City Council Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, September 6, 2016 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

Bonnie D. Michael, President
Scott Myers, President Pro-Tem
   Rachael Dorothy
   Douglas C. Fost
   David M. Norstrom
   Douglas Smith
   Michael C. Troper

Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council

If you have questions regarding this agenda please contact the Clerk of Council at 614-786-7347. This agenda and amendments that may be made to it can be found at www.worthington.org
CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

1) Recognition of Worthington Pools Lifeguards

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2) June 20, 2016 – Regular Meeting
3) July 5, 2016 – Regular Meeting
4) July 11, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
5) July 18, 2016 – Regular Meeting

VISITOR COMMENTS

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

6) Resolution No. 33-2016

Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

7) Resolution No. 34-2016

Authorizing the Use of a Portion of the Proceeds of Bonds or Bond Anticipation Notes of the City, in the Principal Amount of Not to Exceed $5,000,000 to be Issued for the Purpose of Financing the 2016 and 2017 Capital Improvement Program Projects Including Street and Utility System Improvements Identified as Bonded Projects in the 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Program, to Reimburse the City’s Capital Improvement Fund for Moneys Previously Advanced for Such Purpose.

8) Resolution No. 35-2016

A Resolution in Support of an Application for a Local Government Efficiency Program Grant.
9) **Resolution No. 36-2016**

Authorizing the City Manager to Seek Financial Assistance from Federal Attributable Funds for the Project at Worthington Galena Road, Huntley Road and Wilson Bridge Road.

10) **Resolution No. 37-2016**

Authorizing the City Manager to Seek Financial Assistance from Federal Attributable Funds for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Project.

11) **Resolution No. 38-2016**

Amending the Position Description for Police Chief.

12) **Ordinance No. 29-2016**

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

13) **Ordinance No. 30-2016**

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 Community Center Shingle Roof Replacement Project and all Related Expenses, Determining to Proceed with said Project and Declaring an Emergency. (Project No. 631-16)

14) **Ordinance No. 31-2016**

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 Design Costs of the Municipal Building Chimney Repair Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 632-16)
15) **Ordinance No. 32-2016**

   Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund and Accrued Acreage Fund Unappropriated Balances.

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

Policy Item(s)

16) Permission to Bid – Wayfinding Project

**REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**OTHER**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**ADJOURNMENT**
City Manager Report to City Council for the Meeting of Tuesday, September 6, 2016

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

1) Recognition of Worthington Pools Lifeguards

Dr. Douglas Rund, Medical Director for the Worthington Division of Fire, will recognize two lifeguards from Worthington Pools who performed life saving measures to rescue a boy who nearly drowned. Additional information about the event is included in the attached memorandum from the Fire Chief.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2) June 20, 2016 – Regular Meeting
3) July 5, 2016 – Regular Meeting
4) July 11, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
5) July 18, 2016 – Regular Meeting

Recommendation: Approval of Minutes as Presented

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

6) Resolution No. 33-2016 – Transfer of Funds

The staff’s review of expenses versus budgeted amounts in each line item in the budget identified line items that will have insufficient funds while other line items that are projected to have excess funds. This review occurs each year and the transfers are made as necessary from line items with excess funds to line items with insufficient funds upon City Council action. This reallocation of funds does not increase the total annual appropriation. Additional information is provided in the attached memorandum from the Finance Director.

Recommendation: Introduction and Approval of Resolution as Presented
7) **Resolution No. 34-2016 – Reimbursement of Costs from Bonds or Bond Anticipation Notes**

The 2016-2020 Capital Improvements Program adopted by the City Council on December 7, 2015, includes projects in 2016 and 2017 such as the Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington Galena intersection design, Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs, Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvements, Community Center HVAC Improvements, Northbrook Relief Sewer Phase II and Wilson Bridge corridor enhancements that are scheduled to be financed through bonds. This Resolution allows the City to be reimbursed by bond or bond anticipated note proceeds for expenditures related to items that are incurred and paid by the City prior to the issuance of the bonds or bond anticipation notes. This Resolution does not provide for the issuance of the bonds or bond anticipation notes. It allows for the City to be reimbursed once they are issued. Additional legislation will need to be approved by the City Council in the future before the bonds or bond anticipation notes are issued. Additional information is included in the attached memorandum from the Finance Director.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval of Resolution as Presented

8) **Resolution No. 35-2016 – Grant Application - Lean**

The City has sent several staff members to training on Lean Six Sigma strategies to improve processes. In addition to the basic training, the City currently has one staff member who is training to become Lean Black Belt certified to facilitate Lean projects for the City. The State of Ohio, through the Ohio Local Government Innovation Fund, offers grants for training in and application of Lean strategies. This Resolution expresses support for an application to offset the costs of the Lean Black Belt training and certification and the associated Lean project necessary to obtain the certification. The City’s match requirement if the grant is approved is $520.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval of Resolution as Presented

9) **Resolution No. 36-2016 – Federal Attributable Funding Application – Northeast Gateway Project**

In 2012, the City applied to the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC) for federal transportation funding (also known as Federal Attributable Funding) to address the congestion issues at the intersection of Worthington Galena, Huntley and Wilson Bridge Roads. In early 2013, the City was approved for the funding. Since that time, preliminary engineering and the feasibility study have been completed for this project. The resulting preferred alternative was approved by the City Council and detailed design has commenced. The feasibility analysis recommended and the City selected a preferred alternative that includes splitting the existing intersection into two intersections. Original federal funding was based on estimates for a traditional intersection widening or roundabout, both of which were found to produce insufficient levels of service improvements.

The preferred alternative is more expensive, necessitating an additional funding request to MORPC. The project was previously approved for federal funds in the amount of
$6,023,470. The City has recently submitted the updated costs for the project to MORPC and requested the federal funds commitment be increased to $10,932,178 based on the preferred alternative that was selected. Due to the unprecedented level of requests from local agencies for increased funding to previously committed projects, MORPC has indicated the City must re-compete for the additional federal funds. This Resolution expresses support for the application for the additional federal funds and authorizes the City Manager to submit the necessary paperwork and enter into agreements related to the federal funding.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval of Resolution as Presented

10) **Resolution No. 37-2016 – Federal Attributable Funding Application – Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Improvements**

The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement Study was completed in 2011 and recommended the enhancement of gateways, the development of new signage and wayfinding and the construction of a multi-purpose trail from the Olentangy Parklands to the railroad. Last November, City Council received a presentation on recommendations for streetscape improvements and bike and pedestrian recommendations for the corridor. At that time, City Council expressed support for a strategy that pursued grant funding to help implement the recommendations.

The City has developed a project to address these recommendations by complementing the roadway improvements made at the I-270/US-23 (High Street) interchange with additional landscaping that includes new wayfinding signage, street trees, fencing and decorative street lights and crosswalk improvements as well as constructing a multi-use path on Wilson Bridge Road that connects the Olentangy Trail on the west side of High Street and the Worthington Community Center on the east side of High Street to the Central Ohio Greenway Trail. This Resolution expresses support for an application for the Federal Attributable Funds (federal transportation funding) to help fund this project and authorizes the City Manager to submit the necessary paperwork and enter into agreements related to the federal funding.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval of Resolution as Presented

11) **Resolution No. 38-2016 – Job Description – Police Chief**

It is necessary to update and modernize the job description of the Police Chief. It is the City's practice to review job descriptions periodically, especially when there is a vacancy. Staff has reviewed the job description and the updated version is attached to the Resolution.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval of Resolution as Presented
12) Ordinance No. 29-2016 – Accepting the Amounts and Rates and Authorizing the Necessary Tax Levies

This Ordinance accepts the tax rates and amounts as determined by the Franklin County Budget Commission. This is an annual action by the City as required by State law and the rates and amounts are based on the tax budget that was submitted in July. The property tax rate remains unchanged for 2017. This is an annual action by the City as required by State law. Attached is a memorandum from the Finance Director that provides additional information. Staff is requesting this Ordinance be scheduled for public hearing on September 19th and approved by emergency to meet the required timelines under State law.

**Recommendation:** Introduction for Public Hearing on September 19, 2016

13) Ordinance No. 30-2016 – Appropriation – Community Center Shingle Roof Replacement

The 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Program contains allocations for roof projects at the Fire Station, Municipal Building and Community Center. Each of these buildings is experiencing roof deterioration and leaking. In anticipation of the projects, the City engaged Mays Consulting & Engineering to conduct an assessment of the roofs at the Community Center (south end), Municipal Building and Fire Station. As a result of the assessment, the shingled roof area at the south end of the Community Center is recommended for immediate replacement prior to the winter. This Ordinance appropriates funds, by emergency, to enable the roof repairs this fall. If approved, staff will proceed with the engineering services needed for the project and then select a contractor since the construction is anticipated to be below the bid threshold. Additional information is included in the attached memorandum from the Director of Service & Engineering.

**Recommendation:** Introduction and Approval by Emergency

14) Ordinance No. 31-2016 – Appropriation – Municipal Building Chimney Repairs Design

In the same evaluation referenced in the previous agenda item, Mays Consulting & Engineering recommended immediately addressing the leaks that are occurring at the four chimneys at the Municipal Building. This Ordinance appropriates funds for the engineering services necessary for the chimney repairs. Once the engineering work is completed, staff will request to proceed with bids since the estimated construction cost is above the bid threshold. Additional information is included in the attached memorandum from the Director of Service & Engineering.

**Recommendation:** Introduction for Public Hearing on September 19, 2016
15) Ordinance No. 32-2016 – Appropriation – Fire Division Overtime & Accrued Acreage Fee

This Ordinance appropriates additional funds for overtime in the Fire Division and to pay the sewer capacity fee to the City of Columbus. The Fire Division has recently experienced the departure of three employees, two of them due to retirement. In addition, we have two employees out on medical leave and we are covering the vacancies with overtime. An additional appropriation is needed to cover the anticipated overtime costs for the remainder of the year. Additionally, we received a large payment for the sewer capacity fees from the Linworth Crossing development which must be passed along to the City of Columbus. We need an appropriation to make the payment, which is offset by the fee paid to the City.

**Recommendation:** Introduction for Public Hearing on September 19, 2016

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

16) Permission to Bid – Wayfinding Project

The 2016-2020 Capital Improvements Program contains funding to implement the wayfinding strategy that was previously approved by City Council. Wayfinding uses local landmarks, signage, pathways and environmental elements to help orient residents and visitors to the City of Worthington. The first phases of the project have been prepared for bid. These phases include wayfinding signage in Old Worthington and at the entrances to the City. Staff seeks approval to solicit bids for the project. The portion of the bid documents that relate to the type of signs and installation locations is attached.

**Recommendation:** Approval of the Motion Authorizing Staff to Bid the Project

EXECUTIVE SESSION

I respectfully request an executive session to discuss appointment of personnel, appointments to Boards and Commission, and economic development assistance.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matt Greeson, City Manager
FROM: Scott Highley, Fire Chief
DATE: August 31, 2016
SUBJECT: Medical Director Awards

Near Drowning Run Info

On July 6th two lifeguards at the Worthington pool recognized that a small child was in severe distress. They rescued the child from the water and immediately began CPR. They continued lifesaving care until the arrival of Worthington EMS crews. Worthington EMS crews continued treatment and then transported the child to Nationwide Children’s Hospital. Within 24 hours of arrival at Children’s, the child was released to his parents care and has since made a full recovery.

Without their actions, the outcome of this incident would have been much more serious, if not tragic. It is for this reason the Worthington Division of Fire and EMS, and their medical director, Dr. Rund, wish to recognize the two lifeguards.

Lifeguards:

Ethan Stupka
Rory Finnegan
Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 20, 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, June 20, 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 7:50 p.m.

Members Present: Douglas Foust, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent: Rachael R. Dorothy

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, Director of Public Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Interim Chief of Police Jerry Strait and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were approximately 46 visitors present.

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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Resolution No. 25-2016

Expressing the Congratulations and Best Wishes of Worthington City Council to the Worthington Kilbourne High School Boys Lacrosse Team for Winning the 2016 Division II State Championship.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 25-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 25-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Vice Mayor Jim Lorimer shared that the sport of lacrosse has enjoyed a highly successful championship and participation record in Worthington. It continues to be the fastest growing sport in our country. It is by far the oldest sport in North America with early Indian artifacts reflecting inter-tribal competitions as far back as the 12th century. Lacrosse is a very fast, most physically challenging and highly popular international game. It is one of the fastest and most aggressive of all team sports. Worthington High School teams have won more Ohio State High School team championships in lacrosse than in any other sport. Thomas Worthington High School won state championships in 1990, 1991, and 1996 and Worthington Kilbourne High School in 2009, and now again in 2016. Those five state championships reflect the athletic ability and commitment of
our community’s best young athletes as well as the experienced and motivational leadership of a skilled coaching staff. The head coach of this year’s championship team is Drew May. He also served as goalie coach for the 2009 team.

This state championship team had a most challenging schedule throughout the 2016 competitive season. They faced ten topped ranked teams and entered the post season with a record of 8 wins and 10 losses. At the state championships they had six straight team victories, defeating Toledo St. Francis 11 to 7 in the final championship game to capture its second championship title. These team members have trained year round during most of their high school years. Several of these athletes received post season awards for their outstanding performance. While each of them contributed to the state championship record, many of them will be playing lacrosse at a wide range of colleges next year. He introduced the senior members of the team who were in attendance: Luke LeVette, Connor Alley, Jake Weirick, Alex Cash, and Jack Maloney.

Vice Mayor Lorimer then shared that this championship team was trained by six Assistant Coaches and one Head Coach. The Assistant Coaches in attendance include Mike Riffe and Mike Lippert. The Head Coach since 2010 has been Drew May. Mayor Lorimer invited him to come forward and presented him with a certified copy of Resolution No. 25-2016 and a placard of this year’s state championship team.

Coach May thanked the school administrators who were present, Principal Angie Adrean and Superintendent Dr. Trent Bowers as well as the Athletic Director Jeff Todd. He thanked Council for recognizing a great group of individuals and the best team that he has been a part of. He also thanked Vice Mayor Lorimer. He appreciates the kind words he shared about the team and coaching staff. He truly appreciates it. Lastly, he thanked his players for continuing to believe in one another and continuing to hold firm in the belief that they could battle through the adversity the team faced this season. He loves them. This is one of the most memorable teams that he has ever been a part of. He again thanked Council for the recognition.

Vice Mayor Lorimer shared that we are honored this evening to have with us some great leaders from the Worthington school system. He introduced the Athletic Director of Kilbourne Jeff Todd, Principal Angie Adrean, and two Assistant Principals in Kevin Johnson and Ken Nally. He also acknowledged Superintendent Dr. Trent Bowers.

Ms. Michael congratulated the team and shared that Council members are proud of their accomplishment. Mr. Norstrom added that members also want to recognize the parents for all of the work that they have done to get the guys to practices and games.

VISITOR COMMENTS

Ms. Michael acknowledged several scouts that were present. She encouraged them to ask questions.
Elmer Troxell, 110 Longfellow Ave.
Mr. Troxell read the following statement:

1. A problem has been created for many of the Worthington Citizens. I feel that I must speak up and bring this situation to your attention. It seems to me, as well as my next door neighbor, Christa Gharbo at 120 Longfellow Ave., and many other citizens of Worthington that a big problem was created, I assume, by the Worthington City Council. Before I continue, I have a question to ask and, hopefully will receive an answer. Are you not the ones who approved the tree planting by the side of the streets?

Ms. Michael asked if he was talking about the street tree program. Mr. Troxell said he guesses that is it. It pertains to the area between the sidewalk and the curbs. Mr. Greeson reported that there is a cost sharing program where the City will cover the installation and a portion of the cost for planting street trees. That program receives a certain amount of funding each year. Residents have the opportunity to request to participate until the funds run out. He doesn’t recall how many trees were planted last year but it is a partnership with interested residents. Ms. Michael added that residents request the trees and select the type from a list. But homeowners are the ones that make the request to install trees. Mr. Greeson agreed.

Mr. Troxell commented that he thought it may have been the Council that thought of this or at least allowed this to happen. He stated that he didn’t agree to participate but they planted trees in his front yard anyway so he will continue to read his statement.

2. When the trees were planted next to the sidewalks, there was no foresight to see that a big problem would be created.
3. As the trees grow and mature so do the roots. As the roots grow underground, they enlarge and displace the soil, causing the concrete sidewalks to rise and, create irregular levels and safety hazards, for pedestrians, joggers and others.
4. The deciding people did not think about the consequences for the action taken. We citizens of Worthington have, in the past, had to pay out of our pockets for a situation that we did not create.
5. Approximately 2-4 years ago, I personally spoke to someone in the service department. He was physically present. I showed him the sidewalk that was starting to raise up. I told him that I had previously paid to have sidewalk repair work completed and, did not want to pay for this damage that was starting to occur. I also told that person I felt the tree was a safety hazard. I showed him that the curb box/shut-off valve for my natural gas line is about 2 feet or so from the tree trunk. I reiterated to the service department person that the tree being so close to the shut-off valve was a safety hazard and, the tree should be removed to preclude a disaster waiting to happen. He did not seem concerned at all with what I had told him. He said there is nothing that he could do. I feel that he could have done something. I believe that he could have had the tree removed or, could have obtained approval to remove the tree, grind the stump and, kill the roots, thereby preventing a future disaster from happening. If
action had been taken, it might have stopped the sidewalk from rising any higher. However, that did not happen. Now, you want me to pay for something that I had previously tried to get taken care of.

6. My next door neighbor, Christa Gharbo, had a storm damaged tree removed in 2015. However, the roots have continued to grow and caused upheaval of the sidewalk. That piece of the sidewalk had been previously replaced about 4-6 years ago and she had to pay for it. That was the same time that I had to pay to have some of my sidewalk replaced. I believe it cost me about $441.00. Now, you want me to pay $663.84 to fix a continually repeating problem. To him, this is crap. He doesn’t agree with it.

7. We citizens are having to pay for the problem that perhaps, (ad lib) he doesn’t want to seem like he is pointing fingers at anybody but he thinks some of our local government officials have allowed this to happen and thereby created the problem. Perhaps this is something that you anticipated before and thought this would be a continuous source of revenue for your future projects. He doesn’t know only you all can answer that.

8. I hope that my statement has not fallen on deaf ears!!! I hope that you will decide to do something that is beneficial for the Worthington citizens and, not expect us to pay again. He feels that that is totally wrong. Anything less would be totally unacceptable. One thing could be to get rid of the trees, stumps and roots that are causing the upheaval of the sidewalks. I believe that removal of the trees, stumps and roots and, not having to pay for a problem created by someone else might be acceptable to most citizens of Worthington. The repetitive repair/replacement of sidewalks because of the tree and root problems cannot continue and should not continue. To do anything less would probably invite somebody from maybe www.abc6onyourside.com investigative team members of Tom Sussi, Kurt Ludlow or Books Jarosz, to conduct interviews to try to find out a little more in-depth as to what is going on and what you all may hope to do to alleviate this problem.

Thank you for allowing me to speak in front of the council. I hope this problem can be remedied somewhat quickly. Thank you for your time.

At Ms. Michael’s offer for comments, Mr. Norstrom asked how trees get planted. Does he understand that it is a request by the citizens? City staff doesn’t plan them on its own initiative. Mr. Greeson replied that in some instances we do. He doesn’t know whether that occurred in the particular instance Mr. Troxell is referring to or not. There is both. The tree program is worked in partnership with the residents who wish to plant trees in the tree lawn. The value being served there is that we are helping encourage replenishment of the urban forest and many people value tree lined streets. In addition to that, City Council appropriates funds every year for a tree project that is done in consultation with the Arbor Advisory Committee. Some trees, for instance, are planted along major thoroughfares, such as the evergreens across from the high school or more recently planted are some along High St. So we do both.

Mr. Norstrom asked if we have a history of this tree. Mr. Greeson replied that we might.
Mr. Myers understands that the City arborist has a list of trees that they have designated for participation in the Street Tree Program. One of the things the arborist would look at would be root invasion. Mr. Greeson agreed that we try to put the appropriate tree in the appropriate spot. He added that there are instances where developers install trees as a part of a project. He used the instance of the house recently built at the corner of Clearview and Evening St.

Mr. Myers requested that Mr. Greeson and his staff look at this issue and report back to Council on whatever they can consider the nature of this tree planting and possibly what is happening. He would prefer the information prior to the August recess.

Ms. Michael shared that she had a copy of Mr. Troxell’s letter that she will make sure he receives it to assist with the research. Mr. Greeson agreed to do that. He added that in all likelihood the gentleman received a letter from the City along with an invoice to repair the displaced sidewalk. He shared the process by which sidewalks are identified for replacement and the options homeowners have for replacing them. He believes the preparation for the re-pavement of Longfellow Ave. is what caused the inspection that resulted in various residents receiving a bill in order to replace the sidewalks that did not meet the Codified ordinance standards.

Mr. Norstrom told Mr. Troxell that he just heard that residents of Worthington are expected to maintain their sidewalks. Staff will work to find out information regarding that tree but he takes great exception to hear him say that he thinks the City has a system for increasing its revenue by planting trees that grow roots. He doesn’t know where he lived before coming to Worthington but this City does not operate that way. To think that it does is a disappointment to all other citizens in this community. Mr. Troxell stated that he meant no disrespect but was just citing that as a possibility.

Mr. Smith asked for a clarification. Thanks to technology he can view his house on his I-pad. He sees what looks like two trees between the sidewalk and the road, possibly three. Mr. Troxell stated there are three trees in the front, one is to the east of the driveway and is one of the ones that is causing the problems. That is the tree he talked to the man from the Service Department about several years ago.

Mr. Smith commented that the one east of the driveway looks a little larger and maybe a little older than the other two. Mr. Troxell agreed. It has been there and started to raise the sidewalks there. He understands that the citizens are tasked with maintaining the sidewalks but there is something as far as they didn’t do anything to allow this to occur when somebody planted the trees and didn’t bother whether he said “yay” or “nay”. They just put some there on the west side of the driveway as well.

Mr. Foust asked how long he has owned the residence and whether he knows any history of the trees. Mr. Troxell replied that it will be twenty years this coming August.

Mr. Foust asked if the trees were in place when he bought the home. Mr. Troxell replied that the trees on the west side were not there. The one on the east side by the curb box
was already there. Mr. Foust concluded that the troublemaker was already there when he bought the house.

Mr. Foust asked what kind of tree it was. Mr. Troxell replied that he doesn’t know although it has some funny little balls with some spikes that come out of them. Mr. Foust believes the tree to be a sweet gum tree.

Mr. Foust asked if the sweet gum tree is in the current list of recommended trees. Mr. Norstrom stated that staff will find out.

Ms. Michael shared that Mr. Hurley is in charge of the street program and is not here this evening. Mr. Troxell thanked members again for their time.

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

Ordinance No. 20-2016 Accepting the Application for Annexation of Land Located in Perry Township, Franklin County, Ohio to the City of Worthington (Linworth Road).

