Worthington City Council Agenda

Louis J. R. Goorey Municipal Building
John P. Coleman Council Chamber

Monday April 2, 2018 ~ 7:30 PM

1. Call To Order

2. Roll Call

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Visitor Comments

5. Special Presentation(s)

5.A Resolution No. 20-2018 2017 Good Neighbor Award

To Congratulate Bob and Jan Davis on Their Recognition as Recipients of the 2017 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Executive Summary: This Resolution congratulates Bob and Jan Davis on their recognition as recipients of the 2017 Good Neighbor Award from the Community Relations Commission.

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented

Update: Chair Jack Miner plans to provide City Council with an update on Community Relations Commission activities.
6. Consent Agenda

6.A. Resolution No. 22-2018  City Representation - Farmers Market Advisory Board

Designating Lynda Bitar to Represent the City of Worthington on the Worthington Farmers Market Advisory Board.

*Executive Summary:* This Resolution designates Lynda Bitar as a City representative on the Farmers Market Advisory Board

*Recommendation:* Introduce and Approve as Presented


Designating Bonnie Michael and Anne Brown to Represent the City of Worthington on the Convention and Visitors Bureau of Worthington Board of Directors.

*Executive Summary:* This Resolution designates Bonnie Michael and Anne Brown to represent the City of Worthington on the Convention & Visitors Bureau Board

*Recommendation:* Introduce and Approve as Presented

6.C. Resolution No. 24-2018  City Representation - Worthington Community Improvement Corporation Board

Designating Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe and Matt Greeson to Serve as the City of Worthington’s Representatives on the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation Board of Directors.

*Executive Summary:* This Resolution designates Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe and Matt Greeson to serve as City representatives on the CIC Board

*Recommendation:* Introduce and Approve as Presented
6.D. Resolution No. 25-2018  City Representation - McConnell Arts Center Board

Designating Rachael Dorothy and Jack Miner to Represent the City of Worthington on the Peggy R. McConnell Arts Center Board of Trustees.

Executive Summary: This Resolution designates Rachael Dorothy and Jack Miner as City representatives on the McConnell Arts Center Board

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented

6.E. Resolution No. 26-2018  City Representation - Old Worthington Partnership Board - David McCorkle

Designating David McCorkle to Represent the City of Worthington on the Old Worthington Partnership Board of Directors.

Executive Summary: This Resolution designates David McCorkle as a City representative on the Old Worthington Partnership Board

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented


Designating Lee Brown to Represent the City of Worthington on the Worthington Resource Pantry Board of Directors.

Executive Summary: The Resolution designates Lee Brown as a City representative on the Worthington Resource Pantry Board

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented

7. Approval of the Minutes

7.A. Committee of the Whole Meeting - March 12, 2018:

7.B. Regular Meeting - March 19, 2018

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented
8. Public Hearings on Legislation

8.A. **Ordinance No. 10-2018** Appropriation - Kenyonbrook/Hardy Way Sanitary Sewer Improvements Design

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 Cost of the Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvement Design Update and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 675-18)

*Executive Summary:* This Ordinance appropriates funds for the design of the Kenyonbrook/Hardy Way Sanitary Sewer Improvements

*Recommendation:* Approve as Presented

*Legislative History:* Introduced March 19, 2018

8.B. **Ordinance No. 11-2018** Appropriation - Energy Conservation Measures Project

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 Cost of Energy Conservation Measures, Authorize the Execution and Delivery of an Energy Savings Contract, and to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 677-18)

*Executive Summary:* This Ordinance appropriates funds and authorizes the execution of energy conservation measures at the Community Center, Griswold Center and Fire Station.

*Recommendation:* Approve as Presented

*Legislative History:* Introduced March 19, 2018

8.C. **Ordinance No. 12-2018** E. Wilson Bridge Rd Water Line Replacement Project-Design Services

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 Design Costs of the East Wilson Bridge Road Waterline and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said
Executive Summary: This Ordinance appropriates funds for the design of the water line replacement project on East Wilson Bridge Road.

Recommendation: Approve as Presented

Legislative History: Introduced March 19, 2018

8.D. Ordinance No. 13-2018 Village Green - Tree Dedication Marker for Mayor Harvey Minton

Approving the Installation of a Tree Dedication Marker on the Northeast Village Green to Recognize the Contributions of former Mayor Harvey Minton to the Worthington Community

Executive Summary: The Ordinance authorizes the installation of a tree dedication marker in honor of Mayor Harvey Minton on the Village Green.

Recommendation: Approve as Presented

Legislative History: Introduced March 19, 2018

9. New Legislation to Be Introduced

9.A. Resolution No. 21-2018 Staffing Chart Amendment

Amending the Staffing Chart of the City of Worthington to Provide for Twenty-six (26) Police Officer Positions in the Division of Police for up to a One Year Period.

Executive Summary: This Resolution amends the staffing chart to allow for twenty-six Police Officer positions for up to a one year period.

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented

9.B. Resolution No. 28-2018 Northeast Gateway Project Right of Way Acquisition Services

Designating Three Consultants for the Northeast Gateway Project and Directing the City Manager to Proceed with the Next Phases of the Local Public Agency Programmatic Selection Process.
Executive Summary: In conjunction with requirements from the Ohio Department of Transportation, staff has reviewed proposals for consulting services for Right of Way Acquisition Services. The three separate firms selected will provide services for three different phases of the acquisition: Identification, Appraisal, and Securing the Rights of Way

Recommendation: Introduce and Approve as Presented


Amending Ordinance No. 41-2017 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the PACE Fund Unappropriated Balance to Provide Funds for the Payment of a Special Assessment to the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority

Executive Summary: This Ordinance appropriates money from the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) fund to pay the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority the amount received from the Special Assessment against the property at 350 W. Wilson Bridge Road. The PACE special assessment was authorized in 2016 to assist the property owner in financing energy efficiency improvements that were part of a significant redevelopment of this property.

Recommendation: Introduce for Public Hearing


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 Olentangy Parklands Restroom and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 676-18)

Executive Summary: This ordinance appropriates $195,000 for the purchase of a new restroom facility to be placed in the Olentangy Parklands in close proximity to the tennis courts, pickleball courts, soccer field, skatepark and adjacent to the Olentangy Trail access and trailhead.

Recommendation: Introduce for Public Hearing
9.E. **Ordinance No. 16-2018** Upper Rush Run Improvements Design Funding

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 Additional Design and Engineering Services for the Upper Rush Run Stream Restoration Design and all Related Expenses with said Project. (Project No. 639-17)

*Executive Summary:* In conjunction with the Northeast Gateway Project, staff has identified severe impairment of the Upper Rush Run that is included in the gateway area. EMH&T was hired in 2017 to conduct a study of the area and make recommendation for needed improvements. They have presented preliminary concepts with a proposal for design services totaling $59,100. Staff is introducing legislation asking for permission to engage EMH&T for the design of said improvements, as well as funding the cost of design services

*Recommendation:* Introduce for Public Hearing

9.F. **Ordinance No. 17-2018** Design of Northeast Gateway Aesthetics Funding Ordinance

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 Additional Design and Engineering Services for the NE Gateway Intersection Improvement Project and all Related Expenses with said Project. (Project No. 602-14)

*Executive Summary:* This ordinance appropriates funds for the design of aesthetic elements that City Council has approved to be part of the Northeast Gateway Project

*Recommendation:* Introduce for Public Hearing

10. Reports of City Officials

11. Reports of Council Members

12. Other

13. Executive Session

14. Adjournment
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 27, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Lori Trego, Personnel Director
Subject: Resolution 2017 Good Neighbor Award

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution congratulates Bob and Jan Davis on their recognition as recipients of the 2017 Good Neighbor Award from the Community Relations Commission.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The Community Relations Commission (CRC) established the Good Neighbor Award to recognize members of the community who promote cooperation and goodwill throughout their neighborhoods and the City of Worthington. The CRC voted to present the 2017 award to Bob and Jan Davis. Jack Miner, Chair of the Community Relations Commission, will be present for this presentation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES (if applicable)

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution No. 20-2018
RESOLUTION NO. 20-2018

To Congratulate Bob and Jan Davis on Their Recognition as Recipients of the 2017 Good Neighbor Award From the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

WHEREAS, the Worthington Community Relations Commission established the Good Neighbor Award to recognize members of the community who promote cooperation and goodwill throughout their neighborhoods; and,

WHEREAS, on April 2, 2018, the Worthington Community Relations Commission will present the 2017 Good Neighbor Award to Bob and Jan Davis; and,

WHEREAS, Bob and Jan Davis of Loveman Avenue exemplify the term “good neighbor” because of their kindness and generosity toward their neighbors; and,

WHEREAS, Bob and Jan Davis lend a hand to neighbors on vacation or overwhelmed with other tasks by mowing lawns, weeding gardens, and lending tools; and,

WHEREAS, Bob and Jan Davis also contribute to the greater Worthington community by volunteering at their church, Colonial Hills Elementary, and Habitat for Humanity; and,

WHEREAS, Bob and Jan Davis have lived in their home since 1968 and should be commended for their 50 years of helping neighbors and contributing to the Colonial Hills reputation as “the Friendly Community”; and,

WHEREAS, through their many good deeds, Bob and Jan Davis have set an example for all of us to follow;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That this Council does hereby recognize Bob and Jan Davis for their kindness, consideration and the promotion of goodwill within their neighborhood and the City of Worthington.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk of Council be instructed to forward a duly certified copy of this Resolution to Bob and Jan Davis and to record said Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted_________________                  President of Council

Attest:

________________________                  Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: Resolution - City Representation - Farmers Market Advisory Board

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution designates Lynda Bitar as a City representative on the Farmers Market Advisory Board

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
Lynda Bitar, a City staff member, serves on the Farmers Market Advisory Board. This Resolution formally designates her as a representative of the City.

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 22-2018

Designating Lynda Bitar to Represent the City of Worthington on the Worthington Farmers Market Advisory Board.

WHEREAS, the Worthington Farmers Market Advisory Board provides advice and guidance for Worthington’s Farmers Market; and,

WHEREAS, a City employee serves on the Advisory Board; and,

WHEREAS, Lynda Bitar is interested in representing the City of Worthington on the Advisory Board.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That Lynda Bitar is hereby designated to represent the City of Worthington on the Farmers Market Advisory Board, and is directed to serve the interests of the City of Worthington in such capacity when discharging the duties as a member of the Board.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted ____________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest

___________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: Resolution - City Representation - Convention & Visitors Bureau - Bonnie Michael & Anne Brown

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution designates Bonnie Michael and Anne Brown to represent the City of Worthington on the Convention & Visitors Bureau Board.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The Worthington Convention and Visitors Bureau Board contains a representative of City Council and a City staff member. This Resolution formally designates Bonnie Michael as the City Council member and Anne Brown as the staff member.

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 23-2018

Designating Bonnie Michael and Anne Brown to Represent the City of Worthington on the Convention and Visitors Bureau of Worthington Board of Directors.

WHEREAS, the Convention & Visitors Bureau of Worthington is a non-profit organization focusing on the promotion of the Worthington area as a unique visitor destination; and,

WHEREAS, the Board includes one member of the Worthington City Council and one City staff member; and,

WHEREAS, Bonnie Michael and Anne Brown are interested in representing the City of Worthington on the Convention & Visitors Bureau Board.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That Bonnie Michael and Anne Brown are hereby designated to represent the City of Worthington on the Convention and Visitors Bureau Board, and are directed to serve the interests of the City of Worthington in such capacity when discharging the duties as a member of the Board.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted _____________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest

____________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: Resolution - City Representation - Worthington Community Improvement Corporation Board

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution designates Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe and Matt Greeson to serve as City representatives on the CIC Board.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The Worthington Community Improvement Corporation has an agency relationship with the City of Worthington. This requires that two-fifths of the CIC Board members be City officials. The Board is comprised of ten members, four of whom are City officials. The four are Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe, and Matt Greeson. This Resolution officially designates them as City representatives.

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 24-2018

Designating Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe and Matt Greeson to Serve as the City of Worthington’s Representatives on the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation Board of Directors.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 1724 of the Ohio Revised Code, in 2005 the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation, a not-for-profit corporation (the “CIC”) was formed to serve the residents of the City in the revitalization and enhancement of property and the business environment within the City by advancing, encouraging and promoting industrial, commercial and civic development; and,

WHEREAS, the CIC was designated as the agent for the City in accordance with ORC §1724.10 and the City Council authorized the City to enter into an agency agreement; and,

WHEREAS, because the CIC is the designated agent of the City, the statute requires that not less than two-fifths of the board of directors of the CIC shall be composed of (i) the municipal executive, (ii) members of the legislative authority, or (iii) any other appointed or elected officers of the City; and,

WHEREAS, the CIC is a ten-member board, with four individuals appointed pursuant to §1724.10, and two of those four seats expire this year; and,

WHEREAS, Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe and Matt Greeson serve on the Worthington CIC Board of Directors.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That the City Council designates Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, Kathy Holcombe and Matt Greeson to serve in the capacity as representatives of the City of Worthington on the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation Board, and who are directed to serve the interests of the City of Worthington in such capacity when discharging the duties as a member of the Board.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted ___________

President of Council

Attest:

__________________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: Resolution - City Representation - McConnell Arts Center Board

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution designates Rachael Dorothy and Jack Miner as City representatives on the McConnell Arts Center Board.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
Rachael Dorothy, a City Council member, and Jack Miner, Chair of the Community Relations Commission, serve on the Board of Trustees for the Peggy R. McConnell Arts Center of Worthington. This Resolution formally designates them as representatives of the City.

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 25-2018

Designating Rachael Dorothy and Jack Miner to Represent the City of Worthington on the Peggy R. McConnell Arts Center Board of Trustees.

