are not many changes between 2015 and 2016. The reduction in expenditures from 2015 to 2016 is due to the survey being funded in 2015. Mr. Norstrom asked why the change in funding for the survey for 2016. Mrs. Stewart responded it was not anticipated to be an annual survey, so we never planned to fund a survey in 2016. The funds have not been spent in 2015 due to dynamics in the community and in the organization, but staff anticipates capturing those funds to have them available to be spent in 2016.

Mrs. Stewart continued the presentation with a discussion of Mayor’s Court.

Mayor’s Court: Accomplishments & Objectives
2015
• Implemented use of Vehicle Registration Blocks to collect delinquent court costs
• Hired a new Deputy Court Clerk
2016
• Monitor changes in court software with intent to purchase new case management software
• Continue evaluation of Court functions and services
• Explore and evaluate traffic diversion programs

Reduction in the consultant’s line item related to funding in 2015 for a community survey.
Reduction in the contractual services line related to anticipated needs in 2016.
Funding & Expenditure Summary
Mayor’s Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$92,525</td>
<td>$100,233</td>
<td>$94,636</td>
<td>$97,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>14,410</td>
<td>30,039</td>
<td>30,221</td>
<td>31,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>22,008</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>31,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$128,943</strong></td>
<td><strong>$164,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>$153,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,445</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Stewart mentioned the fees associated with witnesses and jail keep have been down in recent years so the budget takes this into account by reducing the amount budgeted.

Mrs. Stewart moved on to the Administration and Economic Development sections of the budget.

Administration & Econ. Dev.: Accomplishments & Objectives

2015
- Implemented improvements to the Kilbourne Building
- Negotiated a lease with Sweet Carrot for half of the Kilbourne Building
- Provided grants and loans to five businesses through the ReCAP program
- Worked with Ohio Department of Transportation regarding communication on the I-270/US-23/SR-315 projects
• Negotiated incentives for the redevelopment of 350 W. Wilson Bridge Road and 6600 N. High Street

2016
• Successfully navigate and facilitate the redevelopment of the UMCH site
• Implement a smooth transition in key personnel changes
• Continue to provide frequent updates regarding US-23 and I-270 corridors
• Continue to build awareness of Worthington for economic development

Mrs. Stewart mentioned the transition to a new Economic Development Manager. The position is vacant and they hope to have someone selected by the end of the year.

Mr. Norstrom asked about the ReCAP program. Mrs. Stewart replied the program will continue. Due to needs in 2016, the funding is budgeted to be reduced from the 2015 allocation of $100,000 to an allocation of $85,000 in 2016, which includes $10,000 for the Neighborhood Design Center to continue the design services.

Mr. Myers asked about the language in the budget document that indicates the ReCAP funding is to respond to “approved funding requests”. Mrs. Stewart replied it must be a mistake in wording as there are not any approved funding requests. So there would be $75,000 for projects and $10,000 for the Neighborhood Design Center.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the City will receive funding back through loan payments. Mrs. Stewart responded that the City is receiving repayment of the loans. Ms. Michael asked if those funds go back into the program. Mrs. Roberts responded the funds to into the Economic Development Fund to support the expenditures in that Fund, which is the fund that supports the ReCAP program.

Funding & Expenditure Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs. Stewart noted there are no significant changes in the Administration area of the budget.

Mrs. Stewart moved on the Economic Development portion of the budget.

**Funding & Expenditure Summary**

**Economic Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$92,684</td>
<td>$94,538</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$96,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>17,950</td>
<td>45,461</td>
<td>46,868</td>
<td>48,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>5,232</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>43,600</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $115,866 $145,599 $365,468 $481,485
Mrs. Stewart noted there is an additional $38,000 in consulting services budgeted in anticipation of items that will occur in 2016. For the first time in two years, the budget includes a transfer from the General Fund to the Economic Development Fund to support the activities in that fund. In the last two years, the balance in the fund was sufficient to cover the anticipated and actual expenditures in the fund, but that is not the case for 2016. Ms. Michael asked if there are activities anticipated in 2016 that justify that increase. Mrs. Stewart responded yes and later in the presentation there will be discussion of the Economic Development Fund. As noted in this part of the presentation there is an increase in the allocation for economic development incentives due to commitments the City has made through the Venture Grant program. In recent years, phased payments over time have occurred rather than upfront payments. This funding also allows some flexibility for new incentives.

Mrs. Stewart moved on to the Personnel area.

**Personnel:**

**Accomplishments & Objectives**

**2015**

- Completed employment processes for four positions, a promotional process for one, and appointed two positions from existing lists
- Assisted with an RFP process for consultant services for health insurance consortium
- Completed health screenings for employees/spouses
- Initiated selection processes for four key positions

**2016**

- Revise Citywide Substance Abuse policy
- Provide citywide training on diversity, inclusion and harassment
- Partner with Healthy Worthington, Worthington Schools and Worthington Libraries on employee and community wellness initiative
- Review employment application processes
Funding & Expenditure Summary

Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$189,207</td>
<td>$221,776</td>
<td>$374,228</td>
<td>$276,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>2,344,695</td>
<td>71,995</td>
<td>62,376</td>
<td>60,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>26,306</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $2,560,208 $325,971 $469,504 $379,596

Mrs. Stewart noted the increase in the budget in the retirement pay line item due to the number of retirements anticipated in 2016 by longtime City employees. This is the area of the budget where we pay the cost of payouts of unused accumulated leave time.

Mr. Norstrom commented that last year benefits were moved to individual departments but the retirement payouts continue to be budgeted in this area, correct? Mrs. Stewart responded correct, the large amount in 2014 in this portion of the budget was due to the centralized payment of employee benefits. Those have now been shifted to the department budgets but the retirement payouts have not.

Mrs. Stewart moved on the Finance Department.
Finance:
Accomplishments & Objectives

2015
• Continued to monitor and maintain General Fund Carryover Balance
• Prepared 2014 General Purpose Finance Statements and financial trends report
• Integrated budget modifications related to program based budgeting
• Incorporated Income Tax Code changes required by changes in State law
• Participated in LEAN training
• Achieved uniform participation in the City’s direct deposit program

2016
• Continue reviewing criteria for submission to GFOA award program
• Continue to refine budget documents to capture program based budgeting concepts
• Maintain fiscal stability and monitor investments
• Continue to leverage technology by exploring electronic payment options
• Prepare 2015 GAAP conversion in compliance with new GASB standards
• Prepared for a strive to maintain current unqualified audit opinion

Funding & Expenditure Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$241,520</td>
<td>$277,447</td>
<td>$291,551</td>
<td>$305,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>36,665</td>
<td>149,436</td>
<td>157,426</td>
<td>167,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>1,082,046</td>
<td>1,096,800</td>
<td>1,101,800</td>
<td>1,111,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,362,845</td>
<td>$1,527,283</td>
<td>$1,554,377</td>
<td>$1,588,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs. Stewart noted there are no significant changes planned for the 2016 budget.

Mrs. Stewart continued on to the Department of Law.

**Law:**

**Accomplishments & Objectives**

**2015**
- Provided support for economic development activities
- Assisted with evaluation of a document management system
- Drafted regulations for containment of running bamboo
- Negotiated lease agreement with the Kilbourne Building tenant
- Assisted with selection of construction manager-at-risk for Kilbourne Building improvements
- Managed Community Center Roof Remediation litigation to settlement
- Gathered and compiled responses to significant public records requests
- Provided guidance in the draft of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor District code revisions
- Advised City Council and staff on the procedures and impacts of a proposed City charter amendment

**2016**
- Provide consultative services
- Assist with the selection of a charter review commission and provide advice throughout review
- Provide legal advice as needed regarding the UMCH property and the Wilson Bridge Road corridor
Funding & Expenditure Summary

| Law |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$173,800</td>
<td>$177,252</td>
<td>$181,653</td>
<td>$185,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>32,112</td>
<td>89,809</td>
<td>92,441</td>
<td>97,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>156,782</td>
<td>215,800</td>
<td>215,800</td>
<td>205,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$363,137</td>
<td>$483,661</td>
<td>$490,694</td>
<td>$489,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Stewart noted there are no significant changes planned from 2016. Ms. Michael asked if the contractual services are for outside legal counsel. Mrs. Fox responded, yes those are outside legal services.

Mrs. Stewart moved on the Information Technology.

Information Technology: Accomplishments & Objectives

2015
- Implemented new Fire Division reporting & management software
- Upgraded technology in City Council Chambers
- Installed video network for Community Center
- Upgraded EMS software
- Installed new computers in Planning & Building, and Parks & Recreation Department
- Deployed new modems in police, fire and emergency medical vehicles
2016
• Implement scheduled computer replacements
• Upgrade to new financial server
• Continue to roll out the document and agenda management system
• Complete the transition to a new Information Technology Manager

Funding & Expenditure Summary
Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$156,930</td>
<td>$209,946</td>
<td>$213,002</td>
<td>$221,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>23,951</td>
<td>101,773</td>
<td>119,956</td>
<td>127,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>80,485</td>
<td>98,500</td>
<td>123,500</td>
<td>127,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $271,781 $421,719 $467,958 $488,002

Funds allocated to accommodate new maintenance & support costs for new software (OnBase)
Removed funding for redesigned of City’s website

Ms. Michael asked if anyone is looking at the document retention schedule for how long documents have to be retained. Mr. Greeson said those are reviewed by the Records Commission twice per year. Mrs. Fox commented there is a Records Commission meeting coming up in the next month and they are constantly looking at the retention schedules for records. Ms. Michael suggested a review of the retention schedule with City Council at the Council retreat.
Mr. Myers asked if the 2016 budget includes a salary increase for the Information Technology Manager as it seems the amount is too low. Mrs. Stewart responded staff is in the process of evaluating the operation and what we want to achieve and how we can best achieve it. So the operation as well as the salary will be under review. Mr. Norstrom also noted a discussion about whether to contract out some of the services we provide in house. Perhaps we should budget for additional contract help. Mr. Greeson said staff is not prepared to make recommendations on those issues yet but will have more information as the budget process moves on.

Mrs. Stewart noted the Information Technology budget increases in 2016. The City’s new electronic document management system, Hyland’s OnBase, has ongoing maintenance and support costs that are added to the budget. Staff went through an evaluation process and selected the same system used by Worthington Schools so the City and Schools will share the same system and thus share costs associated with it. There will be appropriate separation of records for the two entities.

Last year, we projected budgeting for a website redesign in 2016. However, due to budget constraints, those funds are not included in the proposed 2016 budget. Ms. Michael asked when the budget was last redesigned. Mr. Greeson responded it has been about three years. Mrs. Stewart commented 2016 would put it at four years. Ms. Michael stated Old Worthington Partnership and the Convention and Visitors Bureau are talking about updating their websites and it might be good to coordinate with them. Mr. Greeson responded we could at least look to coordinate on graphics. The City uses a vendor that provides websites for many municipalities across the country so the back end of it may be different.

Mr. Norstrom stated he has a problem and doesn’t think the current website is sufficient. As we talked about better communications, we should consider finding funds to improve the website. Mr. Greeson responded the purpose of these meetings is to understand the items Council wishes to change and look for ways to accommodate them in the budget.

Ms. Michael commented she knows of residents want to be notified about certain topics and it’d be good to do that through the website. Mr. Greeson responded they can do that now. Ms. Michael suggested getting information out to people about how to do that.

Mrs. Stewart moved on to the Other Accounts section of the presentation which are parts of the budget that do not relate to a particular department. In some cases they are other funds outside of the General Fund.

2016 Proposed Operating Budget
Other Accounts (page 4-70)

Other Accounts

Dept. 1080 – Legal Advertising
  • Reduced slightly
Mr. Norstrom asked if the City is still required by either Code or City Charter to publish in newspapers. Mrs. Stewart responded yes. Mrs. Fox commented the City is required by Charter to publish notice of hearings on ordinances in the newspaper and required by Code to publish notices of meetings. Mr. Norstrom stated the Charter Review Commission could discuss whether to go electronic.

Dept. 1090 – County Auditor Deductions
  • Audit planned for 2016
Dept. 1100 – Board of Health
Dept. 1110 – Transfers
  • Transfer to Police Pension increased slightly
Dept. 1120 – Refuse Services
Dept. 1130 – Utilities
Dept. 1140 – Special Groups
  • Changed to a lump sum amount & increased from $60,748 to $110,748
Dept. 1150 – Contingency
Dept. 1170 – Lodging Tax
  • Budgeted according to Ordinance No. 37-2014

Mr. Norstrom commented on past discussion of legal decisions about the lodging tax being able to go to other organizations besides the Convention and Visitors Bureau. The City may not need to increase the funds by the $50,000 for Special Groups.

Dept. 1180 – Cultural Arts Center
Dept. 1212 – Police Pension
  • Increased from $610,000 to $650,000
Dept. 1414 – Law Enforcement Trust
  • Allocating $29,000 for equipment purchases
Dept. 8150 – MMVLT
Dept. 1616 – Enforcement/Education
Dept. 1818 – Court Clerk Computer
  • Budgeting funds for new Court computer software
Dept. 1919 – Economic Development
  • Slightly increased allocation for consultants (from $10,000 to $13,000)
  • Increased allocation for incentives from $150,000 to $305,000
  • Reduced funding for promotion(from $30,000 to $20,000)
  • Reduced funding for ReCAP from $100,000 to $85,000

Mrs. Stewart noted the increase in incentives is due to the Venture Grant program and existing commitments. Mr. Greeson mentioned in the last two years, there has not been a transfer from the General Fund to the Economic Development Fund since there was sufficient balance in the ED Fund. If these new appropriations are not spent, they will accumulate in the ED Fund balance. The reductions are made to try to offset a portion of the increases.
Dept. 2020 – FEMA Grant
Dept. 4010 – Special Parks
  • Allocating $55,500 to fund projects identified in the 2015 CIP
Dept. 2525 – Accrued Acreage
Dept. 5353 – Bicentennial
Dept. 6111 – Trunk Sanitary Sewer
Dept. 8110 – Capital Improvements
Dept. 8150 – County Permissive Tax
Dept. 9010 – General Bond Retirement
Dept. 1111 – Special Assessment Bond Retirement
Dept. 3333 – O.B.B.S.
Dept. 9020 – TIF/CRA Funds
  • Additional funds budgeted for TIF distributions as revenue becomes available in the TIF accounts

Mr. Troper asked about the electronic payments options referenced in the Finance Department budget and whether anyone is currently paid electronically. Mrs. Roberts responded “very few”.

