



CITY OF WORTHINGTON
Worthington City Council Minutes
June 17, 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, June 17, 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, Beth Kowalczyk, Douglas Foust, David Robinson, Douglas K. Smith, Scott Myers, and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: City Manager Matt Greeson, Director of Law Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, 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 25 visitors present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

VISITOR COMMENTS

There were no visitor comments.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION(S)

Resolution No. 37-2019

Expressing the Congratulations and Best Wishes of Worthington City Council to Justin Braun for his Outstanding Achievement as State Champion in the 400 Meter Dash in the 2019 Ohio High School Track and Field Championships.

Introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 37-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 37-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 38-2019 Expressing the Congratulations and Best Wishes of Worthington City Council to the Members of the State Champion 4 x 800 Relay Team in the 2019 Ohio High School Track and Field Championships.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 38-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robinson

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 38-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Mayor Holmes explained how he is here tonight in place of Vice-Mayor Lorimer, who unfortunately sustained a broken rib from which he is currently recuperating. He explained how over the past 42-years; Worthington City Council has welcomed the opportunity of recognizing the Worthington school athletes who have won statewide championships. Winning a state high school championship is most challenging and places you among the top athletes in the nation.

This year's state champion victory in the 400-meter by freshman Justin Braun, from Thomas Worthington High School, was a most unprecedented and special victory in the sport of track and field. No one can recall a freshman ever having won the 400-meter state championship event. It requires a special combination of athletic abilities that are not found in young athletes at the early high school level. An interesting aspect of Justin's state championship victory is the fact that he is the grandson of Larry Braun, who served as Mayor of Worthington for the 15 years between 1981 and 1996.

A second victory was won this year by the Thomas Worthington High School 3200-meter girl's relay team. Four great female athletes each ran 800 meters to win this championship title. Lydia Miller was the lead-off runner, who is in her junior year and will be able to compete again next year. Morgan Edwards is a sophomore who also competes in cross country and maintains a 4.0 grade point average. Carina Napoleon is also a sophomore and running the third leg of the relay, she passed the baton to her older sister. Gia Napoleon was recognized two years ago by the Worthington City Council when as a sophomore, she won the individual Ohio state high school championship in the 800-meter race.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- Regular Meeting – May 20, 2019 (As Amended)
- Regular Meeting – June 3, 2019
- Special Meeting – June 5, 2019

MOTION Ms. Kowalczyk moved, Ms. Dorothy 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. 22-2019 Amending Ordinance No. 52-2018 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of Curb Improvements at Wilson Bridge Road & the Railroad Crossing for the NE Gateway Intersection Improvement Project and all Related Expenses with said Project. (Project No. 602-14)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Whited detailed how the CSX railroad asks us to pay for their engineering review and inspection work. That will ultimately be reimbursed by the Ohio Rail Development Commission, but in the interim we must fund that account. This would be for the improvements at East Wilson Bridge Road related to CSX and Norfolk Southern Railroads where we are installing curbs, an island, gates and such that we have already approved an appropriation for.

Ms. Dorothy clarified that this does not include any quiet zones. Mr. Whited said that is correct. Ms. Dorothy said she has received feedback about how people are interested in seeing the next steps of implementing quiet zones.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 22-2019. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Ordinance No. 22-2019 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 23-2019 Amending Ordinance No. 52-2018 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Costs of the East Wilson Bridge Road Resurfacing Project and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 692-19)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

MOTION Mr. Robinson moved, seconded by Mr. Foust to amend Ordinance 23-2019 to include \$564,000 and Strawser Paving Company.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson explained that we tore up the road with the waterline project and it needs repaving.

Ms. Dorothy asked about the timeline. Mr. Whited said notice to proceed would be within 21 days and work would begin soon after that.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 23-2019. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No 0

Ordinance No. 23-2019 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Resolution No. 29-2019 Adopting a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for the City of Worthington

MOTION Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Myers to remove Resolution No. 29-2019 from the table.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Myers explained how at the last meeting when the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan came up, he generally approved of the plan, but he wanted us to be clear in the intent that it was guidance and not mandatory. He volunteered to make changes to the resolution which was done along with Mr. Lindsey. He believes this resolution makes it clear that the

plan is one tool that can be used when looking at and discussing future projects. He views this as an aspirational plan or goal, not an intent to build. With that being said, he feels comfortable with the plan if we adopt this resolution. It is an acknowledgement of roads being for all forms of transportation, however not all roads necessarily lend themselves to all modes of transportation. That should be up to the discretion of this and future Councils with this as one tool to use.

