



Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 4, 2016 ~ 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
Scott Myers, President Pro-Tempore
Rachael Dorothy
Douglas C. Foust
David M. Norstrom
Douglas Smith
Michael C. Troper

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, April 4, 2016, 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: Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas Foust, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, Director of Public Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire Scott Highley and Chief of Police James Mosaic

There were thirty-five visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS – There were no visitor comments

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONGood Neighbor Award**Resolution No. 16-2016**

To Congratulate Joanna Saul on Her Recognition as a Recipient of the 2015 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 16-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 16-2016 carried unanimously.

Mr. Greeson shared that the Good Neighbor Award is a great opportunity to honor the good work of one of our citizens. He invited Jack Miner, Chair of the Community Relations Commission to come forward to make the presentation to this year's winner.

Mr. Miner shared that the Commission received many great nominees this year. It is his honor to acknowledge someone who is not just a good citizen but someone who has really changed the city through neighborhood walk. He invited Ms. Saul to join him at the

podium where he read Resolution No. 16-2016 in its entirety before presenting Ms. Saul with a certified copy.

Mr. Miner also introduced Kerrienne Wolf, the resident who nominated Ms. Saul.

Ms. Saul thanked City Council and the CRC for the recognition. She added that more than recognizing her, she thanked council for recognizing walkability in Worthington. It is such an important goal. Every time she goes for a walk she sees something new to love about Worthington. She hopes that Walk Worthington will aid all residents to love and appreciate the great neighborhoods that we have.

Ms. Michael and Ms. Dorothy both shared their appreciation for all that Ms. Saul has done in the community.

Mr. Miner added that another part of this award is a monetary donation to a charity in her name. He thanked council for the opportunity to share.

President Michael acknowledged a Scout from Troop 123 who was present as a requirement of his Citizenship in the Community badge. She encouraged him to ask questions.

Resolution No. 17-2016

Expressing the Appreciation and Best Wishes of the Worthington City Council to Mikel Coulter For His Outstanding Service to the Community.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 17-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 17-2016 carried unanimously.

Ms. Michael joined Mr. Miner at the podium where they jointly invited Mr. Coulter to join them. Ms. Michael read Resolution No. 17-2016 in its entirety and presented Mr. Coulter with a certified copy.

Mr. Coulter shared that he didn't realize that he had served that long. With the time that he has spent on the Community Relations Commission and has seen it change over the years he felt that when he gave up the chair it was time for a transition. He knows that Mr. Miner will do a great job leading and the CRC will continue to do great things.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 7, 2016 – Regular Meeting
- March 14, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Ms. Michael explained to the members of the audience that the introduction of legislation is an opportunity to set the item for public hearing. She invited residents to contact Mr. Greeson if they have anything to share or if they needed information prior to the hearing.

Ordinance No. 10-2016 Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (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 Heischman Park Playground Replacement Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 627-16)

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

Ordinance No. 11-2016 Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the Worthington Station TIF Fund and Worthington Place TIF Fund Unappropriated Balances.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Ordinance No. 12-2016 Amending Section 1107.01, Section 1141.01 and Section 1141.06 and Enacting Chapter 1181 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Facilitate Redevelopment and Reinvestment of the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

Ordinance No. 13-2016 Authorizing the City of Worthington to Participate with Other Central Ohio Jurisdictions in the Funding for a Study of the State Route 161 Corridor and Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost Thereof.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

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.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

- Update of Parks Master Plan

Mr. Greeson shared that Parks Director Darren Hurley will share the update on our Park Planning Process that his Department as well as our Parks and Recreation Commission has been working on. The review is done periodically to ensure that planning is going in the right direction. The intent of this evening's update is to check in with council and obtain feedback as to the direction we are heading. He invited Mr. Hurley to present the information update.

Mr. Hurley shared that he is excited to bring the Park Planning Process and update to council this evening. First he wanted to acknowledge Rob Wendling with the Parks and Recreation Commission who has volunteered to join us this evening and represent the Parks Commission.

Park Planning Process City Council Update

DARREN HURLEY, PARKS & RECREATION DIRECTOR



Park Planning

Reviving the tabled Vision 2020 Planning Process!

Mr. Hurley shared that the Vision 2020 plan began an effort to look at our parks comprehensively and provide a plan for our existing parks and determining ways to keep them up to date, modern and look to revive and expand the amenities in those parks when possible. Members may recall that one of the big discussion points during that process was the dog park. The good news is that resulted in a very nice Godown Dog Park but in effect it also served to take the momentum from the plan itself and shift it over to the establishment of the dog park. So the plan ended up being tabled because once the dog

park process got started we had two successive retirements of our parks directors before he arrived in 2010 so they just decided to table the planning process for the time being. So that is where we are today.

