Mayor Lecklider called the Monday, March 26, 2012 Regular Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 6:30 p.m. at the Dublin Municipal Building.

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION
Mayor Lecklider moved to adjourn to executive session for discussion of land acquisition matters (to consider the purchase of property for public purposes), legal matters (to confer with an attorney for the public body concerning disputes involving the public body that are the subject of pending or imminent court action), and for personnel matters related to the appointment, employment and compensation of a public employee.
Mr. Gerber seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes. (Mr. Reiner and Vice Mayor Salay joined the executive session when they arrived at the meeting.)

The meeting was reconvened at 7:20 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mr. Gerber led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL
Present were Mayor Lecklider, Vice Mayor Salay, Mrs. Boring, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, Mr. Gerber, Mr. Keenan and Mr. Reiner.

Staff present were Ms. Grigsby, Mr. Smith, Ms. Readler, Ms. Mumma, Mr. McDaniel, Chief von Eckartsberg, Mr. Harding, Mr. Hahn, Ms. Crandall, Mr. Hammersmith, Ms. Puskarcik, Mr. Langworthy, Ms. Ott, Mr. Earman, Mr. Phillabaum, Mr. Goodwin, Ms. Ray, and Ms. Husak,

CITIZEN COMMENTS
Ron Geese, 5584 Brand Road addressed Council regarding his concerns about the curve on Brand Road in front of the Jenkins, Herron, and Hubler properties. There are many sizable potholes on the berm, and two large areas where water has ponded. He called the City three times regarding the ponding areas last year. The conditions continue to exist at this time and need to be corrected.

Ms. Grigsby stated that she was not aware of this, but will follow up with staff to have the repairs made as necessary.
Mrs. Boring asked if there is a method for reporting potholes.
Ms. Grigsby responded that a resident can call the Service Department to notify the City of potholes and staff makes the necessary repairs.
Mr. Keenan noted that he is aware that some cities have a GPS phone application to report such problems. Perhaps the City can explore this option.

CONSENT AGENDA
Mayor Lecklider noted that two items are proposed for action on the consent agenda. They are both first readings of ordinances. He asked whether any Council Member requests removal of an item for further consideration under the regular agenda. Hearing none, Mayor Lecklider moved approval of action on the two items as proposed on the consent agenda.
Vice Mayor Salay seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes.

1. **Ordinance 17-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
   An Ordinance Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire a 0.144 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied, and a 0.080 Acres, More or Less, Permanent Utility, Grading and Drainage Easement from Walter L. Shier And Carol Shier, William Sorden and Mary Ann Sorden, Robert E. Shier and Linda L. Shier, and Mark A. Shier and Rene E. Shier. (Second reading/public hearing April 9 Council meeting)

2. **Ordinance 18-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
   An Ordinance Amending Section 2 (Wage & Salary Structure/Administration), Paragraph A of Ordinance No. 73-06 ("Compensation Plan for Non-Union Personnel") for the Purpose of Incorporating Certain Job Classifications and Corresponding Pay Grades. (Second reading/public hearing April 9 Council meeting)

POSTPONED ITEM
Ordinance 07-12(Amended)
Adding Sections 153.057 through 153.066 to the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances (Zoning Code) to Establish the New Bridge Street Corridor Zoning Districts, Development Standards and Approval Process, and Amending Section 153.002 of the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances (Zoning Code) to Add and Modify Definitions. (Case 11-020ADM)
(Mr. Reiner recused himself and left Council Chambers.)

Mr. Langworthy stated that, subsequent to the last meeting and work session, a number of changes have been made to the document at the request of Council and some clarifications have been made as well.

1. Section 153.058, Scope and Applicability. Language was amended to clarify that rezoning to districts other than the BSC districts would continue to be available.
2. Section 153.066, Review and Approval. The amended language provides that the PZC can vote to approve, disapprove, or approve with conditions at the Basic Plan Review. Other changes include that the findings of PZC, once made, are required to be incorporated into the application for either development plan or site plan review. Secondly, in regard to the Basic Plan changing after the approval is made with the submission of a formal application for development or site plan review, a requirement is added to the review criteria for both development and site plan review. This criteria indicates the application must be substantially compliant with the Basic Plan Approval. This will eliminate the potential of major differences between the Basic Plan Review application and the later applications. If the later plans are substantially different than the Basic Plan Review, the applicant has two options: to resubmit for another Basic Plan Review, or alter the application to be more substantially compliant with the approved Basic Plan by PZC. If the PZC denies the Basic Plan, the application would have to be altered and resubmitted to PZC before it could proceed. These changes provide the PZC with more authority than before, yet leave in place the administrative process that has been discussed.
3. Council also asked for specific information of what would be included on the Basic Plan in order to understand the level of detail submitted to PZC. Therefore, a checklist has been provided with the memo that includes the general requirements for all of the reviews. It does not prevent the applicant from providing additional information, if they so desire. Nor would it prevent PZC from requesting additional information, if deemed appropriate.

4. Council also requested more examples of minor and major waivers. Information has been provided about this as well.
5. There were also questions regarding the waiver language, and a letter has been sent by the Stavroffs in regard to this matter. Language has been included that indicates the PZC has a number of review criteria they may use to determine whether a waiver could be considered. It attempts to take into account both physical conditions on the property as well as physical conditions that may exist on adjacent properties, as well as other conditions beyond the control of the applicant. The attempt was to ensure the PZC had some guidelines for approving waivers, as it is a discretionary approval. In addition, adequate guidelines are included to ensure the waiver would be legitimate.

He offered to respond to additional questions.

