



CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Worthington City Council Minutes
March 4, 2019

6550 N. High Street
Worthington, Ohio
43085

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, March 4, 2019, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Member(s) Absent: Beth Kowalczyk

Also present: City Manager Matt Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Law Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Planning & Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire John Bailot, Chief of Police Jerry Strait, Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, Assistant City Clerk Ethan Barnhardt

There were 6 visitors present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

VISITOR COMMENTS

There were no comments

SPECIAL PRESENTATION(S)

- Cornell Robertson – Franklin County Engineer

Mr. Greeson introduced the Franklin County Engineer, Cornell Robertson who is coming to each of his cities to introduce himself.

Mr. Robertson explained the three things that are most important to him: his spiritual faith, honoring our country, and his family. That is then followed by his job at the Franklin County Engineer's office. He has only been the Franklin County Engineer for two years; however, it is the only place he has worked since he graduated from Ohio State University in 1992.

As he gets out to meet folks there are questions about what the Engineer's office is in charge of. They are similar to the Ohio Department of Transportation, but on a much smaller scale. They take care of roads and bridges, drainage improvements, and snow and ice removal. He leads a strong team of employees who take pride in their work. He has a vision to lead the office as an agency of action, innovation, and collaboration. That third element brings him here tonight. He extends an offer to continue to collaborate with Worthington and he desires to strengthen that collaboration even more. He welcomes any questions.

Ms. Dorothy thanked him regarding questions about the salt used on the roads. She explained how he responded within 30 minutes about what kind of salt is being used. Mr. Robertson described how salt is the primary product used on the roads, but they also use beet juice which is more environmentally friendly and not a fracking bi-product. Their strategy is based upon specific weather conditions, so it will depend which product is used. Ms. Dorothy described how there was an image shared online about pedestrian zebra stripes, but ever since she comments on that she has seen pedestrian zebra stripes. Mr. Robertson reminded everyone that the primary function of his office is to provide for safe and efficient movement of people and goods across Franklin County. They must be interested in all modes of transportation.

Mr. Smith asked for an example of collaboration between his office and the City of Worthington. Mr. Robertson brought up the project along the section of road from 161 to Sawmill/315. That is an interest of Worthington's. There has been a study administered by MORPC about how there are elements of unincorporated area and that is where the Franklin County Engineer's office will participate in that discussion and will collaborate on an appropriate improvement.

Mr. Foust explained how professionally he has great interactions with the Franklin County Engineer's office and appreciates and respects what he does.

Mr. Robinson asked about his predecessors. Mr. Robertson explained there is a strong legacy of engineers at their office, and he was prepared well by his predecessors. Mr. Robinson wished him good luck, he is well suited for the position.

President Michael explained if there were questions they would be in touch. She thanked him for coming and sharing tonight.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- Regular Meeting – February 19, 2019

MOTION Mr. Robinson moved and Mr. Foust seconded a motion to approve the aforementioned meeting minutes as presented.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 05-2019 An Ordinance to Revise the Codified Ordinances by Adopting Current Replacement Pages.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

President Michael explained that this is a routine item that updates our code book.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 05-2019. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 05-2019 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 11-2019 Approving Funding to Worthington Community Groups for the 2019 Community Grant Program.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2019. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

Ms. Stewart explained how the City has an annual grant program available for nonprofits that serve the Worthington community. In the 2019 budget there is \$33,750 dollar available for those community grants. City Council has previously designated program priorities focusing on providing basic necessities such as food and clothing, support for community family and mental health counseling, and improvement to the Worthington community. For the 2019 grant program, applications were received from 14 different

nonprofit groups. The grant review committee, including Councilmembers Kowalczyk and Smith, reviewed the applications and their recommendations are submitted for approval tonight.

President Michael asked for details about Syntero. Ms. Stewart clarified that they were formally Northwest Counseling Services.

Mr. Robinson asked for more information about the National Church Residences (NCR) Foundation grant. He detailed how providing seniors of low income with essential services ranks at the top of his list for social programs that the City would be justified in funding. His question is more about NCR foundation and whether their services were provided before the initial grant made in 2017 or new services enabled by the City's contribution. Ms. Stewart responded that 2017 was the first year they had asked for funding which went to help provide support services for low income seniors in the Stafford Village complex to live independently. This grant goes towards helping to provide services free of charge or at a subsidized cost. Some persons were receiving this type of support before, but they were maxed out in their capacity to provide additional support. They applied for this grant to extend services to a broader group that meet those specific needs in Stafford Village. Mr. Robinson said he would support the grant funding this year, but he noted how the NCR Foundation is a well-funded national foundation with net assets exceeding \$100 million, in 2016 their revenue exceeded expenses \$2.5 million, and their top three employees have annual compensation exceeding over \$250,000 per year. Given an organization like that, he questioned whether it is appropriate that the City is giving them money. There are bigger issues when discussing NCR and he will talk about that more when Council discusses Stafford Village. He wanted to get it on record that we should look at the grant more closely.