Mr. Brown discussed the following slides related to his budget.

2016 Proposed Operating Budget
Department of Planning & Building

Division of Planning:
  • Land use planning and zoning
    – Administering the City’s Comprehensive Plan
    – Prepare reports and studies
    – Advise and provide staff to the following:
      • Municipal Planning Commission
      • Architectural Review Board
      • Board of Zoning Appeals
      • City Council

Division of Building Regulation
  • Issuance of building and related permits
  • Performance of building inspection
  • Provision of enforcement of the City building and zoning codes
  • Compliance with City Planning & Zoning regulations
    – Receive and review applications
    – Provision of staff support to Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), Municipal Planning Commission (MPC), Architectural Review Board (ARB) and City Council
    – Provision of enforcement of the regulations as necessary

An organization chart was shown for the Planning and Building Department.
Mr. Brown pointed out the three contractual arrangements. Plumbing inspections are handled by Franklin County. Electrical inspections are handled by Mike Kelleher. Don Schofield provides Chief Building Official reviews when Don Phillips is away from the office. We added a part-time Code Enforcement Officer this year, Chris Keppler.

2015 Accomplishments

- Masonic Lodge – Development – City Council approved a rezoning to allow for the conversion of the Masonic Lodge to 6 residential units; and the construction of 3 new residential units on E. New England Ave.
- Linworth Crossing – City Council approved the Final Development Plan & Subdivision to allow for the construction of two 20,000 sq. ft. commercial retail buildings at the intersection of Dublin-Granville Rd. (SR-161) & Linworth Rd.
- Code Amendment – City Council approved a Code Amendment defining Co-Located Child Day Care Center, Nursery School and Preschool, and providing for these to be considered a Conditional Use in a residential district.
- The Heights at Worthington Place – Building #1 with 93 units, pool, clubhouse, workout facility & 23,000 sq. ft. of Class A office space opened in May 2015.

Ms. Michael asked do you what the occupancy rates are with the apartments. Mr. Brown replied I don’t want to misspeak too much, the last time I checked was about 6 weeks ago and they were over 84% occupied, I usually ask what age group because I know in the first building was going through, the majority of those living in the apartments was 55 and older, but I can get some updated information and get that to you hopefully soon.

- FC Bank – ARB, MPC & BZA approved the redevelopment of 6600 North High Street to permit the construction of a new 18,500 sq. ft. two story bank headquarters to the north of City Hall.
- SNAP Fitness – MPC approved a Conditional Use for a fitness facility to operate in the northern portion of the first and second floors of the Worthington Hardware Store.
- Highline Coffee Co. – MPC approved a Conditional Use for a new coffee shop at 691 High Street in the former Care Uniforms store.
- Congregation Beth Tikvah – MPC approved a Conditional Use to operate an early childhood program at its facility at 6121 Olentangy River Road.
- McConnell Arts Center of Worthington – ARB & BZA approved a freestanding off-premise sign with changeable banners along West Dublin-Granville Rd. to assist in guiding visitors to the site and advertise special events.
- UMCH – MPC held a Special Informational Meeting on June 29, 2015 to hear a presentation by Lifestyle Communities concerning their proposal for the UMCH site. Approximately 350 residents attended this meeting at the Worthington Educational Center.
- Fresh Thyme Farmers Market – City Council approved the rezoning in 2014 to allow for the redevelopment of a site at 933 High Street to allow for the construction of a 30,000 sq. ft. grocery store and the demolition of two existing office buildings.
• Continued improvements to The Shops at Worthington Place, including new light poles and LED lighting on the site.
• Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Overlay and Zoning Districts – Draft language created to facilitate implementation of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study, which promotes redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed use area that will generate new economic growth within the City.
  – The Steering Committee has recommended the draft language to MPC for adoption.
• United Dairy Farmers – MPC and ARB approved the redevelopment UDF on their expansion and redevelopment of a key site at the intersection of Linworth Rd. and Dublin-Granville Rd. (SR-161) in coordination with the City of Columbus to construct a new 4,480 sq. ft. convenience store, gasoline pumps, ice cream parlor and outdoor patio area on the site.
• Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement Project – Further implement the streetscape recommendations found in the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study from the Olentangy River to the west to the Railroad Crossing to the east.
• Wayfinding Project – Wilson Bridge Road Corridor, Old Worthington & Citywide – Working with Studio Graphique and MKSK to implement wayfinding, which uses local landmarks, signage, pathways and environmental elements to help orient residents and visitors to the City of Worthington.
  – The system will accentuate the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor and downtown’s identity, as well as improve movement for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists throughout the City.

Mr. Brown showed several slides with numerous pictures of the 2015 Accomplishments such as the Masonic Lodge Re-Development, Fresh Thyme, FC Bank Headquarters, and Heights at Worthington Place

2015 Statistics
• Investigated 255 building code, property maintenance, and zoning complaints requiring 997 contacts through October 27, 2015.
  – Average case closure time is 69 days.
• 5% decrease in closure time.
• Administered 112 applications to the Architectural Review Board, 49 to the Board of Zoning Appeals, 50 to the Municipal Planning Commission and 16 to City Council through October 27, 2015.
  – Issued 37 Temporary Use Permits during this period.
• Issued a total of 1,293 permits, while conducting 2,727 inspections as of October 27, 2015.
  – 19% increase in since 2014
• Collected fees in the amount of $115,829.48 as of October 27, 2015 representing a valuation of $24,171,324.00.
  – 42% decrease in fees since 2014
  – 32% increase in valuation since 2014

2015 Statistics

• ARB – 89 (71)  * ARB – 112
• MPC – 52 (42)  * MPC – 50
• BZA – 49 (40)  * BZA – 46
• City Council – 11 (11) * City Council – 16

2016 Objectives
• Provide plan review, permit administration and field inspection for all construction projects regulated by the Ohio Building Code, the Residential Code of Ohio and City Codified Ordinances.
• Receive applications and provide staff support and enforcement for the planning, zoning and architectural review regulations.
• Conduct investigations and pursue enforcement where necessary for City regulations related to zoning, building and property maintenance.
• Adoption of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Overlay and Zoning Districts to further the implementation of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study.
• United Dairy Farmers – Expansion and redevelopment of a key site at the intersection of Linworth Road and Dublin-Granville Road (SR-161) in coordination with the City of Columbus.

Ms. Michael asked does that also include re-designing some of the intersection for some turning lanes. Mr. Brown replied yes, there will be some access point management, sidewalk, crosswalk and southbound from Linworth and left onto 161 improvements.

• UMCH – Review future development plans for the site and guide them through the rezoning process once the applicant has submitted their formal application.
• Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement Project – Implementation of the streetscape recommendations for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor from the Olentangy River to the west to the Railroad Crossing to the east.
• Wayfinding Project – Wilson Bridge Road Corridor and Downtown Worthington – Working – Implementation of the wayfinding recommendations.
• Continue to update and refine the current code to be in compliance with all adopted policies and plans.
• The Division of Building Regulation is pursuing a blanket permit process for projects to replace its system of building, electrical, mechanical, plumbing, and fire suppression.
Funding & Expenditure Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$378,276</td>
<td>$409,395</td>
<td>$421,229</td>
<td>$429,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td>59,681</td>
<td>176,136</td>
<td>201,432</td>
<td>210,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>95,258</td>
<td>96,850</td>
<td>106,100</td>
<td>93,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$535,579</td>
<td>$685,681</td>
<td>$736,711</td>
<td>$737,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Brown stated in the category of Contractual Services we do have some items (i.e. Chief Electrical Inspector) that we’ve contracted with since 1986 has been at the same fee since 1986; so he asked for an increase, so you’re going to see an increase in that line item of about a little over $6000. Under our Capital Equipment some of the increase you will see is related to the OnBase Management that Mrs. Stewart mentioned earlier, it will allow us to do some of our document scanning; currently in our office we can scan up to 11x17, so a lot of the larger maps we have to go outside of the office just to be able to scan and as you know probably 9 out of 10 documents that come before us usually is on large sized paper. Ms. Dorothy asked is there any thought into going to be able to accept digital plans; I know a lot of other Zoning and Planning people around the country allow for digital submissions. Mr. Brown replied I think this will help us move towards that and especially with what we can receive coming in our e-mail system, we will have to coordinate with our IT department.

Some of the other things you will see as increase under Personnel Services will be related to what we heard last year at the City Council retreat was related to actual training, not necessarily for staff, but board members so that Boards and Commissions members can received some in-house training and allow them to be able to go to various seminars.
Additional Questions From Council Members:

Mr. Norstrom asked regarding Additional Personnel Services can you discuss that because it’s gone from $60,000 in 2014 to $201,432 in 2016. Mr. Brown explained that a lot of that is related to conferences and training for staff and for Boards; we are now a staff of 6, all of us are certified which requires dues and subscriptions that have dues and memberships related to that, so there was a large increase in that, a lot of that was related to my subscription to APA which is the American Planning Association and the other part of it is with the Boards and Commissions is to offer training and education to the Boards and Commissions members, so for example we have ED411 that is coming up in December, so we would offer the Boards and Commissions members a chance to attend or some of the education components to the board members as part of continuing education. Hopefully in the coming months we will be able to do some in-house training for maybe like BZA, or ARB or MPC. So that is where you the bulk of the increase in the line item.

Mr. Norstrom asked so the $120,000 increase has to do primarily with. Mr. Greeson commented I think that’s the programmatic budget changes that you’re seeing. Mr. Norstrom asked what do you mean by that. Mr. Greeson replied it’s the allocation of the health insurance to his department. Mr. Norstrom asked is that in Personnel Services or Additional Personnel Services. Mr. Greeson replied that’s in Additional Personnel Services.
2016 Proposed Operating Budget
Parks and Recreation

Mission & Vision
It is the Mission of the Worthington Parks and Recreation Department to create community through exceptional parks, programs, facilities and events.

Structure

Parks
• 16 parks
• Approximately 208 acres
• 7 Full-time staff, an array of seasonal and contractual help

Community Center
• 71,000 square foot facility
• Serving center members, program participants, and event attendees
• 11 Full-time staff, many part-time and seasonal staff

Griswold Center
• Over 1,000 members
• Offering a variety of trips, programs, special events, and social services
• 4 Full-time staff, some part-time staff and as many as 300 volunteers

Mr. Hurley showed an organizational chart for the Department of Parks & Recreation

Our Department’s Vision is to:
• Provide safe, family friendly environments.
• Be a leader in customer service.
• Provide exceptional maintenance and cleanliness.
• Lead in community health and wellness.
• Provide innovative parks and recreation.
• Be positive people providing fun interactions.
• Strive for sustainable practices.

2015 Accomplishments
• Facilitating a Parks Planning process with the Parks and Recreation Commission to lay the groundwork for a Park Planning Document for the City to guide future park improvements. We were hoping to have this completed in 2015, but as we really got into it, we probably looking more at 2016 to make sure all the details and thoroughness is covered. We are anticipating have that to you in the first half of 2016.
• Led the formation of an on-going Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board and began monthly meetings. Also, helped guide initial projects including a trail head at the Olentangy Trail and the downtown mobility study.
Ms. Michael asked have we included the parks study which was the parks survey. Mr. Hurley replied yes, if you saw my Park and Talk Survey effort that went over this summer. Ms. Michael asked are we going to receive a copy of the results. Mr. Hurley replied yes you will, they will be part of the report.

Mr. Hurley indicated that the Park and Recreation Advisory Board have had 3 ongoing meetings; we’ve really got involved with the Stafford and High discussion right off the bat; but we’re still going to be organizing and goal setting as we approach the end of this year and the beginning of 2016 and get them on track in terms of moving forward and having a plan in place.

- Renovated Perry Park diamond #2 as the first of three ball diamond renovations to upgrade aging facilities and fields to enhance playing conditions for residents and guests.
- Completed an upgrade to the Parks and Recreation Software system, improving overall customer service, registration and membership transactions, reporting opportunities, and communication with users.

Ms. Michael stated currently if you do an online registration there is an additional fee charge, asked are you going to do that with everybody, because if you register in person you pay less than the person who registers online. Mr. Hurley replied you will no longer be penalized for registering online; that is how our current system is set up and so now it will no longer work that way. To me we should be encouraging our people to register online because it requires less staff resources to do so.

Health and Wellness Initiatives
- Rush Creek Historical Wellness Walk
- Buckeye Battle Fitness Challenge
- Senior Health & Fitness Fair

We are also forming partnerships more recently with Healthy Worthington and the WalkWorthington groups that are here in town and looking to roll out some additional things especially with the WalkWorthington effort starting this winter indoor at the Community Center and then to into the summer.

2015 Highlights and Events
- Joe Blundo visited the Griswold Center, Concerts on the Green had a successful summer, and a certain stuffed tiger name Whiskers made the news!

Fun Facts!
- The Parks and Recreation Department schedules and posts over 100 Village Green signs every year.
- 1,375 street trees are pruned every winter. The city is divided up into quadrants so we will get to every tree at least once every four years.
• Selby Park was voted Worthington’s most favorite park in 2015 through an online voting contest.
• The Community Center offers 20 different styles of group fitness classes, with over 60 classes a week.

Ms. Michael asked if someone is concerned about a street tree that is covering a stop sign, asked do they call Parks & Recreation or the Service department. Mr. Hurley replied either one, and we’ll take care of it.

2016 Objectives
• Assist with the organization of the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board in their first full year of existence to maximize their assistance in furthering the Bike and Pedestrian goals of City Council including setting goals and objectives, updating the initial recommendations of the Steering Committee, and making specific CIP recommendations to City Council prior to the approval of the 2016-2021 CIP process.
• Complete the second of three phases of field improvements at Perry Park to upgrade aging facilities and fields to enhance playing conditions for residents and guests.
• Finalize the Parks Planning Document being put together by the Parks and Recreation Commission to present it to City Council for adoption including a list of prioritized park improvements for consideration.
• Make recommendations to City Council regarding HVAC improvements to the Community Center to address on-going issues and to increase energy efficiency moving forward.
• Complete playground renovations at McCord and Heischman Parks to replace the current structures that are over 20 years old.

