Mayor Lecklider called the Monday, April 23, 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).
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes.
(Mr. Reiner joined the session in progress.)

The meeting was reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mrs. Boring led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Staff present were Ms. Grigsby, Mr. Smith, Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Mumma, Mr. Harding, Mr. Hahn, Ms. Crandall, Mr. Hammersmith, Mr. Langworthy, Ms. Puskarcik, Mr. Earman, Ms. Gilger, Mr. Somerville, Mr. Gunderman, Ms. Ott, Ms. Colley and Ms. Husak.

CITIZEN COMMENTS
A.C. Strip, 5482 Aryshire Drive, Dublin thanked the City staff for the outstanding support services provided last week in conjunction with the funeral for Captain Nick Rozanski. He thanked the Washington Township Fire Department and all the neighboring jurisdictions that provided support services as well for the funeral in Powell, the procession to Dublin, and burial in Dublin Cemetery. He believes he speaks for hundreds of residents of Dublin in requesting that Captain Rozanski be memorialized in a permanent manner in the City. He understands that his first suggestion for naming of the park at Hard Road and Riverside is not feasible, as the dedication ceremony is pending and a name has already been selected. Another suggestion is to name the Avery Park soccer fields after him, as soccer was a large part of Nick's life – first as a player and later as a coach. Avery Park is a public venue and it is extremely fitting that the children Nick coached and those in generations to come share in honoring the contributions he made to the sport of soccer. Captain Rozanski gave all he could to his City and his country, and Mr. Strip asks that the City now consider doing this in return for Captain Rozanski's tremendous sacrifice.

Mayor Lecklider thanked Mr. Strip for his comments and indicated that Council will take this under advisement.

Wallace Maurer, 7451 Dublin Road, Dublin noted that Ben Rattray formed a powerful website called "change.org" and it will revolutionalize activism in the country. He succeeded in bringing knowledge of the shooting and killing in Florida within hours to hundreds of people. This has raised a question for him. Is it legal or illegal for a person, other than security personnel, to enter this building or this Chamber bearing a concealed weapon? Is it legal or illegal for a person entering this building to carry an unconcealed weapon? His question is directed to the City Law Director.
Mr. Smith responded that City buildings are marked with signage that indicates, "no weapons are allowed for other than security persons." The law regarding other properties owned by the City is somewhat different, and the law about who can carry

guns and where in the City has significantly changed. He offered to have Mr. Maurer call him at his office to review this information.
Mr. Maurer stated that he must face the issue of what the de facto situation might be as a result of having this information. The situation is maddening in view of the probabilities of that kind of danger.

Danielle McDuffie, 5398 Portland Street, Columbus addressed Council. She is currently reigning as "Miss Dublin Ohio Plus America." She works at a nursing facility in Dublin as a dietary cook and helps with volunteer activities as well. Her platform of beliefs during her reign is speaking out against elderly abuse and neglect. The elderly cannot speak for themselves and need protection from abuse – mental, financial and verbal. Last year, between January 2011 and December 2011 there were over 1,400 cases of elderly abuse and neglect reported. This year, there was a case of elderly abuse in Dublin that received coverage in the local media. Tomorrow, she will volunteer for Meals on Wheels with LifeCare Alliance and will speak to residents and staff at the facility they will visit. She hopes to bring awareness and educate people on the issue of elder abuse and neglect. She thanked Council for the opportunity to address them tonight.

CONSENT AGENDA
Mayor Lecklider noted that 11 items are proposed for action on the consent agenda. 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 actions requested for the 11 items as proposed on the consent agenda.
Mr. Gerber seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

1. **Approval of Minutes of April 9, 2012 Council meeting**

2. **Ordinance 24-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Appropriating a Combined 0.360 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest, a 1.534 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied Property, and a 0.514 Acres, More or Less, Permanent Easement from Subsidiary Development Corporation.
(Cosgray Road/Shier-Rings Road Roundabout)(Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

3. **Ordinance 25-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Appropriating a 0.093 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied Property from Jason R. Huffman.
(Cosgray Road/Shier-Rings Road Roundabout) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

4. **Ordinance 26-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Appropriating a 0.110 Acres, More Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied Property from Michael E. Haaf and Kimberly Haaf. (Cosgray Road/Shier-Rings Road Roundabout) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

5. **Ordinance 27-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Accept the Dedication of a 0.023 Acres, More or Less, Permanent Sidewalk Easement, and a 0.054 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction and Grading Easement from William

G. Robson. (Corbins Mill Drive Sidewalk Improvements - 2011 Street Maintenance Phase 2) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

6. **Ordinance 28-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Accept the Dedication of a 0.025 Acres, More or Less, Permanent Sidewalk Easement, and a 0.035 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction and Grading Easement from Kevin O'Connor and Karen O'Connor. (Corbins Mill Drive Sidewalk Improvements - 2011 Street Maintenance Phase 2) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

7. **Ordinance 29-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Accept the Dedication of a 0.010 Acres, More or Less, Multi-Use Path, Drainage and Grading Easement, and a 0.238 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction and Grading Easement from Italia Homes, Inc. (Bikepath connection - 2011 Street Maintenance Phase 2) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

8. **Ordinance 30-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Accept the Dedication of a 0.040 Acres, More or Less, Multi-Use Path, Drainage and Grading Easement, and a 0.134 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction and Grading Easement from Stoneridge Medical Office Center LLC. (Bikepath connection - 2011 Street Maintenance Phase 2) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

9. **Ordinance 31-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Accept the Dedication of a 0.035 Acres, More or Less, Multi-Use Path, Drainage and Grading Easement, and a 0.106 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction and Grading Easement from National Church Residences of Dublin II. (Bikepath connection - 2011 Street Maintenance Phase 2) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

10. **Ordinance 32-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire a Combined 0.224 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest, a 2.067 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied Property, a 1.199 Acres, More or Less, Permanent Easement, and a 0.410 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Construction Easement from S.R. Associates. (Cosgray Road/Shier-Rings Road Roundabout) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

11. **Ordinance 33-12 (Introduction/first reading)**
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire a 0.108 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied Property from Ima Moore. (Cosgray Road/Shier-Rings Road Roundabout) (Second reading/public hearing May 7 Council meeting)

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 19-12

Modifications to Chapter 153 (Zoning Code) of the Dublin Code of Ordinances to Add Section 153.237 Administrative Review Team, Modify Sections 153.016 Designation of Zoning Districts, 153.038 District Uses, 153.042 Development Approval Process, 153.044(B) District Uses, 153.173 Board Order Procedure, 153.158 General Requirements for Temporary and Permanent Signs, 153.232 Planning and Zoning Commission and 153.234 Amendments and to Delete Sections 153.035 Historic Residential District, 153.036 Historic Business District, 153.043 Definitions, 153.044(I) Use Definitions (Innovation Districts) and 153.115 Corridor Development District, While Retaining the Section Numbers for Future Use. (Cases 12-009ADM and 12-014ADM)

Ms. Husak stated that there are no changes since the last presentation. She offered to respond to questions.

