



Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 7, 2015 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

City Council

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

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, December 7, 2015, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 P.M.

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

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, Service and Engineering Director William Watterson, Director of Building and Planning Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Police James Mosaic, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were approximately sixty two visitors present.

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

President Michael welcomed members of Scout Troop 365 who were in attendance as a requirement for their First Class Badge. She encouraged them to ask questions.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

RESOLUTION NO. 53-2015 Expressing the Congratulations and Best Wishes of Worthington City Council to the Thomas Worthington High School Field Hockey Team for Winning the 2015 State Championship.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 53-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 53-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael invited Vice-Mayor Jim Lorrimer to make the presentation.

Mr. Lorrimer shared that sports are life in microcosm. They teach us that we get back from all aspects in life in direct proportion to what we put in. That discipline and effort produces better performance and success. We learn how to deal with victory and defeat.

We learn to cope with the anxiety and pressure of personal performance. These are among the many valuable lessons that sports provide. They are the lessons the young ladies that council recognizes this evening have learned and continue to learn.

Field hockey is one of the most physically challenging and athletic demanding of all team sports. It is highly popular at the high school and collegiate level in this country with scholarships being offering to talented athletes at many universities. Our Thomas Worthington's Girls Field Hockey Team has just won its fourth High School State Championship in this highly competitive sport. The last three of these state championships were won in 2007, 2011, and 2015 and all under the head coaching guidance of Terri Simonetti Frost, who has been the coach of the TWHS teams for seventeen years. It has been suggested that in 2016 she and the fourteen championship team members who will be returning next year should focus their great athletic and competitive talents on the sport of football. This group of outstanding athletics would likely do well in any sport. They are proven champions.

Field hockey has a great international following. It was added to the Olympic calendar for Women's athletics in 1980 and has grown rapidly in our country in both high school club and college levels. Coach Simonetti Frost had a four year athletic scholarship at Boston University in this sport. This year's championship team member Hana Sinno has also been offered an athletic scholarship to attend that same university. This 2015 state champion team has a truly remarkable record. In league, district and state championships they had 20 wins and zero losses. In the Ohio State championship tournament the Thomas Worthington team outscored its opponents 20 goals to only 2 for its opponents. In the state championship game against Hudson High School, the opposing team got no clear shots at the goal. It was a clearly remarkable and dominating team victory by the Thomas Worthington girls' team. This experienced state championship girls' team has twenty three members that included eight seniors, five juniors, four sophomores, and six freshman.

Mr. Lorrimer introduced the team members to council members. He talked about several of the assistant coaches before inviting Coach Simonetti Frost to join him at the podium. He read Resolution No. 53-2015 in its entirety and presented Coach Simonetti Frost with a certified copy and a framed copy of the This Week in Worthington newspaper article.

Coach Simonetti Frost shared that this is like Christmas when she attends council meetings because she hangs the plaques in her basement for everyone to see. She has them all over her wall and before they played the state game her girls asked her if they will be on the wall. She replied that they had to win in order to be on the wall so we won. She thanked council for the recognition and for honoring the team. These girls began preparing last December and have worked very hard. This is the first year that Ohio High School allowed the players to be coached four at a time so they would bring four in and then they would leave and another set of four would come, etc. You don't win state championships because you show up August 1st. You win because you put the work into it. These girls put the work into it. They played with all of their heart and with sheer determination. It was such an honor to be their coach this year.

Mr. Lorrimer acknowledged Thomas Worthington Athletic Director Scott Dorne and Thomas Worthington Principal Jim Gaskill. He introduced Dr. Trent Bowers as Superintendent of the Worthington School District. He shared that Dr. Bowers was a 1991 graduate of Thomas Worthington High School. He played football and lacrosse. He returned to his home community nine years ago after obtaining a Bachelor's Degree, a Master's Degree and a Doctorate Degree in educational leadership. He is the first graduate of Worthington High School to become superintendent of schools. He has the responsible for 10,000. We are very pleased to welcome him to this meeting. He invited him to comment.

Dr. Bowers thanked City Council for taking the time to recognize this team. As a school district we are really proud of what they have accomplished in winning the state championship. But he wants council to know that we are really more proud of how they accomplish what they accomplished. These young lady and Couch Simonetti Frost outwork all of their opponents. That begins on the practice field. If you watch them play you will see that they challenge every ball. They out hustle every team that they play against. More importantly we are really proud of how these young ladies represent Thomas Worthington High School and we are proud that they are leaders in the classroom. They lead our school in academics.

Ms. Michael congratulated the field hockey team and then gave them and others in the audience an opportunity to leave before continuing with the meeting.

VISITOR COMMENTS – There were none.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

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

Meeting Minutes to Approve:

- **October 19, 2015** – Regular Meeting

Legislation to Approve/Adopt

Ordinance No. 47-2015

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Contract with the Village of Riverlea for the Provision of Police Protection.

Resolution No. 54-2015

Amending the Staffing Chart of the City of Worthington to Reflect the Positions Authorized in the 2016 Operating Budget.

Introduced by Dr. Chosy.

