Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 9, 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
W. Scott Myers, President Pro-Tempore
Rachael Dorothy
Douglas C. Foust
David M. Norstrom
Douglas Smith
Michael C. Troper

Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, May 9, 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.

Ms. Michael appointed Tanya Maria Word as Temporary Clerk of Council for this evening’s meeting.


Member(s) Absent: Scott Myers

Also present: Deputy Clerk of Council Tanya M. Word, City Manager, Matt Greeson, Assistant City Manager, Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, City Engineer Daniel Whited, Parks and Recreation Director Darren Hurley, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, and Interim Police Chief Jerry Strait, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley.

There were 4 visitors present.

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

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

(1) Whitney House Outdoor Dining Area

Mr. Greeson explained that last year in June Council was actively talking about and ultimately adopted a Downtown Worthington Outdoor Dining Facilities policy and we did that in large measure because you asked us to identify how we would regulate outdoor dining facilities and in particular how we might regulate allowing outdoor dining and the consumption of alcohol in the public right-of-way under certain limited circumstances; so that policy was adopted and we have an application to create an outdoor dining area; this happens to be the one we reviewed when we adopted the policy, it was one of the epitasis for creating it and it’s the Whitney House and Ian Brown is with us this evening.

This in accordance with the policy went to the Architectural Review Board who reviewed some aspects of it. I’m going to turn it over to Mr. Brown to overview the application, the Architectural Review Board’s recommendations and go over the conformance with the policy.
Mr. Brown indicated it was about this time last year when Jeff Harris our previous Economic Development Director was working with Ian Brown of the Whitney House on a request to have outdoor dining that would allow alcohol in the right-of-way; with having alcohol in the right-of-way you are required to have fencing that is adjacent to your building. With the draft guidelines you adopted on June 15, 2015, it spelled out kind of a design guidelines in the Outdoor Dining Guidelines and Procedures; so with any kind of legislation, you see that first actual application come forward and you see this is how it plays out in the real world.

One of the things that did go before Municipal Planning Commission was a modification to their previous existing Conditional Use to allow for outdoor dining and also before the Architectural Review Board to allow for the fencing; part of their privy is to look at the policy that you adopted last June and see if it’s in compliance with those guidelines. One of the issues that popped up through that process was looking at the design guidelines called for a gated area to only be permitted to have one entrance to a gated area, so when staff looked at that, we felt that since this body was the one that originally adopted the design guidelines and the policies and the procedures that we needed to come back to you for your guidance on the request.

So the request that you’re going to see tonight actually has two gates to a fenced in area; the actual application materials that were in your packet are the same materials that Mr. Harris used to draft the draft policy last year when it for adoption. So what you have before you is The Whitney House at 666 High Street. Mr. Brown presented the following PowerPoint presentation.
Front of the building looking south along where the patio area is to be.

The patio area will be up along the actual building.
Looking south towards New England.
Here is the schematic that was submitted last year when Mr. Brown originally came and had the discussion with Jeff Harris on our policies and procedures to allow alcohol and/or dining in the right-of-way. Typically we do allow for outdoor dining, it was the alcohol component that came before you last June for a decision. In the design guidelines it does call for even with the gates being open that you must maintain a 5 foot pedestrian clearance zone, this was reviewed last year by our previous Service and Engineering Director Bill Watterson and by our current Service and Engineering Director Dan Whited and Tom Gilkey, we did walk the site to see actually how this would play out in the actual real world.
So you see before you 4 three tops along the building, this is just an example of the fence that he submitted along with his original application.

