



City Council Agenda

Minutes

Monday, June 13, 2022 at 7:00 pm

6550 N. High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

Worthington City Council met in-person in Regular Session on Monday, June 13, 2022. President Robinson called the meeting to order at or about 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Minutes:

Members Present: Katherine Brewer, Peter Bucher, Rebecca Hermann, Beth Kowalczyk, Bonnie Michael, Doug Smith, and David Robinson

Member(s) Absent:

Also Present: City Manager Matt Greeson, City Manager Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager Economic Development Director David McCorkle, Law Director Tom Lindsey, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Planning & Building Director Lee Brown, Director of Parks & Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Fire & EMS Mark Zambito, Chief of Police Robert Ware, Management Assistant Ethan Barnhardt

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Minutes:

President Robinson invited those in attendance to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

Special Presentation(s)

4. Regional LinkUS Initiative

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson welcomed representatives from COTA and MORPC who are here tonight to overview the regional LinkUS Initiative which is a regional mobility initiative and to see feedback from the City Council. In July we will probably be asked to consider a resolution of support for this initiative.

Mr. Zach Sunderland with COTA introduced himself and how he is to give an update and overview of the LinkUS initiative. He overviewed the timeline starting with 2014 when MORPC looked at the region determining that over a million new people would

be coming into the Central Ohio region. In 2017 COTA looked at its current network and what it could look like in 2050. This led to MORPC's look at what growth would look like through various corridors identified in the Insight 2050 Corridor Concepts in 2019. All of this culminated with the LinkUS initiative between a variety of partners throughout the region to address 21st Century challenges. LinkUS looks at our growth patterns combined with mobility infrastructure investments, and walkable, connected communities to lead to increased opportunities. With further new economic development, the initial investments of how many people may move to the region may increase even further. We have historic opportunities now to latch on to federal funding for mobility investments. He overviewed the growth in the region, including Worthington, starting in 1950 through the present.

Looking at the potential for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), investments would focus on frequency, speed, and reliability, as well as access, and good customer experience. We have looked at other communities such as Indianapolis and Cleveland to examine what they are doing that COTA is currently not doing. They showed slides visualizing what BRT would look like with larger stops, multimodal boarding, and modern electric vehicles. There are three high-capacity transit corridors currently running east, west, and north, and discussed how the LinkUS initiative would look at connecting Worthington to those routes. LinkUS thinks big outside of just BRT, examining walking, biking, and the holistic network and how they can feed into these corridors. COTA went out to all their service areas recently to catalog what their service gaps are today. They financially modeled what it would look like to expand in the ways they have identified and it is just under \$8 billion. The highest item is expanding the BRT, followed by transit-supportive infrastructure to examine where there can be collaborative exercises to examine and address gaps. Funding would come from multiple places including federal grants, as well as a new half-cent sales tax that would need to be voted on within the COTA service area. He mentioned the Pilot COTA Plus program for areas that don't have the transit infrastructure and acts as an on-demand service to provide last-mile connections. Another part of the infrastructure vision is increased miles of bikeways, greenways, and sidewalk improvements. The LinkUS Community Action Plan recommendations are going to be released to the public in the coming days. Specific to Worthington, the plan is going to be to look at connections to the Northwest Corridor with BRT. Additionally, access to Transit Supportive Infrastructure Funds, and bus network enhancements within COTA's five-year CIP. Coming up next, the COTA Board of Trustees will decide on July 27 whether or not to put the sales tax on an upcoming ballot. Trustees are looking for acknowledgment from municipalities that they support the LinkUS initiative. The Federal Transit Administration also considers community support when evaluating high-capacity transit corridors seeking federal funding.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked about the Transit Supportive Infrastructure Funding and whether it would include improvements to bus stops including shelters and seating, also clearing sidewalks from snow because if the sidewalks are impassable, people cannot get to the bus stops. Mr. Sunderland explained that would be a line item in their

typical resources, so with additional funds, it could be looked at and expanded. Ms. Kowalczyk expressed that the benefits to Worthington aside from access to funding, in her mind, would mean access to COTA Plus and she wondered how quickly we could be considered for that and what it would take for our community to participate. Mr. Sunderland explained that it would be in the next four years within the timeframe they are looking at.

