



City Council Agenda

Minutes

Monday, October 3, 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, October 3, 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, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Director David McCorkle, 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, Dan Guttman of BakerHostetler, Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Minutes:

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

4. Visitor Comments

Minutes:

Mr. Jack Jenkins of 119 Chaucer Court asked the Worthington City Council to reconsider its decision on the location of the Northbrook Relief Sewer Phase II. He noted that heavy rains cause sewage overflows into Rush Creek, which needs to be remedied, but the question is how. It is his understanding that the City is pushing to move forward with the plan, even though a better option to reroute the sewer in the City right-of-way is now possible and feasible according to EMH&T, preserving limited greenspace. He asked for Council to be responsive and transparent about why alternative solutions are not viable. The Rush Creek watershed is a valuable jewel for the community and should be preserved.

Ms. Emily Regnier of 135 Chaucer Court explained how they only found out about this sewer project this past Saturday, and the Rush Creek watershed is precious and valued by her and her family. Not enough is being done to protect this incredible resource in the community. She asked Council to inform the neighborhood about what is going on, they should know about this.

Mr. Mark Gideon of 91 Chaucer Court thanked his neighbors for speaking so eloquently about something he feels strongly about. The Rush Creek watershed has been filled in and paved over, and now the City wants to put in a new large sewer that will eliminate trees and destroy wetlands, endangered species, and habitats. It made sense to construct the sewer across the open fields of Worthington in the 1920s, but now it is greatly built out, and makes no sense to construct a sanitary sewer here in 2022 especially when there is a great alternative. Greenspace is so important to our communities and lets us preserve the green space that remains in Worthington.

Ms. Stewart explained how she has been working with the Engineering Department as it relates to this project. This is a vitally necessary project for a sewer that has exceeded its capacity for years and is the second of three projects along this waterline. A number of years ago a study was conducted to look at this sewer, and the alignment that we are pursuing is the one that was identified as the most impactful and effective to address these sanitary sewer overflows. She would be happy to meet with any of the neighbors to discuss this project and noted how we are in active litigation with Mr. Gideon in court.

Ms. Chanda Wingo who is the Interim Director of the Franklin County Office on Aging asked for Council's support for the Franklin County Family Services levy on the ballot this November which will be Issue 10. This levy serves 60,000 and serves the mission to allow seniors to remain in their homes as long as possible. Without this levy, these seniors will go without needed services.

Mr. David Dennis of 112 Chaucer Court explained how he has been coordinating an informal group to clean up the wooded areas along Rush Creek in conjunction with Go Sustainable Energy. He was concerned because the information was not out there about the sewers, and the responses he received from the City were disingenuous at best. He is looking for more information and openness about this because this conversation has not been in the open. He also wanted to know the Tonti Companies' interest in this property along with the City.

Mr. Aaron Shearer of 6875 Bowerman Street East explained that he is going back to the office soon, and this is happening more consistently, but it is difficult because he has had to give up plans to give up public transit because he would have to give up over two hours a day due to the COTA service cuts to our area. He encourages the City to work with COTA because there are residents who want this service and are disappointed with the cuts that make public transit more unusable in our City.

Mr. Tom Burns of 1006 Kilbourne Drive shared about the community and how he is worried that this Council and City do not understand what our community is. We are not talking about being a community, we do not have walls at our borders, the people of the community live, work, and play here and we need to make certain that we

include and value them as members of our community. If we do not focus on the people of our community and keep excluding people from the process, we will be worse off.

Public Hearings on Legislation

5. Ordinance No. 31-2022 Streetscape Improvements (High and North)

Amending Ordinance No. 53-2021 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund and 933 High St. TIF Fund Unappropriated Balances to Fund the Streetscape Improvements at High Street & North Street and all Related Expenses and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 738-22)

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson detailed how this is part of a partnership with Dairy Queen which is wanting to make improvements to its site with streetscape enhancement in the right-of-way. This uses previously appropriated dollars along with TIF funds from the Fresh Thyme development to go towards public improvements.

