Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 11, 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, September 11, 2017, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 P.M.


Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Acting Director of Law Dan Guttman, 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 eleven visitors present.

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

President Michael shared that with this being Patriots Day she wanted to take a moment to remember all those who lost their lives on September 11th. She thanked all who came forward to help at that time including all of the first responders and our military. We know that our freedom is not free. This is a moment for us to be thankful for those who have given us our freedom by paying the ultimate price.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 55-2017 Confirming the Appointment of Thomas Lindsey to the Position of Director of Law.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 55-2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson shared that it is his privilege to introduce Mr. Tom Lindsey. With Ms. Fox’s recent retirement, staff undertook an extensive process to find a new law director. A significant number of experienced attorneys were considered and Mr. Lindsey ran the gauntlet of the multi-step interview process. It is his privilege to recommend him for confirmation by the City Council.
Mr. Greeson then provided background information on Mr. Lindsey and added that his twenty five years of government legal experience certainly makes him qualified to be our Law Director. He asked that Council approve his recommendation.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 55-2017 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael congratulated Mr. Lindsey and welcomed him to Worthington.

Mr. Lindsey thanked City Council for their support and City Manager Greeson’s confidence in his appointment of him. He is looking forward to joining the team and serving Council and the residents of Worthington.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

- Tobacco 21

Mr. Greeson reported that staff conducted some research this summer on Tobacco 21, which has been an initiative of the city of Columbus related to raising the legal minimum age for the sale of tobacco products. A number of other central Ohio municipalities have also passed legislation related to this topic. City Intern, Ethan Barnhardt is prepared to brief members on the subject. He added that Keith Krinn, John Richter, and Melissa McArthur of Columbus Public Health are also present and available to answer questions.

Mr. Barnhardt shared that he did research over the summer on Tobacco 21, which is a national movement and policy approach to raise the minimum legal sales age of tobacco products. The hope is to curtail the number of young people who begin to pick up tobacco and related habits.

Research showed that tobacco usage in Ohio and Franklin County is actually high with one in four juniors and seniors reporting some use of tobacco in the past 30 days. This statistics shows that 80% of current adult smokers began to smoke before the age of twenty and 90% of those who purchase cigarettes to distribute to minors are under the age of twenty one. Our hope by raising the age is that we can curtail the number of people who are actually going to be distributing to those who are eighteen and under. The effort is geared to reducing the numbers of adult smokers and the related negative public health outcomes that come with it.

Legislation does not focus on punishing underage users but rather on business owners and the front line retail staff members who actually sell to minors. The city of Columbus passed their Tobacco 21 legislation in December 2016. He was told that they are just now beginning their enforcement efforts. A retail license with annual renewals is the primary enforcement device they are using. The license permits retailers to sell tobacco products. This retail license brings another level of accountability to the business owner
because they can actually lose their license to sell tobacco products entirely if they are not totally compliant. Columbus Public Health also provides signage for stores (store fronts and all display cases). Columbus also has sanitarians in most of these facilities that sell tobacco products and they have the authority to issue civil penalties for non-compliant businesses that increase with each violation. Columbus Police department can begin criminal proceedings when the number of violations increase. He believes that after the third violation of the civil penalties, businesses can actually lose their retail license for up to five years.

Mr. Barnhardt reported having met with those from Columbus Public Health along with Chief Strait and Ms. Fox to discuss some of the logistics should Worthington decide to join the Tobacco 21 initiative. Since we already contract with Columbus Public Health for health services they think it would be easy for Worthington to adopt the same code that Columbus uses.

Questions:

When asked by Ms. Michael what he would recommend after doing all of this research, Mr. Barnhardt replied that he thinks it is a worthy item to take up because tobacco is a really dangerous product. It definitely is associated with negative health outcomes that get progressively worse and places a burden on society because we have to pay for those health care costs as they progress. He would recommend the initiative.

When asked by Mr. Myers how many tobacco retail establishments are in Worthington, Mr. Barnhardt replied five. They include: Kroger, UDF, BP, Marathon, and House of Cigars. He added that House of Cigars is the only outlier that doesn’t currently have Columbus Public Health sanitarians.