WHEREAS, the Peggy R. McConnell Arts Center of Worthington is a non-profit organization focused on the operation of the Arts Center and the advocacy, creation and nurturing of arts programming; and,

WHEREAS, the Board is composed of fifteen directors, one of whom is a member of the Worthington City Council and one of whom is the Chair of the Worthington Community Relations Commission; and,

WHEREAS, Rachael Dorothy and Jack Miner are interested in representing the City of Worthington on the Peggy R. McConnell Arts Center Board of Trustees.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That Rachael Dorothy and Jack Miner are hereby designated to represent the City of Worthington on the Peggy R. McConnell Arts Center Board of Worthington, and are directed to serve the interests of the City of Worthington in such capacity when discharging the duties as a member of the Board.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted ________________

President of Council

Attest

Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: Resolution - City Representation - Old Worthington Partnership Board - David McCorkle

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution designates David McCorkle as a City representative on the Old Worthington Partnership Board

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
David McCorkle serves on the Old Worthington Partnership Board of Directors. This Resolution officially designates him as a City representative on the Board.

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 26-2018

Designating David McCorkle to Represent the City of Worthington on the Old Worthington Partnership Board of Directors.

WHEREAS, the Old Worthington Partnership is a non-profit organization focusing on the Old Worthington area of the community; and,

WHEREAS, the Board is composed of 11 directors, one of whom is a City of Worthington employee; and,

WHEREAS, David McCorkle is interested in representing the City of Worthington on the Old Worthington Partnership Board.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That David McCorkle is hereby designated to represent the City of Worthington on the Old Worthington Partnership Board, and is directed to serve the interests of the City of Worthington in such capacity when discharging the duties as a member of the Board.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted ___________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
Staff Memorandum
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: Resolution - City Representation - Worthington Resource Pantry - Lee Brown

Executive Summary
The Resolution designates Lee Brown as a City representative on the Worthington Resource Pantry Board.

Recommendation
Introduce and Approve as Presented

Background/Description
Lee Brown, a City staff member, serves on the Board of Directors for the Worthington Resource Pantry. This Resolution formally designates Mr. Brown as a City representative.

Attachments
Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 27-2018

Designating Lee Brown to Represent the City of Worthington on the Worthington Resource Pantry Board of Directors.

WHEREAS, the Worthington Resource Pantry is a non-profit organization that educates, feeds and comforts people who need a helping hand during rough economic times; and,

WHEREAS, the Worthington Resource Pantry has requested a representative of the City to serve on its Board of Directors; and,

WHEREAS, Lee Brown has expressed interest in representing the City of Worthington on the Worthington Resource Pantry Board.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That Lee Brown is hereby designated to represent the City of Worthington on the Worthington Resource Pantry Board, and is directed to serve the interests of the City of Worthington in such capacity when discharging the duties as a member of the Board.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted _____________

____________________________________

President of Council

Attest

____________________________________

Clerk of Council
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, March 12, 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 7:33 PM.

ROLL CALL


Member(s) Absent:

Also present: City Manager Matthew Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Service & Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning & Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Police Jerry Strait, Chief of Fire John Bailot, and Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

There were twelve 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

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Information Item(s)

- Electric Aggregation

Mr. Greeson shared that Mr. Robinson and Mr. Smith both asked for this item to be researched and placed on the agenda. Staff included in the agenda package a
memorandum that overviewed the concept of electric aggregation and provided some links to additional information regarding how it works. Staff also thought it would be important to bring somebody in who does this on a more frequent basis or has this as part of their portfolio. We are members of the Ohio Municipal League (OML) and they have a partnership with Palmer Energy who helps governments (counties, cities and townships) throughout the state put together electrical aggregation programs. We asked the OML to bring them in and provide background to educate us on the topic.

Mr. Greeson introduced Ed Albright from the OML as well as Kirk Mizerek and Amy Hoffman from Palmer Energy. He invited Mr. Albright to comment.

Mr. Albright shared that the service corporation, which Palmer is under, is the for-profit side of the OML. We look at it as a value added service to our membership. Historically OML has not be involved in the service side of matters although members have asked for it. The change of leadership in the OML decided to take it up. Palmer is important to OML as it was the first business that they vetted. The County Commissioners Association also has Palmer as a partner. He thinks they have done their due diligence which is one of the reasons they are happy to have them working with the League and the Service Corporation. He invited Mr. Mizerek and Ms. Hoffman to comment on the process.

OMLSC ENERGY PROGRAM
Ed Albright, Ohio Municipal League
Kirkland Mizerek, Executive Vice President, Palmer Energy Company
Amy Hoffman, Consultant, Palmer Energy Company

Mr. Mizerek shared the following information through a PowerPoint presentation about Palmer Energy:

PALMER ENERGY COMPANY
Palmer Energy Company was founded in 1980 as one of the first natural gas brokerage firms in the country.

Today, in response to changes in the energy industry and business needs, Palmer Energy Company has evolved into a leading unbiased energy consultant for over 1000 entities, including school districts, city and county government, long-term care facilities, manufacturers, municipalities, churches, financial institutions, commercial laundries, office buildings, greenhouses and municipal aggregations.

Palmer Energy Company has over 35 years of experience in energy procurement and savings programs. Palmer Energy Company has demonstrated the ability to produce savings in both time and money for our customers, in a variety of programs.
Mr. Mizerek emphasized that they are completely independent and have been labeled as the truth tellers in the government world which is why they work with the County Commissioners Association, numerous municipalities already as well as many townships in the state.

**PROGRAM SERVICES**

As the energy consultant for the OML energy savings programs, Palmer will:

- Assess energy needs of each community
- Provide exemplary consulting services
- Facilitate savings program process
- Monitor market conditions & trends for extended buying opportunities
- Analyze current regulatory conditions and provide updates
- Prepare savings analysis and budget estimates
- Act as liaison for suppliers and OML group

**ENERGY PROGRAMS** – available through the OML

- Natural Gas Program
- Electric Program
- Government Aggregation Programs:
  - Natural Gas
  - Electric
- Solar Program

Mr. Mizerek indicated the RFP process groups people together to get the best possible rates and products for our constituents.

**PALMER PARTNERSHIPS**

- OML
- CCAO
- Chamber Energy Solutions
- Growers Energy Solutions
- Ohio Alliance of the YMCA’s
- NCTC

Mr. Mizerek shared that as owners of the company, he and Mark Frye often testify before the PUCO on various energy issues. They are committed to that because they feel it is in the best interest of the organizations.

**COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROCESS**

Natural Gas & Electric Program

- Verify current supply contract terms
- Review utility and supply invoices
- Prepare RFP / Pricing proposal
Evaluate rate offers  
Negotiate contract terms  
Meet with community representative  
Execute contract  
Confirm enrollment and rate accuracy

GOVERNMENT AGGREGATION PROCESS  
What is Government Aggregation?  
- Ohio law allows for communities to form aggregated buying groups  
- Effective way to obtain lower rates  
- Placed on ballot and passes by majority vote  
- All eligible residents are automatically enrolled  
- Residents who chose not to participate, can opt-out  
- Renewable energy options

Mr. Mizerek shared that the Renewable Energy Options of Governmental Aggregation is done through an RFP process. After constituents pass the ballot initiative, the RFP process would include the need to have renewable content in this portfolio. The cost to do that is very small, in the neighborhood of \( \frac{1}{2} \) to 1.0 mill. He explained that one mill is \( \frac{1}{10} \) of 1¢ of your electric bill. If you spend 5¢ on your energy, \( \frac{1}{10} \) or \( \frac{1}{2} \) mill to a mill would actually be a green component.

Ms. Dorothy commented that we are just talking about the rate for energy. We now have it separated out that there is a cost of just the transmission lines. Mr. Mizerek confirmed that he is just talking about the electricity that is running through the lines to your customers.

Ms. Dorothy wants residents to know that they will not be using renewal energy but rather whatever energy comes to them from wherever. Mr. Mizerek agreed. He added that it could be a renewal energy if members choose to go there. Ms. Dorothy commented if the renewal energy is made from far away it will not get to us. It will not be the same energy. Mr. Mizerek agreed. He explained that renewal energy is still being purchased. Ms. Dorothy wanted it made clear that residents would be helping to subsidize green energy but residents would not be using green energy. Mr. Mizerek stated that in this particular case and to make it economical the green energy would most likely be coming from wind farms that are away from the area. The City could buy some power in the state of Ohio but it would be more expensive than doing it the other way and suppliers have their own portfolio to use 100% green.

Ms. Dorothy inquired as to how to obtain lower rates. Mr. Mizerek explained that through the RFP process they will put it out for bid. He asked that Ms. Hoffman be allowed to walk members through the process and then he will come back and talk about the RFP process.

Ms. Hoffman covered the following information:
Process once a decision has been made to have Government Aggregation in our community:

- Council passes a resolution
- Meet with community officials
- Resolution to Board of Elections to place on ballot 90 days prior to election
- Community meetings
- Ballot Initiative
- Two Public Hearings
- City executes PUCO paperwork/Palmer submits PUCO paperwork
- RFP process begins/supplier determined
- Supplier secures prospective customer list from utility
- Supplier culls list with assistance from Palmer Energy

Ms. Hoffman reiterated that they work independently and they work with numerous electric suppliers.

Ms. Hoffman explained that the savings comes from comparing it to the price to compare of the utility. AEP has a price to compare that is shown on a bill. In most instances the compare price will be a fixed rate. The RFP process works because of bidding to multiple suppliers. Once they have gone through the process they will provide the City with their recommendation as the energy consultant and then Council will decide the route to take.

The price that is quoted by the suppliers is only given on the day they ask for it. Once they come to Council, they will recommend a refresh with the top two or three suppliers. Prior to the refresh the law director will review the sample contracts of those top suppliers to make sure that the City is comfortable with the language. Once all that is decided, we set the refresh date. If everything is as it should be, the contract will be signed.

When asked by Ms. Michael the length of the contracts, Ms. Hoffman replied that typically they are 12, 24, or 36 months and pricing will be available for each option. Ms. Michael asked if the pricing will be fixed for the entire length of the contract. Ms. Hoffman replied that historically it is a fixed rate. Mr. Mizerek added that there are different deals out there that have some fluctuation. It will depend on where the market is for that time period and will be included as part of their recommendation to Council.

- Once the contract is signed, opt out letter mailed to prospective participants
- 21 day Opt out period ensues
- Customers receive rescission notice from utility, have 7 days to respond
- Power flows and savings begin

Mr. Mizerek stated members need to realize that members of their staff will be present to answer phone calls from residents. Secondly, their number is always available and residents can call them directly. Usually the calls are because of some confusion about the subject. So, they will be there to train staff as well as to assist with the initial calls.
Ms. Michael went back to those residents who have already done some energy shopping and asked if they would be contacted or are they the ones who are supposed to opt out. Ms. Hoffman replied that those residents will not receive the initial letter. Only those who are not currently shopping will receive the letter. She further stated that when their contract with other vendors end, they can opt in at any time. Mr. Mizerek reported that anytime somebody wants out, there are zero termination fees in our program.

Mr. Foust commented he was curious as to what percent of folks call and ask questions initially and then what percent opt out. Mr. Mizerek replied that it will be hard to tell how many will call. A community the size of Worthington may receive forty calls. Mr. Foust concluded that the percentage of calls is very small. Mr. Mizerek and Ms. Hoffman agreed that the number is small.

To Mr. Foust’s second question, Worthington has roughly 5,500 households. He would guess between 2,500 and 3,500 households will participate in aggregation. Remember some are already doing something on their own. Typically 50% to 60% of the actual eligible residents are in the Go bags.

Mr. Smith went back to pre-ballot and inquired as to community meetings. He asked what Council could expect from a consultant on community outreach as some members of the community will call City staff instead of the contractor to ask questions. Mr. Mizerek replied that there are many opportunities. They work hand in hand with a new community and will provide a multitude of ideas but the City will need to provide the specifics. Do you feel that a few public hearings are good enough or do you need something a little more than that? They will do all of the work but they need to know what the City wants.

When asked by Ms. Michael how much their services cost the City, Mr. Mizerek replied zero. The program is set up with a fee to participate and that fee is 0.00045, which is less than ½ mill on your bill. That fee is split between the OML and the City of Worthington. So Worthington will receive a small check which will assist with some slight administrative costs. As to amount of savings for constituents, the answer is probably $100.00 per household per year, but is dependent on a number of variables.

Ms. Dorothy inquired as to what he is basing that number on. Mr. Mizerek replied that currently they are seeing bids in the AP area responses of 4.8¢ or 4.9¢. An average household uses about 10,000 kWh per year. He cautioned that the market changes all the time and that rate is today.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy to explain why the City would agree to do this, Mr. Smith commented that what they have touched upon is having the renewable energy aspect and call it 100% renewable energy option for aggregation for the community electric program. In referring to his letter, he did research how much energy a city the size of Worthington would consume and how much carbon footprint that would have. Based on the 100% renewable energy model he worked up some rough estimates. He asked Mr. Mizerek for clarification. He asked if by using the 100% renewable energy program residents could
still save money? Mr. Mizerek replied yes and explained that based on 10,000 kWh a year usage, instead of saving $100.00, a resident will save $90.00 to $95.00.

Ms. Dorothy questioned Mr. Smith’s estimate of income back to the City of $25,000 annually. When asked if that figure was close, Mr. Mizerek would not quote a number.

Mr. Smith explained the number was based on a non-renewable energy. Members might recall that he brought this up six years ago with Council member Davis. That number was provided by another aggregation consultant. It was roughly $25,000 to $30,000 back to the City annually based on that sharing agreement between OML and the City for non-renewable energy. Mr. Mizerek commented if we go through this process, we can ask for different options with the suppliers. Grant money was popular ten years ago and is occasionally still available.