Mr. Smith said in the early 2010s, we have been hearing there will be a million more people in 2050, and he wondered how well we are matching up with the projections. Ms. Maria Schaper with MORPC explained how they have been doing population projections for a long time, and we are tracking as expected in general. We are still looking at growing to a region of 3 million by 2050 and are looking at the impacts of the Intel announcement and how it will affect those projections. Mr. Smith asked if the actual match the geographic density increases as well, and that growth is happening where it was projected to happen. Ms. Schaper explained that there is a little more disparity there, they do their best based upon local plans when adopted, so when a major announcement is made, that could shift their projections and will be incorporated in upcoming forecasts.

Mr. Robinson brought up the slide showing the tax rate is between 7.25% and 7.75% and asked which rate was Franklin County. Mr. Sunderland responded that it is 7.25%. Mr. Robinson expressed his primary concern is the funding mechanism being a sales tax, which is a majorly regressive form of taxation. He asked if there is another funding mechanism that could be used for this, and if not, why. Mr. Sunderland expressed that sales tax is the primary funder for these large cities for transit. Ms. Schaper shared that a model that was used was to have a fund for transit and nontransit funding. What COTA is able to do with revenue is dictated by the Ohio Revised Code (ORC). To be a transformative initiative we need to fund all types of transportation structures.

Ms. Kowalczyk followed up that there is not strong support for public transit funding at the state level, so she knows there is a challenge there. It costs a lot to run a public transit system, and the people who primarily use it are lower-income so there is a dichotomy between imposing more taxes on those folks because they are the ones really needing the access to transit. She asked about the strategy of looking at these corridors not only about transit but about how the development would occur in these areas. Ms. Schaper explained how one of the line items included was for transit-oriented development, we know that land use and transportation go hand in hand, and to be successful, we know that the development around transit needs to be walkable for people to live-work-play in those areas. Ms. Kowalczyk expressed her support for this initiative.

Mr. Bucher asked if the COTA board moves forward, whether this would be just a Franklin County ballot issue, or would it be broader than that. Mr. Sunderland replied it would be the entire COTA service area, including portions of Union County, Licking County, and Delaware County.

Ms. Michael expressed we are lucky we can levy the sales tax because municipalities

are unable to do so. Hopefully, this money can be used for infrastructure because many municipalities would be happy to assist.

New Legislation - Ordinance(s)

5. Ordinance No. 18-2022 Granting Easement to Columbia Gas

Granting Easements to Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. through Property Owned by the City of Worthington at 26 E New England Avenue and 50 W New England Avenue.

Minutes:

Introduced by Ms. Brewer for Public Hearing on June 20, 2022.

Reports of City Officials

6. Policy Item(s)

a. Palmer Moore Recognition

Minutes:

Mr. Hurley detailed how longtime Worthington resident, Palmer Moore, passed away in 2021, and he was instrumental in getting pickleball growing in Worthington. He urged the creation of permanent pickleball courts, resulting in the courts built at the Olentangy Parklands. He was also a large player in the development of the City's skatepark, which is also located at the Olentangy Parklands. There has been an urging to do some sort of recognition for Mr. Moore and how much he meant to the pickleball community. We agreed that he needed something unique to commemorate, showing a sign that would recognize Mr. Moore. This is not a request to name the courts, it is a gesture to recognize him and his contributions to Parks and Recreation. The sign will be placed soon after the motion by Council tonight.

Ms. Michael introduced Clayton Moore, who is in the audience, the son of Palmer Moore. She explained it would be nice to have a ceremony for this and to put together a Council resolution that can be read at the ceremony, including his multiple contributions to parks and recreation in Worthington.

MOTION: Ms. Michael moved, seconded by Ms. Hermann to authorize a sign at the Olentangy Parklands Pickleball Courts recognizing Palmer Moore.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

MOTION: Ms. Michael moved, seconded by Ms. Kowalczyk to draft a resolution per Ms. Michael's terms as outlined

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

b. Financial Report - May

Minutes:

Mr. Bartter reported that we will have a significant financial discussion in July before the August recess leading us into budget time.

Mr. Robinson asked if there were any additional insights into the withholding changes and the impacts on Worthington. Mr. Bartter replied that currently, it is

a wash.

