City Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, February 6, 2017 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

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

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

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

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

1) Small Cell Wireless Facilities in the Right of Way

VISITOR COMMENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2) December 5, 2016 – Regular Meeting
3) December 12, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
4) December 19, 2016 – Regular Meeting
5) January 3, 2017 – Regular Meeting
6) January 9, 2017 – Special Meeting
7) January 9, 2017 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
8) January 17, 2017 – Special Meeting

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

9) Ordinance No. 03-2017

Enacting a Moratorium on the Consideration of Certificates of Appropriateness for the Installation of Solar Panels on Structures in the Architectural Review District.

Introduced January 17, 2017
P.H. February 6, 2017

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

10) Resolution No. 04-2017

Authorizing Amendments to the Policy & Procedures of the City’s Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

11) Grant Review Committee
REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT
City Manager Report to City Council for the Meeting of Monday, February 6, 2017

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

1) Small Cell Wireless Facilities in the Right of Way

Greg Dunn, an attorney with Ice Miller, will be present to discuss recent state law changes regarding micro wireless (also known as small cell wireless) facilities in the public rights of way.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2) December 5, 2016 – Regular Meeting
3) December 12, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
4) December 19, 2016 – Regular Meeting
5) January 3, 2017 – Regular Meeting
6) January 9, 2017 – Special Meeting
7) January 9, 2017 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
8) January 17, 2017 – Special Meeting

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION


This Ordinance places a moratorium on consideration of applications for solar panels in the Architectural Review District by the Architectural Review Board until May 31, 2017. This legislation is a result of discussions at recent City Council meetings. It provides the City 90 days in which to research, evaluate and discuss options that might address concerns about the visual impact of solar panels on the character of the Architectural Review District. The moratorium will put on hold any new requests for approval of solar panels in the District during this 90-day timeframe. Additional information is provided in the attached memorandum from the Law Director.

Recommendation: Approval of the Ordinance as Presented
NEW LEGISLATION


The Re-Emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) provides grants and loans to encourage exterior enhancement to commercial properties on Huntley Road and Proprietors Road and the connecting portions of Worthington Galena Road and Schrock Road. The program was originally instituted in 2014. This Resolution approves modification of the Policy and Procedures for ReCAP. The modifications were reviewed by the Community Improvement Corporation Board, which recommends approval. Additional detail regarding the proposed changes is provided in the attached memorandum from the Economic Development Manager. Also attached are redline versions of the proposed Policy & Procedures and an excerpt of the draft minutes from the CIC Board meeting focusing on this discussion. A clean copy of the proposed Policy and Procedures is attached to the Resolution.

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

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

11) Grant Review Committee

On December 12th, City Council authorized the announcement of the application materials for the City’s community grants. Those materials were distributed to interested groups and placed on the City’s website in early January with an application deadline of February 3rd. City Council expressed interest in the utilization of a committee again this year to review the applications and make funding recommendations to the City Council. Staff seeks guidance regarding the composition of the committee so the review process can begin. (Note: Last year’s committee was comprised of two representatives from City Council and one representative each from the Griswold Center, the Community Relations Commission and Worthington Schools.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION
Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 5, 2016 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

City Council

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

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, December 5, 2016, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

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

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, 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, Chief of Fire Scott Highley and Chief of Police Jerry Strait

There were six visitors present.

President Michael reported it wasn’t necessary to recite the Pledge of Allegiance again since it was recited during the Joint Meeting of City Council and the Sharon Township Trustees.

VISITOR COMMENTS

Palmer Moore, 6700 Hayhurst St.
Mr. Moore shared that he is a member of a newly formed group in Worthington, The Friends of Pickleball, several members of which were in attendance. They thanked staff members of the Griswold Center, the Worthington Rec Center and City Council for recently offering pickleball as a sport in this town. It is one of the fastest growing sports all over the country. It was originally brought about by seniors but now that the sport is available, younger kids are flocking to it. It is a great aerobic exercise. He thanked the City for accepting their new sport of pickleball.

When Ms. Dorothy asked him how often he plays, he replied every day. He added that they can find out more about the Friends of Pickleball through a website that he is working on.

CONSENT AGENDA

Notice to the Public: There will be no separate discussion of Consent Agenda items as they are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be adopted by one motion. If a member of the City Council, staff, or public requests discussion on a particular item, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.
To address City Council regarding an item on Consent Agenda, please submit a fully completed speaker’s slip to the Clerk of Council prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Meeting Minutes to Approve:

1) November 7, 2016 – Regular Meeting
2) November 14, 2016 – Committee of the Whole Meeting

Legislation to Approve/Adopt

3) Ordinance No. 48-2016
   Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Contract with the Village of Riverlea for the Provision of Police Protection.

4) Ordinance No. 49-2016
   Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Contract Between the City of Columbus Board of Health and the City of Worthington for Health Services.

5) Ordinance No. 50-2016
   Approving the City Manager’s Appointment of the Franklin County District Board of Health as the Provider of Plumbing Inspection Services in the City of Worthington.

6) Resolution No. 59-2016
   Amending the Staffing Chart of the City of Worthington to Reflect the Positions Authorized in the 2017 Operating Budget.

7) Resolution No. 60-2016
   Approving the City Manager’s Appointment of Donald W. Schofield as Alternate Chief Building Official and Alternate Master Plans Examiner for the Division of Building Regulation.

8) Liquor Permit – Transfer – From Pub Out Back LLP dba Pub Out Back to ALD Investments LLC dba Pub Out Back

End of Consent Agenda
Mr. Greeson noted that Ms. Michael read item 6. Resolution No. 59-2016 as 56-2016. Ms. Michael re-read the title of Resolution No. 59-2016.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

The Consent Agenda was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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

Ordinance No. 45-2016 Providing for the Adoption of the Annual Budget for the Fiscal Year 2017 and Appropriating Sums for Current Operating Expenses.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported this being the public hearing on the operating budget for 2017. He thanked members for participating in three workshop presentations that included the Five Year Forecast for the Capital Plan, the 2017 Operating Budget, updates on Council priorities, and presentations from department heads and community organizations. He thinks this budget maintains existing services. While there is no net increase in the number of full-time staff members, there is a modest increase in part-time members. Twenty percent of our income tax revenues are transferred to the Capital Improvement Program, which is consistent with the Council’s policy. The budget helps meet the Carryover Fund Balance goals of the City and in that regard is financially responsible.

Mr. Greeson shared that the original operating submittal was less than 2% over the amended FY2016 budget to reflect some modest inflation over the prior year. He asked Ms. Roberts to overview the amendments made to the originally submitted document.

Ms. Roberts reported the amendments as follows:

1) Refuse collection was increased from $950,000 to $980,000. This is reflective of the bids that were received and the contract approval that Council passed a couple of weeks ago. That also includes the recycling costs associated with the collection of refuse.

2) The Clerk of Council line was increased to more accurately reflect the compensation level associated with the Clerk attending the meetings.
3) There was an adjustment in the Community Arts funding and the Special Groups funding due to a math error. The amount has been reduced from $7,500 to $4,982, which makes the total allocation $108,535. That reflects a slight increase for inflationary purposes for the special group funding.

Ms. Roberts added that she left a list of the numbers that need to be read into Ordinance No. 45-2016 at President Michael’s place. She is happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Michael asked members if they had any questions regarding the budget.

Mr. Norstrom shared that members have yet to have a conversation about salaries for Council members. He is not sure he understands the mechanics since the current budget does not address salaries.

Ms. Michael agreed that it makes sense to discuss Council salaries prior to the approval of the budget. She asked for comments from other members.

Mr. Myers shared that he understood the topic was going to be discussed in the New Year. If members need to put a placeholder in the budget or budget for salary increases, he asked if that was the reason for the discussion tonight.

Ms. Michael explained that some members wanted to discuss it earlier rather than later.

Ms. Dorothy thinks it is appropriate for members to mention it because it could potentially have budget implications for next year but she is not prepared to discuss the issue in depth tonight.

When asked by Mr. Myers what he needed tonight, Mr. Greeson replied that two things need to occur but not necessarily at the same time. First, the budget would have to include sufficient funds to pay Council at whatever salary it determines. That could occur tonight or later. Members could include a placeholder tonight, which means that it would not get dispersed until the ordinance is changed to accommodate the new salaries. Should Council decide to increase its salary as provided for in the City Charter all at once, then that section of the Code would need to be amended.

Ms. Fox agreed that the budget would first need to be adjusted to provide for a placeholder. The second item would be an ordinance to amend Section 121.03 of the Code.

Mr. Myers asked if the funds are appropriated by the budget. Mr. Greeson replied yes. Mr. Myers stated that in that case, let’s suppose he amends the budget to reflect an amount of $50,000 for next year for Council’s salaries. Let’s assume that members pass an ordinance that totals $60,000 for Council’s salaries for next year. Mr. Greeson stated that members would have to amend the appropriation ordinance. There are really two ways to deal with the budgetary side of this issue. Members can either include a
placeholder in the budget tonight or pass the ordinance and then pass another appropriations ordinance that amends the one members adopt tonight.

Mr. Myers concluded that the budget is the appropriations ordinance. The budget appropriates the funds. Mr. Greeson stated the ordinance provides for the adoption of the annual budget and appropriates some funds for current operating expenses.

When asked by Mr. Myers what the current appropriation is for Council member’s salaries, Ms. Roberts replied that the line item is currently set at $15,000.

Mr. Myers shared that his concern is if we start throwing around numbers now we are basically saying what we want and he doesn’t know that any of them have had a chance to discuss that yet.

Mr. Norstrom commented that there are two more meetings this month. It doesn’t make sense to approve a budget that may be changed. We can have the discussion over the next two meetings and can approve the budget to include any changes that may occur.

When asked by Mr. Myers what he proposes, Mr. Norstrom replied that he proposes that members have the discussion regarding salary over two meetings and move forward after that. There is nothing that requires members to adopt the budget now since it is not effective until January 1st.

Mr. Myers understands that he wishes members to table the adoption of the budget instead of inserting a placeholder for salaries, have a discussion on salaries and then vote on the budget at the last meeting of December. Mr. Norstrom agreed.

Ms. Michael understands from Mr. Greeson that the number of meetings could be reduced in December because of the holidays. She asked members what they wanted to do. Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Smith replied that they wanted to keep the three meetings. Other members agreed.

Members understand that the ordinance has already been introduced. They wish to discuss the topic of Council salaries.

Mr. Myers shared that the number he has thought about puts members at a mid-point with what other area council members make. That number was $600.00 a month based on a twelve month pay.

Mr. Smith shared that he likes an amount lower. He thinks $500.00 puts them where they need to be. At Mr. Myers’ request, he then shared his rationale for the amount.

Mr. Norstrom asked what the average salary is for council members in the area.
Mr. Foust thinks it makes sense to look at the salary in terms of both the overall sampling of data as well as our peer group in and around Columbus as they are two separate data points.

Ms. Michael shared that those groups under $7,200, which is the PERS threshold, are Pataskala, Loveland, Delaware, Grove City and Lebanon.

Mr. Smith noted that Pataskala is the closest city to our own in both size and budget volume. He would be okay with a range of $3,600 to $5,000 a year.

Mr. Greeson reported that this conversation has been going on for a while. He doesn’t know if any of the numbers have changed but the information is a little dated in terms of its numbers. Staff could update the information prior to a vote if members wish.

Mr. Myers shared that his rationale for the $600.00 per month, even though he would receive no benefit from it since he already participates, is that it is the PERS threshold for service contribution. Mr. Foust noted that being a benchmark used by a number of communities.

Mr. Myers added that for as long as he can remember municipal politics around here, PERS is driven much like Medicare reimbursement drives the health care industry. PERS tends to drive municipal salary industry and $600.00 is the threshold that PERS has set.

After Mr. Greeson read the Service Credit and Contributing from the OPERS documents to members, it was determined that the earnable salary amount per month is set at “more than $600.00”. Ms. Fox agreed with Ms. Michael that $601.00 is more than $600.00 and should therefore qualify although staff will confirm the appropriate amount.

Mr. Greeson stated that there are at least one or more City ordinances or Charter language that deal with that by saying, “x number of dollars or the greater of the eligibility under OPERS.”

Mr. Smith asked if there is an impact beyond just the cost for service credit to the City. Meaning, does the city has to pay into PERS at a rate more than what members get paid. Ms. Roberts replied yes. She explained that every employee in the PERS system contributes 10% and the city contributes 14% on the employees.

Mr. Smith stated that for $600, the City would have to pay 14% of the $600, times seven plus the salary of $600 a month. Ms. Roberts agreed and added that the City would also have to pay Medicare.

Mr. Smith went back to his suggestion of a threshold of $500. Taking salaries to the PERS minimum and/or above that has a serious impact to the City whereas taking it up to the threshold doesn’t have as great an impact.
Mr. Norstrom thinks his definition of serious impact needs to be reviewed. He agreed that anything compared to member’s current salary could be defined as serious.

Mr. Troper noted that $600.00 per month is less than Council members’ salaries in New Albany, Powell, Westerville and Hilliard. It is the same as Council members in Upper Arlington. He thinks it is certainly a reasonable amount compared with similar responsibilities for similar cities.

Ms. Michael understands that it is the will of Council that staff prepare the budget impact information for members prior to a determination on salaries.

Mr. Norstrom agreed that the information should be available prior to the public hearing at the third meeting of the month. He wants to make sure that the public has ample time to participate in the discussion. Ms. Michael agreed.

Mr. Greeson agreed that staff would prepare the numbers as well as an ordinance that reflects different options.

Ms. Michael added that the current ordinance states that the President of Council receives additional money. She will abstain from anything to do with this but she did want to bring the issue up. She asked if the President of Council should receive more and if so, how much.

Mr. Smith suggested 10% to 15% in additional salary for the President.

Mr. Foust commented that in looking at a sampling of the data provided, ten communities do not provide additional money while eight communities do. It seems to him that if members are trying to model ourselves after what others are doing, it is a very reasonable argument that some difference should be made for the Council President. He doesn’t know if 15% is the right number but there should be a difference for the position.

Mr. Troper proposed a 20% difference, which is what it is at this time.

Mr. Foust shared that sometimes when he looks at exercises like this he thinks it is helpful to just look at a blank sheet of paper and if you were building this today, what would you look at. Set aside what we have done historically and look at the marketplace. Look at the duties and what they warrant in the marketplace and that largely drives the decision. He thinks members should give less weight to the history they have inherited as a Council and look at it as if you were building this today. Ms. Dorothy thinks that is a very fair assessment. It is obvious to everyone, including our electorate who voted members the ability to be able to change our salary that the position of Council member and Council President is undercompensated.

Ms. Michael provided some quick figures.

Ms. Michael asked if members had any thoughts to share with staff for guidance.
Mr. Myers asked if we are talking about introducing an ordinance at the last meeting of the month. Ms. Michael replied that members can either provide a placeholder or introduce an ordinance with some reasonable number.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if members could introduce an ordinance tonight, Mr. Greeson replied that staff is prepared to do that. Mr. Norstrom thinks members should introduce it tonight and deal with it this year. Members can amend the ordinance in the same manner in which we do for a contract and amend it in two weeks.

Mr. Myers recalls a draft ordinance being circulated. Ms. Michael agreed and presented him with a copy.

Mr. Myers made the following motion:

MOTION  
Mr. Myers made a motion to introduce Ordinance No. 55-2016 to establish the salary of Council members and to begin the process so that it would be effective January 1, 2017.

Mr. Greeson stated that the amendment is to Code Section 121.03. Several members agreed.

Mr. Norstrom suggested the second version of the draft ordinance be the one introduced because it includes OPERS consideration.

Mr. Smith commented that it seems like it would change members’ views if they plugged in $599.00 as the amount as opposed to $601.00. He asked why it was important for members to be included in OPERS. Mr. Norstrom replied because it is a benefit. Mr. Myers added that it is a very cheap benefit. It goes from $500 to $600 and the City contribution amount equates to about $11,000 a year.

Mr. Smith concluded that members wanted it for the benefits. Mr. Norstrom asked him to describe what he means by that. We are doing it for the money. Mr. Myers asked if that was a bad thing. Mr. Norstrom thinks that is what he is saying. Mr. Smith replied that he is just being clear.

Ms. Michael shared that when she talked with Dr. Goorey today he said that he almost hates to see it go up like that because he thinks people should do this as a volunteer job and not be doing this for pay. There may be people who run for office because of the money and not to serve the community.

Mr. Smith thinks members should pick a number based on what Mr. Foust was saying. A number that is fair and appropriate and not because of the benefits that go with it.

Mr. Norstrom commented that members are doing it because it is in the marketplace. You asked what the difference is between $599 and $601 and that is the benefits.
Mr. Smith stated that he is outnumbered so he is backing off.

Mr. Norstrom thinks that Dr. Goorey’s opinion may be one reason the salary has sat at $50.00 forever.

Mr. Myers shared that he expressed the same opinion the last time Mr. Norstrom brought the topic up and it didn’t go anywhere. In subsequent discussions he realized that it is a discussion he has lost also and it is time to move on.

Mr. Norstrom commented that as Mr. Mike Duffey said when members were having this discussion years ago, members can always turn down the salary. Mr. Myers agreed.

Mr. Myers agreed to the second draft version of the ordinance. He suggested the ordinance be introduced with a rate of $600.00 per month for individual council members and $700.00 per month for the President of Council. He added that he just wants to get a number inserted so the public will know the ballpark that Council is considering.

Mr. Greeson commented on a point of order. He stated there is currently an introduced Budget ordinance on the floor that needs to be dealt with first.

Mr. Myers apologized and rescinded his previous motion.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to table Ordinance No. 45-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion to table Ordinance No. 45-2016 passed by a voice vote.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to introduce Ordinance No. 55-2016, the second draft version that was provided that specifically references OPERS minimum, effective January 1, 2017 with an amount of $600.00 per month for Council members and an additional $100.00 per month for the President of Council. While it is not in the ordinance as presented, he would include that it would be based on twelve months and not eleven months.

Ms. Dorothy went on record to say that she is not in favor of any Council salary increase going into effect January 1, 2017. She would like to see it come into effect for newly elected people.
**Ordinance No. 46-2016**


*The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.*

**MOTION**

Mr. Troper made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 46-2016 to include the salary figures that were distributed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

*Mr. Greeson commented that the numbers reflected in the amendment are consistent with those included in the budget that was presented and tabled a few minutes ago. The numbers reflect the direction that Council provided related to compensation for positions that are not subject to collective bargaining. The increase is a 2.75% increase.*

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 46-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Ordinance No. 46-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

**Ordinance No. 47-2016**

To Continue the Allocation of the Six Percent (6%) Hotel/Motel Tax as it Relates to the Operation of the Worthington Area Convention and Visitors Bureau.

*The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.*

*Mr. Greeson shared that during the budget workshop the CVB made presentation to City Council. This ordinance reflects that they receive 66% of the hotel/motel tax, whatever that is.*

*When Mr. Smith asked if the Holiday Inn has begun the redevelopment process, Mr. Greeson replied that they are currently going through the review process. Mr. Norstrom pointed out that members received a memorandum from Lee Brown this evening with an update on that project.*

*Mr. Myers noted that the project is still several months away from ARB approval. After that they will have to provide drawings in order to pull permits. Those drawings may*
take several months to prepare. Mr. Brown shared that the Holiday Inn loses their “flag” in July 2017 so he thinks that is the date that they are working towards. Once it goes through several more months of the ARB and BZA process they will be able to apply for their demolition permit and file their plans with the Building Department. Generally plans get reviewed within seven to ten days and provide comments prior to additional permits being issues.

Mr. Smith stated that when the CVB presented in November they accounted for a July “dead zone” date where no bed taxes will be coming from the Holiday Inn. He was a little surprised to see the budget so low so quickly in 2017. He appreciates what they were trying to do to work with the funds they projected will come but say something would happen with the development, this ordinance, if the hotel doesn’t get demolished and they still get to keep their flag, and that bed tax keeps coming in, they would still receive the bed tax. Mr. Greeson agreed that they would receive 66% the way this ordinance is currently drafted.

Mr. Smith asked if there is any way that the City can supplement their revenue stream to allow them to do a little more advertising and marketing like they have been doing as the first rule in marketing is don’t stop a good thing and getting good result. He believes they have been getting good results.

Mr. Myers commented that they came in and presented figures to Council and they have $80,000 to $85,000 surplus in their general fund. So for at least a year their budget will be about the same. It will be the second year out because then their budget will be zero, depending on what they do with their reserve.

Mr. Smith shared that he is looking at some projections they sent him per his request yesterday for the 2017 budget. They are basically deleting all of their marketing and development outreach opportunities. The ordinance that we are discussing would not be able to fund that because of the current structure that they have. That is his concern because we are basically saying that they can exist but just barely and good luck. He asked if that bothers anybody else.

Mr. Norstrom agreed that it bothers him significantly. He thinks we have an agency in trouble and they have made the decision that rather than fire a person they made a decision that they will cut that person to half time and continue to work in whatever manner as opposed to figuring out a way to spend advertising dollars to support the City.

Mr. Smith shared that he believes it to be a relationship industry so having that person is valuable. His thought was to maybe use some of our economic development funds to increase that person’s time and ability to then work in tandem with the City to gather leads from the visitors that come into the City as an economic development opportunity.

Mr. Norstrom stated that members know his opinion of the CVB. He disagrees with Mr. Smith’s statement that their advertising has been effective.
Ms. Michael disagreed with the statement that this organization is in trouble. Their financial situation is coming not as a result of the CVB management or what they do but as a result of their #1 hotel going through major redevelopment. So their main source of funding is going away for a couple of years and the CVB has no control over that.

Mr. Norstrom he fully understands that the cause of their troubles is nothing that they have fostered, but they are still in trouble. If this was a business, they would basically go out of business for two or three years and then resurrect themselves when the money came back. That is not what they are choosing to do.

Mr. Smith agreed that the practice may be true in the private sector but they are sudo-public sector in a way because they are acting on our behalf and trying to sell a product and generate revenue streams for the City. He sees their success and the City’s success completely tied together.

Ms. Michael shared that both Kathryn Paugh from the Chamber and Nina Parini from the Old Worthington Partnership agree that one of the most important times for not just the Holiday Inn but the whole prospects that are going to be up there is that as the buildings are getting completed, being able to bring in new business, people and visitors and having your marketing going. That is not the time for having your marketing die and try to start from scratch all over again.

Mr. Smith stated that the statement he made several months ago in this room was that at one point he thought that 66% of the bed tax went to the CVB and the remaining percent went to the other community organizations. City staff and other council members think he is wrong about that although he still thinks he is right but if he is wrong about that then why doesn’t the City fund them at 100% of the bed tax. Mr. Norstrom commented that the City’s budget would have to be decreased by that same amount.

Mr. Smith added that we determine that the bed tax wasn’t specifically for those community grants. Mr. Norstrom agreed. The bed tax goes to fund City services and you are saying that the CVB is more important than the City operations. Mr. Smith clarified that he is saying relative to other organizations we have given to, they are as important if not more so.

Ms. Dorothy agreed. She added that the reason we have a City is people and places. We need someone bringing in new people and we need places to thrive to have a City. She sees some reason to have the CVB and to market Worthington to get people in here enjoying the community with other residents.

Ms. Michael commented that she has heard from Mr. Smith regarding the CVB receiving 100% of the bed tax. She asked other members for their thoughts.