Mr. Smith asked if the policies that the initiative promotes is against tobacco period or does it differentiate between the different types of tobacco. Mr. Barnhardt replied that it is pretty broad based. It is tobacco products that includes cigarettes, cigars, associated paraphernalia and chewing tobacco, as well as vaping products and e-cigarettes.

When asked by Mr. Foust for clarification on whether it is the city of Cleveland that has adopted this policy or the suburbs of Cleveland, Mr. Barnhardt replied the city of Cleveland.

Mr. Norstrom reported that early in his memo Mr. Barnhardt stated that after Needham, Mass. passed this initiative high school students using tobacco dropped almost in half. He asked if we know if that same kind of statistic follows this initiative in other places. Mr. Barnhardt replied that he did not find any comparable case studies in his research but that was the primary one that was sited in most everything that he read.

Mr. Myers asked who issues the license. Mr. Barnhardt believes the license would be issued by the city of Columbus. Mr. Krinn shared that the license would come from Columbus Public Health.
Mr. Myers reiterated that Columbus Public Health would issue the license and collect the fee. Mr. Norstrom said it would be done on Worthington’s behalf. Mr. Krinn likened it to the signs program that they do for eateries in Worthington. When they instituted that initiative in 2007, Worthington asked to stand back and let them proceed for a year to see how it would go. Worthington City Council then passed a mirror ordinance only with a few nuances (violations go to Mayors Court instead of Environmental Court).

Mr. Myers commented that enforcement could be by Worthington law enforcement as well as Columbus. Mr. Krinn agreed that it could be. Mr. Myers referring to the memo, asked if the enforcement by Columbus Public Health would be by using Worthington’s code or the Columbus code. Mr. Krinn replied that the Health Department would be enforcing the Worthington ordinance. If police are needed, Worthington police will be contacted. Mr. Myers concluded that Worthington could establish its own procedures on the issue. Mr. Krinn agreed.

Ms. Dorothy asked if it is known how the other central Ohio community enforcements are doing. Mr. Krinn replied that he can’t speak to that. Ms. Dorothy asked about Columbus. Mr. Krinn shared that on October 1st Columbus will be enforcing this law. They needed a large amount of time for outreach to all of the establishments. About 75% of the places that are impacted are already in the system because they have a food license. They spent extra time with the other 25% who have not dealt with them before.

Ms. Michael asked if they have already been giving warnings or will warnings begin on October 1st. Mr. Krinn replied that warnings will begin as they are only doing outreach at this time. He shared the process that Columbus will follow.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if he knew the answer to his previous question about whether the dramatic drop in usage that occurred in Needham follows this initiative in other places, Mr. Krinn replied that he can’t speak to that but Columbus will have its own data to either support that or not once we get into this further.

Mr. Norstrom acknowledged that Columbus had a nine month period from adoption to implementation. If Worthington were to adopt this program, he asked if Mr. Krinn would recommend a period shorter than nine months. Mr. Krinn replied yes because not many establishments are impacted in Worthington.

Mr. Norstrom remarked that he thinks members should encourage staff to bring us an ordinance on this initiative so we can hold a public hearing to see what our residents think.

Mr. Myers asked if we have reached out yet to our businesses to get a feel because it does impose an additional fee. Mr. Greeson replied not at this juncture. He added that some will already be familiar because they own sites in the city of Columbus. We will reach out to them as is our practice.
Ms. Michael noticed that penalties are different throughout the communities that have passed this kind of legislation. She asked if anyone had thoughts on whether to follow the Columbus fees or have staff look at the other communities as well.

Ms. Dorothy replied that she would want staff to at least reach out to the other municipalities to see what their thoughts have been since many of them have been established since 2015. Then we can determine the best practices. Mr. Norstrom agreed.

Mr. Greeson replied that staff will reach out to each of those communities but he thinks our research indicates that the system that creates the highest level of accountability is the one where there is an enforcement process for the sale as well as a licensure component that deals with the businesses ability to actually sell tobacco products. Those combined provide the best accountability as opposed to the other jurisdictions which do not have that retail license component.

Mr. Myers thinks since Upper Arlington already has this on the books and we have an Upper Arlington expert coming on board, we can be fully briefed on this issue.

Mr. Smith commented that he knows this is a variable potentially in the marijuana legalities coming up, but if the age for medical marijuana or whatever type of marijuana in the future is eighteen and tobacco is twenty one, he asked how that would be reconciled. Mr. Krinn replied that doesn’t know. What he does know is that the medical marijuana law does not provide for the product to be smoked. It has to be vaped.

