



City Council Agenda

Minutes

Monday, March 15, 2021 at 7:30 pm

6550 N. High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085

Virtual Meeting Information

Link through: worthington.org

Our Government - Live Stream

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

Worthington City Council met remotely in Regular Session on Monday, March 15, 2021, via Microsoft Teams videoconference. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Minutes:

Members Present: Peter Bucher, Rachael Dorothy, Beth Kowalczyk, Scott Myers, David Robinson, Doug Smith and Bonnie Michael

Member(s) Absent: None

Also Present: City Manager Matt Greeson, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager Economic Development Director David McCorkle, Law Director Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Service & Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning & Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, IT Director Gene Oliver, Chief of Police Robert Ware, Chief of Fire & EMS Mark Zambito, Director of Personnel Lori Trego, Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Minutes:

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

4. Visitor Comments

Minutes:

There were no visitor comments.

Special Presentation(s)

5. Good Neighbor Award

To Congratulate Nicole Roedig on Her Recognition as the Recipient of the 2020 Good Neighbor Award from the Worthington Community Relations Commission.

Minutes:

Resolution No. 10-2021 was introduced by Mr. Bucher

MOTION: Ms. Kowalczyk moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to adopt Resolution No. 10-2021.

Resolution No. 10-2021 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Chair of the Community Relations Commission Eddie Pauline described how we can all agree that 2020 was a challenging year and many were able to get through the year due to the wonderful neighbors they have. We received many deserving applicants for the Good Neighbor Award and emerging from those candidates was Nicole Roedig's nomination. She worked hard to create thousands of masks and recruited volunteers to make a positive difference over the past year. She has been given the Good Neighbor Award for 2020. She will be able to display a sign in her front yard and also potentially be featured in the Memorial Day Parade.

Mr. Pauline read the language of the Resolution and congratulated Ms. Roedig on receiving this honor.

Ms. Roedig stressed how she is so humbled and honored to receive this award. She thanked all of those who have helped her in this effort, sewing masks and distributing them. She thanked her family for putting up with the sewing machine for countless hours. She also thanked the community for wearing masks and expressed how we will get through this.

President Michael thanked Ms. Roedig for her efforts giving back to the community and conveyed how we cannot thank her enough for her efforts.

6. Community Visioning Video

Minutes:

Mr. Sherman thanked Council for the time tonight to present the final piece of the visioning work. One of the main goals of the Committee was to create a clear articulation of the community's aspirations for the future. This led to the creation of seven visions and supporting principles. The Committee felt that a video featuring residents describing the vision statements would be an effective presentation of the work to the community. Mr. Lees took on this project, producing the video that you are about to see. A special shout-out goes to Ms. Brown for her assistance and editing talents.

The Visioning Committee video was played for Council.

Mr. Sherman expressed that the video meets the expectations of the visions that are Worthington and it demonstrates how we are a community that cares and our future rests in each other.

Ms. Dorothy asked how this video would be distributed for everyone to be able to see. Mr. Sherman replied that it would be distributed via social media and a link directing

people to the video would be on the Village Green.

Approval of the Minutes

7. Approval of Minutes - February 16, 2021, March 1, 2021, March 8, 2021 (Special), and March 8, 2021

Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dorothy to approve the meeting minutes as presented.

The Motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Public Hearings on Legislation

8. Ordinance No. 09-2021 Facial Covering Requirements Extended

Extending the Requirement for the Wearing of Facial Coverings.

Minutes:

Mr. Lindsey detailed how this ordinance includes a change regarding the date to which we extend the requirement to wear masks. After Council discussion last week regarding vaccination rates and the need to continue wearing masks, a blank has been included for Council to determine when to extend the requirement until. It could be extended to whatever date that Council determines, and it will be monitored whether it can be terminated early, or extended further out. He has included additional Whereas language to express that the date is chosen as a precaution, but we are hopeful to terminate the requirements at a later date.

Mr. Robinson asked whether we could review the rationale behind the date specific requirement, versus the cessation of the public health orders. He does not have a position, but he does not remember the reasoning. Mr. Lindsey replied that the health orders in this case, the Columbus Ordinance does revert to the end of that, but it is Columbus Public Health that establishes their public health orders. It is the State of Ohio that establishes the state's public health orders. Worthington does not have separate authority to establish those. The concern was that it would be preferable to be in Council's authority to determine a date, not some outside entity, since it is Council's ordinance and Council should control when it should end. Mr. Myers expressed that Mr. Lindsey accurately represented his position on this. Mr. Robinson asked if there was any circumstance where we would extend our mask policy beyond the public health orders. Mr. Myers brought up how the City of Austin, Texas has imposed a citywide mask mandate even though the Governor of Texas has repealed the statewide ban, and the Governor has now sued the City of Austin to enforce his order.