Resolution No. 55-2015

Approving the City Manager's Appointment of Donald W. Schofield as Alternate Chief Building Official and Alternate Master Plans Examiner for the Division of Building Regulation.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

Policy Item

- **Liquor Permit Request – Transfer – From Frank J Colleli & Donna J Colleli dba Villa Nova Restaurant to Colleli Corporation dba Villa Nova Ristorante**

End of Consent Agenda

MOTION Dr. Chosy made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 44-2015

Providing for the Adoption of the Annual Budget for the Fiscal Year 2016 and Appropriating Sums for Current Operating Expenses.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Ms. Michael asked for a motion to amend Ordinance No. 44-2015 with the following budget totals that she read for the record:

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Total General Government | \$ 6,916,272 |
| Total Division of Police | \$ 5,682,100 |
| Total Department of Public Service and Engineering | \$ 2,535,540 |
| Total Department of Parks & Recreation | \$ 4,659,744 |
| Total Dept. of Planning & Building | \$ 736,711 |
| Sub-Total General Fund | \$20,530,367 |
| Total Division of Fire | \$ 6,285,662 |
| TOTAL GENERAL FUND | \$26,816,028 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total Street Maintenance & Repair Fund | \$ 940,553 |
| Total State Highway Fund | \$ 138,002 |
| Total Water Distribution Fund | \$ 84,928 |
| Total Sanitary Sewer Fund | \$ 72,428 |
| Total Police Pension Fund | \$ 650,000 |
| Law Enforcement Trust | \$ 36,500 |
| MMVLT Fund | \$ 150,000 |
| Education Supplies | \$ 3,500 |
| Court Clerk Computer Supplies | \$ 53,500 |
| Economic Development Efforts | \$ 423,000 |
| Total Revolving Funds | \$ 988,601 |
| Special Parks Fund | \$ 55,500 |
| Capital Improvements Fund | \$ 1,423,400 |
| General Bond Retirement Debt Service | \$ 2,640,000 |
| O.B.B.S. Surcharge | \$ 7,500 |
| Worthington Station Municipal Public Improvement TIF | \$ 125,000 |

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 44-2015 with the aforementioned budget totals. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Mr. Greeson thanked council for the opportunity to once again talk with them about the operating budget. The annual budget was distributed to council in October. Each of the departments have made presentations to council on this budget. Staff has also gone through the five year financial forecasts with members. He would like to mostly focus on the budget changes (copy attached) that have occurred since the originally submitted document. There are adjustments in several areas that staff feels are important to be able to achieve the objectives of the city. Then staff will be prepared to answer any questions members may have.

Budget changes primarily occur in three areas. 1) Desire for a student intern, 2) Radio Maintenance, 3) Parks Maintenance (restructure Parks Manager and Parks Supervisor positions) and new software system for collection of Community Center fees.

The motion to amend Ordinance No. 44-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 45-2015

Establishing Compensation for Certain Exempt Positions of the Municipal Service For the Period of January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016, and Adopting Class Specifications for Said Exempt Positions.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is the annual compensation salaries for exempt positions ordinance. It reflects a 2 ½% increase as was previously discussed and council directed.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 45-2015 to include the salary figures that were presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 45-2015 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 45-2015 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 46-2015

To Continue the Allocation of the Six Percent (6%) Hotel/Motel Tax as it Relates to the Operation of the Worthington Area Convention and Visitors Bureau.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is an annual ordinance that authorizes the allocation of the 6% to the Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB). Members also received a memorandum from Mrs. Fox that provides background on the legal authority by which the hotel/motel tax is distributed to a CVB. Both he and Mrs. Fox are prepared to answer any questions. He added that members previously received a presentation from the CVB regarding their budget and their accomplishments as well as their goal and objectives. One of their Board members, Mr. France is here this evening.

Ms. Michael commented that Council member Norstrom had sent an e-mail to everybody. She asked him if he had any additional comments.

Mr. Norstrom shared that his e-mail stated that he feels this organization has served its purpose. That we are not a destination. We have found out that the thirty-four bus tours

are not implemented or managed by the CVB but that is done entirely by Experience Columbus. The work that they do can be combined with the work of the Old Worthington Partnership. They could coordinate the activities with Experience Columbus. That would free up \$140,000 of which we are required to provide half to a CVB or like organization, which the Old Worthington Partnership would qualify for. The other \$70,000 could be used by the city for other purposes, such as promoting groups that would attract tourist or people to Worthington. An example would be the Ohio Railway Museum. He thinks it is time that council revisit this issue of the CVB. He could go into more detail but he has made the arguments and has expressed it to all council members. He opposes the motion.

Mr. Smith shared that he distributed a letter to members with a counterpoint argument to Mr. Norstrom's. He is supportive of the CVB as proposed.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 46-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Chosy, Troper, Michael

No 1 Norstrom

Ordinance No. 46-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 48-2015

Authorizing the Issuance of Notes in the Amount of Not to Exceed \$1,560,000 in Anticipation of the Issuance of Bonds for the Purpose of (I) Acquiring a Ladder Truck with Related Equipment, (II) Replacing, Constructing, and Installing a Waterline for the Davis Estates Subdivision, with Related Site Improvements and all Necessary Appurtenances Thereto; and (III) Improving and Replacing Windows in the Community Center Including all Appurtenances Relating Thereto, and Retiring Notes Previously Issued for Such Purpose; and Approving Related Matters.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson commented that the city has completed all of these projects and issued notes to help finance them short term. It continues to be advantageous for the city to "roll" these notes because of the interest rate environment. He asked Mrs. Roberts to discuss the particulars.