Recently the Parks Commission discussed taking the planning process back up.

Who?

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

- 9 Member Advisory Commission
- Mixture of those involved in Vision 2020 and those appointed after

What Approach to Take?

1. Considered desired outcome
2. Evaluated resources available
3. Assessed timing and feel of process

Process Overview

Determined internal, staff facilitated process using the expertise of the Commission was the best approach.

Process – 3 Broad Steps

1. Education/Research
2. Identifying Needs
3. Park by Park Planning

Mr. Hurley shared that because we will not be expanding the number of new parks in Worthington we wanted to really pay attention to our existing parks and what the needs are there.

Education/Research

1. Park Inventory and Benchmarking
2. Park by Park Analysis re: Maintenance
3. Park Trends

Benchmarking

International City/County Managers' Association's (ICMA) Center for Performance Measurement

1. Developed Park Acreage per 1,000
2. Number of Athletic Fields per 1,000
3. Similar Comparisons – Playgrounds, Tennis Courts, Trails, etc.

Mr. Hurley shared that not surprising, Worthington doesn't have glaring deficiencies when it comes to park acreage per resident or how many amenities of various types that we have. We fared well in the benchmarking component as far as how we stacked up with other communities.

Maintenance Analysis

Presentation from Parks Manager to educate members on challenges currently in place.

Overall Themes Serving as Challenges to Meet Expectations



Structure/Infrastructure

- Lack of or Failing Irrigation/Drainage
- Branding and Related Upkeep of Existing 28 signs
- Fencing Replacement/Repair
- Bleacher Pads/Overall Surfacing Challenges

Amenities

- Play Structure Repair and Replacement Schedule
- Aging Buildings

Flora/Fauna

- Invasive Species Control
- Ash Tree Removal
- Whitetail Deer

Equipment

- Outdated/Under-Purpose Items

Mr. Hurley shared that sometimes staff finds itself to be reactive to infrastructure items instead of proactive.

Park Trends

What trends are out there that we may want to consider in planning process?



The Easy Stuff

THE MOST COMMONLY PLANNED ADDITIONS INCLUDE:

- Dog parks (planned by 26.7 percent of parks respondents who will be adding features)
- Splash play areas (26.2 percent)
- Trails (24.4 percent)
- Park structures such as shelters and restroom buildings (21.6 percent)
- Playgrounds (20.3 percent)
- Skateparks (17.5 percent)
- Synthetic turf sports fields (17.2 percent)
- Disc golf courses (16.7 percent)
- Open spaces such as fields, gardens and undeveloped areas (16.5 percent)
- Bleachers and seating (12.1 percent)

<http://www.playgroundprofessionals.com/news/parks-and-recreation/look-trends-parks-recreation106>

The Bricks and the Mortar

Features that saw an increase in the number of parks respondents who plan to add them in 2013 vs. 2012 include splash play areas (up 2.8 percent), skateparks (up 2.7 percent) and synthetic turf sports fields (up 0.3 percent). Bleachers and seating did not appear among the top 10 planned additions in 2012.

The “Scary” Stuff

Oh no, they have ideas.

- Ideas
 - Natural (Unstructured) Play
 - Partnerships
 - Engagement
 - Electronics
 - QR codes
 - Virtual Tours
 - Coupon Programs
 - Geocache
 - Crossfit/Adventure Racing



When asked by Ms. Michael what Geocache is, Mr. Hurley replied that it is similar to a scavenger hunt. It uses GIS coordinate and little boxes are hidden in many public places and people go out on a hunt to try to find them. Staff has developed a policy for having them placed in our parks and under what conditions they can be placed.

Identifying Needs

- 1) Playground Discussion
- 2) Resident Survey
- 3) Brainstorm Needs/Wish Lists

Playground Challenges

How to maintain 14 playgrounds given the current funding levels, life span, and community standards?

Mr. Hurley shared that the current cost associated with playground replacements for an average playground is around \$150,000. The All Children's Playground was a little higher while the Heischman Park Playground will be a little less. If we anticipate that a playground will last between 20 to 25 years, we need to replace a playground almost every other year and we are not doing that. Over time we will begin to have challenges with keeping those playgrounds replaced.

