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CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, November 14, 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 Police Chief Jerry Strait, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley.

There were eight visitors present.

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

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Ordinance No. 42-2016

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

Introduced by Councilmember Troper.

Ordinance No. 43-2016

Authorizing the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Not to Exceed $1,500,000 for the Purpose of Designing, Engineering, Constructing and
Reconstructing Various Sewer Improvements, with Related Site Improvements and Appurtenances Thereto; and Approving Related Matters.

Introduced by Councilmember Dorothy.

Ordinance No. 44-2016

Authorizing the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Not to Exceed $900,000 for the Purpose of Designing, Engineering, Constructing and Reconstructing Various Road Improvements, with Related Site Improvements and Appurtenances Thereto; and Approving Related Matters.

Introduced by Councilmember Myers.

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 Items

Permission to Bid – Community Center Cleaning Contract

Mr. Hurley explained that the Community Center cleaning contract is done on an annual basis (February – January), last year at this time we went out to bid and received bids for the cleaning services for the community center, that contract was awarded to ABM Services, with that annual contract when we award it, we do have an option to renew it for two consecutive terms, but we have made the decision that we are going to go back out to bid; so tonight we are before you to ask for permission to go back out to bid. Ms. Dorothy asked are there any significant changes to the bid from previous. Mr. Hurley replied no it is pretty much identical, we do within the bid have specifications for the nightly cleaning services of the Community Center, it’s a checklist format that outlines all of the different cleaning things, whether they’re daily, weekly, every other day, etc. and we do have staff that do inspections and we work with each company and often times we’ll meet with them and go over expectations and in this case we just feel like we would like to have an opportunity to re-bid.

Mr. Troper asked if you go out to re-bid then you can’t use the renewal option at all. Mr. Hurley replied once we go out bid and accept bids then we would accept the lowest and best bidder; what we’ve done at this point with our current cleaning contractor is notify them that we are going out to bid, we are not going to automatically renew, but they are still eligible to re-bid. Mr. Troper commented so I take it you’re fairly certain we’re going to get a lower bid. Mr. Hurley replied it’s not necessarily based on lower, it’s
based on performance of the current company. Mr. Myers asked are there specific reasons why you didn’t renew. Mr. Hurley replied it’s just performance based.

MOTION

Councilmember Myers made a motion authorizing the Parks and Recreation Director to bid for contractual cleaning services for the Community Center. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

The motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously.

Discussion Item(s)

Refuse Contract

Mr. Chandler explained we had two bids for the contract commencing January 1, 2017, one from Rumpke of Ohio which came in at $15.83 per household per month including the provision of a 65 gallon recycling cart to each residence with no additional surcharge. We are currently paying $14.85 per household per month through our current service with Local Waste and that bid included the carts similar to what you see here really without much option to stay with the bins; it was explained to me it can be a phased approach, the status quo bid came from Local came in at $14.99 per household per month which is very competitive and then they offered as an alternate as we had requested in the bid the carts for 50 cents per household per month which is about of what we’re seeing on the market right now in other communities.

Ms. Michael asked what is the recommendation. Mr. Chandler replied based on the bids our recommendation would be to go with Local Waste, we’ve had good performance from them and they are the incumbent and it is a difference over the contact if we include the carts which makes it an apples to apples comparison it’s $15.49 per household per month versus $15.83 and it’s a difference over the five-year contract of almost $108,000. Our recommendation would be to award with the cartleys for a five-year contract.

Ms. Dorothy asked who does this serve within the city, is it just residents with homes. Mr. Chandler commented it is all households (single family, two-family and three-family) as well as condos; so any apartment buildings deemed commercial and we don’t currently service those with our contract in the way the Ordinance is set up in section 9. Ms. Dorothy indicated that we heard last week that all of our recycling goes to Rumpke anyway, asked is that correct. Mr. Chandler replied yes and we do have a draft document that is ready for council action along with next weeks. Mrs. Fox commented I don’t know if council actually has to approve that contract, but we talked about that before this process started, that Rumpke was the only one who offered the service and you directed us to go ahead and negotiate an agreement with them. Ms. Michael remarked so that’s in addition to the amount that’s on here. Mrs. Fox replied yes, and that contract amount is coming in about $3.50 lower per ton than what we’re currently paying right now.
Ms. Dorothy commented we also heard last week that SWACO is going to try to get all of Franklin County to be recycling more. Mr. Chandler replied yes that is part of their mission statement and what they have reported to the EPA as part of their management plan. Mr. Myers asked so if we stay with Local and don’t go with the larger containers, it’s 14 cents per household per month more. Mr. Chandler replied yes that is correct. Mr. Myers asked if we go with the containers, its 64 cents per household per month and you calculate the difference out to $108,000 over the five year term. Mr. Chandler replied that’s difference between Rumpke’s bid and Local’s bid. Mr. Chandler commented $31,728 per year more to be exact.

Mr. Norstrom asked how much would we save if we achieve the 30% increase on tip increase. Mr. Chandler commented we won’t see any direct savings over this five-year term over and above what’s been bid, aside from as Mr. Marsh from SWACO presented the tipping fee decrease that we’re going to likely see if it’s ratified in April which will translate into 24 cents per household per month decrease from that $14.99. Mr. Norstrom commented so even though we’re increasing our recycling we don’t get any benefit from that. Mr. Chandler replied we don’t get the direct benefit in the tipping fee, but where we see some benefit is in that competitive rate for collection because it makes the collection go a little bit quicker and easier as well as reducing trips to the landfill; so they have translated that over into what I’ve been told by Local Waste into the bid for collection. Mr. Norstrom commented while it appears that most people in a non-scientific survey, asked will residents be able to keep the current bins. Mr. Chandler replied yes residents will be able to keep the current bins and use those presumably to continue to collect recyclables in their garage, carry those to this container or the very few we anticipate they may want to stay with the bins, they do have that option, it’s not something that we will advertise, but I will handle on a case by case basis and make sure that we accommodate residents who believe this is going to be too large and isn’t going to fit in with their footprint in the garage.

