Community Services Advisory Commission

September 13, 2016

Minutes

Commission Members:	**Present:** Christine Gawronski, Ann Bohman, Thomas Strup, Marilyn Baker & Stephanie Hall Vladmir Kapustin & Mindy Carr joined approx 6:42 pm: **Absent:** Kelli Lynn,
Staff Members Present:	Michelle Crandall, Asst. City Manager Matt Earman, Parks & Recreation Director Tami Moore, Recorder
Guests:	Mayor Greg Peterson (to perform the Oath of Office)

I. Call to Order

Ms. Gawronski established a quorum with five members present and called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

II. Swearing-in of New Members

Mayor Peterson was present to swear in CSAC members who were not present at the August meeting. He administered the Oath of Office to Ms. Baker and Ms. Hall; however, Ms. Lynn was not in attendance.

III. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

High School student George Liu was present to observe the meeting, but had no comments.

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes of August 9, 2016.

Ms. Gawronski asked if there were any comments or changes to the August 9, 2016 meeting minutes. There being none, Mr. Strup moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Hall. All in favor, none opposed, the minutes were approved.

V. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Ms. Gawronski asked Ms. Crandall about the term to be served in these roles with the elections having been delayed until September. Ms. Crandall noted that some CSAC member terms may be expiring the end of March, 2017, so the chair and vice-chair term will coincide with that.

Ms. Gawronski asked for nominations. Ms. Bohman (currently vice-chair) expressed her interest in serving as chair. When asked about her interest in remaining as chair, Ms. Gawronski agreed she would be willing to serve in either roll. No others members present expressed an interest in serving as chair or vice-chair. Ms. Gawronski and Ms. Bohman agreed they would be fine with switching roles.

Ms. Gawronski moved to nominate Ms. Bohman as Chair, seconded by Mr. Strup. VOTE: Ms. Baker – yes; Mr. Strup – yes; Ms. Gawronski – yes; Ms. Hall – yes. MOTION APPROVED.

Ms. Baker moved to nominate Ms. Gawronski as vice-chair, seconded by Mr. Strup. VOTE: Ms. Baker – yes, Mr. Strup – yes, Ms. Bohman – yes, Ms. Hall – yes. MOTION APPROVED.

VI. CSAC Orientation

Ms. Gawronski welcomed Ms. Jennifer Readler. She is with the law firm of Frost Brown Todd who provides legal representation to the City of Dublin, and Ms. Readler recently took over the role of Law Director. She explained that in previous years more training had been provided to Board and Commission members to provide an overview of public meeting fundamentals including Open Meetings, Public Records, Ethics Issues and Robert's Rules of Order. Ms. Readler shared a PowerPoint presentation and a handout outlining each area (included herein) as well as providing some examples for clarification. She stated that overall Robert's Rules of Order can be very complicated and overwhelming so recommended that in terms of CSAC meetings the focus be on following some of the fundamentals about motions as noted in her presentation.

With regard to email communication among members, Ms. Baker asked for clarification if those are considered part of the public record. Ms. Readler responded that if a CSAC member is communicating on an issue that is a result of your role as a CSAC member on a topic that you have jurisdiction over, those emails would be considered a public record. Ms. Crandall stated that CSAC members can request a City email account or suggested at least creating a separate personal email account for communication with the City or Commission correspondence. Although there has not been a Public Records Request to date for CSAC, if one is received, the City would be able to access a City email account to search for public records versus requesting them from a personal account.

Ms. Baker asked about corrections to draft meeting minutes, and Ms. Readler agreed that CSAC members can request corrections as long as they can be verified.

Ms. Crandall asked if topics that carryover from one meeting to another require a motion to table or postpone. Ms. Readler clarified a motion is not needed, and the carryover topic can just be identified on the agenda.

Ms. Readler completed her presentation and noted that her contact information is included in the materials if any clarification is needed after members have had an opportunity to review the materials in more detail.

There being no further questions, Ms. Gawronski thanked Ms. Readler for her presentation.

VII. Park Naming Discussion and Recommendation

The park naming process for the new park in the Bridge Street District (unofficially referred to as Riverside Drive Park) was discussed by City Council in July and referred to CSAC to review and determine a small list of park name suggestions for Council consideration. In following with the City's park naming policy, the topic was introduced to CSAC at the August 9 meeting where CSAC members reviewed the lists of names that had been submitted through various social media outlets in the community. Mr. Earman had asked them to consider those names as well as other ideas and suggestions and for each to email him three names for review and consideration at the September 13 CSAC meeting.

