CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, April 8, 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


Member(s) Absent:

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

There were 13 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

Mr. Greeson requested the 911 Dispatching discussion item be moved up on the agenda.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

• 911 Call Answering and Public Safety Dispatching Services
Mr. Greeson explained how we would be overviewing recommendations about our public safety dispatching communications, specifically the benefits of joining a multi-jurisdictional partnership called the Northwest Regional Emergency Communications Center. This service is currently provided by the Worthington Public Safety Communications Center which handles 911 call answering, dispatching of first responders, and after hours dispatching of other city crews. He said that it is important to note that regardless of the recommendation tonight, it will still be Worthington police, firefighters, and paramedics responding to emergency calls. Manning a small communication center is tough because it is technology intensive and a difficult job with demands and expectations that are ever increasing. We are also a secondary public safety answering point and are unable to take 911 cellular calls directly. He directed a team of City staff to explore a possible partnership with other similar jurisdictions, headed by the City of Dublin. The analysis team was led by Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, and comprised of Police Chief Jerry Strait, Fire Chief John Bailot, Assistant Fire Chief Mark Zambito, Finance Director Scott Bartter, and Personnel Director Lori Trego.

Ms. Stewart explained how the team of City staff conducted an extensive and thoughtful analysis to determine what is best for Worthington in the long term. This evaluation originally goes back to 2012 when we first considered the issue through a grant funded consultant-led study to see the feasibility of a multi-jurisdictional center. The report determined that it was feasible and ultimately recommended such a consolidation as a way to share resources and to facilitate quality services. Subsequent to this report, the City conducts some additional analysis, but did not complete it at that time. Last fall we took up this evaluation again to come to conclusions and recommendations around this service.

The ultimate determination was to join the Northwest Center Regional Emergency Communications Center for the City’s 911 call answering and dispatching services. It serves suburban communities similar to Worthington that expect and demand a high level of service. It is a collaboration of resources and sharing of support in this critical service area with many benefits. They are very professional, highly accredited, and certified.

By joining the Northwest Center we can enhance our capability and level of services provided for the community.

Chief Strait detailed how there would be fewer 911 call transfers. Currently, cellular calls are received at Northwest and then transferred to our center, adding 45-60 seconds to the call. This is major considering how time sensitive events such as heart attacks, overdoses, etc. are. This allows quicker response times for Worthington paramedics, fire, and police.

Chief Bailot observed how all the dispatchers at Northwest are cross-trained to handle all responsibilities in the Center. This allows for more focused attention for the 911 caller via call takers in the center. A second person is tasked with dispatching the first responders. He saw this process in action at Northwest. This allows us to follow accepted best practices and is the model for pre-hospital care. What is also important is that our responding paramedics will see on the computers in their vehicles, the information that the dispatcher
Chief Strait explained that they would also be more responsive to future advances in technology and operations. This year text to 911 was rolled out. In 2021 all Communications Technicians, both full-time and part-time, will need to be certified in Emergency Medical Dispatching (EMD). Currently, Worthington does not have an EMD certified trainer. We must wait until the right venue and provider comes about to schedule our people to go through the training, which could be particularly difficult for part-timers. Northwest also provides computer aided dispatching (CAD), sending information seamlessly to the police and fire responders. Northwest also has an GIS systems manager who works directly on their CAD and can provide specialized information on mapping. He illustrated how this would help with someone who is unfamiliar with their surroundings to send assistance. All new information can be updated into the CAD easily. Northwest also has a supervisor on shift, every shift. When they have a low frequency, high risk event, that supervisor can jump right in to assist. The supervisor can also pull Communications Technicians out of center to do quality assurance. They review 10% of their calls to make sure they are following best practices and can provide more training if needed. There are also benefits of having individuals doing scenario-based training.

Chief Bailot presented that there would be a larger capacity for emergency events. Northwest has up to eight dispatchers and a supervisor on duty at all time, which gives flexibility to move people around. If Worthington had a big fire and police issue, they can move dispatchers over to cover that area and have the flexibility to do so. They also have a mobile communications trailer that they are able to take out to the scene and have communication right there, right now. This frees up the dispatchers in the communications center to handle other 911 calls. They have a robust ability to handle these events.

