Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 10, 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, July 10, 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.


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 Scott Bartter, 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 twenty six visitors present.

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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Ms. Michael shared that there are several special recognitions tonight. She plans to introduce two resolutions and then turn to Vice Mayor Lorrimer for the presentations.

Resolution No. 40-2017

Expressing the Congratulations and Best Wishes of Worthington City Council to Gia Napoleon for Her Outstanding Achievements at the 2017 Ohio High School Track and Field Championships.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 40-2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 40-2017 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 37 – 2017

Expressing the Congratulations and Best Wishes of Worthington City Council to the Members of the State Champion Thomas Worthington High School
Boys Track and Field Team in the 2017 Ohio High School Track and Field Championships.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

**MOTION**
Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 37-2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 37-2017 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Vice Mayor Lorimer shared that for the past forty years, Worthington City Council has welcomed the opportunity to recognize the outstanding achievements of Worthington High School students who have won state championships in sports or distinguished themselves as scholars. That community recognition opportunity is most special this evening as for the first time, City Council and our Worthington community commends the outstanding achievement of both boys and girls as Ohio State Champions in the sport of track and field.

On the first weekend in June, the Thomas Worthington High School (TWHS) Boys Track and Field team won the Ohio High School championships held at Ohio State University. The championship title was won in Division I, which involves competition with 288 of the largest high schools in Ohio. This was a great team victory for the young athletes.

The sport of track and field is the oldest and most basic of all sports competitions. Since ancient Olympic times it has tested who is fastest, can run over distance the best, throw and jump the furthest and jump the highest. It tests the limits of personal and human capability. It is also a great team sport in which the competitors combine their athletic skills in relay events and across a range of individual events. The TWHS 3,200 meter relay team placed first by setting a new TWHS record and posting the fastest time recorded in the country for high schools during this current competition year. Each of four athletes ran 800 meters. These four had previously won the OSHS indoor championships earlier in the year where they ran an even faster time than they did at the outdoor event. Mr. Lorimer introduced Ty Banks, Joshua Allen, Andrew Morgan and Arjun Jha as the championship team members. (Arjun Jha also placed second in the 1600 meter race with a time of 4 minutes, 9 seconds). The members who were present stood as Mr. Lorimer briefly shared about each one.

Mr. Lorimer shared that to become an Ohio State Championship Team several athletes had to place in a range of several events. Additional point scorers included the fastest man on the team, Kainnan Ramsey who placed 5th in the 100 meters. Khalil Jones took 5th place in the broad jump event. Andy Payne placed 7th in the 3,200 meter individual run. Cade Richeson was successful in both the discus (placed 3rd) and shot put events.

Mr. Lorimer shared that a State Championship Team also has championship coaching, leadership and guidance. Coach Bill Darling has been on the TWHS coaching staff for seven years and head coach for four years. He is a graduate of Miami University where
he was on the track team and competed in both the pull vault and long jump. Coach Darling coaches at TWHS more as an avocation and love of the sport since his daily occupation is at the Ohio State University as director of Assistive Technology of Ohio. Mr. Lorimer presented a certified copy of the Council Resolution and a plaque of their championship accomplishment to Coach Darling.

Coach Darling shared that it is a real honor for the whole team to be recognized by Vice Mayor Lorimer and City Council. It was a great day down at the Jesse Owens Track. It is very hard to win a State Championship and it meant so much to these kids. Mostly it meant that they were the team this year that really performed the best when it mattered the most. They needed to be great that day to have a chance and they were all great and all contributed. He is very proud of all of them. Coach Darling added that they have the best coaching staff in the state of Ohio as far as assistant coaches. He introduced Leon Cradle, Dominick Mazza, and Mallory Kitts Tecklinburg. He added that although he is not Gia’s coach, he is incredibly proud of her. There are great kids that run track and field who are a credit to their community and we have one of them, her name is Gia Napoleon. She is very good and had an amazing season.

Vice Mayor Lorimer shared that it is his honor to present to City Council Gia Napoleon, who became state champion in the 800 meter at the 2017 championships. He shared that Gia competed as a sophomore. To our knowledge, she is the youngest athlete in Worthington schools history to win a state championship title in an individual sporting event. In the 2017 state meet she won the 800 meter event. Her winning time of two minutes and seven seconds was the best in Ohio this year and also placed her as the seventh best high school athlete in the nation. It also established a new TWHS record. Her time was five seconds faster than her best time in 2016. Mr. Lorimer believes Gia has a chance to represent the United States in the 2020 Olympics should she stay involved in track and continue to improve her time. She also competed in cross country in the fall and she trains year round with both interval and weight training. She is a member of the TWHS student athlete leadership board and is a team Ohio representative to the national federation of high school’s national student’s leadership group.

Mr. Lorimer presented Ms. Napoleon with a copy of her resolution. Mr. Lorimer added that Gia has a younger sister, Corina who will be a freshmen this coming year. Corina is also an extremely talented female athlete so it could be in the coming years that the TWHS Girls Team will be recognized here as the Ohio State Championship Team.

Mr. Lorimer added that for the first time in Olympic history, the 2020 games in Japan will have a co-ed track and field competition in the 3200 meters. Each team will be comprised of two men and two women with each running a quarter mile. That is rather groundbreaking as it wasn’t until the late 1920’s that women were allowed to compete in the Olympics at all.

Mr. Lorimer acknowledged Gia’s coach, Andy Cox who was unable to attend tonight. He then recognized TWHS Athletic Director Scott Dorne, who was of tremendous assistance in providing the background information that was shared. This coming year Mr. Dorne
Mr. Lorimer also welcomed and recognized the newly appointed director of athletics for TWHS, Jennifer Goebbel who is a TWHS graduate. She has been active in coaching soccer for many years and will now use her sports leadership experience as athletic director. He welcomed Ms. Goebbel this evening and knows that we will be recognizing her at many other Ohio High School Championship evenings.