To start the process, Mr. Earman presented a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the Park Master Plan including a conceptual video demonstrating its iconic nature and what is hoped to be accomplished in a five-year plan. He talked about how this park gives the community an opportunity to build and create something very special, bridging the old with the new, and the goal of capturing all that in a name.

This park will be different in that it will be programmed to compliment the development and activities specific to this area.

Since the last CSAC meeting, Mr. Earman had gathered name suggestions from CSAC members and had them displayed on large sheets. He suggested that members provide some insight as to the thought process behind the name selections, openly discuss the proposed names, and then each member was provided dots to vote on three names other than those they submitted. CSAC can then narrow down the list and determine how they would like to proceed with a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Earman completed his overview and suggested that members discuss the names submitted. Ms. Gawronski noted that the names she had submitted by email were not included on the list. Mr. Earman agreed they can be added.

Mr. Earman clarified the bridge naming issue stating that there has been discussion or a suggestion that the City solicit some type of funding assistance for the bridge with naming rights, but he does not have any knowledge of the City currently planning on naming the bridge separately from the park.

Ms. Gawronski stated that generally she felt the names submitted through social media fell into four categories:

- Celtic and Gaelic names
- Native American references to the history of the area
- Names of important people associated with Dublin
- Non-serious or humorous suggestions

Mr. Earman provided large boards listing the park names submitted by commission members: He noted that among the names submitted there was one overlap being Cara Park.

- Cara Park
- Aine Park
- Ha' Penny Bridge Park
- Riverwalk Park
- River Edge Park
- Cara Crossing
- Tullers Landing
- Irish Crossing
- Celtic Landing
- John Sells Founders Park
- Dublin on the Green Park
- Go Halaninn Park

Commission members discussed their submissions and the thought processes behind them including:

- Talking with neighbors
- Talking with kids to get their ideas and what they like, and interestingly the nicknames they quickly came up with
- Consideration of joining the old and new
- The meaning behind the name

- Talking with an Irish friend who warned that the pronunciations of Irish names are rarely what we would anticipate they would be and concern that someone from Ireland would therefore not identify with a spoken name. Also warned to be careful about the meaning.
- Importance of what people will actually call it - keeping the name concise so it doesn't get abbreviated
- Needs to be easy to pronounce
- Don't duplicate the name of a park in the country of Ireland (issue with gps/mapping)
- Don't duplicate the name of an existing Dublin park
- Steer away from names including any of the Dublin Schools mascots
- Importance of the Scioto River to the community and the concept of bridging
- Importance of recognizing the "Founder" of Dublin
- Recognizing the many aspects and connections of "Green" and Dublin
- Importance of recognizing it's a "Crossing" and is bringing people across the river
- Recognizing the disconnect between the east and west sides of the river and the importance of what this park accomplishes by creating a "Commons" area

Discussion ensued among commission members regarding the various reasons why they did or did not like certain names on the list. Several felt that while there are many good name suggestions, none of them really stuck out and captured the importance of this park and what it means to the community. Ms. Crandall stated that CSAC members can suggest new names or combinations of names. Mr. Earman agreed with Ms. Crandall's suggestion that if the Commission members would like to have more time to further consider names, there is certainly time to work through it. This park name is very important and the process can be carried over in an effort to have an end result everyone is proud of. He offered that members could narrow down existing names on the list as well as come up with new suggestions.

Ms. Gawronski ask CSAC members if they would like to take more time with the park naming. Commission members agreed to remove several names from the existing list and move forward with new name suggestions. Based on several of the concepts previously noted, they determined that the names to be removed are:

- Aine Park – difficult pronunciation
- Ha'Penny Bridge Park – duplicates the name of a store in Historic Dublin that is not associated with the park or bridge
- Riverwalk Park – already a Kiwanis Riverwalk Park
- Dublin On the Green – "the Green" is common to neighboring community Worthington
- Go Halaninn Park - difficult pronunciation

Ms. Hall made a motion to remove the five names they had identified to be taken off the list of those under consideration, seconded by Mr. Kapustin. VOTE: Ms. Carr – yes, Ms. Bohman – yes, Ms. Gawronski – yes, Mr. Strup – yes, Ms. Baker – yes, Ms. Hall – yes, Mr. Kapustin – yes. MOTION APPROVED.