**Jay Sommerville – Director of Northwest Regional Emergency Communications Center**

Mr. Sommerville explained that this is collaboration is not new. They have had a longtime partnership with the City of Worthington. The fit between the City of Worthington and the City of Dublin is a really good tie together of a group of communities to provide a high level of service and safety. Their number one priority is that every community that joins this collaboration does not lose service and should not lose service as additional entities are added. Dublin City Council and Administration understand the importance of training, staffing, and education. The mission is to “…protect life, liberty and property. We provide the highest level of service and work in partnership with our communities to ensure public safety. We remain dedicated to service and committed to excellence focusing on the core values of: Professionalism, Integrity, Respect & Commitment.”

Mr. Sommerville detailed the organization of the Northwest Center, the communities they serve, and their current staffing. He discussed how Northwest is a contract for service center. They are an example of how many centers across the country are approaching agreements for service.
Though a contract for service, they operate as a consolidated center with an Executive Committee made up of the chiefs of every agency they dispatch for. The Executive Committee is turned to regularly to advise on structure and structure changes. They assist on the annual budgeting process, long-range planning, and day-to-day management issues. All policies are vetted through the Fire/EMS Policy Committee and Law Enforcement Policy Committee. These committees make decisions on how things will be carried out day to day. Each agency designates a command level officer to liaison between Northwest and the local agencies as a conduit if there are any complaints or concerns. There is also the sharing of information with quality assurance reviews. It is critical there is feedback to employees and supervisors on how they did and how they may improve during the next incident.

He presented some of the highlights for the Northwest Regional Emergency Communications Center and their partners. He noted how the turnover of their staff is lower than the national average.

Mr. Foust observed that Dublin and Hilliard police are working together and asked what they do about fire service. Mr. Somerville reported that Dublin is covered by Washington Township Fire and Hilliard is covered by Norwich Township Fire.

Ms. Stewart said the next steps are to have community conversations because this is a very important service for our community. We want to share with members of the community and allow them the opportunity to engage with us and ask questions. We have planned a number of steps to take over the upcoming weeks. We will be posting a great deal of information on the City’s webpage, sharing on social media channels, and through email and mailed newsletters. We will also be talking with the media, particularly the ThisWeek Newspaper. There will be opportunities for community feedback through public meetings and a telephone town hall meeting. We are looking at a variety of ways to answer questions and get as many citizens to interact with this as possible.

When asked by Ms. Dorothy how we would have faster response times, Ms. Stewart explained that because we are a secondary answering point for 911 calls, calls must be transferred from a primary center to us. Since Northwest is a primary center, that would eliminate the call transfer which can add between 45-60 seconds per call. Ms. Dorothy then asked what phone number residents would use for non-emergencies. Ms. Stewart
reported there would be some administrative staff available to answer calls and after-hours calls would go to the Northwest Center. Ms. Dorothy questioned what would happen to our current staff. Ms. Stewart shared they have had discussions with staff in the Communications Center and will talk with them about next steps since this transition will not occur quickly. Once we get through the public engagement conversation and Council approval, we will have 1-year transition period. The Communications Center will be operational during that time. Once the transition is complete, there will be a need for two administrative support positions, which will be an opportunity for displaced personnel to transition to a new role. The Northwest Center will also need to take on staff. They will conduct a hiring process for our employees that is not available to the general public. We have also indicated to employees that we will reach out to other jurisdictions. Because of the high turnover in this field, there is a constant need for Communications Technicians.

Ms. Kowalczyk summarized that from a resident’s point of view the improvements in response time and the instructions being given on the line sound like great improvements. Ms. Stewart said that our current dispatchers will share medical instructions as much as they can, but given the size of our center, they more frequently have to juggle communications with the caller and responders. With the larger staff on duty at Northwest, it allows the call taker to stay on the line. Ms. Kowalczyk asked about the new technology and what we need to do on our end to make this transition happen. Ms. Stewart said in transitioning to Northwest, some system upgrades and software to communicate with the Northwest center will need to occur. The Information Technology Director has already been exploring those technology changes. Ms. Kowalczyk asked about the Northwest Center’s capacity to take on new municipalities. Mr. Sommerville replied that Worthington will likely be the final addition to their center.

Mr. Myers asked for Ms. Stewart to comment on the short- and long-term costs of the transition. Ms. Stewart explained how there are some short-term transition costs in 2020, but the ongoing annual operating costs are less. It is projected that by year three we will have recovered the transition costs from the annual operating cost savings.