Ms. Michael acknowledged Worthington school board members Marc Schare and Julie Keegan.

Coach Darling also acknowledged their throws coach, Steve Smith who did a wonderful job with Cade and our wonderful throwers. He coaches both the men and women throwers and is an incredible addition to our staff.

Ms. Michael commented that on behalf of City Council, she is very proud of the accomplishments of this team. She also thanked the parents of those athletes.

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

Ordinance No. 24-2017 Amending Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of Arterial Improvements – Huntley Road and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 653-17)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to remove Ordinance No. 24-2017 from the table. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion to remove Ordinance No. 24-2017 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson shared that at the last meeting members tabled the ordinance that would have awarded the bid for the resurfacing of Huntley Road, between Schrock to St. Rt. 161. That was done so that members could pose additional questions, think about the discussion and give staff time to respond to those questions. That has been done. Mr. Whited will share a presentation where we seek to provide much of the information that was requested. Staff will then address any additional questions this evening and present options for moving forward for Council action.
Mr. Whited shared that he put together a quick facts presentation intended to solely answer Council’s questions.

Huntley Road Resurfacing Discussion
July 10, 2017

OUTLINE
- Motor Vehicle License Tax (Use, Balance & Recent History)
- Huntley Road Resurfacing Project (Project Data & Misc Info)
- Quikrete Update - Law Director
- Enforcement & Accident/Incident History Update - Chief of Police
- Information Related to Bike & Pedestrian and NE Gateway Project
- Review & Application of Bike Accommodations
- Discussion & Recommendations as How to Proceed

MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSE TAX
Franklin County Engineer receives funds from tax on license plates. Available for repairs to major arterial roads not designated as State routes.

An arterial road is generally defined as a high-capacity urban road. The primary function is to deliver traffic from collector roads to freeways or expressways, and between urban centers at the highest level of service possible. They allows higher vehicular speed and commonly have lots of intersections and traffic lights.

The City requests these funds for specific road projects.

LICENSE TAX ELIGIBLE ROADS
- East Wilson Bridge Road - N. High to Worthington-Galena
- Huntley Road - Dublin-Granville to Worthington-Galena
- Linworth Road - south corp. near SR161 to Snouffer
- Olentangy River Road - portions in corp.
- Proprietors Road - Dublin-Granville to Schrock
- Snouffer Road - west corp. to east corp.
- Wilson Bridge Road - west corp. to N. High
- Worthington-Galena Road - N. High to east corp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CIP Fund</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>License Tax</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Improvements (Huntley Road, Granville-Schrock)</td>
<td>S&amp;E</td>
<td>EDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LICENSE TAX USE
“Funds shall be used on roadway construction. Acceptable expenditures of the permissive tax funds would be any work that is typically done “curb to curb” on the roadway. Crack sealing, traffic signal improvements, signage replacements along with the standard resurfacing and roadway reconstruction projects are acceptable. Landscaping work or stand-alone sidewalk projects would not be approved.”

LICENSE TAX BALANCES
- Annually receive balance notification from Franklin Co. Engineer
- As of 12/31/2016 balance = $504,401.55
- Receive about $5,917/mo, $71,000/yr (currently)
- As of 6/30/17 balance approximately $539,903.55
- Receive additional MMVLT monies directly from State and County that support the Street M&R Fund, St. Hwy Fund, and Worthington MMVLT Fund
- Last disbursement in 2012 - $265,847.72 for W Wilson Bridge Road Resurfacing.
- No requests made since 2012
- Building a balance of $540k would take about 7.5 years

Ms. Dorothy reported there being bike lanes on West Wilson Bridge Rd. now although license tax money was not used for that work. Mr. Whited agreed.
Mr. Whited commented that they pulled out the Huntley Rd. Design from 1979 although the roadway wasn’t constructed until the mid-1980s. He thought members might be interested in some of this information as it does answer many of the questions that were asked about that project.
The problems on Huntley Rd. at the time of the design are as follows:

Current Problems

The existing problems are as follows:

1. The basic problem is the inadequate number of roadway lanes to accommodate turning vehicles as well as the two traffic signals that restrict flow of traffic at both ends of the study section. Major congestion occurs during the periods of 7:30 AM to 8:30 PM and 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM. Vehicular backups were observed for short periods of time in lengths up to 1,500 feet and were caused by inadequacy of the roadway and the two (2) terminus signals.

The following details the design criteria:

Mr. Whited shared that while the design speed they used was 40 mph, we continue to sign it at 35 mph. Under design criteria, the center lane of a three lane roadway can operate as a two-way left turn lane. This provides left turn movements into the driveways. This was intended to minimalize the level of disruption that occurs although we know that some still continues.
Mr. Whited reported the following as the reference to sidewalks and bike routes:

Mr. Whited believes it to be somewhat dismissive in a sense as there was not a need to accommodate pedestrian or bike traffic in that section based on the bike plan at that time. The following is an exhibit from that plan that probably provides the most information. The project area shows Worthington-Galena, Schrock, Huntley and SR 161 as well Proprietors. It identified Proprietors as the primary north-south bike route in that corridor to connect to Schrock.

Responding to Ms. Dorothy’s question about whether we have built out that plan to have designated bike lanes, Mr. Whited replied that we have not.
Mr. Whited reported there being questions about Average Daily Traffic. The following slides provides that information.
Mr. Whited shared that following information about a PASER Rating of 4.
Mr. Whited explained that a PASER rating of 4 means that the road is in poor shape. That puts you on the declining end of the curb where it tends to deteriorate pretty rapidly. This information is intended to answer the question of “what happens if we do nothing.” It is not the end of the world but recognize that it will tend to deteriorate a little more rapidly than if the pavement was a little less aged.

Mr. Norstrom believes this was presented earlier in terms of a change in approach to our street maintenance issue. The approach is to attack the pavement at the right time before it really goes down. Mr. Whited agreed.