Mrs. Boring stated that in the memo, on page 2, last sentence of the first paragraph it indicates, "The applicant may be required to submit a new Basic Plan Review application for review by the Commission." Can he provide an example of an occasion when this would not be required?
Mr. Langworthy responded that the language should be stronger. The applicant would be required to do so, as it would fail the review criteria. The review criteria must be met, so the language will be modified accordingly.
Mrs. Boring stated that she suggests the staff memo be corrected so that the record is clear. She also suggested another correction, under "Waivers" which indicates that waivers are always approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. She would prefer the language state, "Waivers are always brought to the Planning and Zoning Commission to be approved."
Mr. Langworthy agreed.
Mrs. Boring stated that on page 6 of 21, Criteria for Development Plan Waivers, it indicates, "each required reviewing body shall make its recommendation or its decision...." Where is the required reviewing body defined?
Mr. Langworthy responded that it is defined in the definitions section as well as the chart in the front of the document.

Vice Mayor Salay asked for confirmation that the intent is that the PZC approval, disapproval or approval with conditions is a binding decision.
Mr. Langworthy responded affirmatively. It is binding in two ways: the findings of the PZC must be included in the application submitted and the findings of PZC have to be incorporated into the application itself.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked for clarification. There is a list of items required in the Basic Plan Review. However, there are some places, such as under General Requirements that indicate an applicant should generally outline the potential project – with a note that indicates details may vary widely, depending upon the applicant's stage in the development process.
Mr. Langworthy responded that at the Basic Plan Review stage, the applicant may not know many of the details of the project. Staff is not sure how much information they will provide, beyond the basic items.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that this is the point where it goes to PZC for review.
Mr. Langworthy responded that is correct, but some details – such as number of parking spaces needed – will not be available for some. The sign package may not be ready at that time.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that under the Lot and Block configurations, the language indicates, "if known." Her main concern is that the public has a right to weigh in on any development in the community. The City has worked hard for many years to ensure this. Therefore, the Basic Plan Review version must sufficiently document

what the project will be in order for the public to provide input. If the building type is not known, what will the public respond to in their only opportunity for input?
Mr. Langworthy responded that they will know the building type, as only a certain number are permissible in the District. They may not know whether it will be a loft building or apartment building. But the differences between those in terms of building heights, setbacks may not be significant. The concept is that within these Districts there are certain building types compatible with the areas and the planning around those areas. There will not be huge ranges of concepts submitted. He added that the desire is to maintain some of this at the administrative level so that items can be added without the need to amend the ordinance continually. The PZC will also provide feedback regarding the information they are receiving with the application and whether it is adequate.

Mr. Keenan stated he needs to understand procedurally the adoption of this Code with the adoption of the zoning map for the Bridge Street Corridor.
Mr. Langworthy responded that the districts must first be established, and then the properties can be zoned into those districts. Therefore, Ordinance 07-12 must be adopted prior to Ordinance 08-12.
Mr. Keenan noted that he supports adoption of the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended map.
Mr. Langworthy stated that the two ordinances are completely separate and require separate votes.

Mayor Lecklider asked for clarification regarding page 18 of 21 of the document. It appears some new text has been added regarding the ability to appeal certain actions to City Council.
Ms. Readler responded that language was added to provide Council with the option of hearing an appeal. Currently, the appeals in the Bridge Street Corridor would go to the Board of Zoning Appeals, but their review is limited to what was considered at the reviewing body or administrative staff level. This added language provides a discretionary review by Council. Council could review any information presented to them and so there are not limitations such as those on the BZA.
Mayor Lecklider confirmed that is the preference of Council, as expressed over the past few months.

Mayor Lecklider invited public testimony.

Ben Hale, Jr., Smith & Hale, 37 W. Broad stated that the changes made to the Code are very productive. He has one request, which is related to the letter from the Stavroffs. His suggestion is simple and adds some clarity. Under the "Criteria for Site Plan Review Waivers" there are four provisions. The first one states that the need for the waiver "is caused by unique site conditions, the use of, or existing conditions on surrounding properties or other circumstances outside the control of the owner or lessee, including easements and right-of-way." He suggests that in the second phrase, "use of or existing conditions on" to insert the language "on the property or surrounding properties" so that this applies to the subject property as well as the surrounding properties. This gives applicants the right to request waivers under situations where a number of factors are outside the control of the property owner – such as deed restrictions. There is a need for relief from this type of situation.
Mrs. Boring pointed out that this language is contained on page 6 of 21 and page 10 of 21, as it is in both the development plan and site plan waiver sections.

Mr. Hale continued, noting he is suggesting the following modifications to these sections:

SECTION 153.066 – REVIEW & APPROVAL PROCEDURES & CRITERIA

(4) Development Plan Waiver Review
(e) Criteria for Development Plan Waivers
1. The need for the Development Plan Waiver is caused by unique site conditions, the use **of** or conditions on **the property or** surrounding properties, or other circumstance outside the control of the owner/lessee, including easements and rights-of-way.

(4) Site Plan Review Waiver Review
(e) Criteria for Site Plan Review Waivers
1. The need for the Site Plan Review Waiver is caused by unique site conditions, the use of or conditions on **the property or** surrounding properties, or other circumstances outside the control of the owner/lessee, including easements and rights-of-way.

Ms. Readler stated that the current provision only addresses conditions on surrounding properties. Mr. Hale's modification includes site conditions on the property that is the subject of the application. The last clause of "other circumstance outside the control" was suggested by staff to address the issue.
Mr. Hale responded that to him, both clauses should refer to the property itself to address the title issues that often arise.