Mr. Troper asked regarding renovation at both parks how do you survey residents in what they would be interesting in having for the parks. Mr. Hurley replied our typical process is to do some sort of a neighborhood survey; when we did Indianola Park we did a survey monkey and kind of formulated those results and then had a public meeting where people could come to it if they didn’t participate in the survey or just kinda wanted to see some things and in that case we would bring some drawings of playgrounds and amenities and get their feedback.

So to answer your question, yes there will be an opportunity for public input. Usually we try to gain some initial information so we can create a couple of designs and then we have which one of these do you like and why as a second step in that process.
Mr. Troper stated I saw that there is a vendor food sign at the Rec Center, asked how is that going and is there a long term plan for food service. Mr. Hurley explained we have just a temporary agreement with a food vendor The Little Red Inn Kitchen. They had the concession agreement with the pools this summer, she approached us about if people would ever buy food at the community center like when parents are there in the evening with their children for swim lessons or what not. The menu is a healthy food selection and so we signed a temporary agreement just because we would like to have the data to
see if it’s something would like to bid out and do; it would be no cost to us, so we’re getting a percentage of what she sells and she would just be there a couple nights a week to give us an idea.

Funding & Expenditure Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,215,442</td>
<td>2,313,074</td>
<td>2,365,500</td>
<td>2,429,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>345,879</td>
<td>925,604</td>
<td>945,329</td>
<td>992,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>229,888</td>
<td>239,810</td>
<td>248,710</td>
<td>252,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,329</td>
<td>66,700</td>
<td>66,700</td>
<td>67,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>306,966</td>
<td>952,580</td>
<td>944,385</td>
<td>949,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,160,504</td>
<td>$4,497,768</td>
<td>$4,570,624</td>
<td>$4,691,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Revolving Fund</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Approved 2015</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Forecast 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>446,396</td>
<td>404,300</td>
<td>418,265</td>
<td>428,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,641</td>
<td>71,964</td>
<td>75,336</td>
<td>77,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,109</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving</td>
<td></td>
<td>246,725</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$769,871</td>
<td>$951,264</td>
<td>$968,601</td>
<td>$984,461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Hurley stated I have a pretty flat budget this year; there’s about $16,000 worth of increases if you do not count the cost of living increases to existing staff and $8000 of that is the contractual cleaning of the Community Center which I’ll be talking with you about later on this evening; we have the ability to renew that on a three year basis, so we’ve held that same price for three years, and I’ll be asking your permission to bid that out this evening. Otherwise they are pretty minor increases around the typical supplies and things that have increased from a cost of living standpoint.

Mr. Hurley went on to further say I do plan to talk with you about cost recovery of the department and both centers when we go into our fee discussion a little bit later on. So I am prepared to talk with you about our cost recovery as a department and the individual centers.

Ms. Dorothy asked about the 4.5 million for 2015 is that the cost of your whole department, all the parks throughout the city and then all the events. Mr. Hurley replied
our budget breaks into Parks, the Community Center, the Griswold Center and then we have an administration that’s mostly me and a few of our support secretaries and so forth; and that is what that number represents.

Mr. Norstrom asked what is the revolving fund. Mr. Hurley replied the revolving fund is our programmatic where the expenses match the revenues so that would include classes at the Community Center, summer camps, personal training, things of that nature both at the Community Center and the Griswold Center.

Reports of City Officials

Discussion Item(s)

- Request for changes to the Codified Ordinances (Sidewalks)

Mr. Greeson explained that City Staff sent out a notice to all Crandall Drive residents announcing two things that we had been receiving a lot of questions about; (1) the notice of this discussion, and (2) the notice of a meeting that is more general in nature (this meeting will be held on November 18th here in the Council Chambers); this will be a general forum for Crandall Drive residents just to talk about sidewalks, really anything and everything that you might want to ask about them; you’ll hear a presentation from Mr. Watterson; Mrs. Fox and myself will also be available to answer any questions. The purpose of tonight’s discussion is really to briefly overview a cursory analysis that our Law Director did of Codified Ordinance change that was requested or recommended by a group of residents.

The City Council doesn’t always receive proposed code changes from residents, so you don’t have a formal rules committee like a state legislature might or a committee that has the responsibility of deciding how you want to handle proposed code changes; so the purpose of tonight is to receive direction from the Council after you’ve received a cursory analysis from Mrs. Fox and probably some public testimony, where we want your
direction on what to do with this proposed legislation. Do you want to assign it to be considered and reviewed and receive recommendations from one of your committees such as the Planning Commission or the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board. Do you want further analysis to be done by staff and have it scheduled for a more formal discussion and ultimate public hearing before the City Council or do you want to do nothing and not consider it at all. There are a variety of options that are before you on how you might want to process a piece of proposed legislation.

You will not be able to (because this has not been advertised as a public hearing or introduced as legislation) they are not able to enact legislation related to sidewalks this evening, so no law can be made tonight, no final decision can be made tonight on how sidewalks or the laws related to sidewalks work in Worthington; this is really trying to figure out what do we want to do with this proposal; how do we want to process it in the government system here. I’m going to turn it over to Mrs. Fox who is going to give you a brief overview of her memorandum, and then we will turn it back to you President Michael to direct us from there.

Mrs. Fox stated we were approached by some residents of Crandall Drive several weeks ago, who had indicated they were interested in proposing some code changes and following that meeting we did receive some code changes from the neighbors with some highlighted portions or sections as well as some explanation by the residents as to why they were proposing these changes. Currently and just very briefly under our current code, if at least 51% of the owners on a block petition the City for sidewalks, the City is obligated to pay the cost of the design of the sidewalks, the cost of putting the project out for public bid, the cost of appointing and administering an Assessment Equalization Board, and 50% of the cost of the construction of the sidewalks. Any cost not borne by the City is to be assessed against the properties, apportioned on a lineal footage basis and repaid by the owners either within 60 days, or by special assessment with annual payments made over five years.

These sidewalk provisions have been part of the City’s code since 1995 and were enacted by Council as a measure to encourage the installation of sidewalks within the City where they did not exist. The original language followed the state procedure by requiring at least 60% of the owners’ consent by petition to install sidewalks. Because no petitions were received by the City, in 2002 that percentage was lowered to 51%, in an effort to increase the likelihood that a sufficient number of residents would petition for sidewalks. It is reported that still no petitions have been received under this method.

Certain residents on Crandall Drive have been in favor of sidewalks, but a petition that meets the requirements of our code has not been submitted. The request is made to Council to consider the proposed code amendments so that it may be easier for residents to meet the requirements for sidewalk installation. A summary of those code changes is as follows:

- **Change the area of sidewalk installation from a “block” to a “neighborhood”**.

Under the current code provisions, if at least 51% of the owners of a block
(defined as one side a public street right of way between two intersecting public street rights of way) petition the City for sidewalks, the obligation of the City to install the sidewalk kicks in.

The proposed change would alter that area defined as a “block,” and instead use the number of owners within a “neighborhood”, to mean “a set of streets defined by boundaries on all sides, as designated by the petitioning property owners.” The reason for the change as stated by the residents is to allow homeowners to petition as a group rather than on a block-by-block basis. They acknowledge that the term “neighborhood” should be used as a placeholder until a more appropriate term can be derived.

Analysis

It is important when administering an assessment project that the property owners to be assessed can be identified with specificity. Assessments are rooted in the due process rights of the Ohio Constitution, so we have to be careful in how we’re analyzing who is being assessed and how they’re being assessed. So this block versus neighborhood concept, we just have to be careful that we are defining who is going to be assessed with some clarity rather than maybe defining that area on a case-by-case basis. I think it’s important because not only are we dealing with a particular neighborhood on Crandall Drive, it has to apply to the entire city, so I think we have to be careful on how we’re trying to define that; if the area needs to be expanded or broadened, that’s one thing, but I’m not sure if we change how that area is defined on a case-by-case basis, I’m not sure if that would ultimately be considered valid, but I think it just depends on how that’s worded.

Mr. Myers stated as I read 905.08(b)(1) this allows the petitioner to define what a neighborhood means. Mrs. Fox replied under the change that is the way I would read that.

- Amend the obligation of the City to pay 50% of the cost of construction to “at least 50%”. They want to change it to read at least 50%. My opinion is that the City is able to install sidewalks on its own without an assessment project. I believe that the City has the ability to pay more than 50%, I think we’ve done that in a lot of other assessment projects, paid a larger share, not necessarily on sidewalks, but on other types of assessments. So I don’t see a problem necessarily adding those words to clarify that language. I’m not sure it changes the meaning as far as I’m concerned, but I don’t see a problem with that.

- Allow for the apportionment of the assessment to be made on a “per property owner” basis. Under the current method owners of lots are assessed on a per lineal foot basis. This is probably the easiest way to get to the special benefit we are required to get to under the Constitution. We do it on a per lineal per
foot basis because we can generally say that if a lot is wider, the value maybe is higher, the benefit is greater, I think that is the most common method of apportionment that we see not only in municipalities, but statewide. There are three different ways under the state code to apportion: (1) based on tax value; (2) based on the amount of benefit that is being received; (3) per lineal foot. So I think that’s another one where we just have to be careful. I think in the Crandall Drive neighborhood, the lots are probably fairly even, but they might not be the case in other parts of the city, so I think when we do this on a lineal foot basis, it’s the best way for us to capture the benefit that these residents are deriving to the extent that they believe it’s a benefit. So again, I think that’s another where I think we just need to be careful how we’re doing it. If parties believe that even on the lineal foot basis they are being treated unfairly, that’s when the Assessment Equalization Board kicks in where they can determine whether those assessment amounts have been allocated fairly.

- Increase the repayment term from five to ten years. Property owners have a choice under our code to repay the amount charged within 60 days, or to have the amount assessed and repay in annual installments over 5 years.

In order to increase the affordability of the project to the property owners, the proponents suggest extending the payback period to ten years.

Analysis

The change does not have any legal effects. City-initiated assessment projects under the Revised Code require a repayment period of no longer than 10 years. Whether to require five or ten is more of a budgetary consideration than legal.

Ms. Michael asked if Council members had any comments before opening the floor up for public comments.

Ms. Michael explained that one of the things that was in our memo in the City Manager’s packet was for us to take a look at what we wanted to do; there are a list of possible actions that were listed in the memo that range from: a) choose not to consider the proposed change; b) introduce the New Legislation and schedule it for a Public Hearing; c) refer the legislation to an Advisory Board or Commission (such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board or the Municipal Planning Commission); d) appoint a special task force or committee to review this specific proposal, or e) decide to continue the discussion regarding this matter to a future time.

Mr. Myers commented I would like to hear from the people who have come speak. There are a couple of issues that I think the group recognizes with the proposal, so I think introducing it for public hearing would probably result where we would have little choice but to vote it down. I think the issue of allowing the petitioners to define what the law applies to probably has some equal protection issues. I don’t know enough as I sit here
today about public benefit from assessment. I’m not in a position tonight to make that
decision, I don’t know if I will be in a position in two weeks after public hearing to make
that decision. I think it needs a great deal of more flushing out than what we can do in
this body. So regardless of who we would refer it to, I think those are questions that need
to be answered and I would like to hear from the proponents as to what their thoughts
are on those questions. They themselves point out at least one of the issues.

VISITOR COMMENTS

Kate Wilson, 207 Crandall Drive, thanked Mrs. Fox for her analysis of our proposal;
your points are clear and reasonable. I would like to ask a few questions to make sure I
understand some parts correctly. First regarding the definitions of the block versus
neighborhood; I’m sure you understand the dilemma we face with the block definition; it
presents the opportunity for sidewalks to be built to nowhere; if consecutive blocks don’t
reach sufficient support, we believe that these sidewalks to nowhere would not serve our
neighborhoods or the City of Worthington’s best interest. I understand that we need a
specific definition; asked do you feel a suitable definition could be written to contemplate
multiple consecutive blocks as a single unit. Mrs. Fox replied I think it just has to be very
clear and it has to be something that’s codified though it’s not on a case-by-case basis, I
think the block definition was raised because it’s a very easy area to define. I’m not sure
if you’re interested in 51% by block or if you’re interested in 51% as a whole because
they may change your ability to get a majority the whole versus a block-by-block. I think
one of the other considerations and again this is probably not a legal consideration, it’s
more a financial consideration, but if Crandall Drive was defined as a very very large
area with a 50% commitment by City Council, that could be a very very large number, so
it maybe also to your advantage to have a block-by-block analysis to be able to get things
done more financially feasible for the City as well; so I think that if we can come up with
the definition; the whole point of this was to try to encourage the sidewalks to be built,
and maybe taking it into smaller chunks was a way to accomplish that, but I think we
should be open to trying to see if there is a more definitive area that can be defined.

Ms. Wilson commented from our standpoint there are concerns that well we invest in our
block but that goes nowhere, no one wants to invest in the sidewalks that go nowhere,
and so that is where we were coming from with that proposal. I agree we need to come
up with a more suitable definition. My last question is also regarding the term of
assessment and the percentage contribution of the City; am I correct in understanding
that the current Ordinance would allow for 10 year assessment and greater than 50%
contribution because our understanding from City Management was that these numbers
were fixed at five (5) years and 50%. Mrs. Fox replied as I was looking through all of this
and the state code, as a charter municipality if we have a code provision that’s what we
have to follow, so long as it doesn’t conflict with the Constitution; but we’ve left
ourselves open in our code to allow us to implement the procedures of 729 in the Ohio
Revised Code which is the City Initiated Assessment Projects, so if we didn’t have this at
all, the City could come in, budget for and build a sidewalk and assess the neighborhood
up to 80%, 90% or 100% of the project; but because our Code requires the City to pay at
least 50% I believe that we at least have to try to match this up with the state code. I
would think that we couldn’t burden our citizens more than what the code already provides, but I think we’re able to burden ourselves, the City can always have the opportunity to burden itself more than burdening the residents, because we have the ability to go in and do that project on our own at our entire cost if we want to, so I think we have the ability to burden ourselves more. I don’t think we could burden the residents more unless they initiate a totally different procedure.

