



CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Worthington City Council Minutes

March 5, 2018

6550 N. High Street
Worthington, Ohio
43085

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, March 5, 2018, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 PM.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas Foust, David Robinson, Douglas K. Smith, and Bonnie D. Michael (Beth Kowalczyk arrived at 7:55 p.m.)

Member(s) Absent: Scott Myers

Also present: City Manager Matthew Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Service & Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire John Bailot, and Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

There were two visitors present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Michael invited all to stand and join in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

VISITOR COMMENTS – No Comments

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- Regular Meeting – February 5, 2018
- Special Meeting – February 12, 2018
- Committee of the Whole Meeting – February 12, 2018
- Special Meeting – February 20, 2018

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy moved to approve the aforementioned meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion to approve the minutes as presented carried unanimously by a voice vote.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 12-2018

Approving a Written Debt Policy to Provide Guidance Governing the Issuance, Management, Evaluation, and Reporting of All Debt Obligations.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION

Mr. Robinson made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2018. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

Mr. Greeson reported that staff is undertaking a review of a number of City policies related to financial and administrative matters. He complimented Mr. Bartter for leading a number of those reviews. The debt policy was one of those policies, a draft of which was previously distributed to members. He invited Mr. Bartter to provide comments and introduce our financial advisor.

Mr. Bartter shared that before members is the final version of the debt policy. There are no material changes from the draft that he distributed at the last Council meeting. As we look to go back to the rating agencies, one of the criteria upon which they evaluate us is management. For Standard & Poor, the management score accounts for 20% of the overall score. As part of this score, S&P is attempting to determine if we have the plans and policies in place that show a commitment to sound financial management. These policies include a general fund carry-over balance policy, a post-issuance compliance policy and a debt policy.

The debt policy as presented encompasses several elements and memorializes many current practices. These current practices include exploring all possible financing options, working within all debt limitations and matching debt limits to the useful life of the asset being financed. As we have written both in the legislation and in the policy, the intent of this policy is not to unduly restrict what we can issue debt for but only to provide general direction for debt issuance.

Brian Cooper, who is our financial advisor with Umbaugh was involved in drafting this debt policy and is present to answer any questions.

Ms. Dorothy appreciates that we do not want to bond anything for longer than we anticipate the life of the material. She asked how the life/time expectancy of things that we purchase are determined. Mr. Cooper reported that the Ohio Revised Code spells out different asset types and includes a schedule that sets forth the maximum useful life of those assets for borrowing purposes. If the City were to do a borrowing and there were several types of different assets that were financed, weighted average of the assets being financed are used to achieve a maximum term. Then the maximum term would not exceed that.

Ms. Dorothy concluded that the policy is that whatever we have a debt for, we will not continue to pay for it after we have achieved a useful life and we might have to re-buy. Mr. Cooper agreed.

Mr. Robinson asked if the development of this policy represents any substantive changes or does it primarily codify what is in practice. Mr. Bartter clarified that it is putting into policy what our current practice is.

Mr. Robinson asked if he were to identify one change, what would be the most significant. Mr. Bartter replied that historically we haven't issued much debt. We had the bond anticipation notes for the Davis Estates Waterline, the Fire Truck and before that the Police Station and the Community Center Complex. He doesn't think this policy materially changes anything in our practices.

When asked by Ms. Michael if it will have any impact on our Rainy Day reserve fund, Mr. Bartter replied that it will have no impact on that at all.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 13-2018

Adopting a Job Description for Executive Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk and Amending the Staffing Chart to Accommodate Said Position.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION

Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

Mr. Greeson commented that members know that the Executive Assistant in the City Manager's office position has been vacant for some time. During that time staff has been ably assisted by an intern but have been running short. Staff has been assessing the workload, job tasks, and duties and exploring how we can make most efficient and effective use of the authorized positions and looked at what we need to support both our office as well as the customer service, records management and other functions here in City Hall. This resolution and the next are somewhat companion legislation as they will essentially blend two jobs; Ms. Thress' current City Clerk position and Clerk of the Council with the Executive Assistant to the City Manager. With the adoption of this resolution, Council will authorize him to have that effort in one job description and Ms. Thress will essentially hold both functions. She will move upstairs and support the City Manager's office, while continuing to support the Council and function as City Clerk. The second resolution takes the vacancy and creates an Assistant City Clerk position that will serve the critical functions; support the minute taking responsibilities, and perform records management related duties under Ms. Thress' leadership and perform the critical

phone answering/customer service, permitting issuing function and back-up to the Court Clerk that occurs downstairs.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if Ms. Thress will still attend Council meetings, Mr. Greeson replied that it is possible that the Assistant City Clerk will do that on some nights. Some nights we may have both here. It is quite challenging to effectively take the minutes and also clerk the meeting. It really depends on who we hire and what the skill set is.

