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

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, February 13, 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, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent: David Norstrom

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

There were 13 visitors present.

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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Research on Solar Panels in Historic or Architectural Review Districts

Ms. Michael explained this agenda item is scheduled to hear and discuss the research City staff has completed regarding the placement of solar panels in historic or architectural review districts.

Following the schedule determined by City Council last week, this section will focus on the research and answer questions about it. It is not intended to be a public hearing in which public comments are received.

There is an opportunity for people in the audience to submit written questions on 3x5 cards. If you have a question regarding the research, please write it on a card and submit it.

This topic will be discussed again at the City Council meeting on March 13th at which time there will be an opportunity for public comment.

Mrs. Stewart explained that the tonight’s discussion on the topic regarding solar panels in the historic and architectural review district is to go over the research that staff has
conducted; we’ve reached out to a number of other communities to gather information about how they handle solar panels in architectural or historical areas and so Mr. Brown is prepared to provide an overview of that research and also prepared to answer any questions that you may have regarding the research that has been conducted. I will now turn the remainder of the discussion over to Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown stated as Mrs. Stewart explained we’re here this evening to look at solar panels. Staff reached out to a multiple of a variety of jurisdictions (30+ jurisdictions) and did phone interviews with some of these to see how they regulate solar panels in their historic districts and/or citywide. Before you, what I thought I would start off with is the following presentation:
The core of the district is actually Old Worthington the original 1803 plat of Worthington with High Street and 161 which are in our architectural review district; this is for commercial and residential development. We are celebrating our 50 years of architectural review district, it was established in 1967, again it’s for any new construction or exterior modification or change to an existing structure in that district requires ARB approval.
Worthington Design Guidelines

History:

• Architectural Review District established in 1967.
• Any new construction and/or exterior modification or change to an existing structure in the Architectural Review District requires ARB approval to ensure compliance with the Worthington Design Guidelines.
  — Residential and commercial

Worthington Design Guidelines

Sustainability:

• City Council adopted Resolution #14-2010 (03.01.2010) incorporating sustainable design and building practices in the Design Guidelines with the goal to preserve the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District.
Worthington Design Guidelines

Solar Panel – Current Guidelines:
• 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.

Solar Panels – Discussion:

Current Regulations:
• Architectural Review District
  • ARB approval required
    • Recommended placement on the rear of the structure – residential & commercial
• Outside the Architectural Review District - Citywide
  • Permitted
    • No requirement on the placement – residential & commercial
Solar Panels – Discussion:

Discussion:

- Placement of solar panels in the Architectural Review District, focusing on the Worthington Historic District.
- General consensus amongst all City Council members supporting the use of solar panels throughout the City and in the Worthington Historic District.

Solar Panels – Discussion:

Location:

- Overall support for solar panels being located on the rear of structures in the Historic District.

Issue:

- Placement of solar panels on the front and side of structures.

Research:

- Solar regulations in Design Guidelines and/or Planning & Zoning Code – Jurisdictions
All of these jurisdictions in their design guidelines prohibit solar panels on the front of their structures; the two with asterisks (Fort Worth, TX and New Orleans, LA) actually prohibit them on the front of their structures, but do allow for a formula that does allow them on the sides of structures under certain circumstances and towards the rear of the structure; so those were the two that were kind of a different twist on solar panel placement on the front and sides.
This group makes no direct reference of design guidelines for solar panel placement, but in talking with the jurisdictions they do a case by case review. In talking with the Delaware planner, the preference of their board and staff is to have it to the rear of the structure. I spoke with Randy Black of the City of Columbus who handles all their historic districts from German Village to the Short North to Italian Village, they have no actual direct reference in their guidelines; however, their preference is to have them to the rear of the structure and similar with Granville, OH who also prefer to the rear of the structure and on accessory structures (detached garage or a barn); however with those three they’re not directly referenced in their design guidelines.

The final three Shaker Heights, OH, Cleveland Heights, OH and Hamilton, OH are the three additional that make no direct reference, but also handle it in their Planning and Zoning Code.
This grouping lists the ones that handle it in their Planning & Zoning Code which would be more of a city-wide and would require to deviate from the requirement of having them on the front of the structures and would require a Board of Zoning Appeals action, so Bexley, OH, Cleveland Heights, OH, Bedford, OH, Rock Island, IL, Gun Plain Township, MI, Glendale, OH, Hudson, OH and Springsboro, OH all within their Planning & Zoning code regulate the placement of solar panels to the side and rear structures, not on the front of structures, so to deviate from the Planning & Zoning code at least in these jurisdictions requires you to go before a board to request a variance to deviate from that requirement.