Mayor Lecklider asked if staff has any objection to this clarification as Mr. Hale has suggested.
Ms. Readler and Mr. Smith indicated this modification is acceptable.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked Mr. Langworthy what the results will be in the end, in view of all of the changes to the Code being requested by property owners. Her concern is whether the City will be able to achieve the vision approved at the outset of this process.
Mr. Langworthy responded that he believes the clarifications made during the review were minor and will have minor implications. The ones proposed were fairly detail oriented, took away a high level of specificity, and gave somewhat more discretion to the reviewing body for some approvals. Of all the changes requested of PZC, the ones specifically rejected related more to the level and quality of architecture. The PZC was pleased that the quality aspects were retained. The architects on PZC agreed with the changes that were made with respect to the architectural details. He is satisfied with the outcome of the input provided.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that the City needs to analyze each application as this unfolds to ensure the vision is being achieved – both the intent in terms of appearance and the quality of architecture and materials. She is most concerned about the urban look desired in this area of the city, versus what had been done historically. Adding all of the modifications may compromise what is desired.
Mr. Langworthy responded that he understands the concern. But there were few changes, if any, which related to character elements of the individual districts and areas. There was little comment about changing the location of buildings, parking, the need for outdoor plazas, etc. Most of the comments were provided by developers and builders and related to individual details about architecture and buildings. He agreed that the City does need to monitor every project as it is approved and built to ensure the outcome is what is desired.

Mr. Gerber stated he shares Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher's opinion on this aspect. It is important for staff and PZC to monitor this closely and report regularly to Council on the progress. With respect to Mr. Hale's proposed modifications, it does bring clarity to the sections and he does not object to it.

Ms. Grigsby stated that, as discussed at the work session, staff's commitment is to have a regular schedule for review of what is developed. In the early stages, it will be project by project. As discussed previously, there will likely be modifications needed to the Code in the future, based on experience. The input received from property owners and developers with interests in the area has been very beneficial. Their comments have been incorporated where clarity was needed or where something was overlooked. The intent is to have quality development in the Bridge Street Corridor.

Mayor Lecklider stated that, from his perspective, he wants some reasonable assurance that he will not see in the future what is seen today in the corridor, to state it simply. That is not what was envisioned a year ago for this process. If the modifications to the language as proposed results in more of the same type of development, he is likely not interested.
Ms. Grigsby responded that the key issues of streets and densities represent huge changes, and they will dramatically change the look and development in this area. She believes the Code will serve to implement what is in the vision report.

Mrs. Boring summarized asked Mr. Langworthy to identify the differences between the PZC recommendation and staff's recommendation, including the modifications proposed tonight.
Mr. Langworthy responded that up to the Basic Plan Review stage, they are the same. The difference becomes what occurs when the PZC is ready to act upon the Basic Plan Review. The PZC recommendation calls for PZC to make a determination of whether they would retain approval authority or send it back to the Administrative Review Team for approval. Under the proposal from staff, the next step is for the Administrative Review Team to review it. However, the Basic Plan Review findings by PZC as binding has been added. In the review criteria, the site plan and development plan must remain substantially compliant with the Basic Plan Approval and the application for site and development plan must include the findings of the PZC.

Mrs. Boring asked for clarification – PZC also reviews and makes decisions regarding waivers.
Mr. Langworthy responded that is correct.

Mrs. Boring asked if there are any other items that PZC wanted to incorporate that staff did not include in the latest version.
Mr. Langworthy responded there are not. The point of departure for PZC with the staff recommendation related to what occurs after Basic Plan Review.

There were no further comments.

Mayor Lecklider moved approval of Ordinance 07-12 as presented tonight, with the proposed language changes by Mr. Hale as follows:

> SECTION 153.066 – REVIEW & APPROVAL PROCEDURES & CRITERIA
> (4) Development Plan Waiver Review
> (e) Criteria for Development Plan Waivers
> 1. The need for the Development Plan Waiver is caused by unique site conditions, the use **of** or conditions on **the property or** surrounding properties, or other circumstance outside the control of the owner/lessee, including easements and rights-of-way.
>
> (4) Site Plan Review Waiver Review
> (e) Criteria for Site Plan Review Waivers

1. The need for the Site Plan Review Waiver is caused by unique site conditions, the use of or conditions on **the property or** surrounding properties, or other circumstances outside the control of the owner/lessee, including easements and rights-of-way.

Mr. Gerber seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes.

Vice Mayor Salay thanked all of staff who have worked very hard over the past few weeks on all of the modifications to enable tonight's unanimous vote on this Code.

(Mr. Reiner returned to Council Chambers at this point.)

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCES
Ordinance 14-12
Rezoning Approximately 18.5 Acres, Located on the North Side of Brand Road, Approximately 700 Feet West of Coventry Woods Drive from R and R-1 to Planned Unit Development District (Wellington Reserve PUD) to Establish a 28-Lot Single-Family Detached Residential Development and 3.6 Acres of Open Space. (Case 08-038Z/PDP/PP) (Wellington rezoning)
Ms. Husak noted that Planning, Engineering and the applicant have met since the last reading and the applicant has submitted a revised set of drawings and development text. She noted the following:

- The site plan reflects a shifting of the cul de sac and road slightly west to increase the lot depth of those lots adjacent to lots within Wellington Place. Those lots depth are now the same as what was reviewed at the PZC stage, which is what the residents who testified on March 12 supported.
- The issues identified at first reading related to drainage, the road alignment, tree preservation, landscape buffering, and the maintenance by the HOA.
- Engineering prepared a separate memo and exhibits for the packet regarding the drainage. The road was shifted to allow for more depth on the eastern site.
- Residents to the north expressed concerns with tree preservation. The applicant has created a 40-foot tree preservation zone in the northern portion of the site that includes along Lots 16 and 17 and those are also the heavily wooded areas. The remainder of the site has a 30-foot tree enhancement zone or a 40-foot tree enhancement zone, adjacent to Wellington Place.
- The applicant has revised the development text to require a heavy-duty metal or wood construction fence along the tree preservation zone during the construction activity. Planning further suggests that a tree outside the zone, No. 740, be preserved and that a fence be placed around this sizable tree.
- The applicant has also provided an illustrative master plan that depicts in lighter color the trees that could be preserved, and in darker color the trees that would be replacement trees, if all trees identified as potentially replacement trees must be replaced.
- In follow-up to the discussion of March 12, the applicant has revised the development text to mirror the tree waiver typically granted by Council for heavily wooded sites – for six to 24-inch trees.
- The plan also shows the likely design for the frontage treatment of Brand Road. Most of these details will be in the final development plan, but the intent is for the Brand Road setback to be used as an area for reforestation, with the effect of a natural woodland. This will also assist in the HOA maintenance of this

area after the land is turned over to the HOA, as it will likely be heavily wooded by that time.