Mr. Mizerek knows there is a savings with this program. Residents also receive marketing mailers from suppliers that report significant savings. Many have teaser rates for three or four months and then the rate switches, often to above the market. That type of program does save your constituents money although only for a short time. Ms. Hoffman added that she comments on that a lot at community meetings.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy what happens after the initial contract rate, Ms. Hoffman replied that through government aggregation we would do the RFP process again. It has already passed so there is nothing that Council has to do. They will begin the process anywhere from a year to six months before the contract expiration depending on where the market is, what makes sense and if they have other communities doing their renewals or coming in new. The process would begin, a new RFP, possibly new suppliers, and then they would come back to Council with new pricing. Mr. Mizerek added that the agreements would need to be approved by the City’s legal department. So every two or three years the City will have to go through the process again.

Mr. Smith asked what kind of staff time is required by the City’s people to help with that process. Ms. Hoffman replied it would just be answering the initial phone calls. Mr. Mizerek reported that the law director would have some time involved as well as he will have to look at several agreements. But he doesn’t see a tremendous amount of time.

When asked by Mr. Smith if the consultant would provide the ballot language, Mr. Mizerek replied that the City would do what it wants with it but they will provide the baseline ballot language.

Mr. Robinson in speaking to his motivation behind this reported that he first became aware of aggregation programs back in 2007 and 2008 when he was doing public presentations centered on energy and climate change. His interest in aggregation programs was sparked again last year during the solar panel discussion in the historic district. On that issue, he could see arguments on both sides. He is very much a proponent of green energy, clean energy. He loves solar panels and hopes we see many more of them in Worthington. During that debate it occurred to him that we were probably only talking a couple dozen
homes in the historic district that might place panels on their homes over the next few years. To really have a big impact on our City’s greenhouse gas emissions and help combat climate change, the City would need to do a clean energy aggregation program that would need to include 2,500 to 3,000 households. So with that sparked interest, he made a few phone calls, spoke with the energy managers in Columbus and in Cincinnati. He spoke with Mike Forrester in Cincinnati about their aggregation program. While he tried to find flaws, it seems to him like a win, win. Households save money while reducing greenhouse gas emissions, there is no cost to opt out at any time and there is a small revenue stream for the City to fund solarize Cincinnati and weatherization programs. While Cincinnati is a bigger city than us and might have worked a better deal than we will be able to, it still seems to like a win, win, win to him.

When asked by Ms. Michael how aggregation reduces greenhouse emissions, Mr. Robinson replied because we would be able to specify in our purchases that we are buying green energy generated only electricity as opposed to buying fossil fuel generated electricity through AEP. Mr. Mizerek agreed.

Mr. Robinson in trying to get at what Ms. Dorothy was asking earlier, he thinks that even though we are indirectly buying through a program like this we would still be supporting the development of a clean energy market and infrastructure system, which he thinks is very important. As a businessman there are many ways to incentivize the development of green energy. This is an important way that we could do it. Ms. Dorothy agrees that if we chose to have the RFP written to purchase green energy we would definitely be supporting green energy. She wanted to make the point that we wouldn’t be using green energy ourselves because we would be getting the electricity from the closest power supplier because that is just how energy flows.

Ms. Dorothy stressed that the cheapest energy and the cleanest energy is a watt that we do not use. It is very laudable that you mention that Cincinnati is using their savings to fund energy efficiency efforts. There have been studies about location efficiency versus building type. The EPA looked at the different energy that we use in our daily lives and compared drivable versus walkable cities, conventional versus green building construction, single family versus multi-family and conventional versus hybrid cars. Transportation consistently tops households’ energy use by as much as 2.4 to 1 so we are much better off in a walkable neighborhood than in our most efficient single family house. So we need to also be looking at walkability throughout Worthington if we really want to be sustainable.

Mr. Robinson agreed with Ms. Dorothy that efficiency is the best thing to do of all but whatever energy we do use, he would opt for it to be green and this is a way to efficiently do that for our City and save the residents money.

Mr. Myers said he would like to back up a little bit. Mr. Mizerek stated that he doesn’t have any idea of what the price power is going to be when we go to the electors. Mr. Myers wondered how Council would pitch this because we can talk about green energy all we want to but if most people are like he is, there is a cost. He supports green energy to a point. From what he understands, the RFP process cannot begin until after the election.
results. So prior to the election, without many caveats, we can’t actually tell that voter how much they are going to save. Mr. Mizerek replied that he can know it by providing a great deal of history. They have many different government aggregations so they are in the area. He has a very good knowledge of where the prices are going to come out.

Mr. Myers stated that he knows if he is wrong, you know who will hear it. Mr. Mizerek replied that Council members will. But with their experience and what they are doing here he knows generally where the prices will be. Members need to remember that if something crazy goes on in the market between now and November and 4.8 or 4.9 is no longer 4.8 or 4.9, the other side of the utility market pricing has gone up as well. Ms. Hoffman added that if voters pass the issue it is not automatically put in place. In 2003, there were communities that passed the legislation but did nothing with it until recently. It just gives the City the option of having an opt-out program in your community.

Mr. Myers inquired as to whether the City can go back into the standard market if after 12 months of a contract it decides not to do a new RFP process. Mr. Mizerek replied that yes you can do that but remember there is always a zero termination. They can get out of it at any time. Ms. Hoffman added that Toledo did that. The government aggregation where she lives and they have a natural gas aggregation. It works a little differently but for two seasons they could not guarantee that there would be savings for the residents so they recommended to not have a government aggregation and then they came back when it made sense. Mr. Myers concluded that the City can slip in and slip out at renewal time. Ms. Hoffman agreed.

Mr. Myers stated you go through the RFP process and narrow it down. Would you bring Council a final contract or would Council decide? Ms. Hoffman replied that Council would decide. They send the RFP out to twelve and eight responded. They list who the eight are and their rates so they lay it all out for Council. Their recommendation then will be to refresh the top two or three suppliers that have the best rates.

Mr. Myers stated that his constituents have elected him to make certain decisions and he wants to get his head around the fact that he is delegating some of that decision making to an outside consultant. Mr. Mizerek reiterated they are only consulting. They are not making any decisions. Ms. Hoffman acknowledged that Council will be considering their recommendation. Mr. Myers agreed that Council will be voting on the selection of “A”, “B”, or “C”. Based on that vote, Council will then award the contract to one of those recommendations. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Mizerek replied that when they bring the refresh pricing back after they have gone through the agreements with the director of Law, they will walk in and there will be three pricing, returns, and all of that as well as their recommendation on why they believe a certain supplier should be the supplier for this program. But Council will make the final decision.

Ms. Dorothy asked what kind of contract language they have for people who have a solar system on their house and are net metering. Mr. Mizerek replied he would have to look at our net meter provisions. But he can get that answer back to her within the next couple of days. It is different on different utilities and he doesn’t want to give her the wrong answer.
Mr. Foust commented he likes the fact that this is a way for him to access a green approach to energy. His perception is that kilowatts aren’t like a loaf of bread. If you buy bread out of Indiana, it gets on a truck and shows up here in Ohio. But he pictures energy as something that flows into an exchange but a particular kilowatt hour can’t actually be traced. Those in Indiana set the rate and then it comes to us at that price but the actual origin of that particular kilowatt buying is pretty much unknown. He asked if that is a fair assessment. Mr. Mizerek replied that he wouldn’t say that it is unknown. His assumption is right on the bread versus the energy. Energy and electricity is a lot different than natural gas as natural gas can be stored but electricity can’t be. To your point, yes at some level this is a paper shuffle on where the energy is produced versus where it is consumed. Different power plants come up in different areas but the suppliers are going out there and buying. In the case of the renewables, they are buying energy and transferring over to here through a paper transaction.

Ms. Dorothy commented that we have the potential to support green energy but she definitely wanted to point out again, like the cheapest best way to save energy is not to use it and one of the best ways to do that is by making walkable neighborhoods.

Mr. Greeson asked the speaker to cover how businesses are incorporated into this because there are some businesses that would be part of the aggregation if we moved forward. Mr. Mizerek explained that businesses that use less than 700,000 kWh per year can participate in this as well. That is a decent amount of electricity. Many of those users can go out and get their own better deal perhaps if they do an RFP or find a supplier. We have historically seen that many of the smaller shops do participate in this program and receive substantial savings.

When asked by Ms. Michael if they have to opt-in, Ms. Hoffman replied that if they are not shopping, they will receive the opt-out letter. One letter will say residential and one will say commercial. Ms. Michael wanted to make sure that it will go to City of Worthington businesses and not those outside of the city. Ms. Hoffman agreed that the letter would only go to those in the City.

When asked by Ms. Kowalczyk how many communities in Ohio are doing government aggregation, Mr. Mizerek reported that they have 186 townships, 28 counties, and dozens of cities although there are additional ones available.

Mr. Greeson remarked that staff would like direction. He asked if this is a priority that members want staff to advance. If yes, he would be glad to talk about how he would propose to do that. Secondly, the question is when. Do members want it ready for the November election or the primary election in May 2019? Should members desire to have it ready by the November 6th election, our charter requires an ordinance that would have to be approved no later than the last meeting in July (16th). That would have it 90 days in advance of the general election. We could use the OML program but it is customary for the City of Worthington when we are using professional services to interview a few qualified firms. Should we desire to move forward that is what he would propose to do.
Mr. Smith he would like to see this on the November ballot if possible. His proposal would be to direct staff to move forward with interviews.

**MOTION** Mr. Smith made a proposal to direct staff to move forward with interviews. The motion was second by Mr. Foust.

Mr. Myers asked for clarification on “move forward with interviews” as he is still confused as to whether we have to go through an RFP process on this. Mr. Greeson thinks members can pick a qualified firm because it is a professional services. It is our custom to at least interview a few qualified firms to pick who we think is the best. Mr. Myers asked if the motion is to instruct staff to come back with a recommendation.

**MOTION** Mr. Smith clarified that the motion is to direct staff to come back with a recommendation as to a consultant within 30 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Mr. Myers concluded that the recommendation will come back to Council in April and then we will have three months to get the public meetings in and put a sales package together to put this on the ballot. He thinks that is pretty aggressive.

Ms. Dorothy agreed. She added that she was concerned as to the reason why. Going back to the outline given by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Smith, it seems like we can definitely say that we as a City want to support renewal energy by purchasing from a provider that purchases from renewal energy sources. She can see that. We are not 100% sure that we are saving anyone money although it is very likely that we will. We are also not sure how much money the City will get from this or how much it is going to cost to administer this knowing though that the contractor will help significantly with the administration. She asked if members would want to try to aggregate gas or are we just talking about electric. Ms. Michael suggested just taking one utility at a time.

Mr. Mizerek commented that when you get to the point of the RFP process you will be able to unequivocally know if you will be saving your constituents money or not. Then that gives members the opportunity to put the RFP out there to save your constituents money. If for some reason they are not able to produce the savings, which he finds very unlikely in this current market, the City just wouldn’t go through with it but it is extraordinarily unlikely that you won’t be able to bring some savings to your constituents with this program.

Mr. Smith in addressing Ms. Dorothy’s question from a marketing campaign perspective and thinking about the November election, our message to the public would be that they are voting on giving Council the opportunity to go out and save them money individually and provide the City residences with 100% renewable energy and if we can’t get that for them then we won’t move forward.

Ms. Michael asked if this will be too aggressive to go for a November election. Mr. Mizerek replied no but Council will need to pick somebody quickly.
Mr. Myers stated that the motion as it stands now is to direct staff to come back with a recommendation as to a consultant within 30 days. Ms. Michael agreed. Mr. Myers stated that Council is not deciding at this point whether we are going to go with the November election. Ms. Michael again agreed. Mr. Myers commented that he is okay with that motion. He explained that he has a little bias here as he is trying to get his head around the fact that he is with the government and he is here to help. We are taking an economic decision out of a constituents hand and putting it into ours by way of an outside consultant who is making money in the transaction so he has all of those things that he has to get his head around first. At this point he couldn’t vote to put it on the November election because he is not around those yet. Another 30 days and another conversation with a consultant and maybe a little more education then maybe he will be. As long as we are not putting this on the ballot with this motion and if staff believes that is sufficient time to get back to Council, then he is okay with the motion.

Mr. Greeson agreed that it is not a great amount of time given all of the other things that staff is working on but if Council is desirous to pursue a November ballot initiative then he thinks staff needs to bring it back that fast.

Mr. Myers asked what staff will have to give up or set aside to get it done that fast. Mr. Greeson agreed that there will probably need to be a conversation about our priorities here because while they are all great things, tonight we are talking about one thing that wasn’t on our agenda and next week we will talk about LimeBike that also wasn’t on our agenda when the budget was adopted last year. We will also be talking about community visioning and strategic planning which is probably going to be the most important and biggest lift. He is not overly concerned about any of those things independently but he is concerned about them collectively and not having been priorities when we adopted our budget but are now on our plate and urgent.

Mr. Myers agreed. We have some pretty core issues that we are looking at right now that have to stay high priority like the visioning, like what we will hear about next, and like some development opportunities that are going on. He doesn’t want council to rush into this since it has already been six years since it was first brought up. He asked if five months is critical at this point. He doesn’t think that asking to get a consultant is too much but he thinks members will probably revisit this conversation in 30 days.

Ms. Michael thinks that by then members will have some information on the other things that are out there too. Mr. Myers agreed.

Mr. Robinson commented that Council is not creating the wheel here. This is an established program. The consultants have done this many, many times. The campaign, the language is something that we can customize but again we are not recreating the wheel. Secondly, he feels like this is a great opportunity for Council to demonstrate some imaginative leadership about an issue that is not development or contentious but is something that will benefit the residents of this City and be something that he thinks will appeal to a fairly generalized desire on the part of our City to do more in the area of
sustainability. It is a win, win, win, positive issue that will not take an immense amount of
time. He thinks Council should move forward and ask for the 30 day proposals for the
consultants.

When asked by Ms. Michael if there was any further discussion on moving forward to get
the proposals from the consultants, there were none.