Mr. Smith reported that being discussed in the grant committee's deliberations. It was determined that this was a trackable fund for trackable services in Stafford Village. The higher-level philosophy point is well taken, but he agreed that it should be funded this year.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Smith explained how the committee did encourage Council to revisit the priorities next year. There also needs to be a discussion about how we are funding this next year since there will be no bed tax. President Michael encouraged anything that could be brought forward for suggestions, guidance, or thoughts would be very helpful.

Mr. Foust said he knows there was a well-developed matrix, but he did not know if there was a component assessing the level of need. Mr. Smith stated it was subjective, weighing temporal human needs more heavily. Mr. Foust referenced Mr. Robinson's comment and emphasized the level of financial need. Mr. Smith remarked that is something Council would need to provide direction for. Ms. Stewart noted that the matrix does have a financial need section, but it can be reviewed to see if it appropriately captures the thoughts of City Council as it relates to that financial need.

Ms. Dorothy asked if there are other things that should be captured in the matrix. Mr. Smith said those are the only things that were brought up by the committee. The formula that has been used the past few years works, the process is good, and the outcomes are decent.

Resolution No. 12-2019

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

Introduced by Mr. Robinson

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is a renewal of an existing permit for use of the City's right of way and staff believes it complies with our codified ordinances.

There being no discussion, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 13-2019

Amending the Position Description for Police Sergeant.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson.

Mr. Greeson explained how there is leadership transition going on in the Division of Police. It is customary to update job descriptions before we fill these positions. This is a minor amendment to broaden the number of people in the organization that can apply for the position by requiring 2 years of service with Worthington Division of Police Department versus 3 years previously.

There being no discussion, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 14-2019

Amending the Personnel Rules and Regulations of the City of Worthington to Amend Provisions Related to Temporary Appointments of Communication Technicians.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 14-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mr. Greeson described the trouble with filling some vacancies. This particular recommendation is to amend personnel rules and regulations to allow the City Manager to fill or authorize a temporary full-time position for up to six months in any part of the organization. This amendment would authorize the City Manager to do this for up to 18 months, allowing us to offer qualified part timers who desire to work full time.

There being no discussion, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 14-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 06-2019 To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from C-4, Highway and Automotive Services to PUD, Planned Use District (7007 North High Street).

Introduced by Mr. Myers.

Ordinance No. 07-2019 Approving the Final Plat and Approving a Subdivider's Agreement for the Worthington Gateway (7007 North High Street).

Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.

Ordinance No. 08-2019 Authorizing the Acceptance and Conveyance of Certain Parcels of Real Property in the City of Worthington, Ohio in connection with a Tax Increment Financing Program in Order to Facilitate the Redevelopment of Certain Real Property Located at 7007 North High Street.

Introduced by Mr. Robinson.

Ordinance No. 09-2019 Declaring Improvements to Real Property within the City to be a Public Purpose; Declaring such Property to be Exempt from Real Property Taxation; Requiring the Owners of the Real Property to Make Service Payments In Lieu of Taxes; Establishing an Urban Redevelopment Tax Increment Equivalent Fund for the Deposit of Service Payments; and Authorizing the City Manager to Enter Into a Tax Increment Financing Service Agreement and a Development Agreement with the Property Owner.

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Mr. Greeson noted that this public hearing, unlike the others, will be set for public hearing on April 15th due to the statutory requirements. There is a little bit longer period between introduction and public hearing.

Ordinance No. 10-2019 Amending Ordinance No. 52-2018 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund Unappropriated Balance.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinance(s) in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter unless otherwise directed.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Council Expectations Document

Mr. Greeson detailed how the Council Expectations document is a “civility document” about how Council chooses to work together. Annually it is discussed and amended to make sure we behave how we like. At the retreat much of its content was affirmed, however Council did talk about amending the first section to change the wording to, “Seek to discern the good of the public community.”

Mr. Robinson said that he believes that the grammar is a bit awkward. He thinks it should either be shortened to “Seek to discern the public good” or made more complex such as, “Seek to discern at all time the will of the public and the public good, and to exercise sound judgement and how to harmoniously realize the two.”

Ms. Dorothy stated that she would be in favor of “Seek to discern the public good.” Everything else throughout the document is short.

Mr. Myers thinks that Mr. Robinson’s suggested language may be a run-on sentence and much of what it says is held within the document already.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy moved, seconded by Mr. Myers to revise the Council Expectations document so that Section 1 reads, “Seek to discern the public good.”

