



**CITY OF WORTHINGTON**  
**Worthington City Council Minutes**  
March 12, 2018

6550 N. High Street  
Worthington, Ohio  
43085

---

**CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Members Present:** Beth Kowalczyk, Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas Foust, Scott Myers, David Robinson, Douglas K. Smith, and Bonnie D. Michael

**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 ½ to 1.0 mill. He explained that one mill is 1/10<sup>th</sup> of 1¢ of your electric bill. If you spend 5¢ on your energy, 1/10<sup>th</sup> or ½ 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 6<sup>th</sup> election, our charter requires an ordinance that would have to be approved no later than the last meeting in July (16<sup>th</sup>). 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

**Value Proposition – Worthington Energy Program over 10+ Years**

**Facility Maintenance Program**  
Ensures Equipment Operates as Designed with Occupant Comfort

**HVAC / Lighting Upgrade Program**  
Updates Facility HVAC and Mechanical Needs City-Wide with Focus on CIP Projects

**Sustainability and WMS Oversight**  
Sustainable practices and MS&I in the City of Worthington Facilities Helps the environment in support of the global community

**Community Center Upgrade Program**  
Addresses Critical Infrastructure Needs / Impacts All Aspects of Operation

20

## 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 19<sup>th</sup>. 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:**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>7</b>	Robinson, Foust, Smith, Myers, Kowalczyk, Dorothy, Michael
<b>No</b>	<b>0</b>	

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.**

**Resolution No. 17-2018** Appointing David Foust to the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission and Richard Schuster to the Architectural Review Board.

**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.

/s/ D. Kay Thress  
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this  
2<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2018.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael  
Council President