



**CITY OF WORTHINGTON**  
**Worthington City Council Minutes**  
April 13, 2020

6550 N. High Street  
Worthington, Ohio 43085

---

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

Worthington City Council met remotely in Regular Session on Monday, April 13, 2020, via Microsoft Teams video conference. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Member(s) Absent**

**Also present virtually:** City Manager Matt Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Law Director Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Service & Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning & Building Lee Brown, Director Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire Mark Zambito, Chief of Police Robert Ware, Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

The number of visitors is unknown.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

**VISITOR COMMENTS**

The Clerk remarked that there were no visitor comments.

President Michael commented that because of the pandemic and the statewide orders to stay at home, we are using virtual means to conduct our City Council meetings. Individuals who are interested in sending comments may email them to [council@worthington.org](mailto:council@worthington.org) or call in using (567) 249-0063 with Conference ID: 894 456 406. There is an approximate 30 second delay in the live stream so there will be times during the public comment portions of the meeting when we will pause to allow time for the live stream to catch up and for any phone calls to come in. We will do our presentations first, take Council comments and

then if there are any comments from the public regarding the topic, they will be read into the record.

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- Meeting Minutes – March 9, 2020

**MOTION** Mr. Robinson moved, Mr. Bucher seconded a motion to remove the meeting minutes of March 9, 2020 from the table.

**The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

President Michael understands that Mr. Robinson wishes to amend the minutes that were sent out. She asked if there was a motion.

**MOTION** Mr. Robinson moved, and Mr. Smith seconded a motion to amend the meeting minutes of March 9, 2020 as proposed by Mr. Robinson.

President Michael explained for those watching the meeting online that the exact amendment language was included as part of the Agenda packet available on the City’s website. She invited Council members to comment.

*Ms. Dorothy commented that she would like to amend the statement that categorized her as “interjecting.” She was merely answering a question posed by Mr. Bates.*

Mr. Robinson agreed to the change. No other members had any changes.

**The motion to amend the minutes of March 9, 2020 as discussed carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

## **REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

- Rush Run Stream Study

*Mr. Greeson greeted Council members and those watching online. He explained that this is a Committee of the Whole meeting which typically is when Council and staff workshop and discuss more substantive topics but do not necessarily act. Tonight, there are two important studies that the City has been conducting and will be presenting to Council. The first one is the Rush Run Stream study. He invited Service & Engineering Director Dan Whited to introduce the topic as well as the consultants who will be presenting.*

*Mr. Whited shared that he is excited to present the two studies to Council. The first presentation is by Dr. Hawley with Sustainable Streams and work with consultants with Strand and Associates. This was not an engineering study but rather an evaluation of the*

*erosion conditions with the stream and determine what might be done to mitigate those conditions. He invited Dr. Hawley to share the results of the study and potential solutions.*

*Dr. Hawley thanked everyone for the opportunity to share their information this evening. He is principal scientist at Sustainable Streams and will be joined by Chris Rust from Strand and Associates during this presentation. He invited anyone interested in more detail to review the memorandum that was provided with the council materials.*

*Dr. Hawley displayed a PowerPoint presentation, the first slide of which showed a higher view assessment of the entire reach of Rush Run, which flows from the northeast at Huntley Road towards the southwest through the city. As the stream gets closer to the Olentangy River, there is less elevation for the stream to drop, which creates banks that are shallow, gentle, and well vegetated. Moving upstream from East South St., the banks become taller and tend to be more unstable the closer you get to McCoy Ave. One could ask why this section of Rush Run exhibits so much erosion. They get hired to answer that question.*

*Dr. Hawley shared that streams in a suburban watershed must adjust to greater run off than what use to occur. Rain previously hit the tree leaves and gradually make its way into the topsoil and eventually into the stream. With houses and roads, the sealed surfaces deflect that water and route it more quickly into the stream. The streams adjust to that additional water by getting larger. Streams in suburban watersheds tend to erode about ten times the rate of the rural streams which tend to erode at nominal rates. That is why Rush Run in general is getting larger and having more erosion issues.*

*Conventional detention basins do not begin to attenuate flow until there is a very large storm, like the two-year storm and higher, when you want to hold back water for flood control purposes. Typical storms are less than that two-year volume.*