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson described how Ms. Kowalczyk emailed a recommendation to amend Section 14 of the document by deleting “at Council meetings” so that it reads, “To treat staff with respect at all times.”

Ms. Dorothy said that the same should be said for treating constituents with respect in Section 13. She suggested saying, “To treat all constituents with respect.”

Mr. Robinson agreed with Ms. Kowalczyk’s suggestion.

MOTION Mr. Robinson moved, seconded by Ms. Dorothy to amend Section 14 of the Council Expectations document to read, “To treat staff with respect at all times.”

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Dorothy said she is fine with making Section 13 broader. Mr. Myers described how knowing the reason behind this provision, he would prefer to make it broader than to eliminate what it says. It was designed so that the public could come in and freely speak without being challenged, harassed, or debated unnecessarily at Council meetings. He would like to continue to keep that. He believes that Section 13a reading, “No one should fear coming to a Council meeting,” should stay.

Mr. Foust suggested that he is fine with just removing the word ‘Constituents,’ making it read, “Treat all who come to Council meetings with respect and create an open and welcome environment.” Rather than trying to undo a wrong, lets try to advocate for the right.

MOTION Mr. Foust moved, seconded by Ms. Dorothy to amend Section 13 of the Council Expectations document to read, “Treat all who come to Council meetings with respect and create an open and welcome environment.”

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael explained how this gives people respect from the dais, but she also does not want to hear booing or clapping, so people can feel welcome to come up and speak. People have not wanted to come up and speak before because they feel like they would be booed. Everyone should feel welcome to come bring their views.

MOTION Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Myers to approve the Council Expectations document as amended

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

- Request for Proposals – Community Visioning Facilitation

Mr. Greeson described how Council requested at the last meeting that staff prepare an RFP for a community visioning process. A draft RFP was prepared after looking at examples from the National Civic League’s handbook for community visioning processes

and RFPs from a multitude of other jurisdictions from around the country. This draft can serve as a starting point for Council's conversation about the type of services desired.

He detailed on page three that there is an introduction, background, and project description. The intent is to tell a little about us as a community and as an organization, the challenges we face and the great things about us. The project description explains why we are doing this. He explained how he wove some of the language from the Council adopted resolution into various aspects of this page. For instance, at the bottom of page three it reads, "To accomplish this, the City wishes to engage in a citizen-led comprehensive visioning process that includes all stakeholders, with the goal of gaining a thorough understanding of a broad cross-section of the community representing the will of the people."

On page four, the visioning committee is mentioned, and Council discussed a vision committee mission last week. We do not have all the details, but we can signal to respondents that there will be one and that it is likely that will be sorted through before they are selected.

The next section is the preliminary scope of the work. We wanted to highlight what you might expect a consultant to do, but also to not be overly prescriptive, letting them have the ability to propose their own approach for community visioning. The commonalities across many of the projects that we have looked at, were the steps that were outlined here. They are broad data collection, interviews, and familiarization where the consultants come in and get familiar with our community. Process design is where they would come up with a tentative design for how the process would work for Council's approval. Council has placed a big emphasis on public involvement, so how they would structure public involvement. Communications would be how we accomplish communicating to the public so that they know about the project, so that we build faith and trust in the project, driving participation.

Common to strategic planning and visioning, there is something called an environmental scan which looks at the trends that impact the community. What are the strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats that face the community and what are the trends that potentially impact the community and its ability to realize its desired vision. Interpretation and analysis, there has been a lot of discussion about collecting information and data, statistically valid surveying, and other public involvement. It is necessary to have a consultant that can assist the committee and Council in interpreting that data, collecting it, compiling it, and working with it.

There are essentially three products of the process and common to many of these efforts. First was identifying community values and preparing a community vision statement. This is the statement about what is important and what the community wants to be in the future. There is a term used by the City in the past "Key Performance Areas" which are the areas of work that you need to do well in to realize your vision. These are focus areas to stay on top of. The final item is recommending an action plan, which are the next steps for moving forward with implementing a vision. How to sustain efforts to realize the vision and how

to maintain relevancy and focus on it. He expressed that those are the general work categories and that Council may add some, split some, lump them, or change them.

The next section includes the proposal content and submission requirements. A transmittal letter is requested detailing who they are and why they want to do work for us, and a description of their project team and their qualifications. We want them to tell us what their particular approach is to accomplishing goals. Everyone may have a different strategy. We also want examples of their previous work that includes where they have done visioning work before and their references. Because this is a mix of an RFP/RFQ, we will also want to have a cost proposal. He explained how he does not believe Council should base this solely on cost, this is a project that you want to have based on their ability to execute what you envision this to look like. Also requested is an estimated timeline, recognizing that may change as the process is nailed down.