The motion to direct staff to come back with a recommendation within 30 days passed
by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson thanked Mr. Albright, Mr. Mizerek, and Ms. Hoffman for their time tonight. Mr.
Mizerek encouraged members to contact them with questions.

- Energy Efficiency Evaluation of City Facilities

Mr. Greeson shared that Council member Dorothy was channeling us when she talked
about the best energy being the energy not used. Tonight members will hear a presentation
from ABM, who has assessed all of our facilities. Members may recall that staff solicited
proposals from consultants under the Ohio Revised Code Energy Conservation measure
provisions last year. Our goals in soliciting those proposals and pursuing the evaluation
that they have completed, we wanted to assess the community center and all of our
facilities. We wanted to develop a sophisticated game plan for the life cycle maintenance
of our city facilities and much of our infrastructure that supports those facilities. We also
wanted to make sure that we were being wise in how we address some of our critical
systems for the benefit of our employees and our customers, particularly those in high use
facilities like the community center. This is part of our effort to be proactive in the
management of our facilities, look at useful life, return on investment and opportunities to
reduce energy consumption as part of our sustainability efforts.

Mr. Greeson reported that he, Mr. Whited, Ms. Stewart, and Mr. Bartter worked on this as
the City’s team. Eric Kuns and his team from ABM were invited to make their presentation.

Mr. Kuns thanked Council and staff for allowing them to present this evening. They began
working with staff on this program in late 2015/early 2016. ABM has been affiliated with
the City for over a decade. Mr. Kuns reported being the account manager for Worthington.
He introduced Mark Turner as one of their energy service specialist who helps with Ohio.
Two engineers; Dan Jenkins and Dave Minich, who spent countless hours with Mr. Whited
and his crew in the Engineering Department were also present. They also prepared the
pricing for this effort. Kevin Kovak is an area manager and asked to come along this
evening as he is very aware of the relationship we have with the City. So we are excited to
be here tonight.
Agenda

- Worthington and ABM Partnership
- Process Update
- Overview of IGA (Investment Grade Audit) / Recommendation

Mr. Kuns shared that the IGA is required by the ORC 717.02 legislation.

- CVA Discussion
- Program Benefits / CIP Impact

Mr. Kuns noted he could not have asked for a better lead in to his presentation as two things he heard were a watt not used is the best watt saved. He can’t say that enough because that is really what their program is about. In terms of saving money, with this program it is 100% guaranteed through ABM to the City.

Update on the Process – Where are we today

- ABM Facility Services Agreement Finalized – 5 yr. agreement
- Council Resolution under O.R.C. 717.02 – Ordinance No. 40-2017 Amended and Approved
- Surveys of all city facilities complete
- Analysis completed / options developed
- Program specifications outlined – IGA completed
- Community Center detail reviewed with team
- Contract reviewed and approved by legal – ready for action
- Financial detail developed – reviewed with Finance Team
- Non-Community Center facilities reviewed with engineering team (there were eleven or twelve buildings in total that were evaluated).

Program Goals

- Address critical mechanical needs in city facilities
- Save energy / operational dollars
- Community Center needs addressed
• Savings Opportunities beyond construction
• Create a unified strategic plan for HVAC/Energy/Maintenance
• Seamless facility maintenance planning

Mr. Kuns reported that last year they finalized a five year maintenance program with the City. So while they maintain all of the facilities, they are also looking at enabling this program as well.

• Generate AEP Rebates with the program

Mr. Kuns specified the rebates come back to the City. They advise that the funds be used to reduce the cost of the program

When asked by Ms. Dorothy if you have to be a customer of AEP in order to receive the rebate, Mr. Kuns replied yes. He added they have actually already put in the preliminary paperwork with AEP.

• Program meets multiple priorities for the city

Budget Stress Test

The take away for Ms. Dorothy is that much of the equipment needs to be replaced no matter whether we have a more efficient replacement or an equal in-kind. Mr. Kuns agreed. He added that every piece of equipment was graded as part of that study. Mr. Turner elaborated saying that part of the IGA evaluation is to grade every City asset. Almost 70% of the assets are in need of improvement because as they receive a “c” rating they degrade at a much quicker rate. So those are the three areas that should be focused on. While the assets are well maintained they are aging out. These are City wide assets.

Innovative Project Concepts – Factors to Consider

✓ Mechanical Need in City Facilities
✓ CIP Impact / Timing
✓ Energy & Operational Savings Impact
✓ Savings Opportunities beyond Construction
✓ Rebates & Guarantees
Rate Structures – Utility

Does Program Meet Multiple Priorities?

What We Understand about the Community Center

- Humid, chlorinated air infiltrating the building is causing comfort and equipment issues

Ms. Dorothy understands this to be an entire building solution. We are reducing energy, extending equipment life and also making sure that everyone is comfortable. We are trying to make it better for everyone in every possible way. Mr. Kuns agreed. He added that Mr. Hurley and his staff were great to work with and very knowledgeable about what they needed. They co-authored the program with us and were a joy to work with.

- Poor light levels in pool
- Older equipment is at risk and should be replaced
- Significant Energy and Operational savings are available

ABM Recommended ECM’s

Community Center

- New LED Lighting – Interior / Exterior

Mr. Myers asked if there will be cut sheets for the exterior LED lighting as that is a huge issue for our Architectural Review Board (ARB). They have parameters on temperature, shielding, and those kind of things and it would be nice if what the City is doing, even if not in the District, would be consistent with what our ARB is doing. Mr. Kuns replied that they will get those for him. They don’t want to just stop there but want to do that with everything as well. They want to make sure that Council is comfortable with whatever they recommend.

- Building Automation Installation
- Install Variable Frequency Drives
  AH2, AH4, AH5, AH6 and AH7
- Install New Condensing Boiler in original Building
- Replace AH6, and AH7
- Replace AH1 Dampers and Pressurization control
- Replace 5 ton Rooftop in Original Building
- New Boiler Controls in 2002 Boiler Rm.
- Install New Variable Frequency Drives on Hot Water and Chilled Water Pumps. New 2-Way Control Valves
- Building Envelope Upgrades
- Install Variable Frequency Drives on Pool Pumps
- Provide Water Conservation Upgrades
- Mechanical upgrade / program management
Mr. Kuns shared that they have an energy dashboard that they want to display on the TV at the center to show people what is being used now in terms of kW, ccf, and so on. The benefit to that is not only to show what is being used but also to show what is being saved. It is called an energy dashboard and can be done throughout the City. Their goal is just to educate because we want people to know what is being used or not. Ms. Dorothy thinks the educational component is a huge part to have but also the immediate feedback. One of the ways that is really impactful is to have the user know what they are using and when and you need that immediate feedback to be able to adjust to what you are doing. She thinks that is hugely helpful for education and it would be great to have that in the community center for all of the community to see. It would also be good for all of the users of all of the buildings although she is not sure how expensive that would be. That way staff can challenge each other for the most energy savings over year after year.

Mr. Hurley commented that on the public side they have plans to have it prominently displayed, not only for just the members who are casually coming in and out but also utilize it for some of their programming, especially with the kids and the camps. Some of the schools have done that with some of their projects.

Griswold Center
• New LED Lighting
• Repair AH1 Floor and Drain Pans
• HVAC Armor coil brushing and coating
• Refrigerant RSO
• Building Envelope Upgrades
• Remove Inlet Guide Vanes add Variable Frequency Drive
• Provide Water Conservation Upgrades

When asked by Ms. Michael if the work will include sealing the doors in the big room so air doesn’t blow under the doors. Mr. Kuns replied yes.

Fire Station
• Make-up Air Unit Upgrade

Mr. Kuns reported that the Chief and his team had identified a situation there for a need for make-up air in the fire bays. They highly suggest it be done as part of this first phase.

Phase I Value Analysis
• Project Investment:
  $2,076,759
• Net Annual Savings / over 15 Years:
  $2,688,928
• Scope Inclusion:
  Community Center
  Griswold Center
  Fire Station Make-up Air Retrofit
Mr. Kuns reported that Phase I includes a great deal of work. He is most excited to say that the program is saving around $2.7M over fifteen years. ($170,000 a year). They are hard dollars from the City to pay for this program instead of giving it to the utilities.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy how the items were selected for Phase I, Mr. Kuns replied that it included the items that were listed and already approved as part of the five year CIP. That was done in conjunction with the City’s leadership team. Ms. Dorothy concluded that it was what staff already anticipated needing. She would hope that it included much of the equipment that fell into the “d” and “f” grading categories. Mr. Turner agreed that it includes many “d” and “f” graded items that were already included in the CIP. The next part is probably what hasn’t already been included but should be considered, which is why they are showing the entire asset evaluation.

Mr. Robinson stated that besides the money being saved, he asked if he could share what percentage of energy use or demand approximately would be saved in Phase I through these facilities and after all of the improvements are made. Mr. Turner replied that it would be 25% to 30% savings on average.

Mr. Smith asked what the life cycle is on most of the units. Mr. Kuns replied that the ASHRAE standards, which are standards from an engineering perspective are usually between fifteen and twenty years for all mechanical equipment. If it is well maintained then in many cases it will last longer. In most cases, the City has done that here.

Ms. Michael commented that if we do a massive replacement now, then twenty years from now we will be going through another massive replacement. Mr. Kuns replied not necessarily. With the program that is laid out here, replacements can be done over a period of time. But there are some significant needs both at the community center and at the other buildings including here at City Hall.

Mr. Myers commented that this plan includes a maintenance plan. He asked if it would also include a replacement schedule like has been done with the rolling stock and equipment. Mr. Whited replied yes. It is partly in combination with the work ABM is doing as our maintenance and service provider as well as part of what they are looking at in the Service & Engineering Department to make sure they are following these service lives and using their evaluations to track the criticality of different pieces and try to find that sweet spot of replacement cycle so that we get them before they become critical. Mr. Myers stated that the point is so that we are not hit with this all at once in twenty years. By maintaining, putting things on a scheduling, and staying on top of things, we will be replacing things incrementally. Mr. Whited agreed. Mr. Turner added that is what their evaluation does. We talked about the buildings being twenty five years old. Some of this equipment will last twenty five to thirty years. There is probably some equipment that will last even longer.

Mr. Whited added that much of the evaluation that ABM has done has not just been exhaustive but it has also been exhausting for them. The work that they have done gives
staff the ability to proactively maintain and replace equipment on a schedule that makes sense from a fiscal standpoint as well as an energy savings standpoint and all of those other things that keep us on track for a future of less reactive and costly maintenance.

Mr. Kuns shared that an asset management program was included as part of their maintenance agreement. To answer your question specifically, every piece of equipment, no matter the age was included and is being tracked. So while today it is good, it will be most valuable fifteen years from now as they track it. Their system will also be able to track the amount of work that has been done on equipment. It provides a very real feedback to staff so instead of being reactive about things, they can be proactive. Mr. Myers expressed that as being part of what he understood this evaluation would do.

**ABM Recommended ECM’s – Phase II**

Mr. Kuns shared that the Phase II items include suggestions for the remaining buildings.

**Service/Engineering Building**
- New LED Lighting
- Replace 10 Ton Split System
- Building Envelope Upgrades
- Provide Water Conservation Upgrades

**Parks/Maintenance**
- New LED Lighting
- Replace 3 Ton Split System
- Building Envelope Upgrades
- Provide Water Conservation Upgrades

**Municipal Building**
- New LED Lighting
- HVAC Armor coil brushing and coating
- Replace (7) Split Systems
- Building Envelope Upgrades
- Provide Water Conservation Upgrades
- Window and Entrance Replacement

**Fire Station**
- New LED Lighting
- Building Envelope Upgrades
- Provide Water Conservation Upgrades

**McConnell Arts Center**
- New LED Lighting
- Building Mechanical Retrofit
Worthington Planning Building
- New LED Lighting
- Replace (12) Split Systems
- HVAC Armor coil brushing and coating
- Building Envelope Upgrades
- Provide Water Conservation Upgrades

Phase II Value Analysis
- Project Investment: $1,177,644
- Net Annual Savings / over 15 Years: $1,353,647

Mr. Kuns equates the savings to be $95,000 a year. The bottom line is that the energy and operational savings pays for the program. The program is guaranteed. They guarantee dollar for dollar that the savings will pay for the cost of the program.

Mr. Myers asked for that statement to be explained. He asked if it means that ABM has skin in the game if this doesn’t play out. Mr. Turner replied yes. Part of what they do is through an annual measurement and verification process. If the energy they say will be saved and it is not, they will have to cut a check back to the City.

When asked by Ms. Michael how many years they have been in existence, Mr. Turner replied 100+ years. She shared that she served on Council when the Community Center was built and when we had trouble with the building, the company that did the construction was no longer in business. Mr. Turner replied that they began in 1909. They are a fortune 500 company so all of that information is available but they are here to stay.

Mr. Kuns reported that they provided a comprehensive report on the community. They have the AEP rebates as part of that and are excited because they feel like it meets multiple priorities.

Mr. Kuns shared that while the dashboard is not a major part of the program, he believes it speaks volumes for what they are doing here because so many things that they are doing, people can’t see or touch or really be able to put their arms around. But that is something tangible that people can look at. Ms. Dorothy stated that even if we don’t get that in the community center, which we would like to have, we would still have access for anyone that has the credentials could log in and check out that dashboard no matter what. Mr. Kuns agreed that it could be put on any PC that they want.

Ms. Dorothy reported being concerned about AEP changing rebates or reducing rebates. She asked if there is any way that we can prioritize or does he have any idea how long those rebates will be around. Mr. Turner reported that currently those are the rebates that are forecast at this time. He can never guarantee the rebates because he doesn’t own the
utility but right now if the City was to go through the process, they are the ones they would secure for the City.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy about the timeframe, a staff member from the Service & Engineering Department replied that the rebates are good through 2020.

Mr. Kuns added that they will immediately do the paperwork once the program is enacted because they want to get it in and encumbered by AEP and that is usually how it works.