MOTION: Ms. Hermann moved, seconded by Mr. Bucher to accept the May 2022 financial report as presented.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

7. Discussion Item(s)

a. Parks Foundation Update

Minutes:

Mr. Hurley provided a brief background on what has led up to the discussion tonight on the potential for creating a Parks Foundation.

Ms. Thornton overviewed how since the last presentation to Council, staff has been working on multiple items including drafting foundation documents, identifying outstanding questions/concerns, exploring the creation of a temporary "Donor Advised Fund" under the Columbus Foundation, the potential commitment of \$10,000 as an initial deposit, and identifying assistance from the National Association of Park Foundations (NAPF). Council has been given rough drafts of contracts that have been based on documents gathered from other organizations. These have not yet been modified to suit the City of Worthington's specifications or preferences.

Mr. Hurley detailed how over the next several months, we will be working to identify where we want to go with our foundation. As mentioned previously staff has negotiated an agreement with the NAPF to engage their assistance in reviewing legal documents, helping to propose an appropriate foundation structure, and to advise the City of best practices. Membership to the NAPF also allows staff access to member directories, training, and various resources tailored to help build, grow, and strengthen park foundations. He discussed how some of the action items to complete moving forward entail finalizing all draft documents, clearly defining the Worthington Park Improvement Fund versus Foundation, drafting board configuration and beginning the cultivation of a pool of applicants, opening a Donor Advised Fund, and appointing the initial Board of Directors as appointed by Council. Once appointed, the Board would make more decisions, refine their bylaws, work on branding, and file for 501(c)3. We have a September deadline goal and will go back to the Parks and Recreation Commission for input, before finalizing things to get this ready to be approved by staff and Council.

Mr. Robinson asked what form of Council action would be taken in September to approve the documents. Mr. Greeson replied that it would most likely be a resolution.

Ms. Michael provided her thanks to everyone who has put their hard work into this. This has been a labor of love for everyone involved over the past four years. She mentioned that as long as we have some basic structure, we can start with the Columbus Foundation before eventually moving on to our own. There also might be grant monies that we can apply for to assist with applying

for 501(c)3 status.

Mr. Smith agreed that the Columbus Foundation is a great program as an accelerator, but he also supports this going forward with the 501(c)3 so you can get dollars from more avenues.

Mr. Robinson asked about the Worthington Park Improvement Fund in contrast with the creation of a foundation. Mr. Hurley replied that when someone comes to make a donation for a specific purpose, that is the current mechanism to take in those funds specifically for park improvements. One of the reasons we are pursuing the foundation is that some people are concerned about giving to a City fund, wondering where the dollars go. A foundation would give people comfort in the certainty of where their money will go and what it will fund. We will need to clearly define to which organization dollars go. Ms. Thornton explained how the creation of a foundation would be more for people wanting to give larger donations, who may be a bit leery of giving to the Parks Improvement Fund. She would like to see both entities exist.

b. Commemorative Flag

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson described how Council recently adopted a commemorative flag policy which provided a framework for a Councilmember to propose a commemorative flag, with a policy that meets First Amendment concerns, clearly defining things as City speech. Subsequently, Council authorized the flying of the Progress Pride Flag throughout the month of June. Following that, Council asked to agenda continued discussion about the potential for additional commemorative flags.

Ms. Brewer commented that she spoke with someone on the Community Relations Commission, and they formed a committee to work on a listing of commemorative flags that would be helpful for the Council to consider. Perhaps a calendar could be put together with different commemorative flags and when we should be flying them.

Ms. Kowalczyk followed up by stating that she is supportive of the CRC's idea to examine potential flags. She also suggested this because looking at June there are multiple flags, so having some insight into ways we can have different flags and different times. Especially, looking at Juneteenth maybe we could fly alternating flags on flag posts. We want to make sure to not burden City staff but should honor the spirit of the policy. Mr. Greeson replied that perhaps there could be some ways to consider things other than flags to commemorate events that are not as labor-intensive or numerous.

Ms. Michael explained how she would like to have included in the discussion how much staff time the flag consumes and the expenses involved. Mr. Greeson replied that information can be put together.