The next section includes evaluation criteria, which Council can add to. We are looking at things such as experience with similar projects, a subjective terminology around estimated fit and working relationship with the City, demonstrating an understanding of city's objective. Their project approach, which is how creative, clear, and comprehensive their approach is to the visioning effort. Additionally, efficient allocation of time and resources. The rest of it is mostly boilerplate contract language included in other RFPs such as the one issued for the Bike and Pedestrian master plan, so it is not new. He noted on page nine, questions and requests for clarification, when doing these we want a central point of contact, we want to have a respondent pose their questions in writing to us so we can answer those questions and provide them to all respondents to provide a level playing field for all potential consultants.

Mr. Robinson observed that the introduction, the way it is worded suggests something that is beyond what we are capable of or wanting to be doing. We are not as a Council creating a renewed vision, that is beyond the ability of Council to do. We as a Council can create a statement of Council's vision or create process that facilitates discernment of a public vision. He expressed how he is not comfortable saying we are creating a renewed vision. That goes towards the important question of whether we view this process as essentially us discerning the public vision that already exists, and maybe stimulated and expanded through the process. As worded, he does not believe it conveys that. As a result, he would suggest something more like:

The City of Worthington invites consultant proposals to design and facilitate a process that will result in a renewed articulation of the public's vision for our City's the future.

Mr. Myers asked what Mr. Robinson is trying to do. Mr. Robinson said what he is signifying through the new language is to avoid the suggestion that we are or are capable of creating a renewed vision. Mr. Myers asked what was meant by renewed vision. Mr. Robinson said what that means would be a vision that is updated from that of 15 years ago, one that is a new expression of the City as a result emerging from the visioning process. Mr. Myers asked if he is describing a distinction between what is and what should be. What

he does not want is for us to just articulate a vision of what we are. He wants to communicate that we start with what we are, but we want to know what we want to be. If that is the same thing as what we are, that is okay. The goal is to articulate what we want to be. Mr. Robinson presented that the word vision implies forward thinking, and an analysis of what we are. By definition almost, vision implies an aspirational goal. What he is trying to get at is that he does not feel comfortable with the idea that we are facilitating a process that creates a vision.

Ms. Dorothy expressed her confusion and how she is not sure how we came about this word to begin with. The title of the draft RFP is the “Visioning Process” and she asked if we should get rid of visioning at the top. She explained how she was not a fan of visioning as a word to begin with, but this is getting a little bit more complicated than she anticipated.

Mr. Foust does not know if we are trying to create a vision, but rather capturing, analyzing, and understanding the public’s vision. Mr. Myers says it is not a snapshot in time, he wants to make sure we are not just saying what we are. We are forward thinking in this. Mr. Foust explained rather than creating a vision, we are trying to capture the public’s vision for the future of the community.

Mr. Lindsey explained how the word create is the word creating some concern. What he had penciled in was, “.... a process to ascertain the community’s vision for the future of Worthington” Mr. Robinson asked if ascertain is a better word that discern. Mr. Lindsey said it was a personal word choice. Ms. Dorothy read the definitions for ascertain and discern. President Michael, Mr. Foust, and Mr. Smith expressed that they prefer the use of ascertain. Ms. Dorothy stated that she advocates getting rid of the word “create.”

MOTION

Mr. Foust moved, Mr. Robinson seconded a motion to amend the introduction of the RFP on page three to read, “The City of Worthington invites consultant proposals to design and facilitate a process to ascertain the community’s vision for the future of Worthington”

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Foust asked about the middle of page four and how he appreciated the Q&A process that is an important part of any RFP process. He cited how the middle of page four explains how, “The City is looking for a variety of engagement strategies to ensure that as many citizens as possible participate...” and he explained how he is interested in the phrase, “... and that people and groups not typically involved in civic dialogue are reached.” He asked for clarification about what is meant by that.

President Michael replied that she would interpret it how you get different things from knocking door to door, which is not the same as when they write a letter, go on Facebook, email or other responses. It is about how do you reach the people who do not normally come out of the woodwork for their views.

Mr. Foust said if that is the intent, he is on board with that, but to him it was vague and could go outside the target audience. President Michael suggested adding, “To ensure as many Worthington citizens” which keeps it to the community. We have had a lot of people concerned about how there is only so much time and money to do a survey, we want to reach Worthington residents.