There were no comments or questions.

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

Ordinance 20-12

Establishing Section 130.15 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances, Authorizing the Mayor and/or Mayor's Court Magistrate to Seal Juvenile Records upon the Successful Completion of a Juvenile Diversion Program.

Mr. Smith stated that the City has a juvenile diversion program in place and this will allow the Mayor or Magistrate to seal those juvenile records upon completion of the diversion program.

Mayor Lecklider asked for clarification that the sealing of records is done upon request, and that the records are not automatically sealed.

Mr. Smith responded that is correct.

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

Ordinance 21-12

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire a 0.120 Acres, More or Less, Fee Simple Interest that is Present Road Occupied Property from Beatrice L. Brogan. (Cosgray Road/Shier-Rings Roundabout)

Mr. Hammersmith stated that this relates to acquisition of present road occupied right-of-way at 7025 Shier-Rings Road, and is associated with the intersection improvement from the Brogans at the amount listed in the staff report. He offered to respond to questions.

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

Mrs. Boring asked if it is necessary to include the amount in the ordinance.

Mr. Smith responded that the legislation authorizes the City Manager to execute documents to acquire this land for $300. It is not necessary to have this amount listed in the ordinance.

Ms. Grigsby stated that in many cases related to acquisition of right-of-way, the amount is included in the ordinance because the dollar amount is more substantial. In this case, it is present road occupied and the total amount is $300, which is likely why the amount was not specified in the ordinance. Staff will review this for consistency with past practice.

Ordinance 22-12
Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Ohio University to Induce it to Establish an Extension Medical School Campus, an Education and Research Campus, as Well as Other Economic, Education and Research Development Related Initiatives and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement.
Mr. McDaniel stated that, subsequent to the introduction of the ordinance at the April 9 meeting, there has been ongoing dialogue between staff and Ohio University. Some changes have been made to the agreement, as summarized in the staff memo provided to Council in the packet. The City Manager, legal counsel, bond counsel and he all believe that the changes are not substantial in nature. In addition, since the last meeting, Ohio University announced an expanded and extended relationship with Ohio Health at a news conference on April 17. Dublin staff, several Council Members, Ohio University President McDavis, Dean of the Ohio University College of Osteopathic Medicine Brose, and Senior Vice President and Provost for Ohio University Benoit were all present. Ohio University officials could not be present for tonight's Council meeting, due to a scheduling conflict. He offered to respond to any questions, and indicated that staff recommends approval of Ordinance 22-12.

Mrs. Boring stated that at the April 17 news conference, several Council Members and staff met with Ohio University officials. She had conversation with an OU official who confirmed that OU had been contacted by many communities who wanted this facility to be located in their community. In response to why they selected Dublin, the immediate response was that the staff was so well prepared and the area was project ready. She thanked staff for their work to bring forward this agreement in a timely manner and for instilling the confidence in Ohio University that resulted in their selection of Dublin.

Mayor Lecklider asked about the new language regarding the TIF in Section 4.4(B). Mr. McDaniel responded that this language is intended to clarify. The TIF will be brought to Council for their review and approval at a later date and will apply to all of the area in question. Specifically as it relates to Subarea 3, the City wanted to have more development where property tax was applicable for purposes of generating TIF payments. Both parties agree that the intent is to attract a hotel/conference center to that subarea to support activities at the OU facility as well as at Dublin Methodist Hospital. This provision indicates that, regardless of who does the hotel/conference center operation, the City would still receive TIF payments either from a private entity operating it or from OU if a not-for-profit operates it – equal to the amount it would have received if it were operated by a private entity.
Mayor Lecklider stated that, assuming Ohio University brings forward a user and there is a TIF agreement in place, the TIF agreement has a finite period in which it is in effect. What happens to the income stream once the TIF expires? Is that clear within the agreement?
Ms. Grigsby responded that if the hotel/conference center were owned by Ohio University and if the state would determine it is tax exempt, then the payments that were included in a TIF agreement would expire upon the expiration of the TIF. Based upon the projections of the internal roadway infrastructure and the 25 acres in Subarea 3, staff estimates it will take close to the entire 30 years of what is allowed to be collected in service payments or in payments in lieu of those service payments. Upon the expiration of the TIF or the City being reimbursed, state law would be followed. If the State Department of Taxation would approve the exemption, it would be a tax exempt property.
Mr. Smith added that if, in fact, the state does not recognize it as exempt property because of the hotel portion, the tax must be paid.

Mayor Lecklider stated he is not aware of what criteria are used to make that determination. He is aware that OU operates the University Inn in Athens, and he assumes that facility is tax exempt.
Ms. Grigsby stated that, typically, universities are afforded additional allowances for tax exempt status. Therefore, there is potential for them to operate a facility that has a profit center within it, and yet be identified as tax exempt. Those determinations are made by the State Department of Taxation.
Mayor Lecklider stated that he wanted to clarify that there is not an indefinite income stream. Is that to suggest perhaps that it is in the City's best interests to initiate the hotel/conference center?
Mr. McDaniel responded that both OU and the City agree they would like to see this type of development occur in that location. The key is the cooperative arrangement and the University's willingness to make payments in lieu of – if it is a tax exempt entity.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that Ohio University recognizes that the City needs that income stream from a future hotel/conference center, and both parties will benefit – regardless of who develops or manages it. This seems to be a good resolution to a potentially problematic situation in the future. She asked about the dates that are estimated as 2018, which she understood would be earlier, based on comments at the last meeting.
Mr. McDaniel responded that the date for the medical school being on line and operating is planned for September 1, 2015, although the date of 2014 was mentioned by OU at the last meeting. The City agreed to the extra year because of the accreditation type issues that could delay opening. However, OU is pushing for the date of September 1, 2014. The 2018 date relates to the master planning process and allows enough time to do a very thorough process. He, too, is hopeful this can occur earlier than 2018, but the dates included in the agreement provide some flexibility. The City has offered assistance from the Planning division with the master planning process, and OU has been receptive to this.