*When talking about stream erosion we need to think about the flow of water that initiates the movement of particles on the bed. That movement of particles is when erosion occurs. Greater erosion occurs in our suburban watersheds with conventional detention. The more times that particles get displaced, the deeper the original stream bed becomes and the more unstable and wider the stream. The stream tends to become deeper around what is called the hard points or base level. That is why the farther upstream from the base level, like with the Olentangy, the deeper the stream can get.*

*In looking down on our original stream, this displacement of particles made the banks taller. As they become taller and steeper, they become unstable which leads to bank failure and erosion. The banks will continue to widen because of the unstable conditions. It will eventually begin to develop piles of sediment at the toes of the banks and over long enough periods of time and after eating up a whole lot of channel or property and soil, we can return to an equilibrium condition where the stream is flatter and has returned to stability. There is a great deal of instability between those points. A stream cannot become deeper without eroding the particles on the bed.*

*When thinking about design to hold back water it is important to figure out what the critical discharge is for the stream system and then tailor controls to meet that critical discharge. Data was collected on Rush Run. They have the critical discharge estimate for Rush Run as a design target for our storm water recommendations upstream.*

*Dr. Hawley shared a case study that he and Strand Associates participated in that included the Environmental Protection Agency. In that study, they took a conventionally designed detention basin and inserted a device that restricts the discharge on the typical events from a 24" hole and choked it down to an 8" opening. There was also a by-pass that allows for discharge of a larger amount to maintain flood capacity. They restricted discharge of the more frequent storms. The retrofit was designed to take a system that used to exceed the critical discharge about every three months on average and extended it to only exceed every twenty-four months on average. The device substantially increased the time between events that cause erosion and thereby gives the stream time between erosive events for vegetation to start to re-stabilize the area.*

Dr. Hawley showed slides of the stream before the device was installed and then again six years later. By adjusting the flow rate the stream was able to recover on its own.

Dr. Hawley invited Chris Rust to share the plan for Huntley Bowl.

*Mr. Rust agreed that Huntley Bowl presents a similar opportunity to reduce erosion in Rush Run. As they evaluate detention basins such as the Huntley Bowl Park detention basin, one of the first things they did was evaluate the roughly 565 acres of tributary that flows into the actual detention basin. Not only is the scale of the drainage area large, but the number of impervious surfaces is also substantial. The existing roadway, pavement, and buildings, which amount to 350 acres of impervious surfaces, drain into the Huntley Bowl Park detention basin.*

Mr. Rust explained that they then evaluate the types of facilities to try to understand the amount of storage, volume, and capacity that this type of detention facility provides. He explained the process used to evaluate what the storage volume capacity of the detention basin is. In this case, 57.7 acre-feet equates to 18.8 million gallons of storage volume capacity. They do not often come across a detention basin of this scale from both the drainage area standpoint and the overall storage volume capacity.

*The concrete channels around the detention basin quickly route the flow from upstream directly to the outlet pipe and down the stream into Rush Run. Water detention likely does not occur with the smaller storms.*

Mr. Rust shared several images of detention basin retrofit options that would be appropriate for the Huntley Bowl and will provide a significant benefit in terms of reduced flow rates out of the detention basin. They also looked at an option that included excavation, re-grading and restoration within the bottom of the detention basin. 8,900 cubic yards of excavation will result in 5.5 acre-feet of additional storage volume. The Planning-Level

opinion of probable construction cost is about \$378,000 which includes a 30% contingency.

Mr. Rust showed hydrographs for Huntley Bowl with existing conditions, retrofit conditions with no grading and then with grading. There was a pretty significant reduction in peak flow after the retrofit fit and grading were done. That reduction translates into a significant reduction of excess sediment being transported downstream from the Huntley Bowl basin.

*Dr. Hawley stated that Huntley Bowl is an extremely rare opportunity to address the root cause of the problem. It will not stop all erosion, but it is something the City can do now to help facilitate a gradual return to more natural rates of erosion. Any banks that are currently unstable, especially if they are geotechnically unstable, can remain unstable for some time. But the goal, by holding the flow back, is to give the stream the ability to induce aggradation at the toe of an unstable bank and that aggradation can become stable and be a buttress to an unstable bank and substantially slow that down. It is also not allowing the bank and toe to become further eroded. The bank itself might be unstable but the toe has become stable which is a positive improvement and allows the stream to do that on its own. This is something the City can do now because it is city-owned property.*