Ms. Dorothy reported that the project is still for a full mill and overlay. She asked what could happen if we wait a year. Mr. Whited explained that we are not doing a full mill and overlay. Most of the milling is along the edge lines where the drainage has deteriorated. Some of that may get worse. Ms. Dorothy believes we are definitely doing some. Mr. Whited agreed that we are doing a good bit of it.

Ms. Fox shared that there was some information presented by Bike Worthington that raised some concerns about the Quikrete trucks standing on the center turn lane waiting to get into the Quikrete site. The reference was raised to a prior agreement as follows:

QUIKRETE HISTORY
- In 2011 Quikrete approached the City seeking some form of access to its site from the Huntley Bowl entrance road to eliminate the need for its trucks to queue on Huntley Road
- The City agreed to lease the entrance road to Quikrete for a 3-year term with a one-time 3-year renewal on the condition that Quikrete:
  - bear all costs of its improvements
  - maintain the roadway (including the removal of ice and snow)
  - keep the entrance way open to users of the park
  - pay ~ $2690/year

QUIKRETE
- The site plan proposed by Quikrete required a variance to be heard by the BZA for approval to reduce the number of parking lot trees
- Council approved the lease arrangement and authorized the City Manager to execute the lease
- BZA approved the parking lot landscape variance request
- Quikrete never implemented its proposed plan, including signing and returning the lease
- Quikrete has been at this location since 1958
Ms. Fox added that to her knowledge the City has not received any current request from Quikrete to implement that plan.

Chief Strait reported that one of the issues that was brought up was in regard to parking on the highway in the center lane/common turn lane. He provided the following information:

Worthington Division of Police
Parking on Highways

4511.66 Prohibition against parking on highways

4511.66 Prohibition against parking on highways.

(A) Upon any highway outside a business or residence district, no person shall stop, park, or leave standing any vehicle, whether attended or unattended, upon the paved or main traveled part of the highway if it is practicable to stop, park, or so leave such vehicle off the paved or main traveled part of said highway. In every event a clear and unobstructed portion of the highway opposite such standing vehicle shall be left for the free passage of other vehicles, and a clear view of such stopped vehicle shall be available from a distance of two hundred feet in each direction upon such highway.

This section does not apply to the driver of any vehicle which is disabled while on the paved or improved or main traveled portion of a highway in such manner and to such extent that it is impossible to avoid stopping and temporarily leaving the disabled vehicle in such position.

Effective Date: 01-01-2004.

Based upon the wording of the Ohio Revised Code this section does not apply to vehicles standing in a center or Two Way Left Turn Lane within a business or residence district, per a review of the Chief of Police, Law Director and City Prosecutor.

Chief Strait provided the following slide related to accidents and incidents:
While Chief Strait acknowledged there being an increase in accidents, he believes traffic has increased as well. Most of the accidents have occurred in the intersections themselves. There have been three incidents in front of the Quikrete area (2 in 2016 and 1 in 2017) with all three caused by improper backing. There has been no major incidents because of parking in the common turn lane.

Mr. Whited shared that the following exhibit illustrates the project area. The tan area is the project area between SR-161 and just short of Schrock Rd. by roughly 200 ft. The pink area is Schrock Rd. where there are some existing bike lanes. The yellow area is labeled as undetermined. It is on Huntley Rd. from Schrock Rd. to the Northeast Gateway area. The blue is the portion of Huntley Rd. within the Northeast Gateway.

Mr. Whited reported that because of the length of the project as well as the size of the Northeast Gateway project, it is hard to illustrate in a lot of detail. He tried to zoom in on this area where they connect at Huntley and Schrock and provide a little more detail.
Mr. Whited reported that painted protected bike lanes are proposed on either side of the road as well as five foot sidewalks on each section.

Mr. Whited explained that there is a four foot bike lane with two foot protected painted areas. There are eleven foot travel lanes, two on each side and an eleven foot center lane in the middle.

When asked by Ms. Michael if this goes all the way to Schrock Rd., Mr. Whited replied that it goes down to the railroad tracks, crosses the tracks and then stops. Ms. Michael asked if it is the railroad tracks that Budweiser uses. Mr. Whited replied yes. It does not connect to the Schrock Rd. bike trails. The yellow area has not yet been addressed and we hoped to do that in the very near future.

Mr. Whited commented that he doesn’t expect members to fully understand everything in this next slide but he wanted to show the project area and how it relates to what the Bike and Pedestrian Adversary Committee put together for their priority areas. He does have an interactive map that can be explored later if members wish that identifies priorities. They did focus on Proprietors as that major north/south connection up to Schrock Rd.

Mr. Whited next talked about sharrows, also commonly referred to as shared lane markings. The illustration below is from the NACTO (National Association of City

City of Worthington

Meeting 24-16
Transportation Officials) design guide. He thought it was a good illustration of what they look like. Members can see the painted lane markers and center line of that roadway. The NACTO guidance recommends that sharrows be painted in the middle of the lane for 25 mph or slower. It is not a preferred treatment on roads that have greater than 35 mph or more than 35,000 ADT, both of which exists on Huntley.

The following depicts what sharrows would look like on a portion of Huntley Rd.
Mr. Whited commented that the follow slide depicts what a conventional bike lane looks like. They are lanes that do not have that protected paint area.

The following is a buffered bike lane or protected bike lane. This is not quite the situation we are on because there is a door zone lane that exists within this protected lane but the lanes themselves are identified as four foot width, there is two or three foot of protected area on the outside lane. Where that arrow is, is how we would propose if we were to do something like this on Huntley Rd.
The follow slide illustrates what it would look like on Huntley Rd. We illustrated it as best we could with the buffer to protect the bike lanes. They are four foot wide with a two foot protected area and maintaining twelve foot travel lanes on both sides.

When asked by Ms. Michael if that removes the turning lane, Mr. Whited replied that it did.