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

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING – ORDINANCES
Ordinance 23-12
Amending the Annual Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2012 for the Purpose of Providing Funding Authorization for the Settlement Agreement and Release of All Claims Related to the Right-Of-Way Acquisition of the Hawkins Property.
Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.
Ms. Grigsby stated that this legislation provides funding authorization to meet the terms of the settlement agreement regarding the Hawkins right-of-way acquisition. Staff is requesting that Council dispense with the second reading/public hearing in order to meet the terms with regard to the deposit of the funds.
Mr. Reiner moved to dispense with the public hearing.
Mr. Gerber seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes.
Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE – RESOLUTIONS
Resolution 24-12
Adopting a Statement of Services for a Proposed Annexation of 3.4 Acres, More or Less, from Washington Township, Franklin County, to the City of

Dublin. (Petitioners Harvey R. and Alexander Vesha; Property at 7094 Dublin Road)
Mr. Gerber introduced the resolution.
Mr. Gunderman stated that Resolutions 24-12 and 25-12 are required for the annexation hearing at the Franklin County Commissioners. The property is located adjacent to Dublin Road in the area just north of Emerald Parkway. This is a single residential type lot with a substantial amount of Dublin Road right-of-way included in the annexation. The lot runs from Dublin Road into the Scioto River.
This is an Expedited 2 annexation petition, and approval of the two resolutions – statement of services and statement regarding incompatible land uses – is needed tonight so that the Commissioners can hear the petition on May 1. Also in the packet is a request for a fee waiver, and Council can approve this by motion, if desired. Upon approval of the annexation petition by Franklin County, there is a 60-day waiting period per the statute prior to scheduling of the first reading of an ordinance accepting the annexation by Council.

Mr. Reiner noted that in reviewing the plat, it appears the landowner owns the property into the middle of the river, and in another section of the plat, the land all the way across the river. In terms of land rights for properties bordering the Scioto River, where are the boundaries?
Mr. Smith responded that he is not prepared to discuss riparian rights this evening, but Columbus has always taken the position that property owners of land along the river own land to the point where the water begins. However, there are old deeds that reflect ownership to the middle of the river. He can provide a memo if Council so desires.

Mayor Lecklider invited the applicant's representative to testify.

Daniel Hoy, agent for the applicants stated that when the process of annexing the land began, he met with Franklin County GIS department because of concern with the isolation lot. They indicated that the lot is actually contiguous with Dublin at the center of the river. The City of Dublin was interested in annexing the 1,200-foot right-of-way on Dublin Road, but it must be attached to a lot. This annexation petition provided the opportunity for that to happen. The map was then modified to include the road right-of-way and resubmitted. The property is contiguous to Dublin by the center of the river, as Dublin is on the other side of the river as well.
Mr. Gunderman added that the county advised the applicant that the property line extended even further and that under any circumstances, they would want that extension included in the annexation petition.
Mr. Hoy responded that the surveyors extended that, noting that it is more of a practical line as opposed to the actual property line.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked about the contiguous properties and their status.
Mr. Gunderman stated that the remainder of the surrounding island area is in the township.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked the applicant's representative about the reasons they are seeking annexation to the City.
Mr. Hoy responded that he works for Kevin Knight & Co. who will build a house on this lot for the owners. They desire annexation to the City for sewer and water services.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes.

- Request for waiver of annexation petition filing fee – Daniel F. Hoy, Agent for Petitioners Harvey R. and Alexander Vesha

Mr. Gerber moved approval of the fee waiver.

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

Resolution 25-12
Adopting a Statement Regarding Possible Incompatible Land Uses and Zoning Buffer for a Proposed Annexation of 3.4 Acres, More or Less, from Washington Township, Franklin County to the City of Dublin, Ohio as Required by Section 709.023(C) of the Ohio Revised Code. (Petitioners Harvey R. and Alexander Vesha; Property at 7094 Dublin Road)
Mr. Gerber introduced the resolution.
Vote on the Resolution: Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Resolution 26-12
Accepting the Lowest/Best Bid for the 2012 Street Maintenance Program.
Mr. Gerber introduced the resolution.
Mr. Hammersmith stated that the staff report provides details of this year's program. The program total for 2012 was just under $4.4 million. The Engineer's estimate for the program was $4.2 million, allowing for change orders and contingencies, and on April 5, five bids were submitted. The lowest bid was from Strawser Paving in the amount of $3,976,897.86, which was 5.3 percent under the Engineer's estimate. Notable items in the program this year are:

1. Resurfacing of Coffman Road from Coffman Park Drive/Emerald Parkway up to Brand Road. This will include installation of sharrows on the pavement, similar to Emerald Parkway.
2. Muirfield Drive from Brigids Close up to the Brand Road roundabout, including repair of the pedestrian tunnel at Dublinshire.
3. Muirfield Greene subdivision north of Brand Road, along the east side of Muirfield Drive.
4. Several streets in the Hemingway area, including Adventure Drive and Roscommon.
5. Streets in the southern end of Dublin, including Hirth Road.
6. Bikepath improvements throughout the city, including Dublin Road north near Donegal Cliffs; near Bradenton; and other areas as noted in the staff report.
7. Resurfacing of two parking lots – City Hall and the Fleet Maintenance/Sign Shop, including the access driveway.

Previous experience with Strawser Paving has been very good. They are very cooperative, and coordinate well with staff. Staff will continue to communicate with residents about the program through various channels. The fliers on the front doors have been effective, as well as personal contact with residents through the Engineering project inspector. A separate website provides information regarding the street maintenance program. Additional communication methods are utilized as well. Staff recommends acceptance of the bid from Strawser Paving Company. He offered to respond to questions.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked what special consideration or review is done for the multi-use paths that serve as transportation systems to schools.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff met today regarding the paths. Their condition is monitored, and last year, several paths near schools were paved. Over the next couple of years, several paths in the vicinity of schools will receive particular attention.

Mayor Lecklider noted that last year, the Schools contacted the City about the timing of the repairs to the multi-use paths. Has this been considered in preparation for this year's program?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that rain impacted last year's work in various locations. Ms. Grigsby added that in addition, the process is beginning earlier this year so that even with rain delays, there will be additional flexibility.