Ms. Michael encouraged members to forward any thoughts they have on this issue to Mr. Greeson. She thanked the members of the Columbus Public Health for coming this evening.

Mr. Greeson reported that staff will work with Columbus Public Health to bring back legislation that largely mirrors theirs and we will answer the questions related to the other suburbs and get it back in a reasonable timeframe. He also thanked Mr. Barnhardt for his work on this topic.

- Community Foundation

Mr. Greeson reported that over the years the topic of a community foundation has come up. In the absence of a comprehensive community foundation a number of foundations have been formed in our community that do good work such as the Worthington Educational Foundation, the Dublin-Worthington Rotary Club Foundation and others. But this topic of whether there is a more comprehensive community foundation as well as the topic of whether we have a Parks and Recreation Foundation created keeps coming back up. At his request, Mr. Barnhardt did some research this summer and pulled information from a variety of community foundations (New Albany, Bexley, and Upper Arlington) to look at how these are created, what are their characteristics and missions, how are they managed and governed, etc. We are distributing that research tonight for members’ information. We are prepared to answer some questions about it or have
members identify additional areas of information you may desire regarding this subject matter. He would recommend that if there is an interest in facilitating a community dialog about this subject, then the next step would be to pull representatives of our Community Relations Commission (which has expressed an interest in this subject), and some of the existing not for profits and community foundations in our community who may have an interest in how this interacts with them and maybe a couple members of City Council. That is how he would approach it but he wanted to distribute this information and answer any questions and see where members want to go with it.

Mr. Smith asked when this has been brought up in the past and for what purposes.

Ms. Michael reported that being members of the community who think it would be nice to have a community foundation as a way to solicit additional funds that could be used for certain purposes for the city (maybe capital improvements or parks and bicycle/ped). They favor private donations over a bond issue. A private foundation can do its own fundraising. Some felt so strong about it that after Harvey Minton passed away they contacted the Columbus Foundation and had them earmark a way for people to donate money towards this. In order to do that there has to be a board and a group of people as officers, etc. She would see the City’s role in facilitating a group. It would be a separate, not for profit arm that is not part of the City. Going through the Columbus Foundation they would probably not have to go through the 501(c)3 application process. Several years ago there were some women who said they were going to take this effort up and start moving forward with it but they never did.

Ms. Dorothy reported there still needs to be some work in determining how a Worthington Foundation would work with other organizations. She has been a part of many organizations in Worthington and the same people are asking for service time and money from the same businesses and everyone is struggling for this. The conversations about if we could have an umbrella organization, it would be a mechanism to help direct resources. Everyone would work together. Obviously we wouldn’t want to consolidate these individual groups because they all bring a different part, aspect and perspective to Worthington but if we could have a better mechanism to pull resources of time and money for bigger projects, she thinks that would be very beneficial to Worthington.

Ms. Michael stated there being two things. One is whether or not to do a foundation that would have a board of directors. The other groups that you are talking about all have board of directors and have 501(c)3 tax status. The other idea that she is hearing from Ms. Dorothy is having more of a coordinating board where the leaders of this board would get together several times a year to discuss funding and needs. Ms. Dorothy agreed adding especially if someone made a significant contribution to the Worthington Foundation.

Mr. Troper commented that he would be in favor of the City looking at establishing our own foundation. He recognizes that these organizations all have separate needs (education, library and the arts center). If someone has lived in Worthington for a long
time and wants to give money to the City then he thinks there should be a way for them to
give to support overall City needs.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Barnhardt if there is anything additional that he wants to share that
isn’t in his memo. Mr. Barnhardt reported that the general feeling that he got from his
research is that having a more overarching organization could help to focus some of the
community needs. He definitely felt that it wouldn’t be taking away from the other
organizations. The foundations that are within the City and doing good work but it could
have more of a focusing affect.