Mr. Foust asked if Mr. Bartter or someone has looked at the calculations on these savings and validated that you are comfortable with what you are reading. The reason for his question is because the savings is ten or fifteen years from now. He asked if we are comparing apples to apples. Mr. Bartter replied that while he has not, he knows that Mr. Lindsey has spent some time looking at the guaranteed savings. Mr. Foust stated that he wouldn’t mind at some point to have a deeper dive into that.

Ms. Dorothy thinks that is a great question but we are also going to be spending money to replace this equipment no matter what. Mr. Foust said that while he understands that he just wants to verify that these are real numbers. Mr. Myers shared that members do have the comfort in that whatever numbers they agree to and they present, they are guaranteed numbers.

Mr. Myers and Mr. Foust debated the issue of apples to apples comparisons in greater detail.

Mr. Turner shared that in this program, Council is spending this money with utilities anyway so the whole part of the process is that you are recapturing the money that you are spending to reinvest so there is inflation and things like that that they take into consideration.

**Bottom-Line Impact to Worthington**

- Energy savings pays for the program
- Program is guaranteed financially by ABM
- Addresses extensive mechanical need in city facilities
- Covers HVAC / Mechanical CIP items for the next 10+ years
- Maintenance program in place for preventive HVAC care
- AEP Rebates of $57K+ with the program
- Ensure proper rate structures in place with utilities
- Program meets multiple priorities for the city
Questions & Action Plan

When asked by Ms. Dorothy what the next steps are to proceed with this, Mr. Greeson replied that there were questions about Phase I and Phase II and then we will talk about next steps.

Mr. Greeson thanked the ABM representatives as they have been a pleasure to work with both on the maintenance side and in the development of this program. The teams (Mr. Whited and Mr. Hurley’s) have put a great deal of effort into the evaluation side as well as the City Hall staff working on the CIP evaluation. Members may recall that in the adopted CIP there is about $280,000 programmed in cash that was projected for the Fire Station ventilation equipment and the improvements to the Griswold Center. Staff had projected about $1M that were anticipated to be bonds for the Community Center. Phase I was closer to $2.1 so there is about an $800,000 difference between what we originally programmed in the CIP and what Phase I is now being proposed as. So the energy savings associated with that is similar in amount to what the cost is or more over time so we feel comfortable moving forward with the assessment.

Why did we break it up? Staff believes that we should advance both phases. The first phase is essentially those things that we had been working on together and prioritized as needing to be done now. They are items that are identified in our capital plan. We wanted to address all of the issues associated with the community center, a critical need at the fire station and some significant issues at the Griswold Center that we wanted to address. So part of our chunking of this into phases is to be disciplined in what we are including in the scope and not include things yet that were not in the adopted CIP. We didn’t want to turn a $1.28M budget into a $3+M budget in one year.

The second reason is because he thinks if we phase these it will allow some time for some clarity on some other major capital items that also require financing. Those include right-of-way of the NE Gateway, potentially SwimInc. and things like McCord Park. As we move into the CIP next year the costs of some of those things haven’t yet landed and while the energy savings will help address the cost of this, there is a cash management and a debt strategy that he thinks we should make those financial decisions, particularly as it relates
to bonding in the context of all of our projects that we may finance. Staff will be able to shape our debt strategy with better information.

That is essentially our plan to approach it. He believes that the next steps would be to introduce an ordinance that we would bring forward, the contract with ABM to design and construct the improvements. We introduce that at an upcoming meeting and then have a public hearing and adopt it two weeks later. Mr. Bartter can touch on this but he believes we would pay cash for the amounts we have programmed for cash and then issue bond anticipation notes for the remaining amount.

Mr. Bartter reported that as staff has looked at this project and how it fits into the overall scope of what we are going to issue in terms of debt for 2018, there are actually seven projects. The total bond anticipation note, we are probably looking at about $4.6M. That includes the waterline on East Wilson Bridge Road, the Community Center south end roof, this project, a portion of the Kenyonbrook trunk sewer improvements, the Fire Station roof, and some Municipal Building door replacement. The advantage to that is that it gives us some flexibility. With all of those projects we will probably be looking at 2% to 2.2% on the bond anticipation notes and then rolling them into a larger issuance next year. With any issuance there is substantial amount of issuance costs. It could be $50,000 to $60,000 with a large issuance. So we want to issue the most amount of debt at one time we possibly can. So that is the strategy for bond anticipation notes for the first phase.

Mr. Greeson shared that the strategy for how we finance Phase II would factor not only our experience with the projects ABM outlined but we will have more clarity going into the fall CIP discussion on some of those other issues that he outlined. We just feel better that if we chunked it in that fashion it would make for better decision making.

Policy Item

- Financial Report – February 2018

Mr. Bartter provided the following highlights for the City’s financial report for February:

- The Fund balances for all funds increased from $26,697,378 on January 1, 2018 to $27,016,938 as of February 28, 2018.

- The General Fund balance decreased from $13,491,664 as of January 1, 2018 to $13,407,558 as of February 28, 2018.

- Year to date income tax collections are below 2017 year to date collections by -$489,867 or -10.12%, which is significant.

Mr. Bartter noted on the financial report that the downturn in income tax collections can be attributed to a large employer not paying a year-end bonus that had been paid in prior years. He asked for a motion to accept the report.
MOTION

Mr. Robinson made a motion to accept the Financial Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Ms. Dorothy asked how volatile our income tax base is. Mr. Bartter reported that income tax is a very volatile source of income. We did project less income tax revenue in 2018 than actual in 2017 so we are prepared for this down turn in our income tax.

Ms. Dorothy reported hearing that a major employer is leaving our community. She asked if that was included in our projections for the year. Mr. Bartter replied in the affirmative.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

VISITOR COMMENT

Michael Bates, 6560 Evening St.

Mr. Bates noted that on the ABM proposal it looks like an excellent job on what would be covered. What he didn’t hear is what would not be covered. He understands that hypothetical questions get hypothetical answers but in a situation where you are replacing a piece of HVAC equipment in a building and all of a sudden something happens associated with that HVAC equipment, he asked if that would be covered under this proposal or would the City be responsible for making the correction. He just brings this up in case there are other costs associated with this that may not have been identified. You may need to have some capital money available that is not part of this proposal.

Mr. Kuns reported they call this a performance contract which is an industry term as part of these energy programs. To answer the question, ABM is responsible for that cost. It is a performance based program and it goes back to your questions about the savings. It’s got to pay for it so it is on our shoulders. Additionally, with the maintenance services that we have, we are responsible for all portions of the system. If it breaks down, it is on ABM as well. That is all part of the agreement that has been in place for a few years.

Mr. Greeson mentioned that the City has to pay some of an annual fee. He asked Mr. Kuns to share additional information on that issue. Mr. Kuns reported there being an annual M&V amount (measurement and verification) which is industry standard for making sure that they are saving the money and saving the guarantee. He forgets what the amount was on this. Mr. Bartter reported it being $12,000. Mr. Kuns added that it is to make sure that year after year we are saving the money. Those are audited reports that come back to the City and show the units saved.

Mr. Greeson shared the following items:

- Council had ask that the letter to OPERS be brought back. If so desired he has copies of it.
- The MORPC’s upcoming State of the Region is April 19th. Early bird special is at the end of this week. Please let staff know of interest.
- Ohio City County Managers Association Conference – Last week, our Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart was elected President and will take the presidency of OCMA begin the new year which begins in July.

Mr. Greeson and Council members congratulated Ms. Stewart.

REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Ms. Kowalczyk made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 7 Robinson, Foust, Smith, Myers, Kowalczyk, Dorothy, Michael

No 0

Council recessed at 9:28 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. Robinson.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.


Introduced by Mr. Robinson.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 17-2018. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk.

The motion carried by a voice vote of six (ayes), zero (nays) and one abstention (Foust).

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.
The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this
2nd day of April, 2018.

Council President
CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, March 19, 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


Member(s) Absent:

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 Planning & Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire John Bailot, Chief of Police Jerry Strait, and Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

There were approximately fifty five 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

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

- Oath of Office – Fire Lieutenants

Mr. Greeson invited Chief Bailot, Brad Dunn, Matt Harding, and Jim Wells to the podium.

Mr. Greeson explained that it is his pleasure as City Manager to support and promote talented and exemplary employees. Working in such a stellar organization, many of
these employees wait a long time for the opportunity to be promoted. Mr. Greeson expressed it being his honor to administer the oath of office for the Fire Lieutenant promotions.

Chief Bailot shared insight into process that the new lieutenants went through. One of the promotions was brought about by the retirement of the Prevention Lieutenant while the other two positions had been vacant for some time. Chief Bailot explained that the candidates participated in a competitive process with other talented Worthington firefighters. Chief Bailot expressed how he looks forward to their leadership in moving the division forward.

Chief Bailot shared a brief biography of each individual. Promoted to lead the Prevention Bureau is Brad Dunn. Lt. Dunn began his career with Worthington Fire/EMS in 2009. Lt. Harding began his career with the Galion Division of Fire in Crawford County, Ohio in 2000. He was hired in Worthington in 2007. Lt. Wells began his career with the City of Worthington in 2006. Chief Bailot detailed the educational background, certifications and achievements of each individual.

Mr. Greeson administered the oath of office.

Badge Presentation – Lt. Dunn’s mother pinned his badge, Lt. Harding’s wife pinned his badge and Lt. Wells’ wife pinned his badge. Chief Bailot distributed their new red helmet which indicates that they are officers.

Ms. Michael added her congratulations to each of the new Lieutenants.

- LimeBike

Mr. Greeson explained that the City has an opportunity with LimeBike which is a dockless bike system that could increase mobility options in the City of Worthington. He said that representatives from LimeBike have phoned in on speakerphone along with Mike Reese with Ice Miller who is here representing LimeBike.

Mr. Hurley explained that it is an exciting night for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board which has worked to identify ways to get progress moving, with LimeBike being an example of this. After conducting conversations with LimeBike, it has been recommended to enter into a pilot program before deciding to enter into a more permanent agreement. Previously, the City had investigated the CoGo docked bike system in Columbus to see if it would be a good solution for Worthington. A docked system would require a capital investment from the City. It has been a good thing to come into contact with LimeBike to do a dockless bike share trial in Worthington.

Mike Reese from Ice Miller and Todd O’Boyle from LimeBike begin their presentation.
Mr. Reese introduced himself as being with the law firm, Ice Miller. Before that he worked with the City of Columbus, serving on Mayor Coleman’s staff. Mr. Reese introduced Todd O’Boyle from LimeBike.

Mr. O’Boyle explained that he works for LimeBike, which is one of the nation’s fastest growing smart mobility companies. He comes from a local government and planning background.

Mr. Reese stated that Ice Miller has been working with LimeBike since 2017, and they have had conversations with Worthington and other municipalities and organizations in Central Ohio including Westerville, Grandview Heights, MORPC, and Ohio State. The City of Dublin will be establishing a pilot program in May 2018 and the City of Columbus is in negotiations to start a trial pilot in mid-2018. Any City that LimeBike is entering into on a trial basis, there is a memorandum of understanding that establishes the official relationship. LimeBike uses technology that is dock-less compared to Co-Go which already exists in Columbus. LimeBike covers equipment costs, operations and outreach, and takes direction from the city to address any issues.

Mr. Reese directed attention to a map showing the markets that LimeBike is in; noting that Seattle and Notre Dame broke records for usage during their rollouts. LimeBike started as a pilot, which has grown to 48 US markets including 30 cities, 17 universities, and several European cities. The bikes are unlocked using an app that releases a lock on the rear wheel; the rider is tracked from the beginning of the ride to the end. Once the ride is completed, the back wheel is locked by pushing a lever down and the ride ends. The bike basket has a solar panel built in that charges the battery, it is a self-sufficient system that has proven to be sustainable. The bikes themselves are durable and Mr. O’Boyle stated that the bikes are in their eighth revision, taking feedback and implementing changes that improve the experience.

Mr. O’Boyle discussed how LimeBike is finding ways to fulfill different needs in communities by innovating their fleet; this has included the development of the Lime-E electric assist bike that attaches a small motor to the bike for riders that may need a little assistance, including increased speed and power to ride up hills. LimeBike has the largest fleet of electric assist bikes in the country. LimeBike has also created the Lime-S, a small electric powered scooter that is ideal for short trips between 1/3 and ½ of a mile. This appeals to millennials who grew up riding scooters and in cities where the Lime-S is used, LimeBike has seen high ridership by a younger demographic.

Mr. Hurley made note that the Lime-E electric assist bike and the Lime-S scooter were not reviewed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory committee. These devices were not part of the committee’s recommendations; however it could be looked at in a future agreement if given additional information to review.

Mr. Reese explained the pricing to use a bike, for a dollar the user can unlock the bike and begin using it for the first 30 minutes. Afterwards, there is an added charge for another dollar. Additionally there are monthly memberships and student discounts.
Ms. Michael asked Mr. Reese if a rider rides the bike to the store and gets off the bike to enter the store, does the 30 minutes continue to count or is it paused when the bike is not in use. Mr. Reese stated that if the rider gets off the bike, the bike may or may not be available when they are finished. The idea is for there to be enough bikes in an area that if that initial bike is no longer available, there would be another bike in a close proximity to use, much like using Uber. Mr. O’Boyle commented that dock-less systems and smart mobility is a move away from the mentality of owning a bike to one of on-demand mobility. When a rider uses Uber, one does not rely on the same driver to pick you up; rather there would be a driver on demand nearby. To answer Ms. Michael’s original question, Mr. O’Boyle explained if a rider unlocks a LimeBike to take it to the store, then locks it to get a gallon of milk and comes back out to unlock it, that would still be counted under the initial 30-minute charge.