Mr. Foust expressed how he likes the amendments, which accomplished what he was looking for. Yet, it is tough to separate out the amendment from the plan because the plan still includes references to things such as Complete Streets, which is another conversation. Mr. Myers responded that the plan is a creation of the committee that Council created. There was a lot of hard work on the part of the committee and a tremendous amount of citizen input. But it is not an act of Council, this resolution is the act of Council. The resolution is what speaks for Council.

MOTION Mr. Myers moved to make the amendments to Resolution No. 29-2019 as written and included in the Council packets. Seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Greeson explained how a few weeks ago Council heard a presentation from the City's consultant Blue Zones. Council was presented at that time the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan document. That plan and the Complete Streets policy were developed in tandem with each other along with extensive public involvement. The plan was recommended to Council by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board. There was consensus that the resolution needed to be amended and it was tabled. Additionally, Councilmembers wanted time to review the plan and to comment on it. Mr. Robinson has submitted proposed changes to the plan document. He described how Council has several options. One, you can discuss the plan and if you have substantive issues or concerns that require more consideration, you can refer it back to the Board for further review, debate, and recommendations. You can discuss the plan, discuss the proposed amendments from Mr. Robinson and others, adopt the plan as is, or as amended this evening. Or you can discuss the plan and amendments and decide to table it if you want to have further review and discussion again at a subsequent meeting. Staff is here to support the Council conversation.

Mr. Robinson expressed that a robust discussion would be very desirable. His thinking is that yes the resolution is the authoritative statement of Council, but the studies wield authority with the public that lasts many years. Before joining Council, he referenced the plans and studies, but never looked at the resolutions. As he reads it, most of the language and concepts contained in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan pertain to what he describes as everyday issues and concepts that are additive features and enhancements of current infrastructure, which he views as completely non-controversial and focused on safety and accessibility. Other portions venture into value propositions that have far reaching consequences on what we might do or ought to do. Some of the value propositions

and assessments about how we ought to live as a community have not been adequately discussed with the broad public. He supports continued focus on bicycle and pedestrian friendliness in our city, but he suggests that prior to more robust public consideration, we put into the language of the plan qualifications such as that he has outlined in the content of his text.

Ms. Dorothy said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board has been working very hard on this plan. A report was adopted in 2014 with similar information. The then Committee decided that they wanted a better plan to help inform improvements throughout the City. We as a Council agreed to fund hiring an internationally known consultant that is well regarded as being one of the top consultants in bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. She expressed how she thinks that we are looking at trying to have balance with those most vulnerable in our community. This is a guideline to balance out what we can do in the City. It is a good plan, and this is an additional tool that needs to be considered but does not need to be followed.

Ms. Kowalczyk agreed with Ms. Dorothy. This has not come in a vacuum and it has been discussed for years. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee expresses the value Council puts on the focus of better and safer streets. She does not agree the values expressed in the plan are contrary with our values. The plan does not state that automobiles are onerous. The plan offers guidance and resources on how to improve the livability of our community and it is also a key component of an age friendly community. There have been lots of opportunities to participate and the consultant used data gathered from the community. The report speaks to the data. She stated that she would like to vote on it as-is.