Mr. Foust shared that as he looks at this he is reminded of the exercise that some Council
members have gone through with the City grant money and the challenge of the
competing driving forces. How that money gets allocated to some extent is colored by
whoever gets chosen to participate in that exercise. As he reads the list it looks like
Bexley and Upper Arlington are trying a broad range of different kinds of projects. He is
not in favor of going forward with this only from the standpoint that he thinks we are
creating one more kind of conundrum. He is a believer in a free market and he thinks to
the extent that the Rotary and the McConnell Arts groups and the Friends of the Library
want to advance their own causes rather than having money decided by a small group
who may have their own particular vent, he would rather see the freedom of each of these
groups make their case to the public to promote their causes, to generate excitement and
activity and perhaps remain independent.

Mr. Troper shared that he is not an expert on foundations. He thinks that people can
request the type of organization they want their money to go to or the need that they want
to assist with. That is his understanding. Mr. Barnhardt agreed. Basically you can
earmark the money you donate to go towards a specific purpose or cause.

Ms. Michael shared that currently there is no separate fund. She confirmed that a
Worthington Foundation, which some believe to exist, does not exist. She has personally
checked into this. Since Harvey’s passing, George Norris has contacted the Columbus
Foundation to at least earmark something so if anyone wants to donate there is a place
they can do that even though it doesn’t have its full structure.

Mr. Norstrom shared that the Arts Center did work in setting up a fund through the
Columbus Foundation but it costs money to do that. He agrees with Mr. Foust. Having
served on several not for profits, they struggle to get money and they are basically calling
the same people. We have 14,000 and 7,000 or 8,000 adults and householders. There is
only so much that people are going to give. If they want to give to the City they still can
do that. He would like to have more information from Bexley and Upper Arlington.
Maybe there is no impact but with his experience he believes there would be.

Mr. Myers wants to make sure he is on the same page as everybody else. He doesn’t see
a Worthington Foundation as being established by the City for the benefit of the City.
This isn’t going to be a charitable donation to the city of Worthington. This is going to
be a charitable donation to a separate and distinct foundation that we may have a place
at the table or initiate the dialog. It would be for charitable purposes probably for those people already delivering charitable services in the City for some expanded outreach and not for improvements to parks or sidewalks or things like that. He doesn’t see it as a donation for City infrastructure. If that assumption is correct then he thinks the people we have to ask are those charitable organization who are already providing those services to see if they would encourage it or discourage it. If Ms. Dorothy and Mr. Norstrom are correct in that they are already struggling and this is just one more hand out then they may not really want it. They may say sure if we could have an overarching charitable foundation that collects money on our behalf that is a whole lot better and frees us up to do what we want to do. He thinks Mr. Greeson’s initial suggestion of doing some outreach to our charitable organizations, maybe put together a summit of those people, and sit down and talk to them to see if there really is a need and desire.

Mr. Greeson shared that in talking about City infrastructure, Parks Foundations are something that we have explored before. Mr. Myers thinks that is separate and distinct from what we are talking about. Mr. Greeson thinks that we would need to engage in whether or not a Parks Foundation would be something that we would do distinct and different from this or whether it would be a component part of it and measured against the priorities that the community foundation establishes.

Mr. Myers stated that if fundraising for charitable purposes is difficult in Worthington then the last thing that he wants to do is supplant those donations for city purposes. We need to stand on our own two feet and let that money go to the Pantry or to mental health or whatever the foundation deems appropriate.

Mr. Greeson concurs that we need to pull together some of those parties. Staff would be glad to do that and have an initial dialog. He thinks it would be good if Council had representation in that initial meeting.

Ms. Dorothy reported being confused of what the City’s role would be in forming the Worthington Foundation. Mr. Greeson thinks it falls into the category of us as a platform for launching and facilitating dialogs. There are numerous civic organizations in this community that got their start as an idea of leadership in the city and community calling people together.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she was thinking that many of the donations would be more from planned giving like from an estate type deal. She knows that many give annually to their charity of choice from their annual revenue but she was thinking the foundation could be more of a planned giving from an estate.

Ms. Michael commented that in looking at the memo about Upper Arlington and Bexley, much of what they have is basically augmenting city services and city funds, like Parks and Recreation, which is exactly what Mr. Myers said he didn’t feel was appropriate to be doing. One of the questions we need to ask is whether there needs to be an overall coordinating board. She thinks what she is hearing tonight is that some don’t want to have a foundation that is going to get additional funds for city projects.
Mr. Myers shared that we have a limited pool of charitable assets in the city. He doesn’t want the city to take away part of that pool to the exclusion of the charities that we already have. He is not going to know that until we talk to the charities.