Mr. Reiner stated that he is aware the program is done on a cyclical basis. Does the City allocate adequate funding to meet all of the objectives for this program?
Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff is in the process of completing a new pavement management system that will allow for better forecasting. Staff does have concern that, given the age of the streets in the City and the City's growth rate, there will be a large number of streets in need of maintenance. For this reason, a new pavement management system has been instituted.

Mayor Lecklider asked if it continues to be the City's practice to examine the sidewalks on streets being resurfaced – especially for those that meet or exceed the threshold for repair.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that the sidewalks are not necessarily included, but the curb ramps at the intersections are repaired as part of this program. There is a separate sidewalk program, and further evaluation is underway. Staff is reviewing some alternative means of repairing the sidewalks, and there will not be a separate sidewalk repair program done in 2012.
Mayor Lecklider asked if separating these is a change from past practice.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that in the past, sidewalk repairs were considered if street maintenance was being done in order to coordinate the two and minimize disruption. He noted that the bomanite at Shier-Rings and Emerald will be replaced this year, but residential sidewalks will not be repaired this year.

Ms. Grigsby stated that last year, a pilot program of planing and grading of some sidewalks was instituted. Staff is continuing to evaluate that and anticipates more of this may be done this year. The typical sidewalk repair program of recent years will not be done this year in order to have a more detailed evaluation done. The funding will then be adjusted over the next few years to accommodate the needs.
Mayor Lecklider commented that he is aware of some sidewalks with severe heaving that are in need of repair.
Mr. Hammersmith responded that funding is still in place, and some of the serious problems in critical areas can be addressed. However, a large-scale program will not be undertaken this year.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes.

OTHER

- Holder-Wright Earthworks Master Plan

Mr. Hahn presented the results of the master planning process.

- Approximately 18 months ago, the process began with formation of a visioning committee to gather input on the design for this park. Representation included area residents, educators, Holder-Wright family members, archaeologists, staff and consultants.
- The property studied was the land mass identified in the 2007 Community Plan, and includes land currently owned by the City as well as some adjacent properties. The City hopes to acquire those adjacent properties in the future, but the study contemplated not acquiring those adjacent properties as well – in terms of having a viable park with the current holdings.
- The intent of the design was to ensure that the general park user could elect to learn more about the various inhabitants of the property, dating back to 2000 BC up to the current time. There is also focus on the 1800s when the original pioneer settlers inhabited the property.

- Another intent was that the park construction not destroy any remaining artifacts or information from previous inhabitants of the land.
- During the planning process, the group learned that mound reconstruction is not something that should be done. Importing dirt on the old mound areas can contaminate it in terms of archaeological exploration. The 1.4-acre mound on this site is therefore proposed for planting of tall meadow grass at the same height the mound would have been to give the visitor a sense of the scale of the mound.
- Also proposed for a future date is having a replica of the mound on the site that would give a much better sense of the scale of the mounds as they existed in the past.
- The entrance to this park will be from Emerald Phase 8, and therefore future construction of this park is contingent upon that phase of Emerald Parkway. Some archaeological exploration of the area of Emerald 8 has been done, in view of the fact that once construction commences, it could destroy any artifacts that exist. Staff expects those archaeological reports by early summer of this year.
- Given the historical nature of the house and the original footprint of the house from the 1820s, and the fact that this original portion still exists, part of this plan includes stripping the house back to the way it existed at an earlier time – with the intent of featuring the original architecture. The house could also be used for educational sessions or gatherings in the future park.
- Other features of the park include the stream that runs through it, with nice geology. Further downstream, off of the current City property, there are some dramatic waterfalls and caves. The site has unique natural features, in addition to its historical significance.
- He shared the magnetic survey imaging, depicting the large mound and its original square configuration and all of the other mounds. There remains a lot of exploration to be done on the site, and staff will ensure that park construction does not prohibit future exploration on the site.
- They have had discussion with OSU about having a field lab in the park for their archaeological students.

He offered to respond to questions about the process, as well as the short-term and long-term vision for the park.

Mrs. Boring commented that this is a wonderful plan, and will provide another unique park in the City. She is somewhat confused with the park master plan and the amount of land shown as the study area. It appears the master plan extends all the way to Riverside Drive, but that land is not owned by the City.
Mr. Hahn responded that, during the 2007 Community Plan process, Council directed staff to do an area plan that included all tracts from Bright Road down to Emerald Parkway, Riverside Drive, and to the back property line of Grandee Cliffs. This study is based on that direction. He emphasized that the park will function with the land currently owned by the City. As part of that process, it was determined that if the intentions of the City were to someday acquire more land in this area, staff did not want to create a master plan for 20 acres today and then have to revise it, based on future acquisitions.
Mrs. Boring asked if the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission has reviewed this plan.
Mr. Hahn responded that they have not reviewed this, but staff will present this to PRAC as an informational item.

Mr. Reiner commented that using the tall grasses on the mounds is a good way to preserve the future exploration possibilities. He is interested in the creek on the border of the property, which contains some of the most interesting terrain in the

community, including waterfalls. He understands from talking with citizens that there is a cave tunnel into the earth on that property, called "Devil's Hole" where some Native American remains were found. OSU excavated this area 40-50 years ago. There are very interesting amenities along the waterfalls. He is interested in how this can be incorporated into the parks planning. The Indian works are interesting, stand-alone pieces of archaeology, but from the nature side, the Wright Run creek is even more interesting.
Mr. Hahn clarified that, currently, the City does not own the cave, the stone arch, or the waterfalls. These are part of the McDowell tract, and the City does hope to have those features someday as part of the park itself. The master plan also includes the Ferris cemetery, which is not currently owned by the City. There are some unique features to the west of the land currently owned by the City that would provide a better park, but the 21 acres the City currently owns are very nice as well.
Mr. Reiner commented that if one hikes from the Indian Run Falls park, up the stream bed, crossing to the east under the road through a tunnel, and accessing this property, one can explore all of these interesting features. He is aware that the right side of this tract should be commercial, as it borders Emerald Parkway, but it would be nice for the City to acquire the riparian corridor and a few feet on the other side in order to have control over these amenities.
Mr. Hahn noted that he concurs.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that on page 15, the probable costs are listed, but they do not include the acquisition of additional property, correct?
Mr. Hahn responded that these are park development costs only. The "probable cost" figure does include development of both currently owned and property not currently owned, but it does not include the cost of the acquisition of the additional land.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked what additional acreage is needed to complete the full master plan.
Mr. Hahn responded that he estimates it would be an additional 25 acres.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented that the plan is magnificent. What is the timeframe estimated for completion?
Mr. Hahn responded that staff will first create some construction documents for the renovation of the house. The first major park improvement phase would be the entry feature itself, but it is contingent upon Emerald 8 construction. In the current five-year CIP are four separate funding years -- two for design and two for construction. The uncertainty is related to the timing of Emerald 8. However, items such as the house renovation can be done without the entrance to the park being constructed.