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Ms. Fox shared that this is the second piece of legislation that Council has received on this annexation of approximately eighty feet of Linworth Road north of SR-161. This is now the acceptance of the annexation. On March 7th we passed a resolution of services for that property. We delivered that to the County and they held their hearing on April 5th. Following that hearing, the annexation petition is required to sit with the City for sixty days at which time the City needs to act on it. There is nothing new to add from the information that was provided before. This is a piece of roadway that has kind of stood out there in the Township when most likely it should have been annexed either to Worthington or Columbus when those properties were annexed in from the Township. According to our former City Engineer, it won’t increase our maintenance responsibility and will clear up some confusion about maintenance of that particular piece of the roadway.

Ms. Michael shared additional information for the benefit of the Boy Scouts.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 20-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes  6  Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Smith, Myers and Michael
No   0

Ordinance No. 20-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
Ordinance No. 21-2016

Authorizing the Release of the Balance Due on the Promissory Note Issued to Swiminc., for the Purpose of Improving Swimming Pools and Related Facilities for the Benefit of the City of Worthington and Its Residents.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that this topic was previously discussed on May 16th and Council directed staff to prepare an ordinance that would allow for the forgiveness of the remaining amount of the loan to Swiminc. in order to help facilitate their efforts in fundraising for the renovation of the swimming pool facilities. The original loan was issued in 1996 and has a remaining balance of $105,000 (three payments of thirty five thousand dollar each). He noted that the director of Swiminc. and Worthington Pools, Phil Sobers is in attendance and may be able to answer any additional questions.

Mr. Norstrom stated that a week ago Saturday in a neighborhood meeting discussing parks, Mr. Hurley made an observation that the Swiminc. was an essential part of recreation in Worthington and a valuable asset to the community. Mr. Norstrom shared that he fully supports the request from Swiminc.

Mr. Bates, 6560 Evening St.

Mr. Bates stated that he spoke before Council when this topic was first discussed at the May 16th meeting. He wanted to reiterate his opposition to the forgiveness of the loan. The City has been very accommodating to Swiminc. over the years allowing them to delay payments and renegotiate the loan. To his knowledge there has been no evidence that they can show that they can make it as an ongoing enterprise. Without making those kinds of guarantees he can’t support an affirmative vote on this.

Mr. Sobers replied that the loan was never about sustaining us or keeping us operational. It was a $600,000 to help us with the building and facilities. The $35,000 would allow us to hire a philanthropist to help us raise the $4.5M to $5M that we will need to complete the renovation.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 21-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6  Troper, Norstrom, Smith, Myers, Foust and Michael
No 0

Ordinance No. 21-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
Ordinance No. 22-2016

An Ordinance Enacted by the City of Worthington, Hereinafter Referred to as the City, in the Matter of the Stated Described Project (PID Number 101844, D06 Regional Pedestrian Signals)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that this ordinance is interesting because it provides for a project that is fully funded by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and includes systematic safety improvements in the form of countdown timing devices at crosswalks, which is consistent with the City Council and Bike and Pedestrian objectives for improving pedestrian safety. He asked Mr. Whited to comment.

Mr. Whited commented that while the devices are fully funded by ODOT the City will be responsible for the maintenance once they are installed. There are eleven crossings that are included in the project, primarily along Dublin-Granville Road and US-23. As mentioned, they are countdown timers that will provide safer access crossing at these intersections. Construction will take place in the spring of 2017 with completion in the fall of 2018. The timers will be installed in several communities and he is not sure when they will be doing the work in Worthington.

Mr. Norstrom understands that there will be increased painting on the sidewalks. Mr. Whited shared that the painting is a separate project.

When asked by Ms. Michael if the Wilson Bridge Road corridor is part of this project, Mr. Whited replied that it was not included as part of their study area. Ms. Michael further stated it is not included even though it is one of the most dangerous intersections in our City. Mr. Whited commented that he is not sure how that was initiated as it started several years ago.

Ms. Michael believes it to be a definite improvement for the safety of pedestrians.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 22-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norstrom, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, and Michael

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ordinance No. 22-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 26-2016

Authorizing the Award of Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program Funds to Help Improve Facility Exterior Façade and Streetscape Along Certain of the City’s Commercial Corridors (6334 Huntley Road).

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

MOTION

Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 26-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Economic Development Manager Mr. McCorkle shared that this is the eleventh ReCAP application with ten being funded to date. He briefly explained the guidelines for the program such as: the program pertains to exterior improvements in the commercial corridor of Huntley, Proprietors and Schrock Roads, 50-50 Grant-Loan financing, and includes eligibility requirements. The applications are reviewed by City staff and the CIC who then recommends approval to City Council.

Mr. McCorkle further commented that staff has done some GIS mapping recently of the corridor and is taking a hard look at the success of the program. Upon some recommendations of Council and the general public we have really dug into the properties within the corridor and identified 138 properties that would be eligible for this program, which includes the ten already funded. It is very early in the data analysis but we have seen several of the properties that we have funded actually pay back the loan and resell at more than the County Auditor’s property value.

Application – 6334 Huntley Road – Scorecards Unlimited, LLC
The applicant property is framed with a red outline in the previous slide. The other two properties on the slide have also received ReCAP assistance: the middle property, Columbus Service Supply was approved in March and the bottom property, Loeb Electric, was approved in 2014.

Applicant Information

Applicant: Scorecards Unlimited, LLC
- Site Address: 6334 Huntley Road
- Total Project Cost: $35,500
- Award Amount: $17,750
- Applicant owns building and has been doing business in Worthington since 2006. Also a long-time resident.

Current Condition

Scope of Work
- New painting scheme
- New windows and entry door
- Removal and replacement of existing canopy over entryway
- Landscaping to include planter boxes and low-maintenance plants
- New entry lighting

Conceptual Sketches
Mr. McCorkle commented that the application was reviewed by City Staff as well as the CIC. Staff recommends approval of this ReCAP application in the amount of $17,750. This is 50% of the total project cost. Beau Filing, the owner of Scorecard Unlimited is present and they would both be happy to answer Council’s questions.

Mr. Foust asked about the process used to ensure the commitment is met for the 50/50 match. Mr. McCorkle shared that he sends an invoice to the property owner quarterly although they can repay the entire amount at any time over the thirty-six month period if they choose to. At the tail end of the project the City requires invoices and proof of payment to verify that the work has been performed.

Mr. Myers shared that in reading the minutes from when this was presented to the CIC he thinks Mr. Carter had a good suggestion in that part of the decision matrix should include a discussion as to whether the building has become functional obsolete and therefore it doesn’t make sense. While he is not referring to this property specifically, he thinks in general terms it is a good discussion for the CIC to have. He would hate to be putting a band aid on a building that in reality should be torn down to create vacant space that could then be redeveloped.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 26-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**Ordinance No. 23-2016**

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 Additional City Share of Costs for the SR-161 Pavement Surface Improvements, (ODOT Project R-161-8.67, PID 96305) and all Related Expenses and Declaring an Emergency. (Project No. 617-15)

**Introduced by Mr. Myers.**
Mr. Greeson shared that this legislation pertains to our participation in the Ohio Department of Transportation urban resurfacing projects program. They will be resurfacing SrT 161 from our eastern corporate limit to Olentangy River Road.

Mr. Whited commented that SrT 161 is in rough shape and hasn’t been resurfaced since 1994. The integrity of the surface is very poor. The purpose of this program is to assist urban areas with their paving program. ODOT pays 80% while the community pays 20%. This specific piece of work has been contemplated for several years. ODOT did the design work and the bidding. It had been estimated at a certain amount however he was notified late Thursday/early Friday that the bid came in significantly over the Engineer’s estimate. Our portion of that overage is $29,428. ODOT has requested that he let them know by tomorrow if the City is willing to pay that amount. So it was somewhat out of his control to bring this to Council in such a short timeframe. He apologized for the short timeframe but that is the situation we are in. Given the necessity for this project and the amount that ODOT is paying, he thinks it is appropriate. ODOT wants to proceed but wants assurance that we will pay our 20%. Their low bid contractor is Strawser Paving with whom we are very familiar and comfortable. That is part one of this discussion.

The second part:

Mr. Whited shared that shortly after he came to the City he had some discussion with Mr. Greeson about the crosswalks that are included as part of ODOT’s project. There are eleven crosswalks with some of them being the same ones that are included in the countdown timers that were addressed earlier this evening. The standard crosswalk includes two bars and is not considered high visibility. We asked ODOT to include the ladder style crosswalk in the bid which will add more visibility and safety. The bids came in and the requested style of crosswalk will cost an additional $22,274. Staff is also requesting that Council allow us to include that into the ODOT’s bid as the City is responsible for 100% of the upgrade. The total increase with the two projects is approximately $51,000. Staff thought it might be appropriate to include additional funding in this ordinance so that we could have contingency funds available if needed for additions to the entire project based on our entire 20% costs. With the 10% contingency, the total amount being requested tonight is $70,000.

Ms. Michael shared that if Ms. Dorothy were here she would encourage the passage of this ordinance.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to pass Ordinance No. 23-2016 as an Emergency. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion to pass Ordinance No. 23-2016 as an Emergency carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, Norstrom, and Michael
No  0

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 23-2016 as an Emergency. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes  6  Myers, Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Smith, and Michael

No  0

Ordinance No. 23-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)


Mr. Greeson commented that staff received an appeal of an Architectural Review Board (ARB) action regarding 137 East Granville Road wherein the ARB denied a request for a sign at that property. Our process requires that Council first decide whether it wants to hear the appeal and then schedule a formal public hearing. Customarily Council doesn’t discuss the issue tonight but rather just decides whether to schedule the appeal for a public hearing and set the date or decline to hear the appeal.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the minutes do not reflect any staff discussion at the meeting of May 26th and unfortunately he didn’t ask about the meeting of May 12th. He asked Mr. Coulter is there was any discussion on this subject. Mr. Coulter replied yes. The ARB reviewed this request twice. At the first presentation a member from the sign company (who is with us tonight) presented a drawing of the design that they would like to do. The sign would include the Memorial Township Hall, the women’s group that is affiliated with that as well as their three tenants. During the first review the ARB felt that the sign was too big for the site. The other issue was whether there even needed to be a sign at that location since there is already a sign on the building that can be seen from StRt 161. The biggest sign that they have is the cannon out front. It is the only cannon in Worthington that he is aware of and a visible reference to anyone needing directions.

Mr. Coulter stated that at that point members suggested that if they were to move forward and ask for a vote the request would probably not pass so they requested that it be tabled to allow them time to redesign the sign, which they subsequently did. At the second hearing they showed an alternative sign. They took heed to some of the suggestions the Board had made to make it a little bit smaller but at the end of the day it came back to the same thing. The ARB felt like the Sharon Memorial Hall is near and dear to everybody’s heart and did not require a sign. It has been there many years. Everybody knows what it is and they have the cannon. At the second meeting a vote was taken and the request was turned down.
Mr. Norstrom suggested that in the future somebody say something about the motion because there is actually no comments in the meeting of May 26th. Mr. Coulter assured Mr. Norstrom that there were comments as the proposal was extensively discussed.

Mr. Brown shared that there was a larger discussion at the May 12th meeting. As Mr. Coulter mentioned, much of the focus at that meeting was whether or not there is an actual need for the sign, the size, the placement and the overall design. Much of the 26th meeting was a re-hash of the previous information.

Mr. Norstrom concluded there was discussion at the meeting on the 26th. Mr. Brown agreed although it wasn’t to the extent as the discussion on the 12th.

Mr. Myers commented that the question at hand really has nothing to do with that, in his mind. The question at hand, and we have no standard to guide us on this question, is should Council hear the appeal.

Mr. Norstrom thinks that what he was discussing has a direct impact because there was nothing in the materials that Council has that presents what the discussion was at those two meetings and that would lead him to say that Council should at least entertain a hearing.

Mr. Myers thinks that typically when deciding whether or not to hear an appeal, one wouldn’t really look at the merits, but utilize some other concept as the guide. If then we decided to hear the appeal, we would look at the merits (the minutes, the testimony, etc.).

Mr. Norstrom stated that he fully understands. He was just asking if there were comments. The materials that Council received indicates that nobody commented. Mr. Myers believes that the reason the comments are not reflected in the minutes is because most of the comments were very brief and identical to what had previously been shared. If Council decides to hear the appeal, members will need the whole package, including the minutes from the earlier meeting. He tends to believe that unless there is some glaring deficiency with their appeal then what is harmed by hearing the appeal. That is the way the other provision would be if you were in a court system. He doesn’t have a problem hearing the appeal.

Mr. Smith asked if he is reading correctly in that the motion failed by a vote of three to two. Several members agreed.

Mrs. Fox shared that in the packet she received there is a copy of the May 12th minutes. She asked if members didn’t receive those. Mr. Norstrom doesn’t think his packet included the May 12th minutes.

Mr. Myers stated his only concern about this appeal at this point, if Council decides to accept it, is the date that members set for the hearing. This is the last meeting in June. Council recesses for the month of August and we are going to have Charter Review
recommendations to discuss in July. He thinks our July is probably fairly busy to have a hearing on an ARB appeal. He would move that Council accept to hear the appeal and set it for a time within the 60 day limit. He asked if we could get it in if members hear it in September. Mrs. Fox replied no. The 60 day is from the decision of the ARB, which was May 26th. Mr. Myers concluded that it has to be heard in July.

Mr. Smith pointed out that Council did meet last year in August. Mr. Myers agreed but stated that is what he is trying to avoid.

Mr. Smith commented that he is okay with hearing the appeal in July.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to hear the appeal of the Architectural Review Board Action at 137 East Granville Road and set for public hearing at the Committee of the Whole Meeting on July 11, 2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Foust commented that he is all for moving ahead with hearing the appeal. He asked if it is reasonable to expect at some point moving forward that council set an expectation regarding the appeal having a reason behind it. That is something that somehow was overlooked or a process was violated or some standard was not met rather than simply set it in the precedent if MPC/ARB hear an issue and they make a decision and the answer is that they just don’t like your decision. He doesn’t want to be in the business of second guessing MPC on a regular basis. He asked if there is any standard that says in order to make an appeal it has to at least have a reason why.

Mr. Smith shared that as Ms. Fox told him last time we had one of these discussions, it is each member of Council’s prerogative. He thinks they should stick with that.

Mr. Myers asked if members talked about that at Charter Review. He thought the topic came up. If it didn’t that is his bad because he wanted to have a discussion on the very point being raised. He thinks at this point Mr. Smith is probably right. There is no standard but it is something that we can look at going forward.

Mr. Foust thinks it would be appropriate.

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

Resolution No. 27-2016

Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 27-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.
Mr. Greeson commented that it is not customary for staff to pass out a Resolution that wasn’t established on the Agenda but because of the timing of our effort as well as the five Monday month, Council will not meet for several weeks. Considering this will help staff move forward with an initiative that we have undertaken and one that he thinks members will appreciate and understand since staff has discussed it with members previously.

Mr. Greeson explained that the resolution is a transfer resolution so it is not additional money or an additional appropriation but rather it is transferring funds from a personnel line to a line that will allow us to pay for an information technology consultant. He asked Mrs. Stewart to overview the topic.

Mrs. Stewart shared that late last year the Information Technology (IT) Manager retired. Since that time the position has been vacant because we wanted to undertake an assessment of our IT operation so that we could determine how we could best position ourselves moving into the near term future in terms of supporting the technology interest and needs of the organization. We have spent the last few months going through a Request for Proposal process and a selection process to find a consultant to do that work and that assessment for us. We have identified a vendor, Sophisticated Systems that we would like to perform that assessment. What we are proposing to do with this resolution is transfer a portion of the salary savings from that vacant IT Manager position into a Consultant position in the IT budget to allow us to hire the consultant. That would allow us to move forward with the assessment. We expect that assessment may have some follow on evaluations recommended and this would give us some flexibility to pursue those if we feel they are justified. If we feel that they are not, this line item is actually going toward paying for some consulting assistance that we are undertaking because we are down one of our three IT positions so on occasion we have brought in some consulting help just to keep us up to date with supporting the needs of the organization.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 27-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Information Items

Mr. Greeson shared the following items:

- Compliments to Mrs. Stewart and our Acting IT Manager, Allan MacDonald who is doing an outstanding job keeping pace with a robust amount of work with a small staff. They are doing great work on behalf of the City and having a great attitude about this evaluation process.
- Reminder – Employee Luncheon is this Wednesday, June 22nd. Please let staff know if you plan to attend.
- National League of Cities Conference – July 15th is last date for early bird registration. There are two Council members budgeted to attend. Selections will need to be made. See Mrs. Stewart about additional information.
• Quarterly Report – Distributed at member’s places this evening. Apologize for the delay. Second Quarter Report will be distributed soon.
• Distributed a letter from Dr. Bowers, Worthington School District for members’ information and future direction. The School Board will be undertaking a comprehensive facility planning process and they are creating a task force to assist with that. They would like a representative of the City to participate on a task force. Dr. Bowers deferred to us to select our representative.
• Based on the Charter Review Commission’s action this evening, we are scheduled to receive a report from them at the Committee of the Whole meeting in July. We will likely introduce legislation at the first meeting in July. The report will be shared informally and discussed at the Committee of the Whole meeting and then we will schedule a July 18th hearing for Council to consider potential charter amendments that would go on the ballot. That would allow time to file with the Board of Elections by early August.
• He will be absent for the July 5th meeting.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared the following:

• The Arts Festival and music festival that the MAC put on this weekend appeared to be successful. Several of the artists indicated that in all of their years of coming to the Worthington Arts Festival, Saturday was their highest day of sale.
• The Picnic with the Partnership is Saturday night. Over 300 people have signed up. He learned this evening that we have sold out of all of the picnic baskets that are being furnished by local restaurants. Sounds like we have a capacity crowd.

When asked by Ms. Michael if people could still sign up, Mr. Norstrom reported that they could however they will have to provide their own food.

Mr. Myers acknowledged the Cleveland Cavaliers winning the NBA Championship.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss labor negotiations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 6  Norstrom, Foust, Troper, Smith, Myers, and Michael

No 0

Council recessed at 8:48 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.
MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to return to open session and adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

_______________________________
Clerk of Council

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

____________________________________
Clerk of Council

_______________________________
Council President
Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 5, 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 Tuesday, July 5, 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 7:50 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, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, Director of Public Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Interim Chief of Police Jerry Strait and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were three 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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- May 16, 2016 – Regular Meeting
- June 6, 2016 – Regular Meeting
- June 13, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

MOTION

Mr. Foust made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 14-2016

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 for the Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs at Proprietors Road and SR 161 and all Related Expenses and
Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 618-15)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Ms. Stewart shared that this ordinance was tabled by City Council in early May. She requested that it be removed from the table.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to remove Ordinance No. 14-2016 from the table. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Stewart commented that this item relates to a sewer manhole on Granville Road at Proprietors Road. She asked Mr. Whited to comment.

Mr. Whited reported that the project was brought to City Council in late April/ early May as noted by Ms. Stewart. The project is to repair a sewer manhole on StRt 161 at Proprietors to remove a blind tap to improve hydraulic efficiencies and make the sewer flow better. It would also provide for easier cleaning and operation maintenance. The project was sent out to bid based on an engineer’s estimate from a consultant. Thinking it would be less than $50,000, a simplified bid process was used. Bids were received over the estimate which accounted for the delay. After additional efforts we ultimately combined this work with the street improvement program with Columbus Asphalt. They were able to give us a solid price for the needed work for just under $50,000. The request is for $50,000 so we can go ahead and award the contract and getting moving with the repairs prior to the paving of StRt 161 that will begin in August.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 14-2016 by inserting the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00) in Section 1. and inserting the firm of Columbus Asphalt Paving in Section 2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 14-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers and Michael
No 0

Ordinance No. 14-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 27-2016 Providing for Adoption of the Tax Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning January 1, 2017

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 27-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Ms. Stewart reported this being an annual exercise for the City Council. The tax budget is prepared and approved by City Council for submission to the Franklin County Budget Commission, which is required under the Ohio Revised Code. She asked Ms. Roberts to comment.

Ms. Roberts commented that Resolution No. 27-2016 was included in tonight’s Council packets for consideration, which provides for the adoption of the County Tax Budget as Ms. Stewart mentioned. This is an annual housekeeping item. The estimates reflected in the 2017 budget primarily mirror what was presented to members as a planning document in the 2016 budget. She would be happy to answer any questions about the actual numbers.

Ms. Roberts added that earlier this year at the Council retreat the concept of priority based budgeting was discussed as an area of interest for the operating budget presentation which will occur later this fall. Staff is still in the process of reviewing various resources and materials in an effort to gain more knowledge and insight into the concept so that we will be prepared to address this with Council this fall.

Ms. Dorothy asked Ms. Roberts if she could identify where the vehicle licensing tax is located in the budget. She knows there has been some interest about how much fees we receive and at what rate we received them. Ms. Roberts replied that if members look at the page titled, “2017 Tax Budget Summary”, the motor vehicle license tax that she believes Ms. Dorothy is referring to is what we consider fund #215, which is about midway down in the special revenue line. We receive about $115,000 a year in revenue, or somewhere between $11,000 and $12,000 a month. In the last several years, we have been in the practice of committing $150,000 of that revenue to the CIP fund as part of the payment towards the street improvements fund. So we have been drawing down on those funds. The balance at the beginning of 2016 was $212,000. She is estimating the balance to be around $177,000 by the end of the year.

Ms. Dorothy stated that is a licensing tax that the county collects for municipalities. It is then distributed to wherever the licensee resides. Ms. Roberts explained that the Motor Vehicle License Fee is a fee that the City actually collects each month. There is a separate fund, the Permissive License Tax that the County collects and then holds those funds until we identify a project that has to be an arterial street and has to be approved by the County Engineer before they will release those funds for improvements.
There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 27-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**Ordinance No. 24-2016**

To Provide for the Submission of Amendments to the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, for a Vote of the City Electorate at a Regular Municipal Election Previously Ordered for and to be Held on November 8, 2016.

*Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.*

**Ordinance No. 25-2016**

Accepting Storm Sewer, Water Lines, Sanitary Sewer, and Street Improvements in the Michaela Subdivision.

*Introduced by Mr. Smith.*

**Ordinance No. 26-2016**

Approving the Provisions of a Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Worthington, Ohio and the Fraternal Order of Police, Capital City Lodge No. 9 and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Same on Behalf of City.

*Introduced by Mr. Myers.*

**Ordinance No. 27-2016**

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 Installation and Related Services for Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons at the High Street Intersections of Stafford Avenue, Village Green South and Short Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 626-16)

*Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.*

**Ordinance No. 28-2016**

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 for the Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs on South Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 618-15)

*Introduced by Mr. Troper.*
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

Policy Item(s)

- Request to Bid – Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons

Ms. Stewart shared that the appropriation legislation for this project was just introduced and that public hearing will occur later in the month. In the mean time staff would like to solicit bids for this project. She invited Mr. Whited to shared additional comments.

Mr. Whited reported having no additional comments. Staff would like to bid the project as soon as possible.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to authorize a request for bid for pedestrian hybrid beacons. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

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

- Request to Bid – Sanitary Sewer Repairs on South Street

Ms. Stewart commented that this project is recommended in the Central District Sanitary Sewer Study. Like with the last item, the appropriation was just introduced for a public hearing later this month. Staff is seeking permission to bid. She asked Mr. Whited if he had any additional comments.