Mr. Troper asked where we say amended to pay at least 50% and then how would residents know how much we would be willing to pay unless we set a specific number. Ms. Wilson commented the exact words we used were “no less than.” Mr. Troper I understand that, but if we’re saying “no less than” maybe we want to pay more for a spot over here, but less over there, so how someone know in advance. Mrs. Fox replied someone would not know that in advance and I think that’s typically how the City has done on past assessments, they’ve looked at them on a project by project basis. Mr. Myers commented in my mind if you’re going to say Alright, we’re going to pay 80% for those seven (7) houses and 50% for those 14 houses that’s a problem. Mr. Troper stated someone might say sidewalks are needed more here, so we’d be willing to pay more money to put them in there as opposed to saying well we don’t thing sidewalks are a priority there, so we’re not going to spend as much money to put them in over here. Mr. Myers replied and then the people that don’t get as much money sue us because someone else got more money and that’s one of the issues I have with not only delegating to the citizens how we define what the law reaches, but then apportioning the benefit equally amongst parcel; one parcel, one bill as opposed to someone who has 40 feet of sidewalk is assessed exactly the same amount as someone who has 10 feet of sidewalk and that’s kind of what I’m hearing you (Mr. Troper) say. Mr. Norstrom remarked that’s not what he’s saying. Mr. Troper commented that’s not what I’m saying. Mr. Myers said what he’s saying is if sidewalks are more important here, we pay more money for those. Mr. Norstrom remarked I don’t see anything legally wrong with that, but I’m not a lawyer; the fact of the matter is we make priorities on where we put public investments all the time.

Mr. Myers explained now you’re talking about something very different; you’re talking about allocating capital budget not acting on a petition for an assessment for sidewalks. Mr. Norstrom replied that is correct. Mr. Myers stated if we have a petition from neighborhood A and a petition from neighborhood B under the same statute and we say neighborhood A we’re going to give you more money than we are neighborhood B, even though we’re reviewing under the same statute with the same terms, then we have a problem. Mr. Norstrom remarked oh no, because we could set up what the priorities were, for example: if it’s a sidewalk that school kids would be using to get to a school that doesn’t have a sidewalk now, we could say that’s a higher priority than just connecting some neighborhoods. Mr. Meyers remarked and then we would have to change more of our code than what’s required here because our code is set up so that an apportions cost per benefit, not per overall need, but per benefit.

Ms. Dorothy commented if we really think that we need some safe routes to school, we could also just pass legislation to have that done without a petition, is that correct. Mr.
Myers replied yes that is correct, we do it ourselves and it removes it from this statute, it’s a whole different discussion because now it’s our money; but if we do it under this statute we have to apply it equally to all people, that’s the Equal Protection clause of the Constitution. Mr. Norstrom replied I don’t think (and again not being a lawyer) but if we have priorities established and a neighborhood says we will pay, we will tax ourselves and pay to do that because based on the priorities you’re going to assess only 30% or 20% rather than 50%.

Ms. Michael said one of the other things that we have to take into account also as we define things and how large is the Capital Improvement Budget; asked even if we have an assessment project would the city’s portion come out the Capital Improvement Budget. Mr. Greeson replied yes. Mr. Norstrom commented I don’t think how large our budget is has any reference to this; it’s a priority of where we want to put our money with competing interest. Mr. Myers asked we are required to act on a petition, are we not. Mrs. Fox replied yes under this code. Mr. Myers said so if the petition prevails we build the sidewalk. Mrs. Fox replied yes. Ms. Dorothy asked would anyone else be able to referendum that petition or is the petition once it’s deemed valid we would have to go through with it. Mrs. Fox replied you can’t referendum the petition, but an Ordinance appropriating dollars perhaps could be referendum, but not the petition itself.

Matt Erickson, 278 Crandall Drive, shared I am here again in support of sidewalks on Crandall Drive. I’m here to encourage City Council to move forward. I state this because we’ve been moving forward with this initiative for quite some time. I think the residents of Crandall Drive that is in support of this have worked with City management and City Council to look at some measures to make this more amenable to our neighbors and specifically I would urge inclusion in the upcoming CIP that I think Council is probably going to consider in December. Please recognize one of the biggest drivers for the amendments to the Ordinance that we submitted was to make this more amenable to our neighbors, we do have a petition with language prepared to circulate; we know that cost is the single biggest driver for those who are either unsure of supporting this or opposed to this. We can tell our neighbors what we believe is the minimum obligation that they are going to assessed; we would like to be able to them that City Council has committed additional support either through operating or potentially through the CIP. With respect Mr. Myers, I think the egalitarian methodology for assessing the cost is wholly appropriate for an initiative like this; I look at sidewalks as a public good. I think in the spirit of being good neighbors our intention in doing so was that if we were going to ask our neighbors to bear a certain cost, a certain burden, that I’m willing to share an additional burden for those who are going to be potentially harmed more if they have a wider lot, if they are potentially going to incur a greater cost. I appreciate your consideration.

Dr. Chosy stated I have driven along Crandall Drive several times and in particular I recall on the western end of it there is some very attractive landscape which would be required to be removed for sidewalks and leave behind a relatively small front yard. Even though I understand children walking to school, I’m not hearing anything about some
people who just may not want to do it. Let me make this clear I have not drawn any conclusions.

Barbara Patrick, 334 Crandall Drive, stated that Crandall Drive is a beautiful neighborhood, it’s all mature landscaping, we raised two children and have never felt the need for sidewalks. We have a neighbor across the street from us who has lived on Crandall for 50 years, and there’s many of us who have been there for many many years, raised our families, the children have safely to and from school, we taught them to ride their bikes safely and to walk safely along the street and we have never felt the need for sidewalks. I understand that some residents have a different point of view, and that’s certainly okay. We feel that it is a huge majority of people who do not want sidewalks, we feel like it would be destroying the neighborhood. My viewpoint is that we really don’t need them and we really don’t want them. We feel resentful that a small number of people can come and force us to have them and then on top of that force us to pay for it.

Jessica Schmidt, 75 Crandall Drive, stated I am a fairly recent resident to the Crandall Drive neighborhood, my house is the first one on the right side of Crandall coming from High Street; the southwest lot that has very lovely landscaping; we have one of the largest linear footages and I just want to make sure that I’m heard that I am also in support of the sidewalk initiative. I have a 2½ year old who will be walking down to Wilson Hill Elementary in a couple of years and I don’t mind at all to have my landscaping changed to afford sidewalks for the better good of the neighborhood.

Mr. Troper commented there is a proposal to share evenly or you have the larger lot to pay more. Mrs. Schmidt replied I’m okay either way; I want sidewalks for everyone’s use.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Watterson you’ve inspected the Crandall Drive landscaping, can you give us some insight about what would need to be taken down to accommodate sidewalks on either side, if anything. Mr. Watterson commented all of the driveway approaches would need to be reconstructed, there wouldn’t be any that would be able to be reused; for purposes of a cost estimate, I had included removal and replacement of 25 trees, there may be some bigger trees that there could be some accommodations like sidewalk going around the tree or possibly sand and pavers as opposed to poured concrete. Those type of details would need to be dealt with as the project is designed. There is at least one retaining wall that would need to be reconstructed and there were several landscape areas with stone ornamentation and things like that which would need to be adjusted.

Steve Kirk, 253 Crandall Drive, stated I have chance to take a look at the redline document and when you parse it out section by section the first thing I address overall is that this is entirely a separate issue between Crandall and changing the Ordinance that is citywide, it effects all the citizens of Worthington. My personal opinion is that any change to an Ordinance should be adopted by referendum; I think it should be done by popular vote, not just a small group of residents. Now as far the allocation of the money and the fact that one neighborhood benefits more than another neighborhood based on priorities, etc. that is pretty ambiguous. One thing I noticed that is off the table and hasn’t been
addressed at all is let’s say for instance it is adopted and you’re going to put sidewalks into a particular neighborhood, no one has even mentioned if it’s going to be one side of the street or the other or both. It’s just a really big number and has been stated earlier there’s a lot of residents that don’t want it. I think that what I notice the most about the residents is a lot of people that do want it are younger persons under the age of 45 or so, most of the people that don’t like it over the age of 45, there’s a few (goes either way) we’ve already raised our kids safely in these neighborhoods. I’ve lived here 26 years and over the course of that time (I don’t know how long Matt has been City Manager), but I know there’s been 2 or 3 different studies like the one you just conducted that basically say that the streets are safe, there is not enough traffic, not enough citations written, there have been no accidents; and of course to Mr. Norstrom’s point, there is always going to be a first time, all it takes is one, but that’s true anywhere in this city; we bought that place with an assumption of risk; there is not sidewalks, we bought it with our eyes open years ago; we raised our son in that neighborhood, eyes open, and we continue to walk these streets without any trouble and even to the extent that it didn’t merit a stop sign, we really compliment council on the fact that they overlooked those statistics and put the stop sign at Northland and Crandall anyway; and frankly we thought that kind of quells the concern for safety. We still see people walking up and down Crandall Drive, although I take issue with the number of persons that are going to Wilson Hill School, I still see many of my neighbors walking in the streets like myself perfectly safely. My biggest complaint is the green space violation, if you take a look at the linear footage 11 feet from High Street clear to Northland, its’ going to be about the size of a football field including the end zones and half of it is going to be concrete.

The other thing I really want to address is some of these comments seem to be too dimensional, it’s just from here to there, but they don’t call it Wilson Hill for nothing. When I was walking up Wilson today coming home from Fresh Thyme, I was looking back down the street and I thought the change in elevation is really significant and Mr. Watterson is going to have quite a challenge whether or not he’s going to put in switchbacks on all those sidewalks like he’s done in other parts; how he’s going to deal with water runoff that is going to create; personally I don’t think you can just put sidewalks straight down the street, that’s going to make a heck of a sled ride. Now we’re building these sidewalks so that people with disabilities can walk on them, right...well there only going to be about three season sidewalks if you just make them that way. I don’t know what those answers are, I’m not an attorney or an Engineer, so I’ll leave that to those guys. I see so many ambiguities and so much indecision between the neighborhood, it’s created a tremendous amount of decisiveness just on our street; it’s a hot topic, there’s no question about it. There again, the fact that this is much further reaching than Crandall Drive, it involves the entire city. I believe I was aware of a project of the space that was right outside the library, apparently that project I believe was to build sidewalks around that what they use for football fields or those playing fields. I think I saw a proposal that was in the minutes some time ago; don’t know where they stand on that. I think there are a lot of streets here in the City of Worthington that could use sidewalks, it may be a much higher priority than Crandall Drive. I think the school is just an excuse.
Pat Bendick, 159 Crandall Drive, stated I am opposed, I do not want the sidewalks. I have lived on Crandall Drive for 12 years. Safety has not been an issue that I experienced. I had both my hips replaced and I was walking three times a day up and down Crandall all the way to Northland to keep the rehab going. I walked in the street for 6 months bad weather and good weather. There is no need for sidewalks. I felt better walking in the streets than I think would have walking on the sidewalks (people not keeping their sidewalks clean.) With all the leaves, it’s even tough keeping our yards clean and our neighbor’s yard clean. I am opposed; I do not want the sidewalks. It is a shame that such a small group is wanting to push for the sidewalks and don’t communicate or send us an e-mail or mail us information about what they’re doing. It’s almost like we have to put two forces against each other, and we’re not sure what this small group is doing. I was told this meeting was at 7:30, but the small group that wants the sidewalks said it was at 6:30, so that’s causing decent amongst the neighbors.

Mr. Myers stated this is not about whether a sidewalk is going in or not, we’re a long way from that. This is an issue about whether we should amend a couple provisions of our code. From the proponents I’m hearing two different things and I’m not real sure where you all are; you seem to acknowledge that you have problems with your definition, you want it to go to a vote, you want to set it for hearing, it’s my opinion that if we set this for hearing, we have no choice but to vote the legislation down because the definition of neighborhood alone is so ambiguous and it takes the legislative power away from Council and gives it to the petitioners and I believe that is equal protection ramifications. I don’t think even if we passed this that the courts would uphold it. I think that your proposal in some cases has some merit, but it’s not ready.

Mr. Myers asked is there a consensus with that portion, again, we’re a long way from sidewalks. The whole point of this assessment process is for neighbors to sit down and talk about it and debate it amongst neighbors as opposed to debating it up here. You had proposed that we set it for hearing and vote on it, asked what is your position. Mr. Erickson replied understand that the set of changes we submitted can be considered in whole or in part, one was not necessarily contingent on another. All four changes that Mrs. Fox covered were essentially intended to either make it simpler for us to petition as one group instead of block by block and then potentially remove the risk of having a patchwork of sidewalks that’s the first point you’d consider. The other ones were essentially making the cost more amenable to the neighbors; it wasn’t necessarily that it was going to be all or none. We left it up to City Council to consider the validity of all the changes we had submitted. Mr. Myers asked you want us to redraft the statue, is that what I hear you saying. Mr. Erickson replied I would assume City Management would provide probably provide some direction based on analysis Mrs. Fox has submitted, I would assume that Management would also be able to provide potential recommendations that Council would find easier to approve, Management may suggest that the Ordinances be disregarded all together for all I know.

Mr. Smith commented thinking from a city-wide application as opposed to Crandall even though I know this would apply to Crandall as well, I think these concepts are pretty solid. Avoiding sidewalks to nowhere I think is an important thing; I’m not sure exactly what the wording is, but I’m remembering conversation throughout the city going door-
to-door this fall and other areas of town wanting sidewalks as well, thinking about what specific wording could make sense and apply to all areas of town, but knowing that the concept is here I think is accurate; wording maybe needs tweaked. Mr. Myers asked what concept are you referring to. Mr. Smith replied the first concept about not having sidewalks to nowhere. Having some different wording other than “block” and I don’t know what that is, but some sort of codified language that would allow. Mr. Myers said but you know as it is currently proposed if they would like sidewalks on Crandall Drive, they could include your house along with it. Mr. Myers stated according to the way this is drafted, because the petitioners define what a neighborhood is, they can define that in any way they like, so they could pick a house here and a house there and include that in their neighborhood.