Ms. Michael asked for those persons who wish to keep the same units as they currently have, will we get a reduction per month because the new unit. Mr. Chandler replied no, in order to get that 50 cents it’s an economy of scale, so it’s kind of an all or nothing. Ms. Michael commented so everyone gets regardless if they want one or not. Mr. Chandler replied everyone gets one, we can come and collect it if the resident says I don’t need it. Mr. Norstrom asked will they pick up the old bins. Mr. Chandler replied yes, or if they want to bring them to service department and drop them off, they can do that. Mr. Foust commented I don’t want to make room for that in my garage and I really don’t like the idea of….I can’t put it behind my house because the way my yard slopes off on the side and it’s visible from the street. I personally don’t care for doing that so I’m one of those guys who is going to stick with the smaller bin; my wife and me recycle as much stuff as we possibly can, but we’re a household of two, it will take us at least two – three weeks to fill one of those up. Mr. Norstrom remarked I am two-person household and agree with you completely, but that’s better for the community as a whole.

Mr. Myers asked I’m assuming the transition of this process will be one day when I leave my two bins out and they will take that and drop off the red container that day and I’ll
just wheel it back into my garage. Mr. Chandler replied that would be correct; it depends on how the orders come in, Local does not have almost 5300 of these in stock, so it could be phased over to two – three weeks depending on how the orders come in, but it will be less than a month. Mr. Myers remarked so similar how we switched from Rumpke to Local Waste. Mr. Chandler replied exactly, it would be very similar to that process. Ms. Michael asked what do people have to do if they want to keep their old ones. Mr. Chandler replied just get a hold of us at the Service Department via phone or email me directly. Ms. Michael asked say if you have someone like Mr. Foust who wants to keep their unit, how are you going to get the information to them to tell them what they have to do so they don’t turn around as Mr. Myers has mentioned and all of a sudden recyclables are there and whoops I have this big unit I didn’t want. Mr. Chandler commented each Friday I’m out and about and I communicate very closely with the route supervisors, so anything that we have ahead of time similar to that, I communicate that to the route supervisors and we make sure that those types of things are taken care of, this would be no different as long as somebody communicated to me, even the day of and I got a call. Ms. Michael commented but somehow we need to get it out to the residents that if you want to keep your old ones, here is the procedure.

Mr. Norstrom stated I don’t think that’s the issue; I think if someone doesn’t want it and they complain, they can, but there’s no reason to advertise because it’s to our advantage and given the price that has been quoted it’s based upon wide use of the new container because, it’s faster, quicker, and cheaper; so I think if we encourage people to keep the old containers we are not benefiting the contractor or the bid that we’ve received. Mr. Myers commented if someone gets the new and wants the old ones, I think we can rest assure that they will be calling the service department within a matter of hours. Mr. Norstrom replied I totally agree.

Mr. Foust asked is there any way of doing something other than the red; is there a Forest Green or Taupe or something along those lines. I wouldn’t mind putting that out along the side of the house if it wasn’t such quite a screamer. Mr. Chandler replied that’s something that I can consult with Local Waste and see if that’s a possibility; I will say that that is part of their branding and that the red is partially so the drivers can distinguish that since you’re going from a bin that is readily visible to being different from a trash can, if we have those that are colored very similar to a trash can now we get into some service issues possibly.

Mr. Myers asked what do you need from us to approve the red bins and the Local Waste. Mr. Greeson replied you introduced an Ordinance at the last meeting; the actual Ordinance you vote on next Monday night which will award the contract. This is the opportunity to provide us some input, we’ve got to fill in the blanks of that Ordinance and prepare it for your vote and we wanted an opportunity for you to discuss it and provide us with feedback on whether we’re moving forward with the carts or not; if we are then that will be reflected in the Ordinance.

Mr. Foust stated no disrespect to the vendors marketing, but that is the least of my concerns, I’m still thinking about what looks good in the neighborhood and outside
houses everywhere; I know Mr. Myers is moving towards let’s just do the red thing; asked can we ascertain or somehow caveat in here that we want an alternative to that or are we just moving with red because that impacts how I’m going to vote on it. Ms. Michael replied maybe they can check to see if there is availability of some other color and let us know next week. Mr. Chandler commented I will check with them and see and report back to Council next week. Mr. Troper commented make sure it’s the same price.

Michael Darling, Rumpke Waste & Recycling, 1191 Fields Street, Columbus, OH. Mr. Darling explained that we do have a relationship with Worthington and we provided good service before. One of the things I would like to do tonight is just go over those two proposals; I saw some possibility for some wiggle room in there. First of all our carts we do have 65 gallon recycling carts and they are green. We submitted two proposals, the first one was a three-year plan that basically was $15.50 and with that proposal we actually bring two red bins, 18 gallon recycling bins, each household would get two and then at their convenience, you wouldn’t necessarily be shoving this on people, they would be allowed to call us and say “hey we want a 65 gallon cart”, so at that time we would allow them to switch out the two recycling bins for 65 gallon green recycling cart; what that would do is kind of allow the flexibility for the towns and residents to move towards the cart system; in our experience if you give people the opportunity eventually they move towards the carts and you can’t pry them away from them. I do understand that there are people that like the totes, but it’s not an all or nothing proposal from us; and again that’s $15.50 we give you the red bins, if people want carts we give you the carts and we take the red bins back; we don’t force anybody to do anything. It’s my understanding that our competitors bid, they bid $15.49 on the three year, so there is a penny difference, but I believe it’s all in or nothing with them, but maybe not, I’m not sure. I do understand that you folks might be leaning towards maybe a five-year contract; their good for the contractor, but not necessarily good for the city because you’re locked in then for five years; what if the market changes and we predict that it will change because a lot of the surrounding communities are moving towards carts and already have them, so you have to wait five years in order to go with carts as opposed to three; if you want to go out for bid in three, we would recommend that, there would be a penny difference. The other one is the five-year, I know we’re at 34 cents above the $15.49, we are at $15.83, but what we recommend in our expertise is going along with the three-year which puts us a penny apart and get green recycling carts; if people absolutely have to have those bins, you get two of them as opposed to one and they can hang on to them for as long as they like or they can move to carts and we’ll do the education, we’ll do the media, the flyer and we already have the carts in stock and we already have the CNG trucks ready to go. I understand that all but one of the trucks that they’re using now is CNG, we have one diesel yard waste truck out there.