Mrs. Roberts shared that this will be our fifth renewal of these bond anticipation notes. We started this process in 2011 and then added \$360,000 for the community center

windows. We have been paying down \$100,000 in the principal amount since 2012 and we have received very favorable interest rates in pursuing these short term interest notes and will likely receive the same favorable interest rate with our next issuance.

Ms. Michael asked when these notes will finally be paid off. Mrs. Roberts replied that the longest we can go is twenty years. We have been issuing them on one year renewals since we started this process in 2011.

Mr. Myers asked if the current bonds will mature before Ms. Yellen (Chair of the Federal Reserve) meets again with her group. Mrs. Roberts replied that she thinks they will meet in the first part of January and these mature in the middle of January so not quite.

Mr. Myers commented that he assumes that if they take steps that would impact our interest rate she will report back to council. Mrs. Roberts assured him that she would.

Dr. Chosy commented that if we had longer term bonds in 2011, he asked how that would have compared to the interest amount that we have paid so far. Mrs. Roberts replied that it is a little bit difficult to predict but as a point of reference we just renewed the 2005 bonds and we secured an interest rate of 1.62% for the remaining life of those bonds (5 years). The original interest rate on those bonds varied between 3.75 and 4% so we had significant savings in refunding those bonds. A little bit different issuance but our current interest on the bonds that we are talking about with this ordinance is 1.01%. While she doesn't think we will be able to secure that rate, she thinks it will be somewhere between 1% and 1.62%.

Mr. Greeson added that they are called bond anticipation notes because the capital improvement plan anticipates more debt. When we issue longer term debt we want to package that and as Mr. Myers rightly pointed out, at an advantageous time but also if we package it we avoid paying issuance costs more than once, which can be fairly significant.

Dr. Chosy commented that what we are doing so far is better than if we would have gotten a larger, longer loan early on. That is what he is asking. Mrs. Roberts believes that to be true. Dr. Chosy added that it sounds like it. He asked if we can re-issue every year. Mrs. Roberts replied that we can "roll" these notes like we have been doing over the last four years up to twenty years or life of the improvements. In this case a portion of these bonds is related to the community center windows, which would be twenty years.

Dr. Chosy asked if other municipality finance this way. Mrs. Roberts replied that it depends on the circumstances but this is common practice.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 48-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 48-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 56-2015 Establishing the Compensation Plan, Assigning Compensation Levels for Positions in the Classified Service, Adopting Class Specifications, Providing for Normal Work Weeks, and Repealing Resolution No. 54-2014.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 56-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mr. Greeson commented that this is an annual document. There has not been a significant amount of change except for two minor changes that relate to the Parks Maintenance changes that were talked about earlier. He believes the range for the Parks Manager went down and the range for the Parks Supervisor went up to 19. That change is reflected in this resolution and members saw the offsetting budget amounts in the budget that was passed earlier. That allows us to get those positions more in line with the duties that we have them performing and some of the salary savings are being used to help on the maintenance side. It is roughly a wash budgetary. Staff thinks this better reflects what they do while providing some funds for contract and seasonal maintenance.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 56-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 57-2015 Approving the 2016-2020 Capital Improvements Program for the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Dr. Chosy.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 57-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Greeson shared that staff covered that CIP in a fair amount of detail in a previous meeting. He would like to touch on one change that has been made and then he will answer a question that was posed to him.

In 2016, there was \$10,000 included for a turn out gear washer, which is the gear that firefighters wear when they respond. That washer needed replaced earlier so that will be a reduction in the 2016 allocation by \$10,000.

Mr. Greeson commented that there is \$150,000 proposed for a contribution to the StRt 161 corridor study and he was asked what the other partners would be contributing. He says proposed because any participation in this is planned in the Capital Improvement Program but it would require additional appropriation legislation and additional consent legislation, which is a requirement of the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT). He anticipates bringing ODOT in early next year to be a part of that conversation. But to answer the question specifically:

- 1) ODOT District 6 – 20% of the projected cost or \$120,000.

Note: Typically ODOT participates in construction and not at this level of study.

- 2) Columbus – 45% of the projected cost or \$270,000
- 3) Worthington – 25% of the projected cost or \$150,000
- 4) MORPC – 5% of the projected cost or \$30,000

Note: Funding form MORPC would need to be requested as they typically do not participate at this level of study.

- 5) Perry Township – 5% of the projected cost or \$30,000

Mr. Greeson commented that staff would be happy to answer any questions about the Capital Improvements Program for 2016 and the planned projects for the future years, mostly for planning purposes.

Mr. Norstrom asked if the amounts for the study have already been discussed with the other parties. Mr. Greeson replied that they have but he doesn't know to what degree with the elected bodies.

Mr. Norstrom asked the basis for how the numbers were determined. Mr. Greeson replied that there are three entities that have the largest scope of responsibility: Worthington, Columbus and ODOT. We urged Columbus to take the lion's share of that.

Mr. Norstrom noted that they are paying 45% which is not even half. He asked how much of their population is in the study area versus Worthington. Mr. Greeson replied that he doesn't know the answer to that question.