Mr. Robinson responded that the report does more than what his fellow Councilmembers just articulated. On page six, it identifies walking and biking as preferred. That is not equity. On page seven in the vision, it reads how after thousands of years of building cities in healthy ways, that we have lost our bearing. He shared how his parents moved to Upper Arlington from New York, and for them it was a pathway to freedom. They very much appreciated being able to move out of a crowded Brownstone in New York, they valued the suburban experience. He does not cast judgement on them as having lost their bearing. That statement suggests that now we know better. He does not hold the view that the people who laid out Worthington historically made mistakes. Yes, things are different now, but he asked if we need to lay out a broad historical critique which has broad implications about how we structure our city moving forward. Page seven states that the approval of development proposals should reference the plan and meet the criteria set forth herein. That overstates the plan as being more than guidance. Our development proposals need to meet the criteria of the plan. Page seven discussed the only restraint being funding, it does not list the other restraints of implanting these ideas in a built-out community. There are numerous problems content wise and if we do not amend the language, this Council will be endorsing a vision for our infrastructure that he cannot condone or support.

Ms. Dorothy said walking is the ultimate form of equity, everyone walks. Our Founding Fathers laid out Worthington to human scale for walking and moving on to biking. The

history of Worthington was about wanting us to grow. We are where we are at the moment. For thousands of years society has been human scale and not automobile oriented. This makes plenty of references to guidelines and opportunities, but not that we have to. This is presenting a balance of opportunities throughout the community.

Mr. Smith said that the intent at the formation five to six years ago of the pre-advisory committee, he thinks the conversations back then were that this committee would come up with something a lot like this. He thinks that the consultant came in and did a tremendous job guiding and facilitating the committee. The themes are a little more whitewashed and the intent of the committee was to look at projects specifically as unique capital projects and not to put a blanket statement over everything about how they should be done. That is what this plan with its wording is doing a little bit. He can agree with most or all the changes because it softens the wording back to the intent of the uniqueness of each project.

Mr. Myers stated that Worthington has been a planned community from 1803. The Village Green was originally platted as church and pasture. There are not cows on the Village Green now, but that was the plan. He asked if we rigidly adhere to the plan or do we adhere to the adoption of Council and code. The code is what Council has adopted. We are about to embark on a new planning process. We are a planned community taking planning very seriously. The plan is not a rigid statement of Council and the language of the resolution makes that clear. We continually merge planning and legislation, but they are two different things. Some things are being pointed out he does not disagree with. The committee worked hard for a year and he does not want Council to not adopt their work. The legislation is clear about what we intend.

Mr. Foust stated that there is a lot of great valuable information in this and a lot of the concepts are well based. Where he pauses is what appears to be the inclusion of Complete Streets within the policy. National consultants and MORPC recommendations aside, he does not believe this acknowledges the unique qualities of Worthington. He looks at Complete Streets and reads phrases like, "Over time there are opportunities to right size streets by putting streets on a road diet, narrowing, or eliminating travel lanes from four to three to two." There are places where that works. When the same concept was applied to Indianola south of Morse Road, it is now a one lane street and for automobile traffic it is pretty unfriendly. If the Complete Streets were not in this, perhaps he would feel differently. It seems we have an opportunity here and he explained that he appreciates the distinction Mr. Myers is trying to make, but the Comprehensive Plan is what people look at, not the resolution adopting it. Mr. Myers responded that two wrongs do not make a right. Mr. Foust said that what he is struggling with, is that things like the concept of bike boulevards, which is nicely packaged, but who does not want a complete street, the naming is a little insidious. Same goes for bicycle boulevards, which is a glorious name, but what it really is, is car reduction. He is not saying that is a good thing or a bad thing, but it is not adequately represented here. Much like the Comprehensive Plan, people will not know what we are doing here. When you include things such as on page 87 where several streets are identified for bicycle boulevards and for traffic calming. Implementing those things could draw great ire from the people who elected us. What he would like to suggest is that before we move forward with something that adopts Complete Streets, which the Bicycle

and Pedestrian Master Plan becomes a trojan horse for Complete Streets, we are embarking on visioning process and we can figure out how best to find out about some of these concepts. He would like to see us hold off and have more discussion and either modify the plan, or just delay until we know what the people think.