Mr. Whited shared that this is a project that staff would also like to get moving this year. These fixes will help eliminate the water in basements that we have seen with recent storms.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the recent flooding in the Colonial Hills area and nearby, there is also a project on his street of Hardy Way in the Capital budget and it keeps getting pushed out. He asked if that has anything to do with the flooding problems. Mr. Whited replied that this particular project will not remedy that situation. But there are multiple projects that we are moving for design on that will help. He was just given the final sanitary sewer study this week and is in the process of reviewing that. It identifies additional fixes that will occur in the coming projects.

Ms. Michael asked if this will also help alleviate the problem that we have receive several letters from regarding flooding in the Colonial Hills area. Mr. Whited stated that is unrelated as it is a storm water issue.
MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to authorize a request for bid for sanitary sewer repairs on South Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

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

Information Items

Ms. Stewart shared that the annual audit has recently concluded and we need to have City Council members sign on a form to indicate whether they wish to have or not have an audit conference. Ms. Roberts has the form and it can be circulated after the meeting to complete.

Ms. Roberts reported that the audit was very clean and she doesn’t expect any findings of any kind although there may be a few points of clarification.

Mr. Norstrom asked if a letter was issued. Ms. Roberts concurred that they did issue a preliminary letter. She will make sure that it gets sent out to members.

Ms. Stewart shared that at the last meeting she distributed information about the conference for the National League of Cities. The early bird registration deadline is coming up this month. She would be seeking clarification soon on who will be attending. The budget allows for two members to attend.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared:

- COTA Board – members may have read about an incident where a driver, not in our community, had a passenger who alleged that she was prejudiced and forced off the bus. COTA has investigated that and at this point has found no reasons... the driver may have violated policies but in terms of prejudiced that just doesn’t exist.
- The Smart City Award was made to Columbus, which is going to involve COTA in a number of different ways. That is very exciting for everybody involved.
- The Partnership had a very successful picnic. He knows that some in the room attended. He recently attended the Partnership Board meeting and everything is really good about that. It was the first annual picnic with the partnership.
- The Arts Festival, in talking with the MAC Director Jon Cook, was a very successful festival this year. Some were sorry that it was no longer on the Green but others were grateful for being able to park at the school and just walk over to the MAC. The music added a lot this year as well.
Ms. Dorothy thanked all the City departments and community organizations that helped put on the fireworks and make the family picnic for the 4th of July an enjoyable event. She noted that many biked to the event.

Ms. Dorothy added that Yay Bikes! is offering professional development rides state wide. They are partnering with ODOT and offering municipalities engineering rides and she was hoping that we in Worthington could get that together.

Ms. Michael echoed Mr. Norstrom’s comments regarding the picnic and Arts Festival.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 7 Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, and Michael

No 0

Council recessed at 7:51 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to return to open session at 8:03 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to reappoint Richard Macer and appoint Glennon Sweeney to the Community Relations Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

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

Clerk of Council

Council President
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CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, July 11, 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:

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, Parks and Recreation Director Darren Hurley, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Dan Whited, Service and Engineering Director, and Interim Police Chief Jerry Strait, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley.

There were 20 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

Appeals

(1) Appeal Architectural Review Board Action – 137 East Granville Road

Mrs. Greeson explained that I’m going to have Mrs. Fox first go over the process by which you will consider this appeal, the second thing Mrs. Fox will do is swear in persons in the audience who wish to give testimony, we will have a staff report from Ms. Bitar, hear from the applicant and after hearing from the applicant, hear from the public.

Mrs. Fox explained the process and indicated this is an appeal from a decision of the Architectural Review Board brought to Council by the applicant for a sign at 137 East Granville Road. The process is the same process that the Architectural Review Board would take in hearing an application. You have before you all of the materials that the board had before it, you also have some information from the staff and a recommendation that was made at the last Architectural Review Board meeting is also included in your materials. The action by City Council tonight is just as if you were the Architectural Review Board acting, you can approve this, you can approve it with modifications, or you can deny it.
Your decision is final, so the decision of Council would not be to send this particular matter back to the Architectural Review Board. You also have included in Mr. Brown’s memo the standards for review for approving a Certificate of Appropriateness as the Architectural Review Board would be deciding these matters. There is a motion in the materials that was suggested to be made; you’ll see in that motion that there is a blank. Typically the motions that come before MPC and ARB are motions made in the positive, that’s the way I advise Boards and Commissions to make motions, but sometimes having that particular motion in the materials confuses people because they think that staff is taking a position and that’s not the case here, that’s not the reason here, we just want to make sure we were bringing this to Council without that particular concern on the part of the general public. I would advise that when or if a motion is made that the motion is made in the positive, it’s a motion to approve and then you can either vote that up or down.

Mrs. Fox asked those persons wishing to testify to please stand and raise their right hand to be sworn in.

Ms. Bitar stated that this building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E Wilson Bridge Road in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at this time. The VM zoning district does not reference limitations on the size of the signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

As you know this is a very residential stretch of the community and this property is an unusual one along this stretch and it does have a sign on the front saying Sharon Memorial Hall and it has a big gun out front that is a very good identifier for the building.

The application involved the installation of a free-standing sign 15’ from the E. Granville Road right-of-way and 40’ from the Morning Street right-of-way. On May 12, 2016, the Architectural Review Board looked at this version of the sign and in a staff report that went out to the board addressed were design issues, so if a sign is to go here the design should not include all these different logos, fonts, and styles, and the sign was larger than what you would typically see in a commercial district. As I stated earlier there aren’t any sign regulations for the VM district (the Veterans Memorial District) so we thought that
at the very least it should meet that commercial code requirement and match other signs that are in the city.

The other part of the discussion came from a couple of the board members who said "Why do we need a sign here at all?" This is a very significant building and it's in a residential corridor, it has other identifiers on it and possibly a sign is not needed. Also right before the meeting we received emails and letters from a couple of residents that said they were not sure about the sign; we received an email from the Historical Society that talked about the design, but at the meeting we also had a couple of residents that came up and spoke regarding whether a sign was needed here at all and feeling that it was not needed.

The board let the applicant table it, they had talked about design changes as were addressed in the staff memo; after receiving the letters and emails from the residents and hearing the commentary from the board and from the public, staff reconsidered what was being talked about and thought that there were some other concerns that should be raised like whether the sign was needed at all because of this prominent location and the things I've already mentioned and so when it went before the board a second time, although the sign size was reduced, the number of fonts was reduced and sizes of lettering was reduced all to fit what would work in a commercial code that the board at that time voted 3-2 that they did not feel a sign was necessary here at all. There was not a lot of discussion at the May 26th meeting to that effect, but there were a lot of letters by that time and there was discussion from the May 12th meeting that led to that conclusion and so that is what’s before you this evening.

Ms. Michael asked Council if they had any questions for Ms. Bitar at this time.

**Applicant Comments:**

Jeremy Herman, 181 Rosslyn Ave., Columbus, OH 43214. Mr. Herman commented I am currently the president of the Sharon Memorial Board, we are the group that takes of the hall, both maintenance and hopefully promoting the Veterans groups within the community. We do feel that a sign is warranted; as the memorial board we do wish to promote all veterans groups that are within the community; we are lucky enough to have two organizations to call our place home; the Blue Star Mothers which put a lot of effort into sending packages overseas for soldiers who do not have proper hygiene equipment or any household items. We also have the VFW here in Worthington that calls our building home, they do a lot here in our community; and we feel that this sign is a great opportunity for us to promote these organizations; we feel that it is our duty that we inform the public of uses our hall, and the reason we filed an appeal with the City Council is because we are currently are unaware of what statue we were violating as far as trying to obtain a sign. We are understanding as far as the safety concerns, the design concerns that the public has brought forth, we were happy to go back to the board and reconstruct our design; we obviously made it smaller, modified the colors and logos in order to present this in a more simplistic fashion to hopefully satisfy the residents of the area.
Logan Dilts, 1640 Harmon Ave., Columbus, OH 43223. Mr. Dilts addressed the safety concerns that some of the residents had. I know there were some issues that you may not be able to see when turning off Morning Street, I can assure you there won’t be any issues where 40’ from Morning Street right-of-way and 15’ from the E. Granville Road right-of-way; I’m not sure about how Worthington does it, but I know in Columbus, you’re supposed to have a 30’ foot site triangle and this is very far outside of that. If you would like to meet on site or something, we could do that and I can stand where the sign is going to go and you all can drive by and get a feel for yourselves. The other thing that was brought up was that the letters on the building were an inadequate sign; I can’t read that far from here; the issue mainly there is that the sign is parallel to the road and it’s up really high, so as you’re driving along if you want to read the sign you have to angle your neck to be able to read it which is not the safest thing to be doing while you’re driving. I would be much safer if you had a sign on the ground that you can see as you were coming up to the building which gives you plenty of time to slow down and maneuver onto Morning Street to get to the parking lot where you want to go.

I understand more signage is not something that you want to hear, but in this case more signage is needed than what’s existing there. I know a lot of people that have raised concerns live nearby and have lived in this community for a very long time, but you’ve got to understand that there are a lot of people who don’t sit on this board and are not in this historic district all the time and they need to know where it is and sometimes that sign on the building is not exactly adequate and even the big cannon out front, I know the first time I went there, I drove right past it, I didn’t see the cannon because it was like a cloudy day and it kind of blends in.

Mr. Norstrom asked is the sign lit. Mr. Herman replied no it is not.

Mr. Foust asked as far as noticing what’s in the building, these pictures were obviously taken at various points and times because there’s a sign in this picture, what can you tell me about that. Ms. Bitar replied occasionally we have issued temporary use permits especially for the Blue Stars Moms when they have their packaging event and the community is invited to attend; I know in one other picture, the sign was for the Gary Smith Classic, so these are just temporary signs that are very short term. I’m not sure how long the VFW sign was there, but I don’t believe we issued a permit for that one, so occasionally other signs are placed there as well.

Mr. Smith asked what kind of weekly traffic from outsiders does this building get, because I’ve visited on occasion during the past 5 or 7 years and it’s been dead every time I’ve been there, so I’m just wondering who’s showing up that a sign is needed. Mr. Herman responded currently we do have four tenants that are permanently there, so they have their foot traffic coming in and out; we do have many people using the sidewalk, there are various different activities, an example would be the Memorial Day parade, so a sign would be a huge identifier as to who is in this building. Mr. Smith asked as far as directionally, if someone needed to know directions and therefore needed a sign to be able to identify the building; asked what type of weekly outsiders are coming in. Mr. Herman replied someone possibly attending a VFW meeting or a Blue Star Mothers event...
or one of their meetings. We’ve had funerals there at the building, we don’t charge any veteran groups or veteran individuals to use the facility; we’ve had different people have meetings there for different veterans organizations.

Mr. Norstrom commented based on the minutes and the comments that were made by the ARB, it looks like you decided you had to have the individual organizations on your sign, you don’t want a sign that just says Sharon Memorial Hall, asked is that correct. Mr. Herman replied yes, as I stated before having the veterans groups that use the hall is our main purpose for having the sign.

Mr. Myers asked did the idea for the concept come from the trustees or the tenants. Mr. Herman replied from the memorial board.

Testimonies:

Scott Potter, 181 E. Dublin-Granville Rd. Mr. Potter commented I live a few houses down from this site, and I think this is setting a horrible precedence. Numerous times I have given directions to my house, I say xx number of houses from the cannon; not one person has said “I didn’t see a cannon.” I believe the process has worked excellent, we have an Architectural Review Board that has said “no” twice. As an Ohio Supreme Court Justice once said “just because you might not like the decision doesn’t make it unjust or wrong.”

Suzanne Seals, 123 East New England Avenue. Mrs. Seals commented I am highly opposed to the sign, I think it’s a residential area and I live in the neighborhood and I also believe it’s a bad precedence to set. I want to thank ARB and the City staff for the action they have taken to bring us to this point. I am very relived and glad to see them basically opposing the sign and I would encourage City Council to follow in their footsteps.

Cal Taylor. Mr. Taylor stated:

- I am a Retired Army Engineer Officer
- Sharon Memorial Board President from 2008 – 2013 during the renovation period when we rescued it from demise and decay
- Currently serve as Vice President and on Board of a central Ohio military officers association of over 350 officers. Currently serve on Board of Governors of an Ohio State military alumni society

I developed the original leases with the tenants, many of whom I think are still there and none of them needed a sign; I was upfront with them and I told them to get a sign here, you probably couldn’t. An insurance company wanted to come in there and I told them good luck, well they are now on E. Wilson Bridge Road.

All of the other tenants are not having any problems Four of the tenants in there don’t see a need for a sign. There is one business tenant in there. This is $10,000 of public
funds put into a sign for two non-profit organizations and one business tenant. So one needs to stop and ask is that the place to put public funds.

This board is a public entity according to the County Prosecutor. It started out a non-profit and the County Prosecutor said no, it’s a public entity. So it remains a public entity with public funds.

The sign should not be approved for a number of sound reasons:

(a) $10,000 could be spend in direct support of needy veterans such as thru StandDown, Honor Flight, hospitalized veterans.
(b) WW II gun out front which has served in lieu of a sign
(c) It’s the only three-story historic brick building on Dublin-Granville Road that has a gun in front of it
(d) VFW has been in there for decades, I invited Blue Star Moms to make it their home in 2010 and they never needed signs
(e) There are two churches in there, one of them has been in there over 20 years and never asked for a sign
(f) The Hall is historic 1860’s landmark at eastern Gateway to federally and locally recognized Historic District

VM code became necessary when the City felt that the initial R-10, Low Density Residence, was inadequate to satisfy code. Applying commercial sign code to the VM is a slippery slope rezoning to commercial in the midst of an historic neighborhood; the VM classification was created to prevent such from happening.

Kay Keller, 670 Morning Street. Ms. Keller shared I am in full support of Cal Taylor’s testimony and also the letters you have received from the Old Worthington Association and from the Worthington Historical Society. This building a historic landmark and the cannon in front makes it even more so. In the 39 years I’ve lived down the street, never once has anyone said “where is that building, we can’t find it.” I like Mr. Potter when I give directions to my house, I say you turn at the corner where the double pillars are in front and the cannon in the front; and no one has said I don’t see the building.

There is hardly any traffic on the street. The building is not used a lot by a lot of people. When Councilmember Smith said he stopped by and it was dead, that’s normally how it is.

You need to stop and ask what is the purpose of the proposed sign. It really is for advertising purposes only for that one office that is in the building. The other three offices haven’t asked for that. The VFW and the Blue Star Moms meet once a month, so they are not there every week. There is a temporary sign that can go up which is fine.

Mrs. Fox commented I’m hearing whether a sign is needed at all, so maybe that’s the discussion Council might want to have first.
Mr. Myers stated I don’t think we get to the criteria and I know the discussion at ARB was centered on the threshold question “should there be a sign”; and I take the applicant’s question to heart “what code or ordinance are they violating” and I don’t know that they’re violating anything. I applaud their efforts to promote the building and the organizations that are there, but I think you have to begin with a general purpose of why we have an ARB and why we have a sign code. The ARB purpose is to promote a high character of community development; ARB is to promote, preserve and enhance the distinctive historical village character. That is the general purpose of ARB. From there, once you’ve answered that question that this fits that general rule and criteria, then you go to things like height. I also think it’s telling that if you look at the sign code 1170.05 references signs in commercial districts; 1170.06 specifically references signs in residential districts and 1170.07 has special provisions none of which the VM district fit; so I don’t think there is a provision in the VM zoning district for signs period. Mr. Norstrom commented there is nothing in the code that prohibits signs. Mr. Myers replied my point is that by specifically addressing prohibited signs in every district, but the VM district by the absence of language that tells me it was intentional.

Mr. Norstrom commented given the testimony we’ve heard tonight that’s possible, but since there is no prohibition against signs in the code, signs are allowed; in fact any sign would be allowed. Mr. Myers stated and in my opinion I think that would violate some very standard acts of some statutory construction. The absence when specific reference is made to all other implies an intent to prohibit, so I think there is a foundation both in the general guidelines of ARB and in the sign code. There is a basis to address the threshold question should there be a sign here at all and I think if we were to vote to deny the sign, it is supported by the ARB statute and the sign statute; so I think we have and ARB had a basis in the City code to deny the sign in the first instance and never had to get to the criteria, so when we look at the design of the sign, that is the second part of the question which ARB never really got to.

Mr. Troper asked Mrs. Fox if she is in agreement with Mr. Myers statement. Mrs. Fox replied yes, but the threshold question, I think the ARB and staff had initially looked at the criteria because you saw that in the presentation; you saw the size requirements, the setbacks, and all that. I think then the discussion began to gear toward is the sign appropriate here or should there be a sign here and I think that’s the first question that Council needs to answer.

Mr. Troper commented I think the sign is neither appropriate nor necessary.

Ms. Dorothy commented I think with the cannon out front it demonstrates that there is enough character of that building without calling attention to it with additional signage. I do not think there needs to be a sign with the cannon out front.

Mr. Smith stated I think it would diminish the intention and purpose of honoring our veterans by putting the sign up there. I’m good the way it is.
Mr. Norstrom commented I’m surprised the Historical District did not support a sign and considering the conversation I’ve had with some members about signs indicating that there is a historic district I see no problems with a sign; however, I see lots of problems with the sign as presented. To identify this building with a sign would be appropriate and in fact a little plaque with the historical background would be important; but I cannot support the sign as it is being presented.

Mr. Foust commented I would like to think that we are a business friendly community and I’m not unsympathetic to Buckley Financial Planning or whoever else might go in there, but I’d like to think that there are enough alternatives not-for-profit or public sector types of entities that would make good use of that building without the need for a commercial type sign in a residential district.

Ms. Michael commented I agree with the other comments I’ve heard this evening that there is not a problem with being able to identify this building. This is something that honors our veterans and I think Mr. Taylor brought up a lot of very good points as to why a sign is not needed. The other thing that I am finding curious and interesting is that none of the people whose names were on the sign have actually come and testified and said we really need and want this sign; and usually when someone wants something that’s important to them, they would come to the City Council meeting and say this is what we want and the fact that none of them have chosen to speak and say this sign is really important to me, even makes me question all the more how important is this sign really.

Mr. Myers commented I’m not real certain under our code what we’re tasked with as Council. I don’t know if this is a new clean slate to no vote of an application where we sit as a Super ARB and redo the decision. Mr. Norstrom commented we’ve done that before and that’s exactly what we’re doing. Mrs. Fox replied that’s what it is.

Mr. Smith suggested this body have a Council meeting at the Sharon Memorial Hall.

MOTION Councilmember Myers made a motion that the request by Danite Sign Company for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a freestanding sign at 137 E. Granville Road as per Case No. AR 64-15, Drawings No. 64-16, dated May 16, 2016 be approved based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions in the staff memo and presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Norstrom.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the Appeal – Architecture Review Board Action -137 East Granville Road. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Yes 0

No 7  Troper, Smith, Dorothy, Norstrom, Myers, Foust, and Michael
The appeal duly fails.

Information Items

(2) Proposed Charter Amendments

Mrs. Fox on behalf of the Charter Commission we have submitted a report to you; I also have provided for you this evening at your places a red-lined version of the charter. I’m going to ask Sue Cave who served as the Chairman of the Charter Review Commission to come and give introductory remarks.

Ms. Michael thanked the entire Charter Review Commission and staff for all of their hard work, time, and effort in putting together this report for us tonight.

Sue Cave. Ms. Cave thanked the City of Worthington for the opportunity; I certainly enjoyed serving as chair of the Charter Commission and would like to make a few comments about the Commission itself and then a few comments about the proposed amendments to the Charter and in general and then turn it back into the hands of Mrs. Fox to talk about the details of those amendments and to answer the more technical and legal questions from Council members.

As I said it was a pleasure working with these commission members; I’ve not had the opportunity in all of my years of working with groups of public officials and groups of citizen officials to work with a group that got along quite as well as this one. You were cordial, you were civil, you participated in the meetings, you attended the meetings and you did your homework. I would like to thank the staff Mrs. Fox did a wonderful job of explaining things to us that were far beyond what some of us really wanted to delve into; thank you to Mr. Greeson for his contributions and Mrs. Stewart for hers and Mrs. Thress for sitting and listening to us and taking wonderful minutes of each of the meetings.

The product you have is a report which kind of is the easy version of what those charter amendments were. Twenty-three (23) sections were amended or suggested that there be amendments to. Sounds like a lot but in reality it isn’t a lot. You will find in the charter that there are in some cases multiple sections dealing with a topic, and if you make a change to one of them, you have to make a change to the others. Some of these changes are what I call technical which maybe one, two, or three word changes; some of them change the names of statutes that have been referenced and cross-referenced in the charter due to changes that were made in state law renaming those statues—very simple amendments.

Almost everything that was voted on was unanimous; however, there were a couple of issues that did not quite rise to that number in their approval process. However, the discussions on them were cordial and productive and I think we addressed everything that came before the Charter Review Commission. We talked about salaries, the Mayor and the Vice-Mayor, we talked about the publication of Ordinances, duties of the City
Manager, we talked about how the city borrows money, purchasing and competitive bidding and you will find that we talked about them and that there are actual recommendations for charter amendments to those various issues.

Mrs. Fox stated that one of the issues that the Commission did talk about, but no recommendations for any changes were made were the Issue 38 Amendment that passed last fall; so the commission did have a discussion about that, there was some question about whether they were able to talk about that; the commission determined that they could talk about it, but believed that in light of its recent adoption the commission members just wanted to see the effects of that charter amendment and ended the debate without making any recommendations.

The first issue for suggested change was under Salary and I know that’s gotten some attention in the press and I would like to provide a little bit of information on Council member’s salaries as a kind of a background.

Let me begin by saying that Section 2.04 of the Charter always gave Council the ability to establish their salaries by Ordinance. The change that is being discussed and was mostly discussed in the Charter Review Commission was the timing of that particular Ordinance. There was a lot of discussion about the low amount of compensation that this Worthington City Council gets, particularly in comparison to other central Ohio jurisdictions; so for some perspective I asked Mrs. Thress to pull the history on Council salaries and she pulled Ordinances back to 1957 and the salary in 1957 immediately prior to that Ordinance was $5.00; the Council voted to raise their salary to $25.00 and then in 1988, I believe it was, the salary went up to $50.00 per meeting. At some point in 1967 or 1964 the $10.00 extra for the Council president was instituted.

So this Council certainly does not have a history of passing Ordinances raising their salaries; it’s been two times in the last 59 years, but I think that’s probably one of the reasons why the salaries are so low because I think that the issue of salary has come up and then been voted down. The Ohio Ethics Commission from time-to-time has weighed in on whether council members can give themselves in-term raises which is what this is considered to be. I want everyone want to be clear that the conversation at the Charter Review Commission was not centered on what some people might think as the self-serving decision of Council, but it was really based on the low amount that this council is getting compared to other central Ohio jurisdictions.