Mr. Norstrom suggested to Ms. Michael that council approve \$50,000 in our capital budget for this so we can show that we are interested in participating. He and Mr. Greeson were talking recently and one of the needs for downtown is parking. He understands that the appropriate way to approach that would be to do a parking study. That \$100,000 could be used within the city of Worthington to study downtown parking. He doesn't know if that is the right number but it is something that could be added to the Capital Improvements Program that we do not currently have and it is as big a need for Worthington. The issue on StRt 161 has been there the entire time that many of us have been in Worthington. The good news is that the state did push it forward so he thinks

there is some action there but he thinks the difference between \$50,000 and \$150,000 for Worthington is big as opposed to ODOT or to the city of Columbus.

Mr. Greeson respectfully asked that council approve the amount proposed in the CIP at least for planning purposes and give him an opportunity to go back and talk about Mr. Norstrom's contribution concerns with the partners.

Mr. Norstrom believes that Mr. Greeson's thinking is backwards. We should be setting the policy of how much council wants there. The fact that Mr. Greeson is suggesting a recommendation, a public recommendation to us already puts it on the table and that is backwards.

Dr. Chosy asked what is being looked at with this study. Mr. Greeson replied that council approved the city's participation in a study that all of those entities asked MORPC to conduct, which was basically an update of all of the traffic data. That did several things:

- 1) Looked at current congestion levels.*
- 2) Projected growth in the area*
- 3) Potential traffic growth over the next 30 years.*

Mr. Greeson commented that the study was done in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration requirements because ultimately this multi-jurisdictional concern would require federal funding because of the costs. The next stage of any project of significance that would attract federal funding would be to perform a planning/engineering/design study. This is a much deeper analysis with the end result being that the jurisdictions pick a preferred alternative for an improvement. The anticipated study runs between Olentangy River Road and Sawmill, although the preferred alternative could be something smaller than that if that is what the jurisdictions decide. It would include such things as an environmental analysis, an analysis of right-of-way needs, and it would model the traffic benefits of each alternative. Embedded in that process would be extensive public involvement to help influence what would ultimately be picked as a preferred set of projects that we would then seek funding for. He would imagine that we would not only look at the three primary challenges with that corridor identified with the traffic study that MORPC conducted, which include the at-grade crossing at the railroad traffics, the intersection of Linworth and StRt 161, and the Olentangy River Road intersection. There is also a significant desire by the parties to look at how we do bike and pedestrian accommodations so the study would look at that. So it is a fairly significant effort that usually takes twelve to eighteen months. Given the importance of public involvement in this one it could take longer than that.

Mr. Smith shared that he heard from the public about this and their comments were along the line of what Mr. Norstrom was saying. He is starting to agree with that. He has some expertise in this industry sitting beside him (Mr. Norstrom) so he figures he somewhat knows what he is talking about with this. He would be interested in reducing the funding as well, at least for the short term.

Ms. Dorothy thinks the study is absolutely needed. She has heard from the public about the increase in traffic with the new apartments on the other side of the railroad tracks. The policy question of what we want to put in the budget for what we pay for is a very interesting question but she thinks the study needs to be done for the betterment of our community.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he fully supports the concept that the study needs to be done.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to amend the Capital Budget to decrease the amount for the study from \$150,000 to \$50,000 and to insert a line item in the budget for studying downtown parking of \$100,000.

The motion died for a lack of a second.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to amend the Capital Budget to decrease the amount for the study from \$150,000 to \$50,000. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Ms. Michael acknowledged that both downtown parking and a traffic study are needed. She is concerned because we have the momentum going right now for the StRt 161 project. This is something that is in the budget now and we have a chance to appropriate it. The amount can be lowed after a conversation with the other partners has occurred.

Mr. Troper asked if council agrees to keep the amount at \$150,000 is Mr. Greeson looking to negotiate a lower rate. Mr. Greeson replied that clearly there are several who don't want to contribute at that level and he respects that. Council is not appropriating the funds. You are putting it in the plan, which means you are authorizing staff to work on it. We would appropriate the funds with an additional piece of legislation. So for all practical purposes it is a placeholder but it guides staff's actions. Council would have to adopt additional legislation and you would have to adopt more formal consent legislation that ODOT requires. He would recommend that council leave the suggested amount in the CIP but if members are not comfortable with that amount then give him an opportunity to address that with the partners and he will do his best to do so.

The motion failed to pass by a vote of two (2) "ayes" (Smith, Norstrom) to five (5) "nays" (Troper, Dorothy, Myers, Chosy, Michael).

Mr. Greeson commented that given the sentiment of the conversation he heard, he will discuss that with the partners and try to address Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Smith's concerns.

Ms. Michael thinks that Mr. Norstrom brought up a good point in that we do need to be looking at some kind of downtown parking and that might be something that staff might want to look at related to a parking study.

Ms. Dorothy commented that she would like to see what impact our signage has. She thinks that there are quite a few parking spaces that people don't know about and our new signage package is supposed to make it easier for people to find existing parking.

Mr. Myers asked that the topic be included on the agenda for the retreat. That would give members an opportunity to decide its priority. Ms. Michael agreed.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 57-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 58-2015 Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 58-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mr. Greeson commented that this is a transfer of savings from certain line items to cover costs that have exceeded the line item appropriation in another line. It is not an increase in the total appropriation of the budget. In particular we continue to struggle with unanticipated leaves in the Fire & EMS Division. We are asking for a transfer to cover costs for overtime.