Mrs. Boring asked if other funding sources have been pursued.
Mr. Hahn responded that one member of the Committee indicated that the potential for grants from the federal or state government is not good in view of the budget cuts. Historic preservation efforts in general are lacking in grant funding. There may be grants available that center on education, and these may be worth pursuing. Grants related to acquisition, construction or enhancement of historic locations are not likely. Staff will continue to work to identify grant sources.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher encouraged staff to seek private foundation monies, as they are sometimes designated for specific interest areas. With the unique nature of this park, it is possible that private foundation monies may be available.

Mr. Gerber stated that he has walked this property with Randy Roth several times, and he is very pleased with this master planning work.

Mayor Lecklider asked if Washington Township has contributed to the acquisition of this land.
Mr. Hahn responded they have not.

(Note: subsequent to the meeting, it was clarified that Washington Township contributed $460,000 to the purchase price of $1.5 million.)
Mayor Lecklider noted that this is a tremendous plan, and it will be a great addition to Dublin's wonderful park system.

Mr. Reiner noted that, archaeologically speaking, this is one of the most northern outposts of this Indian tribe.
Mr. Hahn responded affirmatively. There is reason to believe that the site will still yield more information about the past inhabitants, especially with the technology available in the future.

- Discussion of Regional "Draft Agreement to Use Economic Growth Incentives for New Jobs and Investment"

Ms. Grigsby stated that over the past 18 months, there have been numerous discussions with regard to a potential economic development agreement among Central Ohio communities. The discussion originated at a Mayors/Managers meeting – this group meets regularly throughout the year. The economic development staff from all of the various jurisdictions have been engaged in the discussion as well, evaluating some of the potential elements to be considered in the agreement. She noted the following:

- The focus of the effort was to identify ways that the jurisdictions can all protect their own best interests in economic development. It is a difficult area to come to agreement on, as economic development is critically important to all cities, given that Ohio cities are very dependent upon income tax revenues. The City's focus on economic development over the last decades is evidence of its importance.
- One of the valuable outcomes of these discussions is the honest, healthy debate with regard to how each jurisdiction does economic development and how all can work better together in the region to focus on growth of new jobs within the region, with a de-emphasis on movement of jobs around the Central Ohio area – especially those tied to incentives.
- Last December, a letter of intent was signed by the jurisdictions involved, identifying four areas of focus. When discussions began a month later, it was determined that the group would focus on two of the four areas because of the number of issues involved. The first construct discussed was how the jurisdictions could work together to develop incentive packages to bring new jobs to the region – perhaps multi-jurisdictional economic development incentives – so that the region could better present itself. This focus area and the focus area of redevelopment were set aside so that discussion could center on financial incentives and how those are handled throughout Central Ohio.
- At the outset, there was discussion of having income tax revenue sharing if certain criteria or levels of payroll were met in the incentive agreements. Once discussions began of how to determine the manner in which those revenues were shared, it was recognized that it would be difficult to make progress on this area.
- At this point, the focus was on how the jurisdictions could limit the incentives offered with the goal of slowing down the acceleration of incentives. Typically, in Central Ohio, the majority of jurisdictions use Community Reinvestment Areas (CRAs) or tax abatements as incentives. The City of Dublin has typically not done this. Dublin's philosophy has been that the businesses – either the developer or the company – needs to pay their fair share of taxes, as do all other commercial or residential property owners. The City of Dublin focuses, for the most part, on the use of tax increment financing, which allows the development to fund the infrastructure needed to support it, as well as provide infrastructure for the general public to use.

- In recent years, communities that provide CRAs or tax abatements have also offered other incentives, which results in Dublin having to increase the incentives it offers.
- The discussion focused on whether there is any way to limit financial incentives. Dublin expressed significant concerns, as this is the primary tool it uses for economic development.
- Dublin focused on the issue of communities that use CRAs or abatements, and that Dublin would be able to provide incentives up to the amount of the CRA or the value of the abatement. Typically, Dublin does not match these, as the numbers are substantial. Dublin has not in any case matched the value of a tax abatement offered by another community.
- The focus has therefore been on how the jurisdictions can come to terms that are fair and acceptable to everyone within the Central Ohio area, which is challenging in view of the different practices utilized in various cities.
- Part of the reason such an agreement has never been executed previously is because of these issues. Other areas of the state have engaged in similar efforts, such as Cuyahoga County.

In summary, a draft agreement has been assembled that includes 12 principle terms. These terms were outlined in the staff report, and staff addressed each of these 12 areas. A chart in the back of the draft agreement recaps what the 12 terms provide.

- Key issues are that for any business currently in Dublin – no matter where they are looking – the City has the ability to continue to offer any incentive to retain that business. Under the terms of this agreement, other communities would be limited as to the incentives they could offer such a business, which would result in Dublin having to increase the incentives to retain the business.
- Another element is that all jurisdictions would be able to provide any incentives for new jobs into the region in order to increase the job opportunities within Central Ohio.
- The difficult issues relate to existing businesses within a community who are seeking a new location for their business. Much of the discussion centers on communities with CRAs – either pre-1994 or post-1994 CRAs. There were changes in state law in June of 1994 in terms of the rights being vested in the abated area once established. Any company could go in and receive that abatement in the specific area without any approval from the community. For a post 1994 CRA, an agreement for the abated area must be executed by the community. For the pre 1994 CRAs, cities can all continue to compete up to the value of that abatement in the CRA. In the post 1994 CRAs, cities like Westerville who established such CRAs invested their cash into the infrastructure, with the expectation of a return on investment coming from the businesses who would locate in that area. Therefore, Westerville chose not to participate in this economic development agreement because of their decision to fund their infrastructure with cash. They now need to keep the CRA in place in order to receive the return on investment they anticipated.
- She noted that Dublin provides financial incentives in EDAs based on payroll performance. The payments made by the City come from "non-tax revenues." The Ohio Constitution does not allow cities to use tax revenues to pay for those types of incentives. Over the years, Dublin has carefully monitored the amount of non-tax revenues available. Until 2009-2010, when economic conditions impacted the revenues received from development and permits, the City had adequate capacity for these payments. However, as the City continues to provide additional incentive payments for economic development, the City must be cautious in terms of the amounts offered, due to this restriction. The Wendy's EDA, entered into last year, includes significant payments that will result in an increase in the financial incentives offered from the non-tax