CSAC members discussed liking names that include the words "Landing", "Commons" and "Crossing" but agreed that their brainstorming efforts would not be limited to including these words. Mr. Earman noted a few of the names he had heard mentioned including Dublin Commons and Sells Riverfront Park would be added to the existing list. He asked if there were any additional names commission members wanted to add at this time. There was a suggestion to add Blarney Stone Commons, but there was not agreement to add it.

To move forward with the naming process, Mr. Earman agreed to email CSAC members a collective list of park names from this meeting, and set a deadline for members to respond with any additional names. Mr. Earman will then compile a list of all names and distribute to CSAC members prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Hall moved to table the park naming discussion until the October 11, 2016 CSAC meeting, seconded by Ms. Carr. VOTE: Ms. Bohman – yes, Ms. Gawronski – yes, Mr. Strup – yes, Ms. Baker – yes, Ms. Hall – yes, Mr. Kapustin – yes, Ms. Carr – yes. MOTION APPROVED.

VIII. Next Meeting – October 11, 2016

The next CSAC meeting will be held on October 11, 2016. The agenda will focus on a continuation of the Park Naming topic, and Ms. Crandall also intends to bring a draft of the City's Aging in Place strategic plan. It will be presented to City Council this coming Monday as part of their workshop.

With regard to Aging in Place, Ms. Gawronski stated that Ms. Bohman had found an incredible resource from the World Health Organization available through AARP that could serve as an amazing blueprint for this type of plan. Ms. Bohman noted that she had shared information from the Global Network for Aging called Aging Friendly Cities and Communities which is helping locations work with their rapidly aging populations. Columbus and Cleveland are members of the organization with a five-year commitment. Ms. Gawronski added that they have an on-line toolkit and she will send Ms. Crandall the links. Ms. Gawronski noted that Dublin is rated as a 55 on a scale of 100: 44 in housing, 52 in neighborhood (access to life, work, play), 59 in transportation, 51 in environment, 54 in health, 55 in engagement (civic and social), and 70 in opportunity (inclusion and possibilities). She also noted they hold a conference in September but you must be a member; however, conference summaries of the last three years are on their web site. Ms. Crandall stated that she had seen some of the AARP resources and the City also collected plans from other similar communities for best practices. Ms. Crandall stated she would review this information Ms. Gawronski shares. Ms. Baker asked that Ms. Gawronski also share the information with all commission members, and she agreed.

Ms. Gawronski asked members their preference on having separate email addresses for CSAC business. Ms. Crandall reminded members that they would need to remember to check their separate accounts, and Ms. Gawronski noted that you can have separate email accounts go to one source. However, you do need to reply from the original email source so there is an extra step. Ms. Crandall stated that each member can decide their preference and asked that anyone wanting a Dublin email account email her their request. Ms. Baker made a motion that all CSAC members have a separate email account for Dublin business, seconded by Ms. Hall. VOTE: Ms. Gawronski – yes, Mr. Strup – yes, Ms. Baker – yes, Ms. Hall – yes, Mr. Kapustin – yes, Ms. Carr – yes, Ms. Bohman – yes. MOTION APPROVED.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Baker moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Kapustin. All in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Tamra A. Moore

Tamra Moore, Administrative Support III

DUBLIN

Community Services Advisory Commission Member Training

September 13, 2016

Presented By: Jennifer Readler

Agenda

- Open Meetings
- Public Records
- Ethics Issues
- Robert's Rules of Order

Open Meetings

- Public officials are required to take official action and conduct all deliberations upon official business *only* in open meetings so that the public may attend and observe.
- "Meeting" is defined as "any prearranged discussion of the public business of the public body by a majority of its members" and "an occasion for the transaction of business."
- A public body must not circumvent the act by scheduling back-to-back discussions of public business, which, taken together, are attended by a majority of its members.

Open Meetings Continued…

- Minutes of regular and special meetings of public bodies must be maintained and open for public inspection.
- Public officials cannot participate in meetings via Skype or similar videoconferencing technology under Ohio law.
- Be careful that message exchanges over the internet (on personal *and* on city social media pages), as well as emails and text messages, do not become meetings.
- The Ohio Supreme Court recently heard a case from the Olentangy School Board regarding an exchange of emails between board members to discuss a fellow member and how to respond to a newspaper editorial criticizing board policy. The Court held that Ohio's Open Meetings Act prohibits any private prearranged discussion of public business by a majority of the members of a public body regardless of whether the discussion occurs face to face, telephonically, by video conference, or electronically by email, text, tweet or other form of communication.