Chief Highley added that they are currently down three people for a variety of reasons. It is not any one thing in particular but we do have a relatively higher age organization and some of the wear and tear tends to manifest itself in leaves. They currently have an individual out on surgical leave with another one possible next year. Those are just the kind of things that unfortunately sometimes stack up in groups.

Mr. Smith recalls that in recent years we have decreased staffing. He wonders with the aggregated age increasing if it might make sense to increase staffing like we did a few years ago. Chief Highley agreed that could be discussed but commented that there is costs involved that would be higher in costs than the overtime costs. Those would then be permanently incurred costs so that is the problem.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 58-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 49-2015 Approving a Grant as Part of the City's Economic Development Venture Program and Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Economic Development Grant Agreement for the Same.

Introduced by Dr. Chosy.

Ordinance No. 50-2015

Approving the City Manager's Appointment of the Franklin County District Board of Health as the Provider of Plumbing Inspection Services in the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

Ordinance No. 51-2015

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations From the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the 2016 New and Replacement Equipment Items and for Certain Projects as Identified in the 2016 Five-Year Capital Improvements Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Projects.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

Ordinance No. 52-2015

Amending, Adopting and Ratifying the Amended and Restated Central Ohio Health Care Consortium Joint Self Insurance Agreement and Approving Participation by the City of Worthington in the Central Ohio Health Care Consortium for the Three-Year Period Beginning January 1, 2016.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

Ordinance No. 53-2015

An Ordinance Approving a Written Post-Issuance Compliance Policy in Connection with the Issuance of Tax-Preferred Obligations by the City.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinances for the Council meeting of December 14, 2015.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALSPolicy Item(s)

- **City Council Salaries**

Mr. Greeson shared that council asked staff to prepare two things. One was a document that we prepared earlier in the year that compared the salaries of councils and mayors for various municipalities. This document includes all of the suburban central Ohio

communities that members are familiar with as well as a number throughout the state. That document was included with council materials. Originally this was created by the city of Dublin when they went through a similar discussion and then staff updated it. Additionally, Mrs. Fox was asked to prepare an ordinance that should council so desire would amend council's salaries. She is prepared to walk members through that ordinance.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he would like to introduce that ordinance. Ms. Michael acknowledged the introduction.

Ordinance No. 54-2015

Establishing Compensation for the Members of City Council and Declaring an Emergency.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Norstrom added that the ordinance will be discussed at the next meeting. He wants to get this ordinance in the record.

Mrs. Fox shared that this document was presented based on the information in the charter. Members may recall that council members are not permitted to increase their salaries during their terms. So for four of the council members who are in the middle of their terms, an increase does not apply. In addition, any ordinance to increase the salaries must be effective before the first of the year so it is prepared as emergency legislation. It is introduced with blanks for salaries. Currently the council president receives a different salary than the remaining members but council can decide how best to do that. The ordinance was prepared leaving that option open.

Ms. Michael shared that Mr. Greeson commented that it is better from an accounting purpose that it was better to do something monthly or annually as opposed to a per meeting. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that Mrs. Roberts can comment further upon her return to the meeting.

Mr. Norstrom commented that this ordinance has been introduced but it would be scheduled for discussion at our next meeting. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that because of the goal for a light agenda before Christmas break and because there is a gentleman at the dais whose service we want to celebrate, all of the ordinances that were introduced tonight will be heard at the December 14th meeting.

Dr. Chosy asked for clarification on "time for council member pay" column. Ms. Michael and Mr. Greeson replied that it is annual. Dr. Chosy concluded that the figure equals how much a council member would make in a year.

Ms. Dorothy asked the last time that compensation was addressed for council members. Mr. Greeson replied in 1988. Mr. Norstrom added that is the last time it was changed. The topic has been addressed previously by him.

Ms. Michael thinks that council members need to look at: a) should the amount be increased and b) to what amount. Right now we are the lowest paid council in the entire area.

Ms. Dorothy commented that Hilliard is not on this list but she knows that just recently they discussed their compensation and they mentioned Worthington. Because ours was so low they did not consider it in their review.

Ms. Michael thinks that is something that needs to be looked at so the rates can be revised.

Ms. Dorothy asked what members current compensation is. Ms. Michael replied that it is \$1,850 a year. Ms. Dorothy added that is the rate if members attend every meeting. Ms. Michael agreed. The rate is \$50.00 a meeting.

Mr. Smith said he would be interested in the rates for Bexley and Pataskala as well. Mr. Greeson agreed to provide that information. He added that he will also provide Hilliard's rates.

Dr. Chosy noted that Worthington council members only get paid if they attend a meeting. He asked if that is the case with all of the other municipalities. Mr. Greeson and Mr. Norstrom replied that it varies.

Ms. Michael commented that it is difficult to compare apples to apples because all of the communities have different meeting structures. Mr. Greeson added that many of them probably get paid regardless of whether or not they attend the meeting.

Mr. Greeson commented that Ms. Michael had asked a question while Mrs. Roberts was out of the room about the benefits of having a salary as opposed to a "per meeting" basis. He asked Mrs. Roberts to comment. Mrs. Roberts shared that it makes things more clear if it is a straight salary versus a per meeting basis. She added that PERS changed the regulations a few years ago and she believes if we made it a straight salary versus a per meeting arrangement it would fit better within their criteria.