This application before you tonight will be a yearly renewal which is required. One of the things that the Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission saw was that this fenced in area would be installed seasonally and in the winter it would be removed; so all the pavers would have to be put back to the original order and then
again apply for in the spring. So I think it is one of those things that as we’ve looked through the design guidelines, you kind of see okay this is how it’s going to work in the real world; there are going to be some tweaks and modifications probably coming before you in the coming months. Dave McCorkle, Dan Whited and myself will be looking at revising and tweaking some of the requests that will come before you; but I think one of the things that we would like to see since this was only adopted last June is to see how it would play out for one year, again it is required as the current policy as drafted they do have to come back each year for a renewal that would go to Mr. Whited for approval.
The table and chairs you see before you; no umbrellas, but again the fenced in area. The board did not approve umbrellas because they felt they would interfere with the pedestrian walkway, so there will be no umbrellas as part of this.
Questions from Council:

Ms. Dorothy asked so the bench we saw in a previous slide was that moved previously last year or will it be moved. Mr. Brown replied it will be moved, one of the things you may recall when PK O’Ryans was in this location they used to have 2 four tops out in that location, they had four little 2 tops along the windows and then they had to the 2 four tops out closer to the curb and the bench was kind of shifted over. I would imagine that
we would shift the bench back to this location just so that we can keep that 5 foot clearance zone, that’s with the gates open that we would still be able to maintain that 5 foot clearance zone to allow for the pedestrians to move freely through the area. Probably the bottleneck would happen would be the Farmer’s Markets on Saturdays; again this would be seasonal and in the winter months the fencing would be removed, the pavers put back to their original location and then the applicant would need to make application again next year to re-install.

Ms. Dorothy asked about the hours of operation, for the project details, it notes that the approved hours of operation; asked who approved that as the hours of operation. Mr. Brown replied those were the hours that were a part of the conditional use application; the board has the ability to look at hours of operation for any type of use that is exterior or interior. With this one the State Liquor Control Board usually has their time limits on it, so this would be the latest; I’m not sure….I’ve never been at The Whitney House at 2:00 A.M., but I think a different Mr. Brown might be able to give their current hours of operation.

Mr. Ian Brown indicated that the outdoors would be the same hours as we currently operate inside; for instance the longest and latest day would be a Saturday which we’re open until 11:00 P.M. and usually since I am the one there on Saturday nights at 11:00, there’s typically not a whole lot going on; that’s not a big concern of mine.

Mr. Foust commented I’m struggling with what this going to do to the pedestrian traffic. Mr. Norstrom explained that I think this has more clearance than the prior did when they had tables both on the inside and the outside and walking through that area; at least here they will have a minimum of 5 feet. I understand your concern, but I think this is actually preferable to what was there before. Ms. Dorothy commented in regards to pedestrian use and not really pedestrian access, I think we do mitigate the access issue by maintaining that five foot clearance, but in regards to pedestrian use, there has been numerous studies where you see people outside using an outside facility, you’ll get more people using it and so I think we’ll get more pedestrians with the more people outside using that facility; and on times that are not just that one specific farmer’s market time, which there are many other vendors that create pedestrian accesses than this outside dining facility will.

Mr. Foust explained that I want it on the record that I’m concerned; I think it will make it a bit unfriendly for people trying to access downtown Worthington; I understand all the studies, we can find the arguments that make why this is a great idea. I’m not comfortable with the logistics of it; I’m glad we got at least this notion of one year and come back and review it, because I will be up there a few Saturdays myself checking it out. I’m not convinced this is a good way to go. Mr. Brown commented I think that’s one of the things staff initially thought last year, how does this play out in the real world; so this would be valid for one year and I think you’re going to see some changes and tweaks to the current policy in the coming months, but I think once we’re able to see how it actually functions in the real world that next year we’ll be able to at least have some clarification or needs, do you add planters or do we not permit it next year.
Mr. Ian Brown remarked I’m excited to be the guinea pig for this; I love where we are and I love what we do and I really want this to work. My whole thought process going into this from the very beginning was my requirements (at least in my mind) are very simple; I just need to be able to put a fence on our city sidewalk so that we can continue our culture from the indoors to the outdoors and if we can all figure out what that actually means in a procedural way then that’s what I’m willing to do. I think that those comments are important and trust me; we will be very sensitive to all of these things. This year and next year and five and ten years down the road.

