1. Call To Order

2. Roll Call

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Special Presentation(s)

4.A. SwimInc

   Executive Summary: Chairman of SwimInc, Rob Schmidt, will provide an update on the status of Worthington Pools' facilities planning efforts.

5. Public Hearings on Legislation

5.A. Ordinance 14-2018 Appropriation – Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) Fund

   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: Approve as Presented

Legislative History: Introduced April 2, 2018

6. Reports of City Officials

6.A. Policy Item(s)

6.A.I. Tobacco 21

Executive Summary: This agenda item considers an initiative to increase the minimum legal sales age for tobacco products to 21 in order to reduce tobacco use and improve public health.

Recommendation: Motion to prepare an ordinance for introduction

6.A.II. City Council Retreat Report

Executive Summary: Review of the report from the City Council Retreat held in February

Recommendation: Motion to accept the Retreat Report


Executive Summary: The Finance Director will present the Financial Report for the month of March.

Recommendation: Motion to approve
6.B. Discussion Item(s)

6.B.I. Community Visioning and Strategic Planning

*Executive Summary:* City Council has discussed an interest in community visioning and strategic planning. This agenda item provides time for Council to discuss this topic and determine next steps.

7. Reports of Council Members

8. Other

9. Executive Session

10. Adjournment
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 9, 2018

Date: March 26, 2018

To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager

From: Scott F. Bartter, Finance Director

Subject: Ordinance No. 14-2018 - 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
Approve as presented

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 9, 2018

Date: April 5, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson
From: Ethan C. Barnhardt, Intern
Subject: Tobacco 21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This agenda item considers an initiative to increase the minimum legal sales age for tobacco products to 21 in order to reduce tobacco use and improve public health.

At the September 11, 2017 City Council Meeting, City Staff and representatives from Columbus Public Health delivered a presentation on the merits of Tobacco 21. Staff was directed to provide additional research on other municipalities that have adopted ordinances that restrict the sale of electronic smoking and tobacco products or paraphernalia to individuals under the age of 21. Please see the attached memo detailing the actions taken by municipalities in Central Ohio and their experiences from implementation.

Melissa McArthur, Program Manager for Tobacco 21 with Columbus Public Health and Jeff Stephens from the American Cancer Action Network will present to the City Council.

RECOMMENDATION
Preparation of an ordinance for introduction

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The City of Columbus and several other Central Ohio communities have passed legislation to raise the minimum legal sales age for purchasing electronic smoking and tobacco products. Representatives from the City of Columbus Public Health inquired last year as to whether the City of Worthington is interested in adopting similar legislation. After conducting research into the issue, City Staff and representatives from Columbus Public Health discussed the issue at the September 11th, 2017 Council meeting. At that meeting, staff provided a memo and presentation detailing the data and rationale behind increasing the age to purchase tobacco and related products, following by Columbus Public Health detailing their passage of a Tobacco 21 ordinance and how its enforcement mechanism.
Council directed staff to compile additional information about the processes and experiences of other Central Ohio communities that have implemented different ordinances with varying levels of enforcement. In the attached memo, communities that were surveyed include: Columbus, Dublin, Grandview Heights, New Albany, and Powell.

Staff recommends the drafting an ordinance mirroring the City of Columbus’s code, and bringing it to council for public comment and consideration.

**ATTACHMENTS**
Tobacco 21 Memorandum
Tobacco 21 Community Benchmarking Memorandum
In 2005, Needham, Massachusetts became the first city in the United States to increase minimum legal sales age (MLSA) for tobacco products to 21. After passing this legislation, the rate of tobacco use by high school students dropped almost in half. In March 2015, The Ohio State University College of Public Health published a white paper that built off the success in Needham, Running the Numbers that catalyzed the movement in communities across the state of Ohio to raise the MLSA to 21 in order to reduce tobacco use and improve public health. Youth tobacco usage in Ohio and Franklin County is high, with more than one in four juniors and seniors reporting the use of some form of tobacco during the past 30 days. The US Surgeon General has referred to tobacco use as a “Pediatric Epidemic” with 80 percent of adult smokers beginning to smoke daily before 20 years of age, and 90 percent of persons who purchase cigarettes for distribution to minors are under 21. However, evidence shows that almost no one begins smoking after the age of 21. Adolescents are particularly vulnerable to long-term harm from tobacco with usage leading to heavier daily consumption, stronger nicotine addiction, and a harder time quitting later in life. If current trends continue, 259,000 Ohio youth alive today will die from tobacco use, with 7,100 children becoming daily smokers each year. The economic impact of increased health care costs is $5.64 billion directly caused by smoking and another $5.88 billion in lost productivity.

An increase of the MLSA for tobacco products, would reduce the prevalence of smoking, and create improved overall public health outcomes. Support for these measures is overwhelming with a 2015 study by the Centers for Disease Control finding that 75% of adults favor raising the tobacco age to 21, including 70% of current smokers and 65% of those aged 18-24. As of May
2017, five cities in Central Ohio and Cleveland have passed an increase of the MLSA for tobacco and nicotine based products to 21. The local legislation has not focused on punishing those who possess tobacco products underage due to the difficult logistical issues stemming from the variation of local tobacco laws. Instead, the approach has been to deter retailers from selling to people under 21 through the use of additional licenses and fines.

**Tobacco 21 – City of Columbus**

- Voted on and passed unanimously on December 12th, 2016 by Columbus City Council
  - Columbus Public Health (CPH) conducted outreach and education with retailers to ensure there was compliance before enforcement began in October 2017.
- Implemented a $150 retail license, renewable annually for each location where retail tobacco product sales or paraphernalia sales are conducted. Separate from any state fees for selling tobacco products.
- CPH will provide signs to all licensees who hold a Retail Tobacco Sales License.
  - Signs must be posted at points of transaction and posted on display cases of tobacco products and tobacco product paraphernalia.
- Department of Public Safety, Division of Police holds authority to enforce sections 2329.12 and 2329.14 of the Columbus City Code and will conduct an inspection. The department issues the aforementioned penalties in response to observed violations.
  - Inspections will be conducted for all locations that hold a Retail Tobacco Sales License and at Temporary Retail Tobacco Product Paraphernalia Sales License events.
  - CPH will contract with a community based organization to conduct at least one underage buy attempt per year.
  - Food sanitarians are already doing inspections at most retail tobacco vendors due to the fact that they also sell food items.
- Civil penalties issued by CPH for businesses who are non-compliant:
  - Advisory letter is sent and informational meeting is held for first violation
    - Gives retailers an opportunity to achieve compliance before levying a fine.
    - The advisory letter will include information about fines for future violations and the importance of maintaining compliance to keep their license in good standing to continue selling tobacco products and paraphernalia.
    - Advisory letter and informational meeting strengthens the due process for additional enforcement steps.
    - When retailers fail compliance checks, CPH will automatically schedule additional checks to verify future compliance or non-compliance.
  - $500 fine for second violation
  - $1000 for third and subsequent offenses
  - After the second and additional violations, CPH will notify the Columbus Police Department of illegal sales witnessed by a sanitarian. Police are then responsible for criminal process.
    - CPH will also begin the process to move forward to license revocation or non-renewal after the third violation.
- Criminal penalties issued by Columbus Police Department who sell to under 21:
o A retailer that sells or distributes without a license is guilty of a first-degree misdemeanor with a fine of up to $1,000 and up to 180 days in jail.
o Subsequent violations subject the offender to lose their ability to obtain a license for up to 5 years.
o Individuals who sell to a person under the age of 21 or fail to check the ID of persons under 30 years of age can be cited for a 4th degree misdemeanor with a $250 fine and up to 30 days in jail.
o Subsequent offenses are charged as a 3rd Degree misdemeanor with a $500 fine and up to 60 days in jail.

- Retail Tobacco Sales License can be denied, suspended or revoked:
o For giving or selling cigarettes, tobacco products or product paraphernalia to anyone under the age or 21.
o If no proof of age is obtained by the tobacco retailer for customers under 30.
o For failing to post Tobacco 21 signs; failing to pay outstanding fines; having the business declared a nuisance by the court, submitting inaccurate or false license application, and failing to be in compliance with applicable city, state and federal codes.

**Products Included in the City of Columbus Tobacco 21 Legislation**

- **Electronic Smoking Devices** including, but not limited to: e-cigarettes, e-cigars, e-pipes, vape pens and e-hookah
- **Paraphernalia** including but not limited to: pipes, rolling papers and electronic cigarette cases
- **Tobacco Products** including, but not limited to: any product that is made from or derived from tobacco and intended for human consumption, or is likely to be consumed using a method such as smoking, chewing, inhaling or ingesting.
- **Tobacco Products** including, but not limited to: cigarettes, cigars, pipe tobacco, chewing tobacco, snuff, snus, electronic smoking devices, filters, rolling papers, pipes and liquid, with or without nicotine, used in electronic smoking devices

**Additional Cities in Central Ohio that have Increased the Age of Purchase**

- **Upper Arlington**
o Upper Arlington was the first city in Ohio to approve an increase for the age of purchase ordinance, passing it on June 8th, 2015 unanimously.
o Cooperated with the Preventing Tobacco Addiction Foundation to support the ordinance.
o Penalties for individuals/businesses who sell to persons under 21:
  - Violations are an unclassified misdemeanor with no accompanying potential for jail time:
    - $150 fine for first offense
    - $250 fine for second offense
    - $500 fine for third offense
  - Both the individual selling/distributing tobacco products as well as their employer will be held accountable for the sale of tobacco products to young adults under 21.
- **Bexley**
  - Voted on and passed unanimously on June 23rd, 2015
  - Penalties for business who sell to under 21:
    - First offense is a 4th degree misdemeanor with a $250 fine and up to 30 days in jail.
    - Subsequent offenses are a 3rd degree misdemeanor with a $500 fine and up to 60 days in jail.