Ms. Michael acknowledged that Ms. Thress has done a good job. Ms. Dorothy agreed as did Mr. Greeson. This is a compliment to her skill set and her duties because we believe she makes an excellent City Clerk as well as an Executive Assistant.

Mr. Foust commented that he assumes Class 203, and 248 are some reference as to how they are graded from a job pricing standpoint. He asked if there is any notable impact as far as City budget. Mr. Greeson replied that it will probably be lower. He explained that the City Clerk and Executive Assistant are more comparable to each other while the Assistant City Clerk is a lower job classification.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 14-2018 Amending the Job Description for Assistant City Clerk and Amending the Staffing Chart to Accommodate Said Position.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 14-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 14-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 07-2018 Amending Ordinance No. 41-2017 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Costs of the Municipal Building Chimney Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 632-16)

Introduced by Mr. Robinson.

Ordinance No. 08-2018 Amending Ordinance No. 41-2017 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Community Technology

Fund and General Fund Unappropriated Balances to Provide Funds for City Council Video Streaming and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

Ordinance No. 09-2018

Amending Ordinance 46-2017 to Establish Compensation for the Unclassified Position of Executive Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

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

Information Item(s)

Mr. Greeson shared the following items:

- 1) Document were distributed that includes links to an article and Governor Kasich's gun proposals
- 2) E-mail - Mr. Bartter summarized what he received from OPERS in terms of their investments in gun manufacturers.
- 3) Previously distributed a letter that relates to OPERS investments and gun manufacturing. He is ready to discuss that if members' so desire.

Ms. Michael asked if everyone had a chance to read the letter that was drafted by Mr. Bartter to OPERS as she would gladly sign it if members are comfortable. The letter would request that OPERS not purchase shares of stocks for the investment portfolio that has to do with guns, especially the AKs. Ms. Dorothy shared that she has not read it.

Mr. Greeson redistributed the letter for members to review.

Mr. Foust asked if Mr. Myers, who was quite passionate on this topic, had a chance to weigh in as he would love to have his comments as well.

Ms. Michael decided to have a discussion on this topic at the next meeting. She asked members to provide Mr. Bartter with any comments they may have prior to that meeting.

Mr. Foust wondered if it would be appropriate for several members of Council to sign the letter too as he would be happy to add his name. Ms. Michael agreed to include any member's signature to the letter who wanted to be included.

Mr. Greeson reported that the item would be added to the next meeting's agenda. Additionally, it is a Committee of the Whole meeting and we will have two significant presentations.

- 1) Consultants ABM – They are preparing to give a substantive presentation on our energy evaluations on our City buildings, most importantly the Community Center that was part of the energy conservation measure study that Council authorized. It fits within our sustainability goals and is consistent with our efforts to be more energy efficient. Much of it is consistent with what is planned in the CIP. While some of it is not in the CIP, it provides a road map for future investments, energy efficient and life cycle maintenance investments in our facilities.

- 2) Electrical Aggregation - Staff has done a fair amount of research on this topic as there was an interest from some members in learning more about it. Staff have pulled previous memos on that subject, talked with other jurisdictions and the OML and some others have identified about four different consultants that work in that space. If members are interested, the PUCO has a really good interactive map about all of the communities that have electric aggregation and it even drilled down into their legislation related to it. The more he did research, the more he determined that it might be better to have somebody speak to Council on this subject who actually does it every day. The Ohio Municipal League has a strategic partnership with an entity called Palmer Energy who has agreed under that OML umbrella to come in and give an educational presentation about how aggregation works. We have no obligation to select them or do business with them but given that they are a Municipal League partner we thought it was logical for them to come in as opposed to anybody else. He believes they also have a strategic partnership with the CCAO and in the northeast they do a lot of work for a Council of Governments that is formed around electrical aggregation in the Cleveland area. Given those partnerships he thought they were a logical choice to come in and brief us but there is no obligation beyond that.