Mr. Norstrom commented you’re a penny apart on three years. Mr. Darling replied we’re at $15.50, we give you the totes or the cart whichever you want. Mr. Norstrom commented I understand all of that, but you go up significantly for those last two years when you submitted a five-year bid. Mr. Darling replied at five years we’d be at $15.83. Mr. Norstrom commented the $15.83 is over the five years; your average for the last couple of years is going to be something like $16.00. Mr. Darling replied that would be
right because we don’t know what the risk is in year four and five; we can forecast three pretty easy, but four and five we have no idea. Mr. Norstrom commented you determine the risk and decided to bid higher whereas the successful bidder or apparent successful bidder has determined the risk is less than you did. Mr. Darling replied for years four and five that is correct; for three years we’re a penny a part. Mr. Norstrom stated let me ask you as a business person if you were in our position, would you rather have a five year guaranteed contract or a three-year contract with options after that. Mr. Darling replied we recommend the three year and bidding again.

Mr. Eric Shays, Local Waste Systems, 1300 S. Columbus Airport Road, Columbus, OH. Mr. Shays explained we like to refer to the color of this cart as Scarlet because our trash carts are grey; I believe all of occur community contracts which was recently awarded consortium 3 which is Grove City, Urbancrest and Jackson Township chose to go with five-year contracts because the price is lower and it’s locked in, now that’s what we have done in the last five years with Worthington; consortium 2 communities like Hilliard, Whitehall, Groveport, all of them have five-year contracts that they are able to budget these costs that won’t go up. We are professionals at if you don’t want your bin, just call and we’ll make it go away, and if you’ll like two bins instead of a cart, that’s not a problem either; you have a lot residents right now that may have four bins that they stack. Prior to me getting a cart, I filled four a week, but they were pretty easy to just scoot down the driveway; now we fill one of those a week. Consortium 3 which I mentioned is Grove City, Urbancrest and Jackson Township, technically the recycling program didn’t start until January 1st, however we took the initiative to get 85% of those carts delivered and we’ve seen the recycling numbers almost double because it’s so much easier to use. It’s amazing how much the recycling numbers have gone up just in the last few weeks.

The programs that SWACO is putting out about recycling we believe down the road will become mandates; the carts will never be cheaper than they are now and we believe five years down the road or so it will become mandatory. They’ve seen the proof that it does increase recycling numbers; our opinion is that now is the time to get them while they’re exceptionally inexpensive; and it does help your recycling numbers. Mr. Norstrom commented that your competition indicated that they are using compressed national gas trucks and you use all diesel. Mr. Shays replied no there is only one truck that we run in Worthington that is not a CNG truck, that’s a yard waste truck, but we have been in the process of converting all of our fleet to CNG, but Worthington gets all but one CNG truck and we’re working on that as well; you’ve had CNG trucks here for at least a few years. Mr. Smith stated I’m still a little confused about we were assured that the price would go down after the tipping fee went down. Mr. Shay replied the tipping fees will go down April 1st I believe 26 cents or 24 cents which makes your cart instead of 50 cents, it makes it 26 cents per month. Mr. Smith said so that’s reflected in the bid. Mr. Shays replied yes.
Budget Workshop #2

Mrs. Stewart started off with the area of Legislative & Clerk, you can see from the chart that the numbers are fairly consistent from years 2016, 2017 and into 2018.

A few notable changes with the budget:

- The 2107 budget shows an elimination of funding for ICMA insights due to the program being discontinued.
- The consulting line is being kept at current levels to provide for airport consultants, if needed.
The only notable change for Administration:

- Fixed Asset Appraisal: Increase of $8,155 reflects the cost to have the City’s fixed assets inventoried and reappraised.
Economic Development is in two different areas of the budget, one part is in the general fund and the other is in the economic development fund; this is the table and numbers associated with the general fund section and then we have another slide that shows the economic development. I will note that it is fairly noticeable the change between 2015 and 2016 on this slide, that was a dynamic of two things (1) in 2015 we only had a partial year cost for salary associated with our Economic Development Manager whereas we are budgeting for a full year salary moving forward for that; (2) and then in 2015 did not need to make a transfer from the general fund into the economic development fund; the economic development fund had sufficient fund balances to cover the expenses in that fund for the year and so there was no transfer; all the other years on this slide have involved a transfer into the economic development fund to support those activities.
Economic Development: Notable Changes

- Transfer line increased in the General Fund to ensure sufficient revenue in the Economic Development Fund.
- Increased funding in the Economic Development Fund to meet commitments in existing economic development agreements.
- Provided a new allocation in the Economic Development Fund to support programming and business development activities associated with co-working and makers spaces in the Kilbourne Building.
This slide shows the economic development fund and projected expenditures for it; as I mentioned, most of those increases are related to existing commitments for venture grant agreements as well as additional services to be provided with CoHatch.

Ms. Dorothy asked what is left over that we haven’t already don’t have agreements or contracts for or what are we budgeting for that is new. Mrs. Stewart replied we are projecting about $75,000 in the new agreements, new economic development incentives and the rest are tied to existing agreements; so in that budgeted line item there is about $75,000 that is not tied to an existing agreement already to give us some flexibility for new agreements next year. Obviously if we have extensive activity that exceeds that budgeted amount we would need to come back for additional appropriations.