- **Grandview Heights**
  - Passed original ordinance on Sept 21st, 2015 on a 6-1 vote prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to those under the age of 21. This included penalties for the retailer who sells the product, and made underage possession and use by anyone under 21 an unclassified misdemeanor.
    - The penalty for underage possession was removed at the mayor’s objection due to the difficulties involved with enforcement because products could be purchased in other nearby jurisdictions with differing ordinances.
  - Penalties for business who sell to under 21:
    - First offense is a 4th degree misdemeanor, with a $250 fine and up to 30 days in jail.
    - Second offense is a 4th degree misdemeanor with a $500 fine and up to 30 days in jail.
    - Third and subsequent offense is a 3rd degree misdemeanor, with a $500 fine and up to 60 days in jail.

- **New Albany**
  - Voted on and passed unanimously on November 17th, 2015
  - Penalties for business who sell to under 21:
    - First offense is a 4th degree misdemeanor with a $250 fine and up to 30 days in jail.
    - Subsequent offenses are a 3rd degree misdemeanor with a $500 fine and up to 60 days in jail.

- **Powell**
  - Voted on and passed unanimously on June 20th, 2017
  - Penalties for individuals/businesses who sell to persons under 21:
    - Violations are an unclassified misdemeanor with no accompanying potential for jail time:
      - Up to $500 fine for first offense
      - No less than $300 and up to $750 for second offense
      - No less than $750 and up to $1000 for third and subsequent offenses

- **Dublin**
  - Voted on and passed unanimously on December 4th, 2017
  - Code becomes effective March 1st, 2018 and penalties for vendors will be enforced beginning on May 1st, 2018.
  - Dublin is partnering with Franklin County Public Health to administer a licensing system for retailers.
• FCPH is the primary licensing agent and responsible for conducting inspections, the City is responsible for enforcement
  ▪ No retailer can conduct sales of tobacco products or alternative nicotine devices without a valid license issued by the City or on the City’s behalf
  ▪ Cost of license is $150 annually
  ▪ License can be suspended or revoked for multiple violations and subject to $150 reinstatement fee
  ▪ License fees and civil penalties may be collected by the City or credited to the licensing agent as compensation for its services
    o Civil Penalties for individuals/businesses who sell to person under 21:
      ▪ First violation is a $250 fine
      ▪ For second and additional violations within one year of the first is $500

Implementation & Enforcement Questions/Concerns - City of Columbus Public Health – June 13th, 2017 at 2:00pm

  ▪ In attendance from City of Worthington: Chief of Police Jerry Strait, Lieutenant Jennifer Wuertz, Law Director Pamela Fox, and City Manager’s Intern Ethan Barnhardt
  ▪ In attendance from CPH: Environmental Health Division Administrator Keith Krinn, Section Chief Christina Wilson, Director of Public Health Policy Kelli Arthur Hykes, Food Protection Program Supervisor John Richter, and Program Manager Tobacco 21 Melissa McArthur

  ▪ City of CPH sanitarians are already in place and currently inspecting most retailers in Worthington that sell tobacco products under the Food Protection Program.
    o Exception could be House of Cigars
  ▪ Licensing system creates accountability for not only the store clerks who make the sale, but the owners of the retail stores selling tobacco.
    o Civil penalties issued by CPH are cited against the business owner/operator for license violations, creating accountability for the owners of businesses that sell tobacco products.
    o Traditional enforcement of the current MLSA of 18, penalties primarily focus on the store clerk.
  ▪ Civil and Criminal cases for violating Tobacco 21 would be held at the Franklin County Environmental Court
    o It was mentioned in the discussion that the contract between CPH and Worthington could be negotiated for the Mayor’s Court to hear cases, however by default they would be sent to the Environmental Court.
  ▪ Intention would be for Worthington to adopt the City of Columbus’s health code language to maintain consistency with definitions.
    o The state government is currently watching the progress of local jurisdictions and the outcomes from Tobacco 21 legislation. There is interest in raising the MLSA to 21 statewide.
    o By adopting standardized language it would help if/when statewide increased MLSA legislation is passed.
Concern that the licensing system could be invalidated based upon past rulings where it has been decided by the Ohio Supreme Court that municipalities cannot, through local licensing ordinances, prohibit activities permitted by state permits.

- The City of Columbus fully vetted the possibility of invalidating the licensing system. The City Attorney is not concerned that it will become an issue.

**Affected Tobacco Retailers in Worthington**

- House of Cigars
- Kroger
- United Dairy Farmers
- BP
- Marathon
APPENDIX B – TOBACCO 21 SIGNAGE
Ohio currently has above average rates of both high school and adult smoking. It is estimated that 259,000 children now under the age of 18 will eventually die prematurely due to smoking. The direct annual costs due to smoking is approximately $5.64 billion, with another $5.88 billion list due to lost productivity.

To address these public health issues, nine cities in Ohio since 2015 have adopted legislation that restricts the sale of electronic smoking and tobacco products or paraphernalia to individuals under the age of 21. Seven of the nine cities with Tobacco 21 legislation have been in Central Ohio, with the city of Dublin most recently adopting an ordinance in December 2017. As requested by the Worthington City Council, I have reached out to the various municipalities that have adopted a Tobacco 21 ordinance to gain a better understanding of their adoption and implementation process and general thoughts on the efficacy of the policy. I specifically communicated with representatives from Columbus Public Health, Dublin, Grandview Heights, New Albany, and Powell

- **Columbus Public Health**
  - Columbus Public Health began the process of enforcing Tobacco 21 in October of 2017. I reached out Luke Jacobs with Columbus Public Health to provide a status update on their experiences with implementing Tobacco 21 and how the process of enforcement has progressed since October. A letter updating their efforts is attached as Appendix A to this memo.
- **Dublin**
  - Dublin has taken a different approach from the other municipalities, after first introducing legislation, concerns were expressed by Council members regarding the enforcement of the proposed age restriction. These concerns were echoed by Dr. Rob Crane of the Preventing Tobacco Addiction Foundation who initially presented the issue to the Dublin City Council. Staff was directed to explore additional enforcement measures, specifically those that would hold businesses accountable, rather than individual clerks.

  The legislation that was passed in December 2017 authorized the city manager to contract with Franklin County Public Health (FCPH) to implement a licensing system, similar to the City of Columbus’s approach administered by Columbus Public Health. FCPH is the primary licensing agent and responsible for conducting inspections at affected institutions, and the City is responsible for enforcement and issuance of civil penalties. No retailer can conduct sales of tobacco products or alternative nicotine devices without a valid annual license.

  City staff provided notices to all of the affected tobacco retailers in Dublin of the pending legislation and the dates for Council consideration.

  At the time of this memo, implementation has not fully occurred, with the code becoming effective on March 1st, 2018 and penalties for vendors beginning to be enforced on May 1st, 2018.

- **Grandview Heights**
  - Grandview Heights initially passed legislation that included penalties for the retailer who sells the tobacco product and made underage possession and use by anyone under 21 an unclassified misdemeanor. However the penalty for underage possession was removed due to the difficulties involved with enforcement because tobacco products could be purchased in other nearby jurisdictions that lacked the same restrictions.

    I spoke with the Grandview Heights Director of Administration, Patrik Bowman who stated that Grandview only has two locations affected selling tobacco products, a gas station and a beer and wine drive-thru. Before enacting their ordinance they did not reach out to give those retailers advance notice. Since the legislation was passed, there have been no reported issues with enforcement and no citations issued.
### New Albany

- I spoke with the City of New Albany’s Clerk of Council, Jennifer H. Mason and Chief Communications and Marketing Officer, Scott McAfee about their city’s experience enacting Tobacco 21 legislation. The effects of the legislation were limited, with only two businesses, the Duke and Duchess and Turkey Hill, in New Albany that sell tobacco or related products. These businesses were given a phone call to inform them of the pending legislation and New Albany Police Chief Greg Jones visited in person. At the second reading of the legislation, a Turkey Hill representative spoke in opposition, citing the fact that tobacco sales account for approximately 35% of their business.

New Albany engaged with members of the medical community who gave their support to the legislation. This included Dr. Rob Crane, the founder and President of the Preventing Tobacco Addiction Foundation and Clinical Professor at the Ohio State University. His input provided the impetus for the introduction of Tobacco 21 in the city.

Since the legislation was enacted there have been no reported enforcement issues and no business has been found in noncompliance.

### Powell

- I conducted an email interview with Officer Ben Boruchowitz of the Powell Police Department who shared the city’s experiences with enacting Tobacco 21 legislation. Prior to enactment of the legislation, the community was engaged in the process and the City Council spent months researching and soliciting the community for input about increasing the minimum legal sales age. Some businesses expressed opposition and other supported the changes. However, the overwhelming majority of residents and businesses supported the ordinance change.

According to Officer Boruchowitz, the biggest challenge of implementing the legislation was the proper education for business to make sure that they were aware of the change in law and what the law requires them to comply with. He and the City of Powell Director of Communications engaged in a door-to-door information campaign to every business in the city, after passing the ordinance, to hand out an educational flyer (SEE APPENDIX A) with relevant law changes and explained the new law and a sign for retailers to post detailing the new sale age. The city also engaged in a comprehensive social media campaign about Tobacco 21 to increase awareness.