Ms. Dorothy asked if he knows what the overall maintenance budget is including or excluding that replacement cost for our parks. Mr. Hurley replied that if he understands her question correctly it has to do with the Park CIP expenditures. One thing needed before recommendations to council can be made at the end of this planning process is to do a historical analysis of what over a ten or eleven year period have we been able to fund annually when it comes to park improvements. We took a look back for eleven years and have averaged just under \$90,000 a year in what we call park infrastructure improvements. That is items out in the parks. If you replaced a playground every other year, which 28 playgrounds would be pushing us that would be \$75,000 a year on average just in playgrounds. That leaves \$15,000 a year to address everything else that we might need or want to replace. If nothing changed and we had the same average over the next ten years that would be the lens that we would be looking through.

Mr. Norstrom asked how much of the \$90,000 has gone for playground replacement. Mr. Hurley replied about 80 to 85% of that has been playground equipment. We worked in some tennis courts here and there but there haven't been large replacements.

Mr. Norstrom concluded that 80% would be \$72,000, which is close to the numbers you are giving us. He asked if he can infer then that we are doing well in terms of funding. Mr. Hurley replied that he thinks the idea is that we haven't been adding any really nice new amenities for the community or taking care of some of our bigger ticket items like some of our restroom facilities, shelter houses, and things like that. We have been putting almost all of our available funding towards playgrounds.

Mr. Norstrom stated that the \$150,000 that he is talking about then would basically keep us going. But now you are saying there are other things like restrooms, etc. Mr. Hurley thinks the framing that they we trying to accomplish with the Commission was to say that if we continue, down the road we will really not be able to put much else on the playgrounds.

Ms. Dorothy commented that this is CIP for infrastructure. We have other budgeted money for maintaining other grounds maintenance and programs. Mr. Hurley agreed that this is only speaking for capital improvements. So this doesn't include our staff painting a building or maybe replace siding on a building that could be deemed more of

an operational expense. We obviously do a lot of that in an effort to maintain our facilities. Programming would be separate. This is big ticket items such as court repaving, if we wanted to build something new, etc. He just wants to educate council that this is the discussion of the Commission and the basis for any recommendations that will come forward.

Ms. Michael asked if the \$90,000 is in addition to every couple of years rebuilding a playground or is it included in there. Mr. Hurley replied that it is the average that includes everything including playgrounds. We have not been replacing playgrounds every other year. Some playgrounds were last redone in the early 90s with Heischman being the oldest, which we are getting ready to address. So we are right at the end of that 25 year window for those playgrounds.

Mr. Hurley acknowledged all of that as a big discussion point. He added that with that has comes some philosophical thought processes in terms of; is there a need for fourteen - \$150,000 playgrounds or are some of these trends like natural play relevant. We looked at a map that showed the location of all of our playgrounds as well as the school playgrounds. We questioned what is the standard that we want in the community in terms of everyone being able to walk to a playground, push a stroller to a playground, etc. They were able to identify and are in the process of identifying some playgrounds that might be able to be done either a little differently or with a unique approach that would still keep us within the standard we want for our residents in terms of accessibility for play. Members can think of some like Heischman in relationship to McCord Park. Selby and Indianola Park are also close together so those are a few of the ones that they may end up making recommendations that would help us along that path.

Resident Survey

1. Build off of 2008 Survey
2. Community Feedback from General Park Users
 - Navigate Special Interest
3. Create Community Engagement

50 yard signs
prominent at every
Worthington Park with
QR code links to survey





Video



Website

Mr. Hurley shared that the survey done in the parks produced 273 responses. While it wasn't a huge response it did provide some initial information and a way for us to compare how we were doing compared to the original survey in 2008.

The following is an example of one of the survey questions:



Mr. Hurley shared that they also indicated in the survey which park they visit most often. We felt like although the number sampling wasn't as large as we had hoped for, the spread around the community was good because there was good representation from every park. So we know that we were getting some sampling throughout the community and not just specific parks for specific reasons (soccer, baseball, etc.).

Mr. Hurley added that they do have other plans for additional feedback that he will share a little later.

Wish Lists/Ideas

1. Commission Members Ideas Captured
2. Added Staff Input
3. Incorporated Survey Responses

Park by Park Planning

1. Wish Lists Ranked by Park
2. Park by Park Subjective Discussions
3. Final Listing of Projects by Park in Priority Order

Mr. Hurley shared that the finished document will eventually be presented to council and will show park by park, these are the projects that they think are the most important.