Comments were made that sometimes it’s difficult to get people to run for office because of the low amount of salary. I don’t think there is anybody here at this Council that is interested in raising Council salary because they just want more money themselves. I think that has not been the history of this Council, that’s not been the discussion and that wasn’t the discussion at the Charter Review Commission meetings. The Ohio Ethics Commission weighs in on this from time-to-time because they have the section of the Ohio Revised Code which is 102.03D&E that indicates that public officials cannot use their position to receive anything of value, but there’s a qualifier, so as to manifest a substantial and improper influence upon that public official with respect to their duties.
So I think that’s important to bring that up because it’s not quite as easy as saying we’re giving ourselves a raise because we want more money. It’s not that; that would be close to issues that the Ethics Commission would be concerned about, but that’s not what this Council has ever done. So I think we have to keep in mind that issue with respect to the Ohio Ethics Commission. The second thing is that the Ohio Courts have fairly consistently held from time to time that council salaries are a matter of purely local concern. A lot of the advisory opinions of the Ethics Commission has issued deal with statutory cities who are subject to the statues of the State of Ohio; there are statutes out there that prevent in-term raises for council members for statutory cities, but even non-charter municipalities are able to pass Ordinances regarding council salaries and under home rule that’s been permitted. I think that those particular points need to be made that this is something that has typically been viewed as a matter of local concern.

I also think that there is nothing more transparent and open than having your citizens vote on whether or not this method is something that is acceptable to them. By putting it in the charter you’re having the citizens vote on this particular method and I think that this is an extremely transparent way of providing information to the general public about what it is that you’re doing. I’m happy to answer any questions about the information presented to you thus far.

Ms. Michael thanked Mrs. Fox for the information shared with Council this evening.

Ms. Dorothy asked was there any discussion about having a fixed sum entered into the language of what the raise would be; currently we have the $50.00 and $60.00 in our charter. Mrs. Fox replied you currently have the $50.00 and $60.00 in your Ordinance, but not in the Charter. No the commission didn’t speak to that specifically. I have seen charters where specific amounts have been in them. I’m not sure that is the best way to handle it, but this is a different type of a provision; this is unique to Worthington, I really haven’t seen this type of a provision, but some things might be similar I saw things in other communities that were interested in at least raising salaries to a certain level at a certain period of time; similar but not exactly what this is. The charter did not have any specific discussions as I recall about amounts in the charter.

Mr. Smith commented I know in the past we have done analysis and that with other communities with similar staff pays and that type of thing; and we’ve adjusted to the marked based on those analyses, asked what is to prevent us from calling this a market adjustment instead of a salary increase or raise. Mr. Norstrom commented I would like to point out that we’re talking about the charter tonight not about how much we get paid. Mr. Smith commented I believe that’s what I’m referring to; I’m looking at the wording of the charter.

Mrs. Fox commented what the charter language is saying is that council can establish that by Ordinance; I think that is the general direction the charter is giving; that still requires Council to come back at some point and time and have a public hearing and an Ordinance on the specific amount and how you arrive at that specific amount will be determined during the course of that public hearing on the Ordinance. Mr. Troper asked
can we put in a “not to exceed” amount. Mr. Myers replied the problem with the “not to exceed” amount is that it’s set for ten years and you then emasculated the whole charter review because now you’ve taken it out of council’s ability at all and the only way a salary can be changed would be by charter review and election. Mr. Norstrom replied no not charter review; we could add a provision on the ballot to amend the charter. Ms. Michael asked Mr. Troper for clarification...are you asking that the charter provisions say that a one-time increase of xxx.00 and then after such one-time increase, the rest of the language remain the same that is in here. Mr. Troper replied a one-time increase not to exceed....as opposed to giving this Ordinance a blanket amount that we could approve. Mr. Myers commented but we still have to vote on it as Council members to justify it; this is just the power to do it, this isn’t an Ordinance, this is a Charter, it’s the Constitution and I just don’t think that kind of detail is necessary or certainly not typical in an Constitution.

Mr. Foust asked for purposes of the charter, we’re simply trying to establish the concept not dollar amounts, asked am I correct in thinking that we should stay completely away from dollar amounts for purposes of this discussion. Mr. Myers replied that’s certainly my position. Mr. Norstrom replied I concur; I was at this meeting and the discussion by the Charter Review Commission was simply one that our salaries were way down (two or three standard deviations to the low side) and it would make sense for one time to raise the salaries and make it effective for all people so that we didn’t have three and four and four and three and that’s basically what the recommendation was.

Mr. Smith commented I can imagine we all understand that to some degree, but I have a really hard time believing that most people would understand this as we’re not just going to hike it up to whatever we want. Ms. Dorothy commented I am concerned that this will be a poison pill and I understand where the commission recommended all the amendments to be voted on together, but I was wondering if this could be voted on separately or removed from the amendments. Ms. Michael commented I spoke with Mrs. Fox about that and we do have the providence of council that we could have two items on the upcoming ballot one salary, one everything else if that is the pleasure of council. Mr. Norstrom replied I guess I have more faith in the citizens to be able to understand this issue, we have fairly educated voters in our community, whether they pay attention or not, that’s a second question. I think separating it brings it more into question. Mr. Smith replied maybe it should be called into question, but I barely understand the text as it is and I sit here every week.

Mr. Myers commented let’s remember why this came up, we at all times have had the ability by Ordinance to give ourselves raises; that has been here (asked when was the first charter enacted) with this tradition, we know at least 1957 that provision has been here. The reason why this came up was there were certain members of this council and I believe Mr. Smith you were one of those members who felt that it was unfair because four members will get it next time and the other three would be $50.00 per meeting for two more years; so this doesn’t really change any power that we didn’t have before, we have always had this power. Unfettered we could pay ourselves $1 million dollars per year if we were that stupid; the city would go bankrupt and we’d all be done. This was merely
done because people thought and the commission thought it was unfair to stagger raises. Universally accepted by the entire commission right off the bat that this council is underpaid never discussed dollar amounts. The discussion was should we make it at the same time for everybody, but at the same time preserve the fact that this is the only chance that you’re going to get to do this; from then on out if we go back to the way it was before you can’t give yourself a raise in turn, so that’s really all this charter provision does. It doesn’t change any power we had before, it just makes it fair.

Section 2.17 – Procedure in the Passage of Ordinances

Mrs. Fox commented this is the procedure in the passage of Ordinances and there are two themes that run through this section; (1) the ability of Council and the option of the President of Council when titles of Ordinances are read to do so in a summary fashion; typically we’ll see very long Ordinance titles in bond legislation and in TIF legislation and being able to just read that title in a summary fashion was something that the commission thought might be a good thing to do. (2) the question of the publication of the hearing date, currently our charter says that the hearing date will be published once in a newspaper of general circulation in a municipality; and over the years and from time to time there have been questions as to whether we can just change that notification requirement to electronic because so many of our residents get their information that way.

We had a very long discussion at the commission about this item, this was one of the 6-5 votes and ultimately the commission decided on what I think was a compromised position which was to require publication in the newspaper as well as at least one electronic medium which it would be determined by council. There were questions about whether nobody wanted to name any particular electronic medium because they come and go and probably in the next ten years we’ll have new types of media and the current medium might be gone, so that was something that the commission thought the council might be able to establish from time to time. Mr. Norstrom indicated I would like to comment on this, in the minutes of that meeting I suggested that the city use the most cost effective way of communication which may include electronic or newspaper notification and council would then have to determine that on a regular basis; Mr. Myers commented that in this day and age that the newspaper is probably the least effective way to communicate and Mr. Foust indicated asked could we change the language to notice of public hearing to be published once in newspaper and/or electronic medium to be determined by City Council and in that 6-5 vote both of those gentlemen voted for the motion not to maintain paper; it was a very broad discussion and since those two members are here this evening, I would like to ask them do they still feel that we should wait 10 years before we address the newspaper again or that we work to change that recognizing that now the newspaper is still used by some, but over the ten years that are ahead of us and since we have not in our history or in recent history changed the charter other than every ten years, would they be willing to revisit that issue.

Mr. Myers replied I think I made the comment during the commission meeting that at least in my profession everything has moved away from paper, everything is electronic,
but there is also universal access to those mediums in my profession. I think that there were some pretty powerful arguments that more is more and I think that’s what carried the day. Everyone acknowledged the fact that we were moving towards electronics, they were reluctant to go to exclusively electronic at this point because there are some people that still do rely on the newspaper and they won the vote, and their argument was persuasive. So I don’t think I’m ready to counterman what the commission has presented to us on this issue.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Norstrom what is it that you’re looking for, what would you propose as an alternative. Mr. Norstrom replied I think your language would work for the language which I suggested earlier. I’m not saying that we don’t publish it in the newspaper, if the newspaper continues its decline as it has and since we as a council has already discussed that we need to get better communication to the public using more social media that we are moving in a direction to depend less on the newspaper, I would not vote to publish this year, but I can see somewhere in the next ten years that would be a potential vote and although it’s keeping the public notified is the important thing, the newspaper cost us $25,000 or so per year; we can spend $25,000 per year on social media and be so much more effective. Ms. Michael asked if I’m hearing you correctly, you are suggesting that this sentence be revised to say “so that Council from time to time will determine whether or not to have notice of publication in newspaper and/or electronic medium. Mr. Norstrom replied the language I would leave up to Mrs. Fox to develop for us, but that language that you just spoke would meet what I’m advocating for.

Mr. Smith commented let me take that a step further, speaking as someone who has done extensive research on newspapers and news and reading behaviors, our citizens do follow the newspaper and print version very much so, more so than most places, but the type of notice and advertisements and announcements that the city is putting in are not being followed in print media, so I would agree with you Mr. Norstrom and even agree with what Ms. Michael just said.

Mrs. Fox explained the clearer the Charter is the better, so that each and every time that there is a public hearing and the question doesn’t come up are we going to be publishing this in the newspaper or are we going to be publishing it on some type of medium.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Norstrom made a motion to direct Mrs. Fox to develop language that would allow Council to choose the mediums of publication in future years with the understanding that at least currently the newspaper is used as just been discussed. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

Mr. Foust stated what about language that whether than referencing any specific medium whether it’s electronic or newspaper, just take out the words electronic and newspaper and somehow reference publication in a medium. Ms. Michael commented let’s leave the language to Mrs. Fox, let us just stay with the concept; and the concept what I’m hearing is people wanting council over the next ten years to be able to make a decision between various types of publications (electronic versus newspaper) being able to have that
ability; asked is that what I’m hearing. Mrs. Fox asked would you want to that on an annual basis. Ms. Michael replied yes, so there aren’t questions raised throughout the year. Mr. Norstrom chimed in at/or around budget time.

There being no additional comments, the motion to direct Mrs. Fox to develop language that would allow Council to choose the mediums of publication in future years with the understanding that at least currently the newspaper is used as just been discussed carried by a voice vote. Mr. Myers opposed.

**Section 2.18 – Publication of Passage of Ordinances**

Mrs. Fox explained that Section 2.18 are the methods by which we notify the public of Ordinances that have already passed and the charter language says that publication of the passage of an Ordinance shall be made by method number one unless a provision of an Ordinance provides for another method, so that’s what we do; we publish by posting copies in four of the public places and they are the Library, the Community Center, the Griswold, and City Hall.

So method number three and number four where you see the change which is just to match it up to the changes we made in Section 2.17 that we just talked about rarely if ever would get invoked, but the language is there because it was changed.

**Section 6.03 – Powers and Duties of Municipal Planning Commission**

Mrs. Fox explained the commission had a discussion on a recommendation that was brought forward by Ken Pearlman about the powers and duties of Planning Commission. This was the other 6-5 vote, we had a lot of discussion about it; there were a lot of comments about this language and in short what this language is intended to do is to require the Municipal Planning Commission to articulate its basis for its decisions by making reference to the relationship that decision has to the comprehensive planning goals of the city. It’s a fairly broad brush addition, broad brush thought to what the Planning Commission should be doing; and there was a lot of discussion about it. I think Mr. Pearlman’s motivation in doing this was that he believes that the Commission should always have that rationale and reasonable basis. I think there was discussion that we believe that they do often times, but he really thought it was important to tie those decisions back to a particular type of comprehensive planning goal. We talked a lot about the capital C, capital P versus lower case in comprehensive planning; the discussion was centered around MPC using a variety of opportunities in either looking at the master plan, the zoning map; the course of Planning and Zoning decisions that the city had made from time to time or whether there was any other comprehensive strategy or goal that may have been previously established.

So for instance we talked about the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Plan that was adopted by City Council and we talked about obviously the comprehensive plan (capital C, capital P), but even if there were decisions that had been made by the city that weren’t necessarily memorialized in a particular document that if decisions had been made and
one of the examples that he gave was years ago when decisions were made based on whether something was on the east side of High Street or on the west side of High Street and that that had been a practice that the city had been engaging in; he acknowledged that was fine to base it on that type of a decision. So this received a lot of discussion, 6-5 vote of including it in the Charter. Mr. Norstrom commented I’m sorry I missed this meeting, I think that would have been a very good discussion; wondering if we could at least not put it in the Charter, but we should tell ARB they need to follow a similar pattern. Ms. Michael commented this would be putting it in the Charter. Mr. Norstrom replied I understand.

Ms. Dorothy commented I would agree with Mr. Norstrom, I think every decision should indicate where the proposal is compliant or not compliant with the code because I am concerned with having it in writing. I’m not sure how that would be done. Mrs. Fox replied and that was pretty much the discussion at the Charter Review Commission, there were a lot of questions about how that might be done and I think that our Municipal Planning Commission already does that, and does either because the staff has provided that information in the staff report and the commission has commented on it or has adopted that staff report in its decision. Mr. Norstrom commented we have an expert here tonight and I’ll ask Ms. Bitar when you write up the staff memos or when you’re involved with writing the staff memos, the normal language is findings of facts and things like that which encompasses your recommendations which would include that it’s in compliance with the Master Plan or something else, correct. Ms. Bitar replied that’s what we strive for when we write those staff reports to tie it to our planning documents. Mr. Norstrom remarked so I take it to answer Ms. Dorothy’s question it’s a relative simple (if any change) is needed it’s relatively simple in terms of our current procedures. Ms. Bitar replied right.

Mr. Myers commented I have expressed some concern about this provision because I don’t know what is meant by a course of zoning or subdivision practices by the City, or any other acknowledged comprehensive strategy or goals previously established at the time of the decision or recommendation. I want to make certain that if an applicant came in that they were well aware of what standard they were going to have to meet, because I didn’t want to set up a situation where basically MPC could sort of do an ad hoc comprehensive plan as they were deciding cases. We have a good example in our packets this evening for Sharon Township Hall application, it details very in-depth how this application fits or doesn’t fit the design guidelines and that’s what MPC decides their case is on.

Mr. Smith remarked I would be interested to see those meeting minutes of the June 20th Charter Review Commission meeting and who voted which way. Mrs. Fox replied we can get you that information. There was also a discussion on whether language of this type was charter language or whether it was more appropriate be in the code, so I think that the commission probably thoroughly vetted the whole matter. Ms. Dorothy commented I’m concerned that the language is a bit vague after we get past “may be found in the Master Plan” .... and I’m concerned with how vague that can get. Mr. Norstrom stated I think it’s fine, I understand Mr. Myer’s concerns, but having served on that board for
many years I got a pretty good idea of what it means when it says “by a course of zoning or subdivision practices by the City, or any other acknowledged comprehensive strategy or goals previously established at the time of the decision or recommendation.” Mrs. Fox also said for example the Wilson Bridge Corridor Plan that we got which is not part of the Comprehensive Plan per se, but it is a plan that we recognize and we understand what is going on. I think for those on MPC that language is not as confusing.

Mr. Myers commented and that was what Dr. Pearlman’s argument response to my argument was the previously established language in the next to last line. The argument comes down to what is previously established; does that mean previously enacted, previously accepted, previously followed….I really don’t know. I am not about to go to the wall on this provision. I think in reality it’s a good goal, it really isn’t going to change anything that isn’t currently happening and it reinforces the general policy that we want to go by here. I just as a lawyer have some questions with the language.

Mr. Troper asked is it necessary, is it broken…. Mr. Norstrom replied I think it is necessary, although I think it is somewhat being done now. I think it is better to have it in the code that it must be done. Ms. Michael commented I guess what I hear you saying Mr. Troper is it this going in code or charter. Mr. Myers commented I think with the commission members, the six people who voted for this, they looked at this as a charter provision not a code provision because they looked at this as a 40,000 foot statement not as a specific property by property statement; they looked at this as much as an expression of policy and goal as they actually did an actual nuts and bolts implementation and we have been (and Mr. Coulter can back me up on this one) we have been sending messages to ARB at least that they need to reiterate why they made this decision and they need to tie it back to the design guidelines and I think this is a policy statement saying the same thing to MPC.

Mr. Smith asked Mrs. Cave did she have anything to add. Mrs. Cave commented I heard up there a lot of what we heard in the commission meeting; I was one of the no votes. I felt it was being done pretty much already without the mandate in the charter.

Ms. Michael explained it is our decision as a Council to decide whether we want to accept the recommendation of the Charter Review Commission to have this go on as ballot language as part of our Charter or not. I’m just trying to get a consensus of how Council feels. Mr. Troper replied take it out.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Troper made a motion to take out the language.

Motion failed due to lack of second.

Mr. Myers commented I voted the same way Mrs. Cave did, against this. I feel that we should give deference to the body that discussed this and worked on this. I don’t think this provision is going to do any harm.

Ms. Michael stated by consensus of Council we will keep this as is and move forward.
Mr. Smith asked may I ask who brought this up to begin with. Mrs. Fox replied Ken Pearlman.

Section 6.05 – Powers and Duties of Board of Zoning Appeals

Mrs. Fox explained our Charter talked about the board granting variances in individual cases as maybe acquired to afford justice and avoid unreasonable hardship to property owners; that standard has been changed by the Ohio Supreme Court and the unnecessary hardship standard applies to use variances still in the State of Ohio, but Worthington does not grant use variances, we only grant area variances which mean the physical features of a property and not how that particular property is used. So our code actually lists out the factors for practical difficulty and so I thought that that change should be made in the Charter and the Charter Review Commission agreed.

Ms. Michael thanked Mrs. Fox for all of the hard work and the hours that she put in on this project.

Ms. Dorothy commented I am still concerned about the salary amendment and I was wondering if it could be voted on separately

MOTION    Councilmember Dorothy made a motion that the salary section be voted on separately at the November election. Councilmember Smith seconded the motion.

Mrs. Fox commented she may be bringing forth a second Ordinance in that regard; I have in the past attempted to split that out and have been told by the Board of Elections “no”, so I think that the best way to make sure that that happens is to bring that forward as a separate Ordinance.

Yes  2  Dorothy, Smith

No  7  Norstrom, Foust, Troper, Myers, and Michael

The motion fails. The salary section will not be split out from the rest of the Charter.

Mrs. Fox thanked Mr. Greeson, Mrs. Stewart and Mrs. Thress for all of their hard work and time they dedicated to this project.

Mr. Foust commented on Section 2.05 – President of Council, President Pro-Tem of Council. I was wondering if there could be a process that could be pre-defined. Let me say this is not personal and I am not challenging the outcome of the election of President and President-Pro Tem; outcome would have been the same, perfectly content with it. I just think it was awkward having a sitting President presiding over potentially their own re-election; the order in which that went down and which is my recollection, I believe Ms. Dorothy nominated Ms. Michael followed by Mr. Myers nominating Mr. Norstrom. A decision was made apparently on the fly that the process would be the that the first
person nominated would be person we would vote on and of that was successful we were done. It seems to me that in that scenario whoever is first out of the shoot to make a nomination drives the process which I don’t think is a good way of doing it. I think we needed a different process, I wonder on who presides over, perhaps the City Attorney should have a role in this or a member of city staff (not the City Manager) should be entrusted to do this.

I also wonder if the candidate should take 5 minutes or so to tell us what their platform is or what their position is on things to give those of us who are voting on President and President Pro-Tem some understanding of what kind of leadership they are going to bring to the table.

Mr. Norstrom replied it sounds like what you’re talking about is the procedures. Mr. Foust remarked that’s exactly what I’m talking about. Mr. Norstrom commented those are handled in an Ordinance. Mr. Foust replied I just want it identified in here that there ought to be by Ordinance a process or something. I think in that first sentence it wouldn’t hurt to reference that, so that we as council are forced to think about.... Mrs. Fox commented you already do that by adopting the Council rules, so in the Council rules I think you could have a process in there about how those elections go. Mr. Norstrom asked where are the Council rules. Mrs. Fox replied right now they are in the front of my City Council book back at the office. We will send you copies of the rules.

(3) Financial Report

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 $22,588,263 to $23,814,536 for the month of June with revenues exceeding expenditures by $1,226,273.

Year to date fund balances for all accounts increased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $23,814,536 as of June 30, 2016 with expenditures exceeding revenue by $2,551,442.

Expenditures for all funds tracked at 90.4% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Year to date revenues for all funds are above 2015 revenues by $854,055 and above year to date estimates by $324,914.

The General Fund balance increased from $11,308,556 to $11,633,470 for the month of June with revenues exceeding expenditures by $324,914.

The year to date General Fund Balance increased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2016 to $11,633,470 with expenditures exceeding revenues by $383,392.
General Fund expenditures tracked at 92.3% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Total General Fund revenues area below estimates by $-53,486 or -.40%.

June 2016 income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $175,929 or 1.41% and above estimates by $6,722 or .05%.

MOTION Councilmember Myers made a motion to accept the June 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

SMITH – stated I was very serious that should look at having a Council meeting at Sharon Memorial Hall.

TROPER – reminded Council about Shootout For Soldiers Ohio to be held July 16th and July 17th. Opening ceremony is Saturday, July 16th at 12:30 P.M., First Game is July 16th at 1:00 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

Temporary Clerk of Council

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

Council President
Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 18, 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, July 18, 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 7:50 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, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Public Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Interim Chief of Police Jerry Strait and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were ten visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

Ms. Michael acknowledged a boy scout from Troop 123 who was in attendance and working on his communications badge. She welcomed him and encouraged him to ask questions during the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 24-2016

To Provide for the Submission of Amendments to the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, for a Vote of the City Electorate at a Regular Municipal Election Previously Ordered for and to be Held on November 8, 2016.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported that this is the public hearing on the Charter amendments. He thinks staff is prepared to walk through them again if Council desires otherwise we will be happy to answer any questions members may have.
Mr. Norstrom stated that on his electronic version of the ordinance, he is not sure he has the correct copy because his version still has some language that says we have to publish public hearings in the newspaper.

Ms. Fox commented that at the last meeting members discussed the language. She thought that Council wanted to continue publishing public hearings in a newspaper. Ms. Dorothy agreed. She added that the issue would be reviewed on an annual basis. Ms. Fox continued that Council would then determine the electronic medium on an annual basis. That was the change.