This is another slide of what they would look like with the transitioning.
Mr. Whited reported that being the information that staff was asked to provide. The following are the options that were outlined in Ms. Stewart’s memo that were talked about last week. He won’t restate them. Staff is ready to open the floor up for discussion.

OPTIONS

1. Move forward with the base project and award the contract without sharrows,  
2. Award the contract with sufficient funds to add sharrows with the possible option of further discussions with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board regarding the sharrows, 
3. Table this item for another week to allow more consideration, with action taken prior to the August recess, or  
4. Delay the project for a year to allow longer consideration of ideas raised by the community. This option will necessitate the rejection of the current bids as they would not be valid for construction next year.

Ms. Dorothy commented that we have center turn lanes throughout Worthington in other business and residential districts. She asked if anyone can stop there. Chief Strait replied that there is no prohibition in either a business or residential district. Ms. Dorothy asked if people can stop in the center lane of SR-161 and High St. Chief Strait replied yes as long as they stay with their vehicle.

Ms. Dorothy asked what is keeping us at 35 mph on Huntley. She asked if we could reduce the speed limit. Mr. Whited replied that because of home rule, there is no reason why we couldn’t reduce the speed limit.

Ms. Dorothy thought she e-mailed out to everyone a video of how trucks back into some sections of Huntley and it pretty much stops traffic like a train. She thinks that is also an obstruction that might warrant us looking at reducing speed limits and incorporating sharrows.

Mr. Foust shared that south of SR-161 is posted at 35 mph on Sinclair but traffic moves more in the range of 40 or 45 mph. North of SR-161 is 35 mph and he would guess that the gateway project will likely be at 35 mph.

Mr. Foust commented that he looked at the NACTO website today and he may be misinterpreting this but talking about typical applications for sharrows, the NACTO states that:

Desirable shared lane marking applications to indicated a shared lane situation where the speed differential between bicyclist and motorist travel speeds is very low, such as on bicycle boulevards or similar low volume, traffic calmed, shared streets with a designed speed of <25 mph.
Mr. Foust concluded that 25 mph is more the standard and not 35 mph. He struggles with the notion of taking the area in between the two 35 mph high volume travel areas and lowering it to 25 mph based on an occasional interruption of a truck. Most hours of the day traffic can flow through there pretty nicely as it stands.

Ms. Dorothy commented that we do have those traffic volumes and it is significantly less than that other sections that you are talking about. We are talking about half the amount of traffic there. There are people who don’t have cars that work along there. She sees them walking and riding their bikes every day when she is going to work. She asked why members are excluding people who don’t have cars from the use of the public right of way in this area.

Mr. Smith asked if we have any idea how many vehicles use the turn lane as it was not being used in the video that he saw from Ms. Dorothy. If the trucks are the main ones that the lane exists for, he wondered if there are other vehicles using the turn lane.

Mr. Whited replied that the requested information is not readily available without some significant observation onsite. Chief Strait agreed. He is aware of truck traffic but can’t answer to the vehicles. He reported there being many vehicles that use that lane to get out into traffic when it is busy, which is seen during rush hour quite a bit.

Mr. Smith commented that turning into a turn lane is also illegal. Chief Strait agreed.

Mr. Greeson reported it being a large center of employment and the customers and employees use those turn lanes to get into the businesses.

Ms. Dorothy showed a video of a truck backing in to a business on Huntley Rd.

Mr. Myers asked what the video proves. Ms. Dorothy replied that it proves that there are occasions when people have to be aware that they need to stop for these trucks that they do not have any other signals for. She is requesting that Council reduce the speed limit from 35 mph to 25 mph. We already have less number of vehicles on this lane and we these turning motions are unpredictable. She is looking to reduce the speed limit.

When asked by Ms. Michael if there is any accident data of people running into trucks when they are backing in like was shown on the video, Chief Strait replied that the only ones that he has from that area are the three he identified at 6225 and all of those were backing.

Mr. Smith recalls Mr. Whited stating that the funds are only available for curb to curb use. He asked if that means we are prevented from extending the curb. Mr. Whited agreed that the funds could not be used for other things. The curb can be replied but we can’t move it.

Ms. Michael invited Michael Bates to speak.
Michael Bates, 6560 Evening St.
Mr. Bates shared that his comments are his and not those on behalf of any advisory board. He thanked staff for getting the data together this past week but thinks outreach to the people who actually work on that block is missing. We know there is traffic other than heavy truck traffic on that street because of the Huntley Bowl and several other businesses. He recalls that one of the options that Mr. Greeson laid out last week was to delay the project for a year or to some future time. He would like to advocate for that option to give staff and whomever an opportunity to do outreach to the people and businesses on that section of Huntley. We talked about the cement company that has been there since 1958. He asked if we know what their plans are. He asked if we know if any of the other businesses are going to stay and/or grow. What the businesses on that block choose to do would affect what we might want to do from a bike and pedestrian perspective. He restated that all of this information is great but he thinks we missed the one component. He would ask the people who are directly affected by having or not having bike and pedestrian access.