Ms. Dorothy said we have had significant public outreach and input for this policy from the start in 2012 to their finalized report to this Council which was adopted. The ongoing committee has continually reached out to and engaged with the public. The Complete Streets policy is a key policy to making safe routes to schools, that is something we get push back on from community members. Without Complete Streets it is very hard for us to even look at each intersection. It does not mean you have to implement anything, but Complete Streets policy looks at the street to see if it is feasible or not. These policies go hand in hand, and it does require you to look at different methods. One reason 20mph is asked for is because if you get hit by a car at 20mph you have a 10% chance of dying, that becomes a 90% chance if you are hit at 40mph. There is a reason why in school zones it is 20mph, and there is a reason why there is a guideline consideration when looking at residential streets. We have had other bicycle and pedestrian plans that people have not even looked at and if we take out any teeth to even look at this, there is no reason to even look at making any of these improvements. When we are looking at attributable funding, having a Complete Streets policy gets us extra points to get grants. Nothing of this is mandatory that we have to implement.

Mr. Robinson expressed that in his suggestions he tried to be respectful and moderate. He did not disparage or criticize. He was very intentional about remaining true to the spirit of considering the content of the studies. He asked what is excessive, inappropriate, or miscalculating. Most of the elements of the plan are good and no one would be against safe passage for our students to school. But the term Complete Streets is such a broad concept involving everything from sidewalks to setbacks to speed limits to narrowing of lanes. He brought up how he discussed this with his wife, and she commented about how there are many people who need to drive, giving the example of parents with a car full of kids who cannot walk or bicycle easily. Many seniors are not able to walk or bicycle. He asked if seniors would want to drive down a road with impediments put in it intentionally or drive down more narrow streets. There are pros and cons to these issues. The language he submitted is quite moderate and he urges its inclusion in the plan.

President Michael reiterated that the options are to look at Mr. Robinson's language to see if we agree to move forward & compromise. Or we can send it back with comments to the committee. Or vote on it as is.

Mr. Robinson proposed that he supported sending it back to the Committee. He described how he talked to someone who is on the Committee who said they were unclear about what Complete Streets meant and he did not want to be argumentative in the committee. He would like to see if the committee would view his suggested edits as unacceptable or true the spirit of what they are trying to do.

Mr. Myers said he has a difficult time separating the two issues here. We have proposed changes to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. It sounds like we almost have a rejection of the Complete Streets concept.

Mr. Foust responded that he does not reject it, but it deserves further scrutiny. We have this visioning process going on and we should find out what the people think. President Michael asked if Mr. Foust was recommending that we do not have the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and Complete Streets policy until after the visioning process is completed in a year or so. Mr. Foust said that if we lift out the Complete Streets component of it, he is okay with it as written. If we leave it in there, we need to find out more about what the residents think before we adopt that as a recommendation.

Mr. Smith asked for clarity because he was under the impression that there were going to be two simultaneous proposals not packaged in one. President Michael said that we do have two separate resolutions for the two topics.

Ms. Kowalczyk said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is a vision for improved safety, livability, and health, and it is aspirational. She would love to slow down traffic in certain areas and improve walkability. She is not going to concede that we should back off of looking at those issues and having a vision of a safer community. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is guidance and resources. It is an implementation toolbox where you pull out what might work. She said that she is confused why we are wordsmithing a few paragraphs in the beginning of the document. Complete Streets is a three-page policy that includes a toolkit for staff to use when looking at these issues. It would be a shame and waste of time if we did not proceed. She supports voting tonight. Either we aspire to these goals or we do not.

Mr. Foust asked if Ms. Kowalczyk would be open to a further revision of the language. Rather than goals and aspirations, use the words toolkit of possible ideas. When you say goals, those are things you go out to do and aspire to do. 20 miles per hours, putting in bicycle boulevards on major streets, and putting in chicanes. Those are the goals. Ms. Kowalczyk responded that those are tools used to accomplish goals, the goals are safer streets, more walkable streets. The toolkit includes options. We can look to see if these goals are appropriate for each project. This is a tremendous resource for our staff.

Mr. Robinson stated that if that is all that this does, then he would support it. But the language does not convey that. Policies are not just ideas or toolkits, but it suggests an operational and/or budgetary element to it. He cited the 2014 Comprehensive Plan update which took on a life of its own. That plan was not viewed as an option to be discussed amongst many. He does not want to vote for a Complete Streets policy that contains things he will have to argue against in the future. He asserted that his suggestions temper the language slightly.