Enforcement has mostly been reactionary by the Powell Police Department, responding to complaints of underage sales or underage tobacco possession.
accordingly. The level of complaints about teens obtaining tobacco has been sporadic, however there has been an increase in complaints regarding teens using vaping equipment and liquid nicotine, but have not been linked to a specific retail establishment. Since the legislation was passed there have been zero observed specific violations by retail establishments.
Tobacco 21 Update Summary
February 2018

Outreach Phase (Feb. – Mar.)

From March 2017 through late summer of 2017 all program activity involved staff outreach to facilities affected by the Tobacco 21 regulation. Outreach staff visited each impacted facility to assist operators with questions and T21 sign placement at proper locations in the facilities. The outreach paved the way for the licensing of facilities in October of 2017.

Successes: The outreach was overall well-received by operators and the direct communication did most likely remove the need for numerous inbound calls and uncertainties with the new regulation. The call volume was overall manageable during this phase.

Challenges: A few operators took excessive time to work with, or disagreed with all or parts of the new regulation causing some difficult communications, but at worst this slowed the process. Overall operators were looking to be compliant.

Licensing Phase (Sept. – Oct.)

The licensing of facilities began in late August 2017 and all applications were due by October 1st of 2017. Facilities were provided materials to be submitted, including an application, supporting documents, and a $150 license fee.

Successes: Due to the need for documents proving the legal owner of each facility (i.e., Vendors license, cigarette dealer’s license) the license process assured correct ownership records at the time of application. This will assist with any further enforcement actions by having accurate owner records.

Challenges: It took most of October to follow up and complete licensing due to late submittals, incomplete applications, and non-filers that had to be sent notices to file for a license.

Compliance Buy Phase (Oct. – ongoing)

One of the provisions of Tobacco 21 is a buy attempt using an underage shopper must be performed at each licensed facility each licensing year. The buyer will be accompanied by a 21 or older partner and will attempt a purchase as a “secret shopper” and document the outcome. For locations where the facility sells to the underage buyer (positive) the facility will receive a warning letter on the first occurrence, all subsequent buys will follow the fine schedule in the regulation. For compliant facility refuses to sell to the underage buyer (negative) they will receive a congratulatory letter stating they were visited and passed.
Compliance Phase (continued)

Below is the compliance data for T21 as of January 12, 2018:
Current # of T21 Facilities: 816
Total # of Buy Attempts: 550
Total # of Negative Buy Attempts: 370
Total # of Positive Buy Attempts: 180
2017 Compliance Rate: 67%

Successes: Utilizing temporary staff of college-age, the program crafted the buy attempt procedures and approach so as to remain anonymous in the facilities and have not had issues with operators identifying buyers. The compliance rate is relatively high given this is the first year of implementation, and is anticipated that future years should show vast improvement with the compliance rate.

Challenges: Given the number of facilities it is anticipated it will take approximately five months to make all first-round buy attempts (Nov. 2017 – Mar. 2018). Given the rate of positive buys (33%) this will now require a second buy attempt at those facilities to assure the location is now compliant. As of this date no monetary penalties have been issued and the process to appeal or contest those fines will involve administrative process and will involve additional oversight by the program.
Dear Tobacco Retailer:
Re: Powell Codified Ordinance: 537.16

The City of Powell recently passed an ordinance restricting the sale of tobacco, tobacco products, alternative nicotine products or rolling papers to persons under 21 years of age. This ordinance is now in effect and subject to enforcement by the Powell Police Department or other authorized law enforcement agency.

In order to assist your business with complying with the change in law, this letter was drafted to provide you the key points of the new law changes that directly affect your business.

- The law prohibits any person or retail location from giving, selling or otherwise distributing any of the following items to any person under 21 years of age:
  1. Cigarettes,
  2. Other Tobacco Products (any product that is made from tobacco, including, but not limited to, a cigar, pipe tobacco, chewing tobacco or snuff);
  3. Alternative Nicotine Products: ("Alternative nicotine product" means an electronic cigarette or any other product or device that consists of or contains nicotine that can be ingested into the body by any means, including, but not limited to, chewing, smoking, absorbing, dissolving or inhaling); and,
  4. Papers used to roll cigarettes.

- The law also requires that your business visibly display a sign that states that giving, selling or otherwise distributing cigarettes, other tobacco products, alternative nicotine products or papers used to roll cigarettes to a person under 21 years of age is prohibited by law.

The Powell Police Department is providing you with signs that you can use to post in a visible place to comply with the new ordinance. You may download additional signs from the City of Powell website as needed at www.cityofpowell.us/police-agency/.

Please feel free to contact the Powell Police Department with any questions or concerns regarding this new law.

Sincerely,

Chief Gary L. Vest
Powell Police Department
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 9, 2018

Date: April 6, 2018
To: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
From: Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager
Subject: City Council Retreat Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Review of the report from the City Council Retreat held in February

RECOMMENDATION
Motion to accept the Retreat Report

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
The City Council held a retreat on February 9 & 10, 2018. The City contracted with Management Partners to provide facilitation services for the retreat. Those services included individual meetings with City Council members and meetings with the City Manager, Assistant City Manager and department directors to discuss current issues and gather background for the retreat. The actual retreat occurred during the evening of February 9th and during the daytime on February 10th. Management Partners has provided a report on the retreat activities which documents the discussion that occurred.

ATTACHMENTS
Retreat Report from Management Partners
Management Partners was hired to assist the City of Worthington by facilitating a Council workshop. The purpose of the workshop was twofold: 1) to allow new and incumbent Council members to engage candidly with one another about their individual concerns and priorities, and 2) to help the City Council, city manager and the leadership team establish priorities for current and future years. The facilitated work sessions were held on February 9 and 10, 2018.

**Methodology**
Management Partners began by meeting with council members, the city manager, assistant city manager and department directors individually to understand their issues, concerns, and desired outcomes. The interview themes were sorted into two categories—operational and project-related issues—and provided a basis for Council’s discussion about priorities during the second day of the facilitated work sessions. A copy of interview themes, as revised during the work session, is included as Attachment A.

Management Partners worked with the president of the City Council and city manager to develop an agenda that would promote team building during the first session and priority-setting during the second. Additionally, the Worthington city manager and assistant city manager developed an environmental scan, so council members had common data and information about state, regional, and national trends and influences; demographic and socio-economic information; school enrollment trends and projections; workforce data; residential and commercial real estate information; General Fund, Capital Improvement Fund and other fiscal health indicators; and a summary of current city issues.

**Summary of Outcomes – Friday, February 9**
During the work session held on Friday evening, council members discussed the key issues presented in the Worthington Environmental Scan, norms for governance and team work and
consensus building. The results of these discussions are included below. The environmental scan is included as Appendix 1.

**Key Issues**
The environmental scan included four slides that categorized important city issues four ways:

- “On the Plate,”
- “Underway,”
- “Other Organizations,” and
- “Yet to Come.”

Issues “On the Plate” included those that are either currently underway or could become active soon. In addition to the issues identified by staff, council members identified other issues. These included the need for age-friendly policies, revenue diversification, Home Rule erosion by the state, debt issuance, and policy review and updates, including fee schedules.

During this discussion, council members affirmed the issues listed in the environmental scan as already “Underway” and discussed “Issues Yet to Come” [excluding the United Methodist Children’s Home (UMCH)/National Church Residences site and the comprehensive plan] and issues from other organizations. There was consensus that the projects or issues below should be included in future work plans and budgets.

**Issues Yet to Come**
- Anthem site redevelopment
- Central Ohio Transit Agency (COTA) turnaround space and improving service gaps
- Electric service aggregation
- Community Relations Commission’s recommendations for nondiscrimination policies
- Age-friendly/livable communities
- Railroad quiet zones study

**Issues from Other Organizations**
- School facilities levy
- Swim Inc. outdoor pool upgrade
- Ohio State University Airport Master Plan

**Norms for Effective Governance and Teambuilding**
After reviewing the environmental scan, workshop participants discussed norms for effective governance. To guide the discussion, council members reviewed a publication from the Institute for Local Government entitled, *Attributes of Exceptional Councils* as well as a draft list of 17 council expectations created in 2008 and revised at work sessions in 2011 and 2012 (see Appendices 2 and 3).
Using these resources, the council members reached consensus about the following characteristics and actions related to norms for effective governance:

- Keep the good of the community above personal agendas.
- Communicate clearly, honestly and respectfully with the public and members of City Council.
- City Council members speak as a unified voice, reflecting the decisions that result from a vote of the majority.
- Council members will support the decisions of the body as documented in the public record.
- Consensus is desirable, but not necessary.

Additionally, council members indicated they would like to revisit the list of expectations and make further refinements to it at a later date. Council members finished the evening by discussing elements of teamwork and how they can work together more effectively to address the priorities of the City.

**Summary of Outcomes – Saturday, February 10**

During the second day of the workshop City Council members, along with the city manager and the leadership team, discussed the specific issues summarized below. For each, topic, discussion points have been captured. There was consensus among the City Council members for incorporating these issue areas into current and future work plans.