Mr. Robinson suggested using, “...residents and community groups not typically involved in civic dialogue...” Mr. Foust expressed how he likes that. Mr. Myers said that we are at a level of wordsmithing now, we say groups, now we say community groups, why don’t we say all Worthington community groups chartered 501c3. We can keep going and going and going with this. We have been discussing this since the retreat. To him what this language says is straightforward. We have our professional citizens, those who like to speak on things. But we have the quiet people, the Wilson Hills people, those who don’t show up at Council meetings. Those are the people we are talking about. Mr. Foust explained how what he was talking about was whether we are telling the recipient to go outside Worthington to Columbus, or MORPC who may have opinions about what the future looks like. Those are not the people he wants to survey. He wants to keep this to Worthington.

President Michael explained how she is hearing:

The City is looking for a variety of engagement strategies to ensure that as many Worthington citizens as possible participate and that people and groups not typically involved in civic dialogue are reached”

She said we are not specifying which groups, she is not sure of all the groups that could be out there. Mr. Foust suggested that he would be comfortable deleting everything beyond “...and groups.” Mr. Myers detailed how he wants to know how they explain it to him. He would ask open ended questions and let them make the assumptions. That is what an RFP is all about.

MOTION *Mr. Foust moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to amend page four of the RFP to insert the word “Worthington”*

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Myers expressed how he is lost. He tried to put too much together, and it was way too complicated. He created a bunch of bullet points about what he wants out of the process. In here we have overall process design, how does that fit in what we are embarking on here with process design. At one-point Council had talked about setting aside some of the work we are brainstorming on right now until we have a consultant to help. At another point we decided to forge forward with our own stuff. He asked as a group where we are at in that process.

Mr. Smith said there are some things we will not be able to figure out until a facilitator helps and/or committee is selected. Other things can be finalized definitively such as the

selection process for the committee and the job description/work detail. That can be started tonight and maybe even finalized next week. As for the architecture of the actual program and visioning process, we can come up with some ideas, but what he has heard and received from Councilmembers via email, it is a little disjointed. He thinks we should wait to finalize that until we have a committee and/or a facilitator.

Mr. Myers described how he has a list of bullet points that Council probably could discuss such as the basic goals of this. He likes the concepts of Dr. Marlowe’s questions that they would ask or answer, he likes that format. President Michael explained the educational component Council talked about too. Mr. Myers mentioned the provision that discusses overall process design would be then appropriate to ask of this consultant. Mr. Smith said he thought so, and after this document conversation, he will bring up other points that can begin discussion tonight too.

Mr. Robinson said under the Visioning Committee Mission on page four, the second sentence reads awkwardly where it says “...the product purpose is to inform, engage and listen to the community members to thereby articulate the aspiration of the community with respect to the future of Worthington....” He stated that the use of the word thereby does not fit. He suggested that it would make more sense to say:

...and to listen to community members to enable a well-grounded articulation of the community’s aspirations for the future of Worthington.

Mr. Myers asked if this had been adopted by resolution last week. If it was then there would need to be a motion to set aside, or a motion to reopen. There will need to be a procedural mechanism to get to that. Mr. Foust said that on page 18 of the minutes from February 18, 2019 where it reads after several pages of discussion that, “Mr. Myers offered the following mission statement, ‘Its product purpose is to discern and articulate the needs, values, and aspirations of the community by informing, engaging, and listening to community members to thereby articulate the aspirations of the community with respect to the future of Worthington.’” Mr. Myers said that if there was no motion, then we just proposed it and said yes, we do not need to do anything.

MOTION Mr. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson to accept Mr. Robinson’s language contingent on any procedural ramifications that may later be discovered.

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no further discussion, the motion to adopt the Request for Proposals – Community Visioning Facilitation (As Amended) passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson explained that staff is assembling a consultant roster for this. He suggested that Councilmembers email their suggestions for consultants who are well qualified in this area to add to the list. The goal is to put this out as soon as possible, but we also want a robust roster of consultants for it. There are also several key questions about how to

manage the selection. Does the whole Council want to serve as the selection committee, should there be a subset of Council, or the appointment of a selection committee? This does not have to be decided tonight. We will build a schedule that we think is customary for this type of RFP process. It will probably be on the street for about a month and an adequate time for the committee, or Council, to review the proposals and then if they are selected to make presentations, followed by a reasonable amount of time for them to prepare their presentation and make travel plans if necessary.

Mr. Foust asked if there was a sense of how many organizations may respond to this. Mr. Greeson said not specifically, but he would think there would be at least five qualified firms. Mr. Foust shared that in his day job, they look to staff to take that field of five or six and narrow it down to a top couple, bringing it to the board of directors to look at the top two. He would be comfortable with that process. Mr. Myers suggested to narrow down to the top three. Mr. Robinson asked for three but make all documents available. Mr. Greeson said in this instance he would encourage some Council input in the screening process, there is value with Council being engaged with this process.