- The applicant also included in the submission for second reading an aerial photo that reflects the health of the trees in Wellington Park area and reflects that the trees are more substantial and healthy in the corner identified.
- In regard to the design of the perimeter buffer and how many trees it will require, the applicant has provided an example of what that buffer could look like. The intent is to have ornamental trees – either existing or replacement ones – and shrubs to provide a buffer that is opaque through the seasons and to have varying heights of the buffer. As suggested by PZC, and as reflected in the development text, the buffer intent is for 75 percent opacity, but the PZC can review existing trees that may help meet this requirement.

Staff is recommending approval of the ordinance with the 10 conditions of the Planning and Zoning Commission, and an 11th condition to install a fence around tree #740 as she has indicated.

Ben Hale, Jr., Smith & Hale, 37 W. Broad Street representing the applicant noted:

1. Mr. Geese has discussed with them the possible need for a fence or guardrail along the area of the dry basin on the Brand Road frontage. While they do not want to commit to that tonight, they would agree to a condition that they work with staff to implement what is appropriate in this location. They would commit to do this prior to the final development plan review, but the Engineering division needs to determine what is appropriate.
2. Some property owners present at the last hearing talked of their serious issues with drainage on their lots. Staff indicated that it may be helpful as the storm system is installed to serve this development to add an inlet or French drain on these properties to address the issues. The developer has agreed to do this, subject to staff's approval and subject to the property owners granting permission to do so. They would be willing to do this in select locations where it is needed.
3. The applicant also agreed that the HOA would have the obligation to maintain the area where the street will be extended in the future, until that extension occurs. He believes this is in the text.

Ms. Husak confirmed this is included in the text.

4. They are also in agreement with Condition #11 to install a substantial fence for the preservation zone and around the large beech tree.

Mayor Lecklider invited public testimony.

Ron Geese, 5584 Brand Road, Dublin distributed a handout summarizing his comments regarding the rezoning.

- Some of the surrounding residents wonder whether this area would be better served with streets and houses and at what density. However, that is a Council and Planning and Zoning Commission matter.
- There are dangerous driving conditions on Brand Road. As a 60-year resident of Brand Road, he notes there are curves, potholes and poor maintenance of the curve. He questions the location of a detention basin that will be 40 feet from the center of the road, with a depth of 10-12 feet. If a car veers off the road into the detention basin, it will overturn. This is too close to the roadway for such a basin. As an example, in front of his property, there is a guardrail in place because of the number of cars that have driven off the road into the 12-foot deep creek. To install a basin without guardrail and with a bikeway in front of it will be a dangerous situation.
- He wants to ensure that there are concrete tiles in the ditches in view of the 6-7 feet drop-off. This is important so that drainage is effective, and he

encourages a gradual, 1-3 foot grade off the road. It is not in the text, but he assumes this will be addressed.

- He has many concerns with the nearby deer population and believes they will relocate into the Brandon or Wellington Park areas. The deer population grows 40 percent per year, absent a deer management program or predator. He advocates a deer management program, so that the deer do not continue to multiply. He has three family members who have been involved in collisions with deer.
- He asked about mounding along Brand Road in this plan. In reviewing Earlington and most of the developments along Brand Road, there are sizable mounds of six feet. There should be sizable mounding provided for this development with trees planted on the top. He does not believe this is included in the text.
- He pointed out a health, safety and welfare issue that needs to be addressed. There should be some flattening of the curve on Brand Road at the City's expense. This is a sharp turn, and it should be modified and extended somewhat to the north.
- He thanked Council for their service to the City.

Dave Jenkins, 5071 Brand Road, Washington Township commented that he would like this project to be consistent with the rest of Brand Road development in terms of mounding. He does not understand why a dry basin is to be installed versus a wet basin, as there are wet ponds all along Brand Road. He is skeptical that the dry basin will appear as the drawing indicates. He agrees with the safety issues that Mr. Geese has highlighted. He added that there are too many houses facing Brand Road in this development. With the elimination of some of these houses, a wet basin could be installed.

Bruce McCloughlin, 5131 Brand Road, Washington Township noted that he and his wife have lived in their home for 30 years, and are located across the street from the westernmost portion of the proposed development. He previously sent in written comments regarding the rezoning. He commented as follows:

- It is hard to understand how various rezoning proposals can be discussed for 4-5 years, one is finally approved by Planning and Zoning Commission, and what is before Council tonight is not what Planning and Zoning Commission approved. The most logical solution is to send this rezoning proposal back to PZC so that those who have been involved in the discussion have another opportunity to review this. He does not understand setting a precedent to make a decision at PZC and change it when it comes to City Council. The plan on the website is not what is proposed to Council tonight. This does not seem to be appropriate.
- In driving from Dublin Road to Hyland Croy, he sees no location along the roadway with the six-house scenario of Lots 1-6 in this development. Council's job is to protect the aesthetics of Brand Road, and he believes Council should instruct the developer to build no more than three houses along the Brand Road frontage, consistent with the remainder of the roadway. He sees no reason to damage the character of Brand Road in this way.
- The original plan had 195-foot deep lots on the east side of the roadway and 155-foot lots on the west side of the road. It seems the lot depths should be balanced on both sides.
- Storm water management up and down Brand Road consists of wet basins. There are two lovely wet basins in Wellington. The developer indicates the Planning staff has forced them to install dry basins for this development. He objects and believes Council should demand these be wet ponds.