The ones with an asterisk is kind of a two-step process require Architectural Review Board approval in addition to their Board of Zoning Appeals approval. A local one that actually kind of shock me that has no reference in their design guidelines or in their Planning & Zoning code is actually the City of Upper Arlington has no regulation on the placement of solar panels in their districts. Mr. Troper asked did you talk with anyone in Upper Arlington. Mr. Brown replied I’m friends with two of the planners and they’ve only had one residential case and there was no discussion.

Again a lot of the jurisdictions all do it as a case-by-case in review of the process.
Solar Panels – Discussion:

- Ohio History Connection (formerly the Ohio Historical Society) and the National Park Service recommendation on the placement of solar panels:
  - Placement of solar panels should not negatively impact the historic character of a property and should not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Solar Panel – Discussion:

Language:
- The current language found in the Worthington Design Guidelines seems similar to what you will find in other jurisdictions solar regulations as to the placement of the panels.
Solar Panels – Discussion:

Solar Panel Regulations:

• Consistent theme in permitting some type of latitude or wiggle room in their review.
• There does not appear to be a one size fits all regulation for solar panel placement.

Solar Panel – Discussion:

Key Issue:

• Location of solar panels on the front and side of structures.
• Almost all of the jurisdictions that regulate the placement of solar panels in an area that is subject to Design Guidelines do not permit their location on the front and sides of structures.
• Some jurisdictions referenced their location on the side of structures towards the rear of the structure, however the consensus was to not have them directly located on the front of the structure.
Solar Panel – Discussion:

Key Issue:
- Location of solar panels on the **front** and **side** of structures.
- Almost all of the jurisdictions that regulate the placement of solar panels in an area that is subject to Design Guidelines **do not permit** their location on the **front** and **sides** of structures.
- Some jurisdictions referenced their location on the **side** of structures **towards the rear** of the structure, however the consensus was to not have them directly located on the front of the structure.

Solar Panels – Discussion:

Next Steps:
- **February 13th City Council Committee of the Whole meeting**
  - Present research findings related to how solar panels are regulated in the Worthington community in comparison to other cities in Ohio and the U.S.
  - Answer Council questions related to the findings.
  - Informational meeting.
- **Week of February 20th or February 27th**
  - Meet with interested parties to gather feedback, answer questions and discuss issues or concerns.
- **March 13th City Council Committee of the Whole meeting – Public Input**
  - Public will have the opportunity to provide comment and input.
- **March 21st City Council meeting**
  - City Council will discuss the findings of the research and the information collected through public input.
- **April 3rd Worthington City Council meeting**
  - If changes to the Design Guidelines or Ordinances are warranted, draft legislation will be provided to City Council for consideration.
**Questions from Council Members:**

Ms. Dorothy asked if we had looked at all about the functionality of the solar system; I thought our code with that fifth bullet point gave some latitude to be able to implement a solar system that actually functions well. It actually looks like Ashville, NC does that; it says that “Solar energy collectors shall be located inconspicuously as possible while still allowing for reasonable use. Every effort should be made to limit impact to historic character defining features.” It does allow the functionality to be put in this solar collectors...that’s what I’m worried about, is that we’ll have half the district that won’t be able to have functional solar panels if they want to in the future.

Mr. Foust stated as far as the schedule, I have a trip out of town that cannot be moved on the night of the public discussion; I don’t know the opportunities are for a different night, but I would like to be a part of the discussion and hear the public input. Ms. Michael asked is okay if we move everything down a week. Mr. Myers commented I agree with the President, it has been our intention to give ourselves plenty of time to do this; I think that’s a very significant meeting and I would like to see everybody here, so I certainly would not be opposed to moving everything down a week; that still gives us plenty of time and we’re still ahead of the game.