**Community Visioning and Strategic Planning**

Include the following elements and tools of strategic community visioning:

- Develop a community-wide perspective
- Conduct a needs assessment
- Include an educational component
- Use statistically valid surveys
- Engage a large part of the community (at least 80% of Worthington population) using multiple avenues:
  - Social media and technology
  - Neighborhood networking
  - Community values census
- Provide Council updates to share what members have learned from talking to residents

**United Methodist Children’s Home site**

- What are the desired uses for the site? (Site is currently zoned for commercial)
  - Attract commercial/mixed use along High Street
  - Develop park amenity/green space and tree buffer (need to determine appropriate size)
  - Protect the Tucker Creek area
  - Prepare density analyses scenarios
- What is the potential for revenue generation?
Communication

- Develop a strategic communications plan for two-way contact
  - Informs decision-making
  - Leverages various methods to explain the what and why of Council decisions
  - Minimizes the use of jargon
  - Provides regular contact
  - Is concise and easy to understand
  - Is modeled after best practice customer service approaches
  - Uses story-telling
  - Provides timely and purposeful response to the public
- Active outreach
  - Use “blue signs” on sites/visibility/accessibility
  - Use video messaging and media
  - Use social media
- Preference for human-to-human interactions; minimal use of automated phone trees

Sustainability

Develop policies and practices that:
- Minimize the carbon footprint
- Address design issues
  - Innovative and creative approaches
  - Limits erosion, runoff
  - Solar power
  - LED lighting
- Promote proactive preventative maintenance, considering life cycle costs and replacement
- Reject “throw away” mentality
- Reduce sprawl
- Provide incentives for “green” equipment and energy consumption within departments
- Promote “complete streets” (pedestrian, bike, transit)
- Get people out of their cars
- Promote zero waste (e.g., composting or plastic bag ban)

Another issue that was discussed was age-friendly/livable communities. It was acknowledged that this area has implications for how the City promotes quality of life amenities for residents of all ages, but not achieve consensus as a priority.

Age-friendly/Livable Communities

- Establish creative aging-in-place zoning regulations for single-floor living [including accessory use dwellings (AUD)]
- Use universal design
- Provide accessibility for all abilities
- Emphasize walkability
- Identify services and community support
**Conclusion**

The Worthington City Council endorsed staff’s list of issues and projects and identified several other ideas for inclusion in short- and long-term planning. Areas of specific interest to the Council included community visioning and strategic planning, the UMCH site, communications strategies, and sustainability practices.
Attachment A – Summary of City Council Interview Themes

The following is a summary of key themes from Management Partners’ interviews with the members of City Council on January 8 and 9, 2018. These themes were reviewed and revised by City Council members during their work session on February 9 and 10.

**Operational Issues**
- Rules of conduct
- Ground rules/process for Council discussions
- Teamwork and consensus building
- Getting to know each other and discussing Council members’ real issues
- How to work together as a group
- Process for advancing new initiatives and ideas
  - Rationale for decision making
  - Transparency and clear messaging/Letting residents know that the Council and City administration are listening to them
- City revenue/fiscal sustainability
- Policy for carryover balance; how much/what percentage
- Worthington branding

**Project Related Issues**
- United Methodist Children’s Home (UMCH) site
- McCord Park
- Community connectivity and Complete Streets
- Economic development; retention and new development
  - West Wilson Bridge Road area
  - Anthem site
- Bike and pedestrian connectivity, sidewalks/Complete Streets
- Outdoor pool enhancements/Swim Inc.
- Summer activities for teens
- Affordable housing options
- Sustainability
- Age-friendly/livable communities policies
- Community electric aggregation
- Re-do of the Worthington comprehensive plan/Comprehensive community visioning
  - Land use policy for new and infill development, including tear downs
  - Historic district preservation
  - Urban design guidelines to prevent new development from eroding the Worthington brand
  - Mixed use and density/human-scale development
  - Walkability and getting people out of automobiles
  - High-touch resident engagement approach
Global/National Influences

• Global Connections and Issues
• Trust in Government
• National Politics Manifested Locally
• Technology Change in Everything
• Federal Funding/Intergovernmental Systems
• Changing Leadership
• Work at Home/Change in Office Environment
• Aging Population
Columbus Trust Study

83%
68%
65%
56%
42%
32%

Trust in political leaders
Trust in mass media
Trust in American people

Source: Gallup, Inc.
Columbus Trust Study

Honesty & Ethical Standards: Occupations

- Firefighters: 80%
- Nurses: 68%
- Farmers: 62%
- Medical doctors: 57%
- Police: 54%
- Bankers: 35%
- Funeral directors: 34%
- Financial advisors: 30%
- Real estate agents: 19%
- Lawyers: 17%
- Journalists: 16%
- Auto mechanics: 15%
- Local government officials: 13%
- Insurance salespeople: 12%
- State government officials: 10%
- Car salespeople: 7%

Percent that say honesty and ethical standards of people in these fields are “high” or “very high” are indicated.

Skeptical view of business people and public officials.
Global/National Influences

- Global Connections and Issues
- Trust in Government
- National Politics Manifested Locally
- Technology Change in Everything
- Federal Funding/Intergovernmental Systems
- Changing Leadership
- Work at Home/Change in Office Environment
- Aging Population
State/Regional Trends

State
- Lack of Support
- Funding Decreases
- Political Changes
  - ODOT/Jobs Ohio

Regional
- Growing Population & Economy
- Smart Columbus
- High Capacity Transit
Population – Age Distribution

- Total = 14,155
- 52% females
- 48% males
- Median age = 43.1 years
- 25% under 18 years
- 20% 65 years and older
Housing Characteristics

Type of Housing

- Owner-occupied 80%
- Renter-occupied 20%

Length of Time in Housing Unit

- Moved in 2010 or later 33%
- Moved in 2000-2009 32%
- Moved in 1990 to 1999 16%
- Moved in 1980 to 1989 10%
- Moved in 1979 or earlier 9%
Median Household Income

Household Income

- Median household income has increased by 6.4% from 2010 to 2014.
- The percentage of lower and middle class households is decreasing.
School Growth

• School enrollment is 10,200 students
• Enrollment over the last five years has increased by 1,000 students.
• Enrollment over next five years is projected to increase by an additional 800 students.
• Worthington Schools is in the Top 10 in enrollment growth in Ohio
Economic Trends

Workforce

Increasing percentage of population ‘aging-out’ of workforce.
Residential Real Estate 2017

• Residential sales: 462
• Median Days on Market: 7
• Average Sale Price: $263,527
  – High Sale Price: $813,000
  – Low Sale Price: $62,000
• Average SqFt: 1,717
• Average Price/SqFt: $152

Buyers still looking for walkability, character, strong schools. Willing to give up finished basements, big closets, 2-car garages, big yards, etc. for location.
Direct Vacant Rates Comparison
High Street / Huntley Road / Wilson Bridge Road
Source: COCIE / Xceligent

*87% of vacancy in High Street corridor is the Anthem property
General & Capital Improvements Fund

- **General**
- **Capital Improvements**

Yearly Totals:
- **2008**: $2,593,458
- **2009**: $2,348,397
- **2010**: $1,689,206
- **2011**: $2,941,562
- **2012**: $5,070,388
- **2013**: $8,631,597
- **2014**: $10,245,729
- **2015**: $11,250,077
- **2016**: $11,628,193
- **2017**: $13,491,664

Additional Budgetary Numbers:
- **2008**: $9,292,551
- **2009**: $8,279,098
- **2010**: $7,405,460
- **2011**: $6,659,029
- **2012**: $6,862,172
- **2013**: $5,603,565
- **2014**: $6,147,409
- **2015**: $6,335,112
- **2016**: $7,139,921
- **2017**: $8,606,289

Worthington

Founded 1803
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### Fiscal Health

#### Fund Balance as a % of Expenditures

1. City of Dublin 79%
2. City of Gahanna 78%
3. City of New Albany 77%
4. City of Westerville 66%
5. City of Powell 63%
6. City of Grandview Heights 63%
7. City of Upper Arlington 57%
8. City of Hilliard 47%
9. City of Worthington 45%
10. City of Grove City 30%
11. City of Whitehall 25%
12. City of Bexley 17%
## Fiscal Health

**Revenue 2008 - 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>Interest Income</th>
<th>EMS Fees</th>
<th>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</th>
<th>Parks &amp; Recreation</th>
<th>State Controlled</th>
<th>Property Tax</th>
<th>Income Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9.26%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>60.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
<td>64.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>64.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>69.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td>69.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>71.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
<td>73.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>9.78%</td>
<td>75.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>75.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiscal Health

Comparative Municipal Cost

Household Income: $100,000  Property Value: $200,000  Water Use: 1,000 ft³/mo.
Live & work in same community
Issues “On the Plate”

- Energy Efficiency
- Railroad Quiet Zones
- Job Loss
- School Facilities
- Bike/Ped Master Plan
- SwimInc
- Nondiscrimination
- National Church Residences
- Budget & Fund Balance
- Murals
- Wilson Bridge Road
- Holiday Inn
- SR-161 Recommendations
- Electric Aggregation
- Market Day
- OSU Airport Master Plan
- Small Cell Technology
- Staff Turnover
- NE Gateway
- McCord Park Plan
- COTA Turnaround
- Strategic/Comp Plan
- UMCH
- Wilson Bridge Road
- Holiday Inn
- Market Day
- NE Gateway
- McCord Park Plan
- COTA Turnaround
- Strategic/Comp Plan
- UMCH
Already Underway