Mr. Brown provided an overview of the history of these improvements to the Dairy Queen location to improve the corner of High Street and North Street, making it safer for pedestrians and cyclists. He showed renderings from POD Designs on what the streetscape improvements will look like.

Ms. Brewer asked how long this project would take. Mr. Brown replied that it is hoped to get them to ARB before Christmas, and then it could be kicked off at the beginning of the year, so hopefully sometime within 2023.

Ms. Kowalczyk said she is concerned about the plantings that would decrease space on the sidewalks and it looks like it is pushing people closer to the street. Mr. Brown responded that the idea is to add greenery providing an additional buffer, which would push people towards the ramp. Ms. Kowalczyk shared her concerns about safety with this design, and she hopes it is something that can be worked with the ARB. She asked for there to be an alternative walkway provided during the construction, so people who walk can get by.

Ms. Hermann asked about the width of the sidewalk Ms. Kowalczyk is asking about. Mr. Brown replied, the planter to the curb is six feet.

Mr. Robinson asked if the relocation of utilities from the basement to the back of the building was necessary. Mr. Brown replied that the previous cooler has been having issues and that to get any new equipment, it would need to be taken apart to get moved down. The hope is to make it more easily accessible.

Mr. Shearer conveyed that from a transit and mobility perspective, a six-foot sidewalk is pretty narrow, especially for a wheelchair to get by.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 31-2022.

The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

6. Ordinance No. 32-2022 Establish Ohio Opioid Settlement Fund

Authorizing and Directing the Establishment of a Fund for the Purpose of Receiving and Expending OneOhio Opioid Settlement Funds.

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson described how last year Ohio reached an agreement with the three largest suppliers of opioids, and as part of that settlement, Worthington is estimated to receive over \$165,000 in 18 payments. This legislation creates a settlement fund where we can receive and eventually expend funds for purchases that are legal under the OneOhio plan.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 32-2022.

The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

7. Ordinance No. 33-2022 Additional Appropriation - Waterline Repairs and Distribute JEDD Funds

Amending Ordinance No. 53-2021 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund, Water Fund, and Sharon Township JEDD Fund Unappropriated Balances.

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson explained how this appropriates JEDD funds where more income tax revenues have been generated so we need to increase that amount so we can distribute the funds in accordance with the JEDD agreement. The second appropriation is more significant, for repairs of water mains from the City of Columbus. Columbus maintenance crews repair water main breaks as they occur, and there is a provision that Worthington will pay for repairs that are greater than 150% of the repair-maintenance ratio, and we exceeded the expected ratio. This cost is highly variable from year to year, and we review each break that is billed to confirm it was in Worthington.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 33-2022.

The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

8. Ordinance No. 34-2022 Amend Code (Domestic Violence to Include Intimate Partner)

Amending Section 537.14 "Domestic Violence" of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington.

Minutes:

Mr. Robinson shared how following the Uvalde shooting, this Council voted to send letters to our elected officials asking them to take action regarding gun safety. He along with others wanted to explore other steps beyond letter writing, and so we examined some of the ordinances that Columbus has passed in recent years related to firearms. There was discussion about which pieces of legislation Worthington could pursue, without ending up in court. The Law Director identified this piece of legislation dealing with domestic violence, particularly broadening the definition of domestic violence to include intimate partners. Federal law restricts possession of firearms to certain groups of people, including those who have been convicted of first-degree misdemeanors, such as domestic violence.

Chief Ware shared how it is admirable we are looking to protect vulnerable populations, such as those subjected to domestic violence. The state has not adopted