Mr. Reese explained that when entering a community or region, it is necessary to have local staff. Having staff in the community is necessary to make sure bikes are repaired or replaced as quickly as possible, to relocate parked bikes, or to respond to emergency issues. In regards to parking, there must be education in advance and during the rollout of LimeBike’s services. There are places that communities do and do not want bicycles located and that can be built into the app to indicate where parking is and is not acceptable. Additionally, there are rewards built into the app for riders who park properly.

Mr. O’Boyle discussed how satisfaction with LimeBike’s level of service is dependent upon the ability to properly educate and enforce parking. LimeBike uses videos online, social media channels, and on the ground teams to educate riders on parking compliance. LimeBike conducts regular audits to ensure that there is compliance with the parking standards put in place. He cited the City of Greensboro, North Carolina that has roughly 1000 bikes in place and LimeBike was never below 94% compliance in their parking audits.

Mr. Reese explained their use of data and how they use that to gauge demand, making sure that bikes are in the proper place. Also, they use data showing where users open the app but do not unlock a bike and use that information to determine if that location is an area of unmet demand. The data may be used then to relocate additional bikes to that area. Mr. Reese concluded the presentation and asked for questions and comments.

Mr. Robinson stated that he thought that LimeBike may be a very interesting experiment in Worthington. He questioned whether someone was required to remain in the City of Worthington if they began their ride on the bike in Worthington, or would they need to leave the bike in the City. Mr. Reese responded no, especially considering the neighboring communities that are soon to be served by LimeBike. Mr. O’Boyle said that the app can send notifications if a rider enters a non-LimeBike serviced area and ask that the rider not drop the bike off in that location, encouraging them to end their trip where LimeBike is authorized. However, if bikes are parked in a non-serviced area, the local team on the ground would be able to recover the bikes and return them to an authorized
Mr. O’Boyle commented that bikes parked in non-authorized areas have facilitated organic growth for LimeBike, with cities seeing LimeBike bike usage in their area and thinking that it may be a good idea for their community.

Mr. Robinson inquired about how many bikes will be used at the outset of the program. Mr. Reese responded that would be determined by working with the City Council and City Manager’s office to come up with a number. As a reference, the City of Columbus is discussing the deployment of 150 bikes in 3 different areas for a total of 450 bikes. The City of Dublin is looking at deploying approximately 150-200 bikes. Mr. O’Boyle stated that as a rule of thumb there would be a ratio of 1 bike per 100 in population, however in Dublin there may be a higher number to start with. Depending upon usage, LimeBike will adjust the count of bikes in an area. Mr. Reese explained that bikes would ideally be placed in denser areas, where there would be higher usage.

Mr. Robinson asked what internal metrics would be used and what information would be shared with the City at the end of the pilot to determine the impact of the program. Mr. O’Boyle stated that there would be a regional dashboard and a Worthington dashboard that will have heat maps showing origin and destination points. This data would be anonymized and show information such as trips per bike, average miles traveled, and average trip time. There would also be information showing levels of carbon saved by riders in Worthington over a specified timeframe. LimeBike aims to share as much anonymized data as possible for communities to make the best decisions for themselves. Mr. Reese explained that in every contract with LimeBike, there is a 30-day termination clause allowing a community to opt-out of LimeBike services with no financial penalty to the City. However, no city or organization has utilized this clause.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked what LimeBike’s metric to measure success is. Mr. O’Boyle stated that success is finding the right number of bikes needed to reach the desired number of 1-2 trips per bike, per day. Secondly, a more broad measure of success is to lead a regional dock-less, smart mobility program that meets the need of cyclists in the area. Ms. Kowalczyk then asked how customer feedback is received and how that information could be relayed to the City of Worthington. Mr. O’Boyle said that there is a LimeBike customer service phone number that is available 24/7 for feedback, also there is an email on LimeBike.com that is also monitored 24/7. LimeBike social media pages are also monitored closely for feedback. Surveys and user polls are utilized to receive information on how LimeBike can be more effective. That can be used to help the City when making decisions to be more bike and pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked what LimeBike’s experience with theft has been. Mr. Reese explained that the way that the bicycles are manufactured, pieces of a LimeBike can only be used for LimeBikes. There is also technology that will signal an alert if someone attempts to use the bike without properly unlocking it. Additionally, there is technology that will automatically make it nearly impossible to pedal the bike if being improperly used. Mr. O’Boyle reported the industry standard for loss due to damage or theft is 1-2%, LimeBike has experienced a rate of ½ of 1% rate for losses.
Ms. Kowalczyk inquired about accessibility with adaptive bikes for people with disabilities to have access to the LimeBike program. Mr. Reese stated that LimeBike is constantly looking at demand whether it is accessibility or improving the bicycle itself. Mr. O’Boyle stated that development includes other types of mobility options such as tricycles and hand cycles that would serve the purpose of greater accessibility. Ms. Kowalczyk expressed her pleasure with this direction and made a final suggestion for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and LimeBike when this program rolls out to engage in a greater education effort about bike lanes, where bike paths are, and what the bike laws are. That could be done to help promote the program and educate the community.

Mr. Myers asked what happens if a rider takes a bike from Old Worthington and rides it home, would the bike be locked in front of their house. Mr. Reese said that is possible if it is an appropriate zone determined by the city. Another rider could then use that bike, or staff would recycle it into an appropriate zone. Ms. Michael asked how bikes would be recycled into a new zone. Mr. Reese said that the team on the ground would balance the bikes out by picking them up.

Mr. Myers then asked if a bike is in an area of low use, how long would that bike stay in the area. Mr. O’Boyle stated that a bike could stand idle for approximately 3 days before sending a signal to the local team that it needs to be moved. On the app, there is also a button to report issues. Mr. Myers asked if there are any markings on the bikes to allow a non-LimeBike user to report an issue. He anticipates that there will be issues with parking and he wants to make sure that LimeBike is receiving phone calls about problems, not city staff. Mr. O’Boyle said there is a phone number on the bikes and clear contact information for whom to call for issues. Mr. Reese stated that the same discussion is going on with the City of Columbus to minimize issues and incoming calls into city staff. Mr. Hurley said that during the trial period any calls or efforts made by city staff will be tracked and taken into consideration during future agreements.

Ms. Michael asked if there are any questions in the audience about the LimeBike presentation. An audience member asks if there is the potential for distracted driving for bike riders who are using the app while riding the bike and trying to find somewhere to park. Mr. Boyle said that the bikes have a cellphone holder mounted, allowing the rider to plug their destination information into Google. For parking, LimeBike attempts to minimize distractions by tagging designated parking areas. Another audience member asked who determines parking spots. Mr. Reese stated that the city determines that. Ms. Michael stated that parking spots could change dependent upon usage and data received. Ms. Dorothy said she hopes that this promotes local people visiting local businesses and the city can see that information. She also mentioned that existing bike racks could be used as parking locations.

Mr. Foust stated his concern that bike racks are going to be a parking spot for the LimeBikes, taking up space meant for personal bikes. Ms. Dorothy agreed that could be a legitimate concern in the future. Mr. Foust would like to see data in the future indicating how often, what percentage, and how many times a day LimeBike staff is
running their van to relocate bikes. If one of the purposes of this program is to protect the environment, what offsetting pollution is generated by a van having to pick-up a bike and place it elsewhere. Mr. O’Boyle states that they are always looking to decrease van trips. He stated that he would work with the City Manager and his staff to determine where the best places are to park locally.

Ms. Michael asked if there are no more questions, then there is the consensus to move forward with a trial of LimeBike in the City of Worthington.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy moved to authorize the City Manager to enter into a trial agreement with LimeBike to provide dock-less bike sharing in Worthington for a period not to exceed six months. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk.

The motion to authorize the City Manager to enter into a trial agreement with LimeBike carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael recognized several students who were in attendance as a scouting requirement.

Mr. Greeson asked Ms. Michael since there are members of two community groups in attendance, that Resolution No. 18-2018 be moved forward in the agenda. Ms. Michael replied that she would like to approve the minutes before moving that agenda item forward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

• Regular Meeting – February 20, 2018
• Regular Meeting – March 5, 2018
• Special Meeting – March 12, 2018

MOTION Mr. Robinson moved to approve the aforementioned meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

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

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

At Mr. Greeson’s request, Resolution No. 18-2018 was moved forward for consideration.

Mr. Greeson explained that Council budgets funds each year to provide grants to community organizations that provide services to Worthington citizens. A committee is
appointed to provide recommendations on how much money should be allocated to each organization.

Ms. Stewart explained that council designated a committee to review the applications for alignment with the priorities that council established for the grants including providing basic human necessities and improvement to the Worthington community. Grant requests significantly exceeded the funding available for awards. The committee included Councilmembers Smith and Kowalczyk along with three other appointed members who reviewed requests and made recommendations.

Mr. Smith explained that the committee utilized a formula based on a rating matrix that calculated the recommended amounts. Mr. Smith noted that the amount recommended for Drug Safe Worthington differed significantly from the requested amount in light of the previous request that the organization made last year to help fund the Speaker Series. If they again requested additional money it could be approved by council. Mr. Myers asked what amount was requested for the Speaker Series. Mr. Smith replied that he thought it was $9,000 to guarantee the Speaker Series and then Drug Safe Worthington went to the community to solicit funds, securing additional money from the Franklin County Prosecutor. Mr. Myers explained that the council has made drug and opioid issues a top priority and he wants to make sure that Mr. Smith is comfortable with the level of funding provided to Drug Safe Worthington. Mr. Smith confirmed the committee is comfortable with the funding level considering that if they come back with a specific request it would be considered.

Resolution No. 18-2018

Approving Funding to Worthington Community Groups for the 2018 Community Grant Program.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 18-2018. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 18-2018 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)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.
Mr. Whited reported that this legislation was introduced two weeks ago. Bids came in and staff recommends 2K General Company as the contractor with an amount not to exceed Eighty Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($82,500.00).

In response to Ms. Dorothy’s question about when the project will begin, Mr. Whited replied that it should get moving within thirty days.

Mr. Greeson stated that the ordinance needs to be amended to include the amounts and the name of the contractor.

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to insert in Section 1 an amount not to exceed Eighty Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($82,500.00) and in Section 2 the firm of 2K General Company, Inc. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 07-2018 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes  7 Robinson, Kowalczyk, Foust, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, and Michael

No  0

Ordinance No. 07-2018 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

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.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson explained that for quite a while, members of council have been interested in streaming City Council meetings. A process has been conducted with Mr. Smith and Mr. Robinson along with City staff to vet prospective vendors and a recommendation has been made to go with the vendor Swag-it. This ordinance appropriates $80,000 from the Community Technology Fund and $12,000 from the General Fund to cover up front expenses and initial year of operation costs. Ongoing costs will be approximately $30,000 per year.
Mr. Oliver summarized that Swag-It meets all requirements in the RFP. Mr. Myers asked whether archiving would be done by Swag-It. Mr. Oliver stated that the City would retain all rights to the video and could download them at any time. Mr. Myers questioned whether public requests would be segregated for archived videos. Mr. Lindsey said that by contract Swag-It can maintain and provide records on request. Since the city can download the videos, the city could be the archival source for the long-term depending on the decision made about retention schedule. Mr. Myers asked to confirm that paper minutes would still be made. Mr. Lindsey said that paper minutes are the permanent record of government action.

Mr. Myers asked what storage fee would be charged as part of the contract. Mr. Oliver said that there is not a fee; it is included in the price. Ms. Dorothy stated she is concerned about the cost of this program and it is a larger price tag than anticipated. She asked if this is a large enough problem that the City must go toward video streaming and how long would videos be available. Mr. Oliver replied that would be dependent upon what policy is set.

Mr. Myers asked if this is a single year appropriation for the contract. Ms. Stewart replied that yes, this is for the upfront equipment cost and the annual fee. Ms. Dorothy asked if the City is locked into a three year agreement. Mr. Oliver replied that the City is not and the three year costs were provided to show the prospective costs over that period. Ms. Dorothy and Mr. Smith stated their discomfort with the high-costs with Mr. Smith explaining that it is the market costs for professional camera equipment and live streaming. Mr. Oliver noted that of the five quotes received, Swag-It was the low cost provider. Mr. Greeson explained that the funds being used from the Community Technology Fund cannot be used for general purpose uses and must be used for something like a community access channel or this streaming initiative.

Mr. Robinson noted that in light of the state of the current body politic, he is supportive of this effort. Ms. Michael expressed she believes this is valuable for people who are unable to attend meetings and they can see what really happens in Council meetings. Mr. Smith inquired if the City would own the equipment after the initial investment. Mr. Oliver said yes. Ms. Dorothy asked when the service would become operational if this is approved. Mr. Oliver stated installation would begin in late May with it becoming operational in June.

Michael Bates, 6560 Evening Street
Mr. Bates asked if there were performance measures built into Swag-It’s contract. He explained his history with capital outlays where there have been projects with equipment that sits in a closet unused.

Mr. Oliver replied that Swag-It has a strong reputation and the quality could be determined quickly from the production quality of the final product. There was also a minimum service level specified in the initial RFP.
MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to insert in Section 2 the sum of twelve thousand dollars ($12,000) and in Section 3 the firm of Swag-it. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 08-2018 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7  Kowalczyk, Foust, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Robinson, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 08-2018 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 09-2018

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

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson said that this is further implementation of the combining of the City Clerk and Executive Assistant to the City Manager functions.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 09-2018. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7  Foust, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Robinson, Kowalczyk, and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 09-2018 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 19-2018

Approving an Agreement and Permit for and between US Signal Company, LLC, a Michigan Limited Liability Company, to Operate and Maintain a Telecommunications System Within the City of Worthington Pursuant to and Subject to the Provisions of Chapter 949 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.
Mr. Greeson explained that the City’s codified ordinances have a provision for placing telecommunications systems in the public Right-of-Way. This a renewal of the permit that US Signal currently has for the Right-of-Way.