- He has mentioned landscape mounding at the bottom of the road that travels from north to south. The architect showed him tonight that there is mounding proposed in that location. If that is part of the final development plan, he has no issues with this item.
- The City of Dublin saved $1 million by not installing bike lanes on Brand Road. A left turn lane will be installed by the developer of this project. There is a multi-use path to be installed on Brand Road. With all of this construction and the cost savings, the Engineer should consider moving the roadway 10 feet or so to modify the existing curve, improving the safety of the citizens.
- He would like the City to consider some kind of extension of the sewer system along Brand Road instead of allowing it to be routed back into the subdivision. There are many Washington Township residents in this area who would like to annex to Dublin, but their opportunity for sewer service is nonexistent. This could be an opportunity to have a sewer line available, which would be a great enticement for property owners to annex to Dublin.

Bill Riat, Casto, 19 Sessions, Columbus, Ohio responded to some of the comments. The only changes they have made in response and at the request of the neighborhoods relate to trees and lot setbacks. Secondly, regarding the Brand Road setback, the fronts of five homes face Brand and are set far back from the street. The adjacent neighborhood homes are quite a bit closer to Brand Road, and there are 10-12 homes that back up to Brand Road. The dry basin is a result of being responsive to the system desired by the Engineering department. The dry basin is only 8 feet deep at one end, and 3 feet at the other end and is heavily treed.

Mr. Keenan asked about the curve in Brand Road as referenced. Is this at the point at which the guardrails come together and the traffic is squeezed, or is it west of what they are addressing?
Mr. Hammersmith responded that he believes it is located just to the west of that.
Mr. Keenan noted that in the discussion of the multi-use path, there was some discussion about bridging at that juncture and the potential ability to make some changes.
Mr. Hammersmith clarified that there was discussion of the potential of adding width to the road, but not changing the horizontal curve. It is presently a 35 mph speed limit roadway.
Mr. Keenan commented that if there is some improvement that can be made, it would make the road much safer.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff can review this matter further.

Vice Mayor Salay noted that to the west of this development, the intersection with Coffman Road will be a modern roundabout. This will likely slow the traffic through the area. It seems that widening the roadway could lead to increased speeds. If there is a speeding issue, perhaps the Police could increase their patrol in this area.
Mr. Hammersmith agreed that added lane width on a roadway generally leads to increased speeds.
Vice Mayor Salay noted that she assumes staff will address the guardrail issue as appropriate in the final development plan stage.
Mr. Hammersmith agreed.

Mr. Keenan stated that all of Council is interested in the appearance of Brand Road into the future. Recently, the City purchased the Wallace property along Brand Road, which consists of 14 plus acres, taking it out of any development potential. Council has invested a considerable amount of funds to maintain this 14 acres as passive parkland.

Mrs. Boring noted that she travels Brand Road regularly and does not recall Coventry Woods and Wellington as having mounding in place.
Ms. Husak responded that there are manicured ponds in these locations.
Mrs. Boring stated that if mounding were added to this property, it would not be consistent with what is in place. She prefers it be consistent with the appearance of existing neighborhoods along Brand Road.
Ms. Husak noted that subsequent to development of Coventry Woods and Wellington, the Community Plan was updated, incorporating a slight change to the road character within the Plan. Brand Road was identified as having more of an informal effect along the frontage and for this reason, staff suggested the dry basin as an informal frontage treatment.
Mrs. Boring noted that several citizens have suggested mounding, but based on this, it would not be consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods.
Ms. Husak confirmed that mounding is not present in the adjoining neighborhoods.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked staff to provide information on the setbacks along Brand Road for houses facing Brand.
Ms. Husak responded that there is a 100-foot setback requirement from Brand Road. There was originally 130 feet of setback proposed within this plan. From the road, the setback is 130 feet. For Wellington Place and Sheffield Place, there is 100 feet of setback to the homes. For these homes, the proposal is for 150 feet setback from Brand Road.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that as one travels west, past the roundabout, there is a phase of Muirfield consisting of about six homes. What is the setback for those homes?
Ms. Husak responded she is not certain, but recalls that many of those developments were approved with a 200-foot setback from Brand Road.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked if there is a reason why the City would not install the sewer system along Brand Road so that properties on the south side could take advantage of it.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff would need to review this. Either the developer could do this, or the extension could be done in association with this project. Staff has reviewed all of these unserved areas, but he does not recall how it is to be served. He will check on this and report back.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that this would give the City an opportunity to implement the service for this area in conjunction with the other construction projects.
Mr. Hammersmith stated that it may be an issue of depth of the eight-inch sewer going west. It works with routing up through the development, as the property grade falls from the northwest towards Brand Road. Staff will review this.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked that staff stay in communication with the township residents interested in sewer service so they are aware of what decisions are made and for what reason they are made.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that another issue brought up is in regard to the dry basin versus a wet basin. She understands that staff is recommending a more natural approach to this, but in terms of consistency and continuation of appearance, it seems the water ponds would add value to the aesthetics of the entry as well as those on the south side of Brand.
Ms. Husak responded that another consideration was the maintenance issue for the future, and the fact that a woodland area would require less maintenance costs for the HOA. Another concern was the safety aspect of having a pond located close to the roadway, and staff believes the dry basin is a better option. She noted that guardrail has been added in areas previously, as warranted.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented that she is familiar with only a couple of dry basin areas and those have not been well maintained. She is concerned with the ability to keep them properly maintained. The guardrail is an alternative that should be

considered with any ponds, as has been discussed, for safety reasons. She believes that when the guardrail was installed near Mr. Geese's property, the decision was to install a wood guardrail for aesthetics. She would hope this would be considered in this area as well, in keeping with the natural wooded areas along Brand Road.
Ms. Husak commented that the PZC was also concerned with the dry basin and emphasized to the applicant that this would be looked at very thoroughly within the final development plan review. The applicant, therefore, is aware that the expectation is for a dry basin that will retain its state.

Mr. Keenan stated that there is a dry basin in Coventry Woods, which is well maintained and is utilized as a play area for the neighborhood.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked who is responsible for maintaining a dry basin – the homeowners association?
Ms. Husak responded affirmatively.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that the HOA will need some education to understand how to maintain it.