Mr. Myers shared that he is not looking at this site specific but rather with a broader brush and philosophically. He appreciates the concept that every street should include alternate methods of transportation but he also appreciates the fact that as with any City we deal with limited resources. It is Council member’s job to appropriately allocate City resources. He was not at the last meeting so if he is going over things that have already been said or if he is missing something then he apologizes. After the Bike and Ped Committee gave their presentation, they looked to Council for guidance as to where they should go from here. He thought that Council consensus was for them to begin to develop a master plan. We kind of put some parameters on that plan because we asked them to search for the most appropriate streets to move non-vehicular traffic. He thinks that in the earlier study they looked at Proprietors. This committee originally saw Proprietors as the North/South access. If we have limited resources he thinks members should pick the best route. He understands we cannot be all things for all people but that is just the nature of government. We allocate what we have. It was his understanding when Council left two weeks ago that the Bike and Ped Committee were going to go back, prioritize, allocate, and come up with a master plan. It was his hope that the master plan was not going to be that every single street should be a complete street. When he drives through Mansfield or any small/medium size town that experiences truck traffic, there are always two different routes to get through that town. There is a truck route and there is a car route. The reason for that is because they want to route trucks away from the major pedestrian arteries. He thinks it is the same thing as non-vehicular traffic. We want to put them in the safest place possible. He is not convinced that regardless of what Council does, Huntley Road is that place when we have a viable alternative in Proprietors Road. He knows it is not perfect and doesn’t get everyone that rides a bike to Quikcrete to work but it may be the best we can do with what we have. To him, this is why we have the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee to develop the criteria for Council based on what our goal is. He asked if members’ goal is to put a bike lane on every street in Worthington or is it to effectively move non-vehicular north/south and east/west. What is Council’s goal? His thinking is that the goal is to safety and appropriately move traffic north/south and east/west because he doesn’t think that we will ever have the
resources, as Mr. Smith is suggesting, now we are talking about potential land acquisition to widen the road. That money doesn’t grow on trees. Members have to be good stewards of our resources and do as much as we can for as many as we can because we will never be everything for everyone. He stated that his position is that members vote the current proposal off then send the planning back to the Bike and Pedestrian Committee. If it turns out they want stripes on the road, we can go back and re-stripe it. He does believe it to be that difficult. He thinks members have to have more discussion about what is Council’s priority and what is our goal, possibly as a retreat topic.

Ms. Dorothy shared that one of the reasons members are having this conversation is because she wants to make sure that Council is spending our money appropriately because we know that it took about 7½ years to accumulate the motor vehicle tax. Everyone that has a car pays into that fund every year for their license. Most people in Worthington that have a car also have multiple bikes. Her family has more bikes than cars but sometimes it alternates. They do appreciate getting around in their vehicles, which are bikes and bikes are traffic. Non-vehicular traffic are pedestrians but we are looking to make sure we can accommodate the greatest number of people, the most traffic throughout Worthington for the least amount of money. That is what this is all about. Her proposal of having sharrows with 25 mph is a very minimal addition to the existing proposal and will accommodate bikes and vehicular traffic. We don’t accommodate pedestrian, which is outside the scope but that is something that she is willing to do within our budget.

Mr. Norstrom commented that he has been moving the greatest number of people for forty years through the use of buses. They do not require sidewalks or bike lanes. He complimented the staff on the research they did and is sorry they had to do it. This issue could have been dealt with as staff has already acknowledged. Bike and Ped should have been involved in this earlier so we have learned a lesson there. This is an opportunity to look at something because the money is being spent. He understands Ms. Dorothy’s prejudices and interests in that area but he thinks simply because this came up on our list doesn’t make it a good thing for bike lanes or any other consideration at this point in time. As pointed out, it is mostly an industrial area. As Mr. Bates has indicated it could potentially become more over time but we are on a moving path. Members have to make decisions now and we try to make decisions that don’t preclude us from making future decisions that would involve a lot of additional money and making things happen because we made a bad decision now. Moving forward on this project is not a bad decision. He thinks there are numerous other places in this community where members could put bike and pedestrian lanes that would be much more effective than in this corridor.

Mr. Smith asked when we anticipate touching this particular part of Huntley Rd. again in any way from a structural maintenance perspective. Mr. Whited replied less than fifteen years. That is the intent with the paser curb he showed. Fifteen years is the typical life. Mr. Smith state that theoretically if we don’t touch the road this year we don’t lose the money that is earmarked for this. Mr. Whited agreed.
When asked by Ms. Michael if there is any staff recommendation on this matter, Mr. Greeson replied that all the options are feasible and reasonable for members to take. Staff has thought a lot about this and had a great deal of conversation over the last week. He thinks that staff’s recommendation is that Council go ahead and move forward with the project as proposed with the successful bidder. He would suggest being open to the Bike and Ped Advisory Board’s recommendations related to sharrows or no sharrows.

**MOTION**

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 24-2017 in Section 1. to insert the sum of Four Hundred Sixty Two Thousand One Hundred Thirty Five Dollars and Forty-Five cents ($462,135.45) and in Section 2. the firm of Decker Construction Company. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to amend Ordinance No. 24-2017 passed by a voice vote.

*There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 24-2017 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norstrom, Foust, Smith, Troper, Myers, and Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinance No. 24-2017 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

**NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED**

**Ordinance No. 28-2017**

Amending Ordinance No. 16-2017 to Establish Compensation for the Unclassified Position of Assistant to the City Manager/IT Director and Authorizing the City Manager to Extend Certain Benefits Related to this Position.

*Introduced by Mr. Myers.*

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

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

*Discussion Item(s)*

**2018 Operating Budget and 2018-2022 Capital Improvement Plan**

*Mr. Greeson commented that at Council requests, staff wanted to spend a little time before the August recess to discuss some of the trends that will impact our upcoming*
budget and structure an opportunity for members to share your thoughts on the budget adoption process. Mr. Bartter will cover revenue trends leading into the budget and then he will talk about some of the expenditure demands and the process.

**Purpose of Discussion**

Discuss significant trends and demands that will impact the operating budget and capital plan so they can be considered when the proposed documents are developed.

Clarify expectations for this year’s process to present, consider and approve the 2018 Operating Budget and the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program.