Mr. Myers commented one thing I noticed that is pretty consistent (maybe not) and I don’t know if it’s by design or not, and it would seem to me if they were drafting design guidelines, it would be different than if you were drafting code...a lot of places where they use the word “should” and that would be more appropriate in a design guideline. The word should is not typically a word that you would see in an Ordinance and I just want to point out that there is some legal significance to the choice of word “should” vs. “shall”. Shall of course is mandatory and you don’t have a choice, should is directory and it says you should do this, but you’re not required to do this. When you’re reading through, I see places where it says “shall”; I think Ms. Dorothy pointed out Ashville uses in their design guidelines the word shall, then I look at other places where they say “solar panels should not be visible.” So there is a distinction when you look at the research between those two words. I just want to point that out because it seems like at times they’re used interchangeably, but there is a legal distinction between the two words.

Mr. Myers stated during the discussion on the last application, the word “contributing property” came up on several different occasions, asked can you explain what is meant by contributing property and whether we address that term in our code or guidelines. Mr. Brown replied in the current Worthington Design Guidelines the only place that the contributing properties or contributing structures comes up is when we made application to recognize historic district, that was the only those properties or structures did not meet that 50 year requirement for age, so with that there is no other reference to contributing property. Mr. Myers replied so our code and design guidelines make no distinction between a contributing and a non-contributing property. Mr. Brown replied that is correct, it’s the district.
Mr. Foust commented I think one of the reasons why we ended up with these split discussions on ARB and such, might be that the language feels a little bit like saying to your teenage son or daughter “your curfew is midnight, but 1:00 or 2:00 I can live with that.” It’s that continuation, it’s like you’ve got a fairly clear statement and then you got this O by the way, but if….I’m wondering how that came to be. Ms. Michael replied I think it was pretty much us leaving the door open in case there were circumstances that ARB and the City Council thought that it would fit and it would be acceptable; it left the door open so that there could be discussion and discretion in the decision making. Mr. Troper asked do you remember what those circumstances were at the time. Ms. Michael replied I don’t remember there being specific circumstances, it was a general consensus leaving the opportunity in case there would be an opportunity of having that application that didn’t fit right. Mr. Myers commented as I remember Evening Street was not up yet, but we were talking to the contractor and that was back at the time when solar was sort of in its infancy and there was a secondary market for the tax credits and there was of these different financial vehicles to get panels done more in a commercial context, so it was in it’s infancy. We didn’t have an application, we didn’t have a residential panel, shortly thereafter I think we had a hot water application on the back, but I don’t think it ever got built; so the first thinking was to encourage the development of solar in Worthington, we thought it was progressive and it was fitting with Worthington’s character. The second thing for me was it didn’t really have a lot to do with solar panels, it had to do with more of my philosophy of Boards and Commissions, and I’ve argued this when we’ve had appeals come up; I believe that certain defers should be given towards boards and commissions because we appoint them as our experts in certain subject matters and so until they abuse that discretion and we have an appeal to correct that; that we should vest them with certain discretion to review it on a case by case basis; and I would say that with solar panels, solar shingles, fences….that’s just my general philosophy of government and the boards and commissions process. Our Architectural Review Board does have five Architects on it and we have your brother and while he is not an Architect, he certainly is an Architectural Historian; we have people who really know what they’re talking about and so I think that was my thinking when I first proposed this; it was more in line with my general concept of how this city government ought to work and that the appeal would then correct any abuse of discretion that we saw.

I think Mr. Foust is right, we have a couple of 4-3 votes at ARB and then we come to Council and have a very similar vote which is why I think we’re engaged in this conversation right now because we need to hash this out and come to a consensus. Ms. Michael commented I think we have divided philosophies, in the community I think everybody is pro-energy efficiency, but then there’s also a large group that feels like energy efficiency is fine, but we should not do that at the expense of removing the historic character of the historic district; so know we go the two philosophies and I’m not sure where the twain shall meet.

Mr. Brown commented that one of the things we did when we were reaching out to some of the jurisdictions was to find out with technology changing so rapidly with solar as Mr. Myers mentioned from 6 or 7 years ago til today and what’s to what’s coming online in the next 4-5 years, the majority of the jurisdictions that I looked at and had kind of that
philosophical discussion would you allow for solar panels on the front if it meant XYZ and a lot of the jurisdictions mentioned they’ve had a couple approval for solar panels on the front of the house where it looks like standing seaming metal, examples would be like slate tile or terra cotta tile, so that change in technology, it also looks like dimensional shingles, so there’s that change that’s rapidly coming with technology that some of the jurisdictions are looking at “okay as long as you’re not going to change the character of the roof line or unique pattern design like maybe a slate roof; maybe these are options we would allow you to do if it’s located on the sides or the front of the structure as long as it didn’t take away from the character of the structure itself. So that’s at least in the discussion with some of the communities they are looking towards that direction while still maintaining the character of the historic districts.

