



Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 17, 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, October 17, 2016, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

Members Present: 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, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, 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, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were four visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

President Michael acknowledged several students who were in attendance. She encouraged them to ask questions.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Regular Meeting October 3, 2016**

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. 34-2016

Determining to Proceed with the Acquisition, Construction, and Improvement of Certain Public Improvements in the City of Worthington, Ohio in Cooperation with the Columbus Regional Energy

Special Improvement District (350 W. Wilson Bridge Road).

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Ms. Fox shared that the first two pieces of legislation are because of a statutory requirement associated with the PACE financing application for the 350 W. Wilson Bridge Road building that staff presented during last week's Council meeting. She would be happy to answer any specific questions that members may have. Ordinance No. 34-2016 addresses the state statute that determines to proceed with these public improvements. Ordinance No. 35-2016 addresses levying the special assessments, which is statutory that would authorize the Finance Director to certify the ordinance down to the County Auditor. Ordinance No. 36-2016 authorizes the agreements for special energy assessments and the relationship among all of the parties that will set forth how the money will get from Trivium to the County, to the City and then to the Authority. Those agreements are on file with the City Clerk. If anybody has any questions other than what we talked about last week, she would be happy to try to answer those.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 34-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 34-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 35-2016

Levying Special Assessments for the Purpose of Acquiring, Constructing, and Improving Certain Public Improvements in the City of Worthington, Ohio in Cooperation with the Columbus Regional Energy Special Improvement District (350 W. Wilson Bridge Road)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared additional information regarding the subject of these three pieces of legislation for the benefit of those in the audience.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 35-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 35-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 36-2016

Authorizing and Approving an Energy Project Cooperative Agreement by and Between the City of Worthington, Ohio, the Columbus Regional Energy Special Improvement District, Trivium Worthington LLC, and the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority, a Special Assessment Agreement by and Between the City of Worthington, Ohio, the Treasurer of Franklin County, Ohio, the Columbus Regional Energy Special Improvement District, and Trivium Worthington LLC, and Related Agreements, All of Which Provide for the Financing of Special Energy Improvements Projects (350 W. Wilson Bridge Road).

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

There being no questions or comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 36-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 36-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 45-2016

Authorizing the Award of Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program Funds to Help Improve Facility Exterior Facade and Streetscape Along Certain of the City's Commercial Corridors (7057-7069 Huntley Road & 7079-7085 Huntley Road).

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 45-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Economic Development Manager David McCorkle began by providing a recap of the Re-Emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP). The legislation for consideration is one resolution but two separate applications for the buildings located at 7057-7069 Huntley Road and 7079-7085 Huntley Road.



Applicant Information

- Applicant: Worthington Galena LLC (Oxford Realty)
- Site Address #1: 7057-7059 Huntley Road
 - Total Project Cost: \$47,642
 - Award Amount: **\$23,821**
- Site Address #2: 7079-7085 Huntley Road
 - Total Project Cost: \$45,238
 - Award Amount: **\$22,619**

Mr. McCorkle shared that the only difference between the two projects is replacing the glass door front on one of the two buildings.

Applicant owns both buildings and has owned multiple buildings in the Worthington area over the last 40 years

Current Condition



Scope of Work

- Stucco entryways (built up above the building line)
- Paint trim/doors
- Metal canopy over entryways and windows
- Window framing/trim
- New LED light fixtures – approximately 13 on each building
- Letter signage
- Planters
- Replace glass storefront on unit 7067

Conceptual Sketch (7057 – 7059)



Mr. McCorkle shared that the renderings were done through a contract with the Neighborhood Design Center. The structures in place, the metal overhang, the stucco finish, the planters, trim, lighting, letter signage will all be intact as shown but the color scheme will likely be darker. They have another building next door to these two buildings and the color scheme of the entryway is actually closer to brown so we will likely see the trim around the windows and doors brown instead of red.

Conceptual Sketch (7079 – 7085)



Mr. McCorkle shared that the CIC placed three stipulations on the approval of funding as follows:

- 1) Fund the applications as a package
- 2) The channel letter signage on the buildings needed to be consistent regardless of change out of tenants.
- 3) They were asked to update the two monument signs in the front of the buildings.

Mr. McCorkle reported that the applicant agreed to all of the stipulations.