Mayor Lecklider noted that one of his concerns is with the shallow depth in this area. There are existing water features on Brand, west of Muirfield Drive on the north side of Brand. There was not adequate depth in that location to do anything more. In retrospect, it would be more appealing if left in a natural state, as proposed for this development.

Mr. Reiner asked about the basin. Will the bottom be planted so that it is forested, or is it to be a mowable one that is easy to maintain?
Ms. Husak responded that the details are not yet determined. Some of the discussions indicated there would be mowable area around the basin, but not at the bottom.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that, based on the rendering, it would be treed with some water loving plants.

Mr. Hale stated that the intent is to have a wooded preserve. He clarified that the houses are 200 feet back from the roadway.

Greg Chillog, The Edge Group, 1400 Goodale Boulevard stated that the intention for the bottom of the basin is to have trees, shrubs, and no mow grass resistant to periodic flooding. From the frontage, it will appear very natural. There is a 4 to 1 slope on the sides at the steepest, so this is a gentle slope. The feature is not the basin, but the wooded frontage.

Mr. Reiner asked if bald cypress trees will be utilized for this.
Mr. Chillog responded affirmatively, adding that there will be different zones – some areas with more water than others. The deep areas will require a bald cypress tree type plant, while the areas on the fringe will have shrubs. The overall bottom of the pond will not be mowed, but it will be some type of basin planting mix.

Mr. Reiner noted that at the last hearing, there was discussion of excavation of the houses and hauling away of the dirt. With the option of the mounds and the cost savings for not hauling away the dirt, is there any interest in creating mounds along the street?

Charles Ruma, 4020 Venture Court, Columbus responded that they will do whatever the City desires in this regard. It would certainly be less costly to retain the dirt on site and build mounds versus hauling it away. He noted that there are only two ponds

along Brand from Dublin Road to Muirfield Drive. There is not a prevalent system of wet ponds along Brand Road. This area is very wooded. They believed it was preferable to have the front of the homes on Brand Road versus the back of the homes. The setback is at least 200 feet along those houses, and this will be a very pleasant community along Brand Road.
Mr. Reiner responded that he is pleased to hear that the 200-foot setback is being maintained along this scenic highway. He is aware that there is a difference of opinion about the preference for mounding or a natural appearance. The Asherton apartment complex is heavily mounded, but it was developed 20 years ago.

Mr. Riat stated that there is not adequate depth to accommodate a wet pond along the frontage. The only two other ponds along this portion of Brand serve as an entry feature for the Wellington subdivision. They are willing to continue working with staff on finalizing the details for the development.

Mrs. Boring stated that the large beech tree referenced will eventually be part of someone's back yard, once the lot is sold, and the City will have no control over that tree. Is that correct?
Ms. Husak responded that this is true, but the tree is on the property line within the side yard setback, so the likelihood of someone building in that location and removing the tree seems remote. It is true, however, that the property owner would have control over the tree in the future.

Mr. Gerber stated that he agrees with the use of a dry basin, based on this discussion. In addition, he is supportive of investigating options for bringing the sewer line to the west, which would be beneficial to the overall community.

Mrs. Boring asked if there is a pipe draining water into the dry basin, because there is an unsightly pipe at the Lowe's basin. How can the City ensure that does not occur with this development?
Mr. Hammersmith responded that the City's new design standards provide that if there is a headwall, it requires stone facings. The Lowe's development pre-dates that requirement for aesthetic treatment.
Mrs. Boring asked if the owner of Lowe's can be required to make the pipe shorter, as it is unsightly.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff will review this.

Mayor Lecklider summarized that there are 10 conditions listed in the memo, and asked Ms. Husak to summarize the two additional conditions discussed tonight.
Ms. Husak responded that these two additional conditions are:

11. That a temporary metal or wood construction fence be installed around the critical root zone of Tree #740;
12. That the applicant work with Engineering to install, if deemed appropriate, a wood guard rail along the Brand Road frontage; and

Mayor Lecklider asked if these are consistent with Council's understanding.
Hearing no comments, Mayor Lecklider moved to approve Ordinance 14-12 with the 10 conditions identified in the memo, and the two conditions appended by Council tonight.

A citizen in the audience requested to testify.

Collette Feldmann, 5053 Ballybridge Drive, Dublin stated that she submitted a letter signed by all seven of the homeowners on Ballybridge Drive in Wellington Place that backs up to this development. She is not certain that Council has heard their concerns. These seven properties that back up to Brand Road knew there was a 100-

foot setback and expected that when the farmland was sold, it would benefit them. The designation of Brand Road as a scenic roadway meant that what would eventually be built behind their homes would be similar to what is seen across Brand Road – beautiful estate homes that are set back from the road. They had expected no more than three such homes in this area, as Mr. McLoughlin has indicated. Now that the homes are 200 feet back – 100 feet more than required by Code – pushing the homes directly into their backyards, it is very disappointing. They chose to build on lots that backed into farmland and they expected when the land was sold, it would be developed to maintain the scenic roadway nature of Brand. While the developer has cooperated to improve things, all seven property owners are very unhappy and do not believe what has been proposed maintains the scenic roadway of Brand Road.

Mike Ensminger, 7502 Kilbrittain Lane, Wellington Place trustee noted he has additional comments.

- The developer and their representatives have been very cooperative throughout the process. He noted that the neighborhood continues to be opposed to this development in their back yards, compromising the rural nature of Brand Road. They are pleased with the trees and landscape buffer, and the level of opacity they are providing. They are pleased with the setbacks restored to the original sizes.
- One issue he continues to have concerns with is the drainage issue. He asked that Council append a 13th condition to the rezoning – that the developer continue to work with staff and residents to mitigate drainage issues.
- He appreciates the developer's willingness to work with the residents to resolve these issues.