*Dr. Hawley shared that instream solutions are technically feasible but need to be systematic to ensure long term success. Small projects can be undermined by instability in adjacent reaches. Even designs by experienced practitioners can be prone to failures, especially in challenging settings. The Huntley Bowl is a challenging setting. This type of solution is technically possible. It is much less expensive and gets at the root cause of the problem.*

*President Michael thanked Dr. Hawley and Mr. Rust for the presentation and asked if any members had questions.*

*Mr. Bucher thanked the two for their presentation and stated that he is looking forward to seeing this project move forward.*

*Mr. Myers stated that he was curious as to whether Mr. Whited has prepared a recommendation at this point. Mr. Whited replied that he recommends going forward with this Huntley Bowl mitigation/improvement plan. He thinks it will go a long way to mitigating some of the problems in the stream. As Dr. Hawley said, it is rare to have an opportunity to make significant improvements to the stream. It will take some time for it to do healing, but he thinks it will. That does not mean that other things will not need to be done in the stream over time but carefully, well-thought through and in conjunction with the Huntley Bowl improvements will change the characteristics of the stream flows*

*When asked by Mr. Myers if he thinks this will impact the erosion all the way to the Olentangy, Mr. Whited thinks the impact will be all the way. The characteristics of the watershed Mr. Rust described shows a large component of that impervious watershed is upstream but there is a significant component downstream that does change the flow*

*characteristics. The improvements in the flow characteristics will lessen as they go downstream. It will have an impact all the way as the flow characteristics change and the physical characteristics of the streams change.*

*Ms. Dorothy commented that she wanted to confirm that currently we have in-stream controls that are failing, which is one of the reasons we are at this point. Mr. Whited agreed.*

*Ms. Dorothy further stated that Huntley Bowl is not currently being used to its full potential as was already noted. There is a great potential there and we could use it more. Mr. Whited explained that it was designed in an old school manner, which was more of a flood control than an erosion control characteristic. During those big storms it would hold the water back and flow over a larger period at a higher flow rate.*

*Ms. Dorothy commented that the vegetation we want to see after the peak flows are reduced. She asked if planting of any vegetation would need to occur. Mr. Whited thinks that some will occur naturally but whether we would want to supplement is a question for Dr. Hawley. Dr. Hawley agreed that it will certainly be colonized by the vegetation that is out there. Much of the vegetation is invasive so many communities supplement with native vegetation. One way is through the live stake programs which plant live cuttings of native plants like willows and silky dogwoods. He explained that the seed bank of herbaceous ground cover is there, and they expect it to take off. He added that if we can have one or two years of normal rain, then that is when we can kind of give the system the pause for that vegetation to take root and facilitate that recovery.*

*Mr. Robinson noted that David Hudson sent an email at 6:30 p.m. and asked if the Sustainable Streams and Strand report includes separate recommendations for stabilization of the Rush Run stream bed, as well as retrofit alternatives to the Huntley Bowl Detention Basin. He asked if Council is planning to implement both sets of recommendations at this time. Mr. Whited explained that the City owns the Huntley Bowl property. There is no environmental permitting required and no easements or access questions. The instream work must be planned out extremely carefully. We recommend doing the excavation work at the Huntley Bowl first then investigate and analyze what impact that has on the stream. At the same time, consider what other options can be down downstream with the new discharge rate we will have. After the work on the Huntley Bowl, the characteristics of the stream are going to be much different than they are today. It will have an impact on the design and environmental permitting in the stream would be significant and take several years to design, let alone build.*

*Mr. Robinson believes Mr. Whited answered questions one and two of Mr. Hudson's. His third question focused on the stabilization of the streambeds. He asks whether the recommendation for the repair or replacement of the gabion baskets is only for the first 1,100 feet from McCoy bridge downstream. He asked what the intention is for the remaining baskets beyond that. Mr. Whited replied that Dr. Hawley's study did not go into individual reaches. Those specifics would be in the final design work.*

*Tom Lindsey acknowledged receiving the email from Nicky and David Hudson as well as questions from Susan and Dustin Mondrach. Since the Hudson's email has already been addressed, he asked the Clerk of Council to read the remaining questions.*

Mrs. Thress commented that the Mondrach's questions pertain to the area below 290 E. South Street and are as follows:

1. Your conceptual recommendations dated August 2019, Page 1 recommends evaluation by structural engineer & geotechnical engineers. You further state on Page 2 that "A full solution for a privately owned hillslope that tall and steep (e.g. a deep retaining wall, sheet piles, etc.) would need to be developed by a geotechnical/structural engineer." Engineered solutions for deep retaining wall, sheet piles, etc. were developed prior to your report in the Summer of 2018 and rejected by the City for the CDC Designed "Boulder J-Hook" solution (attached). I'm sure you've seen this. Why does this report still recommend deep retaining wall, sheet piles, etc?
2. The CDC design proposed a "Willow Live Stake Planting Area", & "Erosion Control Matting" in the exact location that structural engineers and geotechnical engineers maintain the deep retaining wall needs to be located to prevent further subsidence. Can the City Reasonably develop an alternate solution at this location that includes a retaining wall?
3. The CDC Engineered details illustrate shallow bank diagrams in the areas of the Willow Stakes & Erosion Control Matting. Will the creek width be made narrower at these locations to decrease the angle of the bank? If not, how is the first 5' (the Toe of the riverbank) to be maintain as it is almost vertical?

*Mr. Whited explained that before we got involved with Dr. Hawley, CDC had looked at some potential to do a piecemeal solution in front of Mr. and Mrs. Mondrach's house based on a meeting he and Mr. Lindsey had on site with Mr. Mondrach. That was sort of an isolated attempt to do what Dr. Hawley is looking to do in a different way because there are some physical changes to the stream. It all must be reevaluated. Once we began conversations with Mr. Mondrach and his attorneys and then engaged with Dr. Hawley, we completely set CDC aside and did not look at it any further. They are sort of unrelated now that we have changed the approach to how this will be accomplished.*

*Secondly, no final design has been done. The design in CDC was started and never completed and will have to be reevaluated. The answer is that it is currently hard to tell.*

*The third question goes to what Dr. Hawley stated in his report and described tonight. The change in the characteristics of that stream bank would do that based on it being aggregated back to its condition over time. It was what CDC was planning to do in a different way.*

Mrs. Thress reported receiving another e-mail from Mr. Mondrach in which he asked who will coordinate the instream repairs that need to be systematically installed.

*Mr. Lindsey replied that the City has gone down sort of two simultaneous paths after he and Mr. Whited met with the Mondrachs at their property. Mr. Whited started down the path of contacting CDC to do some localized repair work as he indicated. Mr. Lindsey reported that at the same time he was starting to make preliminary overtures to Dr. Hawley and Sustainable Streams about doing a more comprehensive study. Also, during that time, the City received a demand letter from the Mondrach's attorney, which then sort of changed the source of how the City responded to two ventures. The City did receive C.I.P. funding and Council approval in 2019 however, further design and implementation of the localized repairs were put on hold and the study with Sustainable Streams did proceed forward in the summer of 2019.*

*Mr. Lindsey reported on the settlement discussions that occurred over time and concluded only recently when the City Council's attorney and the Mondrach's attorney approved that settlement. Part of the settlement authorized funding necessary to do repairs over a thirty-year period. The funding for the work proposed in the settlement included two components: one was the study that Dr. Hawley performed. That work has now been completed. The other portion of that work in the C.I.P. from 2019 was the localized repair, which has not yet been done. Mr. Whited indicated the design of that work is in the final form. If the Huntley Bowl project moves forward, it sounds like the appropriate design may change based on the change in the flow rate of the stream. He anticipates the design engineering would be a coordinated effort between the Mondrach's attorneys and the City's insurance defense attorneys.*

*Mr. Lindsey added that the settlement was a compromised settlement of the disputed legal claim where neither party admitted liability or responsibility. The City's position at the onset was that we did not have legal liability for the upper bank repairs and therefore moving forward it would be the property owner's responsibility as to what repairs they might or might not be willing to fund. He would anticipate that at some point the City may want to entertain whether to play a role in coordinating the appropriate design for the repairs needed for each property owner. There would need to be detail and legal determination of appropriate design. There would also need to be legal determination of access rights and authority and permissions granted to do the work. Lastly, the funding of the project would also need to be determined. There are many questions left to be resolved and he recalls Mr. Whited saying that the EPA permitting process is lengthy. He thinks that after the Huntley Bowl improvements are completed and time determines whether the improvements were as Dr. Hawley expects, we will know how to proceed.*

Mrs. Thress reported receiving an additional e-mail, this one from Paul Dorothy. Mr. Dorothy asked if the intent is to repair/replace the existing gabion baskets or could a more natural looking solution utilizing class B rip-rap be utilized given the reduced velocity of the release after updating Huntley Bowl.