President Michael thanked all those involved and the hard work making this decision which was not easy.

Mr. Myers asked about the next step for Council. Mr. Greeson said that we would start the public information effort first with a goal to bring this back to Council in late May/early June.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 18-2019

To Authorize the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement for the Provision of Competitive Retail Electric Aggregation Services and Electric Power Supply for Eligible Customers Within the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Mr. Robinson.
MOTION  Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 18-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Greeson explained how the voters of the City authorized us to become government aggregators, approving a ballot initiative supporting our ability to do so. Council approved an operations plan, which was then approved by PUCO. Energy Alliances made recommendations from six vendors who responded to the RFP with the goals of our program. What we are seeking is guidance from Council in the adoption of a resolution. It will require the insertion of kilowatt hours and the name of the successful respondent.

Rich Surace – Energy Alliances

Mr. Surace described how the process of running this RFP was a unique one because there are a lot of layers including price, renewables, budget building, and net metering. Finding a supplier to meet most or all of those requirements was a tricky balance. He explained that this was the first time they had brought multiple offers to a government body to choose from. They need guidance on which choices may be best for residents and businesses of the City of Worthington.

Mr. Surace described the bidding qualifications for the program.

The Essential Qualities

- Competitive Price
  - Ability to offer Savings compared to AEP Ohio’s (“the utility”) Price to Compare (PTC)
- Offer Renewable Energy
- Ability to administer “Budget Billing” on the generation/supplier charges
- Ability to handle potential credits for customer who take advantage of “net metering”
- No fees to enter or leave the program at any time
- Ability to manage the program to the City’s and Energy Alliances expectations

He then explained the concepts of budget billing and net metering.

- **Budget Billing** – The budget plan allows one to pay the same amount each month for most of the year. Bills are trued up, or “caught up” annually or sometimes semi-annually. When this happens a bill will go up or down, based on the actual usage for the true-up or settlement period.
  - **Choosing a Supplier** – If one decides to go with a retail electric supplier via aggregation (or if opting-in to a suppliers program), the transmission and distribution portion of the bill can continue to be levelized by AEP (“the utility”). However, it is up to the supplier if they offer the service to handle the levelized billing of the generation/supply charges.
- **Net Metering** – The ability for a customer to generate kWh on site which feeds back to AEP’s system. If a customer generates less kWh than they use in a month then the “netting” leads to a lower billed kWh. If the customer generates more kWh than they use in a month then they are credited for the excess kWh on the generation-related energy charges.
  - **Choosing a Supplier** – If one decides to go with a retail electric supplier via aggregation (or if opting-in to a suppliers program), then it is up to the supplier if they offer the service to handle possible credits.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked why someone would do budget billing. Mr. Surace said that it can provide some certainty with billing for someone who would want to stay in some sort of range throughout the year. People with fixed incomes also tend to utilize it. Mr. Myers shared that he has done budget billing for 15 years because the energy usage from air conditioning during the summer prompted him to do so. Mr. Surace said that for average customer in Worthington, 40% of their usage was in the three-month June thru August period. Because people use so much energy in over that small period, they use budget billing to smooth out those bills. Ms. Dorothy clarified that we are still paying one bill going to one place no matter what. Mr. Surace said that was correct, it would be a single consolidated bill.

Mr. Surace brought up how there are a couple dozen people in Worthington using net metering which allows someone who generates electricity onsite to take that volume and put it back out on the grid. The best example of this would be someone with rooftop solar.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked if that was an incentive for someone to go solar. Mr. Surace agreed and said that it is also an incentive lowering volume on distribution costs.

Mr. Robinson asked for clarification about the people using net metering. Mr. Surace said we first get the list from AEP, it has every account in the City of Worthington, but then that list gets whittled down. There are people who are initially not eligible, so that could be people who have already shopped or on the Percentage of Income. So from the 40 using net metering, roughly 15-20 were not a part of that initial list and most have probably shopped for their own supplier before this program began. Mr. Robinson asked if those people could cancel their existing contract and join this program. Mr. Surace said yes they could join this program, but they would need to do their due diligence first.

Mr. Robinson asked for the number of households that are budget billed. Mr. Surace responded that approximately 684 are budget billed, which is roughly 14% of the eligible list.