Mr. Myers asked if there were any conditions placed on the channel letter signage as it relates to color, materials, or size of the lettering. Mr. McCorkle replied that the particulars have not yet been identified.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 45-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson shared that Resolution 46-2016 has been withdrawn.

Ordinance No. 37-2016

Authorizing the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation to Execute a Lease Agreement Between the WCIC and COhatch Worthington LLC for a Portion of the Kilbourne Building.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Ordinance No. 38-2016

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Development Agreement with COhatch Worthington LLC for Development Services Associated with COhatch's Co-Working and Makerspace Operations in the Kilbourne Building.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

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

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- **Economic Development Transfer (TRES) of Liquor Permit**

Mr. Greeson provided background information on TRES.

Mr. Greeson shared that this application is for Bogata Pizza who will occupy a space in the new Linworth Shopping Center. Members previously declined to request a hearing regarding their D-1 and D-3 liquor permits at a previous meeting. This TREX would allow them to sell wine along with their liquor and beer. He believes they plan to open later this year or early next year.

Mr. Myers reported Bogata being one of the first tenants in this development. Mr. Greeson agreed.

MOTION Mr. Smith a motion to endorse and acknowledge this transfer as an Economic Development Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Permission to Bid – Sewer Lining Project

Mr. Greeson shared that the City has been under the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) consent orders to study each of the sewage districts or basins in our City and then complete projects recommended by each of the studies. To date the Southeast Sewer Shed and the Central District have been studied. One of the projects recommended is a sewer lining project. He asked Mr. Whited to report on that project.

Mr. Whited reported that this project is an effort to do some repairs that were identified in the study that DLZ did for our sewer project as well as repair deficiencies in the sewers that staff discovered with our own equipment. The first picture below shows a broken pipe that has storm water flowing into the pipe through a small crack. The second picture shows an obstruction that was drilled into one of our pipes that will need to be removed and the pipe repaired. The last picture shows a completely broken pipe that will need repaired.

Broken Pipe

Obstruction

Broken Pipe



Mr. Whited shared that most of the work to be done with cured in place liners, which runs a liner through the middle of the pipe and then go back and cut out the “y’s”. We hope to fix almost a mile worth of line with this project with most of that being 8” sewer. About a third is 12” sewer and the remainder is 10”. We hope to begin this project as

soon as possible once we get Council's permission to bid. The estimate for the project is around \$247,000. We hope to get the work moving soon to protect the integrity of our sewers and comply with EPA regulations.

Mr. Smith asked about the pipe that had the obstruction. Mr. Whited shared that a pole of some sort was drilled right into the pipe. The obstruction will be removed and then the sewer lined.

Mr. Myers asked if he had any kind of a guess as to how much money we save by lining rather than replacing. Mr. Whited replied that it depends greatly on the depth and size of the sewer but the savings is significant. Possibly \$100 a foot or so.

At Mr. Greeson's request, Mr. Whited shared the lining technology with members. It has to be done in certain weather conditions and has to be done by a certified installer as well.

When asked by a member of the audience if this lining system decreases the diameter of the pipes, Mr. Whited replied no. It is a very thin membrane so it doesn't really affect the nominal diameter of the interior of the pipe. It does however reduce the friction so the water can actually move faster through the pipe. It is a cementitious liner which is not really concrete so it will not affect the diameter of the pipe.

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to authorize staff to bid the project.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Permission to Bid – Refuse Contract

Ms. Fox shared that Rob Chandler attended a recent council meeting to ask for some direction about several of the provisions that staff wanted to include in the contract. Members should have received a copy of the draft of the instructions to bidders that contained pretty much all of the components of the agreement that we are looking at. It has been tweaked slightly but nothing substantial. There is an opportunity for bidders to bid a status quo bid, which is Friday collection with an 18 gallon bin, which has been our tradition for many years. They could offer an alternate collection day, to see if a different price may be offered. They could provide an alternate for the city's rental and/or purchase of the 64 gallon recyclable containers as a surcharge per month per residential unit bid that we would get. Those are the primary components, otherwise the components are the same as seen in the past with residents being able to rent or lease those bins of any size that are available. The removal of the CFCs from the appliances, carryout service (if it's requested by the resident) and if it becomes applicable billing services for the collection to the residences are all just standard components that we had in our last set of documents. Many of the municipalities around central Ohio have the same thing. We are looking to advertise for these bids this week and hope to open them on November 4th.