language to do so, so there are some nuances for the City in terms of how the prosecution takes place that is important to understand. Typically, the Mayor's Court can handle local ordinance offenses such as traffic related cases, but they are not allowed to adjudicate domestic violence cases. Anytime it appears there is going to be a jail sentence, when possible, we will charge under a state statute so that the city is not billed for those services. In the case of a situation where we develop a city ordinance without that mirrored state code, it will be the city that pays those expenses. For 2023, the Mayor's Court has \$4000 budgeted for incarceration, which would equate to 40 days to house someone in the Franklin County jail. If we go beyond that, the concern is whether we have enough money budgeted if we face an extended jail sentence. He added that our policy is a preferred arrest and if we do not arrest in a domestic violence case, they must have a supervisor give that approval. If there are any signs of physical violence or threats which fit in this statute, then our preference would be an arrest. Oftentimes we will arrest both parties if they have both committed violent acts or it is difficult to determine who the aggressor is. If he has one concern with the legislation, by bringing in intimate partners, it includes all intimate partners and we do not have as much discretion to use another ordinance as we would if this is enacted because this will be treated the same way as other domestic violence statutes. With this comes some collateral consequences, which can eliminate several careers for an individual such as a young person, domestic violence is one of the few charges that cannot be expunged from someone's record, impacting military, safety service, or licensing requirements. With the assault and menacing charges, there is not that presumptive prohibition. He shared the history of the number of altercations that would fit this, and in 2018 there were 5 altercations that may fit within this, 2019 had 5, 2020 had 1, and 2021 and 2022 to date each had 4.

Ms. Brewer asked about the age range for these altercations cited. Chief Ware shared that they are across the board, we are a passthrough location and occur in a vehicle.

Mr. Robinson stated that it seems there were a series of arguments made that sounded like they were against this legislation. He asked if the Chief would speak to why we would want to enact this. Chief Ware responded that you have victims that are sometimes afraid of the aggressor and are in controlling relationships and are afraid to call the law on their partner. Domestic violence law as written is to take the onus off the victim, so the recommended actions are doing the same thing for those victims to be protected without signing an affidavit. Mr. Robinson said that it seems our law serves the purpose not only as punishment but also as a deterrent.

Mr. Smith asked what current laws are being used for intimate partner disputes. Chief Ware stated that dependent on the circumstances, someone would have the decision to press charges, but in every situation, they take the totality of the situation.

Mr. Robinson asked if a domestic violence conviction would preclude someone from being in a profession that requires the use of a firearm. Chief Ware said that it would, and it would be a permanent record. Mr. Robinson asked if the numbers cited earlier

for intimate partners were arrests or reports. Chief Ware responded they were reports.

Ms. Michael asked as things are right now, whether someone can be charged with domestic violence in Worthington, and whether this adds intimate partner. Chief Ware responded they can if they cohabitate, have a child in common, or are related by blood or marriage, they can. If someone is convicted of domestic violence, that will be on their permanent record.

Ms. Kowalczyk noted that half of the female homicide victims are killed by current or former male intimate partners, and one in four women and one in ten men have suffered sexual violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner. When we talk about criminal records, it is difficult to get through the domestic violence process for it to make a significant impact on their careers. This is a really important issue. There may be some costs that we need to identify, but this is a significant issue, and it is a shame that the state has not done this at this point. Chief Ware stated that this would be much cleaner and easier if this were legislated at the state level.

Mr. Guttman overviewed what the current domestic violence law does in Worthington, and who is covered. He noted that this legislation would now capture an intimate partner in a dating relationship as a victim or offender and does not meet the definition of family or household member. Not much is changed with the prosecution or crime elements of the statute. The other change would be the removal of this being a felony, so if it is covered elsewhere in the code, that would apply, not this. They also examined the commentary nationally when this has been approved and he gave an overview of how intimate acts have been treated more leniently, so this helps to resolve that aspect. Most intimate partner violence is characterized by the same dynamics of domestic violence abuse. He also cited the murder rate of dating violence, which exceeds the rate of marital violence. 37 states have enacted this type of legislation, and Columbus and Westerville have put similar legislation in place locally. Opponents have stated that there is already dual coverage under the Ohio Domestic Violence Law which covers dating relationships. Courts look at marriage mimicry with the facts of certain relationships that are applicable under current domestic violence law. Also, the same relationship dynamics do not exist, because someone can leave a relationship easier. Since this covers dating and is vague, it is difficult to define what dating means.

Ms. Kowalczyk asked if there was any feedback on Columbus and Westerville's implementation. Mr. Guttman replied that he has heard nothing either pro or con. Chief Ware stated that Westerville's chief said they would be dually charging, which would allow the courts more leeway when it comes to resolving that case through pleading down. He is not sure it is having its intended effect in terms of a domestic violence charge, but it is not certain because of the length of time it has been in effect.