Mr. Myers commented it seems to me that I remember reports coming back periodically whether the recipients are conforming to the agreement as far as job creation, is there a way that next year (a lot of those numbers get lost in my mind especially when I see the budget the next year); is there any way we can also have a report in next year’s budget that goes along with this letting us know in very simple language things like how many jobs were created. Mrs. Stewart asked specifically tied to the agreement; in the summer the TIRC reviews all the TIFs and tax abatements and that report is presented to City Council, but yes we can certainly provide performance on venture grant agreements which I don’t believe we’ve provided to you recently. Mr. Myers replied if I could receive that report yet again during the budget cycle because when we get it in the summer, it’s harder for me to put the two together when I have it in the summer and then again in the fall when I see it in the budget; I’m just asking for staff to give it to me again in the budget so that I can visualize that this is working.

Mr. Norstrom commented it’s not only the number of employees, but we would like an estimate showing what the actual revenue from the employer is. Mrs. Stewart replied that our venture grant agreement focus more on payroll and income tax collection than they do actual number of jobs.
Mrs. Stewart indicated that in this next area Personnel, you see that in 2016 was a higher year than the other years shown on this chart and that was driven primarily to retirement payouts, so we had a number of long time employees retire and when they leave there are certain leave amounts and balances that we pay out when they leave and so that budget was increased in 2016 to be able to cover those, it’s actually reduced a little bit in 2017 although we still do expect to have some retirements; you will also notice as you go into the detail in this area that we have bumped up both in 2016 and in 2017 our funding for testing and assessment and that is related to our hiring and when we have for certain positions potential employees need to go to assessment centers or other specialized testing and we have the budget to cover that.

Mr. Troper commented so we’re budgeting next year for projected retirements, asked is there any budgeting for future years for projected retirements. Mrs. Stewart commented we do have some, I’ll defer to Mrs. Roberts to see if she has anything she would like to add because she and Ms. Trego our Personnel Director tend to work together on this. Mrs. Roberts replied yes we do allocate an amount each year for the retirement payout line and this is also an amount that is included in our GAAP conversion which only probably makes sense to Mr. Troper, Mr. Barter and myself. We do project these as future liabilities and incur those liabilities in our projections.
Mrs. Roberts commented that the Finance budget is relatively flat.
Ms. Dorothy commented we’re part of OhioCheckbook, asked has there been any increase for pushing that information, has there been. Mrs. Roberts replied we have utilized the free portal that is available on the State’s website, we have not budgeted any money to further the software capabilities through OpenCheckbook. Mr. Troper commented you mentioned at the beginning timekeeping and attendance tracking, can
you explain that. Mrs. Roberts explained that’s included in our CIP budget documents and we have been analyzing for several years and Mr. Barter my Finance Assistant is in the audience and as part of his Master’s program we have investigated bumping up our timekeeping and software systems to integrate with our payroll programs so that we can streamline some processes; we use CMI for all our finance and payroll software programs; we would like to get away from strictly excel spreadsheets and generic timekeeping clocks and integrate into one program that would be able to be utilized through each department and then integrate seamlessly into our CMI computer program so that we don’t have duplications and data entry in other personnel.

Mr. Norstrom asked was that budgeted in the capitol budget. Mrs. Roberts replied it was budgeted in the CIP budget.

Mrs. Fox commented we saw a jump in 2016 due to the expenses involved with the community center roof litigation, but the budget for 2017 then becomes reduced; the levels are fairly flat from previous years and I think there hasn’t really been any significant change. Ms. Michael asked does this include any use of magistrates. Mrs. Fox replied no that falls under the Mayor’s Court. Mrs. Stewart commented in the Mayor’s Court we do include a small amount in case we need a magistrate throughout the year. Mrs. Fox explained this does include the prosecutor for Mayor’s Court as well as the Prosecutor downtown as well as our general outside legal services.

Mr. Myers asked for our recurring legal services Mayor’s Court, Labor Relations, do we negotiate a rate in advance for that; I understand for the run off for the roof and things
like that, we’re going to pay closer to the going rate, but how do we arrive at the hourly rates for Mayor’s Court and our Labor Contracts. Mrs. Fox replied we receive for Mayor’s Court, Prosecution Services a fairly flat rate that’s been the same rate for many many years and we get a discounted rate on top of that, so that number has not gone up for at least for the time that I have been here. Those are pretty competitive rates; I think it’s like at $95.00 per hour for the Mayor’s Court work, for the Labor Relations work we negotiate somewhat of a flat rate, not by hour, but more of a flat rate amount that if it exceeds that by a certain percentage, we talk about what we pay; if it goes below that, then the amount drops, those activities go up and down fairly unpredictably; as we all know hours are hours, so it’s easier from a budgeting standpoint for us to be able to pay a flat amount and then evaluate throughout the year how we’re doing...whether we’re exceeding or not exceeding that amount. Mr. Myers asked you feel certain since we have been with the same firm for many years that we’re getting a competitive rate as much as we can. Mrs. Fox replied I do. I think that if we would want to get the same level of service from somewhere else I think the rates would be fairly competitive.

Mr. Norstrom stated a couple of decades ago my work took me into a situation where we were forcing many transit systems to go out to bid for legal services which was something they had not done for years; some of the selected the incumbent, but many of them changed and found that they saved substantial funds and when I hear you say that we have been with this same firm for a number of years it raises a question of whether or not we should test the market; I don’t need to have an answer tonight, but while I was thinking about I wanted to ask you to look into that. Mrs. Fox commented she would.

Mrs. Stewart stated the next is Information Technology and is relatively consistent, 2015 was a little lower than 2016 because 2016 is when we took over some of the maintenance cost associated with our document management system and so that contributed to some of that increase from 2015 – 2016. You will probably recall we have a vacant IT Manager position, we’ve been undergoing an IT Assessment; we expect to start reviewing those recommendations from the assessment very soon and start talking about where we go in the future with IT; we still have that vacancy and we’ll need to figure out whether we’re going to fill the position and if so, will we fill it at the same level with the same essential duties or whether we’ll need to change our approach to that position or whether we choose not to fill the position and choose to have more external or contract assistance. For the 2017 budget we are budgeting for the salary in that position because that’s what we’ve had in our budget in the past and we haven’t made any decisions to move away from that, but if we choose to do something different we’ll come back to amend the budget next year.

