



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 market place. 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

Establishing Compensation for Certain Exempt Positions of the Municipal Service For the Period of January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017, and Adopting Class Specifications for Said Exempt Positions.

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 issued.

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. Greason 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 than 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 year's 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 Establishing the Compensation Plan, Assigning Compensation Levels for Positions in the Classified Service, Adopting Class Specifications, Providing for Normal Work Weeks, and Repealing Resolution No. 56-2015.

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.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

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

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President