Ms. Kowalczyk expressed her support for doing other things as well, which we could empower the CRC to explore further. For things such as organizing events,

more Council discussion would be needed. There really is a return with the flags and how it makes people feel in the community, regardless of the financial component. Being thoughtful about being a diverse and inclusive community and finding ways to show that through the City is very powerful and she would like to continue having that discussion. She explained that she requests recognition for Juneteenth next year and would like for there to be further discussion on how to do that.

c. Response to Gun Violence

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson explained how initially Council and staff worked to draft a letter to go to our state legislative delegation to express concern about gun violence in the United States. In addition to that, there was interest in examining what local governments can do because the legislature has preempted most of our home rule authority over gun regulations. In the agenda package, there is an overview of some of the things that the City of Columbus has done.

Mr. Robinson brought up a third action item from the previous meeting which was to invite Senator Kunze and Representative Liston to come to next week's Council meeting and share their thoughts on firearms. He sent them invitations and he has heard back in the affirmative only from Representative Liston. He explained how his recommended changes to the letter to be workshopped tonight were mostly stylistic changes.

Mr. Robinson asked how best to move forward with sending this letter out. Mr. Greeson replied that one way is to make a motion for the amended draft as reflected on the screen. Mr. Lindsey noted that since it has not been introduced as a resolution or ordinance, Council may work through the draft on the screen and then move to authorize that version as drafted.

Council members discussed proposed changes in language to the draft letter included in the Council Packet and shown on the screen in the meeting.

Mr. Robinson suggested that there is a general consensus to send a letter to our federal elected officials, we should work on a version of the letter geared towards them next week. Let us maintain the focus on the state official-oriented letter tonight though.

Ms. Kowalczyk expressed that this letter should also go to Governor DeWine, particularly because of the recent legislation that he signed.

MOTION: Mr. Robinson moved, seconded by Mr. Bucher to accept the letter as modified and authorize the sending of the letter to Senator Kunze, Representative Liston, and Governor DeWine

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

Mr. Lindsey explained how the staff has provided ordinances that the City of Columbus passed in 2018 in response to mass shootings. Columbus took a variety of approaches, and he has spoken with Lara Baker-Morrish, the Chief Counsel for City Attorney Zach Klein about the litigation that followed, as well as

Attorney David Kessler who represented the plaintiffs in the lawsuit against the Columbus case, so he has heard from both sides on what occurred in that litigation. What is clear about the challenge filed regarding the Columbus legislation, it was primarily focused on the provisions related to weapons under disability and having domestic violence added to the list of weapons under disability. Firearm legislation at the state and federal levels provides certain categories of people who are not permitted to possess firearms, including people with certain felony convictions as well as those with certain mental illnesses. In addition to the listed felony offenses, Columbus added a misdemeanor domestic violence charge as an additional basis for which someone would be unable to own or possess a firearm. The two prongs being challenged by Ohio Concerned Citizens were the weapons under disability provision as well as a provision that outlawed trigger accelerators such as bump stocks.

Mr. Robinson explained how there are six ordinances that have been presented to Council, and three of them seem undesirable to pursue because the City was challenged and forced to pay a fine, so he is fine removing them from the discussion. The three remaining ones remain viable options as he reads them, particularly the two involving domestic violence.

Mr. Lindsey detailed how the Bump Stock provision was later repealed by Columbus, the courts never made a determination as to the grounds being challenged initially. One of those grounds was ruled to be unconstitutional under the courts, so he would strongly encourage Council not to pursue that because of how the Ohio Supreme Court has ruled. The question of whether or not to proceed with the weapons under disability provision that addresses domestic violence as an additional factor to prohibit someone from owning a firearm was not determined. As to that or the other provisions that might relate to the broad category of firearms legislation, we can do our best to determine if the courts would not find it in violation of the ORC, but there is no guarantee of that. What Columbus passed has not been challenged yet. Any of these actions run the risk that they may be challenged, and may pursue a smaller municipality with fewer resources, such as Worthington. If we are challenged, even if we repeal, we are still subject to the provisions regarding the cost of bringing the lawsuit.