Mr. Robinson expressed that it seems to him that the ordinance reads now that any folks that are not in the same family or household outside, are required to wear masks as long as they are not sitting down and eating. It seems with the emergence of vaccines, this situation becomes more complicated. We might want to revisit this to nuance and qualify the policy as written. Mr. Lindsey replied that what we have

proposed is to simply extend the previous requirements, but expired at the end of the year. He does not rule out that as we move forward with vaccinations, there may be some appropriate changes. We would need to work with Columbus Public Health on good medical advice for those requirements.

Mr. Myers brought up how at the last meeting, the discussion around the date was for either July or December. If we decide to change this to July, he would hope it would be the first of July since we will be in recess in August. With the July date we are trying to convey some optimism.

Mr. Lindsey suggested that given the question raised by Mr. Robinson that there may be some changes worth considering, the end of June or early July, might coincide with a decision to alter the requirements if we need to extend it again.

Ms. Kowalczyk conveyed that she would prefer selecting the end of the year, because she does not want to be overly optimistic. We can bring it back if things turn out to be better than expected, or considering rescinding the ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk to insert the deadline of December 31, 2021 in the sixth Whereas clause and in Section 12.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll of Ordinance No. 09-2021 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Vote Results: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

New Legislation to Be Introduced

9. Resolution No. 11-2021 EMS Billing Rates

Establishing Rates and Fees for Emergency Medical Transportation Services Provided by the City of Worthington.

Minutes:

Introduced by Mr. Robinson

MOTION: Mr. Bucher moved, seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk to adopt Resolution No. 11-2021

Mr. Greeson brought up how we periodically make adjustments to our ambulance fees tied to the ambulance inflation factor adopted by the federal Medicare program. During a recent review it was determined to be an appropriate time to make an adjustment.

Ms. Michael asked if this is paid by the government, insurance, or the individual. Mr. Bartter replied that this is paid by the insurance or Medicare. Mr. Myers asked if these would be Medicare reimbursement rates. Mr. Bartter replied that we will only collect up to the Medicare reimbursement rates. We will not collect the difference between our rates and the Medicare reimbursement rates, but the increase in the rate is set by Medicare.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked what portion of our budget is accounted for from these fees. Mr. Bartter replied that in 2020 we collected \$589,788 of EMS fees. It is significant revenue generated from this. Ms. Kowalczyk asked how much the increased would generate. Mr. Bartter replied that would depend on the number of calls we have,

which can fluctuate from year to year. Moving forward, this will be added to cadence of annual legislation in the fall, completed every year as opposed to being done in 4-5 year increments.

Ms. Dorothy asked about whether we are looking into ways to try to reduce the number of visits, based on what their emergency is, which could limit the number of times we have to leave on, reducing costs. Mr. Bartter replied we are looking at an EMS Coordinator which could have an impact on EMS billing collection. Chief Zambito explained that person would educate staff on report writing, which could lead to a higher rate of return. There is the hope of having some resources to visit our high utilizers. He is not sure if there would be a reduction in transports or not.

Mr. Smith asked if there are correlations between these fees and overtime costs, or whether they are just sunken costs we get back in aggregate from these fees. He will write up his thoughts and send them to Chief Zambito.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-2021 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

10. Resolution No. 12-2021 Electric Aggregation Renewal Agreement

To Authorize the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement with AEP Energy, Inc. for the Provision of Competitive Retail Electric Aggregation Services and Electric Power Supply for Eligible Customers within the City of Worthington.

Minutes:

Resolution No. 12-2021 was introduced by Mr. Robinson

MOTION: Mr. Bucher moved, seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk to adopt Resolution No. 12-2021

Mr. Greeson detailed how earlier a memo was sent to Council regarding considerations for renewing the electric aggregation program. We also made a presentation of those considerations and the proposals we received. This resolution will authorize the City Manager to move forward with AEP Energy for the next two years, who is the provider that had the lowest price as well as the combination of expected services.