President Michael asked if all Councilmembers want to be involved in screening. Mr. Foust said like the community grant process, we could identify two or three Councilmembers to work with staff jointly. The idea of having all the information available out there where Council can tap into it, is great, but like the grants that were just approved if we could have a couple Councilmembers to help narrow the field. Ms. Dorothy said if we look at appointing anyone, we have a whole slew of resumes, and when we have a whole slew everyone goes over every single resume and then picks their top 3 then submits, narrowing it down from there. President Michael said when we have that many proposals, she assumes that the proposals will be significantly longer than a resume. Mr. Foust said the analysis of these RFP responses will be a weighty project.

President Michael remarked that we would not decide who the people would be at this point because we do not have all seven members in attendance tonight. She does think that the general concept is that there be a subcommittee of Council to work with staff to review. Mr. Foust said 3 or 4 responses is very different than 10 or 12 responses. Mr. Greeson responded that his estimate was for the number of quality responses. Mr. Foust described how in his day job that they put out a request for responses for a wellness vendor and 15 organizations responded. You have to do the fast cut and need to know deal breakers to get it down to a manageable number. Mr. Greeson observed that it sounds like Council is comfortable with a committee that is made up of staff and representatives from Council that will screen to get down to a reasonable number. That is how staff will articulate the process to prospective respondents.

Mr. Smith asked members how big they want the committee to be. He detailed three options. Options one and two come from Dr. Marlowe. Option three is a compromise with his own thoughts. The second question to be answered is how the committee is to appoint a chair, does Council appoint or does the committee select one themselves.

President Michael brought up that in Ms. Kowalczyk's submitted comments where she expressed support for Dr. Marlowe's process selection for the number of people.

Mr. Myers identified Dr. Marlowe's suggestions for a committee of 7 or 15 persons. In the first, Councilmembers appoint seven members and Council would select a chairperson. In the second, Councilmembers appoint seven, Council selects seven as a whole, and Council selects the chair. He suggested having 13 instead of 14, with seven individuals appointed by Councilmembers and six selected by Council as a whole under the criteria Dr. Marlowe had essentially put down. The committee would then appoint their own chairperson and vice chairperson. Mr. Smith reported that suggestion as a perfect mishmash of his own ideas and Dr. Marlowe's.

Ms. Dorothy can see the merits of Council appointing a chairperson or the group appointing a chairperson. When she was on the Facility Commission Board, they selected their own chair which took longer to do, and it will potentially string out this process. She explained that she really needs a facilitator because this is out of the realm of what she does well, and she would like someone to help guide this process. She was happy with Dr. Marlowe who has done a lot of work with a host of communities with different issues. Hopefully with the RFP being sent out, more qualified people will submit that are potentially more local..

Mr. Myers said that he is not as concerned with the timeline as he is with the validity and integrity of the result. When doing a bullet points about what he wants out of this, he listed things such as independent, autonomous, community-driven, and citizen-led. If this committee is dysfunctional because they picked the wrong chair, he has no problem with Council stepping in to tell them to fix it and make sure work is getting done. He has no problem with how long it takes.

Mr. Robinson fully endorses the mishmash proposal. The issue of the committee determining its own chair is important for both practical and symbolic reasons. This is intended to be a citizen-led process. Enabling the committee to determine the chair by itself conveys a message about the commitment to being citizen-led. Practically, the process of the group going through the process builds a sense of an esprit de 'corps, resulting in a better functioning committee.

Mr. Foust emphasized how words and phrases like integrity and citizen-led are key. He wants to see this process move forward at a reasonable pace. To him, because of the number of people who will ultimately be involved, our act of helping select a leader who has the skillset to keep the group on task, is not driving the outcome. He advocated for getting a framework set up and getting out of the way.

Mr. Myers stated how he does not disagree because he knows the seven people up here and the caliber of the appointments that will be made. Any one of the seven to be appointed would be competent to lead that organization. Maybe the consultant will want to begin with a little retreat, but it might be the group feels Council appointed may be more credible, because Council appointed them. But even those not individually appointed who were

selected by nomination process, will need to be chairperson quality. Any person picked could be chairman and we need to appoint 13 people that are chairperson caliber.

President Michael asked if the consensus is that 13 is the right number and that each Council picks one, and then there will be a pool that Council as a whole select six from. Mr. Robinson stated his understanding is that each Councilmember will nominate one that would then be hopefully approved by the rest of Council. Mr. Myers said Councilmembers would not have a veto on a Councilmember's pick. Mr. Smith said the only statement which is five words that is in option three, which is what we are talking about here, is approved by a majority of Council just to clarify the conversation. Mr. Myers said his proposal is different, they are appointed not nominated.

Mr. Robinson wanted to make the case for a majority vote. All nominees would receive that and in terms of getting full buy in from the body for the composition of the committee, he suggested Council have a vote for each of the nominees.