Mr. Smith reiterated that his initial instinct is to provide them with assistance from the economic development fund and have them work in tandem with the City to prove out
leads from visitors to Worthington, have a great time and decide to start a business here. Get those contacts in the door.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if he thinks that is a more effective use of our economic development dollars then our current approach, Mr. Smith replied that he thinks building relationships is always the way to go. Mr. Norstrom agreed. He added that he doesn’t think the CVB is the agency to build those relationships. Mr. Smith replied that if we do it right, it absolutely is if they work in tandem. Mr. Norstrom contends that there are cities around this country that realize that CVBs for a City this size is not a good use of monies and they put those funds elsewhere.

Mr. Troper commented that he is fine with funding the CVB in the manner it is currently being funded.

Mr. Myers thinks that changing things right now is kind of the eleventh hour and feels ill prepared to do that. He has some concerns. In past years their budget has been about $140,000. Half of that is $70,000 and with the $80,000 in surplus that they currently have that is a year’s budget that we’ve funded them at this year. If they come back and say they have shut down operations and haven’t done anything even though they have $150,000, he has a problem with that. He thinks they can get a years’ worth of work done with the money they have this year. After seven years of wearing him down, some of Mr. Norstrom’s views are beginning to crystalize with him. He wonders if Council doesn’t really need a full discussion going forward as to the inter-relationship of our economic development department, the Worthington Partnership, the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to see how Council/the City can best coordinate the efforts of all four groups and how to best fund all four groups. He doesn’t think that at the eleventh hour of a budget on the first week of December that members can really have that full and fair discussion of those issues. He believes one bleeds into the other and they all have ramifications. He thinks both Mr. Smith and Mr. Norstrom have made good points on this subject. This topic would be a nice opening retreat topic. Members could spend the better part of a day just talking about this issue. If the City continues with the way we have done our budget that discussion then leads into our budget presentation at the end of next year and frames part of our budget for 2018. That is the way he would like to see it addressed. He hates to kick the can down the path but this is just too big and this has been festering for many years now. It is time members really address the issue.

Mr. Myers proposed that members leave things as it is proposed in the budget at this time. If we are going to make changes, we take a ground up approach as to how we want to do this and we have a full and fair discussion of the topic beginning with the retreat and implement it in the next budget, however that comes out.

Mr. Foust stated that he supports Mr. Myers’ comments. He goes back to his earlier analogy of members starting with a blank piece of paper and determining what it is we are trying to accomplish in this endeavor. If we had no legacy what would members like to see happen and what would be the most efficient way to make that happen. Then see
where the infrastructure that is there dovetails with that and make decisions based on that. Mr. Myers agreed.

Ms. Dorothy agreed with Mr. Myers in that the organizations should be funded how members have already discussed with the current budget. She also agreed that a discussion later on in 2017 about moving forward should be arranged.

Mr. Myers restated that he would like this included as an agenda item for the retreat.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Myers if he is also advocating that the CVB spend its reserve for advertising. Mr. Myers replied yes. He thinks they still need to be out there and be active. Mr. Norstrom commented that is not what they are proposing at the moment. Mr. Myers stated he understands that and if they carry through with that, he will be a little disappointed because they do have the money to fund for at least six months. He would like to see some work for six months. If at the end of six months they feel they have to shut down because they need to carry that reserve for the next year that is their choice. He thinks that is just one item of a much bigger issue. One of the things that he would like to hear about that he doesn’t think he is well enough informed about is the Main Street concept. If that Main Street intertwines with the CVB and how all of that works. If members are going to discuss the Partnership and going forward and how they will interact he needs to know more about that concept. He asked that the topic be included on the agenda with just a brief discussion.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 47-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, Michael

No 1 Norstrom

Ordinance No. 47-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 57-2016 Approving the 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program for the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 57-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson shared that there are no changes from what was previously presented. The plan includes projects, equipment, and debt payments for projects already completed or to be completed. It is about a $39,000,000 program over the five years. The investments
are primarily focused on maintaining existing infrastructure. On the debt side it includes the final five years of the Community Center, Police Station and new debt associated primarily with mandated sewer projects. If members look at the cash flow in the first few years it is essentially revenues meeting expenditures (a little positive in the first year, slight negative in the second year, and positive in the third, fourth and fifth years). So it is particularly tight in the first few years. As we get into the out years staff expects they will be equally tight with some judgments to be made about budgeting revenues and expenditures. Staff thinks it is responsible and continues our practice of trying to effectively maintain the infrastructure of our built out community and recommends that Council approve it this evening.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 57-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 58-2016


Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 58-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Mr. Greeson commented that the compensation levels are accounted for in the proposed budget and does not deviate from that. They are consistent with the increase provided for in the previous ordinance of a 2.75% increase.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 58-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 61-2016

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

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 61-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Ms. Roberts affirmed that this transfer legislation does not increase total appropriations for the 2016 operating budget but rather reallocates funds from one account line to another account line in generally the same function areas for Police, Services, Parks and Recreation and Fire overtime.
There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 61-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 51-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay for Engineering Services for the Central District Sanitary Sewer Improvements on East North Street and Morning Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 618-15)

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

Staff requested that this item as well as Ordinance No. 52-2016 and 54-2016 be set for public hearing on December 19, 2016. Council members agreed to the request.

Mr. Myers asked when the voted charter revisions take effect. Mrs. Thress shared that the City received its certification on the passage of the charter revision today. Mrs. Fox added that the amendments are effective.

Mr. Myers commented that this will be the last time that the President has to read the entire title of the ordinance. Mrs. Fox acknowledged that she could introduce the legislation in summary fashion if she chooses.

Ordinance No. 52-2016

Amending Sections 1141.01, 1141.06, and 1180.02(a), 1181.04(d) and Enacting Section 1141.07 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Make Corrections to Previously Amended Sections.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

Ordinance No. 53-2016

To Amend Sections 1301.06(f) and 1305.08(d) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington, Ohio to Revise Plumbing Fees.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

Staff requested that this ordinance be set for public hearing on December 12, 2016. Council members agreed to the request.

Ordinance No. 54-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations From the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the
2017 New and Replacement Equipment Items and for Certain Projects as Identified in the 2017 Five-Year Capital Improvements Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Projects.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Mr. Greeson shared the following information:

1) A memorandum from Lee Brown was put at members’ places this evening that provides an update on the Holiday Inn
2) He thanked President Michael. At one of the last meetings Council authorized staff to send letters and make calls expressing our concern about a property tax exemption related bill. He reported that it has undergone significant revision as a result of municipal input across the State. It is likely that it will pass but we don’t see it as a negative to municipalities. He will send out a summary of the changes that appear to be part of the final bill.

When asked by Ms. Michael about the AT&T bill, Mr. Greeson shared that there is a great deal of conversation occurring around a bill related to small cell technology. It would essentially preempt some of our right-of-way regulations as it would allow utility providers to place small cell technology in our right-of-way including in our municipal infrastructure and grant some pretty broad authority that is inconsistent with our right-of-way regulations as they exist today. As members can imagine that did not go over well with municipalities. AT&T is the primary advocate of that. We understand that there are significant changes being made to it and hopefully it will be improved.

Ms. Michael added her concern of the loss of home rule this type of legislation would allow. Mr. Smith suggested discussing this issue at the retreat because that is coming at some point. Council may want to preempt it and build out some guidelines for small cells because of driverless cars, etc.

Mr. Greeson agreed that the industry is pushing for statewide regulations and its efficiency and permitting over home rule and that is the tension. As cell towers were, as all of these technologies, it requires a great deal of thought and new legislation.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared that on Friday several staff members and he attended the Economic Development 411 event. There were two outstanding speakers. It was very challenging and very good.
When asked by Ms. Michael if the event was recorded, Mr. Norstrom replied that he thinks so. Ms. Michael asked Mr. Greeson to work to provide members with a link so they can listen to the presentations if they wish. Mr. Norstrom suggested checking the MODE website.

Mr. Smith stated that he would like to add personnel compensation to the Executive Session list of topics.

Mr. Myers expressed his gratitude for how the budget process went this year. He thinks members took steps towards implementing the discussion of the budget as much as a policy item as a financial tool. He hopes that the process continues next year and that what we want to do as a City is reflected in how members discuss and present the budget.

Ms. Dorothy shared that the School Facility Commission had a public meeting tonight as well as another one for everyone in the community at 6:30 at Kilbourne High School. It is a second public meeting with one more sometime next year.

Mr. Troper thanked Mr. Aaron Shank who wrote an excellent letter (copy attached) to Vice Mayor Lorrimer on his presentation to the Field Hockey team on November 21st. It was an excellent letter.

Ms. Michael thanked staff and all of the organizations that did our holiday open house and the luminary shopping. They were two excellent events that took place in our community. Mr. Norstrom shared that both of those events were sponsored and supported by the Partnership.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of Compensation and Personnel. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No  0

Council recessed at 8:56 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to return to open session at 9:35 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.
ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

____________________________________
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of January, 2017.

____________________________________
Council President
Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 12, 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, December 12, 2016, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

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

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, 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, Chief of Fire Scott Highley and Chief of Police Jerry Strait

There were no visitors.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

There were no visitor comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 53-2016

To Amend Sections 1301.06(f) and 1305.08(d) of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington, Ohio to Revise Plumbing Fees.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson informed members that the City contracts with the Franklin County Public Health Department for plumbing inspection services. They increased their fees for inspections this year. The City collects the fees and then remits them to the County. This legislation recommends that the City increase our fees consistent with Franklin County.

Mr. Brown added that he noticed a typo in his memo to Council. It was actually 2003 and not 2013 when the original changes took place. Ms. Dorothy thanked him for the clarification.
There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 53-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No   0

Ordinance No. 53-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

- Discuss Public Notices

*Mr. Greeson shared that Ms. Stewart’s memo outlined a variety of notice issues that we should consider over time. There are two items that Council needs to provide direction on this year. They are found in Section 2.17 and Section 4.03 of the Charter. One relates to the procedure and the passage of ordinances while the second relates to advertising the public hearing on budget estimates.*

*The change to the Charter states that City Council determines annually how to advertise a Notice of Public Hearing on legislation and on the budget. The advertisement could be in a newspaper of general circulation and/or posted on at least one electronic medium. Staff is seeking direction from Council at this time for that method of advertisement.*

*Staff also thought it was important to layout each of the other areas of the Codified Ordinances where there are notices that require them to be published in a newspaper of general circulation. Council has the opportunity, if so desired, to modify that method in the Codified Ordinances as well. Staff would have to bring back legislation for that to occur and could call for electronic notifications if members wants to be consistent with how you want to handle the other ones.*

*Mr. Greeson reported that the notifications include:*  

1) Meeting Notices of Municipal Public Bodies  
2) Notice of Public Hearings  
   a. Passage of Ordinances  
   b. Conditional Use Permits  
   c. Board of Zoning Appeals – Hearings  
   d. Procedure for Change in Zoning Districts  
   e. PUD Procedures  
   f. Architectural District – Application and Notice  
3) Purchasing/Bidding  
4) Hiring/Recruitment of Employees
5) Other
   a. Water Conservation Emergency; Restrictions

Mr. Greeson reported there also being an overview of the discussion with the Charter Review Commission included in the memorandum. They recommended advertising in both the paper and through electronic medium. Several examples of the advertisement in the paper we also included. The electronic medium is arguably more accessible to a broader set of our citizenry, which maybe ten years ago was not the case. Publishing costs average $23,500 annually for these type of advertisements. We have the ability through a number of different electronic mediums to make people aware of our public meetings. Staff would like Council’s input and specific direction in those two areas.

Mr. Smith reported being aware of at least one municipality that has a similar type of “and/or” language. They do a general announcement in a newspaper, possibly quarterly, that says that all of these things can be found on the website or on whatever digital medium Council selects.

Mr. Troper remarked that quarterly notices sound like a waste of money after the first time. He thinks we put the information on our website and make people aware. He views notices to bid differently. Posting those notices somewhere in a publication is going to get a broader reach than just our website. He thinks publishing the notifications is a waste of money because he is not sure if many people look at them.

Mr. Myers recalls the discussion on this subject at the Charter Commission as being pretty spirited. He believes that this represents a compromise between the two sides with the expectation as he understood it. Commission members acknowledged that we are moving towards electronic notification but there was still a certain subset of the population that relies on the newspaper. He thinks that at least for significant event, it was the Commission’s wish that we continue to do both.

Mr. Foust agreed with Mr. Myers recollection of the conversation. He has had some time to think about it since and was going to suggest the direction that Mr. Smith proposed. He thinks the long term goal is to transition to electronic medium but that quarterly published notice is a great way to go after least for a few years.

Mr. Myers shared that he is not sure the Charter Review Commission fully understood what a legal notice was. He thinks they equated notice to the newspaper as an article. He is not sure that many people read those notices unless they are in the profession or if your house is about ready to go into foreclosure and you are curious about when the sale will be.

Mr. Myers reported being in favor of moving the notices of our Boards and Commissions to electronic only because he thinks that everyone who is interested in those, at least with ARB and MPC, they are hooked in and that is where they go for information. His concern about the passage of ordinances and the quarterly notice is what will happen when we get a big application, such as a PUD application in front of Council or an
appeal of an ARB decision or something that may be more significant. Council has worked very hard in the last year on communicating in every way possible. He wants to make certain there isn’t a perception that we have taken a step back because there are still people left in our town that do not do electronic medium very well such as Facebook or twitter.

Mr. Troper clarified that members are talking about putting the information on the City’s website. It has nothing to do with twitter. People have access to the internet although they may not be on twitter or Facebook. He is not on either but he has access to the internet and knows how to access the City’s website. Mr. Myers noted that a concern at the Charter Review Commission was that technology was not a universally held skill set.

Mr. Foust commented that he thinks Mr. Myers’ comments are well placed regarding the attention given to communication. The City has made some progress and we want to build on that. He thinks Council members and probably City staff has a good idea of those things (PUD, appeals, etc.) that are going to be issues drawing attention in general because it is written as and/or. If the default is electronic and members direct staff on those things that could be even potentially controversial. Get the information out there.

Mr. Norstrom directed members to Ms. Stewart’s memo. There are two; Section 2.17 and Section 4.03 that we need to address. He thinks what he is hearing is that we go ahead and publish a notice in the newspaper informing readers that we will no longer be publishing notices in the newspaper. He suggested adding that if anyone objects please contact City staff and then we say that Section 2.17 and Section 4.03 will be published on electronic medium. It could be twitter or Facebook but that is up to staff to figure out the best way to communicate.

Ms. Michael thinks the public should be informed of the selected method.

Mr. Troper noted his opposition to Facebook or twitter being utilized because that would require that people sign in and have an account. Mr. Norstrom commented that younger people as well as older people receive twitter notices.

Mr. Foust shared that as someone who communicates with 88 counties, he has found that twitter is growing significantly. It has certainly become an effective tool within his organization.

Mr. Greeson thinks in the case of Sections 2.17 and 4.03, staff certainly will use twitter and Facebook or whatever evolving social media tool is important to communicate with our community. He has envisioned a more robust section on the City’s website for all of our notices. In this instance, if we are moving away from “newspaper of general circulation” he would recommend that members select the electronic medium as the City website for the notices required in Section 2.17 and 4.03 and that you would further direct, if it is the Council’s desire, that staff periodically place an ad in a newspaper of general circulation promoting the accessibility of those notices on our website.
Mr. Norstrom believes the key issue is whether anyone objects to the switch. If anyone is paying attention to these written notices they will let us know.

Ms. Michael thinks it is important during the transition period to buy some notices to let people know where to look for the notices. Moving the information to the website makes sense to her. She also thinks it should be included in our e-talks and blast it out to all of our groups and organizations.

Ms. Dorothy remarked that the more avenues we have to communicate the information the better as long as they are effective. She also does not want to increase our budget to accomplish this.

Mr. Greeson thinks it would be pretty easy to include a simple link to our public notice section of the website in our newsletters and other publications that get sent out.

Mr. Norstrom believes members to be in agreement on Section 2.17 and 4.03.

Mr. Troper commented that Mr. Norstrom mentioned asking if anyone objects to putting the information in the public notice. He asked what will happen if anyone objects. Mr. Norstrom replied that staff will bring it back to Council for review and evaluation.

Mr. Greeson noted that members will decide annually the best method of advertising those two sections, which would make it pretty easy to change the approach.

Ms. Michael recapped that this year members are looking at moving to the electronic medium for notifications and purchasing some legal notice to let people know where to in the information. There will also be an all-out internal media blitz to let people know where the notices will be published.

Mr. Norstrom added that he would like for staff to report back to Council at the end of January if any negative comments are received.

Mr. Greeson requested a motion for Sections 2.17 and 4.03 notifications. He reiterated that Council is authorizing staff to use an electronic medium, specifically the Worthington.org website to handle notices required by the Charter for Section 2.17 and Section 4.03. In addition, Council is further directing staff to make the public aware of that change by utilizing other electronic medium and periodic advertisements in a newspaper of general circulation.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if he needs a motion to that affect, Mr. Greeson replied that staff will bring back a simple motion.

Mr. Myers and Ms. Fox discussed the differences between a notice in a newspaper of general circulation and a press release to the local paper. Ms. Fox reported that notices are published in the Dispatch because they own the local newspaper. Its prices are the
same and the publication dates with the Dispatch are daily which provide greater flexibility.

Mr. Myers asked whether there would be both notifications, some sort of press release to our local paper and another notice to the newspaper that we would typically publish the notice in? Mr. Greeson replied that if we are not trying to meet deadlines for specific hearings and just making the general public aware then we could buy an advertisement in This Week in Worthington newspaper. Mr. Myers thinks that would be more effective than a legal notice in the Columbus Dispatch. They may not pick up on a press release but at least we could try.

Mr. Greeson asked Mr. Smith if that was close to what he suggested. Mr. Smith agreed that it was. He added that he would prefer it be published locally regardless unless it was a deadline issue. For our purpose, outreach wise, it makes sense to go with the Worthington paper.

Mr. Greeson commented that with that direction staff can prepare something that is clear and concise for members to vote on. He asked if there is any other direction related to the sections that require ordinance changes. Mr. Norstrom replied that he would like to talk about those.

Section 1127.03 Conditional Use Permits – Mr. Norstrom agreed with the previous comments regarding publishing the information in a newspaper as he doesn’t think that is the most effective means. Putting a sign in front of a property that everybody can see and know something is going on is effective. He believes the neighbors also receive direct mail. Mr. Brown agreed that staff send notice to all residents adjacent and across from the application. A blue sign is also posted on the property. He added that the appearance of the blue signs generate most of their calls.

Section 1129.03 Board of Zoning Appeals – Mr. Norstrom recalls that BZA applications are treated the same as MPC/ARB.

Section 1145.02 Procedure for Change in Zoning Districts – Mr. Brown shared that currently we post the property and send direct mail to those properties that are within 300 feet of the property. It is also posted on the website with ARB/MPC and ultimately comes to City Council.

Mr. Norstrom asked if Council should codify the current procedures. Mr. Brown reported that the procedures are addressed in the Code. Ms. Fox believes the only thing that is not in our Code is posting the information on the website. She agreed with Mr. Brown’s comments.

Purchasing/Bidding

Mr. Norstrom shared that he has been involved in sending out the RFP to a number of firms. He assumes that is the process that the City uses. Ms. Fox agreed that we follow
that process. Staff is also evaluating an electronic bidding format that would allow all of those interested contractors to join that bidding organization and receive the notices electronically. So there may be some changes.

Mr. Whited reported that the trend in the contractor/construction bidding process is through the on-line bidding process. Nearly all qualified bidders are a part of that. They receive e-mail notification. They can also find the process for that bidding on the City’s website. Mr. Norstrom stated that he highly recommends electronic bidding. Mr. Whited thanked him. The change will save on many aspects.

Mr. Norstrom asked if there are any industry publications that staff publishes in. Mr. Whited replied not at this time. Mr. Norstrom noted there being no lack of competition in our bidding process. Mr. Whited agreed. He added that Dodge and the other construction industry catalogs and organizations do pick up our bid and post them on their sites as well. When asked by Mr. Norstrom where they are picked up from, Mr. Whited replied from the newspapers and hopefully from our website in the future. They constantly e-mail him for information. Mr. Norstrom commented that staff knows who those organizations are and can e-mail them directly. Mr. Whited agreed.

Ms. Fox reported that with respect to competitive bidding, the State has also gone to a somewhat abbreviated advertising process where there is an advertisement in a newspaper and the second advertisement is then run electronically through a state website or clearinghouse. She thinks that is something that they are trending to as well. Mr. Norstrom thinks that is all great.

Section 925.02 Water Conservation – Mr. Norstrom thinks publishing once in a newspaper when we have a water emergency makes sense. We don’t have to do it like the other ads. It would be front page news if we had a water emergency anyway.

Mr. Greeson commenting on the issue of procurement, stated that staff will be bringing back some ordinances anyway related to design building and some of the other types of procurement that the Charter amendments allow us to pursue so he thinks that would be a good time to deal with the advertisement requirements in that section.

Mr. Norstrom stated that given that we’ve run through those, he recommends that staff change those accordingly and bring a packet back to Council at the next meeting. Ms. Fox doesn’t know if staff will have all of the procedure changes in Chapter 11 ready for next week but if not next week then for the very first part of the new year.

- Community Grant Process

Mr. Greeson reported that Council has already looked at the applications and the review procedures for the process so we do not need to go through that tonight, however the operating budget has $108,535 in it for Special Groups. The Historical Society and the Old Worthington Partnership made presentations to Council and requested $27,500 and
$50,000 respectively. If Council assumes that both of those request are granted in full then that leaves $31,035 to disburse to the other groups. So that raises two questions:

1) Does Council wants to fund the Historical Society and the Old Worthington Partnership in the full amount thus allocating $31,035 to the other Special Group process.

2) Is Council comfortable with using a similar committee make up like we did last year to review the applications for funding? If Council is then staff will proceed to manage that process.

Mr. Troper supported funding the two groups in question 1 at the full amount. He is not sure that a committee is needed to divvy up the remaining $31,000. He thinks Council could do that.

Mr. Myers recalls from last year with the committee approach that there was some frustration on the part of the committee maybe because it was newer or maybe because Council did not provide clear direction as to just exactly what was supposed to happen. He asked if his recollection is accurate at all. Mr. Troper and Mr. Foust agreed to the accuracy of his memory.

Mr. Myers thinks this time he agrees with Mr. Troper. Maybe staff should just bring it back in-house.

Ms. Dorothy commented that members are making the decision right now to prioritize the Historical Society. . . Mr. Myers agreed. He is going on the assumption that Council will fund the Historical Society and the Partnership full ask leaving us with $31,000 to disburse to the remainder of the organizations. Maybe until we can come up with a little better idea of what we can do maybe it is more effective if we just bring it back in-house this year.

Ms. Dorothy stated that by virtue of how we had the people present we already identified them as being higher priority than other groups that didn’t present so we are okay with giving them less money than what they are asking for. We don’t have much money to fund everyone to begin with so we reduced the Historical Society. If we are giving them more then we definitely will reduce everyone else.

When asked by Mr. Myers if the budget figure is higher for 2017 than it was for 2016, Ms. Roberts replied that the budget is sufficient enough to cover the other groups as funded historically, including the allocations that were requested for these two groups.

Ms. Stewart added that if you remove the Historical Society funding last year, the amount given directly through Council was $30,410. Mr. Myers concluded that it is roughly the same amount even if we fully fund the Historical Society at the requested amount.