Mr. Troper asked why the bid is for three years with two, one year renewals or for a five year term. He asked what the history/logic is for doing it that way. Ms. Fox replied that the logic behind that is if we have a five year contract then we have a set amount for the full term. We don't know what those numbers might be if we have a three year contract plus two one year renewals. The theory is that maybe with a three year contract, if the prices are different (more or less) we can kind of hold their feet to the fire with a renewal. If the price doesn't come in as well as we wanted to see on a five year contract then maybe we would opt for a three year contract and then perhaps go out to bid after three years instead of waiting for a full five years, depending on what that cost is. That is a pretty standard way of bidding around central Ohio. It is what we did the last time. It was just that Local Waste bid the same number for three years with two, one year renewals as they did for five years so it really didn't impact us one way or another.

Mr. Myers commented that ultimately the bid will come back to Council to approve. Ms. Fox agreed. She added that hopefully at the meeting of November 7th if everything goes well with the bids being opened the Friday before that meeting.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to authorize staff to bid for refuse services. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Permission for Request for Proposals – Community Center South End Roof Design

Mr. Whited shared that this is a request for Council permission to proceed with acquiring statements of qualifications per Administrative Regulation 4.0. The cost estimate on this project is around \$900,000. Regulation 4.0 requires that for projects that are estimated to be over \$1,000,000 we go through a formal Request Statement of Qualifications process and then proceed from there to a Request for Proposal process. He has taken this project through that process because he thinks it may run over \$1,000,000. We will know that better once we go through the process. We are going to include in the process an opportunity to investigate the ability to provide solar panels on the roof. He will ask for that to be included in the analysis although he doesn't know if the roof is structurally capable or fiscally possible but we will investigate that and make sure we take every opportunity to do that. The EPDM membrane on the roof is in very poor shape and leaks badly. The attempt here is to acquire a larger list of qualified contractors who will provide their Statements of Qualifications and include the solar panel analysis. We will go through those qualifications and narrow it down to a list of three or so that we can bring in for an interview, based on a prepared technical scope and cost estimate, including their project team principles, cost and all those sorts of things so that we can make a final determination, select that consulting firm, proceed to design and have them take it to bid for us.

Mr. Myers stated that this item is just the first step. Mr. Whited agreed.

Mr. Myers commented that they identified a need and now they are looking for a design professional firm that can evaluate the scope of work, help prepare the request for bids, and then you go to bid. Mr. Whited clarified that this is the first step to find a pool of candidates to then give us the more technical proposal.

Mr. Greeson commented that staff is looking for authorization to do two steps. The request for qualifications will narrow it to three or so of the most qualified candidates that we want to submit formal proposals and do interviews. Ultimately out of this two-step process we will bring a recommendation to Council for a firm. Mr. Myers concluded that Council is only approving the process. They are not approving staff's ability to appoint the consultant yet. That will come back. Mr. Greeson agreed that staff would come with a consulting contract once we have gone through this two-step process.

Mr. Myers stated that at that second vote not only will we have the firm but we will also have a price for services. Mr. Whited agreed.

Mr. Foust asked if members would see the pricing of all three of the candidates at that time. Mr. Whited stated that staff can provide that.

Mr. Norstrom stated that we want the best. Cost is not a factor in this first selection. Mr. Whited commented that it is a part of it but not the total. Mr. Greeson agreed that it is a factor.

Mr. Norstrom commented that his question is why don't we negotiate to get what we consider the best and then negotiate with them for the price. Mr. Whited replied that we sort of do a hybrid of that. We go through that statement of qualification process to find the best three or so candidates and then let them provide a technical approach. We then analyze their approach and take some of our own ability to qualify and quantify that and attach their costs to that. He hears what he is saying about going with straight qualifications, which may be appropriate in some cases but with the potential for different technical approaches we need to evaluate both the approach and the costs at the same time because they may not have an approach that we consider to be the best. Mr. Norstrom stated that he understands. We are not sure what the technical approach is. He asked if Mays has not given us any idea. Mr. Whited replied that they have provided an idea but no technical details. Mr. Norstrom concluded that if we don't know what we are getting then it is better to ask and look at what the different approaches are. Mr. Whited agreed.