Mr. Surace showed the details of three offers from AEP Energy and Dynegy. One supplier stood out price wise but did not initially have all services. AEP was not the lowest price. He explained how there was not a clear winner.
President Michael asked about the long-term stability of some of these companies. Mr. Surace explained how they do not do business with First Energy who is a large aggregator in the state because they are currently going through bankruptcy with the parent company First Energy Solutions. He tries to keep an eye on that in the market. He asserted that at least one of these names will not be the same in five years because it is an industry with many mergers and acquisitions. As far as the services, if any of these were purchased by someone else he would not be concerned about service because they continue to raise the bar to each other.

Mr. Greeson explained how information was sent out that was a larger group of pricing, with proposals for 12, 24, and 36 months. The most competitive proposals were in the 24-month range. Mr. Surace said for every supplier, the 24-month term was the lowest. There was a total of 19 different offers.

Mr. Surace said two suppliers had the most responsive and responsible proposals and were selected as part of the second round of negotiations in an attempt to find a compromise to balance the “price vs. services” value proposition.
Mr. Foust said that online opt in jumped out to him. Also the fact that AEP Energy was the only one with net metering credit capability. Despite it being only 22 households, it is an important statement to support that capability.

Mr. Surace pointed out that Dynegy brought two separate offers with the understanding they would have budget billing capabilities available by September. They also offered the lowest price across all of the suppliers for any term. However, they had no commitment on the ability to have net metering. Additionally, they are trying a new program, the Greenback Energy Program, which includes an opt-in at a slightly higher rate, and you would gain $50 per year for rewards in a store as an investment in sustainability. In the second scenario from Dynegy, there is a delayed start. However on day one they would have all the services, except for net metering, in September.

President Michael asked for clarification with Option 2 and budget billing. Mr. Surace said with the June start there are a few ways to handle budget billing. We could send out a letter and someone could opt out and then opt back in when budget billing starts in September. Or with a June start we do not send those marked as budget billing a letter. We almost consider them not eligible. They can always call to opt-in, but we do not push them down a path to opt out. Then, before September they would send a specific letter to that group. It would almost be two different opt-outs.

Mr. Myers asked about the people who get a letter in September, or if they decide to opt-out in June and later opt-in, if they would still get the benefit of the contract price we enter into now, or would they have a separate price they are paying. Mr. Surace said that if we decide to do a June start, no matter when a person enters the program, they would get the price set at that time.

Ms. Dorothy said she is troubled by the opt-in to the Greenback Energy Program. She expressed how she is confused how that benefits anyone. She then asked about pricing options on the top with 100% renewables. Mr. Surace said that his understanding is we were doing 100% renewables. We are still saving money compared to the AEP standard service offer. These prices are very competitive compared to those that do not guarantee renewables. Ms. Dorothy said she would hope we agree to using 100% renewables. She asked about the added benefit of the Greenback Energy Program and how to get out of the opt-in. Mr. Surace said it is a new program they’re launching to promote sustainability. He does not know if the program has been used with anyone else, they were looking to Worthington’s emphasis on sustainability as a part of an offering if they were selected.

President Michael asked about the $50 credit at AEP for their rewards store or $50 from Dynegy through the opt-in with Greenback. Mr. Smith said it is essentially a pledge to reduce overall energy use, not just the cost.

Mr. Myers said that when he shopped around three years ago, he did not have the level of expertise Mr. Surace does. He said that AEP saves a little less, but companies were dropping off left and right. He went with AEP and paid a little more but knew what he was
getting. It is a known quantity. He wishes we could go to market on delivery service, he would dump AEP in a heartbeat. He expressed how he leans towards AEP at this point.

Mr. Smith said when we started this process, he asked if we could achieve both reduced price and 100% renewables. He is very pleased with the results of this.

Mr. Robinson thanked staff and Mr. Surace for all their background work. He expressed how he appreciated the thoughtfulness of Councilmembers to take this seriously. It is gratifying. The campaign was based on safe, clean energy and he is happy we can achieve those twin goals. Service is equally critical. The promise to the public was that this would be a well-run and painless process. One thing about Dynegy is that the idea of a sequenced program would be confusing, and he does not want to wait until September unless we have to. He views the people utilizing net metering as important. AEP Energy offers the full package and stability.