Ms. Michael asked members how they wanted to proceed with determining funding amounts.
Mr. Myers replied that he isn’t prepared to talk about it tonight because he doesn’t have the material in front of him.

Mr. Greeson ask if members wanted staff to advertise or do you just want us to solicit applications to the groups that were funded last year.

Ms. Dorothy reported being an advocate to solicit more but we went through the whole process where they should have already been an active organization with our groups.

Ms. Michael shared that if we solicit more and do not have more money than we will be giving less funds to those who have been there before or substituting someone who has been there before. Other members agreed.

Mr. Norstrom reported that he does not have a list of who we are now giving to. He recalls a discussion that there would be funds in the budget and members would work out the distribution in the New Year so this is not a decision that has to be made tonight.

Mr. Myers asked if we know if the organizations that the City funded last year even want funds this year. He assumes they do. Mr. Greeson reported there being three new groups last year. All of the other groups have been funded for many years.

Mr. Foust shared a comment from the committee last year that had to do with three separate functions. There was the city municipality marketing, the arts pieces and human service kinds of things. It was his hope coming out of that exercise that we would, perhaps at our winter retreat, take some time and weigh out what it is we are really trying to accomplish with this money. He goes back to this blank sheet of paper. Let’s start fresh and determine what our mission is, what we are trying to accomplish, and determine what we want to support. He thinks we are kind of getting by at this time until we have that more in-depth conversation but we can’t wait until that winter retreat to take these steps in terms of allocation. He asked if that is a fair statement.

Ms. Michael doesn’t know any reason why it couldn’t wait but it depends on when we can get the retreat scheduled.

Mr. Norstrom mentioned that members are dealing with non-profits with relatively small budgets. If we are not going to fund them at what we funded them last year then the earlier they know the better.

Mr. Smith asked when the funding was effective this year. Mr. Myers replied that it was later but he thinks it created some issues for some of the groups.

Mr. Smith shared that he and Mr. Foust were on a committee to create criteria for those grantees that were deemed successful or not successful based on the objectives they told Council. He asked what the timeframe is for that. That is why he asked when they were
originally funded because if it was June then we want to give them a year to finish those objectives.

Mr. Greeson shared that it looks like Council adopted the funding on March 14, 2016. Ms. Stewart added that distribution of funds were later than usual because they were previously awarded in January.

Mr. Smith concluded that members really can’t determine whether they met their objectives or not. Mr. Myers recapped that what Mr. Smith is saying is that members really don’t have an analysis of the benchmarks. Mr. Smith agreed.

Mr. Greeson shared that looking at the list, essentially and reacting respectfully to Mr. Foust’s comment, the CVB and the MAC funding are in a different part of the budget and since we have taken the Partnership and the Historical Society out of it, all of the remaining groups fit into what he categorizes as a social services bucket except for the two groups of Leadership Worthington and Partners for Community and Character.

Mr. Foust asked if you could argue that those two groups fit into the category with those things that kind of define who the City is. Ms. Michael and Mr. Smith agreed.

Ms. Michael questioned whether members need to spend a great deal of time debating this issue. She sees no reason to delay things if we are going to be giving the funds to the same groups.

Ms. Dorothy wants to make sure Council is getting its monies worth. Some of the groups definitely provide services. She doesn’t want to be giving out money if Council doesn’t know what it is getting in return.

Ms. Michael asked if members wanted to continue discussing this topic in January and then make a decision.

Ms. Stewart reported that in the September timeframe City Council had a discussion before we asked the three larger funded groups to come in. At that meeting City Council stated that its top priorities as:

1a. – Basic human necessity such as provision of food and/or clothing for people in need
1b. – Mental health services and/or community counseling to assist people with mental or social health issues
2. – Improvement of the Worthington community

Council adopted the use of the matrix that was used last year within those categories to look at:

1) The need for the initiative
2) The population served
3) Is it primarily the City of Worthington versus Worthington school district?
4) What are their impact indicators?
5) What is their budget?
6) What are their demonstrated financial needs?

So Council actually signed off on all of that back in October. Certainly if Council wants to change those directions at this point you can. Staff can provide all of those materials again but she just wanted to remind members what was discussed back in October.

Ms. Dorothy commented that staff is going to ask everyone who is requesting money from us for that information. Ms. Stewart agreed. She added that at that time Council had signed off on the application and the questions to be asked. It might have been helpful to have that information included in tonight’s packets. The information can be provided again if it is Council’s wish.

Mr. Norstrom thinks it sounds really good. Members did a good job. It sounds like the Kiwanis was a one-off deal so that would not be something he would see Council funding again. It would be good to have that stuff put together.

When asked by Ms. Michael about the timeline, Ms. Stewart recalls from the October discussion that in January all of the application materials were to be distributed. That is why staff was coming to you tonight to make sure we are ready to move forward with issuing those at the beginning of January.

Mr. Myers and Ms. Michael believe Council is ready.

Mr. Greeson shared that staff will prepare a resolution that will specifically allocate the dollars to the Partnership and the Historical Society to members next week. Then members can either tonight or next week authorize staff to initiate the community grant process. Then staff will send the materials out to all of the groups we funded last year.

Mr. Myers commented that he would like to authorize that direction tonight so staff can get the process going.

**MOTION**

Mr. Myers made a motion to authorize staff to take steps in initiate our grant funding program by sending the application to the groups that were previously funded. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Ms. Dorothy interjected that she would like to see the materials posted and made available on the City’s website even though we will not be advertising for new groups.

Ms. Stewart informed members that in the last six months or so staff has been contacted about funding by one or two groups that have not been previously funded. They were informed that information about any potential program would be available at a later
date. She asked if the motion means that Council does not want staff to follow up with those groups and just make it available to previously funded groups.

Ms. Dorothy, Mr. Norstrom and Ms. Michael think that staff should make the applications available to those groups.

**Mr. Myers and Mr. Smith confirmed that they would accept that as an amendment to their previous motion.**

Mr. Myers reaffirmed his motion to include providing the grant packet to those organizations that have requested the information. He asked if that was the understanding that members had. Mr. Smith confirmed that any of the groups from the past will automatically receive a packet while any new groups that have requested the information will be provided a packet. They reiterated that the information will not be broadcasted to the general public that we are accepting applications.

**The amended motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

**Information Item(s)**

- Monthly Financial Report

Mrs. Roberts shared that she will briefly overview the financial report for the month of November. Afterwards, she would request a motion from the City Council for the acceptance of this report for the record.

Mrs. Roberts presented the following financial information:

- Fund balances for all accounts decreased from $23,716,301 to $23,469,095 for the month of November with expenditures exceeding revenues by $247,207.
- Year to date fund balances for all accounts increased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $23,469,095 as of November 30, 2016 with revenues exceeding expenditures by $2,206,000.
- Expenditures for all funds tracked at 89.6% of anticipated expenditure levels.
- Year to date revenues for all funds are above 2015 revenues by $1,069,615 and above year to date estimates by $182,028.
- The General Fund balance increased from $12,178,798 to $12,244,756 for the month of November with revenues exceeding revenues by $65,957.
- The year to date General Fund balance increased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2016 to $12,244,756 with revenues exceeding expenditures by $994,678.
- General Fund expenditures tracked at 91.24% of anticipated expenditure levels.
• Total General Fund revenues are above estimates by $298,361 or 1.24%. The variances are details on page 4 of the report.

• November 2016 income tax collections are above year to date 2015 collections by $1,350,120 or 6.22% and above estimates by $1,050,895 or 4.78%.

Mr. Norstrom commented that Hugh Dorian from the City of Columbus was reported in the newspaper as saying that the City is going to have a difficult year next year. He thinks our governor expects the same to be true for the State. He asked if staff sees any issues on the horizon relative to what they are facing. Ms. Roberts replied that she did not see Mr. Dorian’s article in the newspaper.

Mr. Myers confirmed that he has heard the same comments at the state level. He doesn’t know if this is just pre-budget posturing from Governor Kasich since budget negotiations begin in January but he is predicting a somewhat gloomy forecast for next year.

Mr. Greeson thinks the State has some Medicaid challenges.

Mr. Norstrom congratulated Ms. Roberts on the estimating of expenditures twelve months ago because the numbers are within <1% from what was actual. He believes that to be pretty good budgeting. Ms. Roberts replied that she would like to take full credit but she is sure it is just pure luck.

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to accept the November 2016 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael reported there being a copy of the Old Worthington Association’s, District Improvement Policy proposal at members places this evening. She and Mr. Greeson received the information recently and she wanted to make members are aware of them.

Mr. Greeson shared that none of them should come as a surprise and three are ongoing/long term issues. Several include some collaboration opportunities. One is a fundraising item and two are evaluating certified local governments, which is a historic preservation related item. Staff will evaluate those and maybe report back to Council on how to approach that if it is Council’s desire.

Mr. Greeson shared the following information items:

1) Dr. Browning and his firm was contracted by the Ohio Municipal League to help develop a strategy framework and legislative action agenda that he put at members’ places this evening. The OML has a new executive director, Kent Scarlett, and he has a number of renewed initiatives, one of which is to have a focused strategic plan.
Mr. Greeson shared that he had an opportunity to serve on the committee that worked on this. It will be released publically tomorrow during a press conference at the statehouse at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Scarrett has asked him to be a part of that since he assisted in the effort. So he plans to participate tomorrow in that event. There are a number of items in the plan that are consistent with how the city of Worthington has viewed the State – City relationship. He thinks there is some renewed effort by OML to be relevant to its members so he is pleased with this efforts. Members are welcome to join him tomorrow.

2) An executive session is needed for the purposes of discussing Board and Commission appointments. Ms. Michael added that personnel evaluation and salary for the City Manager is also needed.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared the COTA Board will meet on Wednesday to discuss service changes for early next year, which will effect Worthington with the increased service on High St. It is a very exciting time.

Mr. Myers reported on the Municipal Planning Commission’s meeting from last Thursday meeting.

Ms. Dorothy commented that she serves on the WIFA Board and they will have a presentation about Sayama tomorrow at 7:30 at the Griswold Center.

OTHER

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to meet in Executive Session for the purpose of Appointments to Boards and Commissions and Personnel evaluation and salary. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No 0

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

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to return to open session at 9:09 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.
ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

____________________________________
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of February, 2017.

____________________________________
Council President
Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 19, 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, December 19, 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.

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

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Temporary Clerk of Council Tanya Maria Word, 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, Chief of Fire Scott Highley and Chief of Police Jerry Strait.

There were approximately 3 visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

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

Ordinance No. 55-2016 Amending Section 121.03 of the Codified Ordinances of the City to Establish the Salary of Council Members.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson explained that Council introduced this Ordinance at the last meeting and this is the public hearing on the legislation as introduced it increases the salary to $600.00 per month or such greater amount that will be minimum to qualify for full-time service credit under the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS); and it provides an additional $100.00 per month to the president of Council; we’ve distributed some additional information in particular noting that the OPERS regulations have changed; their regulations indicate that the minimum monthly amount to qualify for full-time service credit in 2017 will be $630.00 and in 2018 it will be $660.00, so that
changes that equation a little bit. I believe Mrs. Roberts is prepared to help address any amendments you may make if you wanted to choose another one of those amounts or answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Norstrom commented to Mr. Greeson, you started your opening by saying it was introduced at the last meeting, it was actually introduced at the December 5th meeting. Mr. Greeson replied thank you for correcting me sir; you are correct. Ms. Michael asked for any thoughts or comments from council members; right now the Ordinance is $600.00, we’ve also heard a number of $630.00 and a number of $660.00.

Ms. Dorothy commented I think it’s obvious that the council members of Worthington should have a raise, I am in not in favor of having an interim raise, but I do think it’s very appropriate that we have a conversation about new council members having an increase in compensation for their service to the city. Any of those amounts would be appropriate.

Mr. Norstrom remarked based on the prior discussion, I think $630 and $660 is where we would be because we said we wanted to be at the minimum of OPERS. Ms. Michael asked if you had to go between $630 and $660, what would your preference be. Mr. Norstrom replied $630 the first year and $660 the second year. Ms. Michael asked Mrs. Fox can we do that or does it have to be a set number now. Mrs. Fox replied the way the Ordinance is written although it was introduced at $600.00 per month, the salary on January 1, 2017 will $630.00 per month because that’s what the OPERS minimum is going to be raised to and then on January 1, 2018 the salary will become $660.00 per month. Mr. Norstrom asked so we don’t necessarily have to specify anything at this point and time because of the way that the Ordinance is written, it allows for that. Mrs. Fox replied the way the Ordinance is written it automatically increases, however, to be clear that increase will not apply to all seven (7) council members on January 1, 2018 because the Charter prevents further increases after the one-time raise to be applied to council members during their term.

Ms. Michael commented so if I’m understanding this correctly, if we leave it as is there would be $630.00 that council would be paid monthly in 2017 and after that the $660.00 would be to those two people who are elected in 2017 beginning their term in 2018 and the other remaining council members would be receiving the $630.00 and not full PERS beginning 2018, am I understanding this correctly. Mrs. Fox replied that is correct.

Mr. Norstrom asked if we as this council were to pass the motion with a two-step, then next year council would not be increasing their salaries and that would not violate our Ordinance, is this correct. Mrs. Fox asked for a little more clarification from Mr. Norstrom. Mr. Norstrom commented if we pass an Ordinance tonight that says $630.00 and $660.00, we’re increasing it to $630.00 for 2017 and $660.00 for 2018. Mrs. Fox commented that second increase would not apply to all seven (7) council members in 2018. Ms. Michael commented so in order to have something applied to the council members for two years it would have to go to the amount of $660.00. Mrs. Fox replied yes you could raise it to $660.00 and you would eliminate the language “or such greater
amount that will be the minimum to qualify for full-time service credit for the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System.”

Mr. Myers commented to be honest I never thought I would support $660.00, but that would be my preference because what I don’t want to see is an automatic escalator if PERS decides to then up again and therefore we would essentially have an unvoted raise that could go on indefinitely. I don’t think that was the intent of the Charter Review Commission and I want to make certain that if that’s the path we want to take, we have to do that and debate that at a minimum every year or two. Mr. Foust commented so to satisfy Mr. Myers concern, am I thinking we would want to remove the language “or such greater amount that will be the minimum to qualify for full-time service credit for the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System.” Let’s say for the sake of easy numbers that PERS chooses to raise it $10.00 every year, those councilpersons sworn in January 2018 would be at $660.00 and if it goes up $10.00 each year, they would remain at $660.00 for their entire four years as it goes to $670.00, $680.00, $690.00 and $700.00 and then if they were to return again, they would move to at that time $700.00. Mr. Myers replied if we voted on another raise for those people, it would not be automatic. I would say lock it at $660.00 now, that’s all we get until we vote on it again.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Myers as one who was there, do you feel it honors the intent of the Charter Review Commission. Mr. Myers replied I think it does. I think it is a one-time raise, that’s what the Charter Review Commission voted for, and that’s what the people voted for overwhelmingly and if you look at the Chart, a great number of municipalities in central Ohio as well as probably the Cleveland and Cincinnati areas paid their salaries to PERS service contribution because we are municipal employees of the sort. I think that’s a rational argument for the amount. Mr. Foust commented I would support that position.

Mr. Smith stated for the record, I am not opposed to a council pay rate increase. As you know we have the lowest pay of any comparable community listed on the comparison chart. We should certainly not be last place on any list. Having the same rate of pay since 1988 compels us to look at the pay rate.

Thanks to the recently passed charter amendment, Council can increase pay one time so that all members get equal pay for equal work. Previous to the charter amendment, half the members of council would get more pay than the other half of the members, but they are all doing the same job. Ethically, that does not make sense to me. So, I do support a pay increase for all of us, at least this one time. But how much should our pay rate be?

Many central Ohio cities have the OPERS minimum listed as their council pay rate. For Worthington to increase the council pay rate to the OPERS minimum would increase our council allocation from $15,000 to $53,000 (with a slightly higher pay for council president). Keep in mind that these "Comparable" central Ohio communities generally have higher populations and bigger budgets. The community that is closest to Worthington in population and budget size is Pataskala. Their council pay is $500/month.
To me, this seems reasonable, and it is the highest we should increase our pay at this time. As I stated previously, my proposal ranges from $300-$500/month. The $300/month comes from the inflation rate from 1988 to present. And, changing the pay to a monthly pay instead of our current 'pay-per-meeting' format makes much more sense because of staff time and current payroll practices.

To increase to $300/month ($400 for president), our budget allocation would increase by $11,400.

If we increase our pay to the OPERS minimum of $630 as of Jan. 1, 2017, we will increase our allocation by $38,000, totaling Approximately $53,000 since the city would pay 14 percent for OPERS contributions in addition to our $630 monthly pay. This total is $26,000 more than my $300/month proposal.

Current $15,000
Proposed $45,360 plus $7,610= $52,970, Approximately $38,000 increase.
Doug’s highest proposal $43,200, which is $28,000 increase.
Doug’s suggested proposal $26,400, which is $11,400 increase and more than $26,000 savings for other city services and programs.

Mr. Troper asked Mr. Smith do you currently participate in PERS. Mr. Smith replied I do. Mr. Troper said so the additional benefit in terms of service credit would not be of benefit to you….is that correct. Mr. Smith replied as of today that is correct.

Mr. Norstrom commented a year ago we were having these discussions about this time and I proposed that we go to $600.00 per month at that point and time for the new members coming in because I felt based on the information we had that we were dramatically underpaid and that was the time to do it; unfortunately other members of council did not agree with me, but I want to make the point that I have been a long supporter of increasing the amount that council gets paid and I support the proposal as of tonight; although I would like to have our legal counsel pursue because as I understand it, if PERS goes up periodically and we are not allowed to basically pass a motion that says we stay at the minimum, I’m not sure why if we pass that now, it’s not good and we’re not voting on increasing our pay, except I do understand that it could be considered a two-time increase, so for future we need to monitor that; I do understand what Mr. Myers position is, but future councils are going to have to look at that closely.

Mr. Troper expressed while I agree with Ms. Dorothy’s comments that the interim raise is not viewed by some as not appropriate given the fact that serving on council it’s only fair to give everyone a raise at the same time. President Michael has been on Council more years than I think the four or five Council members combined, so given all these facts, I think it’s fair and appropriate in accordance with the Charter Review Commission that we are all given raises at the same time.
MOTION: Councilmember Myers made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 55-2016 to increase the amount to $660.00 per month to qualify for full-time service credit for the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System. The President of Council shall receive an additional $100.00 per month. Delete the verbiage/sentence after the sentence “The President of Council shall receive an additional $100.00 per month.” Let the Charter language control as to how subsequent Council increases will take effect. Also delete “or such greater amount that will be the minimum to qualify for full-time service credit for the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System. Councilmember Dorothy seconded the motion.

There being no additional comments, the motion to amend Ordinance No. 55-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

The Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 55-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5  Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Myers and Michael

No 2  Dorothy and Smith

Ordinance No. 55-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 45-2016 Providing for the Adoption of the Annual Budget for the Fiscal Year 2017 and Appropriating Sums for Current Operating Expenses.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

MOTION: Councilmember Troper made a motion to remove Ordinance No. 45-2016 from the table. Councilmember Dorothy seconded the motion.

Ms. Michael asked for a motion to amend Ordinance No. 45-2016 with the following budget totals that she read for the record:

Total General Government $ 7,060,656
Total Division of Police $ 5,960,184
Total Department of Public Service and Engineering $ 2,523,074
Total Department of Parks & Recreation $ 4,780,643
Total Dept. of Planning & Building $756,507
Sub-Total General Fund $21,081,064
Total Division of Fire $6,501,944
TOTAL GENERAL FUND $27,583,008

Total Street Maintenance & Repair Fund $988,029
Total State Highway Fund $140,658
Total Water Distribution Fund $86,218
Total Sanitary Sewer Fund $74,718
Total Police Pension Fund $650,000
Law Enforcement Trust $12,500
MMVLT Fund $150,000
Education Supplies $3,500
Court Clerk Computer Supplies $53,500
Economic Development Efforts $583,000
Total Revolving Funds $1,021,843
Special Parks Fund $-0-
Capital Improvements Fund $1,438,300
General Bond Retirement Debt Service $2,448,016
O.B.B.S. Surcharge $7,500
Worthington Station Municipal Public Improvement TIF $125,000
Worthington Place (The Heights) TIF $189,000

MOTION Councilmember Myers made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 45-2016 with the aforementioned budget totals. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

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

The Clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 51-2016 Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay for Engineering Services for the Central District Sanitary Sewer
Improvements on East North Street and Morning Street and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 618-15)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Whited explained the first step in that process is soliciting engineering services to design the fix for these deficiencies. One critical area is at the intersection of E. North Street and Morning Street. Several sub-basins drain to an obsolete system of multiple manholes. Undersized piping limiting capacity in these sub-basins intensifies the problem and puts the system at risk of overflowing due to lack of efficiency. We are seeking qualified engineering of the system in this area to alleviate all deficiencies and eliminate the risk of eminent sanitary sewer overflows. DLZ has conducted a study of the area and has data and knowledge necessary to do the design work.

Staff is recommending approval by Council to enter into an agreement with DLZ to engineer and design the project. With approval, we plan to proceed immediately to complete design and solicit bids for construction in 2017.

Ms. Dorothy asked when would the plans be started and finished and when would we go to bid. Mr. Whited replied it would be started within the period of time it takes for this Ordinance to become official; it’s about a 20 week process with some lead way in there for programming with the City of Columbus and Ohio EPA as well as the permit to install, so probably a total of about including the bidding process approximately 32 weeks, so it would be a spring construction.

Ms. Dorothy asked do you have an idea of how far we are done with our sanitary improvements EPA mandated. Mr. Whited replied I don’t have a cost on that; some of the stuff is still undetermined with the West study and the industrial area study. I don’t have the sanitary sewer studies completed yet. How about the timeline of when we have to have them completed. Mr. Whited commented I don’t have that information in front of me, but I can tell you there is several more years of it left. Mr. Greeson replied we can get an update on maybe studies to-date, maybe projects to-date and then what we have left; our five-year CIP anticipates that we’re going to be compliant and meet our deadline.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 51-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 51-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.
Ordinance No. 52-2016 Amending Sections 1141.01, 1141.06, and 1180.02(a), 1181.04(d) and Enacting Section 1141.07 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Make Corrections to Previously Amended Sections.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Brown indicated City Council has approved several amendments to the Planning & Zoning Code. It has been determined that in the course of approval of those amendments, certain errors were inadvertently made that require correction. These amendments have been made to the Planning and Zoning Code regarding Planned Use Districts, retaining walls in the setback and the Wilson Bridge Road zoning districts

1. **1141.01 DIVISION INTO DISTRICTS**
The City is hereby divided into districts under four six general categories which shall be known as: Open Area Districts, Residential Districts, Commercial Districts, Industrial Districts, Planned Use Districts and Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts.

- Added Planned Use Districts and Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts to how the City is divided into six general categories vs. the previous four general categories.

2. **1141.06 PLANNED USE DISTRICTS**
Areas for a mixture of land uses that are compatible with each other and adjacent development with creation of development standards and design characteristics to promote the housing and economic development goals of the City; provide for supporting community facilities; and ensure integration and conformity with the community.