Mr. Norstrom commented if I understand your approach here, the reason you want two doors is because you’ll have minimal space within the gate so you can serve the tables by coming in through two doors rather than one. Mr. Brown replied absolutely; it’s less encroachment to the people who might be sitting there already. Mr. Norstrom remarked to Mr. Lee Brown that the guidelines state one door, but it’s not a firm requirement. Mr. Brown replied that is correct. Mr. Brown commented that’s one of the reasons why we wanted to bring it to you...just for your guidance...here is how it was worded and here is how it was adopted last June. Mr. Norstrom commented as the applicant has just stated by putting two doors in it reduces the spaced in area would occupy so it makes perfect sense to have two doors in this type of situation.

Mr. Foust commented I love the idea of the flowerbox, but I’m picturing black and blue hips from somebody walking down the sidewalk not looking, talking to somebody and bumping right into those things; I think it would be a great look and I know they can’t go on the inside, any thoughts on whether those ought to stay. Mr. Lee Brown commented I do think that was some of the discussion that we (Architectural Review Board) had, a lot of the board members felt having some vegetation that maybe at a higher level might make you look to see where you’re going. Mr. Greeson commented I think if you just leave us the flexibility to work with Mr. Brown if they are problematic.

Ms. Michael stated that this is something a lot of people having been wanting, I think it is going to be a good fit. My question is if two couples come, are they going to be able to sit four to a table or are you just limited to three (3). Mr. Ian Brown replied from a space standpoint, I definitely see in practice some of those tables/chairs getting switched from one table to another and four chairs around one, but again until we actually get into the space with bodies and tables and chairs, we’ll be able to see what we can actually fit in. Ms. Michael asked Mr. Lee Brown is there any flexibility on the number of chairs or is this being restricted to no matter what just three chairs to a table. Mr. Brown replied it was the four tables and three chairs how they’re kind of reconfigured I think there’s flexibility with. I think what you’ll also see is that some of this will be regulated by the State Liquor Board and the approval of the outdoor dining space, seating and capacity; so I think some of it will be limited to the actual size you can get in there.
MOTION

Councilmember Norstrom made a motion to approve the Design Guidelines located in the Downtown Worthington Outdoor Dining Facilities Policy & Procedures with the condition that the Director of Service and Engineering and the State of Ohio Department of Commerce, Division of Liquor Control approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

The motion carried by a voice vote of 5 to 1 (Nay – Councilmember Foust)

(2) Request to Bid: 2016 Street Improvement Program

Mr. Whited indicated I have a short presentation to give context and talk a little bit about the program and how I see it in my brief time here at the City and to some degree how I see it moving forward to perhaps change some with your guidance. You will note on this first slide I’ve included some little snap shots of the paving improvements that have been done since 2011 and I included this slide to remind myself to let you know that our GIS person Rob Wetmore has set up a great database of information which includes the history of our street improvement programs back to 1971.

Mr. Whited presented the following PowerPoint presentation of the 2016 Street Improvement Program.
Lane Miles
- 176 Lane Miles,
- 1.4 miles of walkways
- 12 alleys (1.5 mi),
- 11 hammerhead & eyebrows (.3 mi),
- 55 cul-de-sacs (6.3 sq mi)
- Bike & Ped Trails

Pavement Condition (a.k.a. “PCI”)
- Ranking between 100 (Best) to 0 (Failed)
- PCI 70-100: Good to Excellent
- PCI 40 - 69: Poor to Fair
- PCI 0 - 39: Failed to Very Poor

Worthington has not historically used a rating system. Typical tools to determine PCI are “PAVER” “ODOT PCR” or self developed systems (“COW/PAV” - coming soon?)
Ms. Dorothy asked regarding the Alligator Cracking are we fixing that this year. Mr. Whited replied yes we are fixing most of that this year as best we can; if we can’t do it in a full length replacement, we’ll do it in patches as we saw on our tour on Friday. There are a few areas where I prefer to do it now.
Longitudinal (Linear) Cracking

Cracks parallel to pavement centerline or laydown direction. Can be a result of both pavement fatigue, reflective cracking, and/or poor joint construction. Joints are generally the least dense areas of a pavement.

**FIX:** Less severe cracks measuring <1/2" can be sealed to prevent moisture from entering into the subgrade. More severe cracks should be fixed by removing the cracked pavement layer and replacing it with an overlay.