Mr. Surace made a point about Dynegy that they do not have budget billing because most of their business is in southwest Ohio and Duke does the budget billing on behalf of the supplier. As their business is growing and evolving, they are playing catch-up.

Mr. Foust asked if there was anything we were overlooking or undervaluing here. Mr. Surace said no and that it has been interesting to listen to the conversations tonight. Council has come a long way in the past year, asking very smart and thoughtful questions.

Mr. Robinson says that he views the 24-month duration as just right. This program is a continuation of many things the City itself has been engaging in in terms of sustainability. It is also a beginning of broadly engaging the entire community in a program like this. 24-months seems like a suitable duration to give us time to look at what the next step may be.

President Michael asked if there was a consensus of going with AEP Energy. Mr. Myers said Worthington is willing to pay more for exemplary services.

Mr. Robinson moved to amend Section 1 by adding in AEP Energy and in Section 1(a) adding 0.05055. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Mr. Surace brought up that the prices that are listed here are indicative as of Friday, it is a commodity and we will need to go back to AEP and get a finalized executable price that Mr. Greeson would be able to sign on. The market moved up a little today and in fairness this was the price from the other day.

Mr. Lindsey said that the draft was done with a set price point. We will need to amend the resolution further if Mr. Surace needs to contact AEP for the price to enter this program. We will need to authorize the City Manager to accept. Mr. Foust recommended to use language, “...at the market rate to be confirmed at the discretion of the City Manager.” Mr. Surace said they would finalize a price, which is extremely common. Mr. Myers explained that electric is going up and he likes the use of not to exceed language.
Mr. Lindsey recommended inserting, “….at the rate approved by the City Manager upon the consultation of Energy Alliances...” this allows Mr. Surace to do his market analysis and allows the City Manager to indicate to AEP if their rate goes up, we can then go back to the table. Mr. Robinson agreed to a friendly amendment of the company being AEP Energy and utilizing Mr. Lindsey’s language.

MOTION

Mr. Robinson moved, Mr. Smith seconded a motion to amend Section 1 to add AEP Energy and to amend Section 1(a) to read “….at the rate approved by the City Manager upon the consultation of Energy Alliances…”

There being no additional comments, the motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 18-2019 (As Amended) passed unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Discussion Item(s)

- Kenyonbrook Sewer Replacement Presentation

Mr. Whited discussed how this is an outreach effort about what they believe is the most effective way to accomplish a major required sewer project. This will meet orders from the EPA to remove adverse impacts to our residents and our waterways. Over the past 10 years we had over 1 million gallons of sewer overflows in this sewershed alone. This is a sustainability and green project, providing a higher level of service to our residents. We intend to present this information to affected residents in the community. Many different considerations were evaluated relating to this sewer repair, including environmental impacts, disruptions to roads & homes, community quality of life, and interruption of sewer & water. They believe that the alternative that will be presented is a pretty clear decision. He would ultimately like concurrence to move forward.

Marci Bland – EMH&T

Ms. Bland laid out why we are talking about the Kenyonbrook Sanitary Sewer. In 2009 the Ohio EPA put the City of Worthington under Findings and Orders along with other satellite communities to the City of Columbus. What this said was that each of the individual communities had to properly operate and maintain their sanitary sewer system, providing adequate

Why - Ohio EPA Findings and Orders

- Satellite Communities of City of Columbus
- Signed February 11, 2009
- Required City to Properly Operate and Maintain Sewer System
  - Provide Adequate Capacity
  - Take all steps feasible to stop Sanitary Sewer Overflows and “Water-in-Basements”
  - Minimize Excessive Inflow and Infiltration
- Actions Required
  - Perform Sewer System Evaluation Study of Entire System
  - 5-year Schedule or 15-year phased approach
capacity, to take all steps feasible to stop sanity sewer overflows, water-in-basements, and to minimize excessive inflow and infiltration. The City of Worthington chose to take a 15-year phased approach to address this doing a study of an area and then doing improvements before going to the next area.

Ms. Bland detailed the environmental impacts in this area. The photos shown in the slide illustrate how the sanitary sewer cannot handle the flow going through it. It basically hits the ground and overflows onto the ground or may end up in someone’s basement. The Ohio EPA said that you had to mitigate the sanitary sewer overflows.