- When City Council approved the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning, Section 1141.06 WILSON BRIDGE CORRIDOR DISTRICTS was referenced to refer to Section 1181.06 of the Codified Ordinances for the Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts, however it should have referenced it as Section 1141.07.

3. **1180.02 “R” DISTRICTS**
(a) In any "R" District, no fence or wall shall be erected in the area between the right-of-way line and the building setback line except for a wall necessary to accommodate differences in grade. No fence or wall in an "R" district shall exceed a height of six feet.

- The underlined text was inadvertently left out when this section of the Code moved from the Chapter 13 Building Code to Chapter 11 Planning & Zoning Code in 2010.
4. **1181.04 GENERAL PROVISIONS**  
(d) Redevelopment and/or change of use proposals in the WBC shall be a minimum of 2-acres of land and 200’ of frontage along the Right-of-Way.  
- The minimum acreage that was discussed throughout the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning amendment referenced a minimum of 2-acres not 3-acres in all the drafts and presentations that were presented to the general public, ARB, MPC and ultimately City Council for approval.

5. **1141.07 WILSON BRIDGE CORRIDOR DISTRICTS**  
Refer to Section 1181.06 of the Codified Ordinances for the Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts.  
- This corrects what was originally referenced as Section 1181.06 in the Codified Ordinances.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 52-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:  

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

Ordinance No. 52-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

**Ordinance No. 54-2016**  
Amending Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations From the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the 2017 New and Replacement Equipment Items and for Certain Projects as Identified in the 2017 Five-Year Capital Improvements Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Projects.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mrs. Stewart explained with the Budget Ordinance just being adopted, we typically with the operation budget also include the appropriation at the time that the budget is adopted so that those monies are appropriated once the new year starts; however with the Capital Improvements Plan, we don’t typically approve appropriations at the same time that the plan is adopted, so you may recall you recently adopted the 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Plan and that was done by Resolution, but we often bring back projects once they’re bid to come back with recommendations on award of the contract and the appropriation amount at that time; however there’s a number of things in the Capital
Improvements Plan for 2017 as well as other years in the CIP, but right now we’re focused on 2017 that aren’t going to be subject to bid, so the equipment purchases that are scheduled to be made in 2017 as well as some of the smaller cost projects won’t be going forward to bid, so it’s become our practice to bring back an appropriation ordinance to appropriate those funds for the 2017 program and thus allow staff to move forward with those purchases and with those smaller projects; so that’s what this appropriation Ordinance does, it appropriates the funds for the equipment replacement as well as 19 projects that will not need to be bid given our bid thresholds.

Mr. Foust commented just clarification for me, when you say below bid threshold, does that mean that although they don’t necessarily have to go through the entire process as written, do you still shop the market at all. Mrs. Stewart replied we do have a competitive process, typically a more informal quote process where we’re not preparing formal bid documents and doing the sealed bid procedure, but we do an informal quote process where we’re still comparing prices.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 54-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 54-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 62-2016 Approving 2017 Grant Funding for the Old Worthington Partnership and the Worthington Historical Society.

Introduced by Councilmember Norstrom.

MOTION Councilmember Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 62-2016. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 62-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.
Resolution No. 63-2016

Approving an Agreement and Permit for and between AT&T Ohio, Inc., and Ohio Corporation, to Operate and Maintain a Telecommunications System Within the City of Worthington Pursuant to and Subject to the Provisions of Chapter 949 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Councilmember Dorothy.

Mr. Norstrom commented I have a question unrelated to this, where did the outcome of what AT&T and others in the State wanted come out. Mr. Greeson replied it passed, it was significantly modified; by the time it passed we were still opposed because it was essentially in a rushed erosion of the home rules and we didn’t have an opportunity to evaluate its impact, but it did pass and is something that all municipalities are going to have to evaluate how it impacts them and work with the provider. Mr. Norstrom replied I guess the question is potentially these types of Resolutions would not come before us in the future. Mr. Greeson replied this is our existing Codified Ordinance provisions which would still govern these type of permits, what the legislation dealt with as I understand it is a small cell technology which one of the arguments we made is it setting one set of technologies with one regulatory and another set of technology with another regulatory system.

MOTION

Councilmember Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 63-2016. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 63-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 64-2016


Introduced by Councilmember Norstrom.

Ms. Michael read the following names being reappointed to the Municipal Planning Commission:

- Mikel Coulter
- Tom Reis
- Scott Myers (Council Appointee) (One-Year Term)

Ms. Michael read the following names being reappointed to the Architectural Review Board:

- Dave Foust
- Amy Lloyd
Mr. Foust and Mr. Myers both requested to abstain from voting on this Resolution.

MOTION Councilmember Troper made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 64-2016. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 64-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.


Introduced by Councilmember Norstrom.

Ms. Michael read the following names being reappointed to the Worthington International Friendship Association (WIFA):

- Ryan Hoover
- Anne Brown
- Bob Chosy
- Virginia Duym
- Jeanne Earhart
- Joe Kohler

In addition the following persons are being appointed as new board members; these people represented Worthington and WIFA on the 2016 delegation to our sister city Sayama, Japan:

- Beth Cullinan
- Marsha Mueller
- Nicky Robie
- Jody Schomaker

The new appointments and reappointments would serve terms through 12/31/19.

MOTION Councilmember Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 65-2016. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 65-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.
REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Liquor Permit Request – Trex – Borgata Pizza Bistro - Wine Bar LLC

Mr. Greeson shared that this is a tenant that is going into Linworth Crossing. They are requesting a D-2 permit; you’ve already authorized the Trex which is declaring this an economic development project and allowing a TREX from another part of Ohio to Worthington; you approved it for the D1 and D3 permits which are for bear and spirited liquor; this permit this evening is for the wine and mixed beverages that accompanies those for Borgata that will be located in the new Linworth Shopping Center. Staff is not aware of any reason to object.

MOTION

Councilmember Myers made a motion to not request a hearing on the new liquor permit request by Borgata Pizza Bistro – Wine Bar. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Public Notices of Public Hearings on Ordinances and Budget Estimates

Mr. Troper asked how much does the ad cost or an approximation. I disagree with the fact that we need to keep advertising that we’re no longer putting the information….I feel that once is enough, I don’t think you need to keep advertising. Ms. Michael stated I think we’re looking at doing this four (4) times per year as opposed to every Ordinance. Mr. Troper replied I think advertising it once is enough. Mr. Foust commented I appreciate Mr. Troper’s viewpoint, I thought in our discussion that we were going down a path of phasing out if you will and so at least in my mind what that looked like was maybe for a year we do a quarterly advertising and then we’re done. Ms. Michael replied that’s what the recommendation is. Mr. Foust replied I’m not sure I read it that way; I think this leaves discretion to staff to basically drop the newspaper ad immediately; it’s an “and/or”; and again I don’t think we need to change what’s written here, but I think it would be nice to at least suggest to staff that for the first year or so we go old school.

Mr. Greeson chimed in you can just approve it minus the “or”; that would be fine. Mr. Norstrom commented I’m not sure I agree with Mr. Foust on keeping it old school, I thought we discussed that we would let the public know we’re going to put it all on websites and other ways and see if anybody said anything; if they didn’t, we would just let it go; if they did, we would publish periodically….notice that we are putting on the website. I think this allows us to do that, I don’t feel that we need to do it unless we hear from the public they want it in the newspaper.
Mr. Myers indicated I support the motion as presented, I think it is an effective compromise between the two positions of no newspapers and all newspapers and it allows us to phase it in; I don’t think it’s all that difficult to do. Mr. Foust commented I’m comfortable with the language as recommended.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Myers made approving the following motion: For 2017, notices of public hearings on ordinances and budget estimates will be published in a public notices section of the City’s website ([www.worthington.org](http://www.worthington.org)). Staff is directed to promote the availability of these notices on the City’s website at least quarterly via press release and/or newspaper ad, and through the City’s communication vehicles, including the City’s website News Flash, Neighborhood Network and social media. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Dorothy.

The motion carried by a voice vote of six (6). Councilmember Michael Troper opposed.

**REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**COUNCILMEMBER DOROTHY** – wished everyone a safe and Happy Holiday.

**COUNCILMEMBER FOUST** – I submitted a letter of appeal regarding the decision by the ARB to permit installation of solar panels for 661 Evening Street, Application #AR-129-16 to City Council. I believe the solar panels as approved may be inconsistent with established City Design Guidelines and therefore merit further review.

Councilmember Myers asked Mrs. Fox when do we have to decide whether we will hear it. Mrs. Fox replied there is no time line on when you need to decide whether or not to hear the appeal, but if you choose to hear the appeal, you have to hold the hearing within 60 days from the date of the decision. Mr. Myers asked so as long as we address this issue in January we’re okay. Mrs. Fox replied yes.

**COUNCILMEMBER MICHAEL** – I wish to pass on some of the comments I’ve heard from our public to both our Parks & Recreation and Service Departments on the outstanding job that both departments have done throughout our city (i.e. the holiday programs that we’ve had, the beautiful Christmas lights that are up, please pass it on to the staff they’re adding a lot to the feel of the holiday for everyone and keeping everybody safe.

**COUNCILMEMBER MYERS** – wished all Happy Holidays.

**COUNCILMEMBER NORSTROM** – acknowledged everyone in their festive holiday attire; wished everyone Happy Holidays.
COUNCILMEMBER SMITH – wished everyone Happy Holidays

COUNCILMEMBER TROPER – wished everyone Happy Holidays and Happy New Year’s.

REPORT OF CITY OFFICIALS

Mr. Greeson stated I am really pleased to share with City Council this evening we have made some promotions within our police division:

- Sgt. Michael Holton is now Lt. Holton
- Officer Damien St. John is now Sgt. St. John
- Officer Jeff Kubersek is now Sgt. Kubersek

We’re going to send out some information from an OSU class we’ve been working with that has been evaluating sustainability ideas in Worthington and they shared with us their PowerPoint presentations and we’ll send that out to you on a variety of sustainability topics.

You have two (2) Community Relations Commission applications in front of you to take with you for review.

You have a memo from Mr. Brown also for your review about ideas on how to approach redevelopment on the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Road.

We’ve met a couple times recently with Franklin County Residential Services and you may have read an article not too long ago in the newspaper; they are a large non-profit that provides a number of direct services and residential options for the developmentally disabled here in Franklin County. They primarily serve an adult population and have been in existence for about 30 years. They’ve entered into a management contract with Step-by-Step Academy and for the next 120 days (we’re a little bit into that time period now), they are evaluating and essentially overseeing the operations of Step-by-Step and the goal that they are pursuing is to merge the two organizations; Franklin County Residential Services is currently located over in the Busch Boulevard area right next to the Sheltered Workshop if you’re familiar with where that is.

That is their goal, they are doing a number of things, they’re going to start community outreach; they’ve met with staff and we’ve briefed President Michael on it; they are now doing some facility evaluations and things like that, and so we expect that they’ll want to brief Council soon and we may bring them before you in the early part of the year to talk about who they are and what they do and they might envision working with the community. They will likely bring over employees from their operations to the east of us including their corporate office staff.

Mr. Hurley stated Ms. Michael I know you are familiar with the Ohio Parks and Recreation and their annual awards program; this year 131 programs and projects were
nominated for their annual awards and we are excited that our Storytime and our Park Program received one of nine first place awards in the area of Programs, so we’ll be receiving that award at their annual conference in February and in addition to that, we just received notification they select three (3) award winners to be nominated for the Governor’s Award for (1) overall award winner and we are one of those three; that is only the second time that has occurred, the Dog Park Partnership was also a finalist, but didn’t win. We’ll keep you posted in February on how we do when we get there.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Councilmember Dorothy made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss compensation of public officials. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Myers.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

Council recessed at 8:25 P.M. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Councilmember Foust made a motion to return to open session at 9:05 P.M. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:07 P.M.

____________________________________
Temporary Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of February, 2017.

_______________________________
Council President
Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 3, 2017 ~ 7:30 P.M.

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

City Council

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

D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Tuesday, January 3, 2017, 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.


Member(s) Absent: Scott Myers

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

There were eleven visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

APEALS

• Determination on whether the Council elects to hold a public hearing on the appeal of an Architectural Review Board application for solar panels at 661 Evening St.

Mr. Greeson commenting on procedure, shared that an appeal has been filed by Council member Foust in accordance with the Codified Ordinances. Council will need to elect or not to hold a hearing on the appeal. If Council decides to hold a hearing, it will have to do so within 60 days of the final Architectural Review Board (ARB) decision. If Council decides not to hear the appeal then the ARB decision stands. An appeals means that members are deciding tonight whether or not to hold a hearing. Staff is prepared to provide a PowerPoint presentation if members wish. The entire ARB packet was included in the Council agenda packet along with e-mails received from residents.

Mr. Greeson stated that if Council elects to hold a hearing, staff will go through the entire presentation. Tonight, Council will need to decide how much information it will need to make a decision on whether or not to hold an appeal hearing.

Ms. Michael noted that the appeal hearing will determine whether or not solar panels are appropriate on this particular house under the current guidelines. Mr. Greeson agreed.
Ms. Dorothy commented that there was an ordinance in 2016 that allows Council members to apply for an appeal but there is no automatic right to a hearing. Mr. Greeson agreed. The ordinance states that an aggrieved party or a Council member can file an appeal. It is the Council as a whole that elects whether or not to hear the appeal.

Ms. Michael thinks it would be helpful to read the existing guideline.

Mr. Brown reported that in February 2010 City Council looked at adding a sustainability section to the Planning and Zoning Code and to the Worthington Design Guidelines. One of the “WHEREASs” reads:

“City Council and the Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District.”

Within that Ordinance was an attachment related to sustainability and recommendations. Item “C” which relates to solar panels states:

“Place solar panels in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties. Generally, panels should be located on roofs in the following manner: the rear 50% of the roof of the main building; the rear inside quadrant of the roof of a main building on a corner lot; or on accessory structures in the rear yard. On sloped roofs, place panels flush along the roof unless visibility is decreased with other placement. With flat roofs, keep panels at least 5’ from the edge of the roof, or place at the edge if a building parapet exists that will screen the panels.

Solar panels at another location on a building or site may be acceptable if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, or the character of the site or Architectural Review District.

The equipment to support solar panels should be screened from view.”

Mr. Brown reported that guidance was added to the Worthington Design Guidelines in February 2010.

Mr. Foust stated that as the appellant on this request he would like to share a couple of comments. While he realizes that tonight is about a particular application, he feels that there is a bigger issue that he would like for Council to take up, if not at this moment then at some point in the very near future.

As he listened to a presentation fourteen months ago, he is not sure that the guidelines just read by Mr. Brown were honored in the 2016 appeal request, which troubled him at the time. He shared phrases like slippery slope or precedence with some members of the ARB following that meeting and he continues to have concerns. He thinks this is about whether city leadership has provided sufficient guidance to ARB regarding how they
should incorporate current technology into architectural standards. The conversations and split votes suggest that we haven’t. He thinks it is about moving forward thoughtfully and the co-existence of heritage and character with technology. He has read the e-mails that were received and is grateful for that input. He doesn’t think that this is about global warming or polar icecaps or fracking nor is it about stopping anything. He is one of seven votes but he believes all of his colleagues support the value of clean renewal energy, our impact on the planet, and our legacy we leave for future generations. He shared that in his day job he helped pave the way for local government to incorporate wind and solar power into their local infrastructure. The point being, he is not anti-anything. As he looks back at the things he voiced in his 2015 campaign and 5,000+ people seemed to agree with it, he talked about things like responsible development based on doing our homework, understanding the impact on schools, traffic and yes, the environment. In preserving those things that caused many of us to choose Worthington as our home. He raises this simply as a matter of getting city leadership to look at this in the same manner as it does any architectural issue. He thinks the goal is to create guidance for the ARB in response to changing technology that allows clean energy alternatives and the long established architectural character of our City, both in and out of the Architectural Review District to co-exist. He added that to him, no single factor here trumps another factor. To him, it is a matter of striking a balance.

Ms. Dorothy commented that she thinks the ARB meeting did a good job identifying the balance we have in the community, specifically in the Architectural Review District. They noted that the house was a ranch style built in 1955 and not a contributing structure in Worthington. All throughout the community we have technology included in the community. For technology we have electric power lines that she thinks are more out of charter with Worthington. It would be great if we could get rid of those. She thinks this is a modern technology that needs to be approved throughout the city including the AR District. She didn’t see anyone against the initial filing including in e-mails and thinks the ARB decision is appropriate for this house.

Mr. Troper added his agreement to Ms. Dorothy’s comments. This house is not a contributing structure in the Worthington historic district. He shared that he met with Ms. Dole about the house and her intent to install the panels. He thinks if we were looking at an older home in the historic district it might be more appropriate for solar shingles but that might be something Council could look into in redefining the guidelines. He supports the solar panels for this particular house.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Foust in that a larger conversation is needed and soon. He hopes that will occur during this year’s retreat and also include electric vehicle stations and any other renewable energy type of progression such as the nods that the state of Ohio just approved as law for AT&T to install on public property. He thinks they will allow some guidelines for architectural and aesthetics as well. Until that point he thinks it should be addressed on a case by case situation. He likes the look of solar panels and he likes them on this structure.
Ms. Michael thinks she is hearing the need for a larger conversation, perhaps restructuring our guidelines. That could be a discussion topic for the February Committee of the Whole meeting.

Mr. Norstrom shared that the thing he doesn’t understand from some of his fellow Council members is whether they read the council approved ordinance that allowed those guidelines to be established. Basically the part that says, “solar panels should be screened from view.” The intention is that the solar panels not be seen from the front of the house. We have fifty years of an Architecture Review District. Before we allow another mistake in that district, he thinks this discussion is the necessary discussion. When we passed this legislation solar tiles were not an option. Those are now available and he imagines that in a few years there will be other options for solar on houses. But Council has worked hard and maybe it is time to change and get rid of the ARB completely. We have established a district and said we want to protect the architecture in that district. As much as he is a solar advocate and has looked at it for his house, it is not appropriate to put the panels in a visible location. That is what Council has stated. He would support the appeal being heard by Council just to debate that issue. If Council doesn’t debate the topic then this application goes forward without that debate. He thinks that debate is important for Council. We either let it go forward on this case or we stop it with this case. Council should not make another exception to our rules.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she has read the guidelines. They also state: “Solar panels in another location on a building or site may be acceptable if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, or the character of the site or Architectural Review District.” That is what Council is talking about right now, which she believes ARB did a good job.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he fully agrees with Ms. Dorothy but the question is what is meant by the “architectural effect of the building.” It is not clear. He knows what that meant when he served on the ARB and this application would not have been approved but it was. The question is whether Council wants to define the adverse effect on architect and buildings now and have that debate. To say that we are not going to have that debate, he doesn’t think is appropriate for the City or for the district.

Ms. Dorothy thinks Council can have that debate without having a hearing on this application. Mr. Norstrom agreed. He added that by doing so Council has potentially allowed a violation of what it wants. If members agree that Council should have that debate then let’s have it now.

Ms. Dorothy informed members that she wants solar panels in the AR district. When asked by Mr. Norstrom if she wants them to have an adverse effect, Ms. Dorothy replied that she doesn’t think it has an adverse effect.

Mr. Smith shared that the definition is based on the Council or Board’s understanding of that definition at the time. Obviously it changes. It is probably going to be changing.
based on a debate that Council will have at a future time. Using this mechanism as an appeal of somebody's house specifically is a poor way to go about that debate.

Mr. Norstrom agreed. Council should have that conversation and we should stop this from going forward because if we were to have that conversation and determine that this would violate what members want in the district then Council should not allow it to happen.

Mr. Smith stated members can vote on that tonight can’t we? Mr. Norstrom agreed that they could.

Mr. Foust agreed with Ms. Dorothy in that they both want solar panels. The question he would pose to Ms. Dorothy and Mr. Troper is where is the harm? We have a precedent and a year ago we raised a concern about whether Council had set a precedent. That precedent has been cited in making a case for a second. So does Council double the number of violations from one to two? Where is the harm in stopping and having a thoughtful conversation before proceeding with a second, possibly erroneous decision?

Mr. Norstrom added that Council is without Mr. Myers this evening. Ms. Michael shared that Mr. Myers contacted her and she has his comments to share. Mr. Norstrom doesn’t think his comments are appropriate because he is not part of the debate.

Ms. Michael informed members that while Mr. Myers left work early because he was ill, he asked that she share his support to accept the appeal for a hearing by Council.

Michael Bates, 6560 Evening St.
Mr. Bates thinks that he misunderstood what tonight's meeting was about. He thought it was going to be a discussion on the solar panels themselves in the architectural district. But since this has come up this evening and the way that Mr. Brown has read the code, it does seem like the solar panels meet the code. The question is what do we want to do going forward. He agrees that we need a plan going forward because solar panels are going to be a fact of life in this community and across the country now and for future generations so we might as well get it figured out now. If that is hearing the appeal or making it a retreat topic that is up to Council but we probably do need to get it nailed down at some point.

To Mr. Foust’s commented about the harm, it is his opinion that we are holding a citizen hostage from going forward with the applicant’s project. That is the harm. If there is a change down the road, then now we have two houses in the AR district that do not meet whatever the new district parameters are. He does not think that it is fair to hold the current homeowner hostage.

Mr. Norstrom shared that he would agree with Mr. Bates if the homeowner was not aware that there could be a problem. She was made aware of the possible issues. Mr. Smith commented that doesn’t make the applicant wrong. Mr. Norstrom agreed.
Rosanne Nagel, 282 McCoy Ave.
Ms. Nagel shared that she lives just outside of the historic district. She is a teacher of history and provides a sustainability course. She has also spent some time working with the Ohio Historic Preservation office. She is frustrated with the idea that Worthington promotes a progressive image and tries to bring in young families and future generations that sees value in the community and present one story that doesn’t necessarily marry to the new story with this concept of integrity. The historic district is going to be very important in terms of the integrity of the architecture. We also have a responsibility to maintain a sustainable future. We need to look at how we want to progress and look at properties within today’s parameters. We need to allow citizens to make decisions especially for a property that is non-contributing. We do not all have the same view in terms of aesthetics. Obviously there is historic integrity but we need to recognize what that greater picture will be for future generations. We do not draw people to this town for the same tourist reasons as one goes to old town Boston. We really need to be a progress community that acknowledges that it is historic but we are also looking at how we can bring together this progress. She hopes that we will consider placing solar panels on this building (City Hall), the fire station, etc. Place them on all of these buildings that have the opportunity to have solar panels. Instead of just sitting here and talking the talk maybe we walk the walk about this issue of sustainability.

In discussing the timeline by which Council needs to decide whether or not to hold a hearing on the appeal request, Mr. Greeson read the code section which states as follows: “The hearing shall be held not later than 60 days after a final decision has been rendered by the Board”. He added that “the Board” means the ARB.

When asked by Ms. Michael what that date would be, Ms. Stewart replied that the 60th day is February 6th, which is Council’s first meeting in February.

MOTION
Ms. Dorothy made a motion to hold a public hearing on the appeal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

When asked by Mr. Smith if she wants the appeal, Ms. Dorothy replied that she can vote no.

Mr. Norstrom commented that while Ms. Dorothy doesn’t know what the votes are, he thinks she is playing with Council and he doesn’t think that is appropriate.

Mr. Smith commented that he is concerned about the wording offered in the motion that was made by someone who intends to vote against the appeal. Ms. Michael explained that traditionally motions are offered in a positive frame. If members do not like it then they can vote it down.