- Energy Efficiency
- Bike/Ped Master Plan
- Job Loss
- Budget & Fund Balance
- Holiday Inn
- Market Day
- NE Gateway
- McCord Park Plan
- Staff Turnover
- Wilson Bridge Road
- Electric Aggregation
- Anthem Redevelopment
- National Church Residences
- School Facilities
- Nondiscrimination
- SwimInc
- OSU Airport Master Plan
- SR-161 Recommendations
- Murals
- Small Cell Technology
- UMCH
- Strategic/Comp Plan
- COTA Turnaround
## Issues from Other Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Quiet Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Church Residences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Airport Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Bridge Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-161 Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Aggregation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Gateway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cell Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTA Turnaround</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic/Comp Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.A.II. - City Council Retreat Report
Issues Yet to Come

- Energy Efficiency
- Railroad Quiet Zones
- Bike/Ped Master Plan
- Job Loss
- School Facilities
- National Church Residences
- SwimInc
- Nondiscrimination
- Wilson Bridge Road
- Budget & Fund Balance
- Anthem Redevelopment
- Murals
- Electric Aggregation
- OSU Airport Master Plan
- Railroad Quiet Zones
- Electric Aggregation
- Staff Turnover
- Market Day
- OSU Airport Master Plan
- NE Gateway
- Small Cell Technology
- UMCH
- COTA Turnaround
- Strategic/Comp Plan
- Wilson Bridge Road
- Electric Aggregation
- Staff Turnover
- Market Day
- NE Gateway
- Small Cell Technology
- UMCH
- COTA Turnaround
- Strategic/Comp Plan
Issues “On the Plate”

- Energy Efficiency
- Railroad Quiet Zones
- Job Loss
- School Facilities
- Bike/Ped Master Plan
- SwimInc
- Nondiscrimination
- National Church Residences
- Budget & Fund Balance
- Murals
- Wilson Bridge Road
- Holiday Inn
- SR-161 Recommendations
- Electric Aggregation
- Market Day
- OSU Airport Master Plan
- Small Cell Technology
- Staff Turnover
- NE Gateway
- McCord Park Plan
- Strategic/Comp Plan
- UMCH
- COTA Turnaround
Leading public organizations and governing with colleagues on a council is a challenging art of community service. The Institute recognizes that many aspects of leadership and governance are not intuitive. This piece is intended to provide councilmembers and city managers insight into the attributes of exceptional councils as well as provide practical tips to help them become exceptional.

1. Exceptional councils develop a sense of team – a partnership with the city manager to govern and manage the city

The mayor, councilmembers and city manager see themselves and work as a team as they undertake a series of tasks to further their common purpose. The individual team members work in a coordinated and collaborative manner with a high degree of respect, trust and openness. The team values diversity in style and perspective. The team thinks and acts strategically as it examines issues/situations and decides on a course of action serving their city's mission and goals.

KEY CHARACTERISTICS

- Successfully transition from candidate to a member of the council.
- Become a champion of the city. Make decisions based on the needs and interests of the community at-large / the greater good.
- Develop, communicate and support policy goals and council decisions.
- Demonstrate a willingness to work collaboratively (as a team) and have a citywide perspective.

BEST PRACTICE TIPS

- Build capacity to create a more effective team. The governance team (mayor, councilmembers and city manager) should get to know each other; how each person approaches issues, decision making style and so on. This can be accomplished at annual meetings or workshops throughout the year.
- In the event that councilmembers disagree, clear ground rules (norms of behavior and practice) can help quell acrimony before it becomes a problem. It's important to remember that trust is built around understanding and respect, not necessarily agreement.
2. Exceptional councils have clear roles and responsibilities that are understood and adhered.

Exceptional councils understand their role is to serve as policy maker - to represent the values, beliefs and priorities of their community while serving in the community’s best interest. They carry out a variety of responsibilities including: developing and adopting a vision for the city; focusing and aligning plans, policies, agreements and budgets in furtherance of this vision; and holding themselves and the city manager accountable for results.

Exceptional councils understand that the city manager is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the city. The city manager is responsible for undertaking and accomplishing the policy objectives of the council. Exceptional councils recognize the subject matter expertise of staff and utilize their knowledge and experience to guide and inform decision making.

**KEY CHARACTERISTICS**

- Understand the role of local government and their responsibilities.
- Know their role- to set vision and policy, avoid micromanagement.
- Councilmembers should strive to be informed about the issues facing the city and be prepared to ask questions of staff and each other.

**BEST PRACTICE TIPS**

Create a shared understanding of the city manager’s role and the council’s expectations to optimize the working relationships. This shared understanding is informed by local charter and ordinance provisions that provide the overall framework for the relationship. The council should make time to have conversations during retreats and or study sessions to define and/or reveal and refine their role and responsibilities. Since role clarity between the city council and city management is critical to mutual success, having clear protocols helps avoid misunderstandings.
3. Exceptional councils honor the relationship with staff and each other

Exceptional councils understand that a good working relationship with staff is vital for the city to be run successfully. Exceptional councils treat each other and staff with dignity and respect. They act with civility and a high level of professional decorum. Councilmembers build trust by not playing the “gotcha game” and strive to have a no secrets, no surprises approach as an operating norm. Finally, they respect the diversity of styles and perspectives among their colleagues and staff and are open to new ideas.

**KEY CHARACTERISTICS**

- Councilmembers have the ability to respectfully disagree (to disagree without being disagreeable). They are able to leave it at the dais; debates are about policy, not personality.
- Exceptional councilmembers reflect positive decorum/model of leadership by providing respectful tone with colleagues.
- Establish a set of behaviors ahead of time, potentially documented in a code of conduct, to help promote civility and respect.

**BEST PRACTICE TIPS**

Set council priorities and strategic goals at an annual meeting; these goals and priorities are a tool to guide the city manager and staff on where to focus their efforts. This annual meeting provides time for the council to reflect on community priorities as well as offer an opportunity to discuss their decorum and their relationship among each other and the relationship between the city manager/staff and the council.

4. Exceptional councils routinely conduct effective meetings

Open and public meetings are central to democratic decision-making. Exceptional councils master the art of effective meetings. They develop and adhere to meeting protocols and processes. They spend time planning and organizing the agenda with the aim of having a more focused meeting. They allocate the council’s time and energy appropriately (focused on the council’s role and responsibilities) and meeting short- and long-term priorities. They honor the public’s participation and engagement and they generally start on time and are held during reasonable hours.

Exceptional councils use public meetings not only for their intended purpose, information sharing and decision-making,
but they also use the meeting to demonstrate respect and civility for each other, staff and the public. Exceptional councilmembers prepare in advance of the meeting, remain focused on the city goals and objectives and mindful of their role and responsibilities.

**BEST PRACTICE TIPS**

Develop and adopt (with regular reviews and updates), guidelines for conducting meetings and making decisions. These governance protocols typically address meeting procedures (agenda preparation, how to put issues on the agenda, debate and voting procedures (parliamentary rules) and standards of decorum (civility)). As part of a regular self-assessment, councils should evaluate their meetings and their effectiveness and adjust behavior and practices for better results.

5. Exceptional councils hold themselves and the city accountable

Exceptional councils operate openly, ethically and work to engage the community in a myriad of decisions impacting the prosperity and well-being of their community. Toward that end, exceptional councils consistently provide short- and long-term strategic direction and goals, as well as provide budget, program and policy oversight.

Exceptional councils hold themselves accountable for the conduct, behavior and effectiveness of the council. They establish clear priorities and goals and hold the city manager accountable for results. And finally, they embrace accountability as a process and tool to calibrate ongoing efforts to address and meet policy and program objectives.

**KEY CHARACTERISTICS**

- Councilmembers operate ethically and with integrity.
- Councils conduct team building / goal setting exercise to track progress towards mutually agreed upon goals.
- Councils taking responsibility for the results (good and bad).
- Councils celebrate success.
- Councilmembers hold themselves responsible for adhering to operating protocols and codes of conduct.

**BEST PRACTICE TIPS**

Annually evaluate council and city manager performance toward achieving the city's priorities and goals (consider having this be part of an annual goal setting meeting). Council should consider assessing its own behavior and effectiveness as part of its annual self-assessment.
6. Exceptional councils have members who practice continuous personal learning and development

Governance is not intuitive. In addition, the policy and economic environment impacting cities are ever changing. Exceptional councils continually provide the opportunity to build their knowledge and skills, to enhance their understanding of key issues, increase their awareness of best practices and sharpen their leadership and governance skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay informed on key issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain key insights and knowledge on all aspects of governing, from budgets to plans and everything in between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to listen is sometimes more important than learning to give a speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEST PRACTICE TIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek out national, state and local professional growth and educational opportunities. These opportunities can focus on the nuts and bolts of governing to helping you gain valuable information and/or insights on key policy issues facing your city. In addition, city run orientations for newly elected officials provide a good way to acclimate new members to the council’s norms and protocols as well as the budget and key policy issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

COUNCIL EXPECTATIONS
(2008 List Reviewed/Revised in 2011 Novak Work Session)
*Items in bold added at 2012 Work Session*

1. Keep the community good above personal agendas/advancement.

2. Civility.
   a. Practice good meeting behaviors.
   b. Disagree agreeably.
   c. Be honest.
   d. Offer our ideas.
   e. Communicate with one another on a one-on-one basis to get to know each other better and understand our distinctive philosophies and values.

3. Mutual respect.
   a. Be open to new ideas and solutions.
   b. Attention – listen when others are talking.
   c. Listen to understand.
   d. Don’t convey impatience.
   e. Respect other perspectives.
   f. Don’t be dismissive.
   g. Try to really understand another point of view.
   h. Assume a base level of knowledge on the part of your colleagues.