Mr. Smith asked what would happen to a minor that goes through an arrest and conviction. Mr. Guttman replied that since we are expanding the existing domestic violence statute, they would be treated the same way they are treated currently

under the intimate partner law. Chief Ware expressed there is a difference between juvenile and adult charges, there is a lot of leeway with family and juvenile courts. Mr. Guttman said if a juvenile is convicted, they would still have the firearm ban, juvenile or not.

Ms. Hermann gave her thanks for the thoroughness of the research and discussion. She expressed that she appreciates that in Westerville, the dual charging, and asked if that would be a difficult thing for our officers here in Worthington. Chief Ware said that the officers are trained in recognizing domestic violence, and these incidents are the hardest to respond to due to the emotions involved.

Ms. Brewer echoed Ms. Kowalczyk and Ms. Hermann's comments, and how this closes the gap and protects as many victims as we can. She thinks of this as someone with an eight-year-old son, and this is a good preventative chance that we have to counsel folks on what an intimate relationship should and should not look like.

Ms. Michael shared that if we pass this ordinance, we will have a challenge in how to educate people.

Mr. Robinson stated when he considers the life and death consequences of domestic violence and intimidation, anything we can do to make the world safer, he wants to do so. The possibility of dual charging concerns him as it could dilute the intended effect of this legislation, but it could also provide flexibility. He feels strongly about this legislation.

There being no additional comments, the clerk called the roll on Ordinance No. 34-2022.

The motion carried unanimously by the following vote: Ayes: 7 / Nays: 0

9. Ordinance No. 35-2022 Amend Code Chapter 525 (Protecting Election Workers)

Amending Section 525.01 "Definitions" and Enacting New Sections 525.20 "Interference with Conduct of an Election" and 525.21 "Harassment of an Election Official" of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington.

Minutes:

Mr. Greeson explained how Upper Arlington passed poll worker protection provisions, and Council authorized staff to bring forward legislation to mirror what they did.

Mr. Guttman said that he is not totally sure whether this has been fully fleshed out as to what it means yet. He began by providing an overview of the additions and definitions that will be added to Worthington's statutes through this legislation. There are similar pieces of legislation that have been passed by multiple states, along with Upper Arlington in Central Ohio. It is anticipated in recent years that one in six election officials will receive threats, which appears to be increasing as the media focuses more on the negative of the election process. If federal laws are passed, they may have applicability, but they may not depending on if there is an overlapping federal election with local elections. There is discretion in this statute to determine what a threat or intimidation is.

Ms. Michael asked how someone would file an action. She asked if poll worker would also include people coming to vote. Mr. Guttman said that it is not criminal if nothing criminal has occurred. This creates a new area of law where people can make a

criminal complaint if they witness a crime. Ms. Michael asked how a lawsuit would get started if someone is a poll worker who feels they have been harassed. Mr. Guttman explained how they would have resources available to them, which has gone on for a long time now. However, he wondered if the statute adequately defines what is being prohibited. Public speech has a strict scrutiny analysis. The Supreme Court has said that even false statements have protection and that ruling on whether or not something is intimidating is a content-based regulation of speech. If the issue is not an act itself, then you need to look at the content of the speech. The question is what a true threat is and whether there needs to be intent in order for something to be intimidating.

Mr. Robinson said that the intent of voting on this tonight is for the legislation to be in effect by the election in November. If there is a desire to discuss this further, we could do so this month and pass it via emergency conditions to go into effect before the election.

Ms. Brewer stated that she likes option two as described in the memo, giving the public more time to contribute. There is so much here that has not been clarified by the Supreme Court and we do not want to create problems for ourselves.

Ms. Michael conveyed she would also like some additional time for additional legal review.

Mr. Greeson asked if Council would like staff to provide more specificity to the terms that are subjective in the code, or just more time to reflect on the draft before passing it via emergency at the October 17 meeting.

Ms. Brewer shared that she would like Mr. Guttman to look to see if there is more verbiage that could be incorporated.