Mr. Myers shared that given our track record with this roof, Mr. Norstrom is correct. Let's make certain we get the right person. Ms. Michael agreed.

When asked by Ms. Michael how old the roof is, Mr. Hurley replied that there are two parts to this roof project. One is the roof over the gym, which are mostly the original roofs in the 70s. What was the shingle roof over the classrooms, the community room, etc. were originally wood shakes that were replaced between 15 and 20 years ago.

Mr. Norstrom commented that we are not specifying “shingles”. We are leaving it up to the professionals. Mr. Whited reported it being a membrane type roof. Mr. Hurley added that it will match what was just done on the north end of the building.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to authorize staff to proceed with the selection process for design services for the Community Center south end roof replacement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Discussion Item(s)

- Five Year Financial Forecast

Mr. Greeson reported this being step #2 in our budget process. The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) was distributed several weeks ago and staff did a high level review of that plan and the cash flow of it last week. Last week staff also distributed the operating budget for 2017. We always want to begin our discussions of the operating budget with a review of the Five Year Forecast. It is a high level overview of the fiscal condition of the city and what we are seeing as the revenue and overall forecast for our net annual cash position in each of the five years as well as our fund balance.

Mr. Greeson referred to several financial spreadsheets (copies attached) that Ms. Roberts will go through. The first chart, which was shown on the screen, shows the previous five year General Fund financial information while the second chart will show the estimated numbers for the five years going forward.

Ms. Roberts shared that the charts can be found on page 3.1 of the budget document that was distributed last week. She explained that the General Fund Five Year Forecast is a management tool which presents actual and estimated revenue and expenditure projections in both the historical format and then looking forward. This chart indicates actual revenues and expenditures for 2012 through 2015 and then estimates for 2016. As noted at the end on the bottom far right of the document we are projecting, at this point, a deficit in the net cash position at year end 2016 which eats into our General Fund Balance but still leaves us with a Fund Balance over the 25% as required in the Carryover Revenue Policy that was passed in 2014 with Resolution No. 07-2014.

Ms. Roberts shared that the next chart represents the projections for 2017 through 2021, as represented in the 2017 budget. Staff estimates a net cash position of about \$26,000, which we feel is relatively zero base balanced budget. We always factor in the allocation of 2% unexpended appropriations, which feeds into the net cash position. We are again estimating above the 25% net cash reserve balance as we are required and the annual budget increase for 2017 is just slightly under 2%.

Mr. Greeson shared that like the CIP, the operating budget is pretty tight in terms of its growth from year to year. He believes Ms. Roberts is projecting 2 ½% growth in our primary revenue stream over the next five years. Then we were trying to project that we would hold our expenses to that revenue projection. Even holding to that meager revenue projection you see a deficit in the annual net cash position. He thinks this is similar to last year's fiscal forecast so this shouldn't be a big surprise. We show it as we move into this five years, both budget and CIP are going to be tight. We were showing some of these deficits. They are within the manageable range. We are going to have to carefully monitor it and monitor revenues and expenses. His goal as always is to try to make that annual cash position zero or positive if possible so that we are not eating into that fund balance. This is when fund balance is healthy and it becomes important to manage the volatility of the income taxes. As members can see, it is going to be tight given our current programming. Our ability to add new programming, new positions or general fund expenses beyond what we programmatically have now is limited. Our challenge as a staff is to try to figure out either how to grow the revenue or manage the expenses in an effort to close that annual net cash position gap.

Mr. Norstrom asked if he understands correctly that the net cash position already factors in the fact that traditionally we only spend 97 to 98% of what is budgeted. Ms. Roberts replied yes. Mr. Greeson added that it also factors in the supplemental appropriations as well as some expenses through the year that we don't anticipate. Those are shown in the expenditures category.

Mr. Norstrom commented that we are creating the problem because, as we have traditionally, we are setting the 25% goal of the fund balance. If we were to allow the fund balance to drop down to \$8,000,000 instead of \$10,000 we would not have a problem. Mr. Greeson shared that the challenge with that that he sees is that much of the fund balance was created with one time revenue streams so we work really hard to build the fund balance in several ways. One is that during the recession we diverted revenue from the capital into the operating. That benefited the operating budget and resulted in us not having to make huge cuts. It also helped us with what was a really low fund balance at the time. Secondly, we had a windfall of over \$1,000,000 deposited in the last year of the estate tax which was clearly a one-time revenue. That inflated our fund balance beyond what we thought we were going to be able to maintain. Much of that is one-time money. What he always argue with one-time money is if we are going to draw it down then only do it for one-time expenses.