Mr. Surace explained how the prices that came back from AEP that we can execute on would be 5.186 cents per kWh, which is a little higher than what was presented last week. He went back to the other supplier that we had as the bidding process, and all of them came in slightly higher. That made him feel comfortable that the slightly higher price, was in line with where the market is. That will be with 100% renewal energy through the RECs. There is some uncertainty about year two regarding capacity, which is the biggest thing. We are taking on a little risk there. Locking into low energy prices now, we feel this price is competitive and fair. He would like to come back to Council at a later time to talk about what could be potentially done in the future. The not to exceed amount would be 0.05186 per kWh.

Mr. Robinson asked for clarity about the unpredictability, and how that would compare to the price from AEP. Mr. Surace replied the volatility is how it may compare to AEP Ohio's rates. He explained how the price to compare in June will likely be in the 5.3 to 5.5 cent range.

Ms. Dorothy asked if Mr. Surace looked into seeing what it would cost to have local energy offsets, rather than national. Mr. Surace replied there are not enough in-state solar available to even take care of the program. What could be there in small amounts, would increase the cost significantly. The number he was told if using local, would increase the megawatt hour price nearly \$16 dollars, from approximately \$51 dollars based on what is in the market right now. That becomes much easier in the next two years as larger projects come online and you will see more in-state solar available.

Ms. Kowalczyk described how we included in the agreement that residents can opt-in or opt-out at any time. We were fortunate last time to save a small amount of money, and support renewable energy. Her concern is whether we have a plan if our negotiated price is higher about how would communicate to residents to opt-out. Mr. Greeson described how within the first year the price would be below that price to compare. We will have a little cushion as in the previous two years. People receive opt-out letters that are swept every so often so new people who are joining or moving into Worthington have the chance to opt-out. If that happens, we can work to make the community aware of the status of the program. We need to be open and communicative about where we are and the goals of the program. Mr. Surace brought up how there are no termination fees and people can come and go as they like. Opt-out letters will go out at the beginning of the program to every eligible account. Sweeps from there would be to newly eligible accounts that have not already opted-out.

Mr. Lindsey asked Mr. Surace if any of his aggregation clients have notified their customers, midterm of the contract, of a significant cost increase as to alert them they might want to opt-out. He cannot speak to whether the PUCO has any regulations permitting or prohibiting that being done. Mr. Surace replied that as to what is prohibited, there are no set rules there. However, contractually with suppliers, they have made a financial investment, and the community is contractually not allowed to communicate in that way because there is financial risk for all parties. There are things that can be done contractually to try to work with rates when things change. You can get creative as the market evolves and the potential of taking advantage of market movements.

Mr. Greeson explained that staff would monitor things and make sure to communicate to Council what is happening in the market. Most calls to the City regarding aggregation have not been about our price verses the price to compare, the calls are about a resident who is already in some arrangement who needs to figure out how to navigate whether to get out of that, renew that, or how it compares to what we have. Mr. Bucher commented that he is supportive of moving forward with this and it is the right agreement for this time. He would prefer a subset of members looking at this and doing some community engagement around this and future options. Two years will be coming up very quickly.

Ms. Dorothy explained how she was not aware we were doing additional sweeps of people. For several months now we have been higher than the AEP price to compare.

She wondered what type of information people get as they move into Worthington and how often sweeps are completed. Mr. Surace described how newly eligible households get the same letter, and staff is made aware to make sure they are prepared for any additional calls. It is the standard opt-out letter given to newly eligible accounts. Mr. Robinson asked if someone does move into the City and they are eligible, whether they are given the option to enter the program, or is it done automatically. Mr. Surace replied that they have to take action and opt-in if we are not doing active sweeps. When a sweep is done and people do not respond to the opt-out material, those people are included. This is an opt-out program.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 12-2021 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

11. Resolution No. 13-2021 Temporary Fire and EMS Services for Perry Township

Minutes:

Resolution No. 13-2021 was introduced by Mr. Smith

MOTION: Mr. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dorothy to adopt Resolution No. 13-2021

Mr. Greeson explained how Perry Township is a significant Fire and EMS partner, and we have provided those services to many of their areas for many years including Worthington Hills and Brookside. They approached us last week and asked that since they are continuing their dialogue with Upper Arlington, to go ahead and effect their detachment from Columbus if we would agree to continue to be a service provider for them in that area. That will be accomplished through the automatic aid agreement.

Mr. Lindsey said he had a subsequent discussion today with Perry Township, and they indicated that their most recent conversations with Upper Arlington suggests this would be resolved in the month of April. Some of the hiccup was related to one of the Assistant City Attorneys leaving Upper Arlington that caused it not to be at the point where the Upper Arlington Council was prepared to move forward. The agreement is for an initial 45-day period, not knowing the exact status of their negotiations there is an ability to extend that for another 45 days. Any additional extension would need to be approved by City Council.