Mr. Norstrom stated that was not what he proposed during the discussion. He proposed that the newspaper would also be an option. As he remembers, it would obviously not be something that we are stopping now but we would not be required by the Charter to use the newspaper eight years from now. Mr. Smith interjected that it was and/or. Mr. Norstrom agreed that Council would determine what the most effective means is to advertise. That is not the way that the language reads.

Mr. Norstrom reported the language in question is location in Section 2.17. He then read the section in question.

Ms. Fox asked if it is his suggestion that Council determine on an annual basis whether it is going to publish public hearings in a newspaper and/or on electronic medium. Mr. Norstrom confirmed that Council would determine what the most effective way is to communicate to the public on an annual basis. Mr. Smith acknowledged that being his understanding as well.

Ms. Michael asked if that is a motion. Mr. Norstrom replied no. What we have does not adequately reflect the motion that members passed at the last Council meeting.

Mr. Smith asked if a motion was needed to revise the language.

Mr. Norstrom clarified that what he is suggesting before the end of this meeting is to possibly have staff juggle the two or three paragraphs that are there to reflect the motion from the last meeting.

Ms. Fox offered the following suggestion in looking at Section 2.17 and that sentence to read:

The Clerk of Council shall cause a notice of public hearing on the ordinance to be published once in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality prior to the scheduled hearing date or shall cause the notice to be posted on at least one electronic medium either or both of which methods shall be determined by Council on an annual basis.

Ms. Fox asked if that is the gist of what he was trying to get to. Mr. Norstrom reported the gist as:
“. . . shall cause notice of public hearing of the ordinance to be published in a newspaper or electronic medium, which shall be determined by Council on an annual basis.”

Mr. Smith interjected that it could also include both. Mr. Norstrom agreed that it could be either or both. Ms. Fox concluded either or both methods and shall be determined by Council on an annual basis.

Mr. Norstrom agreed. He added that is the language that should be in 2.17. Ms. Fox commented that in Section 2.18 we can state:

“By publication of a notice by the method as determined by Council pursuant to Section 2.17.”

Mr. Foust stated there is a not so subtle difference here as Section 2.18 leads off with “shall be published the Thursday following passage by one or more of the following methods:”. He asked if the same language could be used in both sections.

Mr. Norstrom acknowledged that it gets you where you want to be but he is not sure. Members had that discussion last time. It is something different because in that instance the notice has to be posted in four places.

Mr. Myers suggested inserting “in a manner determined annually by Council” between “published” and “once”. Then change the “and” to an “and/or” between “date” and “shall”. He asked if that will work. Mr. Norstrom agreed to the suggestion.

Mr. Myers read the change as follows:

The Clerk of Council shall cause a notice of public hearing on the ordinance to be published, in a manner determined annually by Council, once in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality prior to the scheduled hearing date, and/or shall cause the notice to be posted on at least one electronic medium.

Mr. Myers added that he doesn’t know if there needs to be a change to 2.18. Mr. Norstrom agreed.

Ms. Fox asked if in 2.18 members wanted to insert “and/or” like was done in 2.17 because we are referring back to the method determined by Council but it might be both (in both #3 and #4 in Section 2.18). Mr. Myers agreed.

Ms. Fox pointed out that there is another one located in Section 4.03. Mr. Norstrom agreed. Ms. Fox stated that and/or will be inserted there as well. Mr. Norstrom thanked her for the changes.
Ms. Fox commented that staff will get the wording from Ms. Thress from the recording.

Ms. Fox stated that the other changes that were included in the attached version of Ordinance No. 24-2016 was a change to Section 2.05 that addresses the election of the President and President Pro-Tem. She has added a sentence that states: The process for such election may be included in rules adopted by Council pursuant to Section 2.15 of this Charter. She thinks that addresses Mr. Foust’s comment from last week.

Ms. Fox reported the only other change being that she changed the title to Section 4.11 from Competitive Bidding to Supplies, Materials and Equipment; Construction of Improvements.

Ms. Michael asked the location of the one-time Council raises. Ms. Fox reported that being in Section 2.04. There were no changes to the recommendation from the Charter Review Commission because she didn’t hear any during last week’s discussion.

Ms. Michael shared that she had a couple of council members contact her about whether to put a top limit on the salary. She just wanted to raise that issue to ensure that Council’s consensus is reflected. The issue is open for comment.

Mr. Troper commented that he said it last week and he will say it this week, he thinks there should be a limit for the one time increase.

Mr. Myers shared that he is of the opinion that the limit can be debated when the topic comes up. Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Foust agreed with Mr. Myers.

Mr. Foust added that he believes a limit just draws everyone’s attention to that number and assumptions made that are probably not correct. He would be inclined to leave it out.

Ms. Michael stated that since she was asked she just wanted to bring it up.

Mr. Norstrom commented that last week members talked about the language related to the Municipal Planning Commission. Ken Pearlman is in the audience. He asked that Mr. Pearlman explain why he propose the language.

Mr. Pearlman shared that he proposed the language because he felt it was important for the Planning Commission, when they make their decisions, to make sure those decisions relate to the planning concerns of the City. Ohio does not have any consistency requirements between zoning and a written plan and this is a way to at least try to make sure that the Planning Commission looked beyond the immediate facts of the case to the broader planning concerns.

Mr. Norstrom stated that there is the discussion of “we will know it when we see it” and he just wanted to make sure that all Council members are comfortable with what that issue was. He thanked Mr. Pearlman for the explanation.
Mr. Smith commented that he knows members had this discussion last week but he just wants to reiterate that it is a mistake to put the salary increase wording along with the rest of the Charter changes because it directly impacts increase in budget potentially. Philosophically, he just thinks those types of issue should be sorted out.

Ms. Michael shared that she would entertain a motion to amend the ordinance as discussed earlier with Ms. Fox regarding Section 2.05, 2.17, 2.18, 4.03, and 4.11.

**MOTION**

Mr. Smith made a motion to amend the aforementioned Sections of Ordinance No. 24-2016 as discussed this evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Ms. Fox stated that one thing that she did not mention last week but that she thinks was in the report is that there was also a recommendation to delete Section 10.07, which is when Charter amendments take effect. She explained that every time the Charter is amended, that date changes. It was a recommendation of the Charter Review Commission to just delete that paragraph altogether because the Charter amendments take effect upon the voting of the public, if it passes. She just failed to share that in last week’s discussion. It is already included in the ordinance but she just wanted to make sure members were aware of it.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 24-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7  Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 24-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ms. Michael thanked the Charter Review Commission members for their hard work, time and effort and the very professional job that they did and the great recommendations that were brought forward.

**Ordinance No. 25-2016**

Accepting Storm Sewer, Water Lines, Sanitary Sewer, and Street Improvements in the Michaela Subdivision.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Whited shared that staff is happy to report that all improvements at the Michaela subdivision have been constructed and tested properly and have all passed. We are
happy to see this subdivision come on line. The bonding has been put in place for the improvements as well. Staff recommends acceptance of those improvements.

Mr. Greeson acknowledged Marty Savko, the developer of the subdivision, is also in the audience.

Ms. Michael asked if the line is so that we can eventually hook up lines from the City over to the residents around Flora Villa. Mr. Whited agreed that it was. Ms. Michael is aware of many in that area who have been waiting for that to occur.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 25-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7  Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 25-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 26-2016  Approving the Provisions of a Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Worthington, Ohio and the Fraternal Order of Police, Capital City Lodge No. 9 and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Same on Behalf of City.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that staff has been negotiating a three year contract (2016 – 2018) with our police officers and have reached what he believes is a fair and equitable agreement. He thanked the members of both teams who worked for many months on this agreements. The City’s team included Ms. Fox, Ms. Stewart, Ms. Roberts, Scott Bartter, Ms. Trego and Acting Chief Jerry Strait and were ably assisted by Dan Guttman and Maggie Reed with Baker and Hostetler. Everybody worked hard on this. We also want to thank Council for the input that you provided throughout the process and helped guide the strategic direction of the contract negotiations. He thinks members are familiar with most of them and there is a good summary in the agenda package. He asked Ms. Stewart to highlight anything that she thinks is important.

Ms. Stewart shared that there is a three page summary of all of the changes that were made to the contract in the Council materials. There is also a red lined version of the contract to show what changes are being made. There are a number of changes to a number of the sections. These changes have already been ratified and approved by the FOP membership. If approved by Council, this contract will be in effect for 2016, 2017, and 2018. The primary financial items in the contract include:
1) 2016 - $2,000 lump sum payment to the members upon ratification. She provided the background.
2) Upon ratification and the contract going into effect members will receive a 3% wage increase this year, 2.75% in 2017 and 2.50% in 2018.
3) Minor bump in the detective on-call rate in 2017 and 2018 moving from $1.00 to $1.25 an hour and then to $1.50 an hour.
4) Shift differential – increases slightly from $1.25 an hour to $1.30 in 2017.
5) Increase in clothing allowance for uniforms and a single reimbursement when serving in the Detective Bureau and on plain clothes assignments.
6) Leave time – bumped up some hours in the annual leave categories
7) Modified – Section that allows for unused vacation leave to be converted for pay. This contract increases those hours from 40 to 60 that can be converted if not used.

Ms. Stewart stated that there are a number of non-economic changes throughout regarding our processes and management rights and so forth. She noted that this contract does add the ability for the City to implement a random drug testing program. Members may recall that provision was also added to the Fire Department’s last contract. She would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Michael briefly explained contract negotiation information for the benefit of the Boy Scout.

Mr. Norstrom commented that one of the reasons that Council had executive sessions was to discuss issues like this. We had several executive sessions related to this contract negotiation. Members have been thoroughly briefed and understand what the changes are as well as the financial impacts.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 26-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 26-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 27-2016 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 Installation and Related Services for Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons at the High Street Intersections of Stafford Avenue, Village Green South and Short
Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project.  
(Project No. 626-16)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that the pedestrian hybrid beacons project has been bid and has a successful bidder. Staff is excited about moving forward with this project to increase pedestrian safety. He asked Mr. Whited to provide an overview of the project.

Mr. Whited commented that the pedestrian hybrid beacons are a pretty exciting opportunity to increase the level of safety for pedestrians crossing High St. and to really increase driver attention to pedestrians while reducing the potential for rear end collisions. Since his arrival staff has been working diligently to finalize the plans with DLZ, produce the plans and put them out for bid. The bid opening was last Friday. There was a successful bid from Complete General Construction in the amount of $188,276.00. Staff is asking that we award that project to Complete General with a 10% contingency for a potential of other issues being involved. That would bring the amount to $207,103.93. The schedule for the project has not yet been determined. The bid did include a schedule but he needs to meet with the contractor to discuss some of the lead time on the equipment that has to be delivered. He understands that the lead time could be up to many months. Staff would hope to get this installed by the end of 2016 or early 2017 but he doesn’t yet know exactly what that schedule looks like. With that, staff recommends approval of this bid.

Mr. Myers requested that staff look at placing a very small plaque somewhere on the side at Strafford that says, “The Dr. Robert Chosy pedestrian crossing”. Dr. Chosy was behind this for probably as long as he has been on Council. He is just sorry he isn’t here to see it come to fruition. He would certainly like for him in some way to receive recognition for all of his efforts to get this done.

Ms. Dorothy understands that this will fund the installation of hybrid beacons at the intersections of Stafford and High St., and replacing the flashing lights at Village Green South and High St. and Short and High St. Mr. Whited agreed.

Ms. Dorothy realizes that these beacons are similar to the flashing lights but will be different so there will need to be some education about how they are to be used as well as how they will be enforced. Mr. Whited agreed. They will work with Anne Brown and the consultant to make sure the appropriate information is communicated to the public.

Mr. Foust challenged staff to get creative in the education process. He recently traveled to northeast Ohio after a conversation about this issue. One of the northeast Ohio communities had installed one of these and it was just several days old at that point and the local news broadcaster was having a field day interviewing people who were totally confused by what the sign meant. So we are on the front edge of something. He thinks it is great and supports it but he doesn’t want to under estimate the challenge of getting people to understand how this works.
Ms. Michael asked if there is any community in central Ohio that has the hybrid beacons. Mr. Whited shared that there are a few but not many. Mr. Greeson added that the city of Columbus is in the process of installing these in a number of different locations throughout the city. He believes we will see more of these in central Ohio. He noted that we will actually have four. There will be the three downtown and then ODOT is installing one to allow for pedestrian access at an I-270 – U.S.-23 on-ramp location.

Mr. Greeson briefly overviewed the hybrid beacons for the benefit of those in the audience. He added that they are timed in conjunction with the other traffic signals.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 27-2016 by adding the sum of Two Hundred Seven Thousand One Hundred Four Dollars ($207,104.00) to Section 1. and the firm of Complete General Construction to Section 2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 27-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, Norstrom, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 27-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 28-2016

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 for the Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs on South Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 618-15)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson commented that bids for this project were opened last Friday and the amount and contractor will need to be added to the introduced legislation. He asked Mr. Whited to overview this item.

Mr. Whited shared that this was our second bid opening on Friday. This project will remediate some issues that we have had with sewer surcharging along South St. to eliminate what is affectionately referred to as “wibs” (water in basements) that occurs from some poor drainage in the sewers. This project will do some line and manhole
modifications to improve the drainage through that area. The successful bidder was Columbus Asphalt Paving, which is very good as they are already doing several projects throughout the city. The schedule on this project is 90 days from notice to proceed. They will do this work in the same timeframe as the street improvements and the other sewer project. Their bid amount was $117,039.60. With adding a 10% contingency to that number, the request by staff is in the amount of $128,743.56. Staff has reviewed the bid and recommends approval of this contract.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 28-2016 by adding the sum of One Hundred Twenty Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-Three Dollars and Fifty Six Cents ($128,743.56) to Section 1. and the firm of Columbus Asphalt Paving, Inc. to Section 2. 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. 28-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 28-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 29-2016 Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

Introducted by Mr. Foust.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 29-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson thinks it is important to note when we do these mid-year budget transfers that this is customary. It is the time of year staff is looking at accounts and areas where expenditures are less and in other areas where expenditures are tracking high and we make transfers in between them. These transfers do not result in an increase in the budget so there is no request for additional funds over and above the total appropriation that was authorized at the beginning of the year. There are a number of transfers, which is typical, in the two main categories of police and fire. The transfer are needed because of vacancies from retirements and in some cases injuries that have resulting in additional overtime. In a number of cases we are transferring dollars from wages and savings from
vacancies into overtime categories or in categories where the work is being completed. We would be glad to answer any questions.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 29-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 30-2016 Authorizing an Amendment to the Final Development Plan for 2245 & 2285 West Dublin-Granville Road and Authorizing Variances (Tom Hayer/ Linworth Plaza, LLC).

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 30-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is a fairly simple amendment to the final development plan to the shopping center being constructed at the former Segna site. He asked Mr. Brown to comment on the topic.

Mr. Brown commented that this amendment to development plan includes a variance. This has actually been going on since he start in August of 2013. We have annexed, rezoned, and subdivided the property. We have also combined parcels, created a development plan, and now we are back for an amendment to development plan.

He showed a drawing of the site that was originally approved by Municipal Planning Commission and City Council. It showed the location of the transformers directly beside the dumpster locations with screening, landscaping, etc.

Mr. Brown stated that what you don’t see is the sanitary sewer line directly underneath the dumpster location. When the applicant was working on all of their utility construction, AEP had an issue with the transformers being located on top of the sanitary sewer line, which makes sense. The applicant went before the MPC on June 23rd and they did recommend approval on to City Council. They recommend a variance for setback for the property line for that transformer bringing it from the required 30 feet to 7 feet. Staff also recommends approval.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 30-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 31-2016 Amending the Position Description for Crossing Guard.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.
MOTION  Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 31-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson shared that we are currently advertising for the crossing guard position as two guards are needed. He added that this is one of the best jobs in City Government because of the opportunity to greet the kids going to school every morning. As is customary when there are vacancies, staff reviews the job descriptions and several are being proposed for this one. He asked Chief Strait to overview the changes.

Chief Strait shared that this job description was pretty outdated and needed some updates. Currently, Officer Tammy Floyd oversees the program. Modifications were made to ensure there was supervision in that line of command. Some additional language was added that removes some risk for the City. He thinks it is up to date.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy how many crossing guards we have, Chief Strait replied three but we need five. Last year we had one retire and we lost our substitute as well. We will need to get those filled because August 17th will be the first day of school.

Mr. Norstrom understands that the City employs the crossing guards but the school district pays their salaries. Mr. Greeson clarified that the schools compensate the City.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 31-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 32-2016  Amending the Staffing Chart of the City of Worthington to Provide for Twenty-Six (26) Police Officer Positions in the Division of Police for up to a One Year Period.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION  Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 32-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Mr. Greeson commented that due to several retirements and injuries staffing has been reduced and created some overtime situations at the Police Department. We have moved aggressively to hire and have recently hired three new officers. We are very optimistic about them. Two of them are undergoing their field training officer program already but one is in the Columbus Police Academy as we speak. The process for that training is different based on the officer and their need for the length of training but they are not yet ready to independently be on the street until they complete our program. As a result we are incurring overtime as we go through this process. Additionally we have several injuries so we are short officers. Council recently authorized an increase in the staffing chart to allow us to hire one of those officers and we used the savings from the retiring sergeant to hire at the rank and file level. We know that we will have a promotion later in the year to sergeant and that frees up dollars to go ahead and hire the gentleman that
is actually in the police academy. We want to do that again as we are anticipating additional transitioning in the organization. We also currently have some command level and support level staff vacancies so we are able to afford an additional staff person at the officer level for another year. We anticipate there being more retirement transition during that timeframe so that we won’t have a problem affording this staffing level. That will help us with manpower as we hit the fall.

Ms. Dorothy understands this being an effort to try to mitigate having as much overtime as we’ve had recently but also to make sure we have highly qualified, trained personnel available. Mr. Greeson agreed. It will help address the holes that we currently have.

Chief Strait shared that besides the Chief’s position, they are also down a sergeant’s position and two officers. They also have three on injured duty and only a thirty-two officer force. They do have some extra people, one being their patrol support person who was injured during an incident at school. It is currently Officer Tammy Floyd’s busy time of the year. Usually he could pull her into patrol and she is actually backfilling on first shift when she doesn’t have special things going on herself so it is difficult to adjust for everything that is transpiring right now. There is a total of eight individuals that are senior level that could retire at any time (including him although he doesn’t plan on going anywhere anytime soon). So he wants to make sure they are prepared going into the first of the year should anyone announce retirement or injuries.

Mr. Norstrom asked if he understands correctly, the department is approximately 20% down in manpower at this point. Chief Strait agreed. It is very difficult. Everyone is working about 6½ days of overtime right now. Mr. Norstrom concluded that overtime costs will be high this year. Others agreed.

Mr. Greeson shared that the police staff is doing a great job. He is thankful for everybody’s hard work during this time.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 32-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Termination of the Sweet Carrot Lease

Mr. Greeson asked Ms. Fox, who has been interacting with the representatives of Sweet Carrot and also assists Ms. Stewart in staffing our Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) to comment. The CIC reviewed this matter at its last meeting and had some recommendations that staff will share tonight, on how to approach it. He added that there is a recommended motion for how we proceed.
Ms. Fox reported that unfortunately staff received notice from Sweet Carrot asking us to honor a clause in their lease that would result in the termination. Their approach to the operations and then construction of the improvements have changed over time when they opened up their Grandview location and realized some of the changes that they would need to make in the Kilbourne Building. After some period of time they ultimately came to the conclusion that the building wouldn’t quite fit their concept without some significant increase in costs. The current estimate to make the changes that they hadn’t anticipated was amounting to over $700,000. There was a construction cost contingency in the lease that if their construction costs exceed $550,000 they had the ability to terminate the lease. However that clause was to be exercised prior to the commencement of the lease. The lease term commenced on May 1st and we didn’t receive notice until late June. At this stage we have a request from Sweet Carrot to honor the construction cost contingency phrase in the lease and terminate it. The CIC had an extensive discussion meeting a couple of weeks ago. The discussion concluded with the CIC wanting Council to pursue any kind of remedies that might be available to us. One of the suggestions was to ask Sweet Carrot if we could take ownership of the building plans that they already had drawn up for the building. According to Angela Petro they have already spent about $12,500. There was also some discussion about whether the City should pursue some kind of a monetary remedy for lease termination based on the fact that the building was off the market for a significant period of time. The damages in this kind of situation are a little hard to calculate because we weren’t actually receiving any monetary rent. It was all abated in exchange for the improvements they were going to put into the building. But if we were to calculate rent for the two month period it would amount to about $6,000. So there was some discussion around whether that is something the City would be interested in trying to pursue but understanding that we entered into this arrangement with Sweet Carrot much as a partnership more than a business deal. But also looking at it from a landlord/tenant perspective.

Ms. Fox reported that direction from the CIC was for staff to pursue an appropriate remedy, taking into account the building plans and to determine whether there should be any kind of monetary penalty associated with that. She has spoken with Angela Petro and let her know about the discussion that occurred during the CIC meeting. She also let her know about the conversation that we were going to be having this evening. Ms. Petro offered to provide us with ownership of those building plans to use in any way we felt that we could. She reported the mechanicals have pretty much been completed. We were receiving plans from their architect the week before she came in and ultimately made the decision. Some of those plans were pretty far along. In her letter she also provided her regret for having to terminate the lease but she hopes that at least their interests and their continued interest in the building has brought some interest on the part of other perspective tenants. She was pleased that she was able to bring Sew to Speak to the building. They are currently under construction and are planning to open in August. Ms. Fox told her that we would have this conversation this evening. Because the City owns the building we are seeking some kind of action from City Council tonight on how to address the lease in light of the conversation we had with the CIC.
Ms. Dorothy commented that when we were doing our own updates to the building, she asked if we had our own plans made of the building. Ms. Fox confirmed that we had plans for improvements to the plumbing, some of the utilities and then improvements to not so much the space where Sweet Carrot was leased to occupy but for the removal of the mezzanine and some of the common area improvements. Ms. Dorothy concluded that we have base building plans that would show utility tie-ins. That is the type of information any tenant would want. They wouldn’t want someone else’s bid out plans.

Ms. Fox shared that CIC members had a discussion about future use of that space and whether that space was going to be usable for restaurant. She is aware of there being some interest in that space since the announcement by Sweet Carrot. She hasn’t seen the plans so she doesn’t know what kind of mechanicals were drawn. This being Ms. Dorothy’s expertise, she stated that it wouldn’t matter. We would want to be able to offer the base building plans to any new tenant but wouldn’t need the bid out plans unless it was already built and as built conditions. If it is plans that are not built then they are pretty much worthless to anyone else unless they are going to exactly duplicate.

Mr. Troper commented that monetary penalty was mentioned. He asked if that amount was the rent for two months. Ms. Fox reported a monetary number was difficult to determine. The only number that we have at this point is what that rent would have been had we actually been receiving dollars from the tenant.

Mr. Norstrom added or conversely what we impute the value to be based on the build out of what they are doing. We never intended to get rent from them. We came up with imputed value, which is approximately $3,000 a month. Ms. Fox explained that $15.00 a per square foot rent calculation was used.