Mr. Norstrom asked when will the IT Assessment be completed. Mrs. Stewart replied they have completed most of their work, actually we just received a draft report that we need to share, we were going to share internally to get some comments on it, and we’ll probably have some follow-up with the firm that’s done the assessment to kind of explore some of their comments and recommendations; so it’s in the very early stages of the report format because they’ve drafted it, but we haven’t had time to really digest it and discuss with them. Mr. Norstrom commented I guess the underlying question is if they are
recommending a change that would result in contracting at a higher level than filling the position, is that something we want to at least plan in the budget rather than have to amend the budget within a month or two of passing. Mrs. Stewart replied I have at least read the report, but I don’t feel like I fully digested it, it is fairly lengthy with a multitude of recommendations that we’re going to need to kind of balance and prioritize and get a strategy around what do we tackle and when; so I guess I don’t feel like I’m ready to say yes we’re going to recommend filling the position or contracting for it because they laid out multiple options that I think we need to explore because it’s not simply around one position.

Mr. Norstrom asked so if we approve a balanced budget which we will do, where would the potential funds come from if we choose to substantially increase our expenditures in this area. Mrs. Stewart replied I think we don’t know that yet because it is still too fresh.

Police – Jerry Strait

Chief Strait indicated as most of you know our problem this year has been with staffing, we are on the mend and actually we just finished part of the Lieutenant’s process earlier this afternoon.
Police: Notable Changes

- Overtime and training lines were modified to reflect anticipated costs due to staffing transitions.
- The position of Operations Support Manager is currently vacant and is anticipated to be filled in late 2016 or early 2017.
- Training was increased for support of enhanced educational funding with the anticipation of two new sergeants to attend Supervisors Training and Education Program (STEP) and one new lieutenant to attend the Police Executive Leadership College (PELC).

Police: 2017 Objectives

- Prepare for retirements by continuing backgrounds for applicants and ensuring staff are ready for the transition, promotion, procedures, training and equipment reviews necessary for the transition.
- Update the Division’s Policies and Procedures using Lexipol; Ensure compliance with State of Ohio Collaborative Requirements.
- Hire a new Operations Support Manager to assist with the development and implementation of policies, procedures, and enhanced training for the Communications Center.
- Ensure officers are compliant with Ohio Peace Officer’s Continuing Professional Training Curriculum.
- Develop and review key operational plans for critical incidents with our internal partners, schools, not for profits and business.
Mr. Whited indicated the budget for Service/Engineering is relatively flat.

Gasoline and fuel systems reflects a $25,000 decrease from 2016 funding levels.

Funding in both the Street Maintenance and Repair Fund and the State Highway fund continues to stay “flat” and the revenue does not meet growing operational expenses, thus increasing the dependence on the General Fund for operational costs.
Mr. Whited explained that the last item on this slide is recently new; it’s important with Columbus Public Health to reduce Fats, Oils and Grease (FOG) in our sewer lines from an operations and a health standpoint and we’re addressing that with a more aggressive program; that’s a change that we’re doing operationally, but primarily on the next slide what we’re really focusing in on with my short period of time (9 months) and I’ve been
able to get a pretty decent handle on our staff and our objectives and what we’ve done historically with our programs. What I’d really like to do and what we’re focusing on with the retirement of our previous superintendent and getting a new superintendent in there and really getting our arms wrapped around what it is that we need to do; it’s really focusing in on integrating technology to a higher level, that’s what is reflected in our budget, not really with a lot of increases, but sort of changes in how we do things with digital bidding, online bidding as we move into 2017, use of online collaborative project management tools that can utilize our entire staff across divisions and departments, increase our use of GIS tools to get a better handle on infrastructure condition assessment and how to best manage those things through incremental improvements and as result to focus on professional training opportunities to increase the technical level of our staff so that we can develop and integrate planned maintenance systems, a little more proactive approach to what we’ve done in our department, nothing wrong with what we’ve done in the past, but we like to be a little more forward thinking in what we do and focus on planned maintenance within our building systems (facilities particularly), also within our infrastructure (grounds maintenance).

We do have standard operating procedures, but they’re somewhat archaic at times or unfindable at times, so we’re really focusing on building those back up and putting those back in place, integrating them; all of these things are focused on what you would hope they would focus on which is safety, really all those things within our mission statement, not just our integrity and compassion, but flexibility, responsiveness, professionalism and dedication of our staff to provide a high level of service. These are the things we need to do to do that. We’ve talked about pavement evaluation and pavement maintenance; we’ve talked about our construction management, our signalization, snow and ice. All this in a planned, predictive and proactive system...what this also will relate to is sort of a different organizational structure to our staff and I’ll probably be presenting some of those things to you relatively soon, they are still in the infancy stages.
Mr. Smith stated with the presentation you gave last spring about the streets and using technology to watch that infrastructure in a proactive way; asked do we need to procure more tools to do that or do we have the tools and we just need the training, what’s the makeup of that. Mr. Whited replied it’s an incremental improvement and this year we’re hoping to take our GIS tools and utilize those to help us do a better assessment and documentation of our pavement conditions and start ramping that up to a true ongoing pavement analysis system. Mr. Smith asked based on your past experiences elsewhere you’ve implemented programs like that. Mr. Whited replied we have, in my previous position we had a much larger system that demanded a higher level of technology, we don’t need that level, I think we have close to the existing tools to do that now; what we really need is the personnel resources to go in and chew up the data and then spit it back out with some meaningful results. Ms. Dorothy commented so we’re looking at the whole lifecycle costs of all our systems. Mr. Whited replied ultimately yes.