Mr. Myers detailed how in his proposal there are seven appointed members, no vote, no nothing. Then there are six that are nominated and then approved by a majority vote of Council based upon the applications received. He described how Mr. Robinson's counter is that the seven Council picks are nominated, not appointed, and confirmed by a majority vote. He asked what the consensus of the group was.

Mr. Foust said in the end, if we go with the appointed method, we look at pool of applicants for the other six. He asked if in the end Council has to vote to accept entire body of 13. Mr. Myers replied no. He said that Council would only vote on the six. What he does not want, he is assuming when the seven Councilmembers go out to seek their appointments, we will get a broad cross-section, then use the other six to fill in anything that is missed. He posed the question what if it does not, what happens if Council picks for example, seven Bernie Sanders liberals. That is not going to get us a very good result. He can go either way. He wants to make sure that it is that we appoint seven and nominate six.

Mr. Robinson asked Mr. Myers for an argument for appointment. Mr. Myers said if it is appointment, we are getting a cross-section that depoliticizes the process. He is going to go out and look for a specific type of person, a longstanding member of the community, with ties, who has expressed opinions on community issues. Different Councilmembers will select different committee members with different backgrounds. We will get a broad cross-section based on our own beliefs and background.

Mr. Smith asked if under Mr. Myer's model, Councilmembers could appoint themselves to the committee. President Michael said we had been discussing from the beginning not having Councilmembers serving on this committee. Mr. Myers said that could be fixed through drafting because that would be horrible.

President Michael established that the general consensus is for a community-led process.

Ms. Dorothy said that she likes the seven appointments and six nominations. She thought obviously that every single Councilmember would not appoint themselves. Councilmembers would try to pick a representative that most fully aligned with their viewpoints and then try to get other 6 common people agreed to. She stated that she is a little confused about having everyone being approved. She asked what happens when five Councilmember's selections get approved but two do not. Mr. Myers said Councilmembers would nominate another person under that approach. Ms. Dorothy asked what the reasoning would be to deny a person. Mr. Myers said it could be for any reason. He would move that we create a visioning committee based upon the following criteria:

MOTION

Mr. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dorothy that each Councilmember will appoint a member of his/her own choosing, that member cannot be a Councilmember, or a member of a current board or commission, or staff, and that we will advertise for an additional six members and select six members by affirmative vote of Council based on applications received as a result of that advertisement.

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael explained how it sounds like the consensus is for the committee to appoint its own chair. Ms. Dorothy said she wanted to note with the caveat that it will lengthen the process, but we are okay with that.

Mr. Myers wants to reopen the discussion on the previous motion because he thought about how many people are currently on boards and commissions. He would not want to put someone from the ARB/MPC on the committee, but he did not think about board and commissions such as WIFA. There are a lot of people on boards and commissions who might be good people for this. Ms. Dorothy explained how they could be part of the six, she thought that was purposeful language. Mr. Myers said he is okay with that.

Mr. Greeson reported that in the weekly packet there was a notice of an upcoming Worthingway Middle School meeting about their expansion and renovation. City staff from Service and Engineering, Planning and Building, and the Division of Fire have been meeting with the architects and engineers about things such as traffic flow and providing technical feedback.

He updated Council that the City has once again purchased Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). They procured the RECs based on estimated kilowatt hours for the upcoming year. Additional information will be included in the upcoming packet.

We are moving forward with the Electric Aggregation effort and Energy Alliances expects PUCO certification soon. After that happens, they will get the customer list from AEP telling us the total number of people who have not already secured their own energy through a choice program. They will then begin on our behalf as a broker if you will, the supplier bid process.

Lastly, for next week's Committee of the Whole we are proposing that the discussion will be around the non-discrimination ordinance. Feedback is needed from the entire Council so that we can massage and ultimately bring forward a revised and refined non-discrimination ordinance.

He asked if there needed to be more discussion of the visioning effort at the next meeting. President Michael emphasized how Council wants to move forward with visioning during part of each meeting. One thing being a draft of core criteria for the job descriptions. If reaching out to the community, people who might be interested in serving, how do we want to describe serving and to do what. A sort of news release where we are calling for people who are interested in what. Mr. Smith explained how he created a draft document of the job descriptions, which he will prepare and distribute.

Mr. Foust circled back to additional questions to be discussed on the non-discrimination ordinance. He asked if those could be circulated in advance so members could look at them prior to the meeting. Mr. Greeson said there may be a matrix of sorts, maybe not specific wording, but a matrix of the specific issues that were identified where Council's feedback might be valuable. Most of them center around the enforcement processes. We also have input from the public meeting which had decent turnout and questions that could be shared with Council as well.