Mr. Myers commented that they weren’t going to actually be paying that. Ms. Fox agreed. She added that no improvements have been made to their space either. Mr. Myers reported there being no liquidated damages clause in the agreement itself. We wouldn’t be receiving any rent even if they were in it and operating. He would find it hard to make an opportunity clause argument for a building that has been vacant and on the market for many years. To say we lost the opportunity to rent it to someone else because they balked for six months would be difficult. In the process, for $6,000 we will lose a lot of good will. He honestly doesn’t see the point in pursuing further.

Mr. Foust asked staff if there is any 20/20 hindsight here. Granted this probably wasn’t anticipated that it would play out the way it did, but is there anything that staff has talked about doing differently in the next contract if and when that arises. Mr. Norstrom replied that from a CIC perspective, there are some lessons learned.

Mr. Myers shared that one might be it won’t support a restaurant. Mr. Norstrom replied at least not one that needs a kitchen in the basement. Mr. Greeson reported that not being part of the original plan. Mr. Myers agreed that the food was going to be brought in and sold.
Ms. Michael asked Ms. Fox for guidance on a resolution to this issue. Ms. Fox stated the primary is to accept the termination of the lease. If Council wants staff to do anything beyond that then we can include that in the motion but our primary objective here tonight is to seek approval of Council to terminate the lease.

Mr. Greeson noted that Ms. Dorothy raised a good point with her expertise but he would be interested in and owning sets of plans as it relates to the patio, and the bathroom and having some of those might be good to have.

Mr. Norstrom thought he understood Ms. Fox to say that they are amenable to providing the plans. Ms. Fox agreed.

When asked by Ms. Michael if that needed to be included in the motion, Ms. Fox replied if they wish.

MOTION  
Mr. Foust made a motion to accept the termination of the Sweet Carrot Lease and request drawing plans. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Myers offered an amendment in that Council waives other potential remedies. Mr. Foust and Mr. Norstrom agreed to the amendment. The motion is as follows:

MOTION  
Mr. Foust made a motion to accept the termination of the Sweet Carrot Lease and waive other remedies and request drawing plans. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

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

Ms. Michael shared that there was one other thing that she wanted to bring up and she read the following statement:

Many of the Council members received a letter last Friday from several resident based organizations asking that we pursue a public conversation about the purchase of the United Methodist Children’s Home property. I think this is an important, complex and very sensitive topic and would be hard to get into the merits of this tonight. In fact, I don’t think that we have the information necessary to do that at this time. I want to note that these organizations have been very active in Worthington and we certainly appreciate the time these residents have taken in their concern. We also care deeply about the future of Worthington. Since this came to you on Friday, like you, I have not had sufficient time to reflect on it. I would suggest that each of you review this letter during our recess. Please feel free to let Matt or me know if you have any questions, concerns, or suggestions. We also want to ask staff to take some time and work with Council members to determine how we wish to respond to the concerns that were raised.
Ms. Michael thinks at this time it is premature to have anything much more than people taking a look at things, thinking about the various options and having some discussion. She felt it was an important letter and wanted to at least acknowledge receipt of it.

Information Items

Mr. Greeson shared that following:

- Community Open Houses that Parks staff has organized. One is tomorrow from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the Community Center. Also Saturday, July 23rd from 10:00 a.m. to noon and Thursday, July 28th from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Those will all be opportunities for the public to provide feedback on the work that the Parks Commission is doing.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if the work entails the long range planning for all of the parks, Mr. Greeson reported this being the long range master plan for the Parks. The Parks Commission has been working with, ‘‘If my park could talk’’ feedback, which was received earlier in the year. It was park user feedback that was used to develop a vision for how each park would develop and be maintained over time.

Ms. Michael asked about the meeting format. Mr. Greeson replied that it will be more of an open house format.

Ms. Dorothy asked how many parks are there in Worthington. Mr. Greeson replied he believes 20. Mr. Brown agreed that it was either 20 or 22.

Ms. Michael hopes the newspaper includes this in their article so that people know about coming. Mr. Greeson thinks all of the information has been included on social media and the City’s website.

- Opioid Addition – Mr. Greeson and Ms. Brown have participated in some conversations with Drug Safe Worthington, a representative of the School District, a representative of the Attorney General’s office, Steven White who is with Senator Portman’s office. There is an event being organized for August 1st around opioid addiction and awareness of opioid’s as a problem in our community and communities throughout central Ohio and the state. This event or similar type events have been done in other suburbs. There is a co-worker of Mr. Myers in the Attorney General’s office that works on helping organize these events and it will involve Senator Portman and Attorney General DeWine, members of the health care community, law enforcement, and families who have been affected by opioid addiction. The time will be announced but will be in the evening of August 1st. The event is tentatively scheduled to be held at the MAC. He assured members he would let them know the specifics once they have been determined.

- Mr. Greeson shared that the City received a letter from the Community Housing Network regarding a project. They finance various types of housing and in this
case it is a proposed apartment with 41 bedroom units with public financing from the Community Housing Network, Franklin County, Columbus and state of Ohio and others. It would provide independent housing for people who are disabled by mental illness, in this case who are able to live independently. This is adjacent to the former Clarion Hotel that has been gutted and is being turned into a psychiatric hospital with in patient care. This project is on land that is owned by the city of Columbus. While it is not the same developer, the intent is for it to be complimentary to the higher level of care facility next door. Because of the type of financing being done by the Housing network, adjacent jurisdictions are notified that the Ohio Housing Finance Agency Multi-Family Funding Program is planning to be a managing member of this residential rental development. Because of our proximity we are afforded an opportunity to comment on it if we have any comments. We have to do that within thirty days of the notice, which will be mid next week. An interesting provision that he had never noticed before is that if we do want to comment it requires a majority of the legislative body to sign the letter of comment. Staff has talked about it. We provide only one area of service to this part of Columbus and that is fire and emergency medical response through automatic aid. He believes we are second to respond so there could be some uptick to responses in that area. Staff would be glad to answer any questions members may have about this proposed development. If members desire to make any comment, now is the time to discuss and direct that.

Mr. Myers said if there is any comment it would be one of support from him. Several other members agreed. Ms. Michael thinks it is great to have this kind of facility coming.

Mr. Myers sees it as a phenomenal opportunity for the residents. He would imagine a great number of them are actually employed.

Mr. Norstrom commented that it is nice that the facility is located on a bus route. Mr. Myers agreed. He knows that the building where he works is cleaned by people who might very well reside in this facility and they are a pleasure to be around.

Ms. Michael asked members what they would feel about sending a simple letter of support of this type of facility.

Ms. Dorothy added that we appreciate the sidewalk that was shown in one of their site plan.

Mr. Norstrom offered that staff tell them that the consensus of City Council is that they think it is a good idea and move forward. Other members agreed. Mr. Greeson stated that staff would be glad to do that.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Myers expressed his gratitude and support to Officer Strait and his force. He understands that even in a sleepy little town like Worthington where approaching a car
on a traffic stop or a house on a domestic violence call can be very dangerous and very serious for any police force. In this time when it’s become even more dangerous to wear the badge, he wants to thank him very much and let him know that City Council has their back because they know the officers have theirs. He asked him to pass that on to the force. Chief Strait thanked him for his comments.

Mr. Troper shared that the Shoot Out for Soldiers was a great success. He thanked the City for the proclamation. They made $57,000 for the cause.

Mr. Troper added that he received an inquiry from a resident who was in support of golf carts and questioned whether or not they were already legal. He forwarded the resident’s question to Ms. Fox. He would appreciate it if we could get some response out about golf carts. Mr. Greeson assured him that staff will get it answered.

Ms. Michael reminded members that the fundraising for the Food Pantry is this Friday night. She encouraged members to support the Worthington Food Bank by purchasing tickets to the event.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion for City Council to recess for the month of August. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

__________________________

Clerk of Council

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

__________________________

Council President
RESOLUTION NO. 33-2016

Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Legislation, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is made the following transfer of previously appropriated funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Account No.</th>
<th>To Account No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.1160.511062</td>
<td>101.1030.511014</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.1160.511062</td>
<td>101.1160.511065</td>
<td>11,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.2020.511019</td>
<td>101.2020.511151</td>
<td>22,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.2030.511020</td>
<td>101.2020.511151</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.512216</td>
<td>101.4050.540500</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.512216</td>
<td>101.4030.540560</td>
<td>940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.521000</td>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>22,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.521000</td>
<td>101.4020.512216</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.521000</td>
<td>101.4030.521005</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.521000</td>
<td>101.4030.540563</td>
<td>8,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4030.511067</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4020.512216</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4030.511067</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.533001</td>
<td>101.4030.511067</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.533001</td>
<td>101.4030.511067</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.511151</td>
<td>101.4020.521005</td>
<td>1,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.511151</td>
<td>101.4020.521005</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.511151</td>
<td>101.4020.521005</td>
<td>788.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.533001</td>
<td>101.4020.521005</td>
<td>3,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.533001</td>
<td>101.4020.521005</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.511065</td>
<td>101.4030.511066</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.512218</td>
<td>101.4030.511066</td>
<td>1,363.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.521000</td>
<td>101.4030.540501</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.521000</td>
<td>101.4030.540560</td>
<td>360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4050.512216</td>
<td>101.4030.521029</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4050.512216</td>
<td>101.4050.540500</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total General Fund Transfers $103,935.00

Revolving Fund (#224)
RESOLUTION NO. 33-2016

224.2424.511043   224.2424.511067   12,600.00

Total Revolving Fund Transfers   $12,600.00

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in full in the appropriate resolution book.

Adopted ______________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

Date: August 30, 2016
To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
From: Molly Roberts, Director of Finance
Subject: Resolution No. 33-2016: Transfer Resolution

This resolution authorizes the transfer of previously appropriated funds to cover expenses as anticipated for the remainder of the year in appropriate accounts. Approval of this resolution will not result in increased total appropriations.

Additional funding is requested for two administrative staff positions. Additional funds are requested for the continuation of the Student Intern as part-time administrative support for the remainder of this year. Also, additional funding is needed for the position of IT Systems Administrator to cover anticipated expenses for the remainder of this year. These transfers are requested from the funds allocated for the IT Manager position which has remained vacant since the retirement of the IT Manager in 2015. An assessment of the IT department and functions is currently being conducted in order to further analyze the duties and tasks of this essential department.

From: 101.1160.511062 IT Manager Salary – MIS Services
To: 101.1030.511014 Student Intern Wages – Administration $ 2,800.00

From: 101.1160.511062 IT Manager Salary – MIS Services
To: 101.1160.511065 Systems Administrator Salary – MIS Services $ 11,500.00

The following transfers are requested within the Police Department accounts. These transfers are necessary in order to capture overtime expenditures in the appropriate account. The Police Department has experienced several retirements and other staff transitions this year which has increased the demand for overtime staffing.

From: 101.2020.511019 Lieutenant – Police Community Service
To: 101.2020.511151 Overtime – Police Community Service $ 22,800.00

From: 101.2030.511020 Sergeant – Police Support
To: 101.2020.511151 Overtime – Police Community Service $ 25,000.00
The following transfers are requested within the Parks and Recreation Department accounts. These transfers are necessary in order to capture various expenditures in the appropriate account lines for anticipated expenses and obligations for the remainder of this year. As with the Police Department, staffing retirements and transitions have provided for some flexibility in the salary and wage lines to offset the additional funding needs in other expense areas within the Parks and Recreation Department accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.512216</td>
<td>101.4050.540500</td>
<td>Training – P&amp;R Administration</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.512216</td>
<td>101.4030.540560</td>
<td>Building Maintenance – Community Center</td>
<td>$ 940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.521000</td>
<td>101.4030.540560</td>
<td>Office/Photo Supplies – P&amp;R Administration</td>
<td>$ 1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4010.521000</td>
<td>101.4010.540504</td>
<td>Copy Machine – P&amp;R Administration</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4030.511089</td>
<td>Park Manager Salary – Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 4,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4030.511067</td>
<td>P.T. Specialized Instructor – Community Center</td>
<td>$ 3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4040.521005</td>
<td>Maintenance Supplies – Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 1,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.511063</td>
<td>101.4020.540563</td>
<td>Grounds Maintenance – Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 8,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4020.512216</td>
<td>101.4030.521005</td>
<td>Training – Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.511151</td>
<td>101.4030.511089</td>
<td>Overtime – Community Center</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.512218</td>
<td>101.4030.521005</td>
<td>Uniforms – Community Center</td>
<td>$ 788.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4030.533001 Furniture –</td>
<td>101.4030.521005 Maintenance Supplies –</td>
<td>$3,624.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.511065 P.T. Support</td>
<td>101.4030.511065 P.T. Support Staff –</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff – Recreation Programs</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.511066 P.T. General</td>
<td>101.4030.511066 P.T. General Instructor</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor – Recreation</td>
<td>– Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.512218 Uniforms –</td>
<td>101.4030.521005 Maintenance Supplies –</td>
<td>$1,363.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Programs</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.521000 Office/Photo</td>
<td>101.4030.540501 Printed Forms – Community</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies – Recreation</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4040.521000 Office/Photo</td>
<td>101.4030.540560 Building Maintenance –</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies – Recreation</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4050.512216 Training –</td>
<td>101.4030.521029 Pool Chemicals – Community</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Programs</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.4050.512216 Training –</td>
<td>101.4050.540500 Equipment Maintenance –</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Programs</td>
<td>Senior Citizen Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.2424.511043 Summer Staff</td>
<td>224.2424.511067 P.T. Specialized</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages – Revolving</td>
<td>Instructor – Revolving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following transfer is requested within the Revolving Fund accounts in order to capture the wage and salary expenditure in the appropriate account line as anticipated for the remainder of the year.
RESOLUTION NO. 34 - 2016

Authorizing the Use of a Portion of the Proceeds of Bonds or Bond Anticipation Notes of the City, in the Principal Amount of Not to Exceed $5,000,000 to be Issued for the Purpose of Financing the 2016 and 2017 Capital Improvement Program Projects Including Street and Utility System Improvements Identified as Bonded Projects in the 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Program, to Reimburse the City’s Capital Improvement Fund for Moneys Previously Advanced for Such Purpose.

WHEREAS, the City may advance costs for the above-referenced purpose (the "Project") from its Capital Improvements Fund; and,

WHEREAS, the City intends to reimburse itself, within eighteen months from the later of the date of expenditure or the date the Project is placed in service (but in no event more than three years after the original expenditures are paid), for the expenditure of not to exceed $5,000,000 for the Project from the proceeds of one or more series of tax-exempt obligations (the "Obligations") to be issued by the City;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. The City intends that this resolution shall constitute an "official intent" for purposes of Section 1.150-2(e) of the Treasury Regulations prescribed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and declares its intention to use a portion of the proceeds of the Obligations to reimburse the City for expenses of the Project advanced from its Capital Improvement Fund, for those projects identified as the City’s 2016 and 2017 Capital Improvement Program Projects including Street and Utility System Improvements, as more fully described in the 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Program approved with Resolution 57-2015.

SECTION 2. It is hereby found and determined that all formal actions of this Council concerning and relating to the passage of this resolution were taken in an open meeting of this Council, and that all deliberations of this Council and of any of its committees that resulted in such formal action, were in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all legal requirements including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

SECTION 3. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in full in the appropriate resolution book.

Adopted _____________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
Date: August 30, 2016

To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

From: Molly Roberts, Director of Finance

Subject: Resolution No. 34-2016: Reimbursement Resolution

The attached resolution authorizes the use and advancement of Capital Improvement Funds for projects identified as “bonded” in the 2016 Capital Improvements Program (CIP). These expenditures will be reimbursed to the CIP fund when bonds are issued. Council adopted Resolution 11-2014 on April 21, 2014 for the same purpose for projects identified in the 2014 and 2015 CIP.

The adopted 2016 CIP includes various projects identified as projects which will be funded through the issuance of debt. The attached resolution authorizes the use of a portion of the CIP fund balance to pay for these projects and then issue bonds at a future date to repay the CIP fund for these expenditures. Passage of this resolution will allow staff to continue to proceed with projects and then repay the CIP fund with the bond proceeds when the debt issuance process is completed. Several CIP projects will be combined together for a larger debt issuance in order to secure a lower interest rate and reduce debt issuance costs.

The following projects were identified as bonded in the 2016 CIP and have received prior authorization by council for completion:

- Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington Galena Intersection Preliminary Design, approved with Ordinance 01-2016 in the amount of $840,992.
- Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs – West South Street Sanitary Sewer Repairs, approved with Ordinance 28-2016 in the amount of $128,744.

These are 2016 CIP planned projects which will need future authorization by council:

- Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvements – design cost estimate $141,600.
- Community Center HVAC Improvements – estimate $900,000.
- Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancements – estimate $800,000.
- Northbrook Relief Sewer Phase II – design and construction estimate $460,000.
RESOLUTION NO. 35-2016

A Resolution in Support of an Application for a Local Government Efficiency Program Grant.

WHEREAS, the Local Government Efficiency Program (LGEP) offers political subdivisions grants, training and support to learn and apply Lean Six Sigma strategies to improve processes, better provide customer service and save money; and,

WHEREAS, the Ohio Development Services Agency (ODSA) provides grants for the LGEP through the Ohio Local Government Innovation Fund; and,

WHEREAS, ODSA is soliciting applications for the current funding round; and,

WHEREAS, the City desires to apply for funding to train a staff member to become Lean Black Belt certified to facilitate Lean projects throughout the City’s operations; and,

WHEREAS, the training and project required for the certification are eligible for the grant; and,

WHEREAS, the City understands its financial obligation associated with the grant is 10% of the total cost, which is estimated to amount to $520.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the City of Worthington fully supports this grant application and agrees to provide the required local match if awarded grant funding.

SECTION 2. The City Manager is hereby authorized to apply for the Local Government Efficiency Program grant.

SECTION 3. The City Manager is further authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

SECTION 4. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in full in the appropriate resolution book.

Adopted ____________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________________________________________
Clerk of Council
RESOLUTION NO. 36-2016

Authorizing the City Manager to Seek Financial Assistance from Federal Attributable Funds for the Project at Worthington Galena Road, Huntley Road and Wilson Bridge Road.

WHEREAS, the Ohio Department of Transportation receives federal transportation funding through the Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, and Transportation Alternatives Program and in turn sub-allocates this funding via the Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Large Cities Capital Program to the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC); and,

WHEREAS, public agencies can apply to MORPC for these funds; and,

WHEREAS, under the oversight of the Attributable Funds Committee and with final approval by the Transportation Policy Committee, MORPC conducts a process every two years to solicit applications for funding, evaluate the proposed projects, and commit funds to those selected; and,

WHEREAS, in 2012, the City submitted an application to address the congestion at and near the intersection of Worthington Galena Road, Huntley Road and Wilson Bridge Road; and,

WHEREAS, the City received notification in early 2013 that it was approved for Federal Attributable Funding for the project; and,

WHEREAS, since 2013, the City’s consultant, EMH&T, has completed preliminary engineering and a feasibility study that determined the preferred alternative for the project and City Council approved the alternative and proceeded to detailed design; and,

WHEREAS, the cost of the project has increased since the last submittal to MORPC; and,

WHEREAS, MORPC determined the project needs to re-compete for the additional federal funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. The City Council expresses support for the project at and near the intersection of Worthington Galena Road, Huntley Road and Wilson Bridge Road.
RESOLUTION NO. 36-2016

SECTION 2. The City Manager is hereby authorized to apply to MORPC for additional Federal Attributable Funds for the project at and near the intersection of Worthington Galena Road, Huntley Road and Wilson Bridge Road.

SECTION 3. The City Manager is further authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

SECTION 4. That the Clerk be and hereby is authorized to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted ____________________

_____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_____________________________________
Clerk of Council
RESOLUTION NO. 37-2016

Authorizing the City Manager to Seek Financial Assistance from Federal Attributable Funds for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Project.

WHEREAS, the Ohio Department of Transportation receives federal transportation funding through the Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, and Transportation Alternatives Program and in turn sub-allocates this funding via the Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Large Cities Capital Program to the Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC); and,

WHEREAS, public agencies can apply to MORPC for these funds; and,

WHEREAS, under the oversight of the Attributable Funds Committee and with final approval by the Transportation Policy Committee, MORPC conducts a process every two years to solicit applications for funding, evaluate the proposed projects, and commit funds to those selected; and,

WHEREAS, the City’s adopted Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Enhancement Study in 2011, which recommended the enhancement of gateways, the development of new signage and wayfinding and the construction of a multi-purpose trail from the Olentangy Parklands to the railroad; and,

WHEREAS, the City has developed a project to address these recommendations by complementing the roadway improvements made at the I-270 /US-23 (High Street) interchange with additional landscaping that includes new wayfinding signage, street trees, fencing and decorative street lights and crosswalk improvements as well as constructing a multi-use path on Wilson Bridge Road that connects the Olentangy Trail on the west side of High Street and the Worthington Community Center on the east side of High Street to the Central Ohio Greenway Trail; and,

WHEREAS, the City desires to apply for Federal Attributable Funds for this project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. The City Council expresses support for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Project, including enhancements to the High Street gateway.

SECTION 2. The City Manager is hereby authorized to apply to MORPC for Federal Attributable Funds for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Project, including the enhancements to the High Street gateway.
RESOLUTION NO. 37-2016

SECTION 3. The City Manager is further authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

SECTION 3. That the Clerk be and hereby is authorized to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted ____________________

______________________________
President of Council

Attest:

______________________________
Clerk of Council
RESOLUTION NO. 38-2016

Amending the Position Description for Police Chief.

WHEREAS, City Council wishes to amend the position description for the position of Police Chief; and,

WHEREAS, it is necessary to amend the position description for the position of Police Chief to properly reflect the duties of this position;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the position description for the position of Police Chief (Class Specification No.122) as per the description attached hereto be and the same is hereby amended.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk of Council be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted ______________

_____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_____________________________________
Clerk of Council
CITY OF WORTHINGTON
POSITION DESCRIPTION

General Statement of Duties

The Police Chief leads and directs the Worthington Division of Police. It is a highly responsible managerial position which administers all police functions including the protection of life and property, apprehension of criminals, community relations, and enforcement of local ordinances and state and federal laws and regulations. Work involves budgets, public and media relations, managing facilities and equipment, and establishing policies, procedures and general orders.

The Police Chief also serves as liaison with the community and community groups and other law enforcement agencies.

Essential Functions of the Position:

Plans, directs, manages, and evaluates the effectiveness of all divisional functions and operations.

Formulates and enforces Division rules, regulations, work methods and procedures.

Makes all personnel assignments within the Division.

Delegates the appropriate levels of responsibility and authority to supervisory personnel.

Makes recommendations to the City Manager for the appointment, promotion, suspension or dismissal of officers.

Works with Division staff, the City Manager and other Department and Division Directors on various personnel matters including evaluations, backgrounds, bargaining, investigation of complaints and, when necessary, internal investigations.

Enforces disciplinary measures when necessary.
Ensures that recruits and regular officers receive adequate training in police methods and procedures.

Directs the investigation of major criminal incidents.

Cooperates with city, state, county and federal officers in the apprehension of wanted persons and in the prevention of criminal activities and/or enterprises. Prepares the annual budget estimates and controls expenditures of all Division funds.