Other Key Steps

Mr. Hurley shared that the Other Key Steps are yet to be taken or are in the process of being taken.

1. Historical Financing Reference

Mr. Hurley stated that they want to be realistic with the items that are recommended/ suggested to council so time has been spent talking about where we've been and where we might expect to be with funding.

2. Operating Budget Impact Evaluation
3. Additional Public Feedback – Open Houses

Mr. Hurley shared that an effort for additional public feedback will be forthcoming through a vehicle of open houses. They will list all of the draft parks improvement recommendations of the Commission on line and share public information about open houses so they could come, view all of the recommendations, and provide feedback. Then the Commission will take that feedback and make changes as needed.

Ms. Michael asked if the open houses will be held at the various parks. Mr. Hurley replied that they are still determining the best approach to take. Whatever is decided

they will make sure to get the information out to the public. They will also have a component on line where they can review the plans and provide feedback. The approach for the open houses is to give them something to react to and critique and provide additional feedback of things staff might not have thought of.

4. Alignment with Other Planning Documents

Ms. Dorothy asked what the timeline is for this process. Mr. Hurley replied that the Parks Commission is drawing to an end as far as what they can do without public feedback. They feel like they are close to having their park by park recommendations drafted. They wanted to get feedback from council tonight to make sure they were on the right track as far as council was concerned. They think the best time to have public feedback is in the early summer when people are active and out using the parks. Their goal would be to do that and then depending on the feedback and whether it takes them in a different direction, they would anticipate being able to incorporate that later this summer and be back to council yet this year.

Mr. Smith commented that an audience member last time mentioned wetlands potentially at the West Wilson Bridge Road parkland. He thought that was an interesting concept. He asked what the process would be to determine whether that was possible and then incorporate it into the plan. Mr. Hurley replied that he doesn't know the answer on how to work that one out because there is the challenge of some of the land located on private property although he does have experience with wetlands. He thinks it could be considered a resource if it were accessible. He knows there is a lot of interest in the parklands with river access and capitalizing on the great natural resource that is down there. He thinks the options of that would fit into that conversation.

Proposed Outline of Final Plan

- I. Introduction
- II. Background
- III. Methodology
- IV. Current Conditions
- V. Current Park Information
- VI. Benchmarking Information
- VII. Park Trends
- VIII. Survey Results/Public Feedback
- IX. Playground Challenges
- X. Park Maintenance
- XI. Park by Park Vision
- XII. Most Critical Improvements
- XIII. Overall Recommended Park Improvement Projects
- XIV. Funding Options
- XV. Conclusions

Much of the outline has been completed. The important part will be some of the items towards the end such as Park by Park Vision and determining the overall Most Critical Improvements that they want to recommend to Council for consideration.

Ms. Michael stated that when looking at the Most Critical Improvements are you just looking at improvements or does it also include land acquisition in the case of the wetlands. Mr. Hurley replied that currently it is drafted as a Park by Park component that includes a vision and recommendation by Park and then there is an Other section that includes projects that they would like to see but that are not tied to a particular park. He added that the big focus of the Commission has really been more on replacing, improving, and maintaining what we have as opposed to adding new things. There have been a few items that we don't have that have come up but not many. The Commission wants to make sure that what we have is well maintained, is being replaced in a timely way and keeps to the Worthington standard.

Mr. Hurley stated that he is looking to see if members have any questions or feedback on this outline. If there are steps that they have not heard but that they think are important to take, the Commission and staff would welcome those comments.

Ms. Dorothy asked if there has been any thought in partnering with Columbus for the Rush Run Nature Preserve to see if there is any way to assist with that the piece of property that is located in Worthington behind the Walnut Grove Cemetery but owned by the city of Columbus. Mr. Hurley replied that the topic has not come up as of yet but if members would like for him to pass that along it can be added to the discussion.

Ms. Dorothy also reminded everyone of a clean-up day at the Moses Wright Park on April 23rd. Mr. Hurley confirmed that to be the date. The event includes Sustainable Worthington folks and will run from 9:00 a.m. to noon. Ms. Dorothy added that the city of Worthington provides the tools and equipment but they are in great need of workers.