Mr. Greeson mentioned that at Central Ohio Mayors and Managers Association (COMMA) meeting there was discussion around Governor DeWine's proposal for increasing the gas tax. He will distribute information to Council relating to that, including the estimated revenue potential to Worthington for projects and maintenance should something like that pass. The Ohio Municipal League is supportive, and COMMA took position in favor of it on Friday.

REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Lindsey gave an update on the House Bill 49 litigation that the City was a part of challenging. A decision was rendered on January 29th, and the coalition of cities has filed a motion for reconsideration with the Court of Appeals. The State of Ohio filed a memorandum contra to that motion to reconsider and the coalition filed its subsequent reply to that. That is currently sitting with the Court of Appeals for determination on the motion of reconsideration. That action stays the time period in which they have to seek review from the Ohio Supreme Court. Once the Court of Appeals rules on the motion, then it would be timely for the coalition to put in an appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court assuming the Court of Appeals did not take the case. As you may recall, Judge Tyack, a Worthington resident, did sit on that three-judge panel in the Court of Appeals, he will be retiring soon, therefore another judge will have to rule on the motion. It is undetermined how his replacement would consider the matter.

Ms. Dorothy attended the cemetery board meeting. They have hired Hardline Designs to do master planning for Ozem Gardner property along with Steve Kolwicz from POD

Design for landscape architecture. They are still in the middle of that and plans should be able to be shared by the end of the year. She said that she did not attend the last WIFA meeting, but shared information about upcoming events and programming.

Mr. Myers explained he does not know if this discussion needs to be added to the Committee of the Whole, but the ARB/MPC is discussing the Stafford Village project and he understands there may not be votes on Council to approve a PUD under any circumstances. As liaison to that board, he needs to know if this project is dead in the water. The applicant has spent a great deal of funds on this already and he would like that discussion before the next ARB meeting which is next Thursday. He would also highlight again that there is one page of ordinance that governs ARB and 140 pages of guidelines. There is a distinction between the two. There was an issue that came up at the last ARB about interpretation of guidelines which is by its nature subjective. He would be willing to engage in that discussion. He requested feedback because this needs to be communicated back to the board.

President Michael asked if it should be discussed at the Committee of the Whole or have Councilmembers individually get in contact. Mr. Myers said if feedback is not submitted he may have to ask for it to be added to Committee of the Whole next week. He also pointed out that he hopes this is not just to communicate from ARB to Council, but Council to ARB. He appreciates that dialogue back and forth.

Mr. Foust clarified if the question is whether Councilmembers are supporting a PUD at some point or support a PUD on a near approximation of the project so far. Mr. Myers said he does not know, he has heard both. We do not know what is coming to Council. It is a long way from being finalized and it will change. What he really needs to know is if there is no way there will be a development on that project regardless of what form it takes, we need to let NCR know to withdraw because they are not going to get the PUD through. If there are ways that you want to see it navigated that can be taken back to the board. It is independent and they will do with it what they want and ultimately it is up to Council to approve what is recommended. Mr. Foust said the dialogue he has heard revolves around things such as height, mass, and fitting with surrounding buildings. His sense is that there are still significant concerns about the project as presented and we are not talking about tweaks. Mr. Myers does not know what to do with that, because that involves a philosophical discussion that has been had between himself and Mr. Foust for several years now. He has always been of the opinion to let the board go its course and see what is brought to council and then approve or disapprove. He does not want to micromanage what our boards do, but he also does not want to string along an applicant if it is not going to prevail. We owe applicants feedback. Maybe at the Committee of the Whole we need to have that discussion about guidelines and what means, because if you look at the height of this building they are consistent with the other properties around there. The guidelines call for height of 2.5 stories. If it does not work on this property how do we interpret that, where do you go with that, what are you looking for. Mr. Foust said there is a significant difference between someone building a two-story house with conventional 8-foot ceilings versus a more commercial configuration with 9-foot ceilings. There is two stories and then

there is two stories. President Michael said this is something to be added to the Committee of the Whole meeting. Mr. Greeson affirmed it would be added.

Mr. Smith said that Kate LaLonde submitted info on the Orange Johnson project. He hopes Councilmembers review that and maybe it will be brought up in the next couple meetings.

Mr. Robinson detailed how he went to last week's MPC/ARB meeting. The first item relating to Sharon Memorial Hall passed by a vote of 4-3. Following a discussion with several of the board members afterwards, he has concluded that he wants to file an appeal pending a conversation with Mr. Myers. This may fit in well with an MPC/ARB conversation.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Mr. Myers moved, Ms. Dorothy seconded a motion to adjourn.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

/s/ Ethan C. Barnhardt
Assistant City Clerk

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
18th day of March, 2019.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President