Michael Bates – 6560 Evening Street, Worthington, Ohio

Mr. Bates expressed that he understands Mr. Robinson’s point, but he does not agree with him in this particular case. He discussed a conversation that was had about repaving Huntley Road. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee discussed putting bikes on Huntley Road and Mr. Myers said that would be ridiculous due to truck traffic. We did not have a plan and there was no position on how to do this. We started this idea because we needed a comprehensive plan when opportunities come up and now we have a document that we can go to and see what the guidelines say could happen with certain criteria. For example, the Pingree crossing and what should happen as far as a crossing on 161. There is a lack of a signalized crossing but there was a need. There was discussion about what the draft plan says and there was a need for a crossing somewhere in that area. The point is that, it now gives the engineering group, staff, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board, and City Council something to reference when these things come up. He expressed that Ms. Kowalczyk did a great job explaining how this document should be used as a toolkit and what things should be looked at. There are money limitations, legal limitations, and practicality limitations. The idea of this as aspirational is the right way to go. He suggests not putting it back to the Committee. We have been through the planning process with significant outreach to the community. He asked what could be expected to be done differently. He does not see anything else the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board can add to what has already been done.

President Michael thought that the problem she is hearing is going back to the resolution that was amended and the language about this being an expression of goals and aspirations.

Mr. Foust asked if it is an acceptable compromise to drop the words “...goals and...” because stating these are goals is a pretty powerful statement.

MOTION Mr. Foust moved, seconded by Mr. Robison to drop the phrase “...goals and...” from section one of Resolution No. 29-2019 (As Amended).

The motion to amend Resolution No. 29-2019 (As Amended) carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Mr. Smith asked about how the Complete Streets and Master Plan resolution formed together. He wants to know how and when that happened.

Mr. Hurley said that two summers ago, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board made a presentation to Council and were tasked with working on a Complete Streets policy and a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. That is what originally put them together. When we started working with Mr. Whited and his team, it did not make sense to do them separately because it may create contradictory policies talking about bicycle and pedestrian access. While Complete Streets policy is called a policy, the policy part does not say you will make these specific changes. It just says that Mr. Whited will not complete

a street project without looking at the Complete Streets toolkit and deciding whether to apply the toolkit to the streets. Complete Streets policy does not say you will definitely do the things in the toolbox.

Mr. Greeson said that it obligates staff to articulate why they would not implement. Mr. Hurley gave the example of the repaving of Worthington-Galena. It was very straightforward because there was no budget for it. The message to the Bicycle and Pedestrian committee was that this is not the opportunity for financial reasons, and we planned to go ahead with repaving in this scenario. Hopefully in five or six years we would be able to do something more specific. However, it required us to look at it.

Mr. Robinson responded to Mr. Bates and thanked him for all the work done, and how he agrees with the nature and purpose of plan. He thinks the description of the criteria that would be used moving forward supports his recommended edits. For instance, the term used applicability or practicality to assess specific projects. That is exactly what he was trying to get at in his fourth paragraph, where the text as written right now reading, "...given funding limitations, strategic implementation of recommendations is necessary for improving conditions for walking and cycling in Worthington." The only criteria cited in the text right now is funding. The presumption is that if the funding is there, you would proceed with the policies as outlined. His suggestion says given funding limitations, physical constraints, and inherent challenges of employing the full Complete Streets concepts in a mature built-out community... it specifies there are other criteria other than just funding. As he understands Complete Streets policy there are things that are not applicable to Worthington. With the language as written, if money is available, then we will implement Complete Streets concepts. The burden of proof is on staff to say why we are not implementing the Complete Streets concepts, changing the staff orientation of the new normal. This is not a small matter.

Mr. Foust said that Mr. Hurley's comments flipped him from being closer to yes and to the realization that staff must defend why they are not doing this. This is no longer a toolkit, it is prescriptive.