Mr. Hale stated that they have no objection to this 13th condition.

Mr. Ruma added that all of this property flows from west to east, and it is pretty severe. So all of the water coming from the two or three properties to the west are all flowing to Mr. Ensminger's back yard. What the developer will do is install a street, and the only water that will affect Mr. Ensminger's property is the water from the highest street curb back to his lot. At his lot line, there is a storm sewer to catch the drainage before it gets to his lot. So, in essence, his current problems will disappear. If a problem continues, the developer is willing to help with French drains or other means to help dry it out.
Mr. Ensminger stated that he appreciates the commitment and hopes the communication will continue at the final development plan stage.

Mayor Lecklider amended his motion to add a 13th condition:

13. That the applicant works with adjacent property owners to address their drainage issues.

Mr. Keenan seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion to approve Ordinance 14-12 with 13 conditions: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes.

Ordinance 15-12
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire a 0.302 Acres (all of which is Present Road Occupied), More or Less, Fee Simple Interest, a 0.426 Acres, More or Less, Permanent Utility Grading and Drainage Easement, and a 0.107 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction Easement from Bates Property Management, Ltd.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that this acquisition is associated with the Cosgray/Shier-Rings Road roundabout project. This includes Present Road Occupied as well as a temporary construction easement and is being purchased for the appraised value.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Ordinance 16-12
Amending Sections 96.23, 137.04, 137.06 and 137.08 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances Related to the Regulation of Firearms to Comply with Revised Case Law Requirements.
Mr. Smith stated that this brings the Dublin law into compliance with case law in the Supreme Court.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, no; Vice Mayor Salay, no; Mr. Gerber, yes.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented that she understands the need to be in compliance, but she does not support the original law that was passed.
Vice Mayor Salay stated that she concurs with Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher.

INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE - RESOLUTIONS
Resolution 17-12
Appointing Members to the Various Boards and Commissions of the City of Dublin.
Mr. Gerber introduced the resolution.
Vice Mayor Salay, Administrative Committee Chair noted that she reported at the March 12 meeting those candidates to be formally appointed with legislation on March 26. She recommended approval of the resolution as drafted.
Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes.

OTHER
- 2013 Art in Public Places

Ms. Ott stated that the staff report identifies four additional potential locations for the project, based on feedback from the March 12 Council meeting. These locations are all along major thoroughfares in the community. A staff group reviewed opportunities for public art in conjunction with the current CIP schedule. Locations that offer unique views were selected, and pedestrian access was considered as well. Another consideration was the feasibility in terms of budget for the various locations.

Mr. Keenan stated that he likes all the locations presented in the report, which are all high traffic areas. For him, the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33 provides an opportunity for 11,000 vehicles to view it on a daily basis. There are many examples of such public art in Scottsdale and Phoenix with respect to bridges and artwork along freeways. The Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33 also has pedestrian access, which was a concern with some of the roundabout locations for public art. His vote would be for the Emerald Parkway/US 33 bridge.

Mr. Gerber stated that in terms of priority, he favors the BriHi Square location. There was previous discussion of a town pump in that location.
Council Members clarified that the direction at the last Council meeting was to do the BriHi Square town pump project as a commissioned special project. Mr. Gerber was absent from the meeting due to illness.
Mr. Gerber stated that, given this, he will reconsider and offer another option.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that she likes all of the proposed sites. She is fine with Mr. Keenan's suggestion. She would like to see more public art in the southwest in the future. The Perimeter/Commerce roundabout location does provide a prominent location close to Coffman Park, but the Emerald Parkway/US 33 bridge is also in that vicinity. She is fine with either of these two sites.

Mr. Reiner stated that he, too, supports the proposed Emerald Parkway/US 33 bridge location in view of the high traffic volumes. Depending upon what kind of art is selected – vertical that can be viewed from under the bridge or art to be viewed by those driving on the bridge – this is the area with highest visibility and impact for the next project.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she was somewhat concerned with all of the proposed sites because of the lack of pedestrian capacity. If the Emerald Parkway bridge location is selected, she will be interested in more discussion about what the art will be and where exactly it would be located on the bridge. She is not familiar with the art locations Mr. Keenan has mentioned in Arizona.
Mr. Keenan stated that he recalls items such as a giant teapot – bigger than life-size art – and some are ordinary household items. These do attract attention along the roadway and bridges.
Mrs. Boring recalled that she viewed some of these at NLC in Arizona some years ago. At the time, she recalled thinking that whimsical art would be a great addition along the river. She noted that she is in favor of the next public art project location as the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33. She has concern with roundabouts and the tall grasses that can impede vision of the traffic. She is not certain that public art could be accommodated in these locations for safety reasons. She also asked that staff review the roundabout at Sycamore Ridge near Dublin Village Center and the visual problems that exist. She summarized that she supports the location of the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33 for the 2013 Art in Public Places project.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented in regard to the locations offered in the memo for the March 12 packet. The shade structure for Emerald Fields is a wonderful idea, and she would advocate this as a regular CIP project. It serves a purpose over and above its visual appeal.
Ms. Grigsby stated that the shade structure is currently programmed in the CIP for 2016. Staff can review what options are available to do this earlier.

Mr. Gerber noted that he concurs with everyone and his preferred location is the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33. He also suggested that at some point, it would be important to add public art at the Justice Center, as many citizens visit this building – similar to a downtown courthouse location in a large city. It is a center of activity and would make a statement for the City.

Mayor Lecklider agreed with the comments about the Justice Center, but would support the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33 location. He is trying to visualize where the public art would be located with respect to the bridge. Would it be in the median?
Ms. Ott responded that she would recommend that the artist have some license in this regard. The initial thoughts involved the planters in the middle, the flanking on either side of the bridge where the sidewalk comes up, and the bridge deck itself – but the artist would want to experience the site and return with some concepts.