Ms. Dorothy stated we do know the functionality of these systems rely on what direction they are facing the sun and how much solar energy they gain depending on the placement of them on the roof and what direction they face and the angle and we do know that and we don’t seem to put much emphasis on that, but I think we’re doing a disservice to just about half of the ARB by not putting that characteristic in these guidelines to allow for people to have functioning systems. We did just update our requirements for condensing units for air conditioners because we had so many BZA appeals to put condensing units on the side of houses because they function much efficiently with the shorter condensing line prongs and now it’s in our guidelines that we approved in 2015 to make it more efficient to be allowed in the sideyard instead of the front. Mr. Myers replied when we get to the point where we’re discussing actual language that will be a valid and legitimate point to bring up; and as you pointed out I thought there were two or three who actually addressed the functionality as one of the conditions for possibly putting panels in the back; I thought it was a code provision which said if you’re going to put them on the back, it doesn’t even have to go to Architectural Review Board, staff can approval panels on the back, which is another route to go; if you want to put them where they can’t be seen, staff can handle that, it doesn’t even have to go to ARB. There is a lot of language we can consider when the time comes.

Ms. Michael stated I do have two questions from a resident in the audience regarding solar panels:

(1) Would solar panels jeopardize our status as a historic district or the National Registry of Historic Places? Mr. Brown replied we did reach out to Ohio History Connection as part of this review process and we need to ask ourselves is this the character and look we want for the district; however it’s not going to jeopardize our status as a historic district. If we start demolishing structures that’s when they would come in and we would probably have an issue with losing our historic district status; but at least with adding solar panels, if they were to the front or sides we would not lose our historic district status.

(2) Is Council open to receiving information about Ordinances and additional communities. Ms. Michael commented yes if there are communities people want to provide additional information about, by all means yes do so; provide the
information to Mr. Brown and he will make sure Council receives the information.

Mr. Foust indicated I’m still pondering Ms. Dorothy’s comment and it’s a great one, “what do you do about those houses where they’re placed or faced in such a way that it just doesn’t lend itself” and we’re going to have these two kind of competing factors of trying to honor one versus the other; I don’t know how they’re going to co-exist; and to your point I would love to add a third bay onto the garage of my house, but the piece of property I bought doesn’t allow for that. Whether your house has a pitch that runs east, west, north or south, it kind is what it is; I’m not sure how we’re going to be able to accommodate 100% of the homes in the area.

Mr. Smith stated I didn’t get a lot of time to research on cities outside of what staff provided, but looking at other states like Massachusetts which is fairly solar friendly and other east-coast states; I didn’t see any specific wording or language that would give any clear direction; I’m not convinced I dug deep enough yet, so I’m going to look into that a little bit more, specifically more on the east-coast; what I’m interested in finding is maybe like zones in a sense like what Ms. Dorothy was just talking about (i.e. if there are all front facing houses on the south side, you do this, and all east facing houses, you do this.)

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 05-2017  Expressing the City of Worthington’s Opposition to the Micro Wireless Facility Provisions of Senate Bill 331 and Agreeing to Work in Cooperation with Other Ohio Municipalities to Challenge the Restriction on the City’s Constitutional Home Rule Authority.

Introduced by Councilmember Troper

MOTION  Councilmember Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2017. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Myers.

Mrs. Stewart expressed that this item was discussed extensively at last week’s meeting, and this Resolution was prepared at the request of City Council at that meeting and brought back, so hopefully it reflects your discussion and your intent. I will invite Mrs. Fox to offer any comment(s) she may have since she is the one who prepared the Resolution. Mrs. Fox replied I have no further comments, but I’m happy to answer any questions Council members may have.

Mr. Myers asked when we had the presentation there were a couple of different theories including one home rule, statewide impact because it exempted out counties and townships which is the home rule argument; I don’t know if it would be appropriate to add this, but you speak in Section 1 of the Resolution “with other Ohio municipalities
that stand ready to challenge such provisions as a violation of municipal home rule authority, subject to an acceptable method . . . .”; would it be appropriate to add into this “and such other claims as may be appropriate.” Mrs. Fox replied I think we can do that. Mr. Myers stated I want to make sure that we are not excluding ourselves because our Resolution is too narrow. This addition will go immediately after the word “authority” in Section 1.