Mr. Troper asked how residents are being contacted to obtain their thoughts and comments on possible renovations at Heischman Park. Mr. Hurley shared that they like to come with some ideas that people can react to so staff is in the process of putting together three or four proposals for playgrounds to have at a public meeting. We typically work with our GIS staff at Engineering to just draw a circle in the neighborhood and we direct mail an invitation to a public meeting to the residents who live around a neighborhood park like that. We will also send out a general public announcement through our typical sources. We will invite them in to review the playgrounds and provide feedback. That information will be processed and a final design assembled that will then be shared with the Parks Commission and City Council.

Mr. Norstrom asked how much interaction has there been with the school district when considering the new design because obviously they have tennis courts and basketball courts. When we consider parks or facilities within the city clearly there is some overlap. Mr. Hurley agreed. He thinks an example of that was playgrounds but we want to look beyond because as you know the topic of baseball fields there is sometimes the feeling

that we don't have enough but the reality is that there are many baseball fields on school facilities so we have to balance what we have versus what the community has access to. That has been a part of our discussions. Mr. Norstrom found it interesting that he mentioned baseball fields because he is not sure that 20 years ago we would have considered soccer fields important. So if we are looking 20 years out, he thinks what he would be looking at from the Parks Commission is some strategic discussion on the direction we are going. In other words, we can try to be everything to everybody or we can make a decision that policy wise "this" is what we are going to emphasize. For example, it could be trails, it could be walkability, it could be sports facilities but he thinks what he is looking for from the Commission is a direction to go. That means at times it may be contrary to what some citizens think but it is overall better for the community given the direction we feel this community should be going. For example, if we were to emphasize physical activity, such as walking and hiking and things like that and a good mix of what those things are. He added that baseball is not necessarily a sport that is thriving in the 21st century.

Mr. Hurley commented that if he is hearing correctly, some direction in terms of our emphasis, because he thinks as a community a well-planned parks system can do many things for many people but he hears what he is saying. When decisions have to be made, what would the priority be?

Mr. Myers thinks Mr. Hurley eluded to this but he is assuming there will be or there has been some discussion as to whether we need to consider repurposing some parks. It would seem to him that a great deal of our budget is spent on playgrounds. We see the results of the survey and it almost seems like there is an age demographic in play here and can we target those neighborhoods that may have a higher concentration of children and therefore playgrounds may be more appropriate. He is assuming that will be in the discussion. Mr. Hurley agreed. One thing that has come up and is still be reviewed is the idea that some parks may need to be looked at comprehensively, i.e. McCord Park, which we have kind of bounced to the out years of the CIP just because we couldn't settle on an amount and a plan. So instead of going piece by piece do you do a full look at a park like McCord? Mr. Myers interjected Indianola and Selby. Both of those playgrounds are used extensively but is there a way we can repurpose one or the other. Mr. Hurley agreed that definitely in terms of playgrounds but even in terms of parks overall there has been a very close look at a couple of parks where we need to take a comprehensive look before we start going one project at a time versus other parks where we are not dramatically changing the purpose of this park. He added that most of this is just about having a planned, pro-active approach so that we are not coming to council when things are past the point of needing fixed. While we may not always be able to accomplish them we are at least communicating to Council ahead of time what the needs are and when we think they will occur and we need to have a plan of how to address them.

Mr. Myers added that he believes that at the ASA Regionals, 4 years ago at Berliner Park brought in about \$19,000,000 to the city of Columbus. That was just softball.

Mr. Norstrom added that he will be looking for information on what the national move is in terms of parks and recreation and what is coming up. Splash pads is not something we would have talked about ten or fifteen years ago so what does the parks and recreation field see as the future. Geocache was provided as an example earlier and there may be other things. We were one of the first to put a skate park in and he doesn't even know if it is still highly used. Mr. Hurley assured him that it was.

Ms. Michael commented that when talking about some repurposing, she hopes they will look at the sustainable movement. She understands that the community garden is completely filled. Do we look at having some of our parks include some additional community gardens or includes edible plants? The changes might not even be the repurposing of an entire area and might not be that expansive to add but may be able to bring in a more diverse variety of people.

Ms. Michael added that she hopes there will be some opportunity for public/private sources of funding along with some ideas for grants. Other communities have a Parks and Recreation Foundation. She doesn't know if that is something that is needed or desired but those are just some of the funding things that she hopes people are looking at. She is also aware of a local push for a wetland area and maybe there is some public/private partnership that could be done. Mr. Hurley thanked her for the comments.

Steven Rosandich, 140 Caren Ave.

Mr. Rosandich thinks the comment about re-using some of the space for a public garden is very appropriate. He suggested adding cross-fit along the trails or any place where there is space as it is becoming very popular. It only needs a little space where people can stop and do specific exercises. It doesn't have to change the use of the park but rather just adds a little something along the side.