Discussion followed about whether the art would be for the primary benefit of those traveling 33 or the people traveling Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Keenan stated that it could benefit both, depending upon how it is executed.

Ms. Ott commented that she and Mr. Guion can do some research with other agencies that have done art in such locations, including the budget for such projects. In addition, conversation would need to take place with ODOT to obtain their feedback.

Mrs. Boring stated that she does not want to have a complicated process where the artist interprets this. She asked for Council's input.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher responded that is exactly what artists do.
Mr. Keenan added that it is part of the jurying process for the public art.
Mrs. Boring stated that the issue may be having whimsical or traditional art.
Mr. Keenan stated that the first step would be to view examples of other art from around the country. That should provide some clarification.

Ms. Ott stated that some communities do provide thematic direction.
Mrs. Boring stated that is her question – whether Council wants to provide more direction than has been given in the past. Personally, she would prefer to do so at the appropriate time.
Ms. Ott responded that it would be important to provide such direction early in the process, as it is critical in the development of the call for artists and for guidance in the selection panel.
Ms. Ott will bring back some examples of public art projects located in similar locations in other cities.

Town Pump Art Project at BriHi Square
Ms. Ott stated that staff requests that Council continue the tradition of not requiring review by boards and commissions for this project. This particular site has the potential for review by Planning and Zoning Commission as well as the Architectural Review Board. In developed a call for artists process, staff needs direction regarding whether an artist would be subject to direction of those two boards in their design work – or if Council would waive the requirements for these reviews.
Vice Mayor Salay stated that she recommends waiving the requirement for such review for this project.
She moved to waive the review requirement by City boards and commissions for the town pump art project.
Mrs. Boring seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Gerber, no; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes.

Mr. Reiner asked about the right-of-way detailing of the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33. Everyone who drives through this part of Dublin views this. Does ODOT have concerns if the railing on the bridge is changed to be more interesting and more definitive?
Ms. Ott responded that ODOT would need to be involved in this discussion. They have been engaged in some other art projects around the state, so she is hopeful that some positive discussion will occur.

Mayor Lecklider asked if any additional direction is needed regarding the composition of the selection panel.
Ms. Ott responded that it is Council's preference. They may want to delay this until they can view some examples of such art.

Vice Mayor Salay commented that she was pleased with the selection panel for the last public art project. She believes the DAC does a great job of assembling such a panel and should do so again.

Mayor Lecklider moved to select the Emerald Parkway bridge over US 33 as the site of the 2013 Art in Public Places Project and to exempt the project from review by any City board or commission.
Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Vice Mayor Salay moved to have the Dublin Arts Council determine the composition of the artist selection panel for the 2013 Art in Public Places Project.
Mrs. Boring seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS
Ms. Grigsby reported that a memo was included in the packet regarding the draft agreement for economic development among the Central Ohio communities. Staff did not anticipate the discussion of the agreement tonight, but suggests it be scheduled for discussion on April 23, given the Bridge Street area rezoning scheduled for April 9. It would be scheduled under the "Other" portion of the agenda on April 23, unless Council prefers to schedule a separate meeting for this purpose.
It was the consensus of Council to schedule this discussion for the April 23 meeting.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS/COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE
Mrs. Boring:

1. Asked if the board and commission recognition program is taking place on April 4. She has not received her invitation.

The Clerk responded that the event is scheduled for April 4 and she will check to see if the Council invitations have been sent.

2. Asked about the report regarding Tuller Road that was included in the packet. Her understanding is that it will remain as is until the new east/west connector is completely constructed.

Ms. Grigsby stated that the east/west portion on the recently approved Vrable development would be constructed at the time of that development. The piece from that development that connects down to Riverside Drive could be deferred. The plan is not to relocate the Tuller Road signal to that location until Emerald Parkway Phase 8 is constructed.

3. Reminded staff to check on the pipe at the pond at Lowe's.

Mr. Gerber noted he was recently at the Dublin Justice Center and the paint on the pillars is peeling. Is there a plan for maintenance in the near future?
Ms. Grigsby responded that there are funds programmed this year for painting and some of the work was delayed until the drainage issues related to the paver installation were addressed.

Vice Mayor Salay reported that a constituent contacted her over the weekend regarding the City ponds and the fact that people are fishing in the ponds and taking the fish. Because of this, it is hard to establish stock of a good size. She is interested in making all of the ponds in Dublin "catch and release" ponds – so that people can enjoy the fun of fishing, yet the stock is allowed to grow. Signage would need to be installed around the ponds indicating the "catch and release" policy, and she assumes an ordinance would be needed to make this enforceable.

Mr. Hahn responded that there are no laws in place regarding fishing in Dublin ponds. He believes it would be appropriate to regulate the fishing. There are circumstances

where bluegill becomes overpopulated. But, in general, taking fish out of the ponds should be discouraged for the reasons outlined. There is good water quality in the ponds, but they are not pristine. He believes having such regulations should be pursued to protect the ponds and this resource.
Mr. Gerber noted that on some golf courses, they prohibit fishing except on one day per summer – in order to thin the stock.
Vice Mayor Salay asked that staff bring back a recommendation, with input from the Law Director.
Ms. Grigsby agreed that staff would provide this for the second meeting in April.

Mayor Lecklider:

1. Complimented staff for their efforts with the March 15 State of the City event. There were interesting displays in advance of the presentation, and it was nice to have the event on a non-regular meeting night.
2. Reported that he participated in the annual Dublin Business Appreciation Day on March 16, together with Economic Development staff. It was fun and he encouraged Council Members to participate next year, if possible. The businesses appreciated the visits. Local businesses offered coupons for drawings, and everyone enjoyed the recognition.
3. Noted that on March 21, for the third year, he was fortunate to be able to participate in the LifeCare Alliance Mayors for Meals. They delivered meals to Dublin area residents and the meals were much appreciated by the recipients.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Timothy A. Lecklider
Mayor – Presiding Officer

Anna C Clarke
Clerk of Council