Ms. Michael asked if that is because of the accumulation of government service time. Mrs. Roberts explained that in 2014 they increased the threshold for full-time service from \$250 a month to \$600 a month. Otherwise it is pro-rated.

Other comments

Mr. Greeson shared the following items:

1) Distribution of grant applications from community groups. He would like for members to determine how to process the requests at the December 14th meeting. Applications were received from every group that we have traditionally received requests from along with request from three new groups.

2) A memorandum from Mr. Brown is being distributed that outlines a discussion staff has been having with COTA.

Mr. Greeson shared that COTA is in the process of improving the effectiveness of their entire system which includes some changes in Worthington. He outlined some of those changes. There is an addition of service on StRt 161 and High Street to the Easton area. Anytime service is expanded and ended in a new area, one of the challenges that transit systems face is trying to figure out where to turn the bus around and to lay it over in order to sync it up with the route timing. COTA has begun some discussions with staff on where to put a bus turn around/lay over. When you consider the area there are not many places to accommodate such a requirement because the turnaround is located in Old Worthington. Staff put a memorandum together to outline some of the issues and some of the ideas that they have of how to accommodate the change. Staff would like members input and plan to discuss the process in greater detail at the December 14th meeting.

3) Creating the new zoning ordinance for the Wilson Bridge Road area. Members had an initial presentation on that and as a staff we are prepared to bring that back. Staff would like some direction on when to hear the item.

Members requested the item be discussed in January.

4) Staff has an opportunity to review a city of Columbus application that has been made by Linworth Baptist Church on a property that is in the city of Columbus but located across the street from the church.

Mr. Brown shared that there are two parcels located on the west side of Linworth Road that are owned by Linworth Baptist Church. They are doing an expansion north of the church for parking and located in the city of Worthington. The church would like to rezone the two parcels in Columbus to one of their planned district. A planned district sets up how the parcels will be laid out. The two options are for additional parking. The first will keep the existing house for missionaries in the summer and have thirty three parking spaces. The second option, which is their top scenario would be to create forty three parking spaces. When he and Mr. Watterson first heard of the proposals a few weeks ago the thought was on how to get people safety to and from the church across Linworth Road.

Mr. Brown showed slides of the application.

Mr. Brown shared that one of the recommendations that he and Mr. Watterson shared with Columbus includes the requirement for additional right-of-way dedication along Linworth, which will be great for any future plans that we may have but as part of their rezoning process, they will be required to install sidewalks along the front on Linworth Rd. Sidewalks were a request that he and Mr. Watterson were going to make. Then it gets to how to get churchgoers across the street safely.

Mr. Brown commented that part of the planning recommendations from the Service Department and the Planning Department to Columbus would be to incorporate a crosswalk with a rectangular rapid flashing beacon into their zoning request.

He showed a picture of the beacon.

Mr. Brown shared that staff just wanted to bring the rezoning request to council's attention and share with you what staff's recommendations were to Columbus as the request moves through their process. Since it is a planned district Columbus can incorporate staff's request into the application. He added that the crosswalk will actually be located in Worthington right-of-way. That request will eventually have to be approved by Worthington city council.

Ms. Michael asked if it is better to be sidewalk or asphalt bike trail. Mr. Brown replied that he and Mr. Watterson had that same conversation. He thinks that Columbus is open for either one so we can have that conversation.

Ms. Michael heard a number of residents, especially in the Potters Creek and Castle Crest areas say that it would be wonderful to have some sort of safe bicycle/pedestrian access from their area down to St.Rt. 161. She doesn't know if it would be better with sidewalks or bike trail.

Mr. Brown shared that discussions today focused on whether to set money aside and wait until you are ready to do something along the west side of Linworth. He thinks their initial thought was that the church wanted this installed immediately so at least a minimum of a five foot sidewalk but we mentioned to them today that we were going to have this discussion tonight. Staff thought it needed to be installed before they opened up the parking lot.

Ms. Dorothy asked what kind of protection the flashing beacon provides pedestrians. Mr. Brown replied that they hope that as people get accustomed to it, they would see that warning and slow down for anyone crossing Linworth Road to and from the church or other locations in the area. Ms. Dorothy concluded that it is a pedestrian activated yield sign and not a pedestrian activated stop sign. Mr. Brown agreed.

Ms. Dorothy stated that depending on the right-of-way, more than likely the cars will still have right-of-way. It is very similar to the one installed along Snouffer at Brookside. Mr. Brown agreed. He added that Worthington will be installing one on Wilson Bridge Road in the next couple of weeks in the fishing access area.

Mr. Norstrom noted that the discussion of a bike trail or sidewalks along here has been discussed before. He remembers there being a problem somewhere north of this location. Mr. Watterson shared that there are two culverts to the north. The county replaced one probably ten years ago and the pavement was widened with retaining wall. Then there is an additional culvert that needs to be crossed so those are the two more challenging locations.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the question, in terms of right-of-way is if this were to be a bike path then we would be looking at eight or ten feet and the sidewalk is five feet. He asked what space we have at this location. Mr. Brown replied that as part of this rezoning, Columbus is requiring ten feet of additional right-of-way dedication to match up with their thoroughfare plan. At least with that component there would be ten feet of additional right-of-way and not knowing all of the improvements that may be needed in the future at Linworth and StRt 161 it hopefully gives us something additional to work with. Then the goals of being able to go further north would be great.