MOTION
Ms. Kowalczyk made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 19-2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 19-2018 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 10-2018
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 Cost of the Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvement Design Update and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 675-18)

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Ordinance No. 11-2018
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 Cost of Energy Conservation Measures, Authorize the Execution and Delivery of an Energy Savings Contract, and to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 677-18)

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

Ordinance No. 12-2018
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 Design Costs of the East Wilson Bridge Road Waterline and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 678-18)

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

Ordinance No. 13-2018
Approving the Installation of a Tree Dedication Marker on the Northeast Village Green to Recognize the Contributions of former Mayor Harvey Minton to the Worthington Community.

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.
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 reported that he has copies of a previously discussed letter drafted at Council’s suggestion about the request encouraging the OPERS board of trustees to divest themselves of firearms stocks or firearms related securities.

MOTION

Mr. Robinson made a motion to approve the letter to the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith reported that the CIC shifted resources to the PACE program for the Wilson Bridge Road corridor. This is a change in the ReCAP program to incentivize businesses to put money into energy efficiency. Ms. Michael explained that the number of ReCAP applications has decreased and there have been discussions on how to use those funds. Mr. Smith noted that social media feedback on energy aggregation has largely been positive.

Mr. Foust reported that he attended a meeting last week of the Columbus Energy Special Improvement District. They reviewed a PACE project that funded HVAC and other energy efficiency improvements.

Mr. Robinson reported about a tree literacy program he had read about in New York City that he appreciated. He was then pleased when he saw the Spring Activity Brochure at the Community Center featured the different trees on the Village Green with descriptors for each type.

Ms. Michael reported she was at a meeting regarding the Worthington Resource Pantry where Kroger is shifting from giving money to local resource centers. This will have a $100,000 impact on the Worthington Resource Pantry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Myers made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss land acquisition. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.
The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes    7    Smith, Robinson, Kowalczyk, Foust, Myers, Dorothy, and Michael
No     0

Council recessed at 9:29 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION  Mr. Foust made a motion to return to open session at 10:09 p.m.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION  Mr. Myers made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded
by Mr. Foust.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

___________________________________
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this
2nd day of April, 2018.

______________________________
Council President
Date: March 21, 2018

To: Matthew H. Greeson

From: Dan Whited, Director of Service & Engineering

Subject: Ordinance No. 10-2018 - Appropriation - Kenyonbrook/Hardy Way Sanitary Sewer Improvements Design

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
We are seeking permission to enter into a professional services agreement with EMH&T for design of the Kenyonbrook/Hardy Way Sanitary Sewer Improvements. We are also introducing legislation to fund the design at a cost of $172,000

RECOMMENDATION
Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
In 2009 the Ohio EPA placed the City of Worthington under Director's Final Findings and Orders (DFFOs). The documents require the City to complete Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Studies (SSES) of our entire Sanitary Sewer system to identify any deficiencies in capacity as well as any structural defects. The intent of the DFFOs is for the City to ensure Capital Improvements Projects are identified to ensure any shortcomings in the sewer system are addressed and remediated, thus preventing sewer backups, water in basement events, sanitary sewer overflows, or pollution due to spills from our sewer system.

EMH&T completed the first of the SSES in what is identified as the South East Sewer Shed in 2010. Many of the identified projects have been completed, but two remain. The 1920's era Kenyonbrook sanitary sewer line running between High Street and E. New England Avenue is the final section of trunk line sewer in this district in need of upgrade. This will finalize the capacity upgrades which began with the construction of sewer lines west of High Street.

The sanitary sewer line serving Hardy Way was installed circa 1950, but was done so with no dedicated or recorded easements. The sewer now runs beneath (or very near) three structures and must be relocated. While relocation of the sewer has been identified as a
separate CIP project, it outlets to the Kenyonbrook trunk sewer mentioned in the above paragraph, and is part of the remediation for the Southeast Sewer Shed.

Both projects require professional engineering design. We estimated $160,000 to design the Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer. The Hardy Way sewer relocation was estimated at $133,000 for construction, but the in-house design requires updating. EMH&T has submitted a proposal to combine both projects in a single design for $172,000. We are recommending Council award the design contract to EMH&T, and introduce legislation to fund the project from the CIP. Our intention is to use the $160,000 designated for the Kenyonbrook sanitary sewer, and use funds designated for Hardy Way for the remaining $12,483. The balance of that project’s funds would then be carried over into the 2019 CIP and appropriated for project construction.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES** (if applicable)
$172,000

**ATTACHMENTS**
Ordinance No. 10-2018
ORDINANCE NO. 10-2018

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 Cost of the Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Improvement Design Update and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 675-18)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8170.533404 the sum of One-Hundred Seventy Five Thousand Dollars ($175,000) to pay the cost of the Kenyonbrook Trunk Sewer Design Update and all related expenses (Project 675-18).

SECTION 2. That the City Manager be and hereby is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the firm of EMH&T for the provision of the aforementioned services.

SECTION 3. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 4. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ____________

___________________________________
President of Council

Attest

___________________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018

To: Matthew H. Greeson

From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager

Subject: Ordinance No. 11-2018 - Appropriation - Energy Conservation Measures Project

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Ordinance appropriates funds and authorizes the execution of a project to install energy conservation measures at the Community Center, Griswold Center and Fire Station.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The 2018 Capital Improvements Program includes funds for improvements to the HVAC and lighting at the Community Center. Last September, staff recommended to City Council, and the City Council approved, the use of the purchasing procedure described in Section 717.02 of the Ohio Revised Code for energy conservation measures projects. The first phase of the process is to conduct an analysis of the project and prepare an energy conservation report. The report must find that the amount of money spent on the project is not likely to exceed the amount of money the City would save in energy, operating, maintenance and avoided capital costs over the average system life. The second phase involves the installation or construction of the recommended measures.

The City solicited proposals from various firms and selected ABM for the project. As part of the energy conservation report phase, ABM evaluated not only the Community Center, but also all of the City’s facilities for energy conservation investments. Representative from ABM presented their findings and recommendations at the City Council meeting on March 12th. The recommendations include such items as investment in HVAC improvements, lighting retrofits, reduction in air infiltration and exfiltration, and water conservation.

The recommendations are grouped into two phases. The first phase includes the projects already identified in the current Capital Improvements Program, which are HVAC and
lighting investments at the Community Center, improvements at the Griswold Center and the exhaust and heating system in the apparatus bay at the Fire Station. The first phase has a project investment of $2,076,759 and savings over 15 years of $2,688,928. The second phase includes the other recommendations from ABM's analysis that are not currently identified in the Capital Improvements Plan. This second phase has a project investment of $1,177,644 and savings over 15 years of $1,353,647. Staff recommends proceeding with ABM for installation of the first phase. The second phase project will be considered as part of the update to the Capital Improvements Plan later this year.

This Ordinance appropriates the necessary funds; authorizes the City Manager to enter into the necessary agreements to proceed with the project; finds that the amount of money to be spent on the Energy Conservation Measures is not likely to exceed the amount of money the City will save in energy, operating, maintenance and voided capital costs over the average system life of the measures as specific in the energy conservation report; and determines to proceed with the project.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES** (if applicable)
As noted above, the first phase has a project investment of $2,076,759 and savings over 15 years of $2,688,928.

**ATTACHMENTS**
Ordinance No. 11-2018
ORDINANCE NO. 11-2018

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 Cost of Energy Conservation Measures, Authorize the Execution and Delivery of an Energy Savings Contract, and to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 677-18)

WHEREAS, The City of Worthington’s City Council (the “Council”), is authorized under Ohio Revised Code (“ORC”) Section 717.02 to select a vendor for the purpose of developing an energy conservation report; and,

WHEREAS, Ordinance Number 40-2017 authorized and directed the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the firm of ABM Technical Solutions, LLC for the provision of an energy conservation report; and,

WHEREAS, as a result of the energy conservation report, the Council has determined to undertake capital projects consisting of, but not limited to, all or some of the following: a guaranteed energy savings and conversion project, including the planning, design, purchase, acquisition, installation, construction, equipping and furnishing of energy savings repairs, renovations, upgrades and improvements to buildings and facilities operated by the City of Worthington as funds are available to undertake and complete (the “Project”); and,

WHEREAS, in order to implement the Project, the Council proposes to enter into an Energy Savings Contract and an Energy Equipment Installation Contract with ABM Technical Solutions, LLC (the “Contracts”); and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Contracts, the Council desires to acquire certain equipment with a cost of $2,076,759 for Phase I, constituting improvements at the Community Center, Griswold Senior Center, and Fire Station; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed improvements result in an estimated savings in energy, maintenance, voided capital costs, and operating expense of $2,688,928 over fifteen (15) years; and,

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:
ORDINANCE NO. 11-2018

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8130.533406 the sum of Two Million Two Hundred Eight Four Thousand Four Hundred and Thirty Five Dollars ($2,284,435) which includes a 10% contingency, to pay the cost of the Energy Conservation Measures and all related expenses (Project 677-18).

SECTION 2. That the City Manager be and hereby is authorized and directed to enter into agreements with the firm of ABM Technical Solutions, LLC for the provision of the aforementioned services.

SECTION 3. That the City Council finds that the amount of money to be spent on the Energy Conservation Measures is not likely to exceed the amount of money the City will save in energy, operating, maintenance and voided capital costs over the average system life of the measures as specified in the energy conservation report.

SECTION 4. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 5. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed _________________

_______________________________
President of Council

Attest:

_______________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 14, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Daniel Whited, P.E., Director of Service and Engineering
Subject: Ordinance No. 12-2018 - E. Wilson Bridge Rd Water Line Replacement Project-Design Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Ordinance appropriates funds for the design of the water line replacement project on East Wilson Bridge Road.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The 2018 Capital Improvements Project fund designates nearly one million dollars for the design and subsequent replacement of the E. Wilson Bridge Rd waterline. This line has proven to be excessively prone to breaking and causing significant issues with the roadway including degradation and heaving of asphalt. In early February the Service & Engineering Department solicited proposals from six engineering firms for design services.

Four firms responded with proposals. A review panel was assembled and interviewed three of those firms: MS Consultants, CT Consultants and Strand Engineering. The panel recommends MS Consultants to complete the design of the waterline at a cost for services of $70,925. Staff recommends an appropriation of $72,000.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES (if applicable)
$72,000

ATTACHMENTS
Ordinance No. 12-2018
ORDINANCE NO. 12-2018

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 Design Costs of the East Wilson Bridge Road Waterline and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 678-18)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8160.533407 an amount not to exceed Seventy Two Thousand Dollars ($72,000.00) to pay the design cost of the East Wilson Bridge Road Waterline Project and all related expenses (Project No. 678-18).

SECTION 2. That the City Manager be and hereby is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the firm of MS Consultants for the provision of the aforementioned services.

SECTION 3. For the purposes of Section 2.21 of the Charter of the City, this ordinance shall be considered an “Ordinance Determining to Proceed” with the Project, notwithstanding future actions of this Council, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to comply with other requirements of law.

SECTION 4. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ____________________

President of Council

Attest

______________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 15, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Anne Brown, Public Information and Community Relations Officer
Subject: Ordinance No. 13-2018 - Village Green - Tree Dedication Marker for Mayor Harvey Minton

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The Ordinance authorizes the installation of a tree dedication marker in honor of Mayor Harvey Minton on the Village Green.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
According to Section 12.03 of the City Charter, the approval of six members of City Council is required for the construction, installation, erection or placement of a permanent structure on the Village Green. City Council is asked to consider an ordinance permitting the installation of a tree dedication marker to honor the contributions of former Worthington Mayor Harvey Minton.

This Arbor Day, April 27, 2018, a tree will be planted on the northeast Village Green by Worthington community members and school children. This year the tree is being planted in honor of former Mayor Harvey Minton, who passed away in August 2017. Staff would like to install a stone marker with a plaque that recognizes Mayor Minton for his contributions to the Worthington community and support of the City’s tree program and Arbor Day ceremony.

Photos are attached showing examples of stone markers that may be used. A 4” x 6” plaque is recommended, which may read:

- Planted on Arbor Day 2018 in honor of Harvey Minton
- Mayor of the City of Worthington from 1999 – 2013
- For his dedication and exceptional service to the Worthington community
- Tree species -
The marker would posthumously recognize Mayor Minton and make future generations aware of his legacy, his love for the Worthington community and its tree canopy, and pride of the City’s long standing Tree City U.S.A. designation.

ATTACHMENTS
Photos
Ordinance No. 13-2018
8.D. - Village Green - Tree Dedication Marker for Mayor Harvey Minton
8.D. - Village Green - Tree Dedication Marker for Mayor Harvey Minton
ORDINANCE NO. 13-2018

Approving the Installation of a Tree Dedication Marker on the Northeast Village Green to Recognize the Contributions of former Mayor Harvey Minton to the Worthington Community.

WHEREAS, Section 12.03 of the Charter of the City of Worthington provides that the construction, installation, erection or placement of a permanent structure on the Village Green shall require the approval of six members of Worthington City Council; and,

WHEREAS, on Arbor Day, April 27, 2018, a tree will be planted during a ceremony on the northeast Village Green by Worthington school children and community members as part of the City’s annual Arbor Day ceremony; and,

WHEREAS, the City wishes to dedicate this tree in honor of former Mayor Harvey Minton, who served as Mayor of the City of Worthington for 14 years, from 1999 to 2013; and,

WHEREAS, Mayor Minton was a champion of the Worthington community and enjoyed participating in all ceremonial activities, including the annual Arbor Day tree planting ceremony and engaging with children and adults in attendance; and,

WHEREAS, Mayor Minton was an avid supporter of the City’s tree program and was proud of Worthington’s long standing Tree City U.S.A. designation; and,

WHEREAS, the City is honored to posthumously recognize the late Mayor Harvey Minton and make future generations aware of the legacy he has left behind,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio, six-sevenths of the members elected thereto herein concurring:

SECTION 1. That the Director of Parks and Recreation be and hereby is authorized and directed to proceed with the creation and installation of a tree dedication marker in honor of Mayor Harvey Minton.