---

Edge Cracks travel along the inside edge of a pavement surface within one or two feet. Most common cause is poor drainage conditions and lack of support at the pavement edge. As a result underlying base materials settle and become weakened. Heavy vegetation along the pavement edge and heavy traffic can also be the instigator of edge cracking.

**FIX:** The first step is to remove any existing vegetation close to the edge of the pavement and fix drainage problems. Crack seal/fill cracks to prevent further deterioration or remove and reconstruct to full depth fixing any support issues.
Joint Reflection Cracks
These are cracks in a flexible pavement overlay of a rigid pavement (i.e., asphalt over concrete). They occur directly over underlying rigid pavement joints.

FIX: For less severe cracks (<1/2") crack sealing will prevent the further entry of moisture into the subgrade. If the cracks are more severe the removal of the cracked pavement layer followed by an overlay may be required.

Slippage Cracks
Crescent-shaped cracks or tears in the surface layer(s) of asphalt where new material has slipped over the underlying course. Caused by lack of bonding between layers. Often because a tack coat was not used to develop a bond between the asphalt layers or because a prime coat was not used to bond the asphalt to the underlying stone base course. The lack of bond can also be caused by dirt, oil, or other contaminants preventing adhesion between the layers.

FIX: All of the areas exhibiting the "stretch marks" will need to be removed and will require a partial or full depth patch.
Pot Holes
Small, bowl-shaped depressions in the pavement surface that penetrate all the way through the asphalt layer down to the base course. They generally have sharp edges and vertical sides near the top of the hole. Potholes are the result of moisture infiltration and usually the end result of untreated alligator cracking. As alligator cracking becomes severe, the interconnected cracks create small chunks of pavement, which can be dislodged as vehicles drive over them. The remaining hole after the pavement chunk is dislodged is called a pothole.

Raveling (very porous asphalt)
On-going separation of aggregate particles in pavement from the surface downward or from the edges inward. Usually, the fine aggregate wears away first and then leaves little "pock marks" on the pavement surface. As erosion continues, larger and larger particles are broken free and the pavement soon has the rough and jagged appearance. There are many reasons for raveling, but one common cause is placing asphalt too late in the season, because the mixture usually lacks warm weather traffic reducing pavement surface voids, further densification, and kneading of the asphalt mat. For this reason raveling is more common in the more northern regions (snow belt).

FIX: Apply a thin hot-mix overlay. Other solutions could include: sand seal, chip seal, slurry seal or micro-surfacing.
Rutting

Ruts in asphalt pavements are channelized depressions in the wheel-tracks. Rutting results from consolidation or lateral movement of any of the pavement layers or the subgrade under traffic. It is caused by insufficient pavement thickness, lack of compaction of the asphalt, stone base or soil, weak asphalt mixes; or moisture infiltration.

**FIX:** If rutting is minor or if it has stabilized, the depressions can be filled and overlaid. If the deformations are severe, the rutted areas should be removed and replaced with suitable material.

---

Upheaval

Upheaval is a localized upward movement in a pavement due to swelling of the subgrade. This can be due to expansive soils that swell due to moisture or frost heave (ice under the pavement).