4. Be prepared for meetings.
   a. Do what personal learning you need to do in advance to achieve clarity about issues and to understand the rationale behind them.
   b. Put in time beyond Council meetings.

5. Disciplined meetings.
   a. Meaningful discussions.

   a. Council comments should be short and without repetition.
   b. Supporting comments are okay but be disciplined.
   c. Do not repeat staff work.
      - Staff must frame issues when introducing them for Council consideration.

Organizational Resources Group
d. Don’t assume it is your job to educate colleagues at public meetings.

e. Don’t make a point with the press for personal advantage or grandstanding.

7. Seek agreement on priorities and values.

8. Be clear about the decision-making process.
   a. Be willing to work together for consensus – but recognize that ultimately the Council will vote.
   b. Staff should track items that are in progress.
   c. When decisions are made, move on.
      - Understand there is an appropriate time to revisit issues, such as budget time or during goal setting.

9. Focus on policy and setting overall direction for the city.
   a. Resolve not to deal with minutia unless it is relative to the decision you have to make.
   b. If “minutia” is simply information you would like to know, get that information outside the public meeting forum.

10. Be willing to deal with pet issues outside of chambers.
    a. Bring issues to the manager outside public session and trust Matt’s judgment for appropriate disposition.
    b. Deal with immediately.
    c. Bring back to the Council for direction.
    d. “We will get to it” – allow staff to integrate into existing priorities.

11. Be clear when speaking for yourself vs. speaking on behalf of Council.

12. Work through the City Manager.
    a. Do not go below the director level; but, Council can use their judgment about who to call (manager vs. department head).
       - Best to call staff for strictly information.
       - Call manager when seeking a recommendation or to engage in discussion.
    b. Department heads will keep manager informed.
       - Manager trusts department head judgment of when to bring him into discussions, etc.

13. Treat all constituents who come to Council meetings with respect.
    a. No one should fear coming to a Council meeting.
14. Treat staff with respect at Council meetings.
   a. Avoid traps and surprises.
   b. Staff must be prepared.

15. Honesty.

16. Forgiveness.

17. Humor.
   a. Maintain a sense of levity.
   b. Remember humor doesn’t always translate well – especially in written communications.

18. No personal attacks.
   a. Disagreement isn’t personal so don’t make it that way by making it or taking it personally.

MDJORG
11/3/12
Department of Finance
March 2018 Financial Report

Quick Facts

- Income tax revenues are above March 2017 collections by $43,274 or 2.61%; Year to date collections are below 2017 YTD by $-446,592 or -6.87%.
- Income tax collections are below estimates by $-420,283 or -6.49% as of March 31, 2018.
- Refunds issued in March totaled $42,415 with year to date refunds totaling $83,716.

Income Tax Collections

- Income tax revenues are above March 2017 collections by $43,274 or 2.61%; Year to date collections are below 2017 YTD by $-446,592 or -6.87%.
- Income tax collections are below estimates by $-420,283 or -6.49% as of March 31, 2018.
- Refunds issued in March totaled $42,415 with year to date refunds totaling $83,716.

Income Tax Revenue by Account Type

For March of 2018:
- Withholding Accounts – 88.92% of collections
- Individual Accounts – 3.59% of collections
- Net Profit Accounts – 7.49% of collections

For March of 2017:
- Withholding Accounts –88.42% of collections
- Individual Accounts – 3.43% of collections
- Net Profit Accounts – 8.15% of collections

First Quarter Tax Collections

First Quarter Income Tax Refunds
Highlights & Trends for March (continued)

March 2018 Year to Date General Fund Revenue

- Municipal Income Tax: 64.77%
- Property Tax: 19.67%
- Local Government: 1.18%
- Interest Income: 1.38%
- Fines & Forfeitures: 0.41%
- Township Fire Service: 2.60%
- Community Center Membership/Programs: 5.95%
- EMS Transport: 1.67%
- All Other Revenue: 2.37%

March 2018 Year to Date General Fund Expenses

- Planning & Building: 8.72%
- General Government: 24.92%
- Fire Operations: 23.21%
- Parks & Recreation: 23.47%
- Police Operations: 17.14%
- Service/Engineering Department: 2.55%
- Notable Initiatives & Activities

- Fund balances for all funds increased from $26,697,378 on January 1, 2018 to $28,148,218 as of March 31, 2018, with year to date revenues exceeding expenditures for all funds by $1,450,840.
- For the month of March, fund balances for all funds increased from $27,016,938 as of March 1, 2018 to $28,148,218 as of March 31, 2018, with revenues exceeding expenditures by $1,131,280.
- Year to date revenues for all funds are below 2017 revenues by $3,604,261 and above estimates by $227,957. The January 2017 receipt of $3,960,000 in bond proceeds is the reason for the significant variance between 2017 and 2018.
- Expenditures for all funds tracked at 88.93% of anticipated expenditure levels for the month of March.
- The General Fund balance increased from $13,491,664 as of January 1, 2018 to $13,933,742 as of March 31, 2018, with revenues exceeding expenditures by $442,079.
- For the month of March, the General Fund balance increased from $13,407,558 on March 1, 2018 to $13,933,742 as of March 31, 2018, with revenues exceeding expenditures by $526,185.
- General Fund revenues are below 2017 revenues by $199,040 and below estimates by $212,188 or -2.76%
Financial Tracking

### First Quarter Revenue to Expenditures - All Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$8,143,463</td>
<td>$8,113,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$6,779,747</td>
<td>$6,622,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$8,984,981</td>
<td>$7,562,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$9,590,184</td>
<td>$8,526,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$10,179,110</td>
<td>$9,293,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$10,725,036</td>
<td>$9,743,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$8,919,016</td>
<td>$8,909,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$10,700,344</td>
<td>$9,032,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$13,925,506</td>
<td>$10,232,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$10,321,245</td>
<td>$8,870,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Cash Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$5,793,005</td>
<td>$5,806,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,652,776</td>
<td>$5,390,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$6,058,745</td>
<td>$5,524,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$6,305,068</td>
<td>$6,062,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$6,671,087</td>
<td>$6,243,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$6,454,686</td>
<td>$6,192,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5,389,368</td>
<td>$5,835,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$6,743,851</td>
<td>$6,319,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$7,675,540</td>
<td>$6,843,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$7,476,501</td>
<td>$7,034,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 2018
Cash Reconciliation

Total Fund Balances: $28,148,218.08

Depository Balances:

- General Account: $7,749,947.47
- EMS Lock Box: 2,124,773.58
  Total Bank Balances: $9,874,721.05

Investment Accounts:

- Certificates of Deposits: $6,914,977.16
- Certificates of Deposits (EMS) 2,094,000.00
- Star Ohio/Star Plus 1,740,151.90
- Fifth Third MMKT/CDs 7,451,815.13
- Bicentennial Fund CD 71,022.84
  Total Investment Accounts: $18,271,967.03

Petty Cash/Change Fund: 1,530.00

Total Treasury Balance as of March 31, 2018 $28,148,218.08

Total Interest Earnings as of March 31, 2018 $86,449.75

Average Interest Earnings 1.71%

Debt Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuance</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Principal Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015 Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>December 2021</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>$3,040,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017 Various Purpose Bonds</td>
<td>December 2032</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>$3,745,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>OPWC 0% Loan – ADA Ramps</td>
<td>December 2028</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$78,100.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>OPWC 0% Loan – Kenyonbrook</td>
<td>December 2045</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$561,747.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Principal Debt Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,424,848.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of Worthington
#### Fund Summary Report
#### as of March 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>1/1/2018 Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual Revenue</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual Expenses</th>
<th>03/31/2018 Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>$13,491,664</td>
<td>$7,476,500.54</td>
<td>$7,034,421.82</td>
<td>$13,933,742.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>$259,832.83</td>
<td>$232,351.23</td>
<td>$31,054.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>14,156</td>
<td>$37,959.41</td>
<td>$29,563.22</td>
<td>$8,396.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>87,817</td>
<td>$12,395.31</td>
<td>$18,662.59</td>
<td>$81,549.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>66,268</td>
<td>$11,163.82</td>
<td>$20,438.23</td>
<td>$56,993.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>596,983</td>
<td>$97,375.77</td>
<td>$177,765.06</td>
<td>$516,593.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>71,890</td>
<td>$539.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$72,430.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>167,714</td>
<td>$31,214.10</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$198,927.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>48,817</td>
<td>$152.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$48,969.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>234,893</td>
<td>$2,418.00</td>
<td>$1,782.10</td>
<td>$235,528.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>561,016</td>
<td>$7,892.75</td>
<td>$7,204.81</td>
<td>$561,703.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>15,884</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$15,883.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>7,480</td>
<td>$12,880.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$20,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>427,916</td>
<td>$412,435.85</td>
<td>$175,062.51</td>
<td>$665,289.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>27,654</td>
<td>$333.20</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$27,987.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>71,536</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$71,536.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>375,149</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$375,148.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>8,606,289</td>
<td>$1,689,124.56</td>
<td>$1,082,228.84</td>
<td>$9,213,184.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>1,063,223</td>
<td>$55,166.56</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,118,389.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>278,448</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$278,447.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>82,141</td>
<td>$6,088.00</td>
<td>$77,121.00</td>
<td>$11,107.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>$802.77</td>
<td>$791.28</td>
<td>$2,085.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>11,705</td>
<td>$15,632.36</td>
<td>$176.69</td>
<td>$27,160.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>285,098</td>
<td>$85,422.60</td>
<td>$12,835.53</td>
<td>$357,685.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>16,460</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$16,460.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75,489.17</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$75,489.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13,936.52</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,936.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16,488.37</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$16,488.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds</td>
<td>$26,697,378.45</td>
<td>$10,321,244.54</td>
<td>$8,870,404.91</td>
<td>$28,148,218.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Worthington, Ohio General Fund Overview as of March 31, 2018