Works with a variety of community groups to keep the community advised of law enforcement-related issues and solicit their input.

Researches new methods, technology, laws, procedures, and techniques to strengthen and improve levels of services.

Directs Division correspondence, requisitions supplies and recommends the purchase of necessary equipment.

Actively collaborates and interacts with Department and Division Directors where activities of the Division of Police are involved or needed.

Participates in and attends meetings of Chiefs of Police, law enforcement professional organizations, task forces, and regional, state and federal agencies or associations.

Attends and participates in public functions for the purpose of promoting a community oriented policing philosophy, crime prevention, law enforcement and establishing favorable public relations.

Insures the appropriate correspondence is prepared for the City Manager, community organizations and other county, state and national entities which may be required.

**Knowledge, Skills and Abilities:**

Comprehensive knowledge of police administration and law enforcement methods, principles, practices and procedures.

Thorough knowledge of all applicable federal and state laws related to law enforcement.

Demonstrated ability to lead and direct the activities of the police function.
General knowledge of municipal government structure and process.

Comprehensive knowledge of supervisory practices and techniques.

Ability to maintain cooperative relationships with other city officials and the general public.

Knowledge of human resource management practices.

Possess excellent written and verbal communication abilities.

Demonstrated ability to prepare and deliver speeches before community groups and organizations.

Ability to exercise sound reasoning and judgment in difficult situations.

Ability to recognize, analyze and define problems, establish facts, draw valid conclusions, and initiate appropriate corrective actions.

Ability to use desk and laptop computers including word processing, database and spreadsheet software.

Ability to maintain confidentiality in the handling of sensitive events and issues.

**Minimum Requirements of the Position:**

Possession of a Bachelor's Degree in Criminal Justice, Public Administration or other related field, with a Master's Degree preferred. Progressively responsible law enforcement management experience, with a minimum of three years as a Lieutenant or above in a municipal police department.

Certification from the Ohio Certified Law Enforcement Executive (CLEE) program, the FBI National Academy, Southern Police Institute, Northwestern University School of Police Staff and Command, or other law enforcement executive leadership course of studies is preferred.

Certified as a law enforcement officer by the Ohio Peace Officer's Training Commission

Possession of a valid Ohio driver's license at time of appointment
Must be a United States citizen

Adherence to all applicable Federal and State safety laws, rules and regulations and City safety policies and procedures.

The characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

This job description does not list all of the duties or functions of the job. The individual in this position may be asked by supervisors to perform other duties. The City has the right to revise this job description at any time.

Adopted by Resolution No. _ -2016; Effective__
ORDINANCE NO. 29-2016

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

WHEREAS, this Council in accordance with the provisions of law has previously adopted a Tax Budget for the next succeeding fiscal year beginning January 1, 2017; and,

WHEREAS, the Budget Commission of Franklin County, Ohio has certified its action to this Council together with an estimate by the County Auditor of the rate of each tax necessary to be levied by this Council, and what part thereof is without, and what part within the ten mill tax limitation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, Franklin County, State of Ohio, six-sevenths of the members elected thereto herein concurring that the amounts and rates as determined by the Budget Commission in its certification, be and the same are hereby accepted; and be it further ordained that there be and is hereby levied on the tax duplicate of said City the rate of each tax necessary to be levied within and without the ten mill limitation for tax year 2016 (collection year 2017) as follows:

SCHEDULE A

SECTION 1. Summary of amounts required from General Property Tax approved by the Budget Commission and County Auditor’s estimated tax rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount to be Derived from Levies Outside 10 Mill Limitation</th>
<th>Amount Approved by Budget Commission Inside 10 Mill Limitation</th>
<th>County Auditor’s Estimate of Full Tax Rate to be Levied Inside Limitation</th>
<th>County Auditor’s Estimate of Full Tax Rate to be Levied Outside Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Charter</td>
<td>$1,458,408.24</td>
<td>$1,186,314.61</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Retirement</td>
<td>99,270.05</td>
<td>99,270.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Pension</td>
<td>175,182.43</td>
<td>175,182.43</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,458,408.24</td>
<td>$1,460,767.09</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. 29-2016

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED:

SECTION 2. That the Clerk of Council be and hereby is directed to certify a copy of this ordinance to the County Auditor of Franklin County.

SECTION 3. That this Ordinance is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the preservation of the public health, safety and welfare, and notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed _____________

President of Council

Attest:

____________________

Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
FROM: Molly Roberts, Director of Finance
DATE: September 2, 2016
SUBJECT: Ordinance Accepting the Amounts & Rates and Authorizing the Necessary Tax Levies and Declaring an Emergency

Please include the attached ordinance on the agenda for September 6, 2016 for introduction, set the public hearing for September 19th and declaring an emergency for an immediate effective date. This Ordinance is an annual housekeeping item required by each taxing authority within the State of Ohio for the purpose of Accepting the Amounts and Rates as Determined by the Budget Commission and Authorizing the Necessary Tax Levies and Certifying Them to the County Auditor. This legislation item is requested for passage as required by Ohio Revised Code Section 5705.34. In accordance with O.R. C. 5705.34, this legislation item must be adopted and submitted annually to the Franklin County Budget Commission by October 1. This Ordinance must be passed as an emergency measure in order to meet the required deadline of October 1st.

This ordinance accepts the tax rates and amounts as determined by the Franklin County Budget Commission based on the tax budget, which is submitted annually in July. The property tax rate for the City of Worthington remains unchanged for 2016 in the amount of 5.0 mills, which consists of 2.5 mills of inside millage and 2.5 mills of charter millage. The estimated tax revenues are based on current property valuations and any preliminary new construction as of January 1, 2016. Current tax revenues may increase or decrease when actual valuation and effective tax rate data become available in December 2016. These adjustments, if made, would be reflected on the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources as received in January 2017.
ORDINANCE NO. 30-2016

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 Community Center Shingle Roof Replacement Project and all Related Expenses, Determining to Proceed with said Project and Declaring an Emergency. (Project No. 631-16)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio, six-sevenths of the members elected thereto herein concurring:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.4010.533360 an amount not to exceed Sixty-Four Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($64,500.00) to pay the cost of the Community Center Shingle Roof Replacement Project and all related expenses (Project 631-16).

SECTION 2. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 3. That this Ordinance is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the preservation of the public health, safety, and welfare, and notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
From: Daniel W. Whited, Director of Service & Engineering
Cc: Darren Hurley, Director of Parks & Recreation
     Chuck Sgandurra, Building Maintenance Supervisor
Subject: City of Worthington Critical Worthington Roof Repair
Date: August 31, 2016

As you are aware, the City has numerous buildings that are in significant need of repair.

The Service & Engineering Department has been working closely with Mays Consulting &
Engineering (Mays) to evaluate and prioritize the needed improvements related to roofs,
windows and doors. The expected cost of improvements is estimated to exceed $1.6M.

Many of these costs can reasonably be spread over several years of work. However, there are two
repairs items that are critical in nature. Those two items are outlined below.

1. Worthington Community Center – South End Shingle Removal Area

   An area of the original portion of the community center roof experienced leak problems earlier
   this year. Shingles were removed in an attempt to repair the roof area that was experiencing
   nearly constant leakage. After the removal of the shingles, it became apparent that the roof
   insulation and roof deck were severely deteriorated. Mays recommends that this roof area be
   replaced with new roof system similar to the addition area of the community center rather than
   installing a repair that would later be removed when the remainder of the roof areas are
   replaced. Currently the area is covered with a temporary tarp system that provides little
   protection to the building envelope. Estimated engineering services fees for this work is
   $14,200. The estimated construction cost is $45,000.

2. Municipal Building – Chimney Leaks

   There are leaks occurring at the four chimneys at the municipal building. It is recommended that
   these leaks be further investigated to determine the exact cause of the leaks and an evaluation
   be determined for the best method for repair. It is presumed, at this time that masonry through-
   wall flashing installation will be required, along with EPDM roof replacement on all four
chimneys (a full investigation is required to determine final scope of work). Estimated engineering services fees for this work is $24,250 ($9,250 investigation + $15,000 design). The estimated construction cost is $72,000.

Staff recommends Council approval of Ordinance 30-2016 to engage Mays to design shingle roof repairs at the community center and to secure a contractor to complete the repairs as soon as possible. This recommendation included the design fees, estimated construction fees and a small contingency which would allow for the emergency expenditure of up to $64,500.

Staff also recommends the approval of Ordinance 31-2016 to engage Mays to complete the design of Municipal Building chimney repairs (in the amount of $25,000) with the intention of engaging a contractor to complete these repairs in late 2016 or early 2017.

The following background documents, authored by Mays, are attached:

1. City of Worthington – Building Envelope Project Prioritization Recommendations
2. Roof Replacement Professional Service Proposal- Worthington Community Center – South End Shingle Roof Replacement
3. Chimney Repair Professional Service Proposal - Worthington Municipal Building
July 1, 2016

Dan Whited  
Director of Service & Engineering  
City of Worthington  
380 Highland Avenue  
Worthington, Ohio 43085

RE:  City of Worthington – Building Envelope Project Prioritization Recommendations

Dear Mr. Whited:

We have generally reviewed the following projects that are scheduled to have work completed on the building envelope (i.e. roofing, windows, masonry, etc.) and we have the following recommendations for prioritization:

1. Community Center – South End Shingle Removal Area – There is an area on the original portion of the community center that the shingles were removed in an attempt to repair the roof area that was experiencing constant leakage. After the removal of the shingles, it became apparent that the roof insulation and roof deck were severely deteriorated. We recommend that this roof area be replaced with new roof system similar to the addition area of the community center rather than installing a repair that would later be removed when the remainder of the roof areas are replaced.

Timing of Work: 2016

Estimated Engineering Services Fees: $14,200

Estimated Construction Costs: $45,000

2. Municipal Building – Chimney Leaks – There are leaks occurring at the four (4) chimneys at the municipal building. We recommend these leaks be investigated to determine what is causing the leaks and the best method for repair. Construction estimate below assumes masonry through-wall flashing installation will be required in addition to EPDM roof replacement on all four (4) chimneys (investigation needed to determine final scope of work).

Timing of Work: 2016

Estimated Engineering Services Fees: $24,250  
($9,250 investigation + $ 15,000 design)

Estimated Construction Costs: $72,000
3. Community Center – South End Roof – The low-slope EPDM membrane roof system and the steep slope shingle roof system on this building are at the end of their useful life. In addition to the roof system, we also recommend that the existing skylight be replaced, and two (2) windows and related tongue & groove siding be replaced at the same time. The two (2) windows have been problematic with leaks and could allow water infiltration into the new roof system. The skylight lens is cracking, which is an indication that it is at the end of its useful life.

Timing of Work: Design and bid in 2016; Construction 2017

Estimated Engineering Services Fees: $80,000

Estimated Construction Costs: $903,000

4. Sharon Township Fire Station – Roof Replacement – The steep slope shingle roof system and low-slope EPDM roof system are original and are approximately 25 years old. The EPDM roof system was reported to be problematic with leaks with some recent repairs being completed that were reported to significantly reduce the amount of leakage.

Timing of Work: Design 2017; Construction 2018

Estimated Engineering Services Fees: $35,400

Estimated Construction Costs: $295,000

5. Municipal Building – Roof – The steep slope shingle roof system is original and is approximately 24 years old. The main sources of leakage were reported to be at the chimney areas which should be addressed in item 2 above. The remainder of the shingles, cupola siding, cupola low-slope roof are near the end of their useful life.

Timing of Work: Design 2017; Construction 2018

Estimated Engineering Services Fees: $17,500

Estimated Construction Costs: $75,000

6. Municipal Building – Windows and Doors – The windows and exterior doors at this facility are in various states of decay and have been repaired periodically in order to help extend the life of the windows. The window and door systems are in need of replacement and/or repair in order to restore them to a maintainable condition. For budgetary purposes, construction assumes complete replacement of all windows and exterior doors (at main entrances)

Timing of Work: Design 2017; Construction 2018

Estimated Engineering Services Fees: $15,000

Estimated Construction Costs: $100,000
The scope of work and estimates listed above are based on the current information we have regarding each of the buildings. The estimates will be reviewed and refined during the design process once each project is more thoroughly investigated and the design complete.

Estimated engineering services fees include construction phase services. Design would start in year indicated; however phased engineering service fee billing may carry over into following year.

The fire station and municipal building are adjacent to one another. Including these into one larger project with one (1) contractor may reduce the engineering and construction costs.

All estimated costs are in current dollars. Future project estimates should be inflated by the appropriate inflation factor to account for inflation. A summary of the costs is provided on the following page.

Please review this information and provide any comments or additional requirements that are required for this project.

Best regards,

Dan Lawrence, P.E., R.B.E.C.

Dan Lawrence, P.E.
(P.E. Licensed in OH, IL, IN, KY, PA, TX, and WV)
Registered Building Envelope Consultant (R.B.E.C.)
Sr. Project Engineer
# Building Envelope Project Prioritization Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Community Center – Shingle Removal Area</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Building – Chimney Leak Repairs</td>
<td>$24,250</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Center – South End Roof Replacement</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$118,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>$117,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Community Center – South End Roof Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$903,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Township Fire Station – Roof Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Building – Shingle Roof Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Building – Window &amp; Door Replacements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$67,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$903,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Sharon Township Fire Station – Roof Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Building – Shingle Roof Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Building – Window &amp; Door Replacements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$470,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$470,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 29, 2016

Dan Whited, P.E.  
Director of Service & Engineering  
City of Worthington  
380 Highland Avenue  
Worthington, OH 43085  

RE: Roof Replacement Professional Services Proposal  
Worthington Community Center – South End Shingle Roof Replacement  

Dear Mr. Whited:

Mays Consulting & Evaluation Services, Inc. (“Consultant”) is pleased to submit this proposal to the City of Worthington (“Client”) to provide Roof Replacement Professional Services for the Worthington Community Center – South End Shingle Roof Replacement Project.

Recent attempts to perform short-term repairs on one (1) of the Community Center shingle roof sections (south end) have uncovered deteriorated structural roof deck conditions that are in need of urgent repair.

The intent of our services is to provide the technical specifications and drawings to address the required structural deck repairs and installation of a new thermoplastic membrane roof system on this one (1) shingle roof section. In addition, we will assist the Client in obtaining contractor quotes and provide construction phase services, as further described in this proposal.

The roof replacement construction scope of work is anticipated to include the following:

- Roof deck remediation (where necessary)
- Installation of sealed vapor retarder system.
- Installation of multi-layer roof insulation system
- Installation of fully-adhered thermoplastic membrane roof system with color and appearance of standing seam metal roof system (to match natatorium roof system)
- Installation of snow retention system
- Gutter and fascia replacement

Our proposal is based on the following proposed Scope and Cost of Services:
SCOPE OF SERVICES

A. Roof Replacement Professional Services

1. Design Phase

   a. The Consultant shall prepare technical specifications and detail drawings setting forth in detail the technical requirements for the roof replacement project. Technical specifications and detail drawings will be provided to the Client in electronic format (PDF) for inclusion with Client front-end documents.

   - The Client shall be responsible for coordinating and assembling necessary front-end documents and other required documents required for quote process.

   - The Client shall be responsible for coordinating and obtaining plan review approval by the appropriate building code official (if applicable).

2. Quote Phase

   The Client shall be responsible to obtain quotes. The Consultant’s scope of services during the quote phase shall be limited and will include the following:

   a. Attend a pre-quote meeting to familiarize select contractors with the scope of work. The Client shall be responsible for pre-quote meeting coordination and construction document distribution.

   b. Review and respond to contractor requests for technical-related information during the quote process.

   c. Review contractor quotes and provide contractor recommendation to the Client. The Client shall be responsible to prepare and administer contractor agreement for construction.

3. Construction Phase

   a. Review and approve or take other appropriate action upon the contractor's submittals.

   b. Schedule and conduct a pre-construction meeting with the Client and the contractor.

   c. Conduct periodic site visits to review the progress of the work and conformance to the construction documents. Provide written and photographic documentation of the construction progress, as observed during the site visits. *We have allowed for four (4) periodic site visits over an estimated two (2) week construction period.*

   d. Document and certify the contractor's applications for payment.
e. Review and approve or take other appropriate action upon the Contractor’s written warranties and related closeout documents required by the contract documents.

**COST OF SERVICES**

The cost of our services, including expenses, to complete the aforementioned services is estimated to not exceed **$14,200.00**, as outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Phase</td>
<td>$4,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote Phase</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoices will be submitted monthly and in proportion to services performed. Payments are due and payable fifteen (15) days from the date of the Consultant’s invoice.

Mays Consulting & Evaluation Services, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to submit this proposal, and we look forward to working with you on this project. If the proposal is acceptable to you, please sign where indicated and return a copy of the complete proposal and a valid purchase order to the undersigned.

**CLIENT**

(Signature)  
(Printed name and title)  
(Date)

**CONSULTANT**

(Signature)  
(Printed name and title)  
(Date)

The terms and conditions on the following page(s) of this form are part of this proposal. Contact information for return of signed proposal (email or fax is acceptable):

Jim Mays  
Operations Manager  
Mays Consulting & Evaluation Services, Inc.  
PO Box 1020  
Delaware, Ohio 43015  
Phone: (740) 363-9511  
Fax: (740) 363-3050  
Email: jmays@mces.com
TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- Scope of work changes requested by the Client and/or changes caused by unforeseen hidden conditions will be billed in addition.

- In providing services under this agreement, the Consultant will endeavor to perform in a manner consistent with that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the same profession currently practicing under similar circumstances. The Consultant will perform its services as expeditiously as is consistent with professional skill and care and the orderly progress of Consultant's part of the Project. Regardless of any other term or condition of this Agreement, Consultant makes no express or implied warranty of any sort. All warranties, including warranty of merchantability or warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, are expressly disclaimed.

- For all construction projects, the Consultant shall neither have control over or charge of, nor be responsible for, the construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, or for safety precautions and programs in connection with the Project, since these are solely the Contractor's rights and responsibilities. The Consultant shall not be responsible for the performance by the Architect and Construction Manager of the services required by the Architect's and Construction Manager's agreement with the Owner. The Consultant shall be responsible for the Consultant's negligent acts or omissions, but shall not have control over or charge of and shall not be responsible for acts or omissions of the Architect, Construction Manager, Contractor, Subcontractors, or their agents or employees, or of any other persons or entities performing portions of the Project.

- Notwithstanding any other provision to the contrary, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, neither the Client nor the Consultant shall be liable to the other for any incidental, indirect or consequential damages arising out of or connected in any way to the Project or this Agreement. This mutual waiver of consequential damages shall include, but not be limited to, loss of use, loss of profit, loss of business or income or any other consequential damages that either party may have incurred from any cause of action whatsoever.

- The Consultant shall have no responsibility for the discovery, presence, handling, removal, disposal or exposure of persons to hazardous materials of any form including mold. The existing or constructed building may, as a result of post-construction, use, maintenance, operation or occupation, contain or be caused to contain mold substances which can present health hazards and result in bodily injury, property damage and/or necessary remedial measures and costs for which the Consultant shall have no responsibility.

- The Client agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to indemnify and hold Consultant and its subcontractors harmless from and against any and all damage, losses or cost (including reasonable attorneys' fees and defense costs) caused in whole or in part by the Client's acts, errors or omissions and those of anyone for whom they are legally liable. Furthermore, the Consultant agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to indemnify and hold Client and its subcontractors harmless from and against any and all damage, losses or cost caused in whole or in part by the Consultant's negligent acts, errors or omissions and those of anyone for whom they are legally liable.

- The Client agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to limit the Consultant's total liability to the Client or anyone making claims through the Client, for any and all damages or claim expenses (including attorney's fees) arising out of this Agreement, from any and all causes, to the total amount of the Consultant's fee under this agreement.

- This agreement may be terminated upon ten (10) days written notice by either party should the other fail to perform their obligations hereunder. In the event of termination, the Client shall pay the Consultant for all services rendered to the date of termination, all reimbursable expenses, and reasonable termination expenses.

- Any claim or dispute between the Client and the Consultant shall be submitted to non-binding mediation, subject to the parties agreeing to a mediator(s). If the Parties cannot agree upon a mediator the claim or dispute shall be submitted to the American Arbitration Association (AAA) for mediation in accordance with the Construction Arbitration and Mediation Rules of the AAA then in effect. Unless otherwise specified, the laws of the State of Ohio shall govern this agreement.

- All documents produced by the Consultant under this agreement, including electronic files, shall remain the property of the Consultant and may not be used by this Client for any other purpose without the written consent of the Consultant. Any such use or reuse shall be at the sole risk of Client who shall defend, indemnify and hold the Consultant and its subconsultants harmless from any and all claims and/or damages arising therefrom. Electronic files are not contract documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to contract documents because of changes or errors induced by translation, transmission, or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user's sole risk and without liability to the Consultant and its subconsultants.

- Execution of this agreement by the Client, issuance of a retainer, or issuance of a purchase order by Client, will constitute acceptance of the terms and condition of this agreement. Any additional terms or conditions stated in Client's purchase order, or other written communication accepting this agreement, or contained in any general or special conditions issued by Client, or by alteration by Client of this contract form, shall not be valid under any circumstances unless specifically adopted or approved by written response of Consultant. Failure to respond by Consultant shall be deemed a denial of any additional terms or conditions stated in Client's acceptance or counter-proposal of Client.
August 29, 2016

Dan Whited, P.E.  
Director of Service & Engineering  
City of Worthington  
380 Highland Avenue  
Worthington, OH 43085

RE: Chimney Repair Professional Services Proposal - Worthington Municipal Building

Dear Mr. Whited:

Mays Consulting & Evaluation Services, Inc. ("Consultant") is pleased to submit this proposal to the City of Worthington ("Client") to provide Chimney Repair Professional Services for the Worthington Municipal Building.

The intent of our proposal is to perform visual and water-spray testing investigations of the chimney components to determine the cause of on-going moisture intrusion issues and provide recommendations for corrective action (basis of repair design).

After the basis of repair design is determined, we will provide the technical specifications and drawings to address the repairs. The preliminary repair scope of work is anticipated to include masonry through-wall flashing installation and replacement of EPDM roofs on chimneys. Once construction documents are completed, we will assist the Client in obtaining contractor bids and provide construction phase services, as further described in this proposal.

Our services will be performed in accordance with the following proposed Scope and Cost of Services.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

A. Pre-Design Phase (Leak Investigation)

1. Conduct a site visit to perform a visual review of the existing conditions and leaks issues. While on-site, we will also conduct water-spray testing at select locations in the vicinity of the leak area in an effort to isolate and identify the specific components that are suspected to be the cause of leakage. The water-spray testing shall be completed in accordance with a modified version of the AAMA 501.2 test method. We anticipate two (2) full days on-site will be needed to conduct the investigation.
For access and safety reasons, the investigation will be accomplished with the use of aerial lift equipment (80' boom lift), which we will provide. Where aerial lift equipment is to be utilized, it will be necessary to traverse sidewalk and grass areas to get in position to safely access the investigation areas. We will take reasonable precautions to prevent damage to the sidewalks and landscaping when using aerial lift equipment, however any damages to the sidewalks or grass areas shall be the responsibility of the Client to repair. We also request sprinkler systems be turned off one week prior and up until end of aerial lift use.