Mr. Myers asked is there any grassroots movement at the local or state level to do something about increasing fuel taxes and what plans are in place if we go to driverless cars, more electric cars....what happens when the gas tax is gone. Mr. Whited replied that is a fantastic question that I don’t have the answer to. Mr. Myers stated I just wonderful if the municipal league or anyone was beginning to raise the issue. Mr. Whited stated I take part in the Central Ohio Service Directors meetings and Central Ohio Engineering meetings and that is a discussion that relates probably higher to probably Matt, Robyn, and Molly with some of things they’ve been involved with on a policy level. Mr. Greeson replied the Ohio Municipal League has included that in their legislative they recently introduced legislation strategy that released at their conference in October, but I’m not sure they think there’s much of a chance; the other actually more possible legislative proposal is for the permissive vehicle license tax, there’s a bill that was filed last year, but it would essentially give the abilities of cities to modestly increase at their own option (that’s the permissive part of it), the vehicle license tax that we all pay every year. Mr. Myers replied I think they call that a fee even though it’s a tax. Mr. Greeson stated this has been static for many years and Worthington is at the max of what can be charged; that is for fixing roads, so the idea there is that the people who live in your community that own cars are the ones that are using the roads in part and so it’s charged back to the vehicle; so that is another thing that is a part of the Ohio Municipal League’s legislative strategy; I can’t report to you at this time whether it’s getting any traction, but that’s another funding source that Ohio municipalities used to fund local road programs. We fund most of our paving program using income taxes out of the CIP, but we have about $796,000 that’s received....Mrs. Roberts replied that’s received in federal and state gas taxes into the street maintenance repair fund (fund 202) and also into the state highway fund (fund 203) which largely funds our service department activity; so yes fuel taxes matter; and what happens when we don’t have sufficient funds in those areas or they’re flat, we’re making transfers from the general fund which is the income taxes in order to support those funds and others like water and sewer.

Ms. Dorothy commented I see a line item for the MMBLT, what other gas tax or I guess I just want to know what vehicles are paying for the road. Mr. Greeson replied Street Maintenance and Repair Fund, and State Highway Fund. The 202 Fund is the largest
which is the Street Maintenance Repair Fund. Mrs. Roberts stated the MMBLT (the 215 fund) that is the license tax fund and we do a transfer each year into the CIP fund to offset some of the annual street improvement costs.

Mr. Myers stated if staff at any time has an opportunity to kick, scream, yell, plead or beg for either a different system or an increase of the system we have now to cover infrastructure needs, I would strongly encourage that.

Mr. Greeson stated one of the things I want to highlight is Mr. Whited forecasted to Council that he will be probably talking to in the not too distant future about potentially some job descriptions, staffing charts, reorganizing, pretty much modest changes in order to help him accomplish some of these things.

Parks & Recreation – Mr. Darren Hurley

The proposed budget for the Community Center contractual cleaning line reflects an $8,000 reduction due to the pricing secured in the approved cleaning contract for 2017. Since the time in which the budget was prepared, staff has decided to recommend against the option to extend the current contract and instead go out for bid for the services. This will likely impact the reduction included in the proposed budget.
Mr. Myers asked do anticipate the recreation commission have any cost data or is it just a conceptual report. Mr. Hurley replied we had originally not thought so much of doing that, so the process had been geared really toward prioritizing projects knowing that we weren’t trying to fit that in to a specific funding process other than our CIP process, but have received some feedback that would be helpful, so we’re going to work during this first quarter to assign some numbers, at least some ranges to those projects.

Ms. Dorothy so Parks & Recreation Commission is in charge of the Community Center, the Griswold, and then a whole bunch of activities throughout the parks throughout Worthington. Mr. Hurley said our department is essentially divided into the Griswold Center, the Community Center and our Parks Operations and then Programming comes throughout those three areas. Our programming stayed pretty consistent in terms of numbers and stuff, we’ll have full 2016 numbers as we get through this last quarter.
Mr. Brown indicated that the budget is relatively flat; you do see a change from 2015 to 2016 when we added the Part-Time Code Enforcement Property Maintenance Officer who has been on full-time for a year now; he has been a great asset to increasing our response time to our citizens and complaints; also you’ll see some increases in the training area, as you remember from the City Council retreat there was a discussion providing training for our boards and commissions (BZA, MPC) providing them with some professional training and also having the Ohio Ethics Commission come in, so there is a recommendation in our budget to use some of that training money for that to happen hopefully to happen in the spring of 2017.

Also in the budget you do see some capital equipment and that is as you may recall last year approved staff to look for a scanner and a plotter, we had budgeted $5000 last year and realized when we started looking at used equipment, even the used equipment was coming in higher, so I went back for additional money to use for this year with our 2016 money; what we’re hoping to do, to build in on Mr. Whited’s comment is to build and streamline our process for our residents and staff and get a lot of the documents we have in-house scanned and online; we currently have Melissa Cohen who works for Mrs. Fox in our office scanning all the ARB and MPC cases; we have about 15 years scanned so far, so a lot of that we’re able to get online with the goal of having that for our residents themselves that they can go online in conjunction with the GIS, click on a parcel and eventually have a complete history of any and everything that has every happened on that parcel.
Ms. Dorothy asked are we also making ourselves able to have submissions done electronically. Mr. Brown replied that is the goal for next year to do software research to see how we can make it easier for our residents and builders and on staff to have that submitted directly to us 24/7, you don’t have to come in to the office between 7:30 and 4:30. Ms. Dorothy asked and we don’t have to have people scan in paper copies because they’ll already be digital. Mr. Brown replied ultimately that would be the goal. I think we’re still in a community that still likes the paper copies, but if someone came in, the ultimate goal would be to have no paper, but if someone wanted to bring it in we could scan it for them; but I also think it would make it much easier for our boards and commissions, I know we’ve tried to eliminate a lot of the paper and reducing those large size blueprint copies for Planning Commission and ARB, sometimes it is necessary to see something to scale, but we’ve a couple of members go to just using their i-Pad to review the documents and not have a packet delivered to them.