Mr. Greeson said that we are operating in large part this way already. The Huntley Road example is a good one, and it would have been more helpful to have context in that conversation. Essentially, Council has called on us when doing projects to be more discerning and look at opportunities for roadways to accommodate new users. We have been doing that ad hoc with no context. For example, when repaving Wilson Bridge west of Rieber, it was the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board and Council who caused us to look at that road. We saw that we could reduce lane width and therefore increase bike lanes and do a rectangular rapid flashing beacon to accommodate a safer crossing for cyclists to get to the Olentangy Trail. That was essentially Complete Streets already. Huntley was the opposite; we were encouraged to look at bikes but then there was a dialogue and Council decided not to do it. This plan and set of policies would have informed those conversations.

Mr. Foust said that the next time a street comes up for resurfacing, staff will be required to defend why they are not implementing certain features as part of that resurfacing. Mr. Greeson said we would look at it, and we would talk with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board about our funding in the Capital Improvements Program and then discuss opportunities to make improvements within funding and if there are practical limitations, that would be discussed with the Board and Council. He gave the example of putting sharrows in the Kilbourne Village neighborhood, we had practical limitations, that was the realistic thing we could afford to do and publicly acceptable to do.

Mr. Whited said that the point is that it would not be that we would do a bike boulevard somewhere. The toolkit is more pedestrian centric than bike centric. In the past we have looked at the possibility to include bicycle and pedestrian improvements but with no real guidance to do that. This gives us the ability to rationally look at the capability for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The idea that we were forced to do that, that is not really the case. It gives us a framework to come up with feasibility alternatives and the ability to rationally look at accommodations. You are looking at these big things, but those are not going to typically happen because they are not practical, affordable, or legal. Mr. Greeson added there is a proactive side of this where Council will have lots of choice. The larger projects that the Board may advocate for are going to be those that require lots of Council discussion and public input. Mr. Whited referenced the Northeast Gateway and how we could have saved money if we had this type of toolkit. We would be best suited to have some sort of Complete Streets policy because we will be dinged when applying for MORPC funding without it.

Mr. Robinson said the ultimate litmus test is that if the average resident picked up the plan and read it, would they would understand the intent and function or assume something different. He thinks it would be something different. He expressed that he thinks it inadvisable to pass it as articulated.

Mr. Myers responded that people will read it how they want.

Mr. Smith asked if we can put the resolution that we passed as page one of the master plan. Mr. Greeson said we can do that. Council can ask staff to include it in publishing of it. Mr. Myers said the text of the resolution references the attached master plan. Mr. Smith said that he likes the idea of the resolution being page one of the plan.

Mr. Foust said that Mr. Smith's idea to attach as page one takes him from a no to yes.

President Michael expressed that the motion to adopt the resolution would be under the understanding that this resolution will be page one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 29-2019 (As Amended) passed by a voice vote with one abstention (Robinson).

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Prior to the introduction of the next resolution, President Michael requested the language in Section 1. be revised to include the same language as inserted in Section 1. of Resolution No. 29-2019 (As Amended).

Resolution No. 30-2019 Adopting a Complete Streets Policy for the City of Worthington.

Introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk including the language recommended by President Michael.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 30-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 30-2019 (As Amended) passed by a vote of five (Kowalczyk, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Michael) to two (Foust, Robinson).

Mr. Smith explained that it was the intent of Council to start implementing these projects. He hopes that we can increase funding in the next budget, so that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board can figure out what projects to tackle in 2020.

Resolution No. 39-2019 Strongly Urging Members of the Ohio General Assembly to Enact the Ohio Fairness Act.

Introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 39-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

Mr. Greeson explained how Ms. Kowalczyk requested that there be a resolution prepared supporting Ohio Senate Bill 11. As is reflected in the documents before you, like the non-discrimination ordinance, it would prohibit discrimination based upon sexual orientation or gender identity and expression.

Ms. Kowalczyk detailed how she asked for consideration of this resolution because June is Pride Month and we just passed our non-discrimination ordinance. It is fitting that we ask our state leaders to step up and take action to support non-discrimination through the Ohio Fairness Act. The act would enact protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity and expression statewide. Our sending of a message to the General Assembly is important to indicate our support. She asks Councilmembers to support this resolution because this is the right thing to do.