Mr. Norstrom commented in the testimony we’ve heard tonight they have said that neighborhood is probably not the best word and they would like some guidance on it. Mr. Myers replied that’s my point, so where do we go with this. Mr. Smith commented that was my point as well, I think the concept is solid, but the wording is not, so if we give it to some more astute legal minds that work for the City for example, maybe that’s a direction we could go.

Mr. Norstrom let’s seek some clarification here. Mr. Myers I do not think we are going to vote on this tonight, that was never the intention from my understanding. It would have to be introduced and we would have to deal with it, and none of that has happened. This group has been before us several times, they’ve come to us with some ideas and as Mr. Smith just indicated, I think you could identify things like pathways or something along those lines and come up with some definitions of connecting parts of the City together rather than block-by-block, because block-by-block doesn’t make a lot of sense and especially since we had this in our code and there has never been a sidewalk built under it. I also advocate that this doesn’t go to a committee at this point and time; this is something that’s important and we should keep it here working with staff.

Mr. Smith commented furthering my thoughts regarding egalitarian approach to financing it; I do like that because benefit by one benefit to all. In theory, again imagining applications throughout the City not just Crandall, I envision this being a lot more user friendly than the current code. Mr. Norstrom replied if we have people thinking about it, let’s say for example persons that have less than 100 feet of lineal footage would pay one price, people that 100 feet – 200 feet of lineal footage would pay a different price; so there are ways to do it than simply on actual lineal feet. Mr. Myers remarked there has to be a rational basis. Mr. Norstrom commented I understand that, but a rational basis of defining lineal feet it doesn’t have to be foot-by-foot, it could be in 10 foot increments, 50 foot increments.

Ms. Michael stated I know this meeting has been focused to the individuals on Crandall Drive because it’s been their proposal and I have no idea what thoughts or ideas or suggestions that other neighborhoods or other people in the City might be thinking about as to what type of definitions and what would be the right way to define something in an Ordinance. I’m thinking this should be flushed out more through the Bike and Pedestrian
Advisory Board, but I know Mr. Norstrom is not feeling that idea. What are other council members thinking or feeling.

Ms. Dorothy commented I would be more comfortable with having the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board look at this petition definitely for safer routes for bicyclists and pedestrians throughout Worthington that was one of the impetuses of trying to have an advisory board for such things. I also know this is a very defensive topic and through some research, in 1959 Council passed several different Ordinances requesting sidewalks throughout Worthington and one got referendum and it was voted down defeated along Hartford, Orchard and Howard, they don’t have sidewalks because the Ordinance was put out there, there was a referendum vote and it was defeated, but there was quite a bit of newspaper articles about how defensive it was then and it’s defensive now. I would like to see somehow for us to come to a more amicable agreement, but we definitely need to consider safety of the community and I think that’s something that the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board can help guide through for the whole of the City.

Dr. Chosy replied that was my thought as well.

Mr. Myers asked what are they going to consider; are they going to consider this Ordinance because the lawyers need to look at this Ordinance, then maybe if we have any Ordinance that would pass constitutional muster, then maybe we could refer it to the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board for public comment on whether we should adopt the Ordinance or not; but we’re not there yet. I appreciate the effort, but I don’t believe this is a supportable Ordinance as it’s proposed. There are a lot of things that need to be changed on this.

Mr. Smith replied that was my potential proposal to let staff work out some language that makes sense for us to then determine whether or not we want to push it to a committee. Mr. Myers replied if that’s the way we want to do it then I think we need to set some expectations. Dr. Chosy commented I think the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board can utilize the City Attorney and discuss it and change this, not just say yes or no on the way it’s written, but suggest a different way to do it.

Ms. Michael stated if we do refer this anywhere, we need to have a time limit or move it up on the urgency list. Mr. Myers commented the problem is if we’re going to be providing legal services to get this drafted in the middle of a budget cycle and then Boards and Commissions appointments, it’s a lot to add onto an already full plate; and that’s what I mean by setting some expectations, it’s going to be a little time before we can get to this. It’s not going to happen in two weeks.

Mr. Troper stated I think we should give our input and thoughts to Mrs. Fox and we should try to fine tune it the way we would like and decide what we want to do or pass it on to the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board. I think we have the issues here and everyone has their thought(s) on the issues. For me the word “neighborhood” I don’t like that concept initially because I don’t know what a neighborhood means. If this block wants sidewalks and this block doesn’t, I don’t want someone having the potential to
have me pay for sidewalks when I necessarily don’t have any say in it. I understand the concept of sidewalks, but I think it should be on a block-by-block basis. I think that the City should look into paying more than 50% of the cost and I’m also in favor of doing it on a per property basis if that’s legal or however we can do that; and doing it over 10 years.

Mr. Norstrom stated the rationale for block-by-block within a block somebody could object to it. There are 10 houses in that block, 6 houses vote for it and 4 houses vote against it. It passes. The concept is the same regardless of how long the distance is, so for example if you’re living in a block that you don’t want it, but the path that is established and 80% of the people on that path want to have sidewalks, then hard luck. The concept under which we currently have the Ordinance and extending it it’s the same concept. The question becomes how large is the majority going to be based on. We chose “block” years ago and block has not worked. There has never been a sidewalk built under this Ordinance.

Mr. Troper commented I said I’m in favor of increasing the City’s share, so maybe that would help that. I guess I would want clarification on “neighborhood”, I don’t understand what that is, it’s not clear to me. Ms. Dorothy remarked so we definitely need to get a definition of neighborhood.

Ms. Michael stated we should have a definition of how far it should be, what the distance is. Mr. Myers replied not distance, it has to be contiguous for one thing, it can’t be decided by the petitioner, it has to be decided by code. If we want to go out and do it like a zoning map and we could say this for purposes of this statue is a block. There are many ways we can attack this, but it cannot be the petitioners who define what the law is. It has to be Council who defines what the law is; that’s my concern with this part of the statute. The second part of the statue is assessments are supposed to be based on benefit, that’s the way the assessment statute is set up, whether it’s at the state level or at the city level. We need to have something that equates assessment to benefit and that’s where I have a concern with one house one assessment; and the way they’ve solved that in that past is gone to the Assessment Equalization Board or they determined what is the value of that sidewalk to that particular property or as the sort of catch all easy way to do it, by the foot; they have equated the number of feet of sidewalk you have equals that benefits your property; and so you are assessed in that amount. You can’t be assessed disproportionately to the benefit; we can talk about sidewalks benefit everybody, but that’s not the way you levy taxes and this is tax. Those are my two concerns. I’m fine with 10 years. I have no problem with the code, I have constitutional issues with those two provisions.

Mr. Norstrom explained that the discussion that we’re having tonight shows that we are the best qualified group to handle this. The Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board is just starting out and they do not have the understanding or the experience that we have with dealing with legal issues.
Ms. Michael stated what I am hearing as a consensus of Council is that we want to have this proposed amendment to the statute referred back to legal for redefining the two terms that Mr. Myers brought up and then bringing it back to Council and at that point Council will decide whether to move forward with accepting the Ordinance and having an Ordinance drafted and introduced or referring it to the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board.

Mr. Greeson asked when do you want it. Ms. Michael commented we understand how much staff has on their plate and what’s fair considering the work load and what’s going on now and between the end of the year; I know we have a large amount of work going on right through here. Mr. Norstrom commented you don’t have to make that decision tonight, you can report back to us in a week after you’ve talked to other staff.

Dr. Chosy commented let me make clear that we’re not talking about whether we can use this or not; we’re talking about writing something new. Ms. Michael replied we’re talking about fixing their proposal so it’s workable for the whole community. Mr. Myers said so we can get it by the courts. Ms. Michael stated step one would be getting the Ordinance figured out, then moving forward to see how the Ordinance applies and how it will work. Ms. Dorothy asked so when it comes back, what are the next steps. Ms. Michael replied step one would be (1) approve the proposed Ordinance (2) either we decide or go to the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board on how to implement it and what has to be done. Ms. Michael commented there needs to be public hearings on this Ordinance section that is advertised to the City, so people across the City that are in other neighborhoods have a chance to respond because they wouldn’t have known about this. Mr. Myers commented but that’s an issue that is down the road. The first step is let’s get a good Ordinance; the second step is being able to decide what we want to do with it from there to solicit as much public input as possible; the third step would be then if we want to enact it or not.

Mr. Norstrom commented the residents on Crandall Drive who want a sidewalk if they wanted to proceed they can do that under the existing Ordinance even though it would create some problems.

Mr. Norstrom stated to the residents of Crandall Drive if you feel like you’re not getting enough information from us, please let staff know, they will put you on the mailing list and you will be kept informed of this issue via e-mail and/or regular mail.

***Council recessed at 8:35 P.M., came back at 8:45 P.M.***

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

- **Wayfinding & Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement**

Mr. Greeson explained this is an overall long term plan particularly in the elements related to the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancements; there is some significant cost associated with implementing all of those ideas over time and this is a great long term
We have about $800,000 in bond money currently projected in the CIP; there is a fairly sizeable amount of revenue over the next 30 years from The Heights TIF that could be used on West Wilson Bridge Road and then we believe that some of the project elements would be eligible for various grant sources. Over time it will be a multi-layered strategy to finance some of these elements that you’re hearing about tonight.

What we need to know from Council tonight and in the future is what of these elements are a priority; knowing this will help us inform our overall strategy (i.e. which one we finance first, what things we apply for grants, etc.)

Mr. Brown explained The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement Project further implements the streetscape recommendations found in the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study. Adopted in 2011, the Study makes recommendations for the Wilson Bridge Road corridor from the Olentangy River to the west to the Railroad Crossing to the east.

One of the recommendations was to look at wayfinding again for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor, Old Worthington, and Citywide; but then a large part of this was really looking at river to rail and as I stated earlier maybe looking east to improve movement in the city. We’re really looking at streetscape improvements that can happen through the corridor. One of the charges that we were also given during this study was to look at traffic related to this corridor going from High Street over towards Old Wilson Bridge and Wilson Bridge Road to look at possible intersection improvements and traffic related to that intersection.

As Mr. Greeson mentioned we have three (3) consultants on board with MKSK being the lead with GPD and Studio Graphique. We’ve been meeting since 2014 with our steering committee which is made up of council members, MPC/ARB members, residents of the neighborhoods along Wilson Bridge Road and South Wilson Bridge, OWP, OWA and the MAC (all together about 24 people).

What you’ll see tonight has been structured as we have our short-term (1-10 years) and long-term (10+ years) improvements for the corridor. I’m going to turn the rest of the presentation of to Chris Hermann and Darren Myer with MKSK.

**Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement PowerPoint Presentation is attached**

Darren Myer presented and introduced Chris Hermann; Amy Bishop and Scott Seman from GPD and Cathy Fromet from Studio Graphique. I’m going to spend just a few minutes talking about the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor, and then Cathy is going to go through the wayfinding and signage. The corridor is a major gateway into Worthington from the North and the East and the West. You’ve got about 40,000 people that travel combined through those three gateways a day, so this is your first impression of the city; very important from that aspect is also the front door to our office, we have major investment in office space on the outerbelt here and of course that’s a big part of the tax base as well; so the employees that are part of that contribute both to the ability to have shops and amenities there, and also create a mixed use district. We have The Shops at
Worthington Place that has restaurants, bars, retail, really a great wonderful mix of uses there at the corner of 23 and Wilson Bridge Road that again creates amenities that attract employees and residents and are also supported by those same groups. We have residential that borders Wilson Bridge Road, you think of it as primarily being a corridor that carries a lot of traffic and moves employees in and out at the beginning and end of the day, but you can see from Villa Charmante and Worthington Estates and the residential on the east that there’s quite a bit that fronts on or is adjacent to Wilson Bridge Road. Lastly you have two of the greatest assets in the community that anchor this corridor; you’ve got the Olentangy Parklands, McCord Park and the Community Center which are really some of the core assets of the City of Worthington.

In summary it’s effectively a great mix of uses that we have along the Wilson Bridge Corridor when you look at those collectively and in some ways even though it’s different in character, it’s not dis-similar from the collection of uses that you have in Old Worthington where you have shops and restaurants and retail and housing and those types of things. The reason I brought up that reference is that High Street in Old Worthington carries the same amount of traffic that Wilson Bridge Road does; when you look at the traffic counts you can see that each of those corridors carry about 17,000 – 20,000 vehicles per day. What’s interesting when you compare those two is that on High Street in Old Worthington we have Concerts on the Green, a stone throw away from that road, we have Farmer’s Market, we stroll up and down and have ice cream and look at how charming it is, we have quite a different character on Wilson Bridge Road and so there may be some lessons that could be drawn even though the architectural character and many other aspects of Old Worthington are different than Wilson Bridge Road, but clearly you can see when you compare the traffic numbers to the amount of cars itself is not the sole determinant in the quality of the experience that you can get in that portion of the city.

In terms of the investment in the corridor, it’s incredibly important for the businesses, the residents, The Shops, all the things we just went through, the access to the park, making sure that we can connect our residents and employees with our amenities and open spaces and do that in a safe way. I should also say that we’re going to talk about sidewalks in this presentation and I think the big difference here is that Wilson Bridge Road cannot be safely walked on in the road and I know that’s stating the obvious, but it is a different context and so we’ll be talking about some very similar things in terms of the value of sidewalks, but a slightly different context here.

As you can see in the slide, we’ve shown a snapshot of what you see today. In the upper left is coming in off of US23 and again you’ve got 20,000 – 30,000 folks per day coming in here southbound into our community; you can see in the upper right corner once they get to the corner of Wilson Bridge Road we got a pretty collection of utilities, and in the lower left it shows if you west on Wilson Bridge Road and the picture in the lower right shows some of the officescape there. To put all of this into context without necessarily drawing positive and negatives, we’ve shown some snapshots of what some of our neighbors in central Ohio have done, so you can see Westerville’s recent improvements,
the City of Dublin with some of their artwork and gateways into the community, Easton, followed by New Albany.