*Mr. Whited agreed that any sorts of different types of natural solutions and things other than rock and riprap can be considered. The fact that typical stream flow rates will be reduced make those more appropriate. That is certainly a possibility and all a final design issue that would have to be considered.*

*Mr. Whited shared that staff has been working with Friends of the Olentangy Watershed (FLOW) on some of this effort. Because they are very interested in what is going on in this area, they have offered to apply for a 319 grant to the EPA and on behalf of the City. That grant has been submitted and could potentially fund the Huntley Bowl improvements. He just wanted to make Council aware of that and give a big “Thank you” to FLOW. President Michael, on behalf of City Council, added her “Thank You” to FLOW for taking the initiative. She hopes the grant is approved.*

*Mr. Greeson thanked Mr. Whited and Mr. Lindsey as well as Dr. Hawley and Mr. Rust. He appreciates all their work. This is obviously an important project and one that has been identified as a must-do project in our C.I.P. as are many of our projects. Considering the financial impacts of COVID-19, we will likely be reviewing all our C.I.P. Staff is currently evaluating which projects must move forward this year. Each project is to be categorized as must-do, should-do, could-do, or won't-do. Our evaluation puts this project in the must-do category. But we do not make that decision unilaterally as staff. In the coming weeks we will talk to members about all our C.I.P. projects and determine which ones to move forward, which ones to delay, and which ones to cut all together. While he would expect staff to recommend moving this project forward, we think Council should make that decision in the context of the entire C.I.P. and not just our individual presentation this evening.*

*Mr. Lindsey shared that the one exception to the sort of wait and evaluate would be the commitment the City made to the Mondrachs to do the local bank repair. So legal obligations are must-dos and the City has every intention to move forward with that. However, given the questions from the Mondrachs, the need to coordinate may delay between the engineers. He wants to make sure there is no misunderstanding about his comments about coordination that the City was not moving forward because we are legally obligated to do so.*

- Waterline Study

*Mr. Greeson shared that we are blessed to live in a historic community. On occasion that does not feel like a blessing because it means we have old infrastructure that we must replace or provide maintenance on. Staff has systemically evaluated all our infrastructure and Mr. Whited and his team have done a great job. We have comprehensive evaluations of sewer systems and we have been working through each of our major sewer sheds to deal with sanitary sewer improvements. Staff has already reported on some of those sanitary sewer and storm water related items. We have aging waterlines and have been evaluating our needs to invest in our waterline system. Money was included in the C.I.P. each year as a placeholder, to invest in those waterlines until we had a larger game plan rooted in a thorough valuation of the entire system. He asked Mr. Whited to report on this item.*

*Mr. Whited reported being excited to move this item forward with larger initiatives. Like many communities we have some issues with aging infrastructures and waterlines are no small part of that. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was sent out last year and Strand & Associates was selected to review our waterline system. The RFP was sent to multiple firms for a study that included evaluation of adequacy of our existing waterlines, the capacity adequacy as well as serviceable life, needs, and deficiencies. They were to look at best management practices on how to improve that over time as well as identify and help prioritize those waterlines in the highest risk to us for some things that they will go through in their study. Strand and Associates was selected. The RFP also asked for assisting us in evaluating our long-term best management practices for operation and maintenance over time. They have done a very high-level evaluation of our system. He introduced Heidi Rose and asked her to introduce her team.*

*Ms. Rose shared that she is serving as the project manager for this project. Kelly Kuhbander and Nina Duerk are responsible for design and standards that we have set today uniquely catered to Worthington for the priorities we discussed. Lastly Kris Ruggles is helping with funding options.*

*Ms. Rose shared that their goal was to identify the real condition of the water system that is specifically owned by Worthington. They were to help provide prioritize system improvements based on the risk of failure, develop a list of priority projects and anticipated costs to inform the C.I.P. and allow pursuit of outside funding.*

*Ms. Rose reported that the first thing they did was identify the level of service that Worthington is responsible for. Worthington is unique in that it contracts with the city of Columbus. There are separate infrastructures and guidelines that Worthington is required to follow that are like Federal and State standards. They also looked at the City's current practices and help provide some guidance on any industry standards that can give them an opportunity to improve the water infrastructure with the costs. Knowing the cost is limited, we can help put together a schedule that can help the City prioritize those. They are also working with the City on the accreditation process to help the overall City recommendation through ACWA and be recognized nationally for that.*