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Revised Budget</th>
<th>2018 Y-T-D Estimates</th>
<th>2018 Y-T-D Actual</th>
<th>Variance as % of</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Income Tax</td>
<td>$21,006,562</td>
<td>$20,635,497</td>
<td>$5,178,432</td>
<td>$4,842,205</td>
<td>($336,226)</td>
<td>-6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$2,628,416</td>
<td>$2,783,850</td>
<td>$1,391,925</td>
<td>$1,470,345</td>
<td>$78,420</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>$351,928</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$66,568</td>
<td>$1,088</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance Tax</td>
<td>$215,776</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>$157,159</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$49,951</td>
<td>($18,050)</td>
<td>-12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Membership</td>
<td>$1,263,448</td>
<td>$1,455,500</td>
<td>$363,875</td>
<td>$444,887</td>
<td>($80,812)</td>
<td>-22.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Transport</td>
<td>$671,816</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$168,750</td>
<td>$124,743</td>
<td>($44,007)</td>
<td>-6.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Revenue</td>
<td>$1,243,865</td>
<td>$1,203,794</td>
<td>$201,164</td>
<td>$176,914</td>
<td>($24,250)</td>
<td>-1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$27,843,417</td>
<td>$27,988,642</td>
<td>$7,688,688</td>
<td>$7,476,501</td>
<td>($212,188)</td>
<td>-2.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Revised Budget</th>
<th>2018 Y-T-D Estimates</th>
<th>2018 Y-T-D Actual</th>
<th>Variance as % of</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Building</td>
<td>$650,913</td>
<td>$777,207</td>
<td>$194,302</td>
<td>$161,212</td>
<td>($33,090)</td>
<td>82.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$6,639,741</td>
<td>$7,155,413</td>
<td>$1,577,542</td>
<td>($430,556)</td>
<td>78.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>$6,066,468</td>
<td>$6,786,356</td>
<td>$1,469,282</td>
<td>($227,307)</td>
<td>86.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$4,444,601</td>
<td>$4,893,143</td>
<td>$1,084,985</td>
<td>($138,301)</td>
<td>88.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Operations</td>
<td>$5,589,964</td>
<td>$6,102,395</td>
<td>$1,485,822</td>
<td>($39,777)</td>
<td>97.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Engineering Department</td>
<td>$2,087,607</td>
<td>$2,679,803</td>
<td>$551,876</td>
<td>($118,074)</td>
<td>82.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$25,487,293</td>
<td>$28,394,316</td>
<td>$6,330,720</td>
<td>($987,205)</td>
<td>86.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Excess of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Revised Budget</th>
<th>2018 Y-T-D Estimates</th>
<th>2018 Y-T-D Actual</th>
<th>Variance as % of</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>$11,628,193</td>
<td>$13,491,663</td>
<td>$13,491,663</td>
<td>$13,491,663</td>
<td>$1,863,471</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended Appropriations (98.0%)</td>
<td>$567,886</td>
<td>$568,126</td>
<td>$142,032</td>
<td>($1 - Income Tax budget based on individual monthly projections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures versus Prior Year Enc</td>
<td>$492,655</td>
<td>$1,647,970</td>
<td>$411,992.46</td>
<td>$703,702</td>
<td>$2 - revenue budgets are based on semi-annual payments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Balance</td>
<td>$13,491,663</td>
<td>$12,005,905</td>
<td>$11,994,147</td>
<td>$13,933,742</td>
<td>($938,807)</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - All other revenue budgets are spread equally over each month.

All expenditure budgets are spread equally over each month.

---

Department of Finance – March 2018
STAFF MEMORANDUM
City Council Meeting – April 9, 2018

Date: April 5, 2018
To: Worthington City Council
From: Matthew H. Greeson, City Manager
Subject: Community Visioning and Strategic Planning

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
City Council has discussed an interest in community visioning and strategic planning. This agenda item provides time for Council to discuss this topic and determine next steps.

RECOMMENDATION
Revision and discussion of themes outlined in my April 2, 2018 memorandum, establishment of a budget and development of a Request for Qualifications from strategic planning consultants.

BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION
At its first meeting of this year, City Council expressed an interest in community visioning and strategic planning. It was more fully discussed at the City Council Retreat held in February. Since that time, I have met with each City Council member to discuss the topic, held a discussion with department directors, reviewed literature on this subject and contacted other cities who have undertaken these processes. On April 2nd, I distributed a memorandum to you, which is attached, that summarizes the information I heard and the research that was conducted.

ATTACHMENTS
April 2, 2018 Memorandum on Community Visioning & Strategic Planning
April 2, 2018

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Matt Greenson
City Manager

SUBJECT: Community Visioning and Strategic Planning Project

This memorandum is intended to provide background, research, and recommendations on community visioning and strategic planning and prompt a dialogue on how to move forward with such an effort for the City of Worthington.

Background

At its first meeting in January, a motion was adopted by the City Council that said, among other things, “One primary function of any city council is to articulate a vision for the future of the city. One way this can be accomplished is through a community planning process culminating in long range planning documents.”

Additionally, discussion regarding this idea at the City Council’s annual retreat reaffirmed the commitment to undertake a process. To explore this idea further, the City Manager interviewed each Council member; facilitated a round table discussion with department directors, and with the Assistant City Manager, reviewed literature and interviewed representatives from cities who have undertaken community visioning and strategic planning processes in the recent past. These steps were taken to better define the goals of the process, find relevant examples, and determine the range of costs.

Themes

The interviews and discussions revealed common themes about why a community visioning and strategic planning process is important to conduct and the desires the City Council and key staff have for such a process. These have been summarized in “theme” statements that state what we are trying to do by launching this effort and what we think is important as we undertake it. These themes are grouped in three categories: Externalities, Engagement, and Outcomes.

Externalities

Technology and Change: Technology will rapidly change the way we live, work and travel and we want to take the right steps to position Worthington for long term success in a changing
Community Visioning and Strategic Planning
Memorandum to Worthington City Council
April 2, 2018

environment. These changes may impact the way we deliver services, the services expected from the City, and the City’s tax revenues.

**Regional Growth:** There is significant change and growth in the Central Ohio region, including in and around Worthington. We want to understand and shape this opportunity for Worthington.

**Sustainability:** We are concerned about climate change and want to explore how we can be more environmentally sustainable.

**Engagement**

**Community Building:** We want to explore how we can build community and increase everyone’s feeling that they are part of the community.

**Engage New Participants:** There has been change in the community and the City organization with new residents, new leaders and new employees, and we want to engage them in dialogue about the future.

**Build Trust and Ownership:** The City’s strategic plan should create a story about where we are and where we want to go. We want the process of creating the plan or “story” to build trust in City government and consensus or “buy-in” on our strategic direction.

**Broad-Based Participation:** We see a need to engage the community more broadly and through a multitude of means. We desire to receive input from every neighborhood, businesses in our community and citizens of all ages and backgrounds.

**Provide Civic Education:** We think it is important for people to understand how their government works, how it is funded and its role in addressing the various needs of the community. As part of this process, we want to provide information and education on City government and bring useful context to the policy issues being discussed.

**Effective Decision Making:** We want the best data and information; broad-based public input and effective public engagement to help us set priorities and make decisions that serve the whole community;

**Outcomes**

**Shape Long Term Vision:** The Comprehensive Plan was written about 15 years ago and the visioning process, Worthington 360, was conducted 9 years ago. It is time to revisit and update the vision for the future of the community so that it can inform and guide our strategic plan and updates to the myriad of City adopted plans that guide our decisions and investments. In shaping this vision, we want to explore with members of the community what they want to change, what they want to stay the same, and how they would describe Worthington in the future.
Establish Strategic Priorities: We want to determine what we need to do to realize our long term vision, ensure a high quality of life and have City efforts aligned with community needs and desires. We want to determine what priorities are central or most important to achieving the long term vision of the City, so as to bring focus and priority to them.

Organizational Alignment: We want to have a clearly articulated and embraced organization-wide vision, mission and values that can serve as a cultural guide for all City departments, policies, projects, plans and programs;

Realistic Plan, Disciplined Action: In times of change, the lack of strategic direction can lead to loss of opportunity and organizational ineffectiveness. We desire to set a strategic plan that is not limited in creativity, but also not divorced from reality. We want to have a plan that provides a clear sense of direction, consistently guides our work for the next five or more years, provides a roadmap with benchmarks for determining progress and success, is fiscally and organizationally realistic, is aligned with the community’s vision for the future and, when acted upon, enhances Worthington’s quality of life.

Culture of Action: We want to inculcate this type of strategic planning into the culture and regular processes of City government as a best practice for public organizations and a commitment to effective governance. We want the plan to guide multi-year efforts and have “staying power,” but also recognize that it is rooted in our best current thinking and should be updated periodically.

Determine When to Lead, Partner, Support or Follow: We recognize that not all issues and ideas identified during a community visioning process will fall within the City’s role or capability to address. When using the vision and other civic input to craft a strategic plan for City government, we will realistically determine the appropriate role, responsibility and capacity of City government to advance an idea.