One of the things I want to point out is particularly on Wilson Bridge Road because we have that mix of uses and because you can’t walk safely in the street, sidewalks are a critical component in any neighborhood in any city street, but particularly here. If you think about working at MedVet or one of the East Wilson Bridge Road businesses and you want to run across the street to use McCord Park at the Community Center during the middle of the day, there is no marked crosswalk to do that; there are a few legally technical crosswalks if you want to take a risk crossing the street there, but there’s a really fundamental lack of connectivity and safety in some of these areas. So as a very basic recommendation throughout that corridor where we have gaps in the sidewalks and where we have places where you can’t safely cross the street, we want to address that condition. There are a number of reasons (as you will see in the lower right hand corner) why that’s critically important, but one that I want to point out is the OKI Regional Council of Governments (Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments) which is a regional planning association committed to developing collaborative strategies to improve the quality of life and the economic vitality of that region did a study a few years ago and they found that almost 1/3 of the population in that study area in the tri-state could not drive; and that was due to age (whether they were too young or elderly); they might have had a medical condition or physical disability which prevented them from driving, they may have lost their license or they may not be able to afford a car or may not be able to afford two cars if they are a dual income family.

So at a very base level from a community standpoint providing the social equity that sidewalks provide so that you’re not biasing folks that are able to own and drive a car versus those that rely on bike or their feet to get around is a very very core principle to consider as well as the health and wellness aspect. Wilson Bridge Road brings people in and out of the community, but people will use it for local trips; I live in Worthington Estates and I have three young boys ages 3, 6, and 8 and we go across Wilson Bridge Road to get some groceries and do other things, we’ve gotten shouted at before and it’s a little bit scary, so I think a lot of people make local trips in their car. In the extent where we start to make these sidewalks and these connections a little more comfortable and visible and safer that is one way you can start to chew away at the continual widening and widening of roads by reducing those local trips.

From and Economic Development standpoint, this is a critical portion of our tax basis as we mentioned before; just recently this summer Cushman Wakefield, the real estate giant and the University of George Washington put out a study; they were looking at the trend of companies that were migrating from green fields and ex urban areas back into communities and there were a variety of reasons for it; but the number one consistent thread was all of those companies were looking for walkable communities where they could live, work, and play; and if you think back to the slide we showed earlier with the parklands at either end and The Shops in the middle and the residents and the employees, we have exactly that great framework to build from providing that we can create the infrastructure to support what those companies are looking for. Ms. Dorothy commented
a lot of times when we’re looking at transportation improvements we hear about level of services for vehicles; I am concerned about level of services for transportation needs for other mobility, bike/pedestrian; asked are there any other metrics, are there studies that we could have that include level of services for all forms of mobility for transportation.

Mr. Myer replied the state of Florida in their state department of transportation has level of service for bike and pedestrian, there are some other DOT’s that have started to produce those, so we’re starting to see some more of them, they have their limitations as well as their positives, but there are a few metrics and we could start to dig into that if that’s helpful in terms of making investment decisions.

We’re going to go through six (6) focus areas briefly and this is how our priorities were initially organized.

Focus Area 1 – Olentangy Park
The primary issue that we want to address here is at both ends were we have these great community assets is we don’t want to have backdoors into them, we don’t want to have to accidentally discover these great community places. We want to make sure that they are robustly welcoming and accessible and legible and people understand how to get there. You can see from this image, I think you’re not entirely sure if you’re a visitor if you’re going into a parking lot for OfficeScape or if you’re going into a park; so we’ve started to look diagrammatically at some ways we can help enhance that effect. So you can see creating a little bit of a threshold here with the red color, there may be opportunity for some masonry here to create a little bit of a gateway, again a piece here to alert motorists that their not kind of coming off at high speed and racing down there; continuing potentially to public street lighting so that this appears to be a legitimate public street and not a private drive where you are not sure of the destination, as well as some landscape that would even enhance what was done recently with the bike trail to help filter views of the OfficeScape buildings and help this feel more like a great entry into a fantastic park.

Focus Area 2 – West Wilson Bridge Road
This really has to do with solving what seems like a very detailed issue, but a very important issue, the P.M. traffic that comes out of some of the office buildings on Old Wilson Bridge Road does a number of creative things to try and get out efficiently and get the lights that go into Villa Chamante and then go back and turn right instead of waiting for the left turn lane. So what this area proposes is signalizing the intersection of Old Wilson Bridge and Wilson Bridge Road and that would start to address some of the congestion and stacking that you see, it would also help eliminate that sort of odd merge that goes west toward Caren Street. Ms. Michael commented there is a stop light a hop, skip and a jump at the entrance way of Villa Charmante that’s very short distance; you’re talking about two stop lights, that one and then the next. Mr. Myer replied yes partly it has to do with the cut throughs that people are using to try and affect a left turn to get out to Wilson Bridge Road. Ms. Michael explained that one of your left turn problems that you have is that you have people going through Villa Charmante because
they can’t turn left off of Wilson Bridge Road to get into the driveway of the Holiday Inn, so even restriping the road they would have a left turn lane to turn into the Holiday Inn.

Mr. Greeson commented on this particular slide when we did some the analysis for the re-development of the mall site, one of the things we identified as a problem I believe it failed, we had a level of service F when in the P.M. peak hours at Old Wilson Bridge Road and Wilson Bridge Road, so we asked in particular GPD Traffic Consultant to look at how do we solve that; it is very difficult for the employees who are exiting at 5:00 P.M. from places like Worthington Industries, CEC, Whalen and all those companies that are up there to make an effective left hand turn onto Wilson Bridge Road at the bottom of the hill. We have the traffic consultant here this evening to speak to the timing issues, they carefully studied options related to that intersection.

Scott Seman, GPD Group, explained as you look it seems the destination is High Street in the P.M., peak you have one light at the shopping mall, one across from the condos, you have a stop sign at Old Wilson Bridge and then you have a stop light a Reiber for the residential here and then it also connects to the OfficePark which does not connect. The first two intersections as you go from High Street west there basically to The Shops at Worthington Place, in the P.M. your offices and your shopping center is all going south to a light and they all want to go east, so it’s all left turns. All that concentration you have a set volume that’s trying to exit basically through two signals, the Old Wilson Bridge being it’s a stop control, it works during the day, but when you get busy traffic on Old Wilson Bridge it’s impossible to make a left turn, you have severe delays.

When we studied this, we looked at the new office/apartments that went up, on the north side of Wilson Bridge we looked at the redevelopent of the Holiday Inn, we took all of that into consideration and we did growth rates for 20 years, we did a sensitivity analysis and what we found was that right now the traffic at Old Wilson Bridge Road needs wires for a signal; and as you’ve experienced over the last year with the construction of the interchange, ODOT has kind of come in and helped the signal system and kind of updated it took work better with the construction being that there’s maintenance of traffic and the patterns through the construction are different, so I think previously your signals at the shopping center weren’t talking to each other, they were pretty much just running free which is okay, but a certain point you get to a point where you have to interconnect them and that’s what ODOT did when they came in; they replaced the controllers, they put some cell modems in there, and basically those two signals started talking to the High Street signal and eventually you’re going to have a coordinated system on High Street that’s going to go from Columbus on the north side through Worthington down on your closed loop, and you’re also going to connect your side streets so all of that stuff works together. From the time we started the study til now we’ve seen an improvement on Wilson Bridge Road traffic just from the coordination of those signals. We did some modeling now and in 20 years in the future with the sensitivity analysis, we added the signal at Old Wilson Bridge, we also interconnected the Reiber Street signal and all four of those work better because basically all those people trying to go south and east at night, their going through two little conduits, well you add Old Wilson Bridge you’re spread out for three conduits; so you kind of make the distance that they need to go to get
to High Street is lengthened, but it provides additional time as storage so you don’t get a light coming out of the shopping center and it’s gridlocked on Wilson Bridge and you can’t do anything, you got to wait for another light.

The idea here is that we may have some type of identifier; this is not the final design, it’s not a first design, it’s more of a diagram to give the idea of how might identify the community. Even though there’s some signage on the proposed improvements on US23, it’s really oblique to the people that are coming across 23, it’s more people on the freeway channel to see, so this is another opportunity to highlight the community coming in and looking at some landscape and some masonry improvements off of US23 you can see a little bit further down that really help set the stage for gateway into the community.

Mr. Hermann stated what we’re showing here is a beefier and a lot more brick columns to help the appearance of the gateway and also a much sturdier metal fence that would go between it as well as street trees.

Mr. Myer said this is as you turn left east onto West Wilson Bridge Road, you have the potential for widened walks here, tree lawn of street trees, street lighting and maybe even the opportunity for some public art; if you recall you go east, you have this sort of terminal view before you swing left and then around again, so there may be some opportunity for public art there as well. Mr. Hermann stated another big piece here is that the City has done a great job the multi-use trail to basically get to Old Wilson Bridge Road and then it char rows up Old Wilson Bridge Road and then the trail picks back up around Kroger parallel to North High gets you to Wilson Bridge Road at High Street. I think the big discussion with the Steering Committee and the City was then the goal is to extend that multi-use trail along the south side of East Wilson Bridge Road to take you from this intersection all the way to the Community Center and then eventually maybe even beyond that. That pink line is a widened multi-use path that would get you through this area all the way to the Recreation Center.

**Focus Area 6 – McCord Park**

Mr. Myer explained here we reference the point you really can’t cross over from the north side to the south side; again Chris just pointed out there’s no connecting path that gets you there along the right hand side view that you see. We also want to make a great announcement of this park as well; you can see some the crosswalks here, street lighting, some landscape improvements and so it’s really going to be a great announcement as you come into McCord Park.

Dr. Chosy asked how do the bikes get to East Wilson Bridge Road. Mr. Hermann replied basically the bikes will have to use the crosswalks at High Street and Old Wilson Bridge Road as they exist today; they’re just on the east, west and south sides, there is no north side, so they have to cross in the crosswalk, but then once they get to East Wilson Bridge Road then they would be back on the path again.

We laid out on the entire corridor how to get sidewalks or multi-use path on both sides of the road, how to get street trees and a tree lawn on both sides of the road and how to
improve crosswalks and streetlights, basically make a complete street design for all of Wilson Bridge Road. We with the other staff have identified first pieces, some easier than others, the first big one is the idea of improving that gateway experience as you come in on US23, so once you get off of the 270 interchange or you coming from Delaware down 23 the gateway is number two that gives you that reinforced presence as most of the traffic comes in and it would take it all the way down to Caren. Right now ODOT project is putting in the streetlights, the decorative mast arms are already in on High Street to Wilson Bridge Road this would take that intersection improvement down one more to Caren to help pull that through; so that’s actually number two.

We did cost estimates and you can see that it is a $2 million price tag

Number one is the improved signalized intersection at Old Wilson Bridge Road and Wilson Bridge Road; and really we see this as an Economic Development piece because it helps employees that are in the Corporate Hill offices get out, get to Wilson Bridge Road and then get out of the community.

Number three is the multi-use path we were just talking about; take it along East Wilson Bridge Road that would basically take you from High Street where it ends today out to McCord Park and the Community Center; and so this is actually a bigger piece which has almost a $2 million price tag that’s because the bigger piece of just putting the path in there, it also means we’re going to be setting up the tree line, the street trees and the street light improvements that would all happen as part of the south side improvement on East Wilson Bridge Road, so it’s really more than just the path, it’s really cleaning up that edge which right now is in places that are overgrown and kind of rural looking and establishing a much nicer edge on East Wilson Bridge Road on the south side.

Number four is the park entries both at Olentangy Park and McCord entry; the City has already a number of improvements at McCord, we would be doing the additional pieces shown in the conceptual design. It would be on the McCord side putting in the crosswalks and doing improvements as a gateway (i.e. signs, those kinds of things) to make it more of a pronounced gateway for the Community Center and McCord Park.

Number five is try to leverage the TIF that’s in place at The Shops at Worthington Place and say let’s use those monies to improve both sides of Wilson Bridge Road from High Street to Old Wilson Bridge Road as well as doing improvements on Old Wilson Bridge Road up through Corporate Hill and backside of The Shops at Worthington Place; so sidewalks, new streetlights, those kind of improvements. Mr. Greeson replied that’s actually the TIF for The Heights which you may recall we retained the proceeds from, so we don’t have an agreement that result in those TIF proceeds going to the developer, it goes to the City for use for this type of activity.

Mr. Hermann commented we talked about some improvements that we would like to see happen at The Shops at Worthington Place internally if they do improvements on their site to help connect the sidewalks and improve the crossings. We do show how the missing segments between Reiber Streets and Olentangy Parklands could be improved
although it’s in pretty good shape now particularly with the multi-use path; but even thinking about cleaning up the south side which exist today, it’s a little overrun, but we didn’t put that as a priority; and then also the north side of East Wilson Bridge Road is nice through the offices, it could use some redo especially as you do the s-curve but that is a little more expensive because there are places where we would need to purchase right-of-way to make that happen, and so we thought it was in decent enough shape, that’s lower on the list, but we do have long range plans for it.

Ms. Dorothy asked what is the timeline for these improvements. Mr. Hermann replied these are really up to Council, the budget and how important it is to all of you. They can start design in 2016 if you have the money and will to do any one of these; you can break these projects up anyway you want; this is presented to you for your input and deliberation.

Mr. Myers asked have we have abandoned the idea of the High Street pedestrian Bridge. Mr. Hermann replied we haven’t abandoned it, it actually shows up in our long range page; it is very intriguing: I think a case could be made (Mr. Greeson could probably jump in here since he is on MORPC board). (Mr. Greeson could probably jump in here since he is on MORPC board), that you could try to say that this is part of the Ohio – Erie trail and work to get funding from those sources to say that right now the destination for the Ohio-Erie trail goes up the south side of 161 past the school and then winds through Old Worthington as a way to get people to experience Old Worthington which is great, but there is no path which means using the streets and the sidewalks and picks back up on Schrock. This is about opportunities and funding and if something hot comes up and jumps to the top of the list, we should take advantage of it.