Mr. Troper stated that Mr. Myers is assuming the pie is limited. Maybe this could make the pie bigger. Mr. Myers acknowledged that maybe it can but he is not in that arena of trying to solicit money so he doesn’t know.

In a caveat on his statement, Mr. Norstrom remarked that we did have a fundraiser with Lou and Nancy Goorey leading an effort to get money where the seven of us probably wouldn’t be able to do that. So there was money in this community to build the arts center. He bets there is money in this community to do something like that. That effort was a brick and mortar thing, something you could see and put your name on, etc. etc. He doesn’t know if that is what members are looking at in this context. Mr. Myers commented that both Drs. Goorey could do many things that he couldn’t do.

Ms. Michael said the takeaway that she is hearing is that somebody on staff will check with the other communities that have foundations and get some information as well as talk to some of the possible stakeholders in the community. She asked that they also include the Food Pantry and Resource Center to the list of organizations.

Information Item(s)

- McCord Park Master Plan

Mr. Greeson commented that with the assumption that not all members of Council were able to attend the McCord Park Master Plan open house this evening before the Council meeting, staff wanted to provide a quick overview of the concepts and the process. We don’t want to get too engaged in the details because ultimately the public comment process will result in recommendations that will be used for decisions. We just wanted to provide a snapshot of what is going on in this stage of the process. He asked Mr. Hurley to comment.

Mr. Hurley reiterated that he just wanted to provide a quick overview and will be happy to speak more individually if someone wants to really dig in to any of the details. We are well underway for the McCord Park Master planning process. As members recall, this was one of the primary and priority recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Commission’s Park Master Plan that included an initial listing of ideas for renovations for this park and ultimately to do a master plan led by a consultant. We have secured the services of POD Design who have completed various other projects over the years for the City. The process to date has included some stakeholder meetings with local businesses along the corridor, the Worthington Youth Boosters, our staff and certainly some of the Parks and Rec Commission members along with some of the things that we collected during the master planning process.
Mr. Hurley shared that this is just a concept. An open house was held this evening at the community center in which we had advertised throughout social media, the website, and direct mailings to all of the neighbors around the park, several of which showed up.

Mr. Hurley shared the attached concept.

Highlights include:

- Center the park entrance on E. Wilson Bridge Rd. with the entrance to MedVet across the street
- Add pull off parking
- Add a Train Observation Node (Worthington AM Rotary Club will donate a caboose and fund the development onsite)
- Proposed ½ mile paved loop that would go around the ball fields
- Completely renovate the ball diamonds that include replacing the dated restrooms and storage facility
- Reconfigure the diamonds slightly to make it a more true quad
- Shorten the drive to the west of the ball diamonds and install parking spaces by the soccer field
- Soccer field will be enlarged to full size
- Renovation of the small playground between the ball field and the Community Center is already funded. Reposition slightly to be more centrally placed.
- The parking lot is in the CIP for repaving in the next few years. We plan to tweak parking and the circle drive to allow for better traffic flow.

Mr. Hurley shared that staff showed a neighborhood pedestrian connection (path) that will run between Eastview residents and the community center. There is already a path there that comes up behind the community center to the All Children’s Playground. A connector was added that would run into the other playground and the park. Staff thinks that would be beneficial but members may hear from some of those neighbors who shared some concerns tonight so we will have to figure out how to balance that.