Mr. Rosandich stated that the last comment about partnering with in the neighborhood, there are many businesses that could turn around and try to take over a whole park and want to change the name. There may be smaller businesses that want to take on the responsibility of a park. We recognized some scouts earlier. We might want to see if any are interested in helping with the parks. Ms. Michael shared that the scouts have done a wonderful job over the years in helping us. They have completed some beautiful park improvement projects many times. She is sure that will continue. Mr. Hurley shared that many of the pavers and benches along the trail have been Eagle Scout projects.

Mr. Smith shared that council received a notification from a resident last week about safety on the bike trails, specific to dogs and how they interact with bicycles. Hopefully we as Council and a staff can talk a little more about that from an ordinance perspective but from a Park's planning perspective how to integrate more safety and awareness about dog and bike safety. Mr. Hurley reported that one of the Bike and Pedestrian's projects is planning and assessing the trail. If the trail would ever connect us to Highbanks to the north of us, we would definitely see an increase the volume of users. There is all kinds of data out there about what happens if you add lanes or widen the trail and there are pros and cons to all of that. He added that the resident did attend the Bike

and Pedestrian meeting last week so they did hear his feedback directly but there are many things along the trail that are going to need discussed in the short term.

Austin Mitchell, family recently moved from Pittsburgh

Mr. Mitchell shared that he and his family recently moved to Worthington from Pittsburgh. They enjoyed Schenley Park while there that was located in the heart of the Oakland neighborhood in Pittsburgh. The park had several different food stands and restaurants that served beer. It sort of reminded them of the time they spend in Europe where they actually had beer gardens inside of parks, which is something that really brought people out on a Saturday afternoon. It was always pretty civil and a lot of fun. He doesn't know what the local laws are but that is something to consider.

Mr. Hurley thanked council for the opportunity to share. They will be getting information out to the public about the open houses. The Parks Commission meets every third Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. at the Community Center and they will continue to work on this process at those meetings and setting up public forums soon.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Troper shared that he noticed that 5/3 Bank has a 2% interest rate on a five year CD. He wondered if staff considered investing in that kind of rate to increase our rate of return. Mrs. Roberts reported that they look at the market as our CDs mature and they ladder our CDs with other instruments to meet our portfolio needs. So yes she does look at CD rates on a continual basis. As things mature we roll those into CDs that are offering a more attractive rate.

Ms. Dorothy thanked Mr. Hurley for all of the hard work he has been doing with Parks and Recreation and Bike and Pedestrian. She believes the Bike and Pedestrian gave Council a preliminary outline of what they wanted to do so hopefully members can talk about that at a council meeting soon.

Mr. Greeson asked if member want that as an agenda item. After conferring with member's Ms. Michael asked that it be included as an Agenda item for a Committee meeting.

Mr. Smith commented that he thinks next week he is on the agenda regarding the topic of potential sidewalk ordinance changes. He asked if that was still a go. Mr. Greeson replied that they will talk about two resident generated proposals and that is still a go. The public has been notified to that affect. Mr. Smith commented that if any council members have any questions for him prior to the meeting feel free to reach out.

Ms. Michael mentioned that she attended another meeting of the Central Ohio Mayors and Managers Association along with Mr. Greeson. She thinks it will be an interesting group because as they get more organized they plan to talk about different types of legislation that the local municipalities in central Ohio are looking at. She would like to share those ideas with the council members. She added that they received a great

presentation on current legislation being considered in the state house. There was a piece that they asked for comments on and that is whether our council feels it is a good or bad idea for the legislature to allow municipalities to increase the costs of license plates and giving the fees to the municipalities for maintenance of roads and streets in that municipal area. If members have any thoughts, she would like to hear it. Mr. Greeson added that staff can put some information together on that issue. The fees haven't been adjusted since the 1980s and the question is not whether Council wants to do it but whether members want the authority to do it sometime in the future.

Mr. Greeson added that the meeting also included our new Ohio Municipal League director, Kent Scarrett. Mr. Scarrett has been a long time Municipal League staffer and replaces Worthington resident, now retired Executive Director Sue Cave, who is serving on our Charter Review Commission as its chair.

Ms. Michael shared additional information for the benefit of the audience about the Central Ohio Mayors and Managers Association.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Mr. Foust 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 8:35 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress

Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
2nd day of May, 2016.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael

Council President