*Ms. Rose shared the first step of any good operation is to know what you have. To do that we needed to look through the system inventory. She invited Nina Duerk to comment on this item.*

*Ms. Duerk explained how they went through the water system inventory mapping for the city of Worthington. They started high-level looking at the city limits, the topography, land-use, streams, railroads, street classification and water system. They looked at the hydrants, pump station and services. Then they looked at the sanitary and storm sewers, the customers served by the water system and then the emergency services within the City. This research helped them take a holistic view at everything and decide in conjunction with the City, how to prioritize the water main. They looked specifically at the water main information and into the ownership, whether it was city of Columbus or city of*

*Worthington. The size and materials used, break history, installation year and redundancy were also looked at. With any system one must start by looking at the information you have. As they started digging into the GIS information that was received from the City, they found there were approximately 278 missing attributes for any of the given data she mentioned. They needed to begin by filling in those gaps so, they met with City staff and together worked to complete the information to get the best overall view of the system.*

*Next, they began talking about the water system evaluation. This is where they get into the overall risk prioritization, defining the risk of failure of a pipe. She explained that the process included assigning the pipes a probability of failure between one and ten and a consequence of failure between one and ten. The pipe that is the highest risk of failure would receive a score of 100 and pipes with the lowest risk failure would receive a lower score. The probability of failure criteria includes the useful life remaining, number of breaks and break rates. The lowest probability of failure receives a score of one while the highest would receive a score of five.*

*With useful life remaining they looked at type of material and the year it was installed. That enabled them to quantify the pipes in the two to four range. A score of five would mean the pipe is past useful life. The number of breaks and break rate are a little bit different because the number of breaks on a pipe segment does not always describe what is going on in GIS since a shorter segment could have more breaks than a longer segment. This is all factored into the consequence of failure and gets classified with its proximity to railroads and streams, emergency services, major customers, redundancy, critical economic customers, and then the critical assets set by owner.*

*To touch on a couple of things, pipe diameter can tell the consequence of failure. Straight classification, the busier the road, the higher the consequence a break would be as it would disrupt more traffic. Also, the agency coordination – different types of roads would require higher levels of coordination between agencies and the City. This would need to be classified as a higher consequence of failure because they may take longer to repair. The proximity to railroads and streams cause environmental impacts and coordination required to fix both. Any pipe near a stream or railroad would receive a higher score. Consequence of failure would also be higher with items classified as emergency, like schools and police and fire stations as well as major customers such as industries.*

*With redundancy, they looked to determine if there would be a different way for customers to receive water within the system if one pipe broke or is it a critical pipe within the system that would cut people off from water. Economic customers and the pipes that serve those customers were identified by the City. With critical assets by owner, once the GIS information is given back, the City will be able to adjust those critical assets however it sees fit and identify projects that need to occur.*

*They looked at all of this information through the GIS data they received and had almost 2,000 different pipe segments. Since they could not look at each individual segment, they developed an ark python computer code and were able to assign the pipe a Consequence of Failure and Probability of Failure score and ultimately that Risk of Failure score. This*

*approach allowed them to look at every pipe without having to spend the extra time stepping through it. The City will receive this GIS code and can update as needed.*

*Ms. Duerk commented that overall, the system has many pipes in good condition. There are some in the older part of the City that have a higher Probability of Failure either because of a higher number of breaks, break rate or the pipes could be past its useful life.*

*On the Consequence of Failure map, we noticed that the main roads, highways, and the industrial corridors show a higher consequence of failure but overall, the system is not in a critical state.*

*The Risk of Failure map helped them identify some of the project areas. It considers the Risk Failure and Consequence of Failure and generates a map that shows some issues in the industrial corridors and again in the older areas of the City.*

*Ms. Kuhbander provided an overview of some of the projects they identified using this system. After completing the Risk Assessment, they have a Risk Ranking score that is assigned to each individual water main in the City. Their next step was to determine how to break the map with the Risk scores into logical project sizes that can be accomplished in one C.I.P. project and then determine what order to put each of those projects into. Then they had to decide which projects were the most critical. There were additional things that needed to be considered to determine the most critical such as planned paving programs, sewers projects and other capital projects. Anytime multiple projects can be combined into one construction contract that causes less disruption for the residents. Once they identified the project locations, they can run them through the prioritization criteria sheet to assign a score based on the risk. By putting the projects through this process, a list ranking the City's current top three priority water main replacement projects was developed. She used "current" because they are still going back and forth with the City doing final tweaks as they wrap up their evaluation. Every tool they developed, every scoring matrix they have done has been customized for the city of Worthington. It has been developed in a way that the City can update and continue to score new projects in the future. With the COVID-19 issues, the City is going to need tools like this to help determine what projects can move forward and what projects must move forward. It gives the City the ability to make those decisions.*