Mr. Norstrom commented that there is currently nothing in the CIP for a bikeway or any sidewalks or pathways at that location. Mr. Brown agreed. He added that staff just wanted to bring this to council's attention.

5) Crandall Drive Meeting – Sidewalks

Mrs. Fox reported that on the continuing theme of sidewalks, staff met with a fairly large number a residents from Crandall Drive and a few other places in close proximity to that to go over the current process, some of the proposals that some of the residents on Crandall had requested and then just to hear from residents about how it was going. Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Smith were in attendance. The meeting probably could have lasted longer but we allocated two hours and we went over by about fifteen minutes. It was a good discussion.

Since that time staff received some e-mails from the residents who had proposed four changes to the code and essentially indicated that they would drop the two most problematic of their requested changes, in terms of making sure it was going to be specific enough for our purposes. The two that they dropped were: the definition of a neighborhood rather than a block in terms of who was going to be subject to the assessment; and 2) the manner in which the parties would be assessed. They dropped trying to do that on a per lot basis as opposed to the front footage basis that we now have in our code.

They did ask that we continue to consider the two other changes which were: 1) consider extending the repayment period from five years to ten years; and 2) provide language where the city's portion of the payment to be "no less than 50%". She and Mr. Myers have not yet had our discussion about that issue and whether that works or doesn't work. She let them know that going from five to ten years was more of a budget/finance issue but that that 50% language had not yet been reconciled at the council level. Staff is prepared to address these issues at any time. She let the resident know that she would ask council for direction on when to place it back on the agenda. Staff would then notify the Crandall residents so that everybody has an opportunity to hear that discussion. She thinks it will be a shorter conversation than the last one that occurred. Staff is looking for direction.

Mr. Smith asked if under the current ordinance the petitioner could place a “cap” somewhere on the petition so that residents would know in advance how much their portion will be. If the project estimates were to exceed the cap, then the project would not happen. Mrs. Fox reply that the way the code is written today she doesn’t think a cap is allowed because we just don’t provide for that but that is not to say that it can’t be. That dovetails into the whole “not less than 50%” of the project as well. If the costs were \$500,000 or more then they may ask the city to pay more than 50%, which she thinks is what staff saw when they first came to us, in terms of how much they were asking the city to pay. If that is a provision that council wants to have available to include in an ordinance, she would be happy to see if there is a way to arrive at such a provision. She thinks the key is for the people signing the petition to have a very clear understanding of exactly what they are signing. The flip side of it is that they sign but they still don’t know how much they will be subject to. She thinks that is why they tried to look for ways to limit that cost for them by going from five to ten years and seeing if the city would pay more.

Mr. Norstrom thinks in the public testimony in that meeting and the answer to the questions was that at no time will the signers of those petitions know exactly what the cost is going to be. Mrs. Fox agreed. She added that because of the way the process works residents don’t know until the design is finished.

Mr. Smith commented that if there is a way for the petition to state that “if it is above, in this case \$500,000, the project will not continue”.

Mr. Myers asked what it is that staff is asking council to do when you put this on the agenda. It sounds like we are having the debate now on some of these issues. Mrs. Fox replied that she just needs some direction on whether council wants this back as a code change. Does council want to consider that now or do you want this to be considered by a bike and ped committee or some other public discussions. Staff is just looking for direction.

Mr. Norstrom commented that if he understands the two issues, he asked if either of the issues require an ordinance change. Mrs. Fox replied yes.

Mr. Myers thinks that because it is an ordinance change, it needs to come to city council. Typically the way it would come to council is we either schedule it for a committee of the whole meeting and debate broad principles or we would ask for an ordinance and members would debate the ordinance.

Mr. Greeson commented that members could provide an answer next week if they want to think about it.

Mr. Norstrom shared that he thinks there are two issues involved. 1) The immediate issue of the street and what the residents want there and there is clear division; 2) A revisit of our ordinance that has never been used and that is longer term. He could see that going to bike and ped for recommendations to council but he thinks the first one, as

you pointed out the change in the ordinance for this specific location could come to council in a relatively short period of time.

Ms. Michael commented that she is concerned about approving the project before we change the ordinance. If we are going to change the ordinance, she thinks we should change the ordinance first and then look at the project and determine how it fits with it. Mr. Norstrom stated that he doesn't know if we will change the ordinance in the long term but he does think that for example the bike and ped commission could identify high priority areas that in the neighborhood concept that was proposed by the Crandall residents and doing that takes time. The residents of Crandall have come before council and asked for something. He thinks council should respond to them in a way that meets their needs as well as ours and then look at the longer term issue.

Mr. Myers stated that since it looks like council put a couple of items into January, and as much as he hates to put this off any longer than he has to, he asked if staff could bring council a proposed ordinance and possibly a small alternative proposed ordinance and we will schedule that for the first of February. Mrs. Fox agreed to do that. Mr. Myers added that he thinks that Mr. Norstrom was right. Globally, this is something that should be perpetually on the Bike and Ped Commission but for this ordinance specifically he thinks it should come right to council.

Mr. Greeson thinks that one of the two items will require a little debate but he thinks the time frame is not an issue. Staff is fine with ten years.