Mr. Robinson asked about the financial risk to us. Mr. Lindsey replied Cincinnati was ordered to pay \$168,000 for the other side's attorneys after going through the entire process. In terms of how much someone may spend on the front end, that is difficult to say, though someone may be over \$50,000 before a lawsuit is ever filed as a rough guesstimate.

Ms. Michael asked what Mr. Kessler's thoughts were about the legislation we have it narrowed down to. Mr. Lindsey explained that Mr. Kessler indicated generally that he would not bring a lawsuit against Worthington as a resident, however, that does not mean that other lawyers would not take it up. The domestic violence laws, he believes there were valid grounds for the lawsuit

that was filed.

Ms. Brewer brought up the Cincinnati case and how the plaintiff was determined to lack standing. Mr. Lindsey replied it was the Columbus case that the Ohio Supreme Court determined the Ohio Citizens did not have standing as alleged in the complaint since they did not allege any of the facts predicate to their being subjected to it as an entity. The Cincinnati court acknowledged what happened in the Columbus case, but the City of Cincinnati by its pleadings had met the standing requirement. Ms. Brewer said that typical plaintiffs are residents or groups of residents. Mr. Lindsey explained that you would have a plaintiff subject to it. Obviously, Columbus's legal counsel thought that there were grounds for their legislation. They believe that the accessories to guns were a distinction from the prohibition against firearms and munitions themselves.

Ms. Kowalczyk shared her frustration of how nothing has been done to address this issue that has become horrible, but also that we have pretty much been restricted from what we can do to have any impact on the issue. It is important to have this discussion about what the implications are of passing legislation like this. She does want to step back and think that generally when we pass legislation there is a specific purpose or impact we are going to have, and these are very specific things she would be concerned about how we implement and what the impact will be. We are so hamstrung in what we can do and spending a lot of time on something like this, to start going down a path on this legislation she would want more information on enforcement and what impact there would be. Mr. Lindsey responded that he reached out to the City of Columbus and that there was at least one case that had some litigation involved with it regarding how the domestic violence prohibition played out, but he does not have a general sense of volume. Regarding the imitation firearms, he would defer to Chief Ware on whether or not there has been much of a problem.

Ms. Michael explained how what got everyone's attention on this were the mass shootings and murders and what is happening in the schools, the things that are included in the letter we are sending. What we would want to prohibit the most are the things we are kept from being able to do such as banning assault weapons. She agreed with Ms. Kowalczyk that these two items may not be so important that we get into.

Chief Ware explained that is the one ordinance that he struggles with as he does not know how that would benefit us. Gun control and this dilemma we have is very complex. With imitation firearms, a more progressive view may or not be that if an imitation gun is used in an offense, whether that would be prosecuted as being armed with a weapon, and thus enhanced because of the use of the weapon, would be his first question. Mr. Lindsey replied his sense is that it would not be, and that is why Columbus pursued legislation regarding imitation firearms. Chief Ware explained how imitation weapons is a very subjective decision as to whether or not a weapon is made to look like a real weapon. An officer that approaches a scene is not going to be able to tell initially whether a

weapon is real or not. Those are split-second, life-altering decisions. In terms of a toy weapon that is marked to tell you it is a toy, defacing or removing those features, he is comfortable with. The overall theme for him as an apolitical Chief is that anything his officers do has to be constitutional. We have a lot of instances where we have to surmise in a short period of time whether what they are doing violates the Constitution. What he hopes for is that we only enact and attempt to enforce ordinances that are clearly established constitutionally because invariably a litigant goes after the deep pockets, but also the actor, which is the officer. If we are going to recruit and retain the best, they have to know that what they are doing is not going to get them sued. So it needs to be constitutionally sound and tested. In terms of how many imitation incidents we have, he does not believe we have enough to make it remarkable.

Ms. Michael expressed that there is no reason for us to do an ordinance on that. To her, that brings us to domestic violence.

Ms. Brewer explained that this topic is such a spider web and no municipality or group of citizens can solve it on their own. However, we have an obligation to at least see what our limits are. Nothing will be solved in a vacuum, and we should be looking at what we can do constitutionally.