Access to a standard ¾” water hose connection within 200’ of test area(s) and an electrical power supply (110V and 20 amps) within 100’ of test area(s) will be required.

While the aerial lift is available on-site, we utilize it to access the tower structure to gather information for the planned future shingle roof replacement project.

The Client to arrange for access to relevant interior areas, as necessary, during the testing so that leaks produced by the testing (if any) can be monitored. The intent of the water spray testing is to replicate leaks in a controlled manner in order to better determine the source of the leakage. We will attempt to minimize leak conditions caused by the testing, however the Consultant is not responsible for any damage to the building, building interior or contents which result from the testing. The Client agrees to waive all Consultant responsibility and liability regarding potential damage as a result of the testing.

2. Provide a written report, which will include leak investigation findings, photo documentation of typical deficiencies and recommendations for corrective action and/or further testing if necessary. The report will be submitted to the Client in electronic format (PDF).

Note: Our scope of services does not include any destructive testing or disassembly of roofing or exterior wall system components. Suspect deficiencies identified during the visual review requiring these services will be brought to the Client’s attention and a separate proposal for these services will be provided.

B. Design Phase

1. Based on the mutually agreed-upon schedule and construction budget requirements, the Consultant shall prepare, for approval by the Client, construction plans, specifications, and bid documents necessary for permitting and construction and setting forth in detail the requirements for the chimney repair work. Following approval by the Client, construction documents will be finalized and prepared for obtaining bids from contractors.

C. Bid Phase

The Consultant, following the Client's approval of the construction documents, shall:
1. Assist the Client in identifying and inviting qualified contractors to submit bids to perform the work. Note: Required bid advertisement publishing costs to be responsibility of the Client.

2. Schedule and conduct a pre-bid meeting to familiarize contractors with the scope of work. Written minutes of the pre-bid meeting will be prepared and distributed.

3. Review and respond to contractor requests for information during the bid process.

4. Attend bid opening with the Client. Evaluate contractor bids and qualifications and prepare summary of bids letter to Client with contractor recommendation.

D. Construction Phase - Construction Administration

The Consultant’s Construction Administration activities shall include:

1. Review and approve or take other appropriate action upon the Contractor's submittals.

2. Schedule and conduct a pre-construction meeting with the Client and the contractor. Written minutes of the meeting will be prepared and distributed.

3. Conduct periodic site visits to review the progress of the work and conformance to the construction documents. Provide written and photographic documentation of the construction progress, as observed during the site visits. *We have allowed for four (4) periodic site visits over an estimated four (4) week construction period.*

4. Document and certify the contractor’s applications for payment.

5. Review and approve or take other appropriate action upon the Contractor’s written warranties and related closeout documents required by the contract documents.

COST OF SERVICES

The cost of our services, including expenses, to complete the aforementioned services is estimated to not exceed $24,250.00, as outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Pre-Design Phase</td>
<td>$9,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Design Phase</td>
<td>$6,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bid Phase</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Construction Phase</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,250.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoices will be submitted monthly and in proportion to services performed. Payments are due and payable fifteen (15) days from the date of the Consultant’s invoice.
Mays Consulting & Evaluation Services, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to submit this proposal, and we look forward to working with you on this project. If the proposal is acceptable to you, please sign where indicated and return a copy of the complete proposal and a valid purchase order to the undersigned.

CLIENT

(Signature)

(Printed name and title)

(Date)

CONSULTANT

(Signature)

Jim Mays, Operations Manager

(Printed name and title)

August 29, 2016

(Date)

The terms and conditions on the following page(s) of this form are part of this proposal. Contact information for return of signed proposal (email or fax is acceptable):

Jim Mays
Operations Manager
Mays Consulting & Evaluation Services, Inc.
PO Box 1020
Delaware, Ohio 43015
Phone: (740) 363-9511
Fax: (740) 363-3050
Email: jmays@mces.com
TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- Scope of work changes requested by the Client and/or changes caused by unforeseen hidden conditions will be billed in addition.

- In providing services under this agreement, the Consultant will endeavor to perform in a manner consistent with that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the same profession currently practicing under similar circumstances. The Consultant will perform its services as expeditiously as is consistent with professional skill and care and the orderly progress of Consultant’s part of the Project. Regardless of any other term or condition of this Agreement, Consultant makes no express or implied warranty of any sort. All warranties, including warranty of merchantability or warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, are expressly disclaimed.

- For all construction projects, the Consultant shall neither have control over or charge of, nor be responsible for, the construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, or for safety precautions and programs in connection with the Project, since these are solely the Contractor's rights and responsibilities. The Consultant shall not be responsible for the performance by the Architect and Construction Manager of the services required by the Architect’s and Construction Manager's agreement with the Owner. The Consultant shall be responsible for the Consultant's negligent acts or omissions, but shall not have control over or charge of and shall not be responsible for acts or omissions of the Architect, Construction Manager, Contractor, Subcontractors, or their agents or employees, or of any other persons or entities performing portions of the Project.

- Notwithstanding any other provision to the contrary, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, neither the Client nor the Consultant shall be liable to the other for any incidental, indirect or consequential damages arising out of or connected in any way to the Project or this Agreement. This mutual waiver of consequential damages shall include, but not be limited to, loss of use, loss of profit, loss of business or income or any other consequential damages that either party may have incurred from any cause of action whatsoever.

- The Consultant shall have no responsibility for the discovery, presence, handling, removal, disposal or exposure of persons to hazardous materials of any form including mold. The existing or constructed building may, as a result of post-construction, use, maintenance, operation or occupation, contain or be caused to contain mold substances which can present health hazards and result in bodily injury, property damage and/or necessary remedial measures and costs for which the Consultant shall have no responsibility.

- The Client agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to indemnify and hold Consultant and its subconsultants harmless from and against any and all damage, losses or cost (including reasonable attorneys' fees and defense costs) caused in whole or in part by the Client's acts, errors or omissions and those of anyone for whom they are legally liable. Furthermore, the Consultant agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to indemnify and hold Client and its subcontractors harmless from and against any and all damage, losses or cost caused in whole or in part by the Consultant's negligent acts, errors or omissions and those of anyone for whom they are legally liable.

- The Client agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to limit the Consultant’s total liability to the Client or anyone making claims through the Client, for any and all damages or claim expenses (including attorney's fees) arising out of this Agreement, from any and all causes, to the total amount of the Consultant’s fee under this agreement.

- This agreement may be terminated upon ten (10) days written notice by either party should the other fail to perform their obligations hereunder. In the event of termination, the Consultant shall pay the Consultant for all services rendered to the date of termination, all reimbursable expenses, and reasonable termination expenses.

- Any claim or dispute between the Client and the Consultant shall be submitted to non-binding mediation, subject to the parties agreeing to a mediator(s). If the Parties cannot agree upon a mediator the claim or dispute shall be submitted to the American Arbitration Association (AAA) for mediation in accordance with the Construction Arbitration and Mediation Rules of the AAA then in effect. Unless otherwise specified, the laws of the State of Ohio shall govern this agreement.

- All documents produced by the Consultant under this agreement, including electronic files, shall remain the property of the Consultant and may not be used by this Client for any other purpose without the written consent of the Consultant. Any such use or reuse shall be at the sole risk of Client who shall defend, indemnify and hold the Consultant and its subconsultants harmless from any and all claims and/or damages arising therefrom. Electronic files are not contract documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to contract documents because of changes or errors induced by translation, transmission, or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user's sole risk and without liability to the Consultant and its subconsultants.

- Execution of this agreement by the Client, issuance of a retainer, or issuance of a purchase order by Client, will constitute acceptance of the terms and condition of this agreement. Any additional terms or conditions stated in Client's purchase order, or other written communication accepting this agreement, or contained in any general or special conditions issued by Client, or by alteration by Client of this contract form, shall not be valid under any circumstances unless specifically adopted or approved by written response of Consultant. Failure to respond by Consultant shall be deemed a denial of any additional terms or conditions stated in Client's acceptance or counter-proposal of Client.
ORDINANCE NO. 31-2016

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 Design Costs of the Municipal Building Chimney Repair Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 632-16)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8130.533361 an amount not to exceed Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00) to pay the design cost of the Municipal Building Chimney Repair Project and all related expenses (Project 632-16).

SECTION 2. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 3. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed _____________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
ORDINANCE NO. 32-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund and Accrued Acreage Fund Unappropriated Balances.

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the General Fund and the Accrued Acreage Fund unappropriated balances to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund #101</td>
<td>Overtime – Fire Operations</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund Total</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Acreage Fund #825</td>
<td>Accrued Acreage Fee</td>
<td>$50,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accrued Acreage Total</td>
<td>$50,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ______________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Wayfinding Program
BID PACKAGE A

Design Intent Drawings
**COLORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paint1</th>
<th>Paint2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP03597 Indigo</td>
<td><strong>Vinyl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP04510 Blue and Grey</td>
<td>Retro-Reflective to meet ODOT/MUTCD requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP11959 Sweet Olive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP32250 Barite White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP14402 Dark Tatar Red</td>
<td>Retro-Reflective to meet 000T/MUTCD requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42202SP Natural White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP19925 Cessna Black Metallic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP03362 Antwerp Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paint1: Matthews Paint*  
*Vinyl2: Certain sign faces require retro-reflective graphics. (See sign type drawings)—Digitally printed colors should match Matthews Paint colors.*

**TYPOGRAPHY**

**Bitter Regular**

**ITC Franklin Gothic Book Condensed**

**ITC Franklin Gothic Medium Condensed**

**Worthington**  
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ  
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz  
0123456789

**Community Center**  
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ  
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz  
0123456789

**Public Parking**  
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ  
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz  
0123456789

**ARROW**  
X dimension should remain the same when rotating arrow

**LOGOTYPE**

--- Old ---  
Worthington

**PARKING SYMBOL**

Note: Designer to provide final artwork

--- Designer to provide final scaled artwork ---

--- Final artwork provided by ---

--- Email ---

--- Phone ---

--- Address ---

--- Copyright © ---

--- All rights reserved ---

--- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION ---

These plans and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Shop Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and construction methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents because changes or errors induced by translation, transmission, or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user's sole risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Refer to provided performance specifications for details on designer expectations of Fabricator and fabrication process.
SIGN TYPE A | OLD WORTHINGTON GATEWAY

HISTORIC DISTRICT

Scale: 1/2" = 1'

ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIDE VIEW
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Fabricated aluminum panel (see next sheet for details)

Sq. aluminum post

Fabricated aluminum bracket

Breakaway pole connection with cover (bevel top)

Note: Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

Fabricated aluminum bracket

Breakaway pole connection with cover (bevel top)

Note: Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

IF NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods.

Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents because of changes or errors induced by translation, transmission, or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user's own risk and without liability to Studio Graphique and its consultants. User is advised performance specifications for details on designer expectations of Fabricator and fabrication process.

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.
Old Worthington

HISTORIC DISTRICT

FOUNDED 1803

SIGN TYPE A | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (FRONT)
Scale: 1" = 1'

SIGN TYPE A | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (BACK)
Scale: 1" = 1'

SIDE VIEW
Scale: 1" = 1'

Old Worthington:
1/2" thick acrylic letters with retro-reflective white faces mounted flush to background

Mount letters with silicone adhesive, studs & locknuts on inside of panel

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents between translation, transmission or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s sole risk and without liability to Studio Graphique and its consultants. Refer to provided performance specifications for details on designer expectations of Fabricator and fabrication process.

City of Worthington
Wayfinding Program

WOR1353

K. Fromet
J. Wilhelm
216-921-0750

Date: 06.01.16

Design/PM: K. Fromet
Review: J. Wilhelm

Contact: WOR1353
Wayfinding Program

Phase 2
SIGN TYPE A (PANEL DETAILS)
OW Gateway
Old Worthington Library
Shops & Dining
Public Parking

Old Worthington
Shops & Dining
Public Parking

OLD WORTHINGTON
FOUNDED 1803

SIGN TYPE B | OLD WORTHINGTON VEHICULAR DIRECTIONAL
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIGN TYPE B | BACK
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIDE VIEW
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Fabricated aluminum panel
(see next sheet for details)

Sq. aluminum post
3/4" deep recess
(all 4 sides of post)

Breakaway pole connection
with cover (bevel top)

Note: Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

Fabricated aluminum bracket

Sq. aluminum post

3/4" deep recess

50 3/4"

56 1/2"

42"

166"

4 1/2"

1 1/2"

6 1/2"

6 1/2"

3 1/2"

9 3/4"

5"

5"

5"

6 1/2"

6 1/2"

48 1/2"

36"

36"

36"

36"

36"

36"

36"

36"

36"
Replace existing parking directional sign

Sign Type C | Sample Elevation
Not to Scale

Replace existing parking directional sign

Existing traffic lights and signs
(may vary per location)

Sign Type C | Old Worthington Parking Directional
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Align with existing signs/traffic lights

11' min.

28'

48'

Aluminum Panel
(see next sheet for details)

date 03.03.16
contact design/pm K. Fromet
reviewed J. Wilhelm

tel 216-921-0750

project WOR1353

CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Wayfinding Program

phase Phase 2

SIGN TYPE C | OW Parking Directional

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.
SIGN TYPE C | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (FRONT & BACK)
Scale: 1" = 1'

Mounting per fabricator to match existing

(1) 1/8" thick aluminum panel with full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face

Center arrows with circle

17" dia.
SIGN TYPE D | OLD WORTHINGTON PARKING LOT ID
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIDE VIEW
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Public Parking

W New England Avenue Lot

Fabricated aluminum panel
(see next sheet for details)

Fabricated aluminum bracket

SQUARE ALUMINUM POST

3/4" deep recess
(all 4 sides of post)

Fabricated aluminum bracket

BREAKAWAY POLE CONNECTION WITH COVER (BEVEL TOP)

Note: Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 30" deep

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents by others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user's own risk and without liability to Studio Graphique or its consultants. Refer to provided performance specifications for details on designer expectations of Fabricator and fabrication process.
These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents because of changes or errors induced by translation, transmission, or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Refer to provided performance specifications for details on designer expectations of fabricator and fabrication process.

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.
SIGN TYPE E1 | OLD WORTHINGTON STREET SIGN (FLAG-MOUNTED)
Scale 1/2" = 1'

GENERAL NOTES
1. For each new street sign, include removal of existing street signs and delivery to City of Worthington.
2. For sign attachment to existing poles, fabricator is responsible for proper strapping sizing, spacing, quantity, attachment and engineering. Strapping shown is for graphic and reference purposes only and does not represent final condition(s).
3. There shall be no bare aluminum in contact with any other metals, wood or concrete. Contact surfaces shall be separated by a coating of zinc chromate and aluminum paint, or a heavy body bituminous paint or by a gasket.

NOTE: Sign Contractor must field verify all locations prior to fabrication to ensure sign will fit at desired location.

See next sheet for details.

SIGN TYPE E1 | SAMPLE ELEVATION
Not to Scale

Replace existing street sign

Existing traffic lights and signs (may vary per location)

Replace existing sign

EXISTING TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND SIGNS
(MAY VARY PER LOCATION)
SIGN TYPE E | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (DOUBLE-SIDED)

Scale: 1" = 1'

High St
HISTORIC DISTRICT

Full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face on aluminum panel

Varies per street name length

Typestyle: Clearview Hwy Two W
6" street name, 4" supplementary text
Type should comply with MUTCD/FHWA standards

NOTE: Spaces should be set at 4" cap ht., not 6" (Supplementary text cap ht. is 67% of Street Name)

EQ. 2 1/8"

EQ. 2 1/2"

EQ. 2 3/4"

EQ. 3/4"

2 1/2" min. margin

2 1/2" min. margin

1/2"

Channel

Decorative bracket

Existing pole

Painted Stainless Steel Straps

6" cap ht.

4" cap ht.

2 3/4"

1 1/8"

1 1/2"

1/16"

3/4"

5"

1 7/8"

2 1/2"

27"

NOTE: Spaces should be set at 4" cap ht., not 6"

50% tracking

2 1/2" min. margin

1/2"

13"

1/4"

1/2"

1/16"

1/8"

1/4"

1/8"

1/4"

1/8"
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1/8"
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SIGN TYPE E2 | OLD WORTHINGTON STREET SIGN (CENTER-MOUNTED)
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIGN TYPE E2 | PANEL DETAIL (DOUBLE-SIDED)
Scale: 1" = 1'

SEE SIGN TYPE E1 FOR DIMENSIONS, SPECIFICATIONS & CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

REPLACE EXISTING STREET SIGNS

GENERAL NOTES
1. For each new street sign, include removal of existing street signs and delivery to City of Worthington.
2. There shall be no bare aluminum in contact with any other metals, wood or concrete. Contact surfaces shall be separated by a coating of zinc chromate and aluminum paint, or a heavy body bituminous paint or by a gasket.

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

Breakaway pole connection painted to match post
Note: Breakaway connection should be as small as possible

Painted 3" x 3" aluminum post

Post cap with street sign panel receiver bracket

Street sign panel connection bracket

"Historic District" footer is part of each street name sign panel

"Historic District" footer is part of each street name sign panel

Full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face on aluminum panel

Test is centered vertically in footer, but should be raised if necessary to accommodate mounting bracket.
SIGN TYPE F | OLD WORTHINGTON COMMUNITY EVENT SIGN
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Frame with Changeable Graphics

ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIDE VIEW
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Replaces existing event signs

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents because of changes or errors induced by translation, transmission, or alterations while under the control of others. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Refer to provided performance specifications for details on designer expectations of Fabricator and fabrication process.

Res: 03.03.16
K. Fromet
Design/PM
CITY OF WORTHINGTON

Wayfinding Program

Contract: WOR1353

J. Wilhelm
216-921-0750

Phase 2

SIGN TYPE F

OW Community Event Sign

Sheet 13
Breakaway pole connection with cover (bevel top)
Note: Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

Attach panel to post without visible fasteners through face

Aluminum Panel
(see next sheet for details)
SIGN TYPE J | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (FRONT)
Scale: 1" = 1'

SIGN TYPE J | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (BACK)
Scale: 1" = 1'

Worthington

FOUNDED 1803

---

SIGN TYPE J | SIGN PANEL DETAIL

See pattern specifications (Sheet 1)

(1) 1/8" thick aluminum panel with full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face

Use artwork from "Old Worthington" logotype

EQ.

T1

C1 +50% tracking

See pattern specifications (Sheet 1)

C7

C7

C4

C8

Use artwork from "Old Worthington" logotype

EQ.

EQ.

C7

EQ.

EQ.

C7

EQ.

EQ.

C7

EQ.

EQ.

C7

EQ.

EQ.

C7

EQ.

EQ.

C7

EQ.

EQ.
CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Wayfinding Program
BID PACKAGE B

Design Intent Drawings
COLORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paint</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP03597 Indigo</td>
<td>Indiglo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP04510 Blue and Grey</td>
<td>Blue and Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP11959 Sweet Olive</td>
<td>Sweet Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP32250 Barite White</td>
<td>Barite White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP4402 Dark Tatar Red</td>
<td>Dark Tatar Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42202SP Natural White</td>
<td>Natural White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP19925 Cessna Black Metallic</td>
<td>Cessna Black Metallic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP03362 Antwerp Blue</td>
<td>Antwerp Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vinyl

- Retro-Reflective to meet ODOT/MUTCD requirements

*Certain sign faces require retro-reflective graphics (see sign type drawings). Digitally printed colors should match Matthews Paint colors.

PATTERN

- Paint: MP03597 (Satin Finish) & MP03362 (Gloss Finish)

CITY LOGO

- Paint: MP03597 (Satin Finish) & MP03362 (Gloss Finish)

LOGOTYPE

- Old Worthington

Note: Designer to provide final scaled artwork

ARROW

- X dimension should remain the same when rotating arrow

Note: Designer to provide final scaled artwork

PARKING SYMBOL

- Digital Print: Match paint colors (digital print should be priced as an alternate to painting)

TYPOGRAPHY

- Bitter Regular
- ITC Franklin Gothic Book Condensed
- ITC Franklin Gothic Medium Condensed

Worthington

ABCDEFHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefgijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
0123456789

Community Center

ABCDEFHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefgijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
0123456789

Public Parking

ABCDEFHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefgijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
0123456789

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Design/Contractor accepts full responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not considered construction documents and cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents. Electronic files cannot be relied upon as identical to construction documents because changes, corrections and errors may occur in the electronic files. The use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants. Use of information contained in the electronic files is at the user’s own risk and without liability to Design Professional and its consultants.
WELCOME TO Worthington
FOUNDED 1803

Fabricated aluminum panel
(see next sheet for details)

Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Breakaway pole connection with cover (bevel top)
Note: Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

Sq. aluminum post

ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

SIDE VIEW
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

date 03.03.16
contact project WOR153
K. Fromet Phase 2
design/pm CITY OF WORTHINGTON
J. Wilhelm Wayfinding Program
tel 216-921-0750

SIGN TYPE L | CITY GATEWAY

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon as such. This construction document is not to be used as a construction document. Further, the material and fabrication in the electronic file is not the final file and without liability to Studio Graphique and its consultants. None of the material contained in this construction document is to be construed as final or definitive. Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.
Old Worthington

SIGN TYPE J | JURISDICTIONAL GATEWAY
Scale: 1/2" = 1'

Note:
Breakaway connection & cover should be as small as possible

Bury in concrete, min. 36" deep

Aluminum Panel
(see next sheet for details)

Breakaway pole connection
with cover (bevel top)

Attach panel to post
without visible fasteners
through face

WOR1353
Phase 2

Wayfinding Program
Trailblazer

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.
SIGN TYPE J | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (FRONT)
Scale: 1" = 1'

(1) 1/8" thick aluminum circle with full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face mounted to sign panel (no exposed fasteners)

(1) 1/8" thick aluminum panel with full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face

Old Worthington

SIGN TYPE J | SIGN PANEL DETAIL (BACK)
Scale: 1" = 1'

(1) 1/8" thick aluminum circle with full-face retro-reflective vinyl sign face

Old Worthington

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
These drawings and notes are for the sole purpose of expressing visual design intent and are not intended for actual fabrication purposes. Sign Contractor accepts total responsibility for final material selection, fabrication and installation methods. Electronic files are not construction documents and cannot be relied upon to identify construction documents being referenced to prepare bids. Updated drawings are the responsibility of Contractor. Contractors are responsible for obtaining all necessary permits. The City makes no claims for errors or omissions in the electronic files. The City bears no responsibility or liability to Contractor and its consultants. Refer to performance specifications for details on designer expectations of fabricator and fabrication process.

Date: 03.03.16
Contact: J. Wilhelm
Phase: Phase 2
Sheet: 5

Design/PM: K. Fromet
Project: WOR1653
City: CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Wayfinding Program: Trailblazer

Copyright © Studio Graphique, Inc. All rights reserved.