**FIX:** Full depth patch
Mr. Whited explained full depth replacement along the roads are indicated in green, patches in areas are shown in red, the little purple triangles indicate some stormwater repair. Ms. Dorothy asked the green and red are basically the alligator or some of the roads that are really deteriorating. Mr. Whited replied that is correct. Ms. Dorothy commented and that’s the majority of our roads that are in that condition, but not all the places. Mr. Whited replied that is correct. Ms. Dorothy asked what other places do you think we’re teetering on getting on the list. Mr. Whited replied Highgate for sure, a portion of Schrock Road east of Huntley, and frankly all of Huntley Road could have been done this year, but we’ve got that scheduled for next year. Ms. Dorothy asked what is our budget for this year. Mr. Whited replied our budget is based on the CIP $900,000, we went through and evaluated what we could do with that money; the engineer’s estimate is $892,000, so we’ve tailored the program to meet the budget. Ms. Dorothy asked how much do we think Highgate would cost. Mr. Whited replied about $160,000 - $180,000. Ms. Dorothy asked when we were looking at this we did look to see if there were any Bicycle or Pedestrian improvements that we could make that would be cost effective while we were doing this. Mr. Whited replied I think that we may not have done that as well as we could historically, we talked about it on the tour; looking at possibly doing some sharrows on Longfellow and Masefield back down to the Olentangy Bikeway; that’s something that I don’t think is necessary in that case, but as we continue to look forward in our next year’s program and the years after that like areas we discussed on Friday (Huntley Road and other roads) may wish to do some more signed and striped and road improvements.
Ms. Dorothy commented that Longfellow seems quite bike and pedestrian friendly at the moment; it might need some pedestrian wayfinding signage to get to the Olentangy trails or back to High Street, but I would agree I don’t think it needs any additional bike sharrow. I was very excited that we were talking about road diets or having other opportunities to have bike and pedestrian; I think Ms. Michael had a couple comments while on the tour also.

Ms. Michael commented I learned the definition of road diet which is reducing the width of a lane so that you have more space on the edges to be able to put in bicycle access.

Mr. Norstrom commented in your introduction about how it’s better to fix the roads at a certain condition less expensive, what I didn’t quite hear is do we have an evaluation of where our road system is relevant to those. Mr. Whited replied no; we need to look at our program a little more scientifically and evaluate pavement condition index by the road diet and bike and pedestrian sharing on the roadways and maybe take a little more in-depth view; our process has been very good, obviously our roads are in pretty good shape, but I think we could take a little bit more scientific approach to valuing our pavement so we can anticipate where our problems will occur in the future and what the consequences of not doing repairs now will be.

Mr. Norstrom asked to get that scientific method, is it visual or do you actually do some. Mr. Whited replied there are varieties of ways that it can be accomplished, some communities use a system called PAVER which they hire consultants or they have in-house staff that could actually go out and do borings in the pavers and evaluate the condition, the thickness through those layers of pavement especially at intersections to see what the loading has been and the impact that it’s had. What has been done here historically which is a drive-thru and say that looks bad, that area looks bad and having a good historical view; and something in between which is to go through and do an in-house pavement condition evaluation on a scale of 1-10 or 0-10 or 0-100. Mr. Norstrom asked do you have the resources to be able to do that this year. Mr. Whited replied no. Mr. Norstrom commented I guess my question is should we spending some money to get that so that we save money in the future; based on what you’ve got here, you can’t tell us there is some roads that we should be fixing because there are 4’s or 3’s or whatever you call them on that chart that could be falling into that bad shape relatively quickly. Mr. Whited commented I can’t give you any detailed analysis of that, but I can give you my gut feeling and that is the program has been good and the roads are in good shape; if I were to guess and say that we’re easily in that satisfactory condition if we did a straight line PCI which would be around 80; but what I would like to do is improve our program so that we would have a better opportunity to be able to evaluate that on a yearly basis and keep track of it.

Mr. Norstrom asked that Mr. Whited come back to Council with a cost for doing that so that we can get an amended capital budget for this year.
Ms. Michael asked do you have any anticipation of how the pavement costs are this year estimated compared to other years...is the trend up or down. Mr. Whited commented a lot of that depends on the magnitude of work that is being done in the communities, but my indication is that it’s pretty much flat-lined. Mr. Smith asked as far as outreach to the community that is immediately impacted by the repairs, I believe in the past we’ve done letters informing the community when
they can access or when they can’t access certain roads. Mrs. Stewart replied yes we do communicate with people on the route, and in fact our practice is that we notify them once we know that their street is in the program because we usually do spot-concrete repair for curbs, sidewalks (which is usually the adjacent homeowner’s responsibility), but they can either choose to fix them themselves or piggyback onto our contract, so there is communication with residents along the routes.