Chief Ware explained that a conviction for domestic violence is a misdemeanor for a first offense, so we have statutes that allow for weapons under a disability to apply to convicted felons. He worries that using a misdemeanor offense with punishment rendered, he wonders if that is a step too far in terms of constitutionality for weapons under disability. The other topic that he has not heard in the letter, which is important, is the sharing of information. When people are in crisis, someone knows that they are in crisis. It is shocking the amount of knowledge we have, that we do not utilize. The firearm is a choice that someone in crisis uses, who thinks they can only take their life or the life of someone else. He believes that we are doing a disservice if we are not breaking down these different regulations to allow people to share the information in a way that protects the public, rather than trying to figure out after the fact why something happened.

Mr. Robinson explained when the shooting at Uvalde occurred and Ms. Brewer sent out an email wanting to do something, the first logical thought was what we did back in 2018 which was to draft a letter and send it. He quickly was overcome with a sense of how impotent that really feels, sending a letter is not going to have a practical effect. He thought we do not have to just send a letter, we could also invite our state elected officials for discussion, which could educate us and give the public an opportunity to hear from their elected officials. His sense is that we are in for a decades-long mission that is going to have to arise from the grassroots. By looking at ordinances, while these are peripheral, he would love to pass a firearms-related ordinance so we can say we did something. The practical effect may be minimal, but it is important to say and do something, or else we are complicit. While there are problems with most

of the ordinances, he would hope we do not deny further consideration, but we table this to think about and discuss further next week.

Ms. Kowalczyk took issue with the idea of us doing something if we pass legislation if it does nothing. If we really want to do something, we need to look at legitimate options that do not put the City at risk of litigation and that our police department can feel confident in. She sent an article about Columbus Public Health looking at another way to look at this issue locally, and there may be other things that we could look at. She welcomes more conversation and ideas.

Ms. Hermann commented that our police officers do a very good job of keeping us safe, and in comparison, we did a lot of work on fireworks to make sure it was clear everyone knew what this was doing. We need to make sure they know what they are doing is constitutional and we are not putting ourselves in a position to be sued. This letter is a fantastic start.

Ms. Michael asked if whatever Columbus Public Health decides, would apply to Worthington as well. Mr. Greeson expressed that Columbus Public Health has expressed interest in discussing their efforts with Worthington. Ms. Michael mentioned an article that she read that said one thing recommended to reduce gun violence, is having a strong education program to encourage people to keep their guns safe and locked up. That would not violate any federal or state laws and would encourage people to keep guns safe.

Mr. Lindsey explained how there is a provision in the federal firearms statute that makes it a disability under federal law. Without providing any guarantee, there are some grounds that might support steps taken in the domestic violence area that allays some of the Chief's concerns. He also wants the opportunity to follow up on the experience in Columbus.

Mr. Bucher asked whether something about increased communications as Chief Ware suggested, should be included in the Federal letter.

Reports of Council Members

8. Reports of Council Members

Minutes:

Ms. Kowalczyk brought up how she would like MORPC to come and present the bigger picture and how the new Intel project plays into it and how we can position ourselves to be prepared. She gave her appreciation to the Worthington Alliance of Black Families and Educators who had their first festival this past weekend. The organization supports families in the school district, and the festival was meant to fund scholarships for black students. She encouraged everyone to attend the Worthington Arts Festival this weekend. She noted that June 15th is World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, and 1 in 10 Americans that are 60 years old or older have encountered abuse.

Ms. Michael conveyed that she has received several letters lately from people who are

upset about aggressive deer in the community coming after people and pets.
Ms. Brewer provided an update on the past MPC/ARB meeting.

Other Business

Executive Session

9. Executive Session

Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Michael moved, seconded by Ms. Brewer to meet in Executive Session to consider the appointment of personnel and to discuss imminent and pending litigation.

The clerk called the roll on Executive Session with the motion carrying unanimously by a roll call vote.

Council recessed at 9:10 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

Council returned to open session at 10:46 p.m.

Adjournment

10. Motion to Adjourn

Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Michael moved, Ms. Brewer seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion carried by a voice vote.

President Robinson declared the meeting adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

Contact: D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council (Kay.Thress@worthington.org (614) 436-3100) | Minutes published on 09/07/2022, adopted on 09/06/2022

/s/ Ethan C Barnhardt
Management Assistant

Attest

/s/ David Robinson
President of Council