*Mr. Bartter stated that anytime we talk about revenue for the City we need to start with the income tax as it continues to be our largest and most important revenue stream.*

**Revenue Trends**

- **Income Tax**
  - 75% of General Fund revenue & 64.5% of all revenue in 2016

*Mr. Bartter shared that the good news when talking income tax receipts is that they have been strong since 2011, which was our first full year with the income tax rate increase. Over the six year span between 2011 and 2016 we have averaged a 4% year over year increase in income tax revenue. That trend is continuing in 2017 where we are up 8% year to date from 2016. It is important to note though that income tax is a volatile source of revenue and very reactive to the economy and economic conditions.*

*Mr. Bartter reported that a group that he is involved with completed an informal poll of fifty different municipalities from the Dayton area, Cincinnati area, and many in the central Ohio area. Of that group, Worthington has the second largest year to date 2017 income tax increase in collections. Many of the central Ohio municipalities are experiencing strong collections but that is not the case across Ohio. There are some that have negative tax receipts for 2017.*

*When asked by Mr. Norstrom if there is any explanation as to why our collections are so good, Mr. Bartter replied that he will get to that shortly.*

*What are the positive trends that we are looking at for income tax revenue?*

1) Our strong commitment to economic development efforts over the past few years have really started to bear fruit. That includes the expansion of MedVet, the 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. building, FC Bank and Wheels Up.

2) Strong financial performances by some of our largest businesses. On occasion he looks at Worthington Industries quarterly returns. Their fiscal year ended May
31st. Their sales were up 7% for their most recent year. He believes they set a record for earnings per share. That is important for the City.

With the positive trends also come negative trends. Most of the negatives stem from the Statehouse and their attempts to uniform the different approaches they are taking with income tax. As a result of House Bill 5, which is the uniformity bill, 2018 will be the first year that we will be required to allow a net operating loss to carry forward. That is a five year phase in. We will have to allow 50% of any loss in 2017 for the return in 2018. These are very difficult to predict the full effect.

- Net operating loss requirement goes into effect
  - Phased in – estimated at $450,000 annual loss by 2022
- Elimination of throwback provision goes into effect
  - Estimated $125,000 annual loss
- Opt in for Ohio Business Gateway goes into effect January 2018
  - No estimate on impact available but it will be negative

Mr. Bartter added that House Bill 49, the state budget bill moves the individual fourth quarter estimate from December 15th to January 15th which affects our cash flow. It does keep the December 15th fourth quarter estimate date for non-individuals so it will be in effect for 2018 as well.

Mr. Bartter switched to Property Tax.

- Property Tax
  - Reappraisal underway now
    - No estimate available, but expect to increase our base

Revenue Trends

- Local Government Fund
  - Continued reduction in the State budget (Result of House Bill 49)
    - Reallocation from municipalities to opioid programs, villages and townships
    - No estimate of impact available

Mr. Bartter shared that Parks & Recreation fees have become an important source of income for the City. We had total fees exceeding $2.1M in 2016. He noted that we did have a slight modification to the way those revenues were allocated.

- Parks & Recreation Fees
  - Beginning in 2016, began allocating facility rental income into the Parks & Recreation Revolving Fund since many of the expenses are charged to the fund
    - Less revenue flowing into the General
    - More revenue flowing into the Revolving Fund
The following graph shows our income tax collections.

![Revenue Trends – Income Tax](image)

The following slide is the same slide although it shows the Income Tax information broken into two funds, the General Fund and the CIP Fund.

Note: From 2009 to 2013 our tax distribution was 80% to the General Fund, 6.4% to the General Fund as an Operating Reserve and 13.6% to the CIP as opposed to now with the 80/20 split. The dip in the CIP is reflected because of the change of allocation.
Mr. Barter shared that Property Tax continues to be steady. He anticipates that it will be steady into the future.

Mr. Norstrom noted Mr. Barter shared earlier in the meeting information about appraisals being updated in Worthington this year that will likely increase property values. He asked if he anticipates a bump in property tax collects because of the new values. Mr. Barter replied that the increase will be minimal. There are tax reduction factors but they only apply to the outside millage. We have 2½ outside and 2½ inside. The increase will only apply to the 2½ inside.

Mr. Barter noted that revenue trends for Parks & Recreation fees has been relatively flat since 2007 although the revolving fund shows an increase because of the addition of rental fees.
The next slide shows the impact on the local government fund as a result of the state funneling those funds to other entities. Staff anticipates the decline to continue as a result of House Bill 49.

Mr. Bartter noted a slight uptick in Interest Earnings in 2015 and 2016. We hope that trend continues although it will take a while to get back to the 2007 numbers.

Mr. Bartter pointed out that the first column in the following slide is from 1992. He thought this visually showed the change in the revenue between 1992 and 2016. Members can see that in 1992 we had a much more diverse revenue stream that included
not only income tax but interest earnings, local government fund and inheritance tax. In recent years city income tax has come to dominate all of our revenue.

Mr. Bartter commented that when we reallocated the money from income tax to the operating reserve from 2009 to 2013 it took a little away from the CIP and you can see that downward trend that is starting to bounce back.

Ms. Dorothy understands that the diversion of those funds were necessary to operate. She asked what the 2016 numbers would have looked like if those funds wouldn’t have been diverted. Mr. Bartter reported that approximately $6,000,000 were diverted. We would have been forced to change our expenditures to meet payroll because 2010 and 2011 were some pretty lean years. Ms. Dorothy concluded that we would have a CIP around $13M and a General Fund around $5M. Mr. Bartter agreed.
Mr. Greeson shared that much of our budget deals with ongoing operating expenses and in the CIP, capital expenditures that members have already identified as a five-year plan. So we bring that into the conversations for 2018. He wanted to highlight some of the demands that staff sees and let members know that these are some of the things that we will be wrestling with how to incorporate as we prepare the budget. Staff also wants to hear anything additional that members may be thinking.