*Mr. Ruggles shared that they investigated essentially every public funding source available in the state of Ohio that they are aware of. There are three eligibility public funding sources identified for Worthington. There are two grants available (the Ohio Public Works Commission and Ohio Development Services Agency) and two loans (the Ohio Public Works Commission and Ohio Water Development Authority).*

Mr. Ruggles explained the grant and loan programs to Council members.

*Mr. Whited commented that this tool is something the City sorely needs. The cost of the top three projects identified (totaling over \$3,000,000) is significantly high. This program is a Service and Engineering Director's dream. He and his staff can go through and*

*evaluate the information on a regular basis and use it to their advantage to make critical decisions. He is impressed with the work they have done and excited to utilize the program.*

*Ms. Dorothy asked what kind of funds are available in the C.I.P. and what kind of projects can we tackle with those funds. She added that for the water system evaluation, is there any weight given to the people in Worthington that have lead components.*

*Mr. Whited replied that he believes the lead is related to the service lines and not the public municipal lines that we have control over. That would be significant but somewhat unrelated to the bigger picture of changing out the large waterlines. To the question about what funds are available, we currently have \$500,000 a year programmed into the C.I.P. Essentially, we could do 1½ of the first two projects depending how they came through. Again, that would go to our must-do, would-do, should-do stuff as we move forward.*

*When asked by Ms. Dorothy what we are currently spending on repairs, Mr. Whited explained that it varies from year to year. This year is going to be well over \$100,000. Last year it was around \$30,000 and the year before between \$70,000 and \$80,000. We spent significant funds to reimburse the city of Columbus for the waterline fixes they have done. It is all based on a formula they do, and that number varies quite a bit each year.*

*Ms. Dorothy commented that it would be nice to become proactive. We obviously needed the study to get our bearings to know what our highest priority needs are. She would love to get as much done as quickly as possible.*

*Ms. Kowalczyk asked if any of the top three projects could potentially qualify for grant funding. Mr. Ruggles explained that all waterline projects are eligible for Public Works Commission funds and having other components like roadway included in those will make them more competitive within the region. It comes down to who Worthington would be competing against and what other components may be involved in the project.*

*To Mr. Bucher's question about whether there is a way to partner with Columbus water on any of this, Mr. Whited replied Columbus supplies the water and we provide the maintenance on the waterlines per our contract.*

*When asked by President Michael if any e-mails were received, Mrs. Thress reported that one email came in from Mr. Paul Dorothy. His comments are as follows:*

The evaluation seems to be biased towards businesses. While it is important to provide sufficient infrastructure to keep and attract businesses to Worthington's business corridors, we must be cognizant that home based businesses are becoming more prevalent—in fact, many of us that are working now, are working from our homes. Further, we cannot lose sight of the fact that water is essential for life. We have significant sections of our residential infrastructure that is failing. During our recent Council election, the Colonial Hills neighborhood was surveyed regarding residents greatest concerns, the condition of the water lines within the neighborhood, which is shown in your study as most of the highest probability for failure sections of the entire Worthington system, was a top concern.

The current approach assumes that by definition businesses are more vital than our residential areas. Many of the consequences of failure metrics are biased toward business usage and business corridors. Approximately a third of the metrics listed result in high scores for business corridors and low scores for residential corridors, well beyond double counting. The result of this type of analysis is clearly shown by how the thermal mapping of the problem gets stood on its head when one compares the probability of failure map to the blended analysis map. This is WRONG! What is more important is the number of impacted persons. There is no metric under consequence of failure that attributes the total number of potentially impacted persons, whether employees or residents. The metrics regarding consequence of failure need to be adjusted to be a fair measure for all concerned.