Mr. Greeson shared that the motion offered in the City Manager Memo was: “A motion to elect to hold a public hearing on the appeal.”
MOTION TO AMEND

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to amend the motion to move the decision to another date. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Amendment failed by a vote of four (Troper, Dorothy, Smith and Michael) to two (Norstrom and Foust).

The original motion failed by a vote of four (Troper, Dorothy, Smith and Michael) to two (Norstrom and Foust).

Ms. Michael stated there will not be an appeal. At this point she would like for staff to dedicate the Committee of the Whole meeting in February for discussing and possibly revising the guidelines. She thinks it should also be understood that any guideline changes be used in future applications.

Mr. Norstrom is not sure that February allows staff enough time. This is a complicated issue because it impacts our architectural review district. If we are saying any modern technology can overstep that or make changes, those are debates that members should have. He thinks having it ready in the timeframe offered doesn’t provides adequate time. He would say 60 to 90 days.

Ms. Michael agreed with the suggested timeline. She directed members to provide any thoughts they may have to Mr. Greeson. She also thinks a discussion should be had with members of the ARB to get their thoughts.

Mr. Smith thinks the middle of February timeline makes more sense and he offered his reasons. If members are committed to making a decision by 90 days then he thinks they should talk about it sooner.

Ms. Michael asked if members wanted an initial discussion in February and then see where things go.

When asked by Mr. Greeson if members wanted to refer the issue to the Architectural Review Board, Ms. Michael and Mr. Norstrom replied no. Ms. Michael added that she believes it is a Council level issue.

Ms. Dorothy reported having larger questions about the AR guidelines to begin with that she brought up a year ago that no one wanted to revisit the whole guidelines. She understands that this is just about sustainable features.

When Ms. Dorothy asked if that was correct, Mr. Norstrom reported this being about the guidelines. If she wants to have that conversation he fully encourages it.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she had previously brought up the guidelines because she thinks that much of them are ambiguous. She feels they could be tightened up in several different aspects including solar panels. She would welcome a review of the entire
architectural review district guidelines. Ms. Michael agreed that a review is very much needed.

Members and staff discussed the issue further.

Mr. Bates suggested that Council place a moratorium on additional applications until there is a firm decision made on the architectural review guidelines. He would hate to see someone else get caught up in a similar type of situation where they have invested money even and then not being able to move forward.

Members discussed the idea of a moratorium.

Mr. Greeson thinks Council can direct staff to prepare legislation to accomplish a moratorium. Ms. Fox could work on that and staff would bring it back.

After some further discussion Ms. Michael declared that there were four members who favored going forward with moratorium legislation.

Mr. Greeson noted that the legislation would establish a moratorium for issuing permits in the architectural review district for solar panel installations.

Mr. Brown thinks staff can start pulling things together but he doesn’t want to promise members a 30 days completion. He shared that staff has been talking to other communities in central Ohio to see what they are doing. While they have only been initial conversations, he thinks we can aim for the February meeting but a March timeframe might be better. That would allow staff time to see what we can find for solar before diving into the rest of the design guidelines. That would at least give staff time to build on that information and then look towards the language that Mr. Greeson mentioned for a moratorium.

When asked by Ms. Michael if there is a problem with having a moratorium until the guidelines are reviewed, Mr. Brown replied not to his knowledge. He added that staff has not talked to anyone in the district but Ms. Dole about solar panels.

Mr. Greeson shared that staff will need to consult with Ms. Fox on the relative merits of the moratorium and bring back legislation and whatever advice she would have on the issue. His experience with moratoriums is that they must be finite in time and specific in purpose.

Ms. Dorothy expressed her objection to the moratorium. She thinks that goes against the character of Worthington as being a progressive city. She thinks putting a moratorium on solar panels in the architectural review district disparages all of the City.

Mr. Troper thinks it is crazy to put a moratorium on this issue. He thinks if people want solar panels they can have them even though they will be on a case by case basis. If members feel that we need to hear an appeal on a specific one then we can do that.
Mr. Foust asked the question again of where is the harm in just slowing the process down a notch.

Mr. Troper asserted that the harm is that people want solar panels. The majority of the letters were in favor of solar panels. The neighbors were in favor of solar panels. The majority of people who spoke were in favor of solar panels. If this were a historic house then he might have agreed to hear the appeal and maybe require solar shingles or whatever but it is not.

Mr. Norstrom commented that the historic district is the entire district. The rules apply to the district and not just historical houses in the district. Which gets us back to maybe having another conversation about the district. But that is what the district is and has been for fifty years.

Mr. Foust in addressing the comment on number of letters, he thinks there were twenty or so, but there were 5,000+ people who voted in this last election and he doesn’t know that 20 is a significant sampling of those 5,000. He noted that some credence has been given to Facebook page postings. He was intrigued by the fact that five people liked it but 104 viewed it. He pointed to that as being another data point along with those twenty letters. To him there is more going on than just a hasty decision. Members have made one decision tonight and he would just ask that members slow the process down a bit.

Ms. Michael reiterated that members want to review the guidelines. She doesn’t want to rush the process but she also doesn’t want it to drag out. If March works for Mr. Brown then she can see March as the beginning of the discussion so that we don’t lose this. Mr. Norstrom shared that there no chance that we will lose this. It is too important an issue to be delayed by Council. Ms. Michael stated that she just wants to make sure it stays as a priority.

Mr. Greeson confirmed that the issue will be back to Council in March.

When asked by Mr. Troper if the moratorium would be from one point to a specific point or will it be an indefinite moratorium, Ms. Michael thinks that something staff should look at while drafting the legislation. Mr. Greeson commented that he would feel more comfortable in Ms. Fox advising members in the mechanics of that process.

Ms. Dorothy commented that the moratorium is what the majority of Council is asking for and she is in the minority. Ms. Michael replied that the vote was four to two (Troper and Dorothy).

Mr. Greeson takes that as direction that staff needs to prepare some information and some guidance to members on how to accomplish that. Ms. Fox is out all this week so it is not likely that we will have legislation prepared for next week but we will probably be able to have a more informed conversation on the mechanics of a moratorium.
NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 01-2017

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Cleaning Contract for the Community Center.

Introduced by Mr. Troper.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 01-2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Hurley shared that bids were opened on Dec 9, 2016 for custodial services at the Community Center. Three bids were received with the winning bid being submitted by Cummings Facility Services. Ms. Kelly Dehn from Cummings is present this evening to answer any questions. He reported that their bid was $8,311.64 per month. The contract will run from February 1, 2017 through January 31, 2018. Sufficient funds are already allocated in our 2017 operating budget to fund the 2017 portion of the contract. Tonight staff is requesting that Council adopt the resolution that would authorize the City Manager to execute the cleaning contract so that Cummins Facility Services can begin the provision of the services on February 1st.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 01-2017 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 01-2017

Amending Certain Sections of the Codified Ordinances of the City to Allow for Electronic Notification to the Public of the Dates of Public Meetings, of Vacancies in Personnel Positions in the City, of a Water Conservation Emergency, and of Applications Heard Pursuant to Part 11 of the Codified Ordinances.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

Ordinance No. 02-2017

Amending Chapter 111 of the Codified Ordinances of the City to Establish Procedures for the Purchase of Supplies, Materials and Equipment and the Construction of Public Improvements.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

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)

- Liquor Permit – Transfer from Shahzad LLC (dba Worthington Marathon) to Manas 99 LLC (dba Worthington Marathon)

Mr. Greeson shared that this is a liquor permit transfer to change the LLC and relates to their C-1 and C-2 permits. He asked Chief Strait to weigh in on this but he is not aware of any reason to file for a hearing. Chief Strait shared that the police have no objection to this request.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if there are any other gas stations in the city with permits to sell beer and wine, Chief Strait replied that he believes the BP and the UDF on Linworth both have these types of liquor permits.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to not request a hearing on the transfer of a permit from Shahzad LLC to Manas 99 LLC. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Discussion Item(s)

- City Council Retreat Dates

Mr. Greeson shared that the first stage to organize a retreat is to select a date. He asked members for some options in the February and March timeframe for a Friday evening, Saturday morning event.

After some discussion, members suggested February 3rd and 4th with March 3rd and 4th as the alternative. Staff will share the suggestions with Mr. Myers to determine a final date.

Mr. Greeson commented that he will engage the Council President for suggestions on what members would like to accomplish and discuss facilitators. Ms. Michael asked members to contact her or Mr. Greeson with their suggestions of topics.

Mr. Greeson noted that members have done a great deal of goal setting/task identification in our retreats, particular last year.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if he had .pdfs of the last few retreats that he could share, Mr. Greeson acknowledged that he does and he will send them out.

Mr. Foust commented that he would pose the question back to city staff on whether there are things about which they would seek guidance from Council that are appropriate for discussion.
REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Ms. Dorothy noted that the pads for the pedestrian hybrid beacons are in place. She asked for a timeline on the installation. Mr. Whited believes they will be installed within the next few weeks. Mr. Greeson added that there will be some corresponding educational sessions offered on the use of the beacons. Mr. Hurley shared that the information is already available on the City’s website and packets of information will be going out to the schools, the library, and the Griswold. There will be both a hard copy educational piece and an online format that will be triggered when the mast arms arrive.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

Council recessed at 8:28 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to return to open session at 8:36 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:36 P.M.

______________________________
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of February, 2017.

___________________________________
Council President
Special Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 9, 2017 ~ 6:45 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 Special Session on Monday, January 9, 2017, 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 6:45 p.m.

Members Present: Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas Foust, Scott Myers, Douglas K. Smith, and Bonnie D. Michael. Doug Smith and Rachael Dorothy joined the Executive Session at 7:15 P.M.

Member(s) Absent: David Norstrom and Michael Troper

Also present: Temporary Clerk of Council Tanya Maria Word

MOTION Councilmember Doug Foust made a motion to meet in Executive Session to interview for Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Scott Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Councilmember Doug Foust made a motion to return to open session and adjourn the Special Meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rachael Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 7:20 P.M.

____________________________________
Temporary Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of February, 2017.

_______________________________
Council President
Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 9, 2017 ~ 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, January 9, 2017, 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.

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

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Temporary Clerk of Council Tanya Maria Word, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Public Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire Scott Highley and Chief of Police Jerry Strait.

There were eight visitors present.

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Dr. Patrick Maynard, CEO/President of Franklin County Residential Services made the following presentation:

- Franklin County Residential Services.

Franklin County Residential Services, Inc. (FCRS) is a private not-for-profit organization, which has been providing direct services and residential options for the intellectual and developmentally disabled (primarily) adult population throughout Central Ohio for over 30 years.
  - Budget of approximately $40 million
  - Approximately 1400 employees
- Step By Step (SBS) Academy is a private non-profit mental health center that provides services to individuals with autism, developmental disabilities and mental illness.
  - Budget of approximately $11 million
  - Approximately 200 employees
➢ The two organizations have been collaborating and advocating alongside each other for over a year.
➢ Effective early November, FCRS entered into a management contract with the SBS Academy.
➢ The Boards of Trustees for both FCRS and SBS, along with the leadership teams, developed this 120-day management agreement which allows key people of FCRS to support the operations of SBS.
➢ Initially, there will be no changes to the services SBS Academy provides to the people served.
➢ The goal is to merge the two organizations which have similar missions to support individuals with mental, behavioral, intellectual and developmental disabilities.
➢ The 120 management contract expires in March 2017. It is assumed there will be a mutually beneficial merger resulting from this management contract.

Meetings with SBS staff and parents of children served have been held and have been met with positive response.

Mr. Myers asked will you be providing any services or just management housing at the site. Dr. Maynard replied Step by Step is providing services there and that will continue; our objective is not only to create sustainability with their existing services, but to expand them to our population. Our services are not provided on a campus, but are provided across the community and there would not be an increase in services that I can see. Mr. Myers asked you don’t anticipate that the footprint of the site would be altered. Dr. Maynard replied no.

Ms. Dorothy stated we appreciate the work that you’re doing and helping out Step-by-Step; thank you so much for this partnership.

Brian Seitz, 415 East Street, Worthington, OH 43085. Mr. Seitz commented I am a direct neighbor to what will soon be Step-by-Step, and I just want to go on record to say that we are looking forward to having neighbors there maybe 24 hours per day, maybe 10 hours per day depending on how you can answer that question. My wife and me are kind of the watchdogs for the property making a few 911 calls to let folks know that there are things going on over there that probably shouldn’t be going on. Thank you and we appreciate these guys coming doing what they need to do.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

Golf Carts

Mrs. Fox explained some Central Ohio communities have enacted Ordinances that allow golf carts on the public roads. Beginning on January 1, 2017, golf carts will be allowed on Ohio roadways that have a speed limit of 35 mph or less if the local authority has granted permission for that operation. A golf cart is considered a “motor vehicle” under
the laws of the State of Ohio and must satisfy the statutory requirements applicable to
motor vehicles. The vehicle must be equipped with the standard motor vehicle features,
pass an inspection by a local law enforcement agency, and be titled, registered and
display license plates. In addition, liability insurance is required as proscribed by the
ORC.

The Ohio legislature passed Senate Bill 114 in 2012 allowing “under-speed” vehicles
(USVs) to operate on public roadways. Golf carts fall within the definition of USVs under
§4501.01(XX), also effective January 1, 2017:

(XX) “Under-speed vehicle” means a three- or four-wheeled vehicle, including a
vehicle commonly known as a golf cart, with an attainable speed on a paved level
surface of not more than twenty miles per hour and with a gross vehicle weight
rating less than three thousand pounds.

Senate Bill 114 also addressed roadway operation of USVs by enacting §4511.214 and
§4511.215. The former prohibits the operation of USVs on roads having an established
speed greater than thirty-five miles per hour. It also prohibits operation on a street or
highway unless the local authority has granted permission under §4511.215. Section
§4511.215 gives local jurisdictions the authority to pass golf cart Ordinances as follows:

(a) The operation must be limited to streets and highways having an established
speed of not greater than 35 mph;
(b) The vehicle owner must submit to a vehicle inspection conducted by a local
law enforcement agency that complies with the Ohio Department of Public
Safety inspection requirements;
(c) The permission is given only for those vehicles that have successfully passed
inspection are registered and titled in accordance with Ohio law; and
(d) The Ohio Director of Public Safety must be notified of the legislation.

So as I read this legislation we have the ability under this law to allow for golf carts in
the community if we pass a Resolution or Ordinance authorizing them to do so.

Ms. Michael asked if Council were to go in this direction would Council be able to
restrict what streets the resident(s) could/could not drive on. Mrs. Fox replied yes, it
says that the local authority may establish additional requirements for the operation of
USVs or mini trucks on its streets or highways. Ms. Dorothy commented but we could
also just allow for whatever regulations Ohio regulations allowed for, we could just
adopt whatever the Ohio Code allowed. Mrs. Fox asked you mean not operating on a
street in excess of 35 mph with the restrictions about the inspection, registration, and
titling, and authorized operator and vehicle meeting all the requirements of the State of
Ohio. Ms. Dorothy replied yes. Mrs. Fox replied yes you are permitted to do that if that’s
what you choose to do.

Ms. Dorothy asked so in our public right-of-ways we could grant people additional
modes of transportation; they can already ride bicycles on these streets which are less
than 3000 pounds and usually going under 25 mph, we already allow bicycles to do that. Mrs. Fox replied the Ohio Attorney General has determined golf carts to be motor vehicles, so they are different obviously in that sense than bicycles are under the motor vehicle laws. Ms. Dorothy commented if we adopted the Ohio State Code we could grant people more rights to choose what mode of transportation they would like to use when using our public right-of-ways. Mrs. Fox asked is that a question. Ms. Dorothy commented it’s something that we have the capability of doing correct. Mrs. Fox replied yes, the statute provides for the inspection for the speed limit limitation and the registration of the vehicle. What cities choose to do beyond that is also allowable under this statute. I think one of the other limitations is that they can’t drive in excess of 35 mph; however, they are permitted to cross over streets that have excess of 35 mph if they’re going from a lower speed street to cross the high speed street. So a lot of those considerations have been taken into effect, certainly you can add more safety features than what the Department of Public Safety requires for motor vehicle inspections; you can limit them to only 25 mph streets; you can impose more restrictions, you just can’t allow them on streets in excess of 35 mph or waive some of the inspection features. Ms. Dorothy commented this could potentially be less dangerous than driving a motor vehicle. In the U.S. in 2015 there were over 6 million police reported crashes from motor vehicles resulting in over 32,000 deaths in motor vehicles, so maybe if people are walking or biking or riding in golf carts, it won’t be motor vehicles that are creating these crashes and property destruction.

Mrs. Fox replied I think Chief Strait can talk about some of the safety concerns with golf carts; I think that we certainly have statistics about golf cart accidents as well, and there are particular concerns about the operation of golf carts when children are aboard and whether those children are properly restrained, whether the passenger(s) are properly restrained; so I think there is a lot of consideration all the way around and looking at whether to allow for that, whether our streets are equipped to handle these types of vehicles and I think these are a lot of the considerations that a lot of the communities that have had these discussions have talked about the pros and cons of the operation of golf carts on city streets.

Chief Strait explained part of the research as I was looking into this is that most of the accidents occur with any size passenger (not just children), but when they make a left hand turn, there is no safety device on the right hand side like a car door to keep somebody inside, there is a small bracket on most of these USVs or golf carts, so actually without a seatbelt a lot of people actually fall out when you make a left hand turn. Mr. Troper asked wouldn’t passenger seatbelts be required. Chief Strait replied you can require passenger seatbelts and actually if it becomes a motorized vehicle, you probably would require child booster seats which have historically not been required, but that has changed in the Ohio Law as well. One thing also with these vehicles they are not a standard motor vehicle hence the new regulations; so you cannot take into the current stats for 2013, 2014, or 2015, you cannot look at those statistics and come to a reasonable conclusion on the number of deaths involved in these vehicles. Each state determines how they are going to report their accidents, so with that being said, unless there is a federal regulation or a state law that says you have to report these accidents, a
lot of times they might be on a golf cart on a golf course in one of these communities and not be registered and if something has an accident in a golf cart of USV or even on a farm which a lot of these are used on farms as well; these people don’t report them to the police departments as accidents or fatalities; so it might just go as an assistance report or some other type of police report, but not an actual police report.

Ms. Dorothy asked isn’t that true of any vehicle. Chief Strait replied no; most motor vehicles that are registered, I mean if it’s a farm vehicle that would be something different, but for most motor vehicles under Ohio law at least, whether it’s on private property or on public property it’s reported; so it’s a little different when it comes to an actual motor vehicle. I don’t want to have you deceived by the fact that some of these injuries involving these types of vehicles aren’t always reported. Definitely seatbelts are not normally added and it’s one of the concerns and now with booster seats being required under Ohio law and historically I’m also always concerned with these vehicles—a lot of people buy them and think they’re not motor vehicles and sometimes there is some partying involved with these vehicles that shouldn’t go about, again those stipulations need to be addressed as well.

Ms. Michael asked what challenges do you see in the enforcement area if this were to become an Ordinance. Chief Strait answered two things are (1) people not paying attention, and (2) management when you have younger kids at home, it’s still a motor vehicle, age 16, driver license required; I’m concerned about younger kids getting in these things and driving around and either hurt themselves or somebody else hurting them; those are my major concerns. I live in a community and in this community they have these golf carts and I see two things (1) very young children in the back not in booster seats and restrained in seatbelts and (2) I see a lot of people that drive their dogs around with them and there is no restraint on them; and again as I stated earlier, if you turn right and you have an older dog or a dog not ready for the turn, they fall out and get hip damage or even killed.

Ms. Michael asked is there any differential safety concern between riding a bicycle on a state route versus having a golf cart; is one more dangerous than the other. Chief Strait replied it should have lights on it under Ohio law; people don’t really pay attention to bike riders, other than that I would have to say again people just don’t pay attention to the smaller low profile vehicles and the same way with bicycles.

Mr. Troper commented I would be in support of the legislation assuming that seatbelts and booster seats would be required.

Mr. Myers commented I personally don’t see the point, I don’t think there is anything that you could say that would convince me to support legislation of this matter.

Mr. Norstrom remarked I agree with Mr. Myers based on safety issues and the statistics background provided by Chief Strait. The demand for golf carts in Worthington is not overwhelming. Mr. Troper asked what is the harm. Mr. Norstrom replied safety. Mr. Troper commented that can be true about anything. Ms. Dorothy asked what statistic are
you referring to. Mr. Norstrom replied the statistics in the report that was cited here the Analysis on Golf Cart-Related Injuries and it says “about 1000 Americans are injured in golf car related accidents each month.

Mr. Foust asked does anyone know what EPA or emissions standards apply with the golf cart; the reason I ask is because if we’re putting another gasoline engine on the street, and imagine it’s a pretty good size. I mean we’re trying to go to electric lawnmowers and get away from all these small engines, you hear about small engine pollution...I don’t know the answer, but we don’t know what kind of emissions concerns are there. If it’s truly a green argument, I think you have to consider that. We’ve made a lot of progress in terms of integrating bicycles into the City of Columbus overall, we’ve done some good things; if you look at what’s happening with Summit Street and North 4th and such; so we actually taken away automobile lanes and created bicycle lanes. When you throw this low speed vehicle into the mix, you’ve now bifurcated the whole thing, yet another time; we’ve made an accommodation that keeps the bicycles separate from the cars and that’s a safety factor; if you take a vehicle whose top speed is below 20 mph and try to integrate that into traffic that’s used to going 25 or sometimes 25+ mph in a 25 mph zone, to me you’ve now got a vehicle that is a little too fast and a little too big to pass safely as one can generally pass a bicycle on Evening Street or wherever. It just seems like a misfit to me. The fact that our own Police Chief seems to be reluctant to me speaks volumes.

Mr. Smith commented it’s a tricky argument for sure, to Mr. Norstrom’s point, there is not going to be a big demand; five people in Worthington have golf carts, I think those five people need to take some personal responsibility with their actions and be safe. In a nutshell, I’d be okay with golf carts with safety restrictions.

Ms. Dorothy commented I would agree that we all want everyone in Worthington to be safe; I think to be safer, it would be great if we could reduce vehicle speed throughout Worthington, the odds of a pedestrian death by being hit by a vehicle going 20 mph is only 5%; going 30 mph getting hit a pedestrians odds of death are 40% and going 40 mph a pedestrians odds of death is 85% and there’s lot of people who go 45 mph on 23; I’d be happy to reduce the speed throughout Worthington, I think lower vehicle speeds are needed throughout Worthington and I would not mind having properly operated golf carts a low vehicle speed operating throughout Worthington with safety restraints. I think people should be able to choose whatever mode of transportation they’d like and I would think that that vehicle operated at a low speed would be more safe than a lot of other vehicles out there.