President Michael asked if we would be paid the contract rate as opposed to nothing from mutual aid. Mr. Lindsey responded that the arrangement is that we would be providing this as a good partner based on our other contract with them. We did not expressly amend the primary contract with Perry Township to account for a temporary providing of service. Mr. Greeson explained how the primary contract is based on a percentage of taxable income based on their fire levy. We do not have a practice of billing them on a per run rate.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 13-2021 passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Reports of City Officials

12. Policy Item(s)

a. Steering Committee Creation

Minutes:

Ms. Stewart described how tonight this is continuing the conversation from the past several meetings regarding the steering committee. Last week, Council came to agreement on language for the summary document around the steering committee and what it will do. In the packet is included an updated and revised job description mirroring the agreed upon language. Next steps would be having Council officially adopt the job description and summary document, which can be shared with potential steering committee members so they would know what they would be committing to. After that, Council would proceed with appointing members and adopting a resolution.

Mr. Robinson asked to clarify what is included in the packet. The first thing he is seeing is entitled "Steering Committee Job Description" and he asked if he is to understand that this reflects the language adopted last week. Ms. Stewart replied that it is a markup version so you can see what has been changed. Those three introductory paragraphs exactly mirror the language that was approved in the previous week. When you get into the tasks, those were pulling over additional language in the other document, however not in the exact same language. When you get to the expected time commitment, that comes from a discussion by Council from a couple meetings ago.

Mr. Robinson expressed he is still not fully understanding the composition as proposed of the committee in terms of how this would work, where we have different boards and entities. He wants an example of how groups would be represented, and what their associations would be. Mr. Greeson responded that ultimately it is up to Council, and in principle we wanted to try to have people who are connected to the institutions that would be partners in implementing the visions. He would recommend that Council have some conversations around who might be best in each of these areas, and there might be some recruitment. In some instances it may be a staff member or board member from the entities, someone who could be a liaison, but also an effective contributor to the committee overall. We would not necessarily give responsibility to the entities for appointing those persons, it would be a conversation with Council first, and then a conversation with the organization.

President Michael expressed that she is hearing this would be a two-step process, with adopting just the job description, then at a later time working towards the resolution creating the committee when we have names for committee members. The first step is just approving the job description, and then we have something to move forward with to discuss who may be appropriate to fill some of these roles. Mr. Robinson clarified if we embrace and adopt the job description, were we then committing to this structure and composition of the committee. He is still not persuaded not having members of the public to be a significant portion of the committee is a good idea. President

Michael replied that the job description is standalone, and the resolution is the next step and would include who should be serving on the committee. Ms. Stewart explained that the resolution can be modified right up to the time of adoption. Mr. Robinson stated he is interested in hearing other Councilmember's thoughts on having only institutional representation is maybe not ideal. Mr. Smith asked if the job description and resolution language officially and technically still allow us to put residents into the position to be liaisons to those organizations. President Michael replied that the resolution leaves it open on who would be best to serve. It is an open ended Council decision. Mr. Greeson detailed how the underlying principle here is not to be rigid, but to involve stakeholders from our partner community organizations that would work with us and be key contributors to implementing the vision. The process to date did not necessarily engage all of these partners, and we think of many of them need to get engaged and take ownership in the priorities and will be critical to achieving success. How they get involved is up to Council, but that is the thought process that resulted in this draft.

Mr. Myers described how if you listen to the visioning video heard earlier tonight, and if you read the visioning report, one of the things they suggest is that there could be some reconsideration of some of our land policies or ordinances. It would make sense to have someone from the Municipal Planning Commission who deals with our land use ordinances twice a month on that committee, where as a citizen may understand the impact and have a place on this committee, but they would not necessarily bring the expertise. The video also discussed the vibrancy of the Old Worthington Business District community, once again a citizen may understand how that feels and what they like, but a business member would understand how to implement that. To him, we need representation from these groups because they have the expertise in these particular areas. When looking at the job description, he would hope we can brainstorm ideas for who we would like to include in the different areas. The job description comes first, then we decide the composition of the committee. We will need the expertise from the different stakeholders.