Ms. Michael stated the Clean Ohio Trails Funding is good on anything that is connecting something to something. Mr. Greeson commented I think we have any opportunity with the bike path connection along East Wilson Bridge Road for either a MORPC Attributable Funding application or either Clean Ohio Trails. Mr. Myers stated we have budgeted $800,000 for this for next year; given the numbers I’m seeing here that’s a rather odd amount, it doesn’t fit anywhere. Mr. Greeson commented that’s what we’ve been holding for a while and so that fits what we’ve been able to plug in the cash flow of the CIP. In addition to that and really not showing up in the CIP yet as proceeds we project over the next 30 years we have projections of about $2 million dollars in net present value of collections from the TIF; with TIFs you don’t see the revenue for several years after construction occurs, so we should start to see that cash flow in 2017 and would be more comfortable saying this is what you’re going to see year in, year out. Mr. Myers commented but if projections that’s $2 million dollars present value spread out over 30 years, so the annual cash flow is not much money.

Mr. Myers stated here’s my concern and why I asked the question, we can do the park entries and Old Wilson Bridge Road with the $800,000 we have appropriated for this year, but I have to say I think that the North High Street gateway for me is the top priority, but do we go ahead and do the signalization and then take the other $400,000 and bank it and wait; that’s my concern. I am really anxious to get Wilson Bridge Road
started. For the first time with the 350 building and with Worthington Industries, the Mall, we finally have some momentum on parts of Wilson Bridge Road. I really want to build on that. I like this listing and priorities, but it doesn’t do us any good if we have to wait five years to have the money and so for me I have to be honest with you the Wilson Bridge Road entrance to McCord Park has always been an eyesore for me, all the times I’ve spent in that park. Do we knock off the easy ones first with the money we have that is the question I pose, or do we wait; that is the question I pose.

Mr. Greeson replied we’re going to have to come back to you when we get a sense of what your priorities are with here’s what we think we can do and we’ll layer in the grant funding cycles and the potential asks, the size of the asks within reason based on previous awards, and we’ll try to answer that question. Mr. Myers replied I think this is the right priority.

Mr. Norstrom stated based on the presentation tonight I see the priority as one getting the traffic on West Wilson Bridge straightened out which is the top one and then the second one is working on the multi-use path as we encourage commercial and retail on East Wilson Bridge. I’m less concerned about the gateways to the community, don’t get me wrong, those are pretty, but the underlying benefits to the community is better traffic and more employment drawn by walkable communities.

Mandy from GPD, definitely understanding the priorities of the study is very important and I have sat down with your team and understanding the priorities of the City is also very important when you’re putting together a funding package because we make think our project is the most important to get built, but there are certainly other need based items that need to be done. Definitely overlaying the funding cycle for the various programs as far MORPC Attributable Funding application cycles begin next year, applications are due in August. Clean Ohio Trail Funds, those are different cycles; so layering all that in and layering in the size of the asks, really what your available matching funds are is key. I love to see communities leverage, but that has to be at your discretion. I am available to sit down and work with you. I haven’t seen a draft of your CIP and I don’t know what your cycle is on your CIP, but we can certainly lay out a strategy and interweave those funding cycles and reasonable asks and given other priorities of the City and really take all those into consideration, but I think to your point Mr. Myers that keeping the momentum going is always important in any project whether you make a small investment and know that you’ll have funds available in 2017.

Every community has a funding profile, how sensitive you are about leveraging what you have, how much debt tolerance you have. If you decide to go with MORPC Attributable funding, you’re looking at 2020 to get funding if they can consider enough regional priority you can bridge that gap for a few years and get sub-loan funding. So there is various ideas to help you keep the momentum.

Ms. Michael commented what I’m hearing is that the signalization is the most important. Ms. Dorothy replied I would agree, I don’t use that intersection very often and definitely not during peak times and I still have problems going left. Mr. Myers commented sit on
the patio of Amano’s and watch everybody cutting every which way trying to get out of the businesses back in there.

Ms. Michael commented then I heard spiffing up the park entrances and I also heard that we should be putting the money aside to leverage it for more walkability and biking trails. Mr. Norstrom replied I don’t we have enough information at this point because right now we have a five year capital plan that shows $800,000 and want the $8 million dollars, so I want to understand more about where our capital priorities are which is what staff has indicated they will provide to us.

Cathy Fromet, Studio Graphique, I want to talk briefly about what wayfinding for a City like Worthington means. Wayfinding is just helping people find their way through your city; but I think there’s a little more that goes into developing a community wayfinding program. I know we talked about a legible city and what that means is that people understand what your city has to offer, that there’s an awareness level of the amenities within your city both for the citizens who live here and those who also visit you from around the region and beyond that support the businesses that are in your area. It’s also about bringing awareness to the character and quality of your city and I think I mentioned this a few times during the course of the design, we’re not here to emendate the city with a ton of different signs, but the signs are here to tell the story; the story of your history, your character, the quality of lifestyle, the quality of businesses that you have here and to help people who may not be aware of what you have to offer to provide them the ability to be able to navigate through your city and understand what they’re here to see.

The first part of the Signage and Wayfinding Plan developed for Worthington was to understand what does your city have to offer, what is your story, what is the character. We worked with MKSK, we worked with several stakeholder groups, we spent two days here driving around also talking with the people here about where they thought challenge points were for understanding navigating the city; what they would like to see in terms of how people felt when they entered the city, where they felt welcomed, areas that they felt people maybe didn’t know how to navigate or what would be easier to get to certain areas. So we did map out what we would consider the major travel paths within the city and I would have to say that out of most cities that we’ve worked in, you do have a fairly nice street grid, an easy main road travel path as people are coming in; but you do have other amenities aside from what you have at 161 and High; so we wanted to make sure we looked at the City holistically; we wanted to look at the entire city to help people understand what is Worthington, what do we have to offer and what are we all about. So part of that was the planning effort, you have to do some planning, you have to understand the sign types that we think you need, where we think they need to go so we can quantify that for you at some point.

The next step in that is once we know where we think these need to go and what types of signs we think you need, we also want to design that for you. The whole point of this activity is to get to a design that you feel comfortable, you feel represents your city well and that we have put all the pieces in place so that we could provide a budget for you and
you know what kind of investment it would be to move forward with a project like this. The planning we have done to this point we call Preliminary Location Planning, we have put together message criteria for who and what goes on both vehicular signs and pedestrian signs and those that would be used for bicyclists as well, so we do have that in place. Part of our next steps if this project were to move forward is to actually solidify the locations, solidify the messages, and put together a location plan and message schedule that would be reviewed. So when you look at all these plans, and I know it looks crazy with a bunch of dots that are totally not in scale with the map, so it looks like you have signs all over; we are considering the context, we are considering how many other signs you have in place and we are making sure we’re that we’re moving old signs that have been a part of Worthington or represented the Worthington brand, we are looking to remove those NOT the ones that are around Old Worthington. Ms. Michael said to confirm we are keeping the Worthington Women’s Club four historic signs with new posts. Ms. Fromet replied yes, but any of the ones that are blue panels that say Worthington on it, those would be removed and replaced with a new sign program; but we are keeping the historic signs. I think we’ll be updating the poles and painting them and making sure they look nice and representative of the character of the community.

Whenever we do our location plan and we’re actually planning and actually saying this is where something is going to go, we are always looking at the context, so the next major phase would be time-out on the streets looking at where things need to go so that their not competing with some of the regulatory signs that have to be in place, but that they are supporting the story of your community. So we did go through a design process, we did share a few sign concepts and the one that we landed on we feel does represent the quality and character of the City of Worthington. We looked at differentiating the city-wide wayfinding program which is everything outside of Old Worthington. We did differentiate slightly what the signs look like outside of Old Worthington so that Old Worthington which is a very special place within your city; people do recognize when they enter area which they already do because the architecture already speaks for itself, but that the signs also support the context of Old Worthington and begin to tell the story of a different place within your city.

We talked extensively with the citizens we engaged with for this project, we considered your current brand, we considered the character of the architecture and the streetscape within your city as we moved through the design and we took that through concept and all the way through design development which we are showing you here. So there are a variety of signs when we do sign programs, it’s not one sign that is going to do the job for everything; there’s multiple signs and we call it a sign family, so our intent is at the outer edges of your city boundaries which you do have to have what we call jurisdictional gateway signs. We are looking to replace just the blue and white panel signs that you have out there and people will be initially welcomed at those borders with what we call the jurisdictional gateway.

As you move closer into the context of the city there are points where we have identified major points of arrival, major points of welcome into the city proper and that’s where you would see the primary gateway signs. The majority of the gateways into your city, we
had a lot of difficulty finding how we would fit signs in those areas; they are very narrow, there is not a lot of landscape, you have a very long name so we can’t put large grand gateways, but perhaps at Wilson Bridge Corridor maybe something a little more spectacular will be presented.

Within the city you don’t have a ton of different directions that we do need to send people, but you do have amenities that people need to understand that they are at least on the right path and that’s telling the story of your city and it’s making people feel comfortable; so within the city proper we do have some directional signs, we also again take in consideration the context, so it’s not our intent to put large signs everywhere; the judgement will be made on whether there is multiple messages where we need to divert people or if it’s just a few messages, so the size of those signs do change.

We are also recommending you consider your street names; as I drive through the City of Worthington the majority of the signs do not fit. The manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices which has now recommended larger street names in the cities; so you can design them to fit within the context of this program or I would just recommend that you do larger street signs because people do use them to navigate your city. As you get into Old Worthington we talked about the fact that we do provide a variance in the design so people understand that the context of their experience is changing; so for example instead of light background signs, these are now the dark background signs; we have used your current brand and we did break it down a little bit; the signs have the curved top which is representative of the logo that you have in place and we have on some of the signs particularly as you’re entering into Old Worthington and we have included the skyscape of Old Worthington.

Once you get down into Old Worthington we do have a few directional signs there; it is also our intent that when people are walking in this area that you have a high quality sign that everything is finished including the backs of the signs, so there is a herringbone pattern that was picked up from a lot of the brick work in your streetscape that we felt would create a nice finish context for the backs of the signs. Helping people especially those that are coming to Old Worthington for Farmer’s Market on the weekends find appropriate parking was also an initiative of this program, so parking lot identification as well as directing to those prime parking areas is part of the program.

We are also considering what the pedestrian experience is in your area, you do not have a highly complex Old Worthington area, but you want to at least tell the story of what you have available here, so we are recommending orientation kiosks; these kiosks would have small maps as well as a directory of the many amenities in the area and this could be changed out based on whatever schedule that you determine, but we have methods for changing out the signs that are inexpensive and easy to replicate probably with any other sign companies that you have in the area.

We are also considering what does the sign family look like in the context of trail identification; to help people connect from the city to the trail and from the trail to the city. Ms. Dorothy asked if you have looked at any reverse angle signs for these more
personal orientation kiosks and trail ids, ones that don’t have blocks view shot so that you down and look back up or that are more ADA accessible. Ms. Fromet replied we did and they are typically used more for interpretative panels that are used by the National Park Service, they are a little harder to change out over time and we’ve also found that for these types of signs with messaging on them, you are usually looking for a method of fabrication that is going to last a little bit longer because there is a lot of sun surface that is actually hitting the face of those signs, so what we are recommending for something that can change and change often, they would fade and they would fade quickly and they would start looking bad if you had them on that angled surface.

The other thing we did look at is we know that your community event signs are well-loved in the city and people want to continue to have those on the green, but they need a little love. We did look at designing a structure that would be representative of the rest of the sign program, but would still allow the ability to change out these signs and have it look clean and more professional and organized. We’re not saying get rid of them, we’re just saying we would give you a different structure.

Mr. Brown commented as the steering committee met monthly one of the things we liked was the homemade look, so we didn’t want to take that part away, but we wanted the overall structure to have a little more beef to it, and then you could still snap in your homemade posters and flyers or what not. Ms. Fromet stated the nice thing about what we’re recommending in terms of the fabrication and these signs is that they do have what we call snap frames and you basically open them up and put your poster in and snap it down and it can stay there for as long as you need and then you can remove it.

We also considered what is this going to look like for the city amenities that you do have and how are people identifying these amenities along with the system that is telling them to get there; so we have considered a design for both city facility signs as well as city parks; and we do know again that there is different context to these, so what would that look like for the community center or the Griswold Center versus one of your free standing parks or a service building; so we have a family of signs we can pick from in terms of how this can be designed and again this is just an overall view of the family of signs all together.

Mr. Norstrom commented you talked about providing directions for visitors basically in many respects, asked did you get any data. Ms. Fromet asked on how many and who and what. When we met with the community group and the community engagement, it isn’t completely based on numbers and counts and whether that is a viable reason to have wayfinding or direction; a lot of that harkens back to awareness of your city and what you have to offer. When we were asked about the visitation in the city, the fact that you do have a brown sign out on the highway directing to Old Worthington is part of the reason why you’re starting to pull people from the highway into that area. You have the market on the weekends that I know has continued to grow in popularity over time, as well as the fact that you do have a very large trail system which does pull regional visitors from the area and I believe the desire is to continue to pull more regional visitors from that system. So you do have probably more than some other cities a larger visitor base than
some, so we do feel there is a reason for direction; direction is always from the point of view the person who has never been here before, but a lot of what we’re presenting here is also character and awareness of your city and making sure that you have a sign program that is representative of that.

Mr. Norstrom commented you said something interesting you said people use street signs. Ms. Fromet replied yes they do use street signs. Mr. Norstrom asked in today’s day and age. Ms. Fromet replied yes in today’s day and age. Mr. Norstrom commented I need some statistics on that one. Ms. Fromet explained while there are people who use the GPS and it tells them what street name to turn down, if the person can’t see the street name, they’re going to miss that turn, and if they miss that turn they’re going to get frustrated. The wayfinding signs we have on here we look very carefully at travel paths, how do we mark those travel paths (1) we do ask the people in the community what are the most traveled roads; we ask them if you were to tell you someone how to get to Old Worthington from the four cardinal directions, how would you tell them, which roads would you put them on; and we’re often looking at what is the best experience, what’s going to show off your city; (2) we consider the locations and destinations within your city and we will google map that ourselves and we will print out directions and we’ll mark those paths; so our intent is to only put signs on those paths that people are going to see them, so whether they’re listening to a GPS that’s telling them to go down a certain street to get to your community center, they can at least see a sign that confirms that they’re at least on that right path or they see a street name where they can make the appropriate turn. Signs are important and I do realize that there are a lot of people that do recognize them as clutter, but what we bring here is a community wayfinding program that is not only a utility to help people navigate within the city, visitors navigate within the city, but it’s also to bring a certain level of awareness to the quality and character and allow the people who live here to feel a sense of pride in what you have to offer.