**MOTION TO AMEND**

Mr. Myers made a motion to amend Resolution 05-2017 in Section 1, to include the following verbiage: “and such other claims as may be appropriate.” The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2017 (AS AMENDED) carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

Information Item(s)

*Mrs. Roberts presented the following 2016 Year End Financial Summary:*
2016 All Funds Summary

1/1/2016 Beginning Fund Balances: $21,263,095

Total Actual Revenue: $38,582,789

Total Actual Expenditures: $36,620,260

12/31/2016 Year End Fund Balances:

$23,225,624

---

2016 Financial Report Summary for All Funds

- Revenues exceeded expenditures by $1,962,529 or 5.36%.
- 2016 revenues totaled $38,582,789 which was $1,275,906 (3.42%) above estimates.
- Expenditures tracked at 87% of total appropriations and prior year encumbrances.
- Expenditures for 2016 for all funds totaled $36,620,260.
Ms. Dorothy asked what is our policy for the percentage that we want for reserves. Mrs. Roberts replied I believe it is 25% general fund carryover from the previous year.
2016 General Fund Summary

1/1/2016 Beginning Fund Balance: $11,250,077

Total Actual Revenue: $26,434,268

Total Actual Expenditures: $26,056,152

2016 Year End Fund Balance: $11,628,193

2016 Financial Report
General Fund Summary

• General Fund revenues exceeded expenditures by $378,116 or 1.43%.
• 2016 revenues were above 2015 revenues by $905,242 or 3.55%.
• 2016 revenues were above estimates by $53,422 or .20%.
• Expenditures tracked at 92.69% of appropriations.
2016 General Fund Revenue

General Fund Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue</th>
<th>Actual Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Income Tax</td>
<td>$19,255,146</td>
<td>$19,907,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$2,710,000</td>
<td>$2,584,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$394,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance Tax</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$137,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$159,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Fire Service</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td>$450,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Revenue</td>
<td>$1,430,000</td>
<td>$1,200,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Transport</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$544,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Revenue</td>
<td>$1,215,700</td>
<td>$1,055,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$26,380,846  $26,434,268
## 2016 General Fund Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Expenditures</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures</th>
<th>Actual Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Building</td>
<td>$736,711</td>
<td>$692,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$7,530,801</td>
<td>$7,315,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>$6,415,662</td>
<td>$6,039,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$4,659,743</td>
<td>$4,483,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Operations</td>
<td>$5,682,100</td>
<td>$5,313,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Engineering Department</td>
<td>$2,591,056</td>
<td>$2,211,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$27,556,073</td>
<td>$26,056,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### General Fund Expenditures

[Bar chart showing budget vs actual expenditures for City of Worthington from 2007 to 2016.]

---
Mr. Myers asked Mrs. Roberts to explain why 2016 was so tight. Mrs. Roberts replied we were just slightly above revenues to expenditures for the year by about $378,000 which it just shows a little closer in gap, this slide on is on a per capita basis and we’re using the 2010 census as our per capita number. Mr. Myers stated so again in 2016 we spent more of our revenue than we have in years past. Mrs. Roberts explained our revenue still exceeded expenditures, but we were closer. Mr. Myers asked is there a reason for that or any one thing you can point to. Mrs. Roberts replied there isn’t any one thing I can point to, we did make some end of year fund transfers to the water fund, the Economic Development fund and the Sewer fund to supplement those fund balances because they were in a position where they were not self-sufficient, so we made some end of year transfers that were appropriated through Council.

Ms. Dorothy remarked it also looks like our expenses go up linearly, but we have some dips in revenue which could be attributed to some things going away. Mrs. Roberts replied to refresh your memory, in 2014 we reverted back to the 80/20 split in the income tax, the period from 2009 – 2013, we supplemented the general fund by the 6.4% reduced out of the CIP.
Mr. Myers asked Mrs. Roberts do you expect this trend to continue into 2017. Mrs. Roberts replied the 2017 budget is pretty tight, so I would expect to see it continue at the same level.