revenue funds. If there is any way the City can reduce the amount of incentive that needs to be provided to a business, that would be of benefit to Dublin – in view of this restriction. The challenge is in predicting what will happen under the current scenario versus a future scenario. In reviewing all of the EDAs that the City has offered, she believes the City would be able to compete on all of these, as the majority of incentives offered in the past five years have been for retention of existing businesses. There have been some that involved relocations of businesses from Central Ohio and some from outside of the City. For Delta Energy, the only incentive provided was selling the land to them at market value so they could have the site they desired, and providing a grant for LEED certification. It is yet to be determined by the group whether a LEED certification would be considered a financial incentive or related to the environmental aspect of the development. For Alcatel Lucent, they were considering another site in a community that does provide a CRA or abatement. Dublin could compete on this one as the abatement is part of the incentive being looked at. It does not mean that in the future there would not be a business looking to relocate from another suburb and requesting an incentive from Dublin to do so. Many times, businesses make their decision based on the community and its amenities. Overall, the terms of this agreement reflect a lot of effort, and the process helped to solidify some of the relationships in Central Ohio among communities.

- Several years ago, members of the Mid Ohio Development Exchange (MODE) all signed a creed that pledged they would work together, and this is likely an outgrowth of that effort. It has been beneficial in terms of how communities react to calls from brokers seeking incentives for clients looking to relocate from nearby communities. This has improved relationships and thereby reduced the need for such incentives.
- There is always risk involved in agreements, and this agreement does provide a good opportunity to address concerns about the acceleration of incentives. There are many companies in Dublin who have never received nor requested incentives.
- An issue that arose in the discussion is whether there is need for a formal, legislatively adopted agreement. She believes there is not a need for that, and that the jurisdictions can continue to work together as a group. Perhaps something similar to the MODE creed can be agreed upon and entered into, and it would not require formal legislation to adopt it.
- Legal staff has reviewed the proposed agreement and indicated that, in general, they have identified no major problems in the provisions. However, there is always the possibility that if another jurisdiction believed a City did not comply with the terms, legal action could be initiated.

She is aware that there are many questions and concerns related to this proposal. There has also been information indicating that the desire is to have this agreement executed by Central Ohio jurisdictions within a particular timeframe. She believes the timeframe proposed is aggressive. Dublin has indicated to the group that if Dublin were to move forward with this, it is uncertain that the timeframe can be met. Council would want to be comfortable with the terms of the agreement prior to taking action. She, Mr. McDaniel and Ms. Gilger can address any questions or concerns of Council.

Mayor Lecklider asked who has established a timeline for execution of this agreement. Ms. Grigsby responded it was discussed at the Mayors/Managers meeting. Originally, the goal was to complete it by March 1 and now it has been extended to June 1. The original timeframe was proposed by the City of Columbus in an effort to resolve the issues of concern.

Mr. Reiner noted that the agreement as drafted is short term.
Ms. Grigsby responded that as drafted, the agreement expires on December 31, 2013.

Mr. Reiner stated that there is a limited time available to analyze the benefits and drawbacks to Dublin regarding entering into this agreement.
Ms. Grigsby responded that, based on the discussions about timeframes, terms and renewal periods, it was felt that a shorter term was more desirable than a longer term.
Mr. Reiner stated that the fact that Westerville is not signing this is of interest, but not surprising given their investment in infrastructure for a large portion of the development area.
Ms. Grigsby stated that Dublin had follow-up discussions with the Westerville City Manager who indicated that their Council would continue to have the City participate in the discussions, wants to be a good regional player in terms of sharing information, and that they would not support efforts to reach out to neighboring community businesses. However, if someone wanted to build a spec building in Westerville that would require a new agreement, Westerville would do so and this would constitute a violation of the proposed agreement. Therefore, they could not support signing this agreement.
Mr. Reiner commented that Ms. Grigsby has indicated that there are limits to non-tax revenues that can be offered as incentives. He presumes the City has adequate resources to support incentives to be offered to a business wanting to relocate to Dublin.
Ms. Grigsby responded that this is continually monitored. It does depend upon how large the incentive would be, and the available non-tax revenues are evaluated closely each year. There are five-year projections done for economic development agreements, and in some cases for the term of the agreement. The City takes a conservative approach and does not underestimate the incentives that could be paid out. However, long term, there is a concern with the restriction of using non-tax revenues only for economic development incentives.
Mr. Reiner stated that he been very pleased with the TIFs offered as incentives, as they benefit the schools and citizens. He does not understand why other communities offer CRAs and tax abatements.
Ms. Grigsby responded that this was a topic of discussion on several occasions. Many of the other jurisdictions asked why Dublin chose not to use CRAs. Dublin's response was that the City believes everyone should pay their fair tax – whether through property taxes or payments in lieu of taxes. Dublin has been very fortunate and able to invest in infrastructure that would not have been possible without the use of tax increment financing.
Mr. Reiner commented that the staff report is well done and responsive to all of his questions.

Mr. Gerber stated that he can understand why Dublin has done TIFs versus abatements. A key factor, as Ms. Grigsby has stated, is that Dublin has the amenities, the school system and good infrastructure to attract economic development. In reviewing this excellent staff report, he is supportive of the concept of Columbus 2020 and those partnerships for attracting those businesses from outside the region. Has there been any discussion with the City of Columbus about the water and sewer rates, which are much higher for Dublin than for Columbus residents? For years, the traffic north of I-270 at Sawmill has experienced traffic back-ups, and this roadway is in the City of Columbus. If infrastructure improvements had been done in this location as needed, the traffic congestion would have been alleviated and Columbus businesses in that area would have benefitted. Has there been discussion in these groups of water and sewer costs and completion of roadways that would benefit Dublin as well as other jurisdictions?
Ms. Grigsby responded that the topic of water and sewer services and rates was touched on briefly in the group discussion, as the majority of the suburbs have agreements in place with Columbus and do pay a surcharge for water and sewer. The discussion was very limited, as this is an enterprise operation for Columbus and they have done their projections based upon the assumption of the surcharge being in

place going forward. In terms of infrastructure, a good MORPC initiative in the future would be to look more at regional planning information from the standpoint of how all of the development occurs and how infrastructure is prioritized. This would be helpful in economic development efforts for the region. Dublin staff has been working much more closely with the City of Columbus on some of the area infrastructure needed. Some of these discussions about economic development and shared services do provide benefit to those areas, as there is better understanding of the needs and the demands of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Gerber stated asked what the remedy is should someone breach this agreement.