Ms. Michael asked if something should be added to instruct how someone brings a suit forward and that is missing from here giving guidance in that direction.

Ms. Mary Woods of 357 Pinney Drive asked if our Division of Police has any special interactions or anything that would be different than any other day. Chief Ware replied that election is a priority for law enforcement and Homeland Security and attempts to monitor for potential threats and problems.

MOTION: Ms. Michael moved, seconded by Ms. Brewer to move to table Ordinance No. 35-2022

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote

Reports of City Officials

10. Discussion Item(s)

a. Continue conversation regarding a process for updating the Comprehensive Plan

Minutes:

Mr. Aaron Shearer of 6875 Bowerman Street East expressed that there have been some conversations here about the Comprehensive Plan, acknowledging that Councilmembers have begun seeking some public input. However, it is easy

to find people we agree with, but he has heard from many residents that we want to be inclusive and welcoming. He would posit that Worthington's racial diversity is not it, that our economic diversity is not it. He liked what Chief Ware said earlier, that it is admirable to care about and focus on people who are overlooked and vulnerable, and Worthington has historically not done a good job of this. Now is the time when we can build Worthington with all people in mind.

Mr. Robinson conveyed that this is a point in the discussion where Council is listening to each other's voices and ideas, before deciding how to proceed in the near future. Perhaps this can be on the agenda again at the first meeting in November.

Ms. Brewer shared how Council needs its own plan on how to do this, and we need to have a non-biased expert tell us what we should be doing. We have so many good ideas and theories but do not know how to narrow them down and how the process should look and what we should focus on.

Ms. Michael agreed with Ms. Brewer, noting how she has been through the Comprehensive Plan process before. Staff does not have the time and we need a professional who is knowledgeable to help oversee, set up, and guide a planning process. Yes, Council will have input, but we also have a Visioning process that should help inform the Comprehensive Plan. She suggested adding funding to the budget for a consultant to help with this.

Mr. Smith said that professionals in the industry are familiar with what a Comprehensive Plan is, and that may or may not be what we need. Much like the Visioning process, Council should own it. Defining and pulling in resources should inform us, and Council should lead that charge.

Ms. Kowalczyk agreed that we should have some external support for staff and Council, it is really important to look at the Comprehensive Plan as a document that will help us implement our Visioning statements on what we want Worthington to be. It can also position us in terms of what is happening in Central Ohio with all of the growth and opportunity. This ensures that the plan is considered an objective proposal that the community as a whole can buy into. She emphasized that we should also include housing as a part of that. She ended by touching on diversity, equity, and inclusion, which is something we should all be aspiring to and should inform this Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Bucher conveyed that it is important to define the basics of what a Comprehensive Plan is, how it applies, and what is the weight in zoning decisions and litigation when that occurs. We need to identify the needs we and the staff have, so we can see what our options are before making decisions. Hopefully, we will also have the proper resources to look at things through the diversity, equity, and inclusion lens as mentioned by Ms. Kowalczyk.

Ms. Hermann explained that a housing study should still be a portion of this and that Vision Worthington is chapter one of a Comprehensive Plan. When reading through the visioning plan, we have some facts and demographics, along with opinions from the public feedback that was received. In re-reading

the Comprehensive Plan, she wants to bring forward our industrial corridor that was last studied in 1970. She would propose that as we move forward, we add an industrial study as a consideration along with a housing study.

Mr. Robinson agreed that some external resources are needed, and the term facilitator rings appropriate to him. This Council needs to lead this process, there is no other viable alternative. We want an expert to come in and help through the process, but in terms of decisions about scope, content, and decisions, that has to be Council. Another issue that has been on his mind is that Council needs to discuss the Visioning report. He has observed how it is being used and he would say misused, and that the same Vision statement can be used by different people to advocate for their policy position. He would like a discussion about how we understand what the visioning report is and is not and what its appropriate uses are. Just this evening hearing the visioning report cited can lead to processes and discussions that would be highly problematic. When someone cites the vision report as justification for their specific policy position and a member of the public does not agree with that policy position, it makes it very difficult if not impossible for that member of the public to then engage in rational dialogue about the policy because the vision report has been wielded as an irrefutable authority. He has trouble understanding the basis of the vision report and the numbers are still unclear to him. We need to have a conversation, so we at least have it out and each understand how one another understands the visioning report and its authority.