Mr. Greeson explained that he would hope all of these committee members would be residents and we are not only looking through specific lenses. These people would also be parents, working here, living here, and would have a broader perspective than just the institution they represent. Mr. Myers agreed and said if we are looking at citizens, it is important that they come with a specific perspective. If we appoint people not a part of these groups, it needs to be carefully considered to make sure we have that umbrella that encompasses everything. Mr. Greeson described we will need to figure out how to bring these partners into this process as we transition from the larger ideas to actual agreement on priorities that we need those partners to help implement. President Michael asked if anyone has any problems with the job description. It would be nice if we could approve the job description, and then move forward to

the resolution where we may want to make some changes.

MOTION: Mr. Robinson moved, seconded by Mr. Bucher to approve the job description as sent out.

The motion carried by a voice vote

President Michael brought up the resolution and how except for the members of the committee, she asked if there are any other comments on anything except Section Two of the resolution.

Mr. Robinson replied that he does not know, he feels like he needs more time to really assess this. It is probably okay, but he cannot say for sure whether he has scrutinized it to his satisfaction.

President Michael asked for Councilmembers to look at everything except Section Two before the next meeting to see if there are any proposed changes suggested.

b. Economic Development Related Transfer of Liquor Permits (TRES)

Minutes:

Ms. Dorothy asked if this would help bring tacos to Worthington. Mr. McCorkle replied affirmatively that it does. Ms. Dorothy asked when they expect to open. Mr. McCorkle stated that the anticipated date is July 1st to open.

MOTION: Ms. Kowalczyk moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to acknowledge this as an economic development project and to authorize the City Manager to sign the TRES application.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

Reports of Council Members

13. Reports of Council Members

Minutes:

President Michael brought up how Mr. Robinson has advocated bringing up use of force policies as an agenda item. Staff reviewed the policy last year and we received information about that review from the City Manager. She asked for Council's thought on scheduling a Committee of the Whole informational briefing on this topic.

Mr. Robinson explained how the reason he has raised this issue is because he looks back at our Racial Equity Resolution passed last June, and one of the sections included a statement about the City undertaking a review of relevant departmental policies, and reporting findings to City Council and the community. He understands that last summer and fall were stressful, specifically for law enforcement, and having this type of discussion did not take place considering the circumstances. However, it is important to do so, and the use of force policy is directly relevant to the events of last year that led to the Black Lives Matter protests, specifically here in Worthington. The issue of use of force is still relevant, and it would be good for our citizenry to hear more fully about what our police, staff, and Council have done in this regard, and how we think about this important issue, and what issues may arise in the future.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Robinson that we should at least have a brief conversation about it. He sees this as tying off a loose end that we did not finish in conversation last year. Having a public conversation about what it is and informing folks would be helpful.

Mr. Myers asked what is the expectation here, the word discussion that has been used means something to him. He has read a few use of force policies, and has litigated use of force policies in the past, and the policy we have mirrors what the courts have told us is appropriate. He does not want to get into a situation where we, not being experts in an area, begin wordsmithing a document. The George Floyd situation involved a violation of a use of force policy, so it is not the policy that is dictating things, but whether that policy is being adhered to. What we are finding is that when a policy is violated, there are consequences. Mr. Robinson replied that his expectation is around questions that would be had by an average household in Worthington about the policies in Worthington, what are the sources of our policy, and how are they formulated. He grows uncomfortable when hearing reference to "the experts" and with the implication that the average citizen cannot quite grasp what is being discussed, and shouldn't have a hand in what our policy ought to be. Mr. Myers replied that he wishes that answering the question of what is a reasonable response to resistance was easy, it is a complicated question. Mr. Robinson expressed this is highly complicated, but it does not mean we cannot talk about it. Mr. Myers conveyed he does not have a problem with education, but we need to be careful if our intention is to somehow change the language of our policy. Mr. Robinson agreed. Last fall when he had a discussion with Mr. Greeson, Mr. Lindsey, and Chief Ware, he had drafted some thoughts and comments as a way to raise issues to discuss them. His hope is if we discuss this, it would not be to delve into policy and wordsmith, but to educate and inform so people better understand what we are doing and why.

Ms. Dorothy stated that she thought it makes sense to talk about it at the same time as body cameras.

Mr. Bucher expressed that this would be a worthwhile discussion to have, and he has some questions he would like some education around as others would. He thinks this discussion is still needed.

Ms. Kowalczyk stated that she appreciated Mr. Robinson bringing up the resolution and looking at issues through the lens of racial equity. She has no problem with us having an overview of the policy and how we came to it. We should look at other city policies through that lens and the internal equity and inclusion committee is looking at how they would do an equity audit. If that is the lens we are looking at these through, she would like it to be a little more comprehensive. She would like to know more in the future of how we are looking at policies through that racial equity lens.