Ms. Dorothy said that we are trying to make sure that things are not combined with the infiltration from areas that were never meant to infiltrate into our sanitary sewer. This is an ongoing concern and we see blue signs that tell people to stay away because there is waste overflow. Ms. Bland said that is correct.

Mr. Robinson asked how stormwater enters sanitary sewer system. Ms. Bland said 50-60% of the clean water flow comes from private properties. The water follows the backfill and gets into the joints and the cracks in the laterals and mainlines. It is an expensive and difficult problem to fix. Dublin is going through the same process with the Deer Run Sewer Shed. They did rehabilitation on every mainline sewer they have. They still have a 20% rainfall capture, meaning when it rains that percentage is getting into their sanitary sewer system. In this particular case we look at improving the capacity so that you can keep it into the system.

Ms. Bland brought up that Worthington began this process prior to the Findings and Orders from Ohio EPA.

**Southeast Sewershed – Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Study (SSES)**

- City began SSES prior to Findings and Orders (2007)
  - Southeast Sewershed SSES
  - Hydraulic Model of the Sanitary Sewer
  - Identified Capacity Issues
  - Pictures from Site Visit March 2008
Ms. Bland said as part of the Southeast Sewershed, a three-phase improvement was recommended.

**Southeast Sewershed – Previously Recommended Improvements**

**Three Major Trunk Sewer Improvements**
- Phase 1 – Kenyon Brook Siphon Removal **Completed**
- Phase 2 – Northbrook Trunk Sewer Replacement **In Progress**
- Phase 3 – Kenyon Brook Trunk Sewer Improvement **In Design**

**Phase 3 – Update Hydraulic Model Resolutions**
- Update Model with new Flow Monitoring
  - Flow Meters were installed from December 2017 through June 2018
- Verify Impacts of Kenyon Brook Siphon Removal Project
- Utilize the updated model to develop Alternatives

Mr. Greeson asked for an explanation of the Kenyonbrook Siphon Removal. Ms. Bland explained that there was a blocked siphon and they designed an aerial sewer to upsize that sewer going through the park in order to relieve the flow into the Columbus system. The issue with the siphon is they are a maintenance nightmare. Because that siphon was in the middle of the park, there was no way to get the cleaning equipment to it, so we got rid of the siphon.

Ms. Bland showed a model that illustrated how there is not enough capacity to use our own sewers. This model throws a 25-year rainfall event on the sanitary sewer system and it shows what the sewer level does. It shows where we are losing flow from the system.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the model was similar to the results they designed for. Ms. Bland affirmed that they are.
Mr. Steve Tennant noted that there are cracks in the pipe and some of the sewage is coming out of the ground, not out of the manholes.

Ms. Bland noted that some of the challenges are from N. High St. to E. New England Ave.

Phase 3 – Kenyon Brook Sanitary Sewer Improvement

- Challenges
  - Construction from N. High Street to E. New England Avenue
  - Utility Conflicts
  - Easement Negotiation
  - Maintaining Ingress and Egress during Construction
  - Close Proximity to Existing Structures

- Challenges
  - Existing Alignment is Located along Rush Run Creek
  - Tree Impacts
  - Suggest Walking the Alignment as a Group

They have evaluated several alternative conceptual alignments. While there are many solutions that will work, they have narrowed the options down to six that will work to solve problem and meet the Ohio EPA requirements. Once we choose a conceptual alignment, we will need to go through the design process. Alternatives 1, 2, 4, 5 are within $400,000 of each other, so we do not talk much about cost. Difference between construction footprint is forcemain versus gravity sewer. A forcemain is a very flexible construction with a very small trench opening.
Alternative 1

Replace along Existing Alignment

Pros
- All Gravity Sewer
- Existing Sewer Under Home is Abandoned

Cons
- Significant Disturbance
- 12 Easements
- Possible Utility Conflicts

Alternative 2

Replacement Along Existing Alignment except Granby

Pros
- Existing Sewer Under Home is Abandoned
- Gravity Sewers

Cons
- Significant Disturbance
- 12 Easements
- Possible Utility Conflicts

Alternative 3

Two Pump Stations

Pros
- Force Main has smaller construction footprint
- Force Main is more flexible to avoid conflicts