Mr. Foust commented that so much of what we do is decided by antidote sometimes, but I’m reminded of my niece driving a mid-sized Pontiac south on Evening Street, crossing 161, the light turned in her favor, she proceeded on through and a car coming westbound down the hill was barreling along pretty nicely hit her broadside, spun the car around, hit two other cars and she got hauled off to the hospital. I shudder to think what life would be like in a golf cart.
Ms. Dorothy replied I don’t think I can make that choice for other people. Ms. Michael asked Ms. Dorothy if she spent any time up at Kelly’s Island or Pu-in-Bay. Ms. Dorothy replied yes. Mr. Myers commented I personally see this as a remedy without a wrong. No one has contacted me about a request to have golf carts. I think we have taken steps and society is taking steps to get vehicles off the road, not put more vehicles on the road. I likened these to riding on the back roads of Holmes County and you have to be very attentive every bridge you go over because there’s a very good chance there’s going to be a horse and buggy on the other side of that hill. I will say that it’s been my experience with most Amish Horse and Buggies they are very responsible drivers; they stay as far off the road as they can; I’m in a two-wheeled vehicle, so I can get around them pretty easy, but I know that I have to constantly be vigilant to watch for horse and buggy. If we’re going to put a golf cart on High Street and this has nothing to do with the golf cart, I am going to have to increase my vigilance because now I’m going to have one more obstruction that I have to avoid. I think we are assuming a risk which maybe we can define, maybe we can’t. There is a definable risk to golf carts on the road. I don’t see it as acceptable to take on that risk when there isn’t a demonstrated need or desire for that vehicle.

Again it’s a remedy without a wrong, and no one has demonstrated to me that there is a need for this vehicle on the road. Mr. Troper commented that’s like asking is there a need for a motorcycle. My sister-in-law wants to drive a golf cart and another person inquired. Mr. Myers replied that’s why we’re here, your sister-in-law wants to drive a golf cart, it isn’t because the community wants golf carts; I’m just stating my opinion I don’t see a grounds for this.

Bill Alsnauer, 544 White Oak Place, Worthington, OH. Mr. Alsnauer stated I am an insurance agent and I am shuddering at this point thinking of having those vehicles on the road. Chief Strait as I understand it, if they’re not allowed and you see one you can pull it over, you don’t have to go through various steps. If it’s approved I assume they have to be doing something wrong to get pulled over. Chief Strait replied that is correct. Mr. Alsnauer said but as it is now if you see somebody driving down the road in a golf cart, you can stop it without any other reason, asked is that correct. Chief Strait replied yes, if they are not registered they are not allowed to be out on the road; and again part of this would require insurance too. Mr. Alsnauer commented there is the line of sight, golf carts are smaller, I’ve ridden in several and they are flimsy little vehicles and they provide no protection. I get the attractiveness and I understand the interest of using it; but it is not made for the main road. I think all of us at some point and time have come up on someone on the freeway driving 45 mph when we’re going 70, you get there really fast almost at the point of running them over; I can’t imagine if you had that same issue with a golf cart that’s below your line of sight and you make a turn, you don’t even see it; and when that death occurs, then my opinion is that’s why you vote against things like this; that’s why public safety is in your charge….this is just my observation.

Mr. Myers asked does State Farm underwrite golf carts. Mr. Alsnauer replied we do, we’ll do it for personal property or to serve the property you’re on, like if you owned the Harding Hospital property, yes we’d insure it, but it would not be as a licensed vehicle.
Mr. Myers commented so it would be off road use. Mr. Alsnauer replied that is correct, but if it became on road use, I imagine the state requirement for insurance and uninsured motorists and things like that….golf carts are not made for the road, they are made for golf courses.

Mr. Troper asked why would the state allow it if there was such a high risk. Mr. Myers commented the General Assembly has done a lot of things over the past couple of years that I disagree with.

Mr. Myers suggested Council instruct staff to prepare legislation and that way we don’t have to vote on the legislation this evening. Mr. Myers commented this would take a vote. Ms. Michael asked if staff prepared legislation….what would they be looking at. If they were to do anything, they would have to be highly restricted in areas. I’m hearing people say any place that’s 35 mph or less; I would not go with that. Mr. Troper asked Ms. Michael what would she go with. Ms. Michael replied I don’t know at this moment. Mr. Myers commented propose what you want and we’ll vote it up or down right now. Mr. Norstrom said just say in compliance with state requirements. Ms. Michael asked does the state requirements include booster seats and seat belts. Chief Strait stated I do not believe they do, I think that is added language that you might want to consider, that’s my recommendation at least.

Mr. Troper said add on booster seats and seat belts. Mr. Myers asked what type of seatbelts 3 point, 5 point. Mr. Troper advised I will let our Law Director make a recommendation.

**MOTION**: Councilmember Troper made a motion to have staff prepare legislation to this effect. Councilmember Dorothy seconded the motion.

There being no additional comments, the motion to have staff prepare legislation failed by a voice vote.

The Clerk called the roll on the passage of the motion. The motion carried by the following vote:

- **Yes 2**  
  Troper and Dorothy

- **No 5**  
  Smith, Norstrom, Myers, Foust and Michael

Motion fails.
Moratorium – Solar Panels in Architectural Review District

Mr. Greeson explained that during the discussion last week whether to elect to hear the appeal regarding the installation of Solar Panels on a home on Evening Street, you asked some questions and showed an interest in pursuing a Moratorium on the issuance of building permits for the installation of solar panels in the Architectural Review district for a period of time, and during that time staff has been directed to research and provide information regarding how our architectural review guidelines might be modified to more effectively regulate solar panels. I was not comfortable in Mrs. Fox’s absence overviewing the mechanics and legal mechanisms and process for establishing a moratorium, and so I’ve asked her similarly with what we just did with golf carts to provide some information for your education related to how moratoriums work and how one would work for this purpose.

Mrs. Fox commented I understand that there were some questions about the existing guidelines and whether they are satisfactory to provide guidance to the ARB in their consideration of applications for solar panels. A moratorium is not completely unknown here in the City of Worthington. It is typically an instrument that is used in areas where there are high opportunities for development, so we don’t see that here in Worthington, but in 2010 the City did pass a Moratorium connection with the Olentangy River Road overlay; so the City has done this in the past and communities do it from time to time, it’s just not something that I think is a favorable action on the part of cities just because depending on what kind of a Moratorium you consider, it can impact people’s property rights and that causes them to file claims of violation of due process and taking without compensation, so in this particular instance I think that it’s important to have a discussion about whether or not you want to implement a Moratorium which is essentially just putting a hold on some activity of the city. Mr. Greeson mentioned building permits, I know that when we passed the Olentangy River Road Overlay, the Moratorium was actually on the MPC’s consideration of subdivision requests in the Olentangy River Road corridor; and in this particular instance I think it would be a similar type of action, not necessarily maybe a building permit stage because what I think you’re looking for is not to completely say no, but what are our guidelines saying, and do our guidelines need to be tweaked, are there additional considerations that need to be included, is it working, is it not working; this actually the threshold question that I want to discuss with you this evening because it’s important when you’re looking at considering a Moratorium, that the time limit is as restrictive as you feel it needs to be to get the work done that you need to do during that period; and it’s also important to have a plan of action during that period of time.

So if you believe that the existing guidelines are inadequate and you would like to impose a Moratorium to address those, then I think you need to consider a short period of time (a six month Moratorium) is certainly fairly common and then to direct staff to institute some plan of action; but I think there are a lot of considerations that need to be discussed---#1, the threshold question, do you think you want something different with these guidelines than what they already say. #2 if the answer the question #1 is yes, do you want the Moratorium to be effective for all applications for solar panels in the entire
district or are you just speaking about the impact of these solar panels in the Old Worthington district. Ms. Michael asked when you say the entire district are you speaking of all of Worthington. Mrs. Fox replied the entire Architectural Review district because these are Architectural Review Guidelines. We’ve only had 2 applications since these guidelines were passed that have been in the Old Worthington area. So I think a discussion needs to be had about the extent of the Moratorium; I mean if you’re going to pass one, I think the easiest thing to do is to just say “these are Architectural Review Guidelines” we want an opportunity to evaluate them, see if there is anything out there that can guide our Architectural Review Board in a different kind of way if you think the board needs to be provided direction in a different kind of way and then look at specifically how you can go about accomplishing that.

Threshold Question #1: Do you believe that the existing guidelines are providing the Architectural Review Board with sufficient direction to make decisions that Council believes to be made.

Mr. Smith commented based on our conversation last week from where I was sitting as a proponent of both Joanne’s solar panels, it seems like the guidelines that we do have didn’t have enough teeth maybe that gave guidance to or that would give guidance to the ARB; seems like there were these wishy-washy abstract type of ideas that maybe or maybe not meant something. I’m looking for a mechanism whether it’s tweak the wording or not, but at least give some credence to those words.

Mr. Foust commented I appreciate Mr. Smith’s comments and I concur given the split nature of the discussion last week and the split discussion at ARB and as I tried to plead for last week, I think just some time to discuss it more thoroughly; if it’s this unclear we need to have the conversation that’s one idea. Six months seems like a long time, I’m curious if we declare a Moratorium and come to some resolution the next 60 days amongst ourselves, I assume we can lift the Moratorium sooner than the timeframe. Mrs. Fox replied yes. Mrs. Fox commented I answered your question quickly, in thinking about this today, I would Council to consider one more thing, if you were to pass a Moratorium and if as a result of that, the decisions that came out of that effort required any type of changes to our zoning code, then the change could be proposed but then there would be a sixty (60) day wait period and that might impact the timing on the Moratorium. It’s just a little bit of a complicating fact, but it just occurred to me earlier today that if you’re going to discuss a Moratorium, this little detail might be important.

Mr. Myers stated I’m more than willing to entertain a discussion on the issue, but we’ve had as many applications for solar panels in the last six years as we have had people request a discussion on golf carts in the last six years; and to be intellectually honest, if I didn’t think golf carts deserved a remedy, I think a Moratorium is a bit draconian; we can continue the discussion if we’d like without a Moratorium. I don’t see a rush to put solar panels on, the process from application to decision at the ARB is at least a month; I just don’t see the need for a Moratorium; I am more than willing to discuss the issue; I’m even willing to request staff to do some research on the issue, but I don’t know that we need a Moratorium.
Mr. Norstrom asked Judy how many have signed up to be a part of the Sustainable Worthington 30 or so. Judy replied there is 10 for sure, but none of them are in the historic district as far as I know. Mr. Norstrom commented to Mr. Myers that there are at least people in this community that are interested. Mr. Myers replied none of which would be impacted by a Moratorium because it would only pertain to the architectural district. Mr. Smith commented to Mr. Norstrom’s point there is an aggressive push by this co-op to promote solar including in the historic district, so it wouldn’t be beyond any comprehensive that there would be people popping up within the next couple of months that do want solar, so that’s what I’m trying to avoid with any sort of discussion that goes on; someone gets in the pipeline of getting the solar panel on their roof in the historic district, and all of a sudden we change everything or we have a similar situation like we did last week and last year, I don’t think anybody wants that, so a sunned timelined Moratorium to me makes some sense because then we make it very clear to folks that we’re going to lift it by May 15th or whatever the date is, 60 days out, so don’t even bother because if you do, you might end up in the same situation as one of the JoAnn’s.

Mr. Brown commented one of the things in talking with Mr. Greeson and Mrs. Fox since last week is that I have a chance to look at 50 or 60 jurisdictions to see how they control solar panels in their historic districts and in their design guidelines or in their actual code itself which is completely different; with those 50 or 60 I’ve been able to talk to about 12 or 15 one-on-one to figure out what they actually do and not do, so that conversation has been evolving; but I would say about 85-95% of the ones I’ve been able to talk to so far or even the ones I’ve able to look at online almost verbatim match up with our wording within our design guidelines; I’m not sure if they were all done 5 or 6 years ago, but their all similar in regulations for their design guidelines, but like I said some of them have actually taken and put it in the actual planning and zoning code….kind of like what Mr. Foust mentioned.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Foust what do you hope to get from a conversation. Mr. Foust commented I don’t think there is one of us up here that doesn’t recognize the virtue and the value of Clean Renewable Energy Sources; I think we’re all advocates in one way or another despite what conclusions you may draw because of some of the objections raised. I also think that we are as a group doing a dis-service to the city at this point by being as unclear as we are, and by ARB being as unclear as they are. We need to come up with a policy that we can agree on; there is too much ambiguity going on. Moratorium or not, I don’t have any strong feelings about that; I think Mr. Myers comments are very well placed; I can certainly do without the Moratorium as long as we can agree that we’re going to have the dialogue and try to bring it to some type of productive close.

Mr. Norstrom commented the major issues as I see it are simple, do we have architectural district or do we not, and if we have an architectural district what are the standards that we have. The standards as they read now basically are for sustainability, but not panels that are visible from the street. However with both locations when they’ve been approved that is the case, they’re not very visible, but they are visible from the
street. The ARB has chosen to move forward with both of those, since we’ve passed those, there is also the term solar shingle versus solar panel and there were solar shingles back since 2005, so they do exist; Scientific American said they are coming down in price to be much more price comparative with solar panels. I was walking down Hartford the other day and just looking, there are a lot of garages there that have south facing roofs that would be extremely visible from the street, but given the way our code is currently written maybe permissible. So the issue I see is does the community still want the district, and if they still do, what do they want the district to look like. If they want the district to look like it could continue to look like if we allow visible solar panels, then let’s make that very clear to ARB, if that’s not what we want, then we need to make very clear to ARB that they have gone in the wrong direction.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Foust if he agreed that visibility is mostly the issue. Mr. Foust replied I believe Mr. Norstrom captured it very well. Mr. Norstrom stated I don’t think this is something that we need a six month Moratorium for, but I do think that we should put the Moratorium in place so that we let people who are thinking about it know....I think Mr. Foust said last week what’s the harm if we delay a couple of months to get this issue worked through.

Ms. Dorothy stated I would like to address your comment about other technologies; Solar panels vs. air conditioners vs. electricity vs power lines and cable lines, the radon systems, cars, garages, all these modern day conveniences that we would not live without today that are incorporated into modern society. Worthington was built on self-sufficiency and sustainability; if the people in 1803 were able to produce their own electricity and use electricity with solar panels they would definitely be incorporating that into their Architecture at that time; I think just as we are now incorporating furnaces, air conditioning. Mr. Norstrom commented the issue is things that you just indicated generally have minimal or no impact on the architecture of the houses. A lot of the houses in Worthington do not have window air conditioners, some do and they do stick out. It’s kind of like having a heat pump or an air conditioner unit in your backyard vs. on the side of your house which is also something that has been invaded by ARB, so those are the issues, not the fact that if sustainable had been here or if we had electricity back then, that’s not the issue; the issue is the visual impact of the district and what we want the district to look like.

Mr. Myers asked what do we need to study and what do we need a Moratorium for. Sounds like to me the issue is really very simple, we need an Ordinance which says we need to change whether it’s 1177.05 the Architectural Review Standards and its subsection (a)(11) that provides for Sustainable Features; we add something to that says “solar panels to the extent that they cannot be seen from the street.” Mr. Norstrom replied except I don’t think that solar shingles are necessarily part of that. Mr. Myers replied and they wouldn’t be because I’m saying solar panels. I think we can come forward next month with an Ordinance that is straight forward and simple and does what you want it to do, we can debate that Ordinance, vote it up or down, if we want to, we can amend that Ordinance during the debate, we can all that done in 30 – 45 days at which time we probably don’t need a Moratorium because it’s going to take that long for that
application to work its way through ARB, or if you want a Moratorium, let’s make it for 30 days. I can get on board with a 30 day Moratorium and we get an Ordinance in front of us the first of February.

Mrs. Fox replied in order to institute a Moratorium I would recommend that be done by Ordinance. Is it more efficient to bring forward the type of Ordinance you were just talking about instead of bringing forth an Ordinance for a Moratorium then following that directly up with changes to the code. Mr. Foust commented I can support and the only question I have is 30 days a realistic time to get all the public comment we’re going to want to get; I’m thinking we ought to hear from some of those for whom the architectural district is near and dear.

Mr. Myers stated if we introduce an Ordinance on the first of February, set it for public hearing for the third meeting in February, it would not surprise me if it gets tabled at that meeting. I don’t know that the first draft is going to be amenable to enough people to get the vote; but looking from today, we are looking at least six weeks. I know one side of the equation with the people that are sitting out in the audience is going to be motivated to be here at the first meeting in February. I know I can count on you to motivate possibly a different interest group. I don’t think we’ll have a problem getting a packed house at the first meeting in February even though it won’t be heard until the third week of February we’ll have a packed house again. What I’m trying to do is get this done quick enough, get it to a debate because I think it’s going to be a pretty robust debate and I don’t think it’s going to be a 7-0 vote and there very maybe amendments to the Ordinance to get that vote to carry it or to get that vote to defeat it. My concern is that I would like to get this on the agenda as quickly as possible so that we do have resolution out there, we don’t have people hanging in the lurch and maybe we can avoid Moratorium, that’s my preference. Mr. Foust commented it works for me. Mr. Norstrom replied I’ll move whatever Mr. Myers said.

Mrs. Fox explained that if a Moratorium is not instituted and may not be that this is a bad thing, I’m just saying that there may be an application that may get filed before that Ordinance becomes effective, because again if it’s a change to Chapter 11, it’s going to be a 60 day wait period. Mr. Myers commented and if there could be a period of 90 days in which prior to the changes to the Ordinance, a new application is filed, so the old Ordinance would apply and while ARB would have the benefit of our discussion, it may be a clear signal as to how we void that rule even under the old Ordinance; it would be 90 days before we had the new Ordinance. Mrs. Fox commented there may be one appeal that you have think about, maybe not, the track record doesn’t show that it would be.

Mr. Greeson commented the direction last week was to bring the Moratorium discussion back, potentially prepare that legislation and prepare for a March Committee of the Whole meeting for the whole solar legislation. I hear you that we need to move it up to avoid the Moratorium. I want to look to Mr. Brown to see if he has any comments. Mr. Brown commented I think the discussions we’re having now are the discussions we need to have, but I still think at the end of the day, if it’s one meeting, two meetings or four meetings from now, it’s going to ultimately be that discussion for you even if criteria is
developed or not developed or the guidelines are modified or the actual Ordinance is tweaked and changed also; so it’s ultimately going to be that conversation with you the council members are you okay with them being in the front or on the side of a house at the end of the day or on the front or side of the house if it met xyz. Mr. Norstrom replied given what you just said, I think a 90 day Moratorium would be something we could consider given what when look at the timeframe. Mr. Myers commented we can consider it, I’m just trying to avoid it. Mr. Greeson said in the absence of clarity which is what we lack here today about what an Ordinance would say, we would be taking the research that Mr. Brown and his staff conduct and probably potentially creating the framework of legislation and a series of alternate pieces. So you might have a restriction related to the front and side of the house, you might have language related to contributing/non-contributing structure. Mr. Myers commented I think we’re overthinking this. There’s going to be a group of us who say “I don’t care if I can see them or not, I think they’re a good thing.” There is going to be a group of us who “say who say they’re a great thing, but I never want to see them.” There may be a middle group who say I’m alright with not seeing them, but what does that mean.” Mr. Greeson replied under what criteria that is outlined in the design guidelines would you be okay with seeing them and that’s what I think is the challenge; we can write yes or no, but we’re going to research the other communities that have been through this.

Mr. Smith asked when is 90 days from the next meeting. Mr. Greeson replied it would be 90 days from the first meeting in February. Mr. Myers commented I will leave it to staff’s discretion as to how they propose that in the Ordinance.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Myers made a motion to have staff bring forth legislation for us to introduce at the next council meeting and posing a 90 day Moratorium on all further solar panels and that staff is directed to begin research with the goal of having an Ordinance before Council addressing the issue of solar panel placement no later than the last meeting in February. Councilmember Foust seconded the motion.

There being no additional comments, the motion to have staff prepare legislation passed.

**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 decreased from $23,469,095 to $23,225,624 for the month of December with expenditures exceeding revenues by $243,471.
Year to date fund balances for all accounts increased from $21,263,095 on January 1, 2016 to $23,225,624 as of December 31, 2016 with revenues exceeding expenditures by $1,962,529.

Expenditures for all funds tracked at 87% of anticipated expenditure levels.

Year to date revenues for all funds are below 2015 revenues by $2,528,484, due to the 2015 Refunding Bond revenue proceeds received in 2015. 2016 total revenue collections are above estimates by $1,275,906.

The General Fund balance decreased from $12,244,756 to $11,628,193 for the month of December with expenditures exceeding revenues by $616,562.

The year to date General Fund balance increased from $11,250,077 on January 1, 2106 to $11,628,193 with revenues exceeding expenditures by $378,116.

General Fund expenditures tracked at 92.69% of anticipated expenditure levels.

December 2016 income tax collections are above 2015 collections by $1,142,094 or 4.81% and above estimates by $815,042 or 3.39%.

Mr. Norstrom commented to Mr. Hurley that our membership revenue is significantly under estimate and I’m just wondering how that plays into next year. Mr. Hurley replied that actually is a little misleading, we changed a practice earlier in the year in terms of how we collected certain revenues and those were displaced from the general fund to the revolving fund, so you will notice the Parks and Recreation revolving fund came in well ahead of estimates; and that was our fault and in our department it was based on the fact that the expenditures come out of the revolving fund and so we moved our revenues to be reflected from there and it was not done in a way that was shown in Molly’s financial report, so we’ll be looking to rectify that in the future, but overall our Community Center revenues were ahead of the 2015 numbers with that change.

MOTION

Councilmember Myers made a motion to accept the December 2016 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson indicated that he would like a brief Executive Session to discuss Personnel Compensation. I have three quick informational items; the first one is flyer listing the various Martin Luther King Jr. festivities going on in and around Worthington. Secondly, Chief Strait and myself had the opportunity last week to attend two ceremonies;
one was the badge pinning of one of our new officers Tyler Rock, he actually went through the academy, so he graduated this past week from the Columbus Police Academy. We had the opportunity to watch his wife pin on his badge on Thursday evening and cross the stage and graduate from the academy on Friday. Officer Rock is a U.S. Army Infantries and has served both in Iraq and Afghanistan and will join very soon with the Division of Police.

I’m going to ask Mr. Hurley to talk a little bit about the upcoming Bike and Pedestrian Retreat. Mr. Hurley stated hopefully Council received an email from Mrs. Thress regarding the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board, they’ve scheduled a special planning session that is in addition to their normal monthly meeting this Saturday, January 14th at 8:30 A.M. at the Griswold in the Thompson room located upstairs. It is a planning session and they’re going to be focused on looking at the projects that they’re recommending and prioritization of those; the session is open to the public and the agenda is posted online.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

COUNCILMEMBER BONNIE MICHAEL – I attended the Central Ohio Mayors and Managers Association (COMMA) meeting last week and I received a very detailed summary of the AT&T bill allowing all the devices; all the problems with the bill and how it impacts cities; there was a very lengthy written piece that described here’s what the cities can’t do, and here is what cities need to be aware of as its coming through. I gave those materials to Mr. Greeson and he will make copies of this presentation and send them out to the Council members so you will also see this. Mrs. Fox is going to be able to check up on some of this more; all of the communities that were present basically had united feeling that something needs to be done perhaps in a court of law regarding this piece of legislation and the negative impact that it has on communities and what they can do. I just wanted to let Council know this maybe a topic coming up for discussion sooner rather than later.

Mr. Norstrom asked do we know the position the Ohio Municipal League is taking. Ms. Michael replied we will be finding out.