Mr. Myers also thinks that as part of the discussion it would be helpful for him and Mr. Smith raised the issue, just what is a typical timeline for something like this. He is not saying that we will go from start to finish in six months but what he is asking is, what are the steps? It does not necessarily need to have dates but when the city receives a petition, then what occurs. Mrs. Fox commented that that information is very similar to what staff presented at the meeting.

Ms. Michael asked for an outline.

Appointments

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to appoint Edwin Hoffman to the Municipal Planning Commission and David Foust to the Architectural Review Board and reappoint Kathy Holcombe to the Municipal Planning Commission and Amy Lloyd to the Architectural Review Board . The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

There being no additional comments, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared that this past weekend they were flying drones at Don Scott Airport. They have been designated by the FAA as an area where drones can be tested. It is all done over airport property and it is done with Sinclair Community College, which is even more advanced in drones than Ohio State is. So if members hear any feedback from the community that there are drone flying around Ohio field that is correct. Whenever the drones are flying there is no flying going on at the airport.

Mr. Norstrom added that a few weeks ago he and Mrs. Stewart toured the airport facility and the university has made the commitment that they are keeping it an airport. They are not going to try to develop it in any other way. However they are also going to make major investments in the property there in terms of research and development in avionics and other engineering and technology related to aviation, including things like drones so it will be an economic development hub for that part of the city of Columbus.

Mrs. Stewart added that she plans to get with Anne Brown because one of the things that they learned in their interaction with the airport is that any civilians who have a drone and are operating it within proximity to the airport are supposed to coordinate their activities with the airport so that the drones don't interfere with air traffic coming and going from the airport. Mr. Norstrom asked that the information be distributed because apparently there are going to be a lot of drones under the tree. Mrs. Stewart agreed.

OTHER

Larry Frances, 231 Abbot Ave.

Mr. Frances began by stating that these remarks are his alone. He is not here representing the CVB or any of its board members. On November 9, 2015 he was present at the Worthington city council meeting and experienced one of the most unprofessional displays by a member of the city council. Mr. Norstrom's use of the council as a bully pulpit to attack a highly talented volunteer organization and its executive director was just out of bounds. His resulting remarks about the CVB wasting a million dollars was just beyond belief. It was fallacious. Had he bothered to look at the report he had in his possession he would have found that the Worthington Holiday Inn had attributed \$434,000 of revenue in their hotel to the CVB activity. That is not wasting a million dollars. As he noted, they have been reasonably responsible for generating \$5.7 million dollars of business to the Worthington community since 2008. By any standard, this is a super success. He took Mr. Norstrom's attack as a personal attack on him, impugning his integrity and assured him that wasting the city money as an attack on the executive director he did not need was ridiculous. As a further note, five other CVBs, which are suburban CVBs have paid employees, one to seven. Mr. Norstrom insults and attack were over the top and disrespectful of the volunteers who gave their time freely to work on this committee.

Furthermore, it has put a damper on his forty years of volunteerism in this community. He has served this community in the Jaycees, the Worthington Sertoma Club, also served

on the Parks & Recreation Board, and the McConnell Arts Center. His attack just ruined his feelings about volunteerism for this community. As he previously stated, this borders on slander, the way he attacked them.

At this time he wished to thank the council members who tried to cut his attack on the CVB. Thank you, all of you. However, he was disappointed that Council President, Bonnie Michael did not use a gavel to shut him down.

In conclusion, he will be removing himself as a target from his attacks from this day forward. He will never volunteer for another thing in the city of Worthington. Good night.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
4th day of January, 2016.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President

2016 Proposed Budget Changes from Original Submittal

| <u>Account Number</u> | <u>Account Title</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Explanation</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|---|
| 101.1010.540523 | Legislative | MORPC Dues | \$ 600 | Increase for Intern Program Fees |
| 101.1030.511014 | Administration | Student Intern | \$ 7,280 | Summer Intern Program through MORPC 14wks |
| 101.1030.512200 | Administration | PERS | \$ 1,020 | PERS obligation for Intern |
| 101.1030.512204 | Administration | Medicare | \$ 106 | Medicare obligation for Intern |
| 101.1050.540650 | Finance | Bank/Merchant Fees | \$ (10,000) | Cost shift to P&R for collection fees |
| 101.2030.540552 | Police Support Svc | Radio Maintenance | \$ 17,200 | COIRS agreement fee increase |
| 101.4020.511037 | Parks Maintenance | Parks Technicians | \$ (8,939) | Anticipated Staffing Transition |
| 101.4020.511038 | Parks Maintenance | Seasonal Workers | \$ 5,500 | Increase to support staffing transitions |
| 101.4020.511063 | Parks Maintenance | Parks Manager | \$ (11,420) | Decrease due to staffing changes |
| 101.4020.511064 | Parks Maintenance | Parks Supervisor | \$ 5,434 | Increase due to staffing changes |
| 101.4020.512200 | Parks Maintenance | PERS | \$ (1,320) | Decrease due to staffing changes |
| 101.4020.512204 | Parks Maintenance | Medicare | \$ (137) | Decrease due to staffing changes |
| 101.4020.540563 | Parks Maintenance | Parks Maintenance Contract | \$ 10,000 | Increased to support staffing transitions |
| 101.4030.540650 | Community Center | Bank/Merchant Fees | \$ 90,000 | Addition for software collection fees (offset by revenue increase) |
| Total Proposed Budget Changes | | | \$ 105,324 | |