Public Records: Generally

- R.C. §149.43 contains the Ohio Public Records Act.
- A "record" is any document, device, or item, regardless of physical characteristic, created or received by or coming under the jurisdiction of any public office which serves to document the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the office.
- A "public record" is any record **kept by** any public office.
  - "Kept by" means any record that is actually in existence and in the possession of the public office or person responsible for public records.
  - Examples of records not "kept by" a public office:
    - a record not yet in existence
    - a record that has been disposed of lawfully

Public Records:
Electronic Records & Personal Notes

- *Records are analyzed based on their content, rather than their storage medium.*
- **Electronic records** (e-mails and text messages) are treated no differently than any other tangible record.
  - A private e-mail account can be subject to the Public Records Act if the content of the e-mail serves to document the organization, functions, policies, procedures, operations, or other activities of the public entity.
- **Personal Notes** can be "records" and are often considered "transitory records" (created for the purpose of transferring their content to an official file, database, report, etc.)
  - Notes are <u>not</u> records if they are (1) kept as personal papers; (2) kept for the employee/official's own convenience; and (3) not accessible to other members.

Ethics Issues

- Ohio law prohibits a public official from:
  - Receiving any benefit from a contract entered into by his or her public entity.
  - Hiring or securing any contract benefits for his/her spouse, parents, grandparents, children, grand-children, siblings, or any other relative living with him or her.
  - Participating in matters where something of value will result for the public official or employee, his or her family, business associates, or others with whom the public official has a close tie that could impair his or her objectivity.

Property Matters Affecting a Public Official

- A commission member is prohibited from using his or her authority or influence, formally or informally, in any matter that would render *a definite and direct financial benefit or detriment to the value of property* in which: (1) the commission member has an interest; or (2) a family member of the commission member has an interest. If a member is in such a position, he or she is prohibited from:
  - Voting;
  - Participating in discussions;
  - Participating in deliberations;
  - Making recommendations;
  - Providing advice;
  - Formally or informally lobbying; or
  - Taking any other action on the matter.

Addressing Conflict of Interest Situations

- If an advisory commission member has a question regarding ethical issues, the member should feel free to contact the Law Director's office in advance of or at any meeting.
- When any advisory commission member has a conflict of interest as a result of the member's affiliation with any person or entity coming before the commission, that member should abstain from all discussion regarding the matter and abstain from voting upon the matter. The member should in no way participate, formally or informally, in the decisions of the board the member serves.
- Announce at the beginning of the meeting when an abstention is made and leave the room.
- The Ohio Ethics Commission has jurisdiction over public officials who violate provisions of the Ethics Law.

Robert's Rules of Order

- Robert's Rules of Order provide additional guidance for conducting a meeting in an orderly manner.
- The Motion:

  When Robert's Rules of Order are being used, a motion is required to bring an item before the group for consideration. Motions usually result from a general discussion about an issue. One member will say, ***"I move that…."***
- Restatement:

  The Chairperson should restate the motion to be sure that everyone has a common understanding of what action is being proposed. He/she says, ***"We have a motion before us to [state motion], do we have a second?"***
- The Second:

  A second is necessary in order to begin debate on the motion. If there is no second, the motion dies and no further discussion on the matter should occur. The rule is intended to ensure time is not spent on items that are not of interest to the group.

Robert's Rules of Order Continued…

- Discussion, Clarification, Debate:

  Only one main motion may be under consideration at any one time. Once the motion has been seconded, the chairperson will say, ***"The floor is open for discussion"***. Members then discuss the merit of the proposal and state their positions.

- Amendment to the Original Motion:

  During the course of the discussion and debate, someone may suggest that the original wording needs to be changed to more accurately express what the majority wants it to say or to reflect a point made during the discussion. The Chairperson should ask this person to offer specific wording for the amended motion. Amendments must relate to and/or clarify the subject of the motion under discussion. They should not introduce a different issue or topic.

Robert's Rules of Order Continued…

- Definitions of Motions
  - Main motion – only one before the commission at a time
  - Motion to amend – changes a motion before it comes up for final vote
  - Motion to table – temporarily puts aside motion being considered
  - Motion to postpone indefinitely – same effect as tabling
  - Motion to postpone to a date certain – postpones until date specified
  - Motion to adjourn – ends all discussion at this meeting

Questions?

Jennifer D. Readler

FROST BROWN TODD LLC

jreadler@fbtlaw.com

(614) 559-7253