Mr. Norstrom shared that he understands. The issue that he is really trying to raise is that as Mr. Myers pointed out at our last meeting, we are overdue for a downturn. Then the question becomes, what is our cushion. That is the fund balance and the fact that even though we have a target for the fund balance, if we have to we could change that target to allow ourselves to survive some modicum of a downturn. Mr. Greeson agreed. When 73% of revenue is income tax then we are vulnerable to cycles of payroll. At one point the fund balance was well under 10%. Ms. Michael agreed.

Mr. Norstrom stated that in terms of a five year projection, he thinks it raises the question of whether we should look at changing the mix. We could potentially increase our property taxes, because property taxes are much less sensitive to the overall financial conditions in the economy. From his background in transit he knows that we don't get major increases or decreases in the revenue stream when you rely on property taxes as opposed to relying on wage taxes.

Mr. Greeson shared that members had that discussion in 2010 when we went on the ballot and at that time members chose income tax instead of property tax.

Mr. Norstrom stated that it was not a strategic issue but rather a tactical issue. We could see that we were going to be in trouble. This is more of a strategic issue. Should members consider the issue of property taxes as we look out over the five year period? He is not saying that members have to decide that now with the approval of the 2017 budget but should we wait and be triggered by the economic conditions or should we think ahead. Mr. Greeson commented that members can see that it is going to be tight. There is a five year period that will affect our approach to the budgeting.

Ms. Michael agrees with Mr. Norstrom that it is something that members should look at.

Mr. Myers shared that he would rather not have a discussion about raising taxes though in the context of a budget, particularly for next year where we show a positive cash flow although not by much.

Mr. Norstrom clarified that members could increase taxes on property and decrease taxes on wages and the overall effect would be minimal in terms of overall revenue, but we would rely less on a less stable revenue base moving forward over the next five plus years. Mr. Myers stated that is a fair enough discussion to have next year. Mr. Norstrom replied that he has no problems with that. Ms. Michael agreed.

Mr. Greeson shared that there are elements of the forecast that staff feels comfortable about. Council raised an unexpended appropriates to 2%. We can look back a long period of time and show that is a pretty safe bet. Obviously revenues could go up too if our economic development efforts yield growth and we are able to see growth in that over time. Certainly our community is seeing some success sometimes. Some of this is also the state budget cuts. The combination of the loss of the estate tax, the reduction in the local government fund and the elimination of the personal property tax really resulted in difficulty in coming out the recession.

Mr. Troper asked about the community center membership revenues. Mr. Hurley shared that memberships run in cycles. September is our slowest month because the building is closed and we are slow in our programming, rentals and things so we do not anticipate overall being off pace by the end of the year. He doesn't think the projections will be off.

Additional Staff Comments

Mr. Greeson noted that in November there will be three hearings. Council wanted to get away from each department director talking about their individual department budget and that level of detail. He is proposing that in the first meeting in November staff comes back with a policy discussion. Essentially he wants to go through the retreat priorities and some of the conversation about all of the things that staff is working on programmatically and talk about how our budget ties to those. So more priority focused as opposed to departmental detail focus. At the Committee meeting he would like members input on what departmental areas they would like to focus on. We will do one of two things. We will focus on the things that council has identified as important to us or we will have all of the departments do a summary presentation where they hit the driving trends in each of their areas. The third meeting in November has been set up to bring the outside groups in; particular the Historical Society, the MAC, the Old Worthington Partnership and the CVB. He asked if that feels like a good structure of the budget process.

Mr. Myers thinks the direction members gave him and what he likes is to focus on the retreat topics. Not just what does this budget say and we all know this budget is tight and he doesn't think that has changed in the six years that he has served on Council but how does this budget move our priorities forward.

Ms. Michael commented that for the second meeting she would like a combination of what you are saying, each of the departments bringing on what are their trends but if any council members bring up any specifics they want to add that in also. She thinks that would be a nice combination on that for the second meeting. Mr. Myers added and how those departments are moving forward with the priorities expressed in the retreat in the budget. He would also be interested in hearing from the departments what one thing they would cut if they had to. Likewise, what would they add if they could add one?