COUNCILMEMBER SCOTT MYERS – I apologize for not being at last week’s meeting, I was ill and at home in bed. I also would like to apologize to Mr. Troper for jumping you a little bit ago about this issue, but I’m a little troubled about what happened at last week’s meeting and I want to clarify my understanding of what I thought the process was and what I read the code as to what the process is: when an appeal is filed from an ARB decision with Council, the first decision has nothing to do with the merits of the appeal itself; it’s a discussion of whether it’s an issue of great significance and therefore should be heard by Council; and it’s my understanding that last week it became a discussion on the merits, I likened it to the court preceding where you lose in the trial court, you have a right to appeal to a court of appeals, if you lose in the court of appeals, you can appeal to the Supreme Court, but that’s not an automatic right. The threshold decision for the court is should they even consider the issue and that’s a
separate discussion among the justices than actually hearing the case itself and the standard that is given to the justices is a matter of great general import or does it pose a constitutional question, so that’s all they talk about before they let the case in, and then once the case is in they talk about whether solar panels are good, whether they’re bad, whether their placement is good or whether the placement is bad. The discussion Mr. Norstrom on your first appeal was all about the process, nothing to do with the merits and I think that’s what the discussion should be; If I’m involved in the discussion next time that’s where I would I would direct it because in entertaining the merits and allowing comment addressed to one side of the merits, it means the appellate did not have the opportunity to prepare his comments or to have his witnesses there to talk about the merits and therefore we’ve jeopardized one side, and in my mind denied due process rights to one party while we afforded them to the other. Doesn’t change how we decide or what we decide, it just changes the process of how we go about it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION    Councilmember Foust made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Personnel Compensation, and Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

Council recessed at 9:00 P.M. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION    Councilmember Foust made a motion to return to open session at 9:03 P.M. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.
ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:03 P.M.

______________________________
Temporary Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of February, 2017.

__________________________________________
Council President
Special Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 17, 2017 ~ 7:00 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 Special Session on Tuesday, January 17, 2017, 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 7:00 p.m.

Members Present: Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas Foust, David Norstrom, and Bonnie D. Michael (Scott Myers, Douglas K. Smith, and Michael C. Troper arrived shortly after roll call)

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress and City Manager Matthew Greeson

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to meet in Executive Session to interview for Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

____________________________________
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of February, 2017.

____________________________________
Council President
ORDINANCE NO. 03-2017

Enacting a Moratorium on the Consideration of Certificates of Appropriateness for the Installation of Solar Panels on Structures in the Architectural Review District.

WHEREAS, in an effort to address sustainability and energy conservation measures within the City of Worthington, applications have been made to the Architectural Review Board for Certificates of Appropriateness for the installation of solar panels on structures within the Architectural Review District (the “District”); and,

WHEREAS, in 2010 City Council adopted Resolution 14-2010 amending the Worthington Design Guidelines for the District by adding a sustainability section; and,

WHEREAS, recent requests for the installation of solar panels on residential structures in the District have given rise to discussions by the City Council about the application of the sustainability section of the Design Guidelines as they relate to solar panels; and,

WHEREAS, City Council wishes to study the impact of solar panel installations on structures in architectural review districts and recommends a ninety day moratorium on the consideration of Certificates of Appropriateness for such installations to allow for City staff to research and recommend whether changes to the Design Guidelines or other measures are advisable.

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

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is enacted a moratorium on any consideration by the Architectural Review Board of requests for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of solar panels on structures within the Architectural Review District, to be in effect until May 31, 2017, or until changes are enacted to amend the Design Guidelines or the Codified Ordinances to address the issues detailed herein, or until City Council approves legislation explicitly revoking this moratorium, whichever occurs first.

SECTION 2. That the City Manager is authorized and directed to facilitate a study by City staff of the impact of the installation of solar panels on structures within districts similar to the Worthington Architectural Review District and to make a recommendation to City Council for the appropriate method to address the concerns of the visual and aesthetic features of those installations while affording the opportunity to property owners in the District to take advantage of the sustainability and energy conservation measures of solar panels.
ORDINANCE NO. 03-2017

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

Passed ________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:       Introduced January 17, 2017
_____________   P.H. February 6, 2017
Clerk of Council
Introduction

As a result of a recent appeal of the ARB decision to permit solar panels on a home in the Architectural Review District, Council has explored the option of enacting a short moratorium for the purpose of allowing some time to Staff to research, evaluate, and present to Council some options that might address concerns about the visual impact of solar panels on the character of the District. As we heard at the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting, a short moratorium on the ARB’s consideration of applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install solar panels is permissible, so long as during the moratorium period a plan is in place to address the issues that are the basis of the moratorium. The Director of Planning and Building continues to study policies, guidelines and legislation of similar communities with historical/architectural districts, with the intent of bringing back options for Council to consider at the first meeting in February. The proposed ordinance establishes a 90-day moratorium with an end date of May 31st, allowing for 90 days following the introduction, public hearing and effectiveness of the ordinance. It was suggested that if Council agreed on a resolution of the issue prior to the end of the 90 days, the moratorium might end earlier. The ordinance provides for an earlier termination if changes are enacted to amend the Design Guidelines or the Codified Ordinances, or until Council revokes the moratorium.

Establishing a Moratorium

A moratorium is a sanctioned delay in approvals or processing of certain governmental actions, thereby preserving the status quo for some period of time to allow government officials an opportunity to address certain issues or concerns that would be difficult to resolve without the delay. Moratoria are most commonly used by governmental entities in the context of property
development applications, but can be enacted for other purposes (e.g., delaying the issuance of licenses for sales of certain products or delaying eminent domain activities for economic development purposes). The courts have generally upheld the imposition of development moratoria, but have cautioned that it is necessary to have a plan developed simultaneously with the adoption of the moratorium legislation that would be implemented during the delay period and address the basis of the moratorium. Otherwise, a moratorium could be declared to be an invalid taking of property without due process.

The period of duration of a moratorium should be definite and only for so long as may be necessary to put appropriate measures in place that would resolve the specific concerns. While six-month moratoria are common, a moratorium lasting more than a year may be viewed with some skepticism but permitted in instances where the plan implementation period is extensive.

Placing an “interim development control” (as a moratorium may be described) allows for the community and its government to step back and evaluate the particular issue involved in a more objective and comprehensive way, without regard to specific property owners’ interests. In our case, the very limited use of a 90-day moratorium – to delay the consideration of Certificates of Appropriateness for the installation of solar panels – would seem to do little to adversely affect a property owner who may be deciding whether to make such an application. For this reason, many of the most critical concerns about development moratoria are alleviated, in that (a) the City is not acting to deprive those property owners of viable and economic use of their property and (b) the moratorium is of a limited duration for applications that are not all that frequent.

**Moratorium Legislation**

Most often, municipalities adopt moratoria by ordinance or resolution, depending on the particular municipality’s process for the passage of legislation. In the context of a development moratorium, it is recommended that an ordinance be passed because the Council is placing a delay on a codified Architectural Review Board process. At the end of the moratorium period, the delay will be automatically lifted. If the concerns of Council are resolved prior to that time, Council can expressly revoke the moratorium as part of a separate piece of legislation (a resolution would be appropriate at that point) or a revocation of the moratorium can be made as part of any other legislation that Council may choose to adopt or pass as a result of the study and recommendations of City Staff.

If you have any questions about this information, please do not hesitate to contact me.
RESOLUTION NO. 04-2017

Authorizing Amendments to the Policy & Procedures of the City’s Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program.

WHEREAS, since 2014 the City has implemented the Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (“ReCAP”) to encourage voluntary investment in the commercial corridor generally comprised of Huntley Road and Proprietors Road, by providing funding for exterior facade and streetscape enhancement projects; and,

WHEREAS, as projects have been approved and completed over the past couple of years, City staff has evaluated the ReCAP Policy & Procedures and the related application materials authorized by City Council on March 17, 2014, as amended on February 1, 2016, and presented some updates to the Board of Directors of the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation, who recommended approval at its November 18, 2016 meeting.

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

SECTION 1. That the Council of the City of Worthington does hereby authorize the recommended amendments to the ReCAP Policy & Procedures as further outlined in the attached EXHIBIT A.

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

Adopted ______________

____________________________

President of Council

Attest:

____________________________

Clerk of Council
Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP)  
Application Scoring Sheet (2017)

This sheet is used by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) to score each application submitted during 2017 for Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) funding. A total score of 100 points is possible; to be considered for funding, an application must receive a minimum score of 65 points.

- Current Physical Condition / Exterior Appearance (**up to 25 points**)
- Scope of Work (**25 points**)
- Applicant’s Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay (**20 points**)
- Applicant’s Demonstrated Commitment to Worthington Business Community (**10 points**)
- Overall Quality of Application (**20 points**)

One (1) scoring sheet is completed by the CIC for each application received, with each scoring session occurring during a regular or special meeting of the CIC. Items in this sheet have been weighted to best gauge the completeness and quality of each Applicant’s responses.

For each item addressed by the Applicant, to the degree indicated, provide a checkmark in the appropriate box. The total evaluation score assigned to each application then is determined by adding the values from all checked items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Staff Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project located within the ReCAP Program Area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed improvements being made to a commercial building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s City income tax obligations and real estate taxes on the building in full compliance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant provided at least three (3) bids by contractors representing all exterior improvements contemplated under the Project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Type</td>
<td>□ Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Tenant, with Owner’s approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Site Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Physical Condition / Exterior Appearance

*Using the items below, gauge the Project Site’s current conditions, including building and site improvement needs, and the applicability of ReCAP assistance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extraordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prominence and visibility of Project Site from commercial corridor(s).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived age of Project Site facilities and lack of exterior upkeep.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which Project Site’s current conditions are impacting surrounding properties.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for exterior improvements to the Project Site – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site does not have a demonstrated need for improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site’s need for improvements is <strong>nominal</strong></td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site’s need for improvements is <strong>preferable</strong></td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site’s need for improvements is <strong>extraordinary</strong></td>
<td>+ 25</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Scope of Work

*Using the items below, gauge the Applicant’s Project Scope of Work (plan to make improvements), the reasons for making such improvements, and the timing in which they will occur.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work’s described improvements will positively impact Project Site’s appearance along the Corridor.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work’s improvements are in-line with design expectations and build quality typical for similar properties in Worthington.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work will result in impactful, lasting aesthetic benefit to the property and does not simply entail deferred maintenance.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which the Applicant demonstrates pre-planning via its Scope of Work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project’s estimated completion time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality and comprehensiveness of Applicant’s Scope of Work—choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scope of Work does <em>not</em> adequately enhance the exterior of the project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Described Scope is <em>nominal</em></td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Described Scope is <em>preferable</em></td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Described Scope is <em>extraordinary</em></td>
<td>+ 25</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay

*Using the items below, gauge how well the Applicant demonstrates that its project is viable, the Applicant has experience undertaking similar projects & Applicant’s ability to repay the loan.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total exterior project costs are reasonable and appropriate to the Project scope.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided contractor bids are in-line with trade customs and comparable projects in the area.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant demonstrates its capabilities and available administrative capacity to successfully manage and complete the Project.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project site not marked by obvious significant obstacles to renovation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank’s letter of credit or loan commitment, or personal financial statement, is indicative of Applicant is likely repayment of the loan portion within three (3) years.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project viability and loan repayment – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant does <em>not</em> adequately demonstrate a viable project and/or its ability to repay the loan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>nominal</em> project viability and loan repayment</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>preferred</em> project viability and loan repayment</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>extraordinary</em> project viability and loan repayment</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Commitment to Worthington Community

*Using the items below, gauge how well the Applicant demonstrates its commitment to the Worthington community.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extraordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is both the owner and the user of the property.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is current or previous member of one or more Worthington-area business associations or charitable groups.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has operated within the Worthington area for some time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has supplied other evidence that sufficiently demonstrates its commitment to the Worthington community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s commitment to the community – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant does <em>not</em> adequately demonstrate its commitment to the Worthington community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>nominal</em> commitment to the community</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>preferred</em> commitment to the community</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>extraordinary</em> commitment to the community</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Quality of Application

*Using the items below, gauge the overall quality of the Applicant’s submitted application, including the nature of the proposed project and the project’s likely outcomes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has supplied a proposal that is logical and easy to follow.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scope of Work describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of Project Site’s current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has completed the entire application, and included any additional materials to allow for full understanding.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project, once completed, will assist in keeping commercial tenants and/or locating new tenants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the exterior improvement project likely will result in an increase in the value of the Project Site and surrounding properties.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s described use of any ReCAP award provides optimal return-on-investment in improving exterior façade.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criterion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Applicant Score</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of Application – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes a <em>subpar</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes a <em>nominal</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes a <em>preferred</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes an <em>extraordinary</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those interested in receiving ReCAP financing for exterior improvements must complete this form and submit to the City of Worthington. The City will review the information to determine whether an award of ReCAP assistance is approved for the described project.

### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Mailing Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name &amp; Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site Address</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Purchased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Leased (lease ends: ____ / ____ / ____ )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant’s Federal Identification Number (FEIN)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ - _______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(attach sheet if additional FEINs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe Applicant’s Commitment to and Involvement in the Worthington Community</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Attach Copy of Applicant’s Recent Letter of Credit or Loan Commitment from a Banking Institution | If the Applicant cannot show recent correspondence from a Banking Institution, Applicant can supply a completed Personal Financial Statement (SBA Form 413). |

### Property Owner Information
As the owner in fee simple of the real property at the Project Site Address, I hereby acknowledge and approve of the Applicant submitting this request for City of Worthington ReCAP assistance to improve said property.

PROPERTY OWNER

______________________________

STATE OF OHIO )

) ss.

COUNTY OF ____________ )

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for said county, personally appeared the above-named Property Owner who acknowledged the signing hereof to be his/her voluntary act for the purposes therein mentioned.

Signed:_____________________________________

Notary Public, State of Ohio

My Commission expires:_______________________

Project Site – Current Conditions

(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

In the Space Provided, Describe the Project Site’s Current Conditions, including Building & Site Improvement Needs

Attach Current, As-is Photographs of the Project Site

Project Scope of Work & Applicant Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Total Exterior Project Costs</th>
<th>$ ______________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Attach additional sheets if necessary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Space Provided, Describe the Exterior Improvement Project’s Scope of Work

In the Space Provided, Describe the Applicant’s Experience in Undertaking / Managing Similar Projects

Attach Renderings, Illustrations and/or Drawings for the Exterior Improvement Project
## Project Work Bids

**Attach Three (3) Written Bids for All Exterior Improvement Work to be Performed under the Project**

Applicant must supply at least three (3) written bids for the work to be performed. Applicants must ensure that all bids are based on the same work (example: if Bid 1 is for tuckpointing, window replacement, and flashing, Bids 2 and 3 must also be for same scope of services)

**NOTE:** Although ReCAP awards are calculated only per the lowest bid, Applicants are free to accept higher bids.

## Contractor Selected & Construction Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Selected</th>
<th>Name: _________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Schedule</td>
<td>Approximate date work to begin: _____ / _____ / ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases, ReCAP-assisted construction must be completed within 24 months of making application.

## Compliance with City Laws & Regulations

Please verify the following by providing a check mark next to the ones that are true.

- [ ] Property taxes are up to date on this property.
- [ ] Applicant is in full compliance with City income tax obligations.
- [ ] Property is fully compliant with the City’s building & zoning code; There are no known violations.

## Applicant Signature

As an authorized representative of the Applicant, I hereby submit this Application. I understand that this Application, once submitted, in no way constitutes a commitment of funds by the City of Worthington.

I hereby represent and certify that I have reviewed the information contained in this Application, and the foregoing and attached information, to the best of my knowledge and belief, is true, complete and accurately describes the proposed project for which the City’s ReCAP assistance is being sought.

I am aware that Ohio law sets forth criminal penalties for falsification on applications for economic development assistance (see Ohio Revised Code §2921.13(A)(4)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Applications are to be submitted to the following:

**City of Worthington, Economic Development**

6550 North High Street

Worthington, Ohio 43085
Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP)
Policy & Procedures 2017

The Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) provides financial assistance to encourage exterior investment and enhancement to commercial properties within certain areas of the City of Worthington. The program provides a mixture of grant funds and no-cost financing to building owners or commercial tenants to improve their building facades and surrounding streetscapes.

ReCAP is part of the City’s efforts to drive new job growth along the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridor, including the connecting portions of Worthington Galena Road and Schrock Road. This corridor’s commercial real estate is comprised primarily of industrial and warehousing space and was defined largely from the 1950s until 1980. As properties along this corridor are improved, the City desires continued attraction and retention of commercial renters and owners that provide employment in Worthington.

Worthington is known for appealing architecture and historic aesthetics, much of which derive from Worthington’s design review and approval of development along the High Street and Granville Road corridors. Other areas of the City, notably the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridor, are not subject to Worthington’s design standards. This program is intended to spur investment in the older properties in this corridor to enhance the attraction of employers to this important commercial area of Worthington.

The ReCAP program began in 2014 and twelve projects have received funding during the first three years of the program. The projects that have been funded are spread across the eligible area with seven of them located on Huntley Road, two located on Proprietors Road, two on Worthington Galena Road and one on Schrock Road. Award amounts have ranged from $5,000 up to the maximum allowed of $25,000. The City’s contribution has been matched at least one to one with private funding in each project.
Section 1: Assistance Available

A combination of grants and no-cost financing are available under ReCAP to fund commercial building exterior enhancements. ReCAP assistance is provided as a one-time, up-front cash payment for the loan portion, as well as a one-time reimbursement of the grant portion upon project completion. This assistance is intended to partially fund exterior enhancements to the properties and improve the aesthetics of the corridor to prevent devaluation and disinvestment along the corridor. This program is not intended to help offset routine/deferred maintenance.

The maximum ReCAP award is fifty percent (50%) of the lowest contractor’s bid (three bids required) for work under the project. The maximum ReCAP award is $25,000. The cash assistance award will be comprised of half grant and half loan (each capped at 25% of the total project cost). The awardee may elect to forego the loan portion, but the grant portion will still be capped at 25% of the total project cost. Each project has a maximum one-time grant reimbursement payment of $12,500, and a maximum $12,500 loan at zero percent (0%) interest for a term of up to three (3) years. The actual award amount is determined by the cost of the work to be done under the project. Here is an example of a ReCAP project award:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost (Lowest of 3 Bids):</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCAP Award (50% of Total Project Cost):</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Portion (25% of ReCAP Award):</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Portion (25% of ReCAP Award):</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the ReCAP Program, the City provides design assistance to applicants through a contract with the Neighborhood Design Center. When potential applicants contact the City regarding interest in the program, City staff will connect them with the Neighborhood Design Center who will provide design advice and assistance related to meaningful ways to utilize funds to enhance the aesthetics of the property. This design assistance is provided at no cost to the applicant.

If qualified to do so, the applicant may perform the improvement work. ReCAP funds cannot be used to compensate the applicant for the purchase or rental of tools and equipment or for applicant’s labor or the labor of family, friends, employees, or others with a financial interest in the business or property. In such instances, ReCAP can be used only to pay for materials.

An application seeking ReCAP funds must be filed with the City to be considered for funding. The City may solicit certain property owners or tenants to participate. Applications will be reviewed by City staff and then forwarded to the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation for recommendation to City Council.
Awards are subject to the availability of funds. Applications will be received throughout the year as long as funds are available. Review deadlines have been established to trigger the review of the applications received. These review deadlines for 2017 are:

February 24, 2017  
April 28, 2017  
August 25, 2017

If all of the funding allocated for 2017 is awarded to projects before the end of the year, the review deadlines for the remainder of the year will be cancelled. The review deadlines may be modified by the Community Improvement Corporation Board as it deems appropriate. Applicants can verify deadlines with the City’s Economic Development Manager.

To be eligible, commercial properties must be located within the ReCAP Program Area.

The grant-loan award must be for exterior front façade enhancements (and/or side building elevation if located on a corner lot) and/or the streetscape adjacent to the subject building.

**Section 2: Eligibility**

Building owners and tenants, with the property owner’s approval, can apply for cash assistance if (1) the building to be improved is in the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A); (2) the improvements are to a commercial building (industrial, office and/or retail); and (3) the applicant and building owners are in full compliance with City ordinances and regulations, including income and real estate tax obligations and building and zoning code regulations.

After an award is made, all build-out work must be completed according to the construction schedule submitted as part of the application. In all cases, ReCAP-assisted construction must be completed within 24 months of making application. All build-out work must be performed by licensed contractors which are bonded and insured for the project. All project work must be in compliance with applicable City building permit processes and planning commission approvals.

Applications must demonstrate, via a bank’s letter of credit, loan commitment or personal financial statement, the ability of the applicant to complete the entire project as proposed and repay the loan portion of the cash assistance award.

To receive funding or otherwise participate in the program, recipients cannot be in violation of any City rules, regulations or ordinances. A project close-out occurs upon an awardee’s submittal of any Certificates of Occupancy issued regarding the project, paid invoices to the licensed contractors and/or suppliers, and the full repayment of the loan component.
Table 1: Eligible Improvement Costs

- Exterior painting that incorporates a major visual change
- Significant masonry cleaning and restoration modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
- Addition of awnings or replacement of awnings with a updated design style that results in a major visual enhancement
- Enhanced exterior building lighting that creates a noticeably enhanced appearance
- Storefront entry systems and individual windows and door replacement or modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
- New or restored façade elements such as: cornices, soffits, canopies, and other detail elements
- Streetscape plantings, street furniture, new curbs and sidewalks, streetlights and related streetscape amenities
- Demolition (if part of an overall design)
- Signage, if new sign is in line with City overlay standards and/or old sign is significantly upgraded from existing old, out-of-date, substandard, or non-conforming signage
- Storm water improvements to parking lots

Table 2: Ineligible Costs

- Paying down on existing loans
- Routine/deferred maintenance (including painting, general masonry upkeep, general window and door upkeep, and repair or replacement of current lighting or removing inoperable lighting fixtures)
- Building Permit & Inspection Fees
- Working capital
- Security fencing or gates
- Inventory
- Roof repair or replacement
- Awning repair or replacement if utilizing the same style of awning
- Interior improvements of any kind
**Section 3: Application & Grant Payment Process**

ReCAP assistance is appropriated by Worthington City Council as part of its annual budget process; in 2017, the program has been appropriated $75,000.

Building owners or tenants with the building owner’s approval, are to complete and submit the ReCAP Application Form, which must include digital photographs of the subject property as well as renderings or illustrations of the proposed improvements. The cost to prepare an application, if any, is solely the responsibility of the applicant.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to contact the City’s Economic Development Manager to discuss the project before submitting application materials. When contact is made, the Economic Development Manager will provide information regarding the program and will connect the potential applicant with the Neighborhood Design Center. The Neighborhood Design Center will provide design advice and assistance at no cost to the applicant. The Neighborhood Design Center is available to prepare renderings or illustrations of the proposed project and assist with other parts of the application.

City staff will review submitted ReCAP applications after the review deadlines listed in Section 1 and prepare them for the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. The Worthington Community Improvement Corporation will prepare formal recommendations of funding for projects to City Council. Awardees should receive the approval of City Council prior to any construction commencing under their respective projects.

A one-time, up-front cash payment for the loan portion will be remitted upon City Council approval of the project and execution of an agreement between the City and the awardee detailing the terms and conditions of assistance. The grant portion will be paid to the awardee as a one-time reimbursement, upon request, after the project work has been completed.