I think looking at the technology upgrades there are ways to streamline our processes so we can reduce legal ads and things like that; I think one of the things we will see as get into looking for that electronic submittal is also looking at the overall code compliance and streamline the process, but also looking at our fee structure, some of our fees have not been changed since 1971; I think the ultimate goal was code compliance not necessarily to receive money for it, but to work towards that goal. Some of the big things that you had on your agenda that all of you know about is the never-ending question about across the street...our role and what will happen on UMCH...how that will phase through next year or the years to come, so that will still be on all our radars.
Ms. Michael asked are we going to actually get to an overlay. Mr. Brown replied what you approved in April was the actual zoning districts and we have the guidelines for the corridor so as properties rezone, you’ll see them having to meet all those development standards, but what we’ve been able to do with the guidelines that we’ve put in place that you’ll probably see maybe next week for The Heights, you’re going to see an amendment
to development plan with a variance; we were able to use code requirements that you approved in April to review the signage packet that you’ll see.

Ms. Michael asked with the way we have everything in place at this moment regarding East Wilson Bridge, can somebody tear down a house and build another house or does it have to move into the other category. Mr. Brown replied we actually sent Mr. Greeson a memo that you will eventually get that talks about Mrs. Fox, Ms. Bitar and I had a meeting in late July with the residents and with Mikel Coulter; we invited all 18 property owners, we had 12 show up; kind of went through here’s where we are now, here’s how we got to where we are, and next steps; so I just sent out the memo to Mr. Greeson this afternoon to update him on that and then once we sit down and brainstorm those next steps, hopefully we’ll have an update in the next week or two.

Mr. Norstrom stated for the record you said it both ways in your beginning comments, but we have actually decreased response times in the planning. Mr. Brown replied what I meant to say was we’ve increased our response time where it used to take several days; we’ve been able to get back to our residents within 24-48 hours. Also what we’ve done on the building side of the department not to leave Don Phillips out, we went this past January 1st to a blanket permit to kind of streamline the process for residents and the builders, and so we’ll be able to have updated numbers for you at the end of this year and hopefully moving into next year you’ll be able to see the true difference from 1st quarter of 2016 to 2017 and the blanket permit has helped streamline the process.
Fire Department – Chief Scott Highley

Mrs. Stewart presented the following information:
Mr. Myers asked what kind of costs do you anticipate. Mrs. Stewart replied things like insurance and some elevator maintenance, some basic cost associated with the building backbone itself. Mr. Norstrom confirmed this are things that would be directly under us not the CIC. Mrs. Stewart replied we are budgeting for them here; as a staff we have not talked about whether these funds ought to be shifted to and transferred to the CIC for the CIC to actually pay those bills or not. If that’s something City Council is interested in, we can certainly talk at the staff level as to how that would work and then bring it back to you. Mr. Norstrom commented there’s no reason to have CIC manage that for us. Mr. Greeson remarked same as staff doing it.

Financial Report

Mr. Greeson asked Mrs. Roberts to provide an overview of the reports for the month of October 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 $23,749,338 to $23,716,301 for the month of October with revenues exceeding expenditures by $33,037.

Year to date fund balances for all accounts increased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $23,716,301 as of October 31, 2016 with expenditures exceeding revenue by $2,453,207.

Expenditures for all funds tracked at 90.15% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Year to date revenues for all funds are above 2015 revenues by $982,636 and above year to date estimates by $209,782.

The General Fund balance increased from $12,079,256 to $12,178,798 for the month of October with revenues exceeding revenues by $99,543.

The year to date General Fund balance increased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2016 to $12,178,798 with expenditures exceeding expenditures by $928,721.

General Fund expenditures tracked at 92.49% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Total General Fund revenues are above estimates by $1,215 or .01%.

October 2016 income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $912,500 or 4.59% and above estimates by $638,926 or 3.17%.

MOTION Councilmember Norstrom made a motion to accept the October 2016 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Foust.
The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Mr. Greeson stated I will be in Atlanta this Wednesday and Thursday, Mrs. Stewart will be the acting City Manager. Additionally there is a meeting this Thursday at 2:30 P.M. at the WEC (Worthington Educational Center) with the 161 Stakeholders Group that ODOT is staffing; the Consultant will be sharing some of the data, scope of the problem information at that meeting; we will be glad to share that information with you so that you can see the data. Mr. Whited is our staff liaison and will be attending this meeting, I believe Mrs. Stewart will be attending as well.

Anne Brown is working diligently with our website vendor CivicPlus and I’m just going to pass down so everybody can take a look at what’s new or updated; we’re in the next to later throws of this process, a lot of the content will remain the same; the functionality, the interface with social media and some of the way we can highlight and spotlight news, there’s new opportunities compared to last time.

Before I go onto legislative issues, one of the things you’ll recall our intern Mary reported on was a Boards and Commissions Reception, we wanted to recognize our volunteers, so we all embraced that idea; now we need to talk about when we want to do it. As staff was thinking about it, the earliest we could accomplish it would be early December before the holidays, but give us three weeks to a month to plan it; that may not be the best time to do it, if you wanted to do it before a council meeting or we can plan something in January or February.

Mr. Smith commented that waiting until after the holidays feels right. Mr. Myers commented in order to best answer that question, what is it that we really want to do; I would like it to be a little bit more than just we have them all stand up at a council meeting and say “thank you”; I thought our initial thought was to make it more of a mixer type environment and maybe offsite and if that’s what we’re going to do, I would rather see it after the holidays so that we have a little more time to plan it. Mr. Greeson asked would you rather it be on a Monday before a council meeting. Mr. Myers replied I’d rather it not be on a council meeting night; the point is to be able to interact with our board members and have more time to spend with them; I don’t want to be rushed.

Mr. Greeson stated I’m going to pass out a bill which Mrs. Fox and I will do our best to explain it to you. Mr. Greeson explained that this is Senate Bill No. 235 that is moving in lame duck session, so it is getting proponent testimony tomorrow and all other testimony on Wednesday. As you can see by one of the documents I passed out the Ohio Municipal League, MORPC, the Township, the Library Council, the Auditors Association, the County Commissioners, the OACB, and a variety of other local government organizations; the superintendents are all opposing Senate Bill No. 235.