### 2017 ANTICIPATED WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CIP Fund</th>
<th>Bonds</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>MNSTP</th>
<th>License Exs.</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street &amp; Sidewalk Improvement Program</td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project consists of improvements to various streets throughout the City’s street system. Work typically includes curb & gutter repair, asphalt overlay, asphalt patching, and miscellaneous concrete repairs. The project includes the repair of sidewalks that do not meet standards for the safety and condition. Work also includes the installation of new or replacement sidewalk pavement. The project is funded through the City’s CIP program.
SHARE THE ROAD OPPORTUNITIES?

Signed-Shared Roadways
Similar to bicycle boulevards, signed-shared routes are streets where bicyclists share a travel lane with motorists. Signage, such as a W11-1 with a W16-1P “Share the Road” plaque, is used to remind motorists and bicyclists of the shared-lane condition. “Sharrow” pavement markings should (but may not) supplement the signage, recommending where bicyclists should ride within the travel lane. These facilities are an improvement helping some users on urban streets where bike lanes are infeasible. They are appropriate on streets with posted speeds of 30 mph or less, and traffic volumes of 5,000 vehicles per day per travel lane. Cost: Approximately $50,000 to $500,000 per mile depending upon the complexity of the project and the density of markings and signs, and other features.

HIGH VISIBILITY CROSSING -- SR 161 PROJECT

Basic Crossing
Basic marked crosswalks consist of pavement markings or striping, as well as signage. Markings can consist of two bars, or more intense treatments such as the ladder where “rungs” make the crossing more visible to motorists. Signage should be placed at the crosswalk, consisting of (W13-3) and a downward pointing arrow (W16-7P) at minimum, showing drivers where the crossing is. Advanced crossing signage, and advanced yield signage (R1.5, and yield bar markings) may also be used, particularly if the crosswalk signage is obscured from approaching motorists. Costs range from $5,000 to $15,000.
Mr. Whited commented I was told due to the lead time on the equipment they won’t be able to have them installed until late this year. Ms. Dorothy commented that would give us plenty of time to inform the public of how those are to be used and make sure that our police officers know how they should be giving out tickets for them.
Mr. Norstrom commented school is going to start in August, when you say late, how long will it be after school starts before we have these in. Mr. Whited replied much later after school starts, the schedule is for December, basically January. Mr. Norstrom asked is there any way that scheduled can be changed. Mr. Whited replied I don’t think so based on the lead time for the equipment.
Ms. Michael asked do we get any funding from MORPC. Mr. Whited replied it is fully funded.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Dorothy made a motion to authorize staff to bid the 2016 Street Improvement Program. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

(3) **Financial Reports**

Mr. Greeson asked Mrs. Roberts to provide an overview of the report and indicated that staff is requesting a motion from the City Council acknowledging the report.

Mrs. Roberts presented the following:

Fund balances for all accounts increased from $22,815,737 to $22,022,526 for the month of April with revenues exceeding expenditures by $793,212.

Year to date fund balances for all accounts decreased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $22,022,526 as of April 30, 2016 with expenditures exceeding revenue by $759,431.

Expenditures for all funds tracked at 92.35% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Year to date revenues for all funds are below 2015 revenues by $1,747,467 and above year to date estimates by $755,728.

The General Fund balance decreased from $11,574,014 to $10,974,873 for the month of April with expenditures exceeding revenues by $599,141.

The year to date General Fund Balance decreased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2016 to $10,974,873 with expenditures exceeding revenues by $275,204.

General Fund expenditures tracked at 93.9% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Total General Fund revenues area above estimates by $75,080 or .87%.

March 2016 income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $133,809 or 1.81% and above estimates by $30,171 or .40%.

Mr. Norstrom asked on the broader picture you don’t see anything in terms of where we are four months into the year that indicates we’re going to have any problems meeting the budget. Mrs. Roberts replied not at this time, I will say that May’s income tax
collection, we receive our income tax collections twice a month and the first distribution was a little lighter than I had anticipated, but I think we’re pretty much on target.

MOTION Councilmember Foust made a motion to accept the April 2016 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

MICHAEL – send our get well wishes to Mrs. Fox for a speedy recovery as she recuperates from foot surgery.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:25 P.M.

/s/ Tanya Maria Word
Temporary Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of June, 2016.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President