**Section 4: Selection Criteria**

City staff will process each ReCAP application that has been submitted by the review deadline and prepare it for full review by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. Applications for assistance will be measured according to the following:

- Current physical condition / exterior appearance
  - Prominence and visibility of site
  - Perceived age of facilities and lack of exterior upkeep
  - Extent to which current conditions are impacting surrounding properties
• Project scope of work
  o Improvements will positively impact the site’s appearance along the corridor
  o Improvements are in line with design expectations and build quality typical for similar properties in Worthington
  o Scope of Work will result in impactful, lasting aesthetic benefit to the property and does not simply entail deferred maintenance
  o Extent of pre-planning via the scope of work
  o Estimated completion time of the project

• Project viability and demonstrated ability to repay
  o Estimated total exterior project costs are reasonable and appropriate for the scope
  o Bids are in line with trade customs and comparable projects in the area
  o Applicant’s capabilities and capacity to successfully manage and complete the project
  o Site not marked by obvious significant obstacles to renovation
  o Applicant’s ability to repay the loan within three (3) years

• Commitment to Worthington community
  o Applicant is both the owner and user of the property
  o Applicant’s involvement in Worthington area business associations or charitable groups
  o Applicant’s length of operation in Worthington
  o Applicant’s commitment to the Worthington community

• Overall quality of the application
  o Applicant has supplied a proposal that is logical and easy to follow
  o Project describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail
  o Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements
  o Applicant has completed the entire application, and included any additional materials to allow for full understanding
  o The project, once completed, will assist in keeping commercial tenants and/or locating new tenants
  o The nature of the exterior improvement project likely will result in an increase in the value of the Project Site and surrounding properties
  o Applicant’s described use of any ReCAP award provides optimal return-on-investment in improving exterior façade
Staff has reviewed the program materials for ReCAP (Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program) and recommends updates. The proposed changes were discussed by the Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) Board, which recommends approval of the revised Policy and Procedures, Application, and Scoring Sheet for the program for 2017. These documents were previously adopted by resolution of City Council, thus the changes need to be approved by resolution. Both clean and redline versions of these documents are attached.

The Policy & Procedures Guide is proposed to be modified as follows:

1. Grant portion of the award would be reimbursable, rather than an advance;
2. Language added to emphasize that the program is not intended to help offset deferred maintenance;
3. Awardees may elect to forego the loan portion of the award. In this case, the total award would only represent 25% of the total project costs, rather than the standard 50%;
4. Updated application review deadlines; and
5. Updated language on how applications will be scored. These changes are reflective of the updates to the 2017 Scoring Sheet.

The Scoring Sheet is proposed to be modified as follows:

1. Increase maximum score of “Current Physical Condition/Exterior Appearance” section from 20 to 25 points. More emphasis will be placed on how the location and visibility of the project site impacts the strength of the corridor;
2. Increase maximum score of “Scope of Work” section from 20 to 25 points. More emphasis will be placed on how the project will result in impactful, lasting aesthetic benefits to the property, rather than just deferred maintenance;
3. Question added about to determine if property is owner-occupied; and
4. Decrease minimum and maximum score of “Overall Quality of Application” section from 10 to 0 points, and 30 to 20 points, respectively. Less emphasis will be placed on the clerical quality of the application, in favor of the aforementioned prominence of the project site and value of the Scope of Work.

The Application is proposed to be modified as follows:

1. General document cleanup and simplification; and
2. Clarifying that three (3) written bids are required, not two (2).
This sheet is used by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) to score each application submitted during 2016-2017 for Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) funding. A total score of 100 points is possible; to be considered for funding, an application must receive a minimum score of 65 points.

- Current Physical Condition / Exterior Appearance (up to 20-25 points)
- Scope of Work (20-25 points)
- Applicant’s Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay (20 points)
- Applicant’s Demonstrated Commitment to Worthington Business Community (10 points)
- Overall Quality of Application (30-20 points)

One (1) scoring sheet is completed by the CIC for each application received, with each scoring session occurring during a regular or special meeting of the CIC. Items in this sheet have been weighted to best gauge the completeness and quality of each Applicant’s responses.

For each item addressed by the Applicant, to the degree indicated, provide a checkmark in the appropriate box. The total evaluation score assigned to each application then is determined by adding the values from all checked items.
### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Type</td>
<td>□ Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Tenant, with Owner’s approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Site Address</td>
<td>Worthington, OH 43____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Physical Condition / Exterior Appearance

*Using the items below, gauge the Project Site’s current conditions, including building and site improvement needs, and the applicability of ReCAP assistance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prominence and visibility of Project Site from commercial corridor(s)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived age of Project Site facilities and lack of exterior upkeep</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which Project Site’s current conditions are impacting surrounding properties</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for exterior improvements to the Project Site – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site does <em>not</em> have a demonstrated need for improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site’s need for improvements is <em>nominal</em></td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site’s need for improvements is <em>preferable</em></td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Site’s need for improvements is <em>extraordinary</em></td>
<td>+ 20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Scope of Work**

*Using the items below, gauge the Applicant’s Project Scope of Work (plan to make improvements), the reasons for making such improvements, and the timing in which they will occur.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Scope of Work describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work’s described improvements will positively impact Project Site’s appearance along the Corridor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work’s improvements are in-line with design expectations and build quality typical for similar properties in Worthington</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of Project Site’s current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements. Scope of Work will result in impactful, lasting aesthetic benefit to the property and does not simply entail deferred maintenance.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which the Applicant demonstrates pre-planning via its Scope of Work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project’s estimated completion time</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

... score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality and comprehensiveness of Applicant’s Scope of Work—<strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scope of Work does <em>not</em> adequately describe the exterior enhancement project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Described Scope is <em>nominal</em></td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Described Scope is <em>preferable</em></td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Described Scope is <em>extraordinary</em></td>
<td>+ 2025</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Viability & Demonstrated Ability to Repay

*Using the items below, gauge how well the Applicant demonstrates that its project is viable, the Applicant has experience undertaking similar projects & Applicant’s ability to repay the loan.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total exterior project costs are reasonable and appropriate to</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Project scope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided contractor bids are in-line with trade customs and comparable</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant demonstrates its capabilities and available administrative</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity to successfully manage and complete the Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project site not marked by obvious significant obstacles to renovation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank’s letter of credit or loan commitment, or personal financial</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement, is indicative of Applicant is likely repayment of the loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion within three (3) years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

…score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project viability and loan repayment – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant does <em>not</em> adequately demonstrate a viable project and/or its</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to repay the loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>nominal</em> project viability and loan repayment</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>preferred</em> project viability and loan repayment</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>extraordinary</em> project viability and loan</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repayment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commitment to Worthington Community

Using the items below, gauge how well the Applicant demonstrates its commitment to the Worthington community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is both the owner and the user of the property.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is current or previous member of one or more Worthington-area business associations or charitable groups.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has operated within the Worthington area for some time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has supplied other evidence that sufficiently demonstrates its commitment to the Worthington community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s commitment to the community – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant does <em>not</em> adequately demonstrate its commitment to the Worthington community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>nominal</em> commitment to the community</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>preferred</em> commitment to the community</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant demonstrates <em>extraordinary</em> commitment to the community</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Overall Quality of Application

*Using the items below, gauge the overall quality of the Applicant’s submitted application, including the nature of the proposed project and the project’s likely outcomes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Extra-ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has supplied a proposal that is logical and easy to follow.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scope of Work describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of Project Site’s current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has completed the entire application, and included any additional materials to allow for full understanding.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project, once completed, will assist in keeping commercial tenants and/or locating new tenants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the exterior improvement project likely will result in an increase in the value of the Project Site and surrounding properties.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s described use of any ReCAP award provides optimal return-on-investment in improving exterior façade.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the marks given to the application above as a guide…

… score the application below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Applicant Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of Application – <strong>choose ONLY ONE (1) of the following choices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes a <em>subpar</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>0–10</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes a <em>nominal</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes a <em>preferred</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally, the application describes an <em>extraordinary</em> exterior improvement project</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP)
Application for Assistance (2016-2017)

Those interested in receiving ReCAP financing for exterior improvements must complete this form and submit to the City of Worthington. The City will review the information to determine whether an award of ReCAP assistance is approved for the described project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant’s Mailing Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name &amp; Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Email</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Phone No.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Site Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this site:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant’s Federal Identification Number (FEIN)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Describe Applicant’s Commitment to and Involvement in the Worthington Community**

**Attach Copy of Applicant’s Recent Letter of Credit or Loan Commitment from a Banking Institution**

If the Applicant cannot show recent correspondence from a Banking Institution, Applicant can supply a completed Personal Financial Statement (SBA Form 413).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Name*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If Applicant is NOT the Property Owner, then Property Owner must supply notarized acknowledgement.

As the owner in fee simple of the real property at the Project Site Address, I hereby acknowledge and approve of the Applicant submitting this request for City of Worthington ReCAP assistance to improve said property.

PROPERTY OWNER

____________________________________

STATE OF OHIO )
COUNTY OF ____________ ) ss.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for said county, personally appeared the above-named Property Owner who acknowledged the signing hereof to be his/her voluntary act for the purposes therein mentioned.

Signed:____________________________________

Notary Public, State of Ohio

My Commission expires:_____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site – Current Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Attach additional sheets if necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Space Provided, Describe the Project Site’s Current Conditions, including Building & Site Improvement Needs

Attach Current, As-is Photographs of the Project Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Scope of Work &amp; Applicant Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Exterior Project Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Attach additional sheets if necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Space Provided, Describe the Exterior Improvement Project’s Scope of Work*

*If the exterior work is part of a larger renovation project at the Project Site, please describe other planned improvements

In the Space Provided, Describe the Applicant’s Experience in Undertaking / Managing Similar Projects

Attach Renderings, Illustrations and/or Drawings for the Exterior Improvement Project
# Project Work Bids

Attach Two (2) Three (3) Written Bids for All Exterior Improvement Work to be Performed under the Project

Applicant must supply at least three (3) written bids for the work to be performed. Applicants must ensure that all bids are based on the same work (example: if Bid 1 is for tuckpointing, window replacement, and flashing, Bids 2 and 3 must also be for same scope of services)

NOTE: Although ReCAP awards are calculated only per the lowest bid, Applicants are free to accept higher bids.

### Contractor Selected & Construction Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Selected</th>
<th>Name: ____________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Schedule</td>
<td>Approximate date work to begin:          Approximate date work to be completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>____ / _____ / ________          ____ / _____ / ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases, ReCAP-assisted construction must be completed within 24 months of making application

### Compliance with City Laws & Regulations

Please verify the following by providing a check mark next to the ones that are true.

- [ ] Property taxes are up to date on this property.
- [ ] Applicant is in full compliance with City income tax obligations.
- [ ] Property is fully compliant with the City’s building & zoning code; There are no known violations.

### Applicant Signature

As an authorized representative of the Applicant, I hereby submit this Application. I understand that this Application, once submitted, in no way constitutes a commitment of funds by the City of Worthington.

I hereby represent and certify that I have reviewed the information contained in this Application, and the foregoing and attached information, to the best of my knowledge and belief, is true, complete and accurately describes the proposed project for which the City’s ReCAP assistance is being sought.

I am aware that Ohio law sets forth criminal penalties for falsification on applications for economic development assistance (see Ohio Revised Code §2921.13(A)(4)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Applications are to be submitted to the following:

**City of Worthington, Economic Development**

6550 North High Street

Worthington, Ohio 43085
The Re-emergent Corridor Assistance Program (ReCAP) provides financial assistance to encourage exterior investment and enhancement to commercial properties within certain areas of the City of Worthington. The program provides a mixture of grant funds and no-cost financing to building owners or commercial tenants to improve their building facades and surrounding streetscapes.

ReCAP is part of the City’s efforts to drive new job growth along the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridor, including the connecting portions of Worthington Galena Road and Schrock Road. This corridor’s commercial real estate is comprised primarily of industrial and warehousing space and was defined largely from the 1950s until 1980. As properties along this corridor are improved, the City desires continued attraction and retention of commercial renters and owners that provide employment in Worthington.

Worthington is known for appealing architecture and historic aesthetics, much of which derive from Worthington’s design review and approval of development along the High Street and Granville Road corridors. Other areas of the City, notably the Huntley Road and Proprietors Road corridor, are not subject to Worthington’s design standards. This program is intended to spur investment in the older properties in this corridor to enhance the attraction of employers to this important commercial area of Worthington.

The ReCAP program began in 2014 and nine projects have received funding during the first two years of the program. The projects that have been funded are spread across the eligible area with four of them located on Huntley Road, two located on Proprietors Road, two on Worthington Galena Road and one on Schrock Road. Award amounts have ranged from $5,000 up to the maximum allowed of $25,000. The City’s contribution has been matched at least one to one with private funding in each project.
Section 1: Assistance Available

A combination of grants and no-cost financing are available under ReCAP to fund commercial building exterior enhancements. ReCAP assistance is provided as one-time, up-front cash payment for the loan portion, as well as a one-time reimbursement of the grant portion upon project completion, payments to awardees, each in the form a half-grant and half-loan. This assistance is intended to partially fund exterior enhancements to the properties and improve the aesthetics of the corridor to prevent devaluation and disinvestment along the corridor. This program is not intended to help offset routine/deferred maintenance.

The maximum ReCAP award is fifty percent (50%) of the lowest contractor’s bid (three bids required) for work under the project. The maximum ReCAP award is $25,000, or $25,000, whichever is less. In all cases, the cash assistance award will be comprised of half grant and half loan (each capped at 25% of the total project cost). The awardee may elect to forego the loan portion, but the grant portion will still be capped at 25% of the total project cost. Each project has a maximum one-time grant payment of $12,500 and a maximum $12,500 loan at zero percent (0%) interest for a term of up to three (3) years. The actual award amount is determined by the cost of the work to be done under the project. Here is an example of a ReCAP project award:

| Total Project Cost (Lowest of 3 Bids): | $40,000 |
| ReCAP Award (50% of Total Project Cost): | $20,000 |
| Grant Portion (25% of ReCAP Award): | $10,000 |
| Loan Portion (25% of ReCAP Award): | $10,000 |

As part of the ReCAP Program, the City provides design assistance to applicants through a contract with the Neighborhood Design Center. When potential applicants contact the City regarding interest in the program, City staff will connect them with the Neighborhood Design Center who will provide design advice and assistance related to meaningful ways to utilize funds to enhance the aesthetics of the property. This design assistance is provided at no cost to the applicant.

If qualified to do so, the applicant may perform the improvement work. ReCAP funds cannot be used to compensate the applicant for the purchase or rental of tools and equipment or for applicant’s labor or the labor of family, friends, employees, or others with a financial interest in the business or property. In such instances, ReCAP can be used only to pay for materials.

An application seeking ReCAP funds must be filed with the City to be considered for funding. The City may solicit certain property owners or tenants to participate. Applications will be
reviewed by City staff and then forwarded to the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation for recommendation to City Council.

Awards are subject to the availability of funds. Applications will be received throughout the year as long as funds are available. Review deadlines have been established to trigger the review of the applications received. These review deadlines for 2016-2017 are:

- February 24, 2017
- April 28, 2017
- August 25, 2017

If all of the funding allocated for 2016 is awarded to projects before the end of the year, the review deadlines for the remainder of the year will be cancelled. The review deadlines may be modified by the Community Improvement Corporation Board as it deems appropriate. Applicants can verify deadlines with the City’s Economic Development Manager.

To be eligible to participate, commercial properties must be located within the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A).

The grant-loan award must be for exterior front façade enhancements (and/or side building elevation if located on a corner lot) and/or the streetscape adjacent to the subject building.

**Section 2: Eligibility**

Building owners and tenants, with the property owner’s approval, can apply for cash assistance if (1) the building to be improved is in the ReCAP Program Area (see Attachment A); (2) the improvements are to a commercial building (industrial, office and/or retail); and (3) the applicant and building owners are in full compliance with City ordinances and regulations, including income and real estate tax obligations and building and zoning code regulations.

After an award is made, all build-out work must be completed according to the construction schedule submitted as part of the application. In all cases, ReCAP-assisted construction must be completed within 24 months of making application. All build-out work must be performed by licensed contractors which are bonded and insured for the project. All project work must be in compliance with applicable City building permit processes and planning commission approvals.

Applications must demonstrate, via a bank’s letter of credit, loan commitment or personal financial statement, the ability of the applicant to complete the entire project as proposed and repay the loan portion of the cash assistance award.
To receive funding or otherwise participate in the program, recipients cannot be in violation of any City rules, regulations or ordinances. A project close-out occurs upon an awardee’s submittal of any Certificates of Occupancy issued regarding the project, paid invoices to the licensed contractors and/or suppliers, and the full repayment of the loan component.

Table 1: Eligible Improvement Costs

- Exterior painting that incorporates a major visual change
- Significant masonry cleaning and restoration modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
- Addition of awnings or replacement of awnings with a updated design style that results in a major visual enhancement
- Enhanced exterior building lighting that creates a noticeably enhanced appearance
- Storefront entry systems and individual windows and door replacement or modification (if part of an overall design restoration)
- New or restored façade elements such as: cornices, soffits, canopies, and other detail elements
- Streetscape plantings, street furniture, new curbs and sidewalks, streetlights and related streetscape amenities
- Demolition (if part of an overall design)
- Signage, if new sign is in line with City overlay standards and/or old sign is significantly upgraded from existing old, out-of-date, substandard, or non-conforming signage
- Stormwater improvements to parking lots

Table 2: Ineligible Costs

- Paying down on existing loans
- Routine/deferred maintenance (including painting, general masonry upkeep, general window and door upkeep, and repair or replacement of current lighting or removing inoperable lighting fixtures)
- Building Permit & Inspection Fees
- Working capital
- Security fencing or gates
- Inventory
- Roof repair or replacement
- Awning repair or replacement if utilizing the same style of awning
- Interior improvements of any kind

Section 3: Application & Grant Payment Process

ReCAP assistance is appropriated by Worthington City Council as part of its annual budget process; in 2016-2017, the program has been appropriated $75,000.

Building owners or tenants with the building owner’s approval, are to complete and submit the ReCAP Application Form, which must include digital photographs of the subject property as well as renderings or illustrations of the proposed improvements. The cost to prepare an application, if any, is solely the responsibility of the applicant.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to contact the City’s Economic Development Manager to discuss the project before submitting application materials. When contact is made, the Economic Development Manager will provide information regarding the program and will connect the potential applicant with the Neighborhood Design Center. The Neighborhood Design Center will provide design advice and assistance at no cost to the applicant. The Neighborhood Design Center is available to prepare renderings or illustrations of the proposed project and assist with other parts of the application.

City staff will review submitted ReCAP applications after the review deadlines listed in Section 1 and prepare them for the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. The Worthington Community Improvement Corporation will prepare formal recommendations of funding for projects to City Council. Awardees should receive the approval of City Council prior to any construction commencing under their respective projects.

A one-time, up-front cash payment for the loan portion will be remitted upon City Council approval of the project and execution of an agreement between the City and the awardee detailing the terms and conditions of assistance. The grant portion will be paid to the awardee as a one-time reimbursement, upon request, after the project work has been completed.

Section 4: Selection Criteria
City staff will process each ReCAP application that has been submitted by the review deadline and prepare it for full review by the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation. Applications for assistance will be measured according to the following:

- **Current physical condition / exterior appearance**
  - Prominence and visibility of site
  - Perceived age of facilities and lack of exterior upkeep
  - Extent to which current conditions are impacting surrounding properties

- **Project scope of work**
  - Project describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail
  - Improvements will positively impact the site’s appearance along the corridor
  - Improvements are in line with design expectations and build quality typical for similar properties in Worthington
  - Scope of Work will result in impactful, lasting aesthetic benefit to the property and does not simply entail deferred maintenance
  - Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements
  - Extent of pre-planning via the scope of work
  - Estimated completion time of the project

- **Project viability and demonstrated ability to repay**
  - Estimated total exterior project costs are reasonable and appropriate for the scope
  - Bids are in line with trade customs and comparable projects in the area
  - Applicant’s capabilities and capacity to successfully manage and complete the project
  - Site not marked by obvious significant obstacles to renovation
  - Applicant’s ability to repay the loan within three years

- **Commitment to Worthington community**
  - Applicant is both the owner and user of the property
  - Applicant’s involvement in Worthington area business associations or charitable groups
  - Applicant’s length of operation in Worthington
  - Applicant’s commitment to the Worthington community

- **Overall quality of the application**
  - Applicant has supplied a proposal that is logical and easy to follow
  - Project describes exterior improvements fully and in sufficient detail
  - Application materials include appropriate visual evidence of current conditions as well as adequate specifics about planned exterior improvements
  - Applicant has completed the entire application, and included any additional materials to allow for full understanding
- The project, once completed, will assist in keeping commercial tenants and/or locating new tenants
- The nature of the exterior improvement project likely will result in an increase in the value of the Project Site and surrounding properties
- Applicant’s described use of any ReCAP award provides optimal return-on-investment in improving exterior façade
The following is an excerpt from the Community Improvement Corporation Minutes, focused on the ReCAP discussion.

CIC of Worthington – Minutes for Friday, January 13, 2017, 8:00 a.m., COhatch Worthington at 659 High Street, Worthington, Ohio.

Board members in attendance were Tom Carter, Melissa Conrath, Bill Evans, Matt Greeson, Kathy Holcombe, Bonnie Michael, Dave Norstrom, Becky Princehorn, Doug Smith, and Ben Struewing. Also in attendance were City Manager Matt Greeson, Economic Development Manager David McCorkle, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart and Law Director Pam Fox.

The meeting was called to order at 8:07 a.m.

Ms. Princehorn asked for approval of the minutes from the November 18, 2016 meeting. Mr. Norstrom moved for approval, seconded by Mr. Struewing. The motion passed.

Ms. Princehorn introduced the financial reports and noted very little activity in October and November. Ms. Michael moved for acceptance of the October and November financial reports, seconded by Ms. Holcombe. The motion passed.

Ms. Princehorn reviewed to the next item on the agenda which is the meeting schedule for 2017. The meetings are proposed for every other month on the second Friday, with the exception of November which is recommended to be the first Friday given the holiday schedule. Hearing no concerns, Ms. Princehorn asked Mr. McCorkle to send out electronic invitations for the 2017 meetings.

Ms. Princehorn invited Mr. McCorkle to comment on the next agenda item, which was the ReCAP program. Mr. McCorkle reported he sent out prior to the meeting the proposed documents for 2017. The program is staying mostly intact with just a few small changes. The grant portion of the project award has been changed to a reimbursement rather than an upfront payment. It has been challenging administratively with the upfront payment when the applicant has not completed the entire scope of the project. This provides for the work to occur prior to payment of the grant. Mr. Norstrom asked if we would make payment during the construction as expenses occur. Mr. McCorkle replied that he proposes it be paid at one time, at the conclusion of the work.

Mr. McCorkle reported on the proposed scoring modification to incorporate points for owner-users. He moved ten points from the quality of the application and put five of the points in the scope of the
project section and five points into the prominence of the location. We’re slightly de-emphasizing the quality of the application and slightly increasing emphasis on the location of the project and the work to be done.

Mr. McCorkle raised a question regarding the loan portion of the project that has arisen from two potential applicants. They want to know if they have to accept the loan as they would prefer to accept just the grant for 25% of the total project. Mr. McCorkle said the only potential downside is that there would be less money coming back into the fund if we reduce the loan amounts. Ms. Princehorn asked why the applicant did not want the loan portion. Mr. McCorkle replied that they don’t need it and would pay it off on day one. Ms. Holcombe commented that since the loans have 0% interest, it doesn’t seem to really matter to the program. Mr. McCorkle asked if the Board would prefer to set aside the amount of the loan that would occur if the application requested it to make it available for future years or instead fund more projects this year. Mr. Norstrom moved to fund more projects this year. Mr. Carter seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.