Mr. Robinson thanked Ms. Kowalczyk for taking the lead on this.

Ms. Dorothy concurred with Mr. Robinson. We should consider this. She is proud that we have done our own part and that we are sending this resolution to our state representatives.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 39-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 24-2019 Amending Ordinance No. 52-2018 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of the 2019 Street Improvement Program and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 694-19)

Introduced by Mr. Robinson.

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)

- Financial Report – May 2019

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

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Dorothy asked about our policy for the percentage of general funds we should carry over year over year. Mr. Bartter responded that the policy is to maintain 35% of the unencumbered balance, before engaging the financial action plan between 25-35%.

Mr. Robinson clarified what would happen with when the balance is above 50%. Mr. Bartter said that the City Manager would schedule a meeting with City Council to discuss any opportunities that may be available.

- Permission to Advertise for Bid 2019 Street Program Project Number 694-19

MOTION Mr. Myers moved, Mr. Foust seconded a motion to grant permission to bid the 2019 Street Program Project.

The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

- Continued discussion regarding community visioning consultant proposals

Mr. Greeson described how there was discussion at the last special meeting about narrowing down the list of consultants this evening and to discuss checking references. Staff is prepared to help with that conversation this evening.

President Michael said it is an important topic and we do not want to fall behind on getting the process moving.

Mr. Foust asked if it was too bold for each Councilmember to state who they had ranked as number one and see what we get out of that.

Mr. Foust	<i>Poggemeyer</i>
Mr. Smith	<i>Jackson Clark</i>
Ms. Kowalczyk	<i>Planning Next</i>
Ms. Dorothy	<i>Planning Next</i>
Mr. Myers	<i>Planning Next</i>
Ms. Michael	<i>Planning Next</i>
Mr. Robinson	<i>Poggemeyer</i>

Mr. Foust stated that Planning Next was his second choice.

Mr. Myers asked if anyone liked Future IQ, they were his second choice. Ms. Dorothy said she liked them, but they did not go deep enough to get information from the community. Mr. Myers said that he liked Poggemeyer, but he was not sure if they got it. It seemed like they wanted to develop a comprehensive plan, not a visioning statement. It was not until the end that the lightbulb went off. Ms. Dorothy said she did not think they went deep enough either, but they could revise their submittal and expand it because they gave us a more limited scope to begin with.

Mr. Robinson said his concern with Planning Next, as indicated through his questions during the interview, is that he was not consoled about their answers regarding their role in shaping the Upper Arlington process. Specifically when asked what their firm's role was, he described the formation of the decision-making committee, which he felt was constituted with councilmembers and BZA members. He did not speak to what he thought was clear about his concern that their process was biased towards developing an outcome that reflected city management. If we hire them, he will be extremely skeptical and vigilant. He thinks they are the wrong choice.

President Michael asked for Mr. Smith's second choice. Mr. Smith replied Poggemeyer, but they were a distant second choice. He said that Jackson Clark has every element that we have discussed that nobody else brings to the table. Ms. Dorothy said Jackson Clark was her second choice.

Mr. Foust said that he found Poggemeyer to be significantly out front for him. There is a very significant cost differential between choosing Planning Next vs. Poggemeyer, it is

almost double. We need to be accountable about spending money. There has already been some criticism out there about this exercise before we have even started.

Ms. Dorothy asked if we could have them revise their cost estimates to make them more aligned with each other. She does not think we are getting apples to apples with these two.

Ms. Kowalczyk responded they were estimates and in further discussion we can tell them what we are comfortable with, and what we expect for the price. Who ever we look at we can work with. That could be mean narrowing it down to two and seeing who we can work with better.

Mr. Smith said he was supportive of narrowing it down to two. He would like to see how the finalists react to some of the ideas of the other consultants. Nobody talked about an education component which we put as a priority. Each consultant took the environmental scan as something different. He would like to ask the question about how much to facilitate and implement an education component as well.

Ms. Kowalczyk said she recalls some discussion about the education conversation, but it is a good follow-up question to clarify.