**Expenditure Demands – Operating**
- Technology assessment recommendations (IT Operations)
- Water main repairs
- HVAC improvements at the Community Center
  - May propose this capital improvement from the General Fund since it will be paid back with energy savings
- City Council Meetings video/audio streaming

**Expenditure Demands – Capital**
- Parks Master Plan
- Bike & Pedestrian Projects
- Evaluation and possible replacement of water lines
- Technology assessment recommendations
- Streetscaping on North High Street and at gateways
- Radios are at end of life, so need to plan for replacement
- Northeast Gateway project – utility relocation
- City Council Meetings video/audio streaming

**Process for Approval**
- Departmental presentations (larger presentations)

Last year with some input from members, staff focused more of our presentations on larger issues, expenditure areas rather than delving deeply into the weeds of any one departmental budget. Some members commented on that process positively. At this point we want to touch base to see if there are any process comments, questions or concerns so that we can structure a meaningful and productive budget dialog.

- Process for community groups
  - MAC, Historical Society, OWP
  - Smaller grants
- Potential schedule
  - October 2 – Distribute proposed CIP
  - October 9 – Discuss CIP
  - November 6, 13 & 20 – Department and community groups presentations
  - December – Budget & CIP Adoption
Mr. Greeson reported the information as something that staff wanted to highlight just to kick off the conversation.

Mr. Myers recalls talking in the past about the budget presentation to be less departmental based, which we moved away from last time and more goal based. In the last couple of months, three things that have come out that are kind of where we are heading with our money: the Wilson Bridge Rd. corridor, Parks and Bicycle & Pedestrian. He would like to see what can be done to increase year over year expenditures in those three areas and have the budget that reflects those priorities.

Ms. Michael shared that while she agrees with Mr. Myers, we also have to take care of water main maintenance. Mr. Myers agreed. He added that Mr. Norstrom has brought this up repeatedly. Ms. Dorothy brought it up tonight. He knows we are projecting out a fairly flat fund balance in our CIP but he would like to at least have a discussion as to whether it is worth it to dip into the fund balance to re-appropriate or move fund to satisfy those goals. That is the way he would like to see the budget prepared and presented so that Council can have that robust discussion as to how we want to spend our money. He agreed with Mr. Greeson that those items are primarily capital projects.

When asked by Mr. Foust to repeat the three items, Mr. Myers shared the first as being Wilson Bridge Rd. which is what members came away from our retreat as a top priority. What we have heard in the last several months is Parks and Bicycle & Pedestrian. He agrees that $100,000 to Bike and Ped when we will take most of that for our beacons that is not reflective of making that a goal. Hopefully a master plan will help with that but he would like to see Council, if there is a way, put our money where our mouth is. If those are truly our three priorities moving forward, which it seems from the public input and committee input that Council has received, those three seem to be our wish list right now.

Mr. Greeson thinks the CIP will necessitate more time spent on it than it has in the past because of the constraints on it. Mr. Myers mentioned that maybe Council can’t do it but we have to engage in that exercise if we are going to sit here and tell the Bike & Ped Committee to go back and do a master plan. If we are going to have Parks & Recreation do a master plan then we can’t just say thank you and good-bye.

Mr. Norstrom noted that he and Mr. Myers disagree on this and he knows he is the minority because we had the vote but targeting specific taxes for doing some of the things that you are talking about is an option as opposed to just having a debate about existing resources.

Ms. Michael asked if he is looking at a bond issue or something similar to that. Mr. Norstrom replied that he is looking at a tax increase to pay for improvements in Parks and Recreation and Bike & Pedestrian. Mr. Myers agreed that they could not more fundamentally disagree on that subject.

Mr. Foust explained that while he appreciates the nobility of the question, every time members have a conversation along these lines he also gets this nervous sense of whether
we are going to build things that we can’t afford to maintain in the future. He asked that “if it is possible” be included as part of that complete discussion. To look not only at the near term expense but also what is the implication of maintaining whatever it might be. What is the cost twenty years out if we build these things? Are we going to become the City that has ratty looking roads/parks/whatever because we can’t keep up with what we decided we could afford to build in the near term? Mr. Myers acknowledged that as a concern. What he is asking for more than anything is that he thinks we need to have that discussion and that discussion should be part of the budget process because that should be an expression of our goals and aspirations.

Ms. Dorothy appreciates the long term thoughtfulness of this. She agreed that members need to look at maintenance costs. She is glad we are finally looking at that and that is going to be part of the capital project which will be another big bite out of the budget. Looking at the long term cost is why she asked that every time members look at putting out significant money for roadway improvements that we look at other modes of transportation because there are limited budgets for everything. If we had made these priorities then we need to look at how to fund them and how we maintain them.

Ms. Michael, in going along with Bike and Pedestrian, shared that she would really like to have a discussion on the prioritization of connecting the Northeast Gateway to Schrock Rd. If anybody is going to connect to any place, you have to connect from that railroad track to Schrock Rd. That connecting piece is going to make a big difference.

Mr. Myers believes that go back to his other comments as to that being the reason we have a committee. They are the most interested people on this subject. He would hope that they would come forward with a recommendation to Council identifying their priorities.

Mr. Norstrom thinks that Council partially needs to guide that process. If members don’t have capital money or want to change our priorities, he doesn’t want to have a group like that spinning their wheels. Mr. Myers agreed. That is why if members are going to make that a priority he wants that expressed in the budget if we can do it.

Mr. Norstrom asked if there is anything Council should stop doing. For example, the City provides a high quality of service. We make sure that we have black streets after snows. That costs us. That is the quality our public has come to expect and we have come to fund. If we are going to continue to provide high quality service, we are going to pay more for those services than other communities might, which is fine but we need to review that and make sure we still all agree that those are where we should be spending our dollars to maintain a high quality of existing services. An easy target is Parks and Recreation. Do we want to increase our fees on Parks and Recreation rather than subsidize that? We traditionally have chosen to not fully recover and he thinks that is a good decision but he would direct staff to look at alternatives on things we could stop doing or do differently as the budget is brought forward.
Mr. Myers asked how long it has been since a fee analysis was done. Mr. Greeson reported that an analysis is due. Mr. Myers knows that in the Building Department we were incredibly cheap for years and we caught up a little bit. He thinks we have fallen back behind. Mr. Greeson thinks an analysis is due in both Building and Parks and Recreation. We are in the cycle where we are due again.