When asked by Mr. Greeson if that satisfies the interest in moving that forward and at least providing an educational opportunity, members agreed that it does.

Mr. Lindsey explained the process if members decide to move this topic forward to the voters.

Mr. Robinson understands that Mr. Greeson spoke with the City of Cincinnati energy manager. He asked if he could share any reactions or insights from that conversation. Mr. Greeson reported that they have done aggregation for quite a long time. Michael Forrester, the gentleman he spoke to was very informative and helpful. He sent him a number of e-mails and pieces of information as a follow-up. He wasn't a staff member when they initially adopted the legislation, put the item on the ballot and ran the communications process but he is managing the outcomes of that. He is managing the program now so he offered that (they have about 80,000 households) they are buying renewable energy certificates by making a sizable investment primarily in wind energy in

the west to offset their impact for the city of Cincinnati. They bid both for “brown” energy and “green” energy and have been able to have bids that are significantly enough under the market that they are not only investing in renewables but also saving people money. But they do bid it both ways so that they can ascertain if it is a good deal. They have had some guarantees for it to be under the market in the past. This last time they did not have that guarantee but they locked in a three year rate and felt really comfortable that they were going to be enough under the market that the market wouldn’t vary enough to be lower than them.

He added that they have an administrative assessment that is part of that. It goes into their general fund, which also helps fund the broader sustainability programs for Cincinnati which also includes some solar investment programs. He made an argument that one of the values of their program that they tout is that they are not targeting the person who is going to shop their energy but rather they try to save money for the person who is never going to take the time to shop their energy.

Mr. Greeson would like to save our strategic planning/visioning process for the following meeting because those are a couple of big presentations with outside consultants coming in.

He asked Mr. Hurley to provide an update on the McCord Park process as well as bike sharing.

Mr. Hurley reported that staff continues to work on the McCord Park master planning process and have continued to have dialog with the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Community Garden group. From that process we had our consultant POD Design meet with a group of representatives from the Community Garden where they came up with some alternative designs; one of which includes the full garden while another one includes a little less than the full garden. We are ready to hold another open house to obtain feedback on the different looking concepts to try to gauge the broader community in terms of the garden and the other amenities in the park. Staff has scheduled a second open house for McCord Park a week from tonight from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Community Center where we will display the different concept drawings and attempt to get additional feedback outside of the groups that have already been involved.

When asked by Ms. Michael if it will include the original concepts as well as the new ones, Mr. Hurley agreed that it would include both the original concept that was recommended by the Parks & Recreation Commission as well as a concept that shows the full garden with things worked in around it and the other priorities they were trying to reach. In trying to push for a bit of a compromise, the garden group and he thinks members saw reference to that in a letter from Mr. Zody, took off about 20% to 25% of the garden in order to fit a few more things in. Those concepts will be displayed with the hope that they generate community feedback. Members will receive a formal invitation this week but he wanted to get that on their calendars. Their target with the open house will be to reach the broader community. They will do our typical notifications

throughout the community and neighborhood. On-line feedback will also be available for those that are not able to make the open house.

Bike and Pedestrian – *Mr. Hurley reported that Bike & Ped has been out with an RFP to request submissions for a master plan. Today was the deadline for that and five submissions were received. While he has not yet had a chance to look at those, they seem to have received some quality submissions so they will be working with Mr. Greeson to put together an evaluation team to review those and narrow it down.*

He reported that at their last meeting, the Bike and Pedestrian Board did make a motion to recommend a pilot program to Council for Lime Bike, which is a bike share group. He knows a couple of Council members have been involved in meetings to learn a little bit about them so we are planning to have that presentation come before Council in two weeks, on the 19th where representatives from Lime Bike and the Bike and Pedestrian Board will be here to provide Council with a presentation and a Q & A. They have also gathered a great deal of research that will be provided prior to that meeting. That will give members an opportunity to learn more about them prior to the meeting and determine if it is something of interest for the community. Staff will then negotiate a trial period as they have learned that some of the surrounding communities are moving in that direction.