Mr. Greeson explained how we will need to wrestle with the sequencing of body cameras and this presentation. We are working hard to have body cameras queued up for discussion in April. However, we can work to prepare an informational briefing on this important subject. The approach he would suggest is taking some time talking about the underlying authority, rules, regulations, compliance issues, how it is

developed, discussing our previous policy and how it has been improved, what each key section means, and talking about how we train and ensure effective management of our policy.

Ms. Kowalczyk provided an update on Age Friendly Worthington, and how they have been meeting every two weeks with a small planning committee consisting of residents, the Libraries, and the Resource Pantry. We committed to engaging in an assessment process. One thing discovered is that Age Friendly Columbus and Franklin County are going to be engaging in an assessment of Franklin County for their initiative and are willing to help us in gathering the data for Worthington. That will be happening later this spring. The planning committee is putting together a broader steering committee to look at how we can help get that data collection moving and what to do with it. The effort is progressing and she is very excited about how engaged people are.

On the Partnership, there have been some questions about the Farmers Market and whether it will be returning to Old Worthington. Due to requirements for social distancing and managing crowds, the assessment will be that they go back to the Worthington Industries parking lot to control crowds. There will be some messaging coming out regarding plans for the near future.

Members may have also seen some information about the curbside composting pilot. The Partnership has volunteered to organize a program separate from the City where the compost exchange comes to pickup compost at the curb. If enough people sign up, there will be cost, but it will decrease with more people joining. President Michael noted that in places like Bexley where residents pay for their trash pickup, they can pay to add on their own trash pickup bill to have composting picked up. That is a different challenge for Worthington where the City pays for trash pickup, and the composting would be added to the City, not the resident. Mr. Greeson brought up there may be legislation Council needs to adopt to allow this effort long term. Mr. Lindsey explained how the current City ordinances around residential collection regulate the number of trucks, we would need a waiver of that requirement to allow companies to engage in this effort. We hope to bring something forward next week so this pilot can begin in compliance with our codes.

Mr. Myers provided an update on the mall progress. There are two ARB applications and one MPC application. The board will likely table the larger ARB application which involves the architecture of the entire PUD project. More than likely at the next meeting, they will approve the first ARB application to approve demolition at the mall. Also hope to vote off a recommendation to Council to approve a PUD for the mall, which would come to Council in April. The reason for the timing, while the referendum period is in place for the PUD, they could begin demolition to facilitate acquisition of the tenant they are seeking.

Ms. Dorothy wanted to talk about the results of the traffic calming study at Foster and Kenbrook. Last summer we were requested by residents to see if there was anything we could do to reduce the speed of cars through the neighborhood. Speeds were monitored and without any traffic calming there was an average speed of 22.2mph,

but max speeds of 50mph along Foster which is unfortunately typical on our residential streets. One of the traffic calming measures was putting a stop sign at Loveman, which reduced average speeds to 21.4 mph, but still had max speeds in the 50s. Then they put in a temporary chicane, dropping average speeds down to 17.2mph, we did not have a graph with the max speed, but the average was significantly lower. It dropped the number of cars going over the speed limit of 25mph by almost 50% on residential streets. The final trial was the speed table, that had the best result with an average result of 16.8mph, with an over the limit percentage of 13.4%. The residents did not like the change, and were concerned about parking and getting in and out of their driveways. We do have speed issues in Worthington, and chicanes and speed tables can decrease speeds. We can alter what our roads look like and we can reduce speeding. If you are hit by a car going 50mph, you are more than 90% likely to die.

Mr. Robinson asked if the information discussed by Ms. Dorothy would be talked about at an upcoming Bike and Pedestrian meeting. Ms. Dorothy replied that it has been discussed and was not a high priority to act on by Bike and Ped. Mr. Robinson explained that he would be interested in understanding the objections that there were to the speed mitigating measures and whether resident perspectives could be changed.

Other

Executive Session

14. Executive Session

Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Bucher moved, Ms. Kowalczyk seconded a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss labor negotiations, land acquisition, and appointment of personnel.

The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Council recessed at 9:40 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION: Mr. Myers moved, Mr. Smith seconded a motion to return to open session at 10:26 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

Adjournment

15. Motion to Adjourn

Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Kowalczyk moved, Ms. Dorothy seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

Contact: D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council (Kay.Thress@worthington.org (614) 436-3100) | Minutes published on 03/31/2021, adopted on 04/05/2021

 /s/Ethan Barnhardt
Management Assistant

Attest

 /s/Bonnie D. Michael
President of Council