*Mr. Whited commented that he disagrees with Mr. Dorothy's statement. Some of the business stuff focused on high-end users like Hyperion, who use a large volume of water. There is also some significant focus given to residents and it is not a final deal yet. We as staff will go through the final analysis and make sure we are focused on being fair and focused on the citizens of the community, both businesses and residents. He agrees with Mr. Dorothy about that being an important thing to do.*

*President Michael commented that members are going to be looking forward to receiving information and having to make decisions on capital improvements considering the COVID-19 issue.*

- Financial Report – March 2020

*Mr. Greeson, before turning the meeting over to Mr. Bartter, stated that this is the Financial Report through the end of March. Obviously, we think April will be dramatically different. Mr. Bartter is going to cover the last month's Fiscal Report and give you context for the next one.*

*Mr. Bartter stated that he wanted to quickly touch base on the financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. As you know, the payment and tax return filing date has been extended to July 15<sup>th</sup>, which will affect our cash flow. What we would have previously received in the months between May and August will not be received until August through November. That impacts individual and net profit returns. Late last week we received early estimations on the impact, due to COVID-19 from the Regional Income Tax Agency (RITA), both in terms of delay and loss of income tax. Individual estimated delay is \$1.353 million. Individual estimated projected loss is about \$246,000. Net profit estimated delay is about \$1.8 million. The withholding estimated projected loss is about \$2 million. The total projected loss related to COVID-19, at least from some early numbers run by the RITA, is \$2,250,000 in 2020. That will impact both 2020 and then how we compound that out into the future in five-year forecast. We are building off a lower base and whether the economy builds gradually or rubber bands back up is going to have a big impact in the projections.*

*The COVID-19 pandemic is not going to affect just the income tax because the closure of both the Griswold and Community Center has a financial impact on us. The Parks and Recreation Department estimated the closure through May 5<sup>th</sup> and they are estimating the loss of revenue at about \$370,000. That is just through May 5<sup>th</sup> so obviously if that is extended, especially into the summer camps, he thinks that is going to be exacerbated. The gas tax, while that does not get receipted into the General Fund, it does impact the street repair and highway fund. We anticipate lower revenue coming in the gas tax due to the Stay at Home order, lower collections and fines and forfeitures from the Mayor's Court, and we currently do not have much in motel/hotel tax. He will continue to provide information as it becomes available. He added that he needs a motion to accept the March Financial Report. He would be happy to answer any questions.*

*Mr. Robinson commented that in the March report Mr. Bartter identified revenue impacts of COVID-19. He asked about the expenses and whether any expenses will be impacted such that the net effect might not be quite as severe as indicated in the initial report. Mr. Bartter replied that at this point we are going to look at reducing expenses to the point where we can conserve cash for the next 60 days. Much of the savings would have come in the way of payroll in terms of part-time employees at the Parks and Recreation Department, which we continue to pay for two pays. There are not many other expenses but again, we are going to go through this with a fine-tooth comb. We have already started looking for possible expenditure saving opportunities.*

*Mr. Robinson stated that on page 6, you give the General Fund overview. He asked what happened with the Township Fire Service variance that is down \$183,000. Mr. Bartter replied that it has not yet come in. We are waiting on the larger portion.*

*When asked by Mr. Robinson about the Property Tax, Mr. Bartter replied that we are waiting on the State reimbursement for Homestead exemption. It has yet to come in as well.*

*Mr. Robinson thanked Mr. Bartter and commented that he provides excellent work as always.*

**MOTION** Ms. Kowalczyk moved, Mr. Myers seconded a motion to accept the March 2020 Financial Report as presented.

**The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

## **REPORT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

*Ms. Dorothy shared that the Arts Fair at the MAC has been canceled as have other neighboring events because of COVID-19. This is going to be interesting times.*

*Mr. Robinson commented that even though doing a meeting like this pale to being with everyone, it is nice hearing from members. He misses them. President Michael shared that she thinks they are all missing each other and the community. She is glad everyone is*

*staying safe and healthy, which is the most important thing. We will find a way to come through this.*

*Mr. Greeson added that they will be hearing a lot more from staff on the financial issues and some of the methodology that was the basis of the numbers that Mr. Bartter shared. That information will be sent out this week. Staff is working hard going through everything as Mr. Bartter indicated, to develop strategies that will prepare us for what could be multiple scenarios that are difficult to predict. Members should expect additional information at each upcoming meeting. We look forward to working with Council on what are really important issues on how we move forward.*

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay. Thress  
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this  
4<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2020.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael  
Council President