Mr. Norstrom asked is there a budget associated with this. Ms. Fromet replied there is. Mr. Brown replied we have in the 2015 budget $120,000 and then as part of our CIP we originally had $25,000 a year and I believe it’s been raised to $50,000 a year to help us implement the wayfinding project over the next three years. Mr. Norstrom asked and you can present this how it would go in. Mr. Brown replied yes. I think our overall focus was to start with the Old Worthington area and then some of our gateways and then when we get to the next budget season and money is available to then kind of group that and do it in like three phases. The one thing I did want to ask for comments on from City Council, throughout the process OWBA asked that their plaque be included on just the four downtown gateway signs; when it went before Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board, they did recommend approval, but I did want to get your thoughts and comments of whether had any cares or concerns.

Dr. Chosy asked at one of the meetings that we had they were shown some little bit different odd signs at the entrances coming in, I don’t any of those. Ms. Fromet commented I think that was earlier on in the process and nobody wanted those. These signs the ones that say Welcome to Worthington would be the entry signs to the city. Ms. Michael commented that as you’re coming over the bridge from 23 going south over the
freeway, there’s the black rod-iron, the black signs; asked am I seeing correctly that the rest of these are more of a green color, Ms. Fromet replied they’re blue. Ms. Michael asked how are we tying in the black structures coming over into Wilson Bridge to the blue throughout the rest of the city. Ms. Fromet replied the sign posts for these signs are actually what we’re calling gunmetal that works well.

Mr. Hermann commented I want to correct a statement I misspoke earlier; on the prioritization list I said those were 2016 dollars, those are actually 2018 dollars.

Dr. Chosy commented they hit the spot with us, very good presentation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• October 5, 2015 – Regular Meeting

MOTION Councilmember Troper made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Dorothy.

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

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 48-2015 Approving Fees for the Worthington Community Center and Griswold Center.

Introduced by Councilmember Scott Myers

MOTION Councilmember Chosy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 48-2015. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

Mr. Hurley presented the following PowerPoint presentation for Community and Griswold Center Fee Recommendations.
Process

- Parks and Recreation Staff completed a periodic review of membership rates this year.
- Last review occurred in 2012.
- Review included:
  - Benchmarking other comparable centers.
  - Analysis of membership and other user fee patterns.
  - Analysis of revenue and cost recovery data.
  - Public presentation at a Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting.

Benchmarking

- Staff conducted benchmarking by directly looking at membership rates of other comparable facilities and by also more generally reviewing structure, policies and procedures to see how we compare.
- Benchmarking should consider that not every “membership” is created equally.
- Findings were we compare favorably to both senior centers and community centers in terms of affordability and offerings within our memberships.
Dr. Chosy asked if this is the present rate. Mr. Hurley replied yes this is the present rate.
Dr. Chosy asked things that people pay for, how is that worked in there. Mr. Hurley replied at the Griswold Center people buy memberships which is currently $10.00 for residents and $15.00 for non-residents and things that wouldn’t necessarily cover their own costs (things that happen at the center that are more drop-in orientated), things that we are not charging the full fare for would go into our general fund, all of our silver sneakers revenue goes into our general fund; so we have the silver sneakers program which is an insurance reimbursement program so that would go into the general fund revenue. A revolving fund would be if we take a trip and so we’re charging essentially the full cost of that trip to the people who go on the trip.
Mr. Norstrom asked of the 4900 how much of those is resident versus non-residents. Mr. Hurley replied we track almost exactly 2/3 residents to 1/3 non-residents.
Mr. Hurley explained that the 719 traditional members these are people that are coming in and paying for a membership; the others are silver sneakers members, so they don’t actually pay us a membership fee; they swipe a card and we get a reimbursement for every time they visit the center, so at the Griswold Center it’s a very good deal for us, we’re making much more money on them than if they were buying a traditional...
membership because every time they utilize the building or a program we’re getting $3.25.

Mr. Hurley stated the recommended rates are listed first, and the current rates are listed in parenthesis; what we’re recommending is a $10.00 increase pretty much across the board with the exception of when you get into the households of 3, 4, 5, etc. in which case we’re recommending a slight decrease based on the idea that we’ve lost a lot of members as oppose to them signing up with their children; in addition to that we’re actually going to increase our kids punch card rate by 50 cents in hopes of balancing that out a little bit.

I will point out that we did not have a teen rate, we looked at not just the communities I showed you in the benchmarking slide, but we looked at 50 community centers nationwide and over 40 of them had some sort of a teen rate and we did not for whatever reason; so we decided that it is a good recommendation to add a teen rate which is a little lower than an individual and see how that goes.

Our corporate membership rates we brought these to you in 2012, at that point we were just starting that up and really hadn’t gotten any feedback, we didn’t know how it was going to go over; and we think now we’re ready to settle in; again just slightly a higher rate based on the experience and feedback we’ve received; we think that’s a good rate that will continue to work with the start-up of corporate memberships. Dr. Chosy commented that’s a pretty significant jump, isn’t it $20.00 per person. Mr. Hurley replied it is, and what we were really trying to do initially was get some people to try it, just to give us a baseline of how it works and how it would work in terms of our computer system and just getting them signed up. The Parks Commission was concerned about the
balance between that rate and what are taxpayers paying and so they thought that jump should be a little more than our jump that we’re making with the individual.

Mr. Norstrom asked we’re dropping the non-Worthington corporations, I assume that’s because we haven’t attracted much. Mr. Hurley replied exactly and we’re trying to be consistent, for some reason some of the fees weren’t consistent; basically it’s a 30% markup from resident to non-resident and a lot of our fees did that; we had some outliers that did not do that and with all the staff and all the history and even the Parks Commission and their history could not find an answer to that, so we wanted to make that more consistent just in the ability to explain that; so a few of our transitions from resident to non-resident were not at a 30% markup and we did move to make those consistent; so when it doesn’t look like a normal change that was the case on the non-resident side that we were trying to make that 30% consistent.

The one change we did make that I eluded to earlier was we’ve called them punch cards, but we’re changing the name to Day Pass Bundles because we don’t actually give anyone a card that gets punched, it’s all in the computer; so we’re just more appropriately naming them, but as you can see for children you used to be able to get them for $3.50 per punch at a bulk rate, we’re just going to bump that to $4.00 again the idea is that there is such a willingness to go that route that maybe that pushes some people back towards our memberships. Mr. Norstrom asked you’re not raising the adults and that’s simply because there’s not a huge volume. Mr. Hurley replied that is correct.
Mr. Hurley stated in terms of day pass sales, we have around 20,000 day pass sales per year, if you break that down that’s about 55 per day on average. We sell around 750 punch cards by the previous name annually, so those are the users that it’s harder to track (to answer your question Ms. Dorothy) because we don’t know how many users make up that 20,000 day passes, we just know that many visits occur.

Mr. Norstrom asked the base rate doesn’t go up that much $10.00. Mr. Hurley commented one point that may help to answer this question and I failed to mention this earlier is that the Parks and Recreation Commission felt strongly about they wanted us to come back to them with a program that is more systematic, more cost-of-living based so we’re not going these long stretches and then making a recommendation because they agreed if you look at the stretch from 2009 – now $10.00 isn’t a very big increase, but they didn’t feel good about people having a budget for coming and using the Community Center and giving them a huge increase at once, so I’ll admit $10.00 is not impactful now, I think the idea would be we figure out whether it’s annually or every other year a more incremental increase to keep up with our inflation of our expenses and our staff costs, but that would not be such a shock all at once to our members; a lot of you know with seniors and everyone else we serve, a bigger jump at one time our commission thought would be problematic.

Ms. Dorothy asked do the punch cards ever expire or have an expiration date. Mr. Hurley replied they have never had one. One of the things we did include in our conversation with the Parks and Recreation Commission was to have a one-year expiration date which our new software will allow us to track better. In the past we could say we had one, but it wasn’t a good way in our system to do it. So our new software will
Mr. Norstrom commented you were comparing us to others in terms of cost or fees, do you have any idea where we stand in terms of recovery in terms of that 63% number. Mr. Hurley replied it’s difficult because since I’ve been at Worthington there was a reporter actually attempting to write an article on the suburban community centers and their cost recovery, of the course the first thing that all of us said to them was just the same conversation we’ve been able to show in the period of year, our cost recovery changed by 20%. It’s really hard to have apples to apples conversations because everyone is tracking different costs, but I can tell you from working in Dublin for 10 years, we recover more of our costs than they do, they were 50% or so, and I know from just informal conversation with other directors, I think we’re positioned pretty normal when you consider what other communities do. Again it’s very difficult with confidence tell you exactly where we are unless you examined all of their budgets.

Mr. Norstrom remarked that Ms. Michael and Dr. Chosy were here, I came in 9 years ago and we had this conversation about how much should be recovered and the goal then was 85%, so under those old numbers 63 = 80. Mr. Hurley commented I certainly think that is a policy discussion and I can provide as much framing for that as you want; the honest answer becomes what can we bear because as you look at our membership rates as they sit now, how much more flexibility is there before you start losing people; we’ve already demonstrated that our memberships aren’t exactly going up even at the point they’re priced now.

Mr. Norstrom commented let me suggest that is a policy discussion item that we should have in 2016.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 48-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 43-2015

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 Community Wayfinding Signage Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 619-15)

Introduced by Councilmember Dave Norstrom

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinance(s) in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter unless otherwise directed.
• Application for Special Groups

Mr. Greeson explained we desire to get something out to the Special Groups as soon as we can. We created the letter that we would send out as soon as Council approves it. People could download the grant application, this would be a request for 2016 and it talks about how much is available to the groups and I think that recognizes that the Old Worthington Partnership is receiving funding as you’ve discussed previously and it also articulates the arts groups would apply to the MAC. It doesn’t outline specifically how much funding we’re giving to the MAC, we have previously allocated about $5000 to two (2) arts groups The Worthington Chorus and Worthington Community Theatre and under this scenario as we talked about before, we would grant that $5000 to the MAC and they would accept applications for art organizations and distribute it.

Then we put together based on your previous discussion just a quick grant application, we tried to get at the things you wanted, what is their purpose, activities, how much are you asking for, what is your desired impact and how will you determine the impact, what is the benefit from the program or project, residences of the City of Worthington, percentage that are residents of the Worthington school district that are served, if you’re a membership organization how many of your members are residents, how many of them are residents of the school district; then we asked them to attach documents (budget for the proposed program, documentation of non-profit status, most recent financials, including most recent IRS filing audit and/or financial review by CPA; then we put together a matrix that we thought might be useful.

Ms. Dorothy indicated you would like to see included how will determine and track the impact; I would like to be able to see what their impact is year after year if they get funding every year.

Ms. Michael stated when we’re asking the question “what is the percentage of your membership that are residents of the City of Worthington and also the percentage that are residents of the Worthington School District you’re counting people twice because if somebody is a resident of the City and then they’re a resident of the school district, so half our group is residents of the City and then three-quarters of the group are residents of the school district because those that residents of the City are also residents of the school district; so we might want to revise it. Mr. Greeson replied we can clarify that.

Dr. Chosy asked in regards to the matrix what do you do with the points. Ms. Dorothy asked what would be the total maximum points. Mr. Norstrom commented those are little things we can discuss after the letter goes out; we don’t have to decide those tonight. Ms. Michael stated there are six boxes at 10 points each which totals 60 points. Mrs. Stewart explained it is possible to label this as draft if you want to work with the scoring matrix and modify it, but this at least gives the applicant some sense of what the priorities would be.
MOTION 
Councilmember Myers made a motion to approve the Special Group Application packet as amended. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

There being no additional comments, the motion to approve the Special Group Application packet as amended carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Stewart added that one of the things we need to put in here is a date and time for the submittal, asked is there a particular time you want to start considering these. Mr. Myers replied by the end of the year. Mr. Norstrom replied within a month. Ms. Michael confirmed December 1, 2015.

Policy Item(s)

- Authorization to Bid – Community Center Cleaning Contract

Mr. Greeson indicated we need to bid the services out for the Community Center.

Dr. Chosy asked you’re not dropping the current company because of level of service, you’re dropping because this is the end of the contract am I correct. Mr. Hurley replied that is correct, the present company has had two renewals and so after three years we are required to bid again. Dr. Chosy asked they will probably bid again. Mr. Hurley replied it is our hope that they will. We are pleased with them.

MOTION
Councilmember Troper made a motion to authorize staff to bid for a Community Center cleaning contract. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Dorothy.

The motion carried by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

BONNIE MICHAEL – indicated we’re going to have to talk about Halloween again; I have received several complaints about children coming in from everywhere trick or treating in Worthington. Dr. Chosy stated he actually got several compliments about Halloween. Council stated it is fine, it’s about kids coming in from everywhere. Ms. Dorothy commented there is no discussion needed about Halloween.

Ms. Michael asked staff to start looking into whether or not we should have a tree Ordinance and what would be included in a tree Ordinance. Mr. Norstrom replied staff doesn’t need to look at anything at this point and time, I think we have a property rights question that we need to discuss. Ms. Michael said there are two things, the property rights question is there, but do we need to have some type of tree Ordinance. Mr. Norstrom commented that’s what I’m saying, I think we need to have that discussion; there are tree Ordinances all over the country; the question is should we have a tree Ordinance, staff doesn’t have to do a lot of work on this, that’s a principal, tree
Ordinance vs. Property Rights. Ms. Michael asked can we set that for a discussion time. Mr. Myers said after the first of the year.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Councilmember Myers made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Board and Commission appointments, and Economic Development. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chosy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No 0

Council recessed at 10:37 P.M. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Councilmember Norstrom made a motion to return to open session at 11:05 P.M. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Councilmember Dorothy made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 11:05 P.M.
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