Ms. Grigsby responded that discussion took place at some of the meetings about the fact that the agreement does not include enforcement provisions. If there is not a formal legislatively approved agreement, she believes much of the intent of the agreement can still be implemented.

Mr. Gerber commented that Dublin has a strong financial base, with a two percent income tax rate for withholding. Many of the jurisdictions involved in this agreement have either increased their withholding tax to a higher rate, or it is anticipated they will do so. It seems that Dublin has an advantage because of its favorable financial management and tax rate. Were there any discussions about this topic with the other jurisdictions?

Ms. Grigsby responded that the revenue sharing discussion was complicated because of the different tax rates, and some cities have less than two percent income tax. Dublin and Westerville likely had the most concerns. Dublin's concern is based on the fact that it does not use CRAs. Part of the discussion was that all of the jurisdictions have "played by the rules" established over the last several decades, and so it is difficult to make changes going forward. Dublin has done well and Council has focused on economic development and providing incentives at an appropriate level and type. Some jurisdictions have established CRAs that are not generating the revenues expected.

Mr. Gerber stated that Dublin has done a good job with the taxpayer money and has established a nice model. Dublin has competed fairly and the taxpayers deserve a return on the investment in their community. With respect to tax revenue sharing, that would not be something he could support.

Ms. Grigsby responded that the draft agreement does not include any provisions regarding income tax sharing, as that was a major hurdle for the jurisdictions in these discussions. Mr. McDaniel and Ms. Gilger work hard to follow-up on information they receive, and Dublin tries not to over react to contacts from brokers regarding the requests for incentives and related timing. The decisions of companies to locate in a community are not always based on financial incentives.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she agrees that the value of the discussions are that the staff in the various jurisdictions had the opportunity to meet. This will improve future communication among the cities. As stated previously, she would not vote in favor of executing this agreement. She believes that she was elected to ensure the financial viability and sustainability of this community. As such, this requires her to ensure that the policies developed, implemented and voted upon will meet that goal. Dublin is in a strong financial position because of long-term good decision making and because the economic development incentives over the years have been based on the goals established. Businesses attracted to Dublin were seeking good infrastructure, good schools, and good community amenities that would encourage their employees to live in the City and raise their families in Dublin. Dublin's experience in working with adjacent jurisdictions has not been positive. For projects like the Sawmill interchange and the Emerald Parkway widening at Tuttle, the only way to accelerate them has been for Dublin to contribute at a higher level. There is not collaboration by the jurisdictions. Dublin then has to make decisions about the importance and priority of the plan at that point in time. In addition, it concerns her that some of the conversation is driven by the private sector and the "game" they engage in between

municipalities to secure the best financial award to come to a particular community. In truth, that is not the primary driver of the final decision of the company. They, too, must take into consideration all of the other factors that will bring them a great workforce and the amenities of the community. This is the reason that most businesses have relocated – the amenities of another community were stronger in terms of the future workforce the company is seeking.
She will continue to support the economic development focus Dublin has had and she supports the continuation of the City's participation in these discussions. To her knowledge, she has not been invited to any meeting of the elected City Councils of any of these jurisdictions. She believes that is another group that at some point in time should begin discussions. The elected bodies make the ultimate policies that jurisdictions implement.

Mrs. Boring asked which communities have signed the agreement and which communities have indicated they will not sign the agreement.
Ms. Grigsby responded that only Westerville has indicated they will not execute the agreement. Gahanna has authorized their Mayor to execute the agreement. There are several other communities in the process of bringing legislation to their Council – Bexley, Columbus, Grandview Heights, Groveport, Hilliard, New Albany, Obetz and Upper Arlington. Several of this group are scheduled to have a final reading prior to the end of April. Many seem to be waiting to see what others are doing. It has been stated that if Dublin, Westerville and New Albany do not participate, many others will not. The City of Columbus has draft legislation prepared, authorizing the Mayor to sign the agreement, but only based upon his judgment that a sufficient number of communities have executed it. Therefore, the Columbus Mayor could still choose not to sign the agreement, based on what occurs in other communities.
Mrs. Boring asked if Reynoldsburg is part of this.
Ms. Grigsby responded that they have been involved in discussions, but currently, the information indicates they are starting informal briefings and will schedule it on their legislative calendar.
Mrs. Boring stated that she, too, has concerns with enforcement of this and the interpretation of following or not following the provisions. In her experience at NLC sessions, she recalls that an expert indicated that communities are giving away too much money for economic development. He indicated that by the time a company approaches a community, they have done thorough research on the location. Dublin needs to rely on that. She is hesitant about taking away any part of how Dublin does business at this time.
Ms. Grigsby noted that she agrees. The best economic development tool that Dublin has is the community. People want to be in Dublin for many reasons – including good roads on which to travel to work, plowed and maintained streets, etc. Economic development efforts are underway everyday with the services that Dublin provides, and the Schools and the Township are also a major component of the quality of the community. Most companies do choose Dublin for the community, more than for the incentives offered, based on the number of companies in Dublin and the number of incentives offered through the years. The vast majority of companies have located in Dublin without being offered incentives to do so.

Mayor Lecklider stated that Council Members have articulated many good thoughts regarding this topic, and he agrees with most if not all of the comments made. The way this issue has been framed as an "anti-poaching" agreement is of concern to him. He clarified that Dublin does not poach – it is not Dublin's practice. Perhaps it applies to other communities. It came to mind last summer with the Nationwide jobs leaving Dublin. Dublin does not engage in poaching. There are companies in Central Ohio that have relocated to Dublin, but the moves have been for all of the reasons already articulated. Dublin has invested millions in infrastructure and public facilities, which results in Dublin being an appealing community in which to live and work. He does

not want to be adversarial in this matter, and believes there is value in the discussions that have taken place and hopes they will continue. The suggestion made by Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher of involving elected officials in some of the discussions going forward is worthwhile.
In reviewing staff's analysis of the 12 major points in the agreement, he was struck by the fact that, essentially, Dublin practices what is being proposed in the agreement. One point stands out -- item no. 2. It is important to ask what is in the best interests of Dublin, and Council Members are elected to do this. Dublin engages in the practice of reaching out to communities whose businesses have contacted Dublin about potential relocation, giving the other community the opportunity to work to retain the business. He believes that Dublin has engaged in regionalism on many fronts, participating in Columbus 2020 and their objectives. However, this agreement strikes him as "lowering the bar" – intending no offense to other municipalities involved in this discussion. If a business wants to locate in Dublin, they will likely do so because of the many amenities offered, and the fact that Dublin is a good business location.
At this point, what is Council's desire with respect to direction to staff? The prevailing sentiment of Council seems very clear. Is there additional action necessary?