Mr. Foust asked if in the original planning process for the parks, a value was ascribed as to the number of users and amount of hours of use in a given week/month/year. Is there some way of identifying what was there and what has changed in that by these iterations in the plan. Mr. Hurley thinks what they are going to try to communicate very clearly is that it is a very fair issue with many valid points on both sides. So they are going to tell the full story in great detail. There is a version of that to a point up on the website now that kind of tells the process up to the point where they made their first recommendation. Today staff were drafting the story since then, which has been going back to the garden group and doing these alternative designs. They are also going to share that there is a portion of the park that kind of had some flexibility outside of the garden that is about the size of Pingree Park. It is an area beyond the ball diamonds between the Community Center and the existing playground. There is a brainstormed list of things they would like to see in that space that included the garden, shelters that can be reserved, greenspace, and a walking path.

So the product of the first meeting was everything, including the garden all in that space. After that meeting it just really came down to a decision that it felt cramped to the Commission and as they looked at data and tried to determine what had to give, they chose the garden. Obviously those that align themselves with the garden have a different priority. He thinks it just comes down to whether it can all fit and still be satisfied with that design. If the answer is “no” then what are the prioritizes.

Mr. Foust confirmed that he did answer his question. He added that while he does not want to create more work, but if there is some way to ascribe a value to let's say the tradeoff was a decision between the garden and a shelter house. If you believe the

shelter house would be used “x” number of days throughout the year by “x” number of people on average. He would like to get some sense of the impact of the various options in this decision tree regarding the number of citizens affected and kind of a long term picture.

Mr. Robinson declared that he and Mr. Foust see eye to eye on many things but not on this issue. He would challenge staff if they do that to also recognize that a number of the argued for value of the garden are immeasurable and intangible. He doesn't know how to express it but he would caution against numeric absolutism in making the decision in this case. For instance, how does one place a value on the effect on our City's image, our branding, and our attractiveness to the coveted millennials if in fact we are not viewing community gardens as something desirable in a very public place? He thinks that is important but something that can't be quantified. He challenges him to come up with a decision making rubric that takes into account the intangibles as well.

Mr. Hurley thinks they did try to capture the users and he thinks it is true of many park amenities because you can count the people that actually use it and then you can count some peripheral things and it is all how you interpret that. They did look at what the impact would be of shelters versus the walking path. Some of those things are easily measureable and some you have to make some assumptions.

Ms. Michael shared that often she has been to the public park input opportunity and it has been sparsely attended and often times focused by whatever interest group shows up. She wondered if for this particular one there will be a larger outreach. Mr. Hurley replied that staff is working on that this week. The typical thing for park planning would be to draw a circle around the park and direct mail to residents in that neighborhood. It is a little different with the community park because there are so many users beyond just the neighbors. They plan to do the typical mail as it did bring out many people to the first meeting. Those involved with the garden are also aware of the meeting. They will also work with the youth boosters because they are such a big usership of the ball fields. They will also notify the business community because they have input in the stakeholder meetings. They will also try to get the word out a little more. They are working to move the meeting out of the classrooms and into the lobby of the community center as they had good luck with that when they did the overall parks master plan just to capture parents and kids and the traffic that comes through. They will also work with Anne and do the typical neighborhood network stuff.

To Mr. Robinson's comment, Mr. Foust stated that he is not proposing it is an either/or, a garden or no garden. His focus is more on the synergy and what is done with all of that land.

Mr. Greeson requested an executive session when appropriate for the appointment of public officials and litigation.

REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Robinson commented that given the recent publicity and the resulting public conversation and most importantly the underlying issue that the City of Worthington historically has committed to maintaining a viable outdoor public pool facility, he suggests that it is time that this Council publically discuss and formulate a plan of action regarding SwimInc.

MOTION

Mr. Robinson made a motion to place the topic of SwimInc. on our agenda two weeks hence, the night of March 19th. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Foust noted that staff made reference to several hefty agendas coming up. He asked where that would fit. Mr. Greeson replied that we would have the Lime Bike presentation and a conversation we were scheduling regarding community visioning and strategic planning at that meeting.

Mr. Robinson stated that he is not tied to March 19th if it is pushed into April that would be fine. His interest is really on just having a public forum so members can talk about it and get the wheels rolling.