Mr. Norstrom added that despite the three items that Mr. Myers has mentioned, he thinks there is consensus amongst Council that we look at how to be more transparent which includes the video and audio. That can be done at a relatively small price. Ms. Michael knows that many neighboring communities are doing it. We should inquire as to it is being done.

Mr. Foust went back to the comment about being due to look at fees, he shared that the hazard with any fixed fee is that the minute you establish it you start falling behind on a percent basis. He asked if those are ever indexed. Mr. Greeson replied that we typically will benchmark ourselves against other communities. We will not only look at it in terms of cost recovery but also the philosophy for charging the fee. We then want to make sure that we are not out of whack with the market so we will compare ourselves with others. Mr. Foust clarified that he is talking about the year to year. He provided an example and asked if staff indexes annually to some benchmark? Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Greeson indicated that being something we don’t do.

Mr. Troper would be curious as to what we are doing to curb rising health care cost.

Mr. Norstrom asked if members want to pick a theme like we did last year with community groups, such as opioids, and direct our money to trying to make a difference. He doesn’t think opioids is the right choice because it takes more money that what we have to allocate. Mr. Greeson asked if members wanted to do that to impact some community outcome and then what kind of a process do members want to use to accomplish that. Mr. Norstrom believes the first question of whether there is anything. Ms. Michael agreed. She added that members should then share their thoughts. Mr. Greeson noted that many of the organizations are dealing with basic issues like mental health and food, which are the priorities that Council chose last year.

Mr. Norstrom complimented staff for bringing this information early. Mr. Greeson thanked members for their input.

Financial Report

Mr. Barter presented the June 2017 Financial Report as follows:

- Fund balances for all funds increased from $23,225,624 on January 1, 2017 to $27,822,641 as of June 30, 2017.

- The General Fund balance increased from $11,628,193 as of January 1, 2017 to $13,177,141 as of June 30, 2017.
• Expenditures across all funds are tracking at 96.03% of appropriations

• General Fund expenditures are tracking at about 93% of appropriations.

• Year to date income tax collections are above 2016 income tax collections by $1,066,562 or 8.46%.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to accept the June 2017 Monthly Financial Report as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Other Items

Mr. Greeson shared the following:

• Mr. Brown will provide an update shortly on 410 Tucker Dr. because he knows that members as well as staff have had questions from residents about that. Staff wants to make sure that members have updated information.

• Members also received a memo regarding another property in Worthington that he wants to make members aware of.

• Mr. Greeson congratulated and thanked Ms. Word for her service. If members don’t already know she will be moving to the state of North Carolina and wearing Tar Heel blue. She has accepted a position to be the town clerk and human resource officer for the town of Granite Quarry. We want to congratulate her and thank her for her eleven years to the City of Worthington. He appreciates all of the support she has provided in the City Manager’s office.

Ms. Michael added that Ms. Word will be missed by everyone.

Mr. Brown provided some background on the building project at 410 Tucker, which began in November 2015. Building permits were eventually issued but work on the project has come to a standstill. Staff has seen no activity on the property for about four or five months. The building permit expires July 26th so to get their building permit extension, they will be required to go back to the BZA. Don Phillips in our office has sent inquiries to the property owner and the contractor several times over the last few months to find out the status of the project and to inform them that their permit will be expiring. We were able to talk to Krysta LaRussa, who’s involved with the project with the Bakhshis. She stated that the project is still going forward however we have seen no activity. Recently staff began receiving calls from neighboring properties on Tucker, Medick and even Highgate asking for an update since it has been relatively quiet. At this point in time, we just wanted to fill you in on what we do and do not know. We know that the permit expires on July 26th and they will need to appear before the BZA to receive an
extension. The Board typically grants extensions up to a year. Because of the size of the house they would have probably needed an extension anyway.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if BZA meets in August, Mr. Brown replied yes. He added that at this point in time the BZA deadline for August is Friday but we have yet to receive an application.

When asked by Ms. Michael what happens if they just don’t do anything, Mr. Brown replied that we can push the property owner to board up the openings that are there but we cannot legally force them to finish the project. Unfortunately our best hope is that the applicant will get going on the project and get it finished or that someone else would like to purchase that property and finish the project. We will pass along any updates.

Ms. Fox shared that a goal she had for 2017 was to get the BZA and MPC/ARB trained in ethics. Mr. Brown has been very helpful in making that happen. As of last week we have finished the training for BZA and have only one more session to for the MPC/ARB to be finished. She expects her predecessor will work to get Council trained. She added that the training has been through e-series. Once the meeting is adjourned an approximately 20 minute video session is shown. There is a total of six but one is very repetitive and is not required.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith stated that BWC is sending out checks starting this week. He thinks they are doing them alphabetically so it might be a couple of weeks but Ms. Roberts was correct in her general idea of what we will get back. It is somewhere north of $200,000.

Ms. Dorothy thanked City staff to help make sure that the 4th of July was safe starting at Colonial Hills and kicking off that 5K. We had some police presence there and then throughout the day and at night at the Thomas Worthington Rotary Family Picnic and fireworks. It was a wonderful evening and everyone stayed safe.

Ms. Michael expressed her disappointment in the Ohio Legislature and all of the funding cuts that they continue to make to municipalities. She has a COMMA executive meeting tomorrow and if there are any updates she will let members know next week. She thinks many are sad that our revenues keep getting taken away from us.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Foust made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Boards and Commissions appointments and the appointment of personnel. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes  7  Myers, Dorothy, Foust, Smith, Troper, Norstrom, and Michael
Council recessed at 9:21 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION  Mr. Myers made a motion to return to open session at 9:40 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

_/s/ D. Kay Thress for Tanya Maria Word
Temporary Clerk of Council

_/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President