Cons
- 6 Easements
Alternative 4

One Pump Station / Partial Gravity

Pros

- Force Main has smaller construction footprint
- Force Main is more flexible to avoid conflicts
- Eliminates portion of sewer along creek

Cons

- 7 Easements
- Possible Utility Conflicts

When asked by Mr. Myers what a pump station would look like, Ms. Bland replied that it could be a variety of things. Mr. Whited said it could be a stainless well with panels above the ground or it could be enclosed in a shed-like or brick structure. Ms. Bland added that it would be about a 2000 gallon a minute pump station, which has about a ten-foot diameter, basically manhole. Everything could be underground except for the control panel, or in a building that is architecturally sound. Mr. Myers asked if there could potentially be a 10 x 10 building in the park. Ms. Bland replied yes. It can be nice to fit in with the surroundings, or as obscure as needed.

Mr. Robinson asked what would happen to the electric pumps if there were a power outage. Ms. Bland responded that there could be a generator on-site that would kick on or there could be a back-up hydraulic pump. In this case it would be important to have a backup because this is going to turn on when it rains.

Alternative 5

One Pump Station

Pros

- Force Main has smaller construction footprint
- Force Main is more flexible to avoid conflicts
- Work is in streets

Limited work in yards and parks

Cons

- 1 Easements
Mr. Myers asked about Alternative 5 and if the pump station would be placed in someone’s yard. Ms. Bland said the diagram indicates the general location to put the pump station. Where exactly, we would need to work with property owners and look where there are existing easements. There is a little bit of flexibility there.

Alternative 6

One Pump Station / 1.0 Million Gallon Storage in Park Blvd Park

Pros
- Force Main has smaller construction footprint
- Force Main is more flexible to avoid utility conflicts

Cons
- Cost Double Others
- Storage Facility
- 1 Easements

Ms. Bland explained that their recommendation is Alternative 5 with one pump station at a cost of $1.8 million and annual operations and maintenance of $16,650. There would be the need for only one easement. The construction footprint is also much smaller and much more flexible. There is not much disturbance in the park because we can fit it within the right-of-way and avoid alignment conflicts with trees, utilities, and other issues.

Mr. Greeson described how the City has been blessed to have a gravity fed system. We currently have no pump stations. We did not come to these recommendations lightly because we would prefer not to have a pump station. However, if you walk the site you will realize that the options where we can use forcemains as opposed to replacement of gravity line, are mostly in the street and much less invasive. It is hard to imagine us constructing some of those alternatives.

Mr. Robinson said he would like to study the design matrix, see pictures of one of the pumps, and walk some of the site itself before forming a judgement.

Ms. Dorothy asked how long the forcemain pipes would last versus gravity main pipes. Ms. Bland said the force main pipe material will still see a 50-100-year life expectancy. The pump station is infrastructure there and the pumps themselves have a 15-20-year replacement. This is not going to feed this area all the time, it will only be active when it rains which will extend the longevity of the sewers themselves. When asked by Ms. Dorothy how long the current mains have lasted, Mr. Whited replied nearly 100 years.

Mr. Myers asked if all of this would fit in the public right-of-way. Ms. Bland responded that the pump station would not, but all the forcemain would. This is assuming we do not
have utility conflicts. Yes, we can most likely fit it all in the right-of-way, but there may be some areas where we cannot. You only need a five-foot width to put it in there versus twenty-five to forty feet. Mr. Myers asked if someone would know when pump kicks on. Ms. Bland replied not typically because the pump is underground. However, if the generator kicked on, you would hear that.

Mr. Greeson said that staff would distribute materials, schedule a walk, and answer any questions from Council.

Policy item(s) – Financial Report - March 2019

Mr. Robinson inquired as to why collections were up in March as opposed to being down in February. Mr. Bartter responded that it is timing of withholding payments for income taxes. We are also up considerably on Parks and Recreation revenue over estimates.

**MOTION**  
Mr. Myers moved, Mr. Foust seconded a motion to accept the Financial Report.

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL

Ms. Kowalczyk reminded everyone of Slice of Worthington happening tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION**  
Mr. Foust moved, Mr. Smith seconded a motion to adjourn.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:57 P.M.

/s/ Ethan C. Barnhardt  
Assistant City Clerk

APPROVED by the City Council, this 6th day of May 2019.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael  
Council President