Mr. Foust reported not having a problem with having that night. In fact there might be some synergy in doing it then.

Mr. Greeson shared that he talked with Mr. Schmidt last Friday and intends to write that conversation up for members' information. He reported that SwimInc. has hired somebody to do a complete full facilities assessment, which would give them insight to both the natatorium as well as the outdoor areas. He thinks they have an RFP out for a pool designer. He believes they would then follow up with a community process to try to make sure that they get community input and buy in into the design of the pool master plan. It sounds like that process could take well into the summer. They would have both the design process as well as the facilities assessment that would inform the fiscal issues and help guide requests of donors, the City and the schools. He thinks we are a little ways away from a formal ask but that was the insight that he received late last week.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked if it is possible to have maybe a status update from Mr. Schmidt at some point in the near future as part of that discussion. Otherwise, is it just Council members discussing it or what is the plan? Mr. Robinson replied that while Mr. Schmidt's report would be central and key, he thinks it is proper for the City Council to determine what our interest is in this because there are three parties: the school board, SwimInc. and the City. As we approach hearing from Mr. Schmidt and talking with the School Board, he thinks it would be smart and sensible for Council to know what our position is and what the City's interest is and so forth.

Ms. Michael thinks there are more than just three entities because the City of Columbus does not have any north pool and there are private donations. She is not sure we are

ready to have a City dollar figure to this when we don't know what the total cost really is because they are still doing assessments. We also don't know what other partners may come in and in what way.

Mr. Robinson reported that his intention is not to propose that Council would talk dollars and an actual proposal but rather to deliberate amongst each other what the importance is or is not to the City. What is the City's position? He is getting asked by folks on the street what Council is doing about this and he doesn't have an answer right now. Council should have it clear in our heads what we want to do.

Ms. Kowalczyk doesn't think members can do that until they have information about where they are heading with the pools, the proposal. She can't make an informed decision on supporting the pools future until she understands what that future is. She has fully supported the pool and has spent many hours and years at the pool. She loves the pool but she would really prefer to have some background information and some understanding about where they are going in addition to what Mr. Greeson has provided instead of having to guess where we think the pool is headed and what we should do.

Ms. Dorothy concurred. She would rather receive all of the facts before having deliberations in front of everyone before this body. She would much rather have SwimInc. know what they want, what their ask is, and make sure they understand what they are doing as they are the ones who are ultimately responsible for the pool. She understands that everyone has a stake in the pool and that we do want to make sure that everyone has a voice and what that stake is but she doesn't think the time is right now.

Mr. Foust shared that he supports the notion of getting out in front of this. He asked Mr. Robinson how he feels about the order of things. He asked if it would satisfy his concern to have the conversation after receiving an update from Mr. Schmidt. Mr. Robinson replied yes since that seems to be the consensus. This conversations in some ways have served his purpose so he is comfortable hearing from Mr. Schmidt and then charting a course forward. He has basic questions about what are we going to do specifically but long term whether the current pool management and operational structure is appropriate and desirable for the City. He would like for members to discuss what is in the City's best interest. If that would best be done after Mr. Schmidt reports then that is fine.

Ms. Michael shared that she spends a great deal of time during the summer at the SwimInc. pool so she is a pool user and would not want to see it disappear. She thinks it makes more sense to wait for SwimInc. to get their design together and determine their partners and bring a presentation to Council once they have completed their research. The City will weigh in but it is just a matter of what, how and when. Their past plan is probably not the same plan they will bring to Council so she would rather make a decision on something that is more concrete.

Mr. Robinson reiterated that he was proposing discussion not to reach a decision but rather to discuss. He asked if Council is a deliberative body or do they only make decisions. He was hoping to discuss how everyone feels about SwimInc. Members have

done that somewhat right now. He agreed to talk about it further after Mr. Schmidt makes his presentation.

Ms. Michael reported hearing two things: 1) Have Mr. Schmidt come in rather soon and have a discussion, and 2) Have research and development and wait until they flush out their plan and know what they are going to be coming forward with even though it might be in the fall before having a discussion. She asked members' preference.