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed________________________ 

President of Council

Attest: _________________________

Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 27, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Lori Trego, Personnel Director
Subject: Staffing Chart Amendment

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Resolution amends the staffing chart to allow for twenty-six Police Officer positions for up to a one year period.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
A current hiring process is underway for police officer to fill two current openings created by retirements at the end of 2017. In anticipation of additional retirements later this year, staff is requesting to temporarily increase the authorized number of police officers by two positions, which will allow two additional police officers to be hired, trained and ready to fill any additional openings.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES (if applicable)
The budgetary impact of two additional police officers will be absorbed by the salary savings between Step A and Step D of the pay range. New police officers will enter at Step A (the retiring officers were at Step D).

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution 21-2018
RESOLUTION NO. 21-2018

Amending the Staffing Chart of the City of Worthington to Provide for Twenty-six (26) Police Officer Positions in the Division of Police for up to a One Year Period.

WHEREAS, in its adoption of Resolution 74-2017 City Council approved a Staffing Chart for the City providing the staffing levels for each of the departments and divisions of the City; and,

WHEREAS, City Council wishes to amend said Staffing Chart to add two Police Officer Positions in the Division of Police for up to a one year period to meet the Division’s needs;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That City Council does hereby amend the Staffing Chart of the City to authorize a total of twenty-six (26) Police Officer positions for up to a one year period.

SECTION 2. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book.

Adopted

_________________________________
President of Council

Attest

_________________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 28, 2018

To: Matthew H. Greeson

From: Daniel Whited, P.E. Director of Service and Engineering

Subject: Resolution North East Gateway Project Right of Way Acquisition Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
In conjunction with requirements from the Ohio Department of Transportation, staff has reviewed proposals for consulting services for Right of Way Acquisition Services. The three separate firms selected will provide services for three different phases of the acquisition: Acquisition, Appraisal, and Review for Relocation.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce and Approve as Presented

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The NE Gateway Project will reconstruct Worthington Galena Road starting 600 feet north of the CSX railroad to Lakeview Plaza Boulevard, Wilson Bridge Road from the CSX Railroad to Worthington Galena Road, and Huntley Road starting 400 feet south of Wilson Bridge Road to Wilson Bridge Road.

As part of the project, the City of Worthington will be required to acquire 124 parcels (35 property owners). Of the 124 parcels, 34 are permanent takes, 5 are standard highway easements, 17 are utility easements, 11 are slope easements, 47 are temporary takes, and 8 are partial vacation of an existing easement. In addition, one (1) residential relocation and two (2) commercial relocations are required.

Per requirements of the Ohio Department of Transportation’s (ODOT) Local Public Agencies (LPA) Programmatic Selection Process, the City solicited Letters of Interest (LOIs) for Quality based Selection (QBS) from qualified consultants to assist in the Right of Way Acquisition Services. QBS is a procurement process for the competitive selection of services under which the most appropriate firms are selected based on qualifications such as knowledge, skill, experience, and other project specific factors, rather than on fees.
The process required three (3) separate contracts:

- **Contract 1:** Right of Way Acquisition and Relocation
- **Contract 2:** Appraisal Review and Parcel Impact Notes (PINS)
- **Contract 3:** Relocation Review

Consultants were allowed to submit LOIs for more than one contract but were required to do so as separate LOIs.

Nine separate firms responded to the solicitation. City staff conducted an exhaustive review of the LOIs using the ODOT LPA Programmatic Selection Process. The following consultants were selected as the most qualified firm for each of the contracts:

- **Contract 1:** Right of Way Acquisition and Relocation – *TranSystems Corporation, Columbus, Ohio office*
- **Contract 2:** Appraisal Review and Parcel Impact Notes *Martin + Wood Appraisal Group, Ltd. Dublin, Ohio*
- **Contract 3:** Relocation Review *Heritage land Services, Westerville, Ohio*

The ODOT LPA process requires that no contracts are to be signed with the consultants until after an appraisal scoping/acquisition kick off meeting (when the appraisal formats are set by all per the manual) and ODOT District 6 staff has reviewed and approved negotiated contracts.

Staff recommends proceeding with contract negotiation with the consultants and ODOT as identified above per ODOT LPA requirements. Final contracts (and associated appropriations) will be presented to City Council once review and negotiations are completed.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES** (if applicable)

**ATTACHMENTS**
RESOLUTION NO. 28-2018

Designating Three Consultants for the Northeast Gateway Project and Directing the City Manager to Proceed with the Next Phases of the Local Public Agency Programmatic Selection Process.

WHEREAS, the Northeast Gateway Project will reconstruct Worthington Galena Road starting 600 feet north of the CSX railroad to Lakeview Plaza Boulevard, Wilson Bridge Road from the CSX Railroad to Worthington Galena Road, and Huntley Road starting 400 feet south of Wilson Bridge Road to Wilson Bridge Road.; and,

WHEREAS, the Project will be funded in part with federal grant moneys administered by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT); and,

WHEREAS, the Project will require the City of Worthington to acquire 34 permanent takes, 5 standard highway easements, 17 utility easements, 11 slope easements, 47 temporary takes, and 8 partial vacations of existing easements. In addition, one residential relocation and two commercial relocations are required; and,

WHEREAS, the City is required to follow ODOT’s Local Public Agencies Programmatic Selection Process in the selection of and contracting with qualified consultants to assist in the Right of Way acquisition and relocation process; and,

WHEREAS, City staff conducted a thorough review of the nine consulting firms that submitted Letters of Interest as part of the Programmatic Selection Process and determined that the following consultants were the most qualified firm for each of the three separate required contracts:

Contract 1: Right of Way Acquisition and Relocation – TranSystems Corporation, Columbus, Ohio office

Contract 2: Appraisal Review and Parcel Impact Notes – Martin + Wood Appraisal Group, Ltd. Dublin, Ohio

Contract 3: Relocation Review – Heritage land Services, Westerville, Ohio; and,

WHEREAS, Council approval of the staff recommended consultants is necessary to proceed with the ODOT review and contract negotiation process of the Programmatic Selection Process.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:
RESOLUTION NO. 28-2018

SECTION 1. That Council hereby approves the staff recommendation of the following consultants for the three contracts related to Right of Way acquisition and relocation services for the Northeast Gateway Project:

Contract 1: Right of Way Acquisition and Relocation – TranSystems Corporation, Columbus, Ohio office

Contract 2: Appraisal Review and Parcel Impact Notes – Martin + Wood Appraisal Group, Ltd. Dublin, Ohio

Contract 3: Relocation Review – Heritage Land Services, Westerville, Ohio; and,

SECTION 2. That the City Manager or his designee are hereby directed and authorized to proceed with the next phases of the Programmatic Selection Process, including submitting the names of the three consultants to ODOT and negotiating contracts with the consultants for review and approval by City Council.

SECTION 3. That the Clerk be and hereby is instructed to record this Resolution in the appropriate record book upon its adoption.

Adopted ____________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

____________________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 26, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
From: Scott F. Bartter, Finance Director
Subject: Ordinance Appropriation - PACE Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This Ordinance appropriates money from the PACE fund to pay the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority the amount received from the Special Assessment against the property at 350 W. Wilson Bridge Road.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce for Public Hearing

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program is a mechanism utilized to finance energy efficiency projects through a special assessment against the property. In 2016, the Council passed Ordinances No. 34-2016, 35-2016 and 36-2016 which authorized the levy of a Special Assessment in the amount of $461,674.42 against the property located at 350 W. Wilson Bridge Road. This Special Assessment is part of an Energy Project Cooperative Agreement made between the Columbus Regional Energy Special Improvement District, Trivium Worthington, the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority, and the City of Worthington. The City of Worthington received the first special assessment payment with the first-half property tax settlement and we need to now pay those funds to the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority. In future years, the City anticipates this appropriation occurring during the budget process so there will be no need for a special appropriation ordinance.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES
The first-half payment will be $16,488.37, with a second payment of $16,488.37 occurring after the second-half property tax distribution is received (mid-August)

ATTACHMENTS
Ordinance 14-2018
ORDINANCE NO. 14-2018

Amending Ordinance No. 41-2017 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the PACE Fund Unappropriated Balance in the Amount of $33,000.00 to Provide Funds for the Payment of a Special Assessment to the Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority.

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the unappropriated balance to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>999.9020.540910</td>
<td>Columbus Finance Authority</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington Ohio.

Passed ___________________

President of Council

Attest:

__________________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 28, 2018

To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

From: Darren Hurley, Parks & Recreation Director

Subject: Ordinance Appropriation - Olentangy Parklands Restroom Project

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The 2018 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) included $120,000 for a new restroom facility in the Olentangy Parklands. As staff have continued planning for the installation of the restroom facility with potential vendors, it has become clear we will need additional funds to accomplish the project in a satisfactory manner. As we moved into design and more detailed quoting of the precast structure and its installation in the park, two factors have significantly increased our anticipated cost of the project. First, in working through the design and consulting with other agencies with similar restroom installations in similar park settings, we are recommending we upsize the structure from our original proposal so it has two stalls in both the men’s and women’s as opposed to the one we were originally proposing. Usage in the park can be heavy and with soccer, trail usage, tennis, pickleball, and the skatepark we feel having two stalls in each restroom area will be necessary. In addition, with the year round usage of the trail, the sledding hill, the skatepark, and even the early spring and late fall usage of the soccer field we have decided running electricity to the facility enabling it to have heat and be open year round is a desirable upgrade. As a result, the total cost for the project has increased to $195,000. This will allow the facility to be sized and operated to most sufficiently serve the very high volume usage in the park.

The purchase of the restroom facility and its installation would be made under 111.05(a), the Cooperative Purchasing exemption to formal purchasing, through the National Joint Powers Alliance, which the City is a member organization of as a result of prior purchases. This national public service agency offers government agencies access to competitively awarded cooperative purchasing contracts saving the individual member agency time and resources to perform the bidding process independently.

The location of the facility is proposed to be on the south side of the tennis courts between the existing storage building and the trailhead/shelter area. The restroom will then be
located in close proximity to the tennis courts, pickleball courts, soccer field, skatepark and right along the Olentangy Trail access and trailhead.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Introduce for Public Hearing

**BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION**
The addition of a permanent restroom facility in the Olentangy Parklands was listed as one of the priority projects in the City's Parks Master Plan. The park which experiences year round usage including over 400,000 annual users of the Olentangy Trail is currently served by two portable toilets which are located in the parking lot. These units are difficult to keep up with due to the high usage of the park which serves not only trail users but tennis, pickleball, soccer, skatepark, and sledding hill users.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES** (if applicable)
The 2018 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) allocated $120,000 to this project. Due to some recommended changes to the precast facility to be installed, staff are requesting an allocation of $195,000 to complete the project.

**ATTACHMENTS**
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 28, 2018

To: Matthew H. Greeson

From: Daniel Whited, P.E., Director of Service & Engineering

Subject: Ordinance Upper Rush Run Improvements Design Funding

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
In conjunction with the North East Gateway Project, staff has identified severe impairment of the Upper Rush Run that is included in the gateway area. EMH&T was hired in 2017 to conduct a study of the area and make recommendation for needed improvements. They have presented preliminary concepts with a proposal for design services totaling $59,100. Staff is introducing legislation asking for permission to engage EMH&T for the design of said improvements, as well as funding the cost of design services.

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce for Public Hearing

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES (if applicable)

ATTACHMENTS
ORDINANCE NO. 16-2018

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 Additional Design and Engineering Services for the Upper Rush Run Stream Restoration Design and all Related Expenses with said Project. (Project No. 639-17)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8140.533369 an amount not to exceed Thirty Five Thousand Dollars ($35,000.00) to pay the additional design and engineering costs of the Upper Rush Run Stream Restoration Design Project and all related expenses (Project No. 639-17).

SECTION 2. That the City Manager be and hereby is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with EMH&T for the provision of the aforementioned services.

SECTION 3. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed _________________

____________________________________
President of Council

Attest:

___________________________________
Clerk of Council
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 2, 2018

Date: March 28, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Daniel Whited, P.E. Director of Service and Engineering
Subject: Ordinance – Design of Northeast Gateway Aesthetics Funding

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Staff is introducing and requesting Council approval of an ordinance to fund the design of aesthetic upgrades to the Northeast Gateway Project

RECOMMENDATION
Introduce for Public Hearing

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The City Council has previously approved conceptual designs for the aesthetic upgrade of the Northeast Gateway project, including an entry sign, façade finishes, brick paver treatments and other important gateway features. Costs associated with these elements are not covered within the parameters of the grant funding we are receiving for the project. Thus, we are introducing legislation to fund the design of them from the Capital Improvements Project Fund at a cost of $41,000.00

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/FUNDING SOURCES (if applicable)
$41,000

ATTACHMENTS
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 Additional Design and Engineering Services for the NE Gateway Intersection Improvement Project and all Related Expenses with said Project. (Project No. 602-14)

WHEREAS, the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio, provides that City Council may at any time amend or revise the Budget by Ordinance, providing that such amendment does not authorize the expenditure of more revenue than will be available;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Municipality of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That there be and hereby is appropriated from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Account No. 308.8150.533330 an amount not to exceed Forty One Thousand Dollars ($41,000.00) to pay the additional design and engineering costs of the NE Gateway Intersection Improvement Project and all related expenses (Project No. 602-14).

SECTION 2. That the City Manager be and hereby is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with EMH&T for the provision of the aforementioned services.

SECTION 3. That notice of passage of this Ordinance shall be posted in the Municipal Administration Building, the Worthington Library, the Griswold Center and the Worthington Community Center and shall set forth the title and effective date of the Ordinance and a statement that the Ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of Council. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law and by the Charter of the City of Worthington, Ohio.

Passed ___________________

__________________________
President of Council

Attest:

__________________________
Clerk of Council