Mr. Greeson shared that staff tried to do that with a little bit different approach with the CIP by identifying what is a constrained CIP causing. What is a constrained Operating Budget causing and where are the areas we would invest.

Mr. Myers just knows at the beginning of the month when he sits down to plan out his budget there is always something he is shooting for that is extra that he would like to buy that month. Most months, at the end of the month he doesn't have the money to do it but at least he had that goal.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared that the Partnership sponsored a Hot Chicken event this past weekend in the corridor. He knows that Mr. Smith attended it. It was a successful night and they hope it becomes another annual event for the Partners. Ms. Michael added that she came late to the event.

Mr. Smith reported there being a huge shout out to Worthington in the Dispatch today.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of Employee Compensation and Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No 0

Council recessed at 8:30 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to return to open session at 9:14 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
7th day of November, 2016.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President

	Actual 2012	%	Actual 2013	%	Actual 2014	%	Actual 2015	%	Estimated 2016	%
General Fund Cash Balance - January 1	\$ 2,941,562		\$ 5,070,388		\$ 8,631,597		\$ 10,245,729		\$ 11,250,077	
REVENUE:										
Income Tax	\$ 16,845,291	65%	\$ 18,025,532	66%	\$ 18,687,466	73%	\$ 18,993,505	74%	\$ 19,255,146	73%
Property Tax	2,496,628	10%	2,553,085	9%	2,411,285	9%	2,564,038	10%	2,710,000	10%
Local Government Fund	593,872	2%	461,011	2%	452,640	2%	447,643	2%	350,000	1%
Inheritance Tax	1,193,606	5%	475,072	2%	149,981	1%	-	0%	-	0%
Interest Earned	47,502	0%	58,394	0%	54,354	0%	110,028	0%	85,000	0%
Fines & Forfeitures	185,333	1%	261,828	1%	254,654	1%	178,214	1%	260,000	1%
All Other Revenue	1,109,482	4%	1,613,013	6%	1,199,553	5%	943,095	4%	1,215,700	5%
Township Fire Service	439,709	2%	381,211	1%	467,726	2%	430,509	2%	475,000	2%
Comm Ctr Membership/Programs	1,201,067	5%	1,270,375	5%	1,294,920	5%	1,359,305	5%	1,430,000	5%
EMS Transport	626,137	2%	637,794	2%	514,233	2%	502,689	2%	600,000	2%
Income Tax Reserve Allocation (6.4%)	1,330,172		1,422,682		-		-		-	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 26,068,798		\$ 27,159,997		\$ 25,486,812		\$ 25,529,026		\$ 26,380,846	
EXPENDITURES:										
Fire Operations	\$ 5,741,972	24%	\$ 5,676,209	24%	\$ 5,680,000	24%	\$ 5,954,865	25%	\$ 6,285,662	23%
Police Operations	4,027,241	17%	4,104,145	18%	4,176,451	18%	5,182,794	22%	5,682,100	21%
Parks & Recreation	2,907,662	12%	3,010,843	13%	3,103,135	13%	4,251,552	18%	4,659,744	17%
Service/Eng Department	1,509,085	6%	1,711,298	7%	1,699,074	7%	2,260,415	9%	2,535,541	9%
Planning & Building	699,102	3%	418,992	2%	508,314	2%	637,665	3%	736,711	3%
General Government	8,593,984	37%	8,198,404	36%	8,135,192	35%	5,528,342	24%	6,616,272	27%
-	-		-		-		-		-	
Transfer to CIP (Fire)	-		-		-		-		-	
Transfer to Street M&R & St Hwy	100,000		100,000		100,000		200,000		300,000	
Supplemental Appropriations									279,045	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 23,579,046		\$ 23,219,891		\$ 23,402,165		\$ 24,015,632		\$ 27,095,076	
Exp. vs. Prior Year Enc.	360,925		378,896		470,514		509,045			
Unexpended Appropriations (Avg of 98.0%)									541,902	
Annual Net Cash Position	\$ 2,128,827		\$ 3,561,209		\$ 1,614,132		\$ 1,004,348		\$ (172,328)	
Total General Fund Cash Balance - Dec. 31	\$ 5,070,388		\$ 8,631,597		\$ 10,245,729		\$ 11,250,077		\$ 11,077,749	