Mr. Hurley shared that the next steps is to share this concept with the Parks and Recreation Commission next week on Tuesday. We will take the comments that we received from the meeting and through the website and share them with the Parks Commission. They will need to decide whether to recommend any changes. If we are able to iron all of that out in their meeting then we will be sending it on to City Council, hopefully in October. If they feel there were enough differing views that they need more time to work out then we may need more time. We hope to have a cleaned up concept with some cost estimates to Council that could be talked about during the CIP process.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the parking spaces are more or less than what currently exist. Mr. Hurley replied that the net is +10 spaces overall. The major changes will be along the alternative entrance west of the ball fields. Many of those spaces will be removed but spaces will be added in the other lots. We rarely see the entire complex parked out.
Mr. Smith asked about the survey. Mr. Hurley shared that there is a link on the Parks and Recreation page where the concept is provided and comments can be made.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she has heard comments about the community garden. People want it larger or an additional one at another location. She asked if the garden will be the same size or bigger or smaller. Mr. Hurley replied that they have had a great deal of dialog on this topic that included discussions with the organizers of the community garden. There are some who believe that is a prime piece of real estate and only benefits thirty users. The current garden is about the size of Pingree Park so that is a pretty significant green space. We certainly have a very active and vibrant community garden. The recommendation of the Parks Commission was to add a community garden and not take one away. There really isn’t room in this park to relocate that many plots so at this point we are showing it as drawn. As members know going through the Dog Park discussions and the Community Garden discussions, we do not have many locations for a garden because they can’t have shade and we need access for parking. So that is an active dialog and there are opinions both ways but we just don’t have an answer yet.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she likes the idea of the path. It looks like you can also get more direct access to the community garden with that proposed path. She asked if the process is to go to the Arbor Committee to discuss all of the trees being proposed. Mr. Hurley replied that our arborist have been involved in the process and indirectly our Arbor Committee. We would certainly work with them. He reported that some clearing of honeysuckle has been done in the tree line between the ball fields and the community center parking lot. They have tried to identify the significant trees because the area is well shaded.

Mr. Myers shared that he has two general comments and will share in more detail off line at another time. But during a conversation with Representative Duffey last night he commented that some of the other towns in his district are kind of getting ahead of us in some respects. Mr. Myers wants to make certain that when we do this our finishes are not just concrete block. Put the extra finishes on it so that it looks like a Worthington park and not just a box. The second thing is that this is our principal softball park. If you know anything about softball in Worthington, one name comes up. He would hope that we could find something, whether the concession stand or one of the fields, but something should be named after Jack Brandenburg. Any who don’t know Jack was really the grandfather of everything softball in the city of Worthington for 25 years.

Mr. Hurley agreed. He added that this rendering is only a concept and not a design. Certainly that facility has been discussed at length and having it become a real focal point, not only for the baseball and softball activity but just for the park in general with nice restrooms, storage, etc. The treatment in the middle, maybe with some pavers or something to just step it up a little, has been a discussion of the Parks Commission.

Mr. Norstrom indicated that the parking lot is in our current CIP. He asked if anything else is in our current plans. Mr. Hurley replied that we have shown the $200,000 for the playground in the 2018 or 2019 CIP but none of the rest of this is currently in there.
That will be a challenge because we are looking at a large number to accommodate all of this.

Ms. Michael thanked Mr. Hurley for the presentation.

- Financial Report

Mr. Barter presented the July 2017 and August 2017 Financial Reports. Highlights from those reports are as follows:

- Fund balances for all funds increased from $23,225,624 on January 1, 2017 to $27,896,186 as of July 31, 2017. Further increased fund balances for all funds as of August 31, 2017 to $29,486,294.

- The General Fund balance increased from $11,628,193 as of January 1, 2017 to $13,250,084 as of July 31, 2017. Further increased the General Fund balance as of August 31, 2017 to $14,617,993.

- Expenditures across all funds are tracking at 89.79% of appropriations for July and 89.89% for August.

- General Fund expenditures are tracking at about 91.94% of appropriations for July and 91.30% for August.

- Year to date income tax collections in July are above 2016 income tax collections by $1,237,301 or 8.45% and $1,327,446 or 7.75% in August.

Mr. Barter said he would be happy to answer any questions members may have. He requested a motion to accept the July and August 2017 monthly financial reports for the record.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to accept the July and August 2017 Monthly Financial Reports as presented this evening. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael acknowledged a student who was in the audience who shared that she was a student at Ohio State and working on her Master’s degree. She enjoyed the discussion on Tobacco 21. Ms. Michael welcomed her to tonight’s meeting.

Other Items

Mr. Greeson requested an executive session to discuss pending litigation.
REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith shared that he and his family attended an event in Westerville this past weekend. There was a whole line up of police and tactical vehicles. It was a really good event. Worthington was well represented and we had one of the best tents there.

Ms. Dorothy commented that today’s Patriots Day event was very well done.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss pending litigation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

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

No 0

Council recessed at 8:36 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to return to open session at 8:58 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 18th day of September, 2017.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President