Ms. Hermann asked what is meant by using it as policy specifically. Mr. Robinson replied when someone is advocating for a policy position and cites the Vision report as a basis for that. Ms. Michael said she is confused and wanted to know what is meant by policy. Mr. Robinson responded that we received an email from a member of the public and cited the visioning report as a basis for why we needed to protect reproductive rights, and Ms. Kowalczyk cited a vision statement when she drafted her resolution regarding a housing study. It happens frequently and it is a body of work that is very tempting for someone to cite as an authority on behalf of their agenda. Right after the report was published, Building Worthington's Future came out by looking through all seven statements and how they apply, and the Project Community Park Worthington had their counterpart. Ms. Michael stated that the visioning report would provide overall guidance on how we define and refine and work within each of the different areas in it.

Ms. Kowalczyk said that City Council adopted the Vision Statements in March of 2021 and included in the resolution is a statement that the Council acknowledges that progress toward achieving the described future of the visioning document is a long-term endeavor and City Council will review the vision statements and supporting principles at Council planning sessions and retreats in order to connect the visions for the community's future to City priorities and programs, update action plans and steps, and track progress

toward moving toward the visions. We have not really done that. It has really been sitting on a shelf and it is not just a couple of statements someone drafted and approved, it was 18 months of work from a community-led process collecting data, talking to the community, to determine what they felt the vision for this City was and now we did nothing with it. She will cite it anytime when there are policies that are implementing those visions. For us to then banter about what this document means, we had the discussion and sat through the process, and had updates from the Committee. She would ask that maybe some members of the Visioning Committee should come and contribute to express their thoughts on what has been done or not done with the visioning document.

Ms. Hermann conveyed the part that touches a nerve for her, she has never heard anyone use the Visioning document in a negative way. The way that this is being approached makes it seem like someone attacked someone in some way. She appreciates that certain groups in our community are adopting the visions because a large part of the population was involved. COVID gave people who normally would not have the time, the ability to be included. She cannot understand the negativity that is coming through tonight considering all the time and effort.

Mr. Robinson said that what he is trying to foster will be difficult because people feel strongly about the visioning report and what it embodies. What he thinks would be helpful would be for us to look at how it is and can be used and perhaps misused. Not having this conversation, we are setting ourselves up for many months and years of arguments that will not be looking at one of the informing factors, which is how people are employing the visioning report on their behalf.

Reports of Council Members

11. Reports of Council Members

Minutes:

Ms. Hermann mentioned that there will be a Community Improvement Corporation meeting this upcoming Friday in the Training Room at City Hall starting at 8:00 am.

Mr. Bucher noted that October 11th is the voter registration deadline for the upcoming general election in November.

Ms. Michael gave her kudos to the Division of Police and Division of Fire and EMS for their open house which was free for members of the community. She asked what the status of setting up a Council retreat was because it is difficult to find dates the closer, we get. Mr. Greeson replied that the staff would be working on that soon. Ms. Michael asked about the status of having the CRC come in to discuss their priorities with the Council. Mr. Greeson said that he has reached out to Mr. Pauline with several dates and will discuss them with Mr. Robinson.

Ms. Brewer gave an update on the upcoming MPC/ARB meeting and gave thanks to Ms. Michael for facilitating the Live Government program for elementary students.

Other Business

Executive Session

12. Executive Session

Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Brewer moved, Ms. Michael seconded a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss pending litigation.

City Council recessed at 9:44 p.m.

City Council returned to open session at 9:56 p.m.

Adjournment

13. Motion to Adjourn

Minutes:

Council moved unanimously to adjourn

President Robinson declared the meeting adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

Contact: D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council (Kay.Thress@worthington.org (614) 436-3100) | Minutes published on 10/27/2022, adopted on 11/07/2022

/s/ Ethan C. Barnhardt

Management Assistant

Attest

/s/ David Robinson

President of Council