Ms. Dorothy said she thought she heard that in Planning Next and with other proposals. But it would be great to clarify what that is, so we know what to expect. She has confidence that we can reach out to get people who will give their input, people we do not normally hear from, which is a key reason why we are doing this. That was heard loud and clear. There are different methodologies.

President Michael said she is hearing that we are talking about seeking additional information from Planning Next and Poggemeyer. She asked what additional information we need from them.

Ms. Kowalczyk said we were going to engage in checking referrals from communities they have interacted with to get feedback.

Mr. Smith volunteered to be scribe again if there are questions for Planning Next, Poggemeyer, or both. He can compile questions and circulate that back out.

President Michael asked if staff would do the reference check.

Mr. Greeson suggested flipping that. We have had single points of contact in Ms. Stewart for the consultants so that we have consistency in that. We can have a collection of questions that we formulate and distribute and have a method of collection of answers from the consultants. Council would engage separately to do reference checks; it may be beneficial to have some of that done by Council. Staff could do the reference check but would need to know what Council wants to ask. A common set of questions for each reference would need developed and then delegate that to one, a group, or staff. Whoever is checking references needs to ask essentially the same set of questions.

Ms. Kowalczyk volunteered to serve on the committee.

Mr. Greeson said staff can work with the committee. It is customary to notify the two who are not finalists and he asked if he could do that. He heard that as Jackson Clark and Future IQ.

REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith detailed how he promised he would re-propose this whole bed tax thing and he proposes a placeholder number to budget \$100,000 for community grants. Mr. Bartter said in the line where that is budgeted, we currently allocate \$136,000 which includes the Ohio Historical Society and the Partnership. He clarified that Mr. Smith would exclude those two and then have the \$100,000. Mr. Greeson said that the portion of the Bed Tax that the City receives that does not go to the Convention and Visitors Bureau goes to General Fund. We appropriated a similar amount last year with a 3% increase. Ms. Kowalczyk said the point is to reallocate more funding to other community grants. She would like to have staff determine the feasibility and have Council consider an increase in allocation for the potential grantees. We struggle with never being able to give enough funding to each of the groups that ask for it. Mr. Greeson detailed how at the end of July there will be a presentation about what staff is seeing from a budgetary standpoint.

Mr. Myers said in July there will be two variances coming before Council. One is an amendment to the Wilson Bridge Corridor. Granby Place missed their excavation by a couple feet and are asking for amendments to their setbacks. Play CBUS is looking for a parking variance.

Ms. Dorothy thanked everyone who attended, planned, and implemented the McConnell Arts Center Arts Festival this weekend.

Ms. Kowalczyk said that the Old Worthington Partnership has instituted a sustainability committee that is looking to implement projects to promote sustainability and looking at sustainability through the businesses in the area. The first meeting discussed reusable bags for the Farmers Market. There was discussion about making sure they are communicating with the City and staff. She volunteered to participate on that committee as well.

President Michael referenced the letter placed a Councilmembers places and how we need to make sure we send a response. Mr. Greeson said that it was anonymous, but we are aware, and we are working on it. President Michael said that the Central Ohio Mayors and Managers Association is asking Cities to prepare resolutions to express their support for Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Ms. Kowalczyk moved, Ms. Dorothy seconded a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss board and commission appointments and land acquisition.

The clerk called the roll on Executive Session. The motion carried by the following vote

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

No 0

Council recessed at 9:49 P.M. from the Regular meeting session

MOTION Mr. Robinson moved, Mr. Myers seconded a motion to return to open session at 10:36 P.M.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Resolution No. 40-2019 To Establish a Community Visioning Committee for the City of Worthington, Ohio, Outlining its Functions and Providing for the Appointment of Members Thereof.

Introduced by Ms. Kowalczyk.

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 40-2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Mr. Myers made a motion to amend Resolution No. 40-2019 to include the appointees discussed and another minor amendment depicted on the document. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

There being no additional comments, the motion to amend Resolution No. 40-2019 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 40-2019 (As Amended) passed unanimously by a voice vote.

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 10:46 p.m.

/s/ Ethan C. Barnhardt
Assistant City Clerk

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
1st day of July, 2019.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President