Ms. Dorothy commented that she would be happy whenever Mr. Schmidt feels comfortable coming in to talk. It is a multi-faceted issue so she would really like to defer more to Mr. Schmidt.

Ms. Kowalczyk suggested since there has been a great deal of questions and focus on it in the press and Council has received some pressure to discuss it then perhaps an update to show that Council is still interested, that we want to know what is going on and we know it is important. We would not necessarily have to deliberate on it or make any decisions but maybe having just an update akin to what Mr. Greeson suggested would satisfy what she is looking for at this point. Then bring the plan back in the future and maybe a date that he can propose to come back with what the ask is and what their formal plan is so that members can have some confidence that they are moving forward in the right fashion.

Mr. Robinson thinks that is a great idea. He would feel comfortable with Mr. Schmidt coming in. He shared that he met with him several weeks ago with Mr. Foust and he left that meeting not strongly assured that SwimInc. was moving forward with sufficient focus, energy, or organizational capacity. He left feeling that maybe the City would be able to lend a hand. He thinks getting Mr. Schmidt before Council would be great and then we could all formulate a reaction and assessment to what he has to say.

Mr. Robinson and Mr. Foust withdrew the motion. Mr. Robinson did ask that Mr. Schmidt be invited to talk with Council soon. Mr. Greeson agreed to schedule that conversation.

Mr. Foust shared that during his last conversation with Mr. Schmidt he suspects that they will not come in with here is what our plan is but rather here is the kind of help we can use from the City in formulating that plan. He thinks it is a great conversation to be had.

Mr. Smith reported that he has spoken with Mr. Schmidt three times in the past two weeks and he gets a similar impression. He needs some support from Council or us to say something pro-actively. When that is, his position would be sooner rather than later based on the timing of the year but he thinks members have a good plan in motion.

Secondly, and also along that same line, school board member Nikki Hudson did suggest that he ask Council if we would like to have a counterpart to her, not only specifically for the pool situation but also to the broader Council to the School Board.

Mr. Foust shared that members are in a really early discussion about this visioning process. He thinks somewhere along the way in that process it would be great to identify that hard tangible direct line. Do we do that now? He doesn't know but he thinks it will be part of that process as a better line of communications. He would certainly support it but doesn't know what the right time is.

Ms. Dorothy reported that the Cemetery Board is buttoning up the Osem Gardner Home, which is the first phase. In 2018 they are planning a public meeting for visioning for that. A history of the property will be provided for the community. It will be a very long project to turn that home into the permanent office for the cemetery but the first phase is just about done.

Ms. Kowalczyk shared that she attended a conference last week and learned that Franklin County has committed some of the senior levy dollars to expand the Age Friendly Columbus initiative for all of Franklin County. They will be working to identify other communities that are ready to step up and start working on their Age Friendly plan. She talked with Katie White who leads Age Friendly Columbus afterwards and told her that she was interested and was sure the Council would be interested in learning more about what that would mean. She has suggested contacting her and hopeful members can hear from her in the near future on maybe a lighter agenda. She is very excited about that because she thinks having a technical support and learning from other communities and being able to take the best practices of other communities is fantastic. Mr. Greeson added that Ms. White is an excellent presenter. He thinks she would make a great committee of the whole presenter and provide some great educational age friendly information.

Ms. Michael shared that she received an e-mail today about an OCCS - Chinese New Year celebration this Sunday from 3:00 pm to 8:00 pm at Worthington Kilbourne High School. She can't attend but thought someone might want to. They will need to RSVP so that they will have sufficient boxes of Chinese food. Mr. Greeson replied that he received the same invitation and may attend on behalf of the City.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Ms. Kowalczyk made a motion to meet in Executive Session to appointment of public official, Board and Commission appointments and litigation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 6 Robinson, Foust, Smith, Kowalczyk, Dorothy, and Michael

No 0

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

MOTION Mr. Robinson made a motion to return to open session at 8:50 p.m.
The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 15-2018 Designating Scott Holmes, Matt Greeson and Jerry Strait to Represent the City of Worthington on the Drug Safe Worthington Coordinating Council.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 15-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 15-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 16-2018 Designating Robyn Stewart to Represent the City of Worthington on the Leadership Worthington Board of Trustees.

Introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 16-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 16-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
19th day of March, 2018.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President