Ms. Grigsby responded that, based on the input tonight, her sense is that the City should continue to participate in the group discussions, do what is possible in terms of continuing good economic development practices, but not to pursue formal legislation to adopt this agreement.

The consensus of Council, as stated by Ms. Grigsby, is that the City will continue to participate in the group discussions, continue to engage in good economic development practices, but will not pursue formal legislation to adopt the draft agreement.

Ms. Grigsby added that staff will follow up regarding the suggestion of having City Council or representatives from City Council participate in the discussions. It has been beneficial at the staff level to interact with the various jurisdictions.

Mr. Gerber asked if the other jurisdictions are requesting that Council vote on this agreement.
Ms. Grigsby responded that the participants in the discussion were to present the agreement to their City Councils for feedback. The hope of the overall group was for some legislative action, recognizing that there was no guarantee of this. Several expressed that they were not certain their Councils would do so.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that in terms of the elected City Councils coming together, she recalls the Dublin-initiated 2004 City Council/City Manager/Township meeting hosted at the McCoy Center in Hilliard. As a result of the initiation of this partnership and collaboration, much has come about in terms of working as a region. What continued after that time was the Mayor/City Manager meetings, but what has not continued is the larger group meeting once or twice per year. She is suggesting that once or twice per year, a large group meeting would be convened with a topic of interest or a speaker of interest to the region. This would be beneficial in developing relationships among the jurisdictions.

STAFF COMMENTS
There were no staff comments.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS/COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE
Mr. Gerber noted that he and Vice Mayor Salay serve on the Social Host task force, which meets quarterly and is comprised of two Council representatives; City staff, including the Police Chief; and representatives from P.E.R.C., ACT, the School Board,

and Dublin City Schools. The purpose of the group is to bring awareness of the Social Host law, the hazards of underage drinking, and to educate as well. With prom season approaching, there will be a blitz of information in the local media and on web sites to remind parents of the Social Host law.

Mrs. Boring:

1. Commented that information was recently circulated from the City's health plan administrator about the Patient Protection Affordable Act. She requests that information be presented to Council, including the section that describes the grandfather rule of that Act. If the City is self-insured, it should be able to provide more than what is required by the Act. In addition, she thought there was a requirement to notify employees prior to the enrollment date about the details of the plan so they could choose what type of enrollment they desire. In reviewing the preventive care guidelines, she asks if this is the minimum coverage the City will provide or if the City will provide more than the minimum. The information is very ambiguous, the codes are not set up, and the doctors don't have clear information. She is very confused about what the City will cover or will not cover, based upon the guidelines. She also wants Council to be informed of the changes before Human Resources distributes this information to employees. The information regarding "creditable drug program" was not given to employees in a timely manner. She also wants to know more about the section that describes the grandfather rule and the precise date that this must be implemented under the Patient Protection Affordable Act.

Ms. Grigsby responded that staff will provide this information in a future packet, and if Council desires to have additional discussion, that can be scheduled. If Mrs. Boring has questions that are specific to her own situation, staff can schedule a meeting with her to discuss this.

Mrs. Boring added that in her review of the text of the Act, it indicates these are guidelines and there is nothing to preclude a company from providing more than the guidelines. However, she was told that the City could not do that because it would be considered "exceptional." She believes that a self-insured entity is exceptional. Health insurance coverage should be clearly defined in terms of what employees will receive and what they can expect, so that if they have other options, they could elect to make a different choice.

Ms. Grigsby responded that she is aware there are some restrictions because of the health savings accounts, but staff will provide Council with updated information.

2. She attended the Legends Luncheon with Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher and Mr. Reiner. She was somewhat disappointed that the Memorial Tournament was described as taking place at Muirfield Village and not in Dublin. In the program, there was no mention of Dublin either – only Muirfield Village. In addition, the emcee, who was a Dublin resident, referred to the Mayor by the wrong first name.

Mr. Reiner:

1. Commented in regard to the major projects monitoring tool provided in the packet. The status of the Glick Road bicycle path system and the Muirfield-Avery bicycle path system were not included.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff is currently negotiating the scope and fees for the design work with the selected firm for the Glick Road path.

Mr. Reiner asked when the design portion will be completed.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that the design work will commence this year, but the Dublin Road South path, Brand Road path, Cosgray-Shier Rings roundabout and the Street Maintenance program are underway and are the priorities at this time. They are working with the consultant regarding the scope of services and fees for the Glick Road path, as he has indicated.

Ms. Grigsby added that staff continues to have internal meetings regarding the various infrastructure projects and, specifically, on the shared use paths. Brand Road and Dublin Road South paths are scheduled for construction in 2012. Staff is focused on making these large connections for the path system.

2. Suggested an element to add in regard to the Bicycle Ambassador program -- to increase interest from youth, senior citizens and neighborhood groups in familiarizing themselves with the path system in order to increase the use of the paths and improve the health of the citizens. This was part of the program design on the west coast. It also included educating students about how to travel the bike paths to school.
3. Commented that the citizens should be very proud of the funeral services and procession for Captain Rozanski in Dublin. The quiet respect given by the citizens was very impressive and deserving of national recognition. He is very proud to live in Dublin.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented regarding the memo about the Glick Road/Dublin Road intersection improvement. It is another example of Dublin providing the majority of the project funding. Dublin citizens continually contact the City about the need for improvement of this multi-jurisdictional intersection. The citizens simply want resolution. However, the other jurisdictions involved have continued to indicate they have no funds available for the improvement. In order to be responsive to the Dublin residents, the City proceeds with the preliminary work in order to bring some level of resolution to address the safety and congestion issues. It is important that the City continuously highlight the decisions that Council and staff make regarding the use of the tax revenues to improve infrastructure and mobility for the neighboring jurisdictions as well as for Dublin.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

_____
Mayor – Presiding Officer

_____
Clerk of Council