Focus of the Strategic Plan

Conversations with City Council members revealed a desire to focus long-term and to look comprehensively at all issues impacting the community. The focus is broader than solely development and land use. Once a Community Vision and Strategic Plan are adopted, the City’s other plans, including the budget, Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Comprehensive Plan will need to be reviewed and updated to ensure congruence.

The conversations also revealed a desire to conduct long-term community visioning for the purpose of informing a City-specific or city-government organizational strategic plan that guides the actions of the City Council and staff in the coming years. The focus for the plan will be on the city government rather than a community-wide plan. However, the community vision process may result in ideas that other community organizations utilize in their own plans, and new partnerships and collaborations may develop to achieve the vision.
Characteristics of Other Cities Efforts

Staff reviewed the strategic planning efforts of five different communities, as well as looked at the Worthington 360 documents, and received some detailed process thoughts from Council Member Smith. A summary of these conversations is attached. There is a broad range of costs associated with these efforts, ranging from the low of $25,000 to more than $100,000. We learned that the cost was driven in large part by surveying and the extent of citizen engagement, and the degree to which City staff performed some of the work.

The architecture of each strategic planning process differed based on the needs of each community and, in part, their budget. Communities with mature strategic plans that are regularly updated had somewhat lower cost structures. Academic articles indicate over 100 different methodologies for civic engagement, many which could be used in a strategic planning process. The most common process elements we found include:

Surveying and Online Engagement: Options here include Citizen Satisfaction Surveys that help leaders understand views of current services; survey questions on community priorities and preferences; and online surveys. The vehicles for online surveys and two-way conversation in online formats have grown. Products and tools like Thought Exchange, Bang the Table, Mind Mixer, or POLCO are all available for a more robust online engagement process than previously.

Focus groups: Worthington conducted behind-the-mirror Focus Groups as part of Worthington 360. These were used to help shape the questions asked in the survey process and bring to light critical issues for research and further discussion. These were professionally facilitated by a third-party. An alternate example is the City of DeLand, Florida whose staff conducted Focus Groups with input and questions developed by the consultant.

SWOT Analysis and Environmental Scan: SWOT is an assessment of an organization or community’s current Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. Additionally, an Environmental Scan assesses the external opportunities and challenges or trends facing the organization or community. These are often conducted by staff members. Expert speakers, industry resources and community partners can be relied upon to inform this process.

Community Workshops: Each community structured these to meet their own needs, but some of the considerations include: identification of stakeholders to participate, selection of a location, and strategies for ensuring diverse representation. Workshops can be structured with different purposes. For instance, Gahanna conducted six workshops, each focused on an area that was deemed important. In other instances workshops or retreats were held to engage community leaders in crafting the long term vision and to collaborate on developing action plans.
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**Steering Committees:** Some cities have appointed Steering Committees to help guide and develop their strategic plans. The role of these Committees in relationship to the City Council needs to be clearly defined early in the process.

In order to accomplish the goals imbedded in the themes outlined above, we will need to incorporate many of these efforts and employ additional efforts as well. Other efforts we noted in our research include presentations, open houses, stakeholder interviews, telephone or online town halls, youth summits and booths at local events. A creative example of how to involve residents was Fort Lauderdale’s Meeting in a Box which asked neighborhood and other leaders to host their own small, living room vision meetings and submit the input. Given the extent to which we want to engage the community, we should anticipate that the budget for such a robust community visioning and strategic planning process could be $100,000. Many of the processes were completed within 6 to 9 months. However, when the time for consultant selection and final approval by the City Council of the completed plan are factored, it is anticipated that the process will take one year.

**Recommendations and Next Steps**

At this point, staff is not recommending specific process architecture or steps. Rather, it is my recommendation that the City Council 1) Review and comment on the themes outlined above, 2) Set a budget; and 3) Authorize the staff to issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) from strategic planning consultants. The RFQ should outline what we are trying to accomplish by using the themes above; ask for vendor qualifications; and get examples of process and cost for similar efforts by the consultant. We want the consultant to conduct their own interviews to get input on the process, which may include external stakeholders as well, and assist us in developing a process for approval by the City Council. We can then evaluate what can be done internally, what needs to be structured or facilitated by the consultant, and how we might supplement the consultant’s efforts to maximize public engagement.
Attachment Strategic Plan/Community Visioning Examples

Gahanna
Strategic Plan – Go Forward Gahanna
- They utilized two consultants, one for public engagement and one for the identification of priorities and goals.
- Cost was $120,000 in 2015.
- Phase 1 of the process involved 10 public workshops and an online forum. The workshops and forum involved nearly 300 participants.
  - Four general meetings in each of Gahanna’s four wards
  - Six topic workshops on (1) business and economy, (2) community involvement, (3) parks and recreation, (4) roads and infrastructure, (5) youth and student engagement and (6) student council at Gahanna Lincoln High School
- Phase 2 included a results workshop to follow up on the phase one activities and develop a set of action priorities.
- Timeline: From issuance of the RFP until adoption of the strategic plan, it was one year.

Comprehensive Plan Update
- About to embark on it
- Estimate the cost will be $90,000 - $130,000

Worthington 360
- Focus groups and survey through Bill Grindle cost $36,000
- Other work with Management Partners, including advising on environmental scan, visioning conference and development of the strategic plan cost $39,500
- Total cost was $75,500 in 2009.
- Timeline: From issuance of the RFP to adoption of the strategic plan, it was one year.

Worthington 360 – original proposal
- Scope included an environmental scan, a visioning conference, open houses for public input on the results of the visioning conference, an action planning conference, preparation of the strategic plan documents and training of volunteers and staff to lead/facilitate action teams to guide implementation.
- Cost was $152,500 in 2009. A community survey was proposed for an additional $22,450 and the cost of a graphic recorder was an additional $8,000.

Councilmember Smith’s Scope
- Scope includes four phases which include digital surveys via email and social media, mail surveys to senior residents, a focus group, education of the community on city operations, promotion of the survey/visioning questionnaire and a door to door street team to get questionnaire completed.
- Cost estimated at $97,800 (or $61,800)
- Timeline: Estimated at about one year if phases done sequentially
Oak Creek, Wisconsin
- Started with an environmental scan done by staff and a survey of City employees focused on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges. This information was used by the Strategic Planning Team to develop a draft strategic planning framework which was provided to the community for input. Three community input meetings were held and they used an online engagement forum which was available for about two weeks. After the conclusion of the community input phase, a retreat and a follow up meeting were held with City Council and department directors to identify future priorities. Staff developed key initiatives and objectives for the priorities and development action plans to achieve them.
- Cost: $25,000 (Staff did most of the work themselves because of a very limited budget.)
- Timeline: From the time of consultant selection to adoption of the Strategic Plan, it was nine months.

Lawrence, Kansas
- Process was similar to that in Oak Creek, with a few modifications. They started with the environmental scan done by staff, then the City Commission and the City’s management team identified a desired future and critical success factors for achieving the vision. This work was provided to the public and feedback was obtained through in-person meetings and an online survey. The results of the public engagement were reported back to the City Commission and City’s management team who held a session to develop a strategic planning framework consisting of vision, mission, values, critical success factors and a list of prioritized initiatives. The final step was a performance measurement workshop for the City’s management team and key staff to develop performance measures to track the City’s progress on each of the critical success factors.
- Developed performance measures for the plan, which are reported to the Commission every four months.
- They plan to revisit the plan every two years, after each City Commission election.
- Cost: $52,000
- Timeline: From the time of consultant selection to adoption of the Strategic Plan, it was nine months.

Westminster, Colorado
- They have been conducting regular strategic planning since 2000. Each year they update the plan. Each year they check whether they are on track or whether to make changes to the plan.
- When they have new Council members, the process involves first a New Council Workshop to discuss operating protocols with each other and staff on issues. Employee feedback for the Strategic Plan is gathered through a division manager retreat, a department head retreat, and videos from staff members that wanted to share their ideas. A Community Summit is held involving members of the City’s boards and commissions, youth advisory panel, a foundation in town and an inclusivity task force. Council members are also encouraged to invite at least ten guests to participate in the summit to
provide input to the strategic plan. The information from staff and the Community Summit are provided at the City Council retreat to work on the strategic plan. The draft plan is brought back to a Council study session for refinement.
- Cost: $30,000
- Timeline: Three months

**DeLand, Florida**

- DeLand has a mature strategic planning process that is now a key part of their organizational culture. They conducted their first strategic planning process in 2000 and did comprehensive update processes in 2005 and 2015. City Commission reviews priorities within the strategic plan each year in advance of the staff budget development process. They have worked to tie the strategic plan to the budget planning and adoption process.
- The 2015 process included a 15 member community steering committee Chaired by the City Manager.
- Staff conducted research and made Environmental Scan presentations to Steering Committee
- Conducted a series of 6 focus groups in different parts of the community. Specifically, had focus groups with African American, Hispanic, Senior and Youth communities.
- Conducted survey through online tool (MindMixer) they called “My Sidewalk.”
- The Steering Committee worked to identify key issue and scenarios; engaged City Commission in ID of strategic issues
- Held a Community Leaders Summit
- Held a Community Town Hall meeting
- Staff drafted draft vision/plan for review by Steering Committee and City Commission
- Once adopted, implementation goals for each strategic plan priority were developed by staff and priorities amongst these established by City Commission.
- Previous efforts included statistically valid phone surveys; Internal all supervisory personnel meetings.
- Timeline: 1 year start to finish
- Spent less than $15k on facilitator (staff facilitated focus groups). Total budget approximately $25k factoring on-line survey tool and other expenses.