Annual Budget % Increase 3.9% -1.4% 1.2% 2.7% 8.3%

Total Fund Balance as % of Previous Year Expenditures 22.0% 36.1% 43.4% 47.1% 46.2%

Total Fund Balance as % of Previous Year Revenue 20.9% 33.1% 37.7% 44.1% 43.4%

	Estimated 2017		Estimated 2018		Estimated 2019		Estimated 2020		Estimated 2021						
General Fund Cash Balance - January 1	\$	11,077,749	%	\$	11,104,470	%	\$	10,966,822	%	\$	10,828,751	%	\$	10,656,662	%
REVENUE:															
Income Tax	\$	19,749,766	73%	\$	20,144,762	73%	\$	20,648,381	73%	\$	21,164,590	73%	\$	21,693,705	73%
Property Tax		2,770,000	10%		2,825,400	10%		2,896,035	10%		2,968,436	10%		3,042,647	10%
Local Government Fund		425,000	2%		450,000	2%		475,000	2%		485,000	2%		500,000	2%
Inheritance Tax		-	0%		-	0%		-	0%		-	0%		-	0%
Interest Earned		135,000	0%		145,000	1%		145,000	1%		150,000	1%		155,000	1%
Fines & Forfeitures		265,000	1%		270,000	1%		276,750	1%		283,669	1%		290,760	1%
All Other Revenue		1,227,060	5%		1,228,447	4%		1,259,158	4%		1,290,637	4%		1,322,903	4%
Township Fire Service		475,000	2%		475,000	2%		486,875	2%		499,047	2%		511,523	2%
Comm Ctr Membership/Programs		1,435,000	5%		1,435,000	5%		1,470,875	5%		1,507,647	5%		1,545,338	5%
EMS Transport		600,000	2%		600,000	2%		615,000	2%		630,375	2%		646,134	2%
Income Tax Reserve Allocation (6.4%)		-			-			-			-			-	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$	27,081,826		\$	27,573,608		\$	28,273,073		\$	28,979,400		\$	29,708,010	
EXPENDITURES:															
Fire Operations	\$	6,501,944	24%	\$	6,671,005	24%	\$	6,840,452	24%	\$	7,011,463	24%	\$	7,186,750	24%
Police Operations	\$	5,960,184	22%	\$	6,138,035	22%	\$	6,337,818	22%	\$	6,496,263	22%	\$	6,658,670	22%
Parks & Recreation	\$	4,780,643	17%	\$	4,889,855	17%	\$	5,012,101	17%	\$	5,137,404	17%	\$	5,265,839	17%
Service/Eng Department	\$	2,523,074	9%	\$	2,589,870	9%	\$	2,654,617	9%	\$	2,720,982	9%	\$	2,789,007	9%
Planning & Building	\$	756,507	3%	\$	768,765	3%	\$	787,984	3%	\$	807,684	3%	\$	827,876	3%
General Government	\$	6,684,898	26%	\$	6,819,262	26%	\$	6,957,992	25%	\$	7,172,621	25%	\$	7,351,937	25%
		-			-			-			-			-	
Transfer to CIP (Fire)		-			-			-			-			-	
Transfer to Street M&R & St Hwy		300,000			300,000			300,000			300,000			300,000	
Supplemental Appropriations		100,000			100,000			100,000			100,000			100,000	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$	27,607,250		\$	28,276,792		\$	28,990,964		\$	29,746,418		\$	30,480,078	
Exp. vs. Prior Year Enc.															
Unexpended Appropriations (Avg of 98.0%)		552,145			565,536			579,819			594,928			609,602	
Annual Net Cash Position	\$	26,721		\$	(137,648)		\$	(138,072)		\$	(172,089)		\$	(162,466)	
Total General Fund Cash Balance - Dec.	\$	11,104,470		\$	10,966,822		\$	10,828,751		\$	10,656,662		\$	10,494,196	

Annual Budget % Increase	1.9%	2.4%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Total Fund Balance as % of Previous Year Expenditures	41.8%	40.6%	39.1%	37.5%	36.0%
Total Fund Balance as % of Previous Year Revenue	42.1%	40.5%	39.3%	37.7%	36.2%