Essentially as I read it and understand it, newly developable property which means a parcel of property which no commercial or industrial operations are currently being
conducted...so think vacant land there is no Certificate of Occupancy issued. These properties if in a ten year period you were planning to do commercial or industrial development on that land, you would not be subject to the taxes on increased value of that land during that period; so essentially it would freeze the taxable value or the taxes you would have to pay on the increased value at the vacant land status for up to ten years while the property owner or developer moved forward with a project or not. The way this is written there are no thresholds...or instance in our tax abatement program we have thresholds for investments, it has to be a $1 million dollar investment to make you eligible for tax abatements, there’s no threshold for it; there I no language that speaks to other economic development objectives other than commercial and industrial development; there’s no outcome orientation in terms of type of commercial and industrial development, no tie to local plans and there’s no reference to how this interfaces with existing tax increment financing districts which a lot of communities are concerned about because some organizations have tax increment financing districts and within those districts there’s vacant land that may increase value and that value would benefit the TIF.

My read on it, is it gives a right to anybody with vacant land who plans (whatever that means) to do commercial and industrial development over a ten year period to not have the value increase during that time period and as a result them pay more taxes. It’s moving.

Ms. Michael asked who’s in favor of this. Mr. Greeson replied none of these organizations and presumably landowners that have plans to develop their property or have land holdings who are seeking to avoid increases in their taxes as a result of value increase which may in some instances mitigate risks in help with absorption risks how quickly will land develop and have some financial benefits to some developers, but it’s pretty far reaching; every vacant parcel that’s commercial and industrial in the state would be eligible. Ms. Michael asked so for example we have across from the Sinsbury Condos we have some land that’s undeveloped that would be something that would be subject to this. Mr. Greeson replied it could be; it’s vacant, if the overall value of that increased over time and the corresponding taxes associated with it increased because the land was becoming more valuable, they could be eligible for this and not have to pay the taxes on the increased value. Ms. Michael said this is another one of those mandates that pulls tax money away from the governmental entities. Mr. Greeson replied it could do that, it could affect TIFs, it also doesn’t buy outcomes; a lot of the premises that Mr. Myers was getting at in his line of questioning, a lot of the economic development programs developed by the state or regional entities or the city are aimed at buying outcomes, in other words their aimed at achieving particular goals of either the community or the State of Ohio whether that’s job creation, certain types of commercial and industrial development and they’re oriented towards that. More essentially it creates a right for not having to pay as value increases. Essentially it’s an abatement for vacant land for the increased value and it ignores a little bit that in some communities and in some instances vacant land can demand services, so one of the premises behind this is their not creating service demand, but in some cases you know wildfires don’t happen on unoccupied properties, dumping doesn’t happen on unoccupied properties, loitering
sometimes happens on vacant properties, so they can create demands for certain services and court actions and things like that and there’s no criteria for when you might lose it if you’re not a good actor.

Mrs. Stewart stated I just want to clarify when I looked at this last week, it not only referred to vacant land, but it also referred to properties with buildings on it that are not in current commercial and industrial use, so I actually see that as potentially more impactful to us because we don’t have a lot of vacant properties, but we certainly do have properties that at times the buildings and structures are on the land, but they go vacant and certainly they can demand more services if people are entering vacant building(s) we may have more police responses to them; I know historically other fire departments I have worked with and perhaps ours vacant properties can be a higher fire risk because there aren’t people in there actively observing and watching the property and so certainly there can be a demand for city services that we would still have to provide even if the property is vacant.

Mr. Myers asked doesn’t this eliminate the ability Tax Increment and Financing; if TIFs are based on the increase and value of a property and now there will be no increase in value. Mrs. Fox replied it’s unclear how this would or would not interface with that TIF financing and I think one of things that is the most important piece of this is that in this document it explains it that these types of exemptions have historically been granted or approved at the local government level and not at just the automatic request of a property owner.

Mr. Greeson stated that Mrs. Stewart referenced that they really divide these up into newly developable properties which kind of means the vacant ones and she was referencing what they describe as definition to re-development property which is one or more commercial or industrial buildings and structures; no commercial or industrial operations are currently being conducted; in construction or reconstruction of new commercial or industrial buildings or structures is planned, but for with the Certificate of Occupancy following completion of the construction or reconstruction has not yet been issued; so you can sit on it and not have to pay increased taxes if the overall value of the land and the buildings are increasing by virtue of your community’s value increasing.

Ms. Michael asked what are you asking from Council. Mr. Greeson replied this is moving quickly, it’s proponent testimony tomorrow; the schoolboard is having a similar discussion this evening, Jeff McCuen is bringing it up with them. What I would like the ability to do is since I’m going to be out of town, I would like the ability to submit written testimony and I may do that in concert with our school treasurer, we may do it individually or we may do it together depending on his board conversation, but both he and I are concerned about this bill, we’ve had conversations about this bill today and want to oppose it.

The consensus of council are in complete support of opposition of this Senate Bill.

Mr. Norstrom commented you had sent a memo out about King Furniture moving to Grandview, has there been any talk with Grandview or MORPC about providing
incentives to companies that move between communities in Franklin County. Mr. Greeson replied Mr. McCorkle has some conversation with Grandview, I have not as of yet, but I will be.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

COUNCILMEMBER MICHAEL – will be attending National League of Cities this week. Also had a resident ask about walkability when it snows.

COUNCILMEMBER NORSTROM – will be attending National League of Cities this week; if anyone has a topic that they would like me to bring back information on, please let me know.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Councilmember Troper made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss appointments to boards and commissions and personnel (compensation). The motion was seconded by Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

Council recessed at 9:30 P.M. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Councilmember Norstrom made a motion to return to open session at 10:18 P.M. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.
ADJOURNMENT

MOTION  Councilmember Foust 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 10:20 P.M.

/s/ Tanya Maria Word
Temporary Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 5th day of December, 2016.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President