Mr. Foust commented I would have thought a reassessment which is about every 10 years by the County Auditor as far as property value, I would have somehow expected a bump in here somewhere along the way. Mrs. Roberts commented the way the Property Tax
State Codes are written, it’s kind of complex, they perceive the leveling out, so as some properties increase in value and others don’t, the effective mileage rate comes into play.
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Mr. Myers asked is anyone working on localized projection for what might happen if the legislature actually pass the tax centralization legislation. Mrs. Roberts replied I know R.I.T.A. (Regional Income Tax Agency) is working on a comprehensive review of the budget bill and they hope to release something later this week. Mr. Myers commented I’ve seen some of that information and I was just wondering if there was any way we could find out how much the General Assembly is going to take from us this time from the City of Worthington specific.

Ms. Michael complemented Mrs. Roberts and the Finance department on a putting together a fabulous memo specifically on central collection. Excellent report, the people I met with today were extremely impressed with the memo. Mrs. Roberts commented I have to commend my Finance Assistant Scott Barter, he did the heavy lifting on that report. Ms. Michael asked Mrs. Roberts to please give him our expression of gratitude, job well done.

Financial Report

Mrs. Stewart asked Mrs. Roberts to provide an overview of the reports for the month of January and indicated that staff is requesting a motion from the City Council acknowledging the report.

Mrs. Roberts presented the following:

Fund balances for all funds increased from $23,225,674 on January 1, 2017 to $25,164,261 as of January 31, 2017. January revenues exceeded expenditures for all funds by $1,938,638.

Revenues for all funds area above 2016 revenues by $492,130 (excluding bond proceeds) and below estimates by $58,628 or .875%. January revenues include $3,960,000 in bond issuance proceeds.

Expenditures for all funds tracked at 97.3% of anticipated expenditure levels for the month of January.


January General Fund revenues are above 2016 revenues by $306,207 and above estimates by $186,425 or 10.20%

General Fund expenditures tracked at 91.99% of anticipated expenditure levels for the month of January 2017.

Mr. Troper asked is there any special reason why the income tax collection was so high. Mrs. Roberts replied I have to just equate that to cyclical collections, there was anything
I found outstanding in the reports that I reviewed; so I just think it was a timing issue on when payments were made.

Ms. Michael and Mr. Myers expressed their views regarding the small cell wireless issue.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Myers made a motion to accept the 2016 Year End Summary and the January 2017 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Foust.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

**REPORTS OF CITY STAFF**

Mrs. Stewart reminded Council of the Council Retreat to be held Friday evening March 3rd – Saturday, March 4th at Linworth High School; Ms. Jane Dockery will serve as the facilitator for this year’s retreat; she is putting together a short survey with some questions which she will email out to Council and so she would appreciate getting some feedback from you. Mrs. Stewart asked Council members if they could please email her any time constraints they may have for either Friday evening or Saturday; we do need to zero in on specific times on Friday evening and Saturday, so if you can let me know if you have some constraints on your time as soon as possible this will help us finalize the agenda for that weekend.

**REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**COUNCILMEMBER DOUG FOUST** – David McCorkle and I attended our 2nd meeting of the Columbus Regional Energy Special Improvement District Board of Directors this past week; right now the group is still in the early formation stages, we are looking at a couple of projects that maybe coming our way; it’s a work in progress; we’ll continue to report as we have things come up.

**COUNCILMEMBER BONNIE MICHAEL** – met today with Senator Stephanie Kunzie and Upper Arlington Council President Debbie Johnson to discuss the central collection, we’re setting up strategies to meet with other groups; if anyone wants to join in on some of these meetings, we’re really focusing in on speaking to people in the House of Representatives; we want the House of Representatives to know and understand that we really do care and while many other townships have been better at lobbying in the past, other municipalities need to come up and start saying “enough is enough”, you need to start taking care of us or leave our home rule alone so to speak. We’re looking first at the finance committee.

Ms. Dorothy asked have you released information to the first tier suburbs groups throughout Ohio. Ms. Michael replied I will check with COMMA and let you know.
COUNCILMEMBER SCOTT MYERS – MPC/ARB last week was relatively non eventful. The medical office building across the street was tabled again, so we didn’t get to consider that; if you get a chance go out on the website and take a look at the plans, I think they’re a whole lot nicer; I think that will probably get approved next time. There was a lot split on Highland, so we’re going to get a new house in the neighborhood.

COUNCILMEMBER DOUG SMITH – thanked Mr. Whited for the report via email about the bids coming back; all had some component of solar.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M.

/s/ Tanya Maria Word
Temporary Clerk of Council

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

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President