

Dublin City Council

October 12, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Amorose Grooms called the Monday, October 12, 2020 Regular Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Amorose Grooms, Vice Mayor De Rosa, Ms. Alutto, Ms. Fox, Mr. Keeler, Mr. Peterson and Mr. Reiner.

Staff members present were Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Rogers, Ms. Readler, Ms. O'Callaghan, Mr. Stiffler, Chief Paez, Mr. Earman, Mr. Hammersmith, Ms. Rauch, Ms. Burness, Mr. Boggis, Mr. Dearth, Ms. Steiner, Ms. Gee and Mr. Plouck.

ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mayor Amorose Grooms moved to adjourn to executive session for the following purposes:

- To consider the purchase of property for public purposes and to consider the employment of a public employee.

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mayor Amorose Grooms, yes. (Ms. Fox and Mr. Reiner joined the executive session in progress.)

Mayor Amorose Grooms reconvened the meeting at 7:06 p.m. She reiterated that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the State's emergency declaration, the meeting is being conducted via an online platform and live-streamed at the City's website and via the City's YouTube. This is now allowed as a result of the passage of Am. Sub. H.B. 197, which includes temporary changes to the Ohio Open Meetings Law. She reiterated her previous statement regarding the submission of any comments by the public prior to the meeting by e-mail to the Clerk or during the meeting via the form on the website. For those who registered in advance to participate in this WebEx meeting and provide testimony, each person will be recognized and will have the opportunity to provide testimony. She emphasized that Council desires to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible throughout this Pandemic.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Rogers led the Pledge of Allegiance.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS/PROCLAMATIONS

- Lifeline of Ohio 35th Anniversary

Lauren Stevens, Manager of Community Outreach addressed Council regarding the mission of Lifeline of Ohio, which is celebrating its 35th anniversary in 2020. They are the designated organ and tissue recovery agency serving Central Ohio. She noted that 2020 has been a challenging year due to COVID-19, but their organization has sustained its work and practices to ensure those in need of a transplant are given their second chance at life. There are more than 108,000 people in the U.S. awaiting a lifesaving transplant. She thanked Council for acknowledging that this is a public health concern. She highlighted how residents can become an eye and tissue donor by going to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles and ask to be a donor, or by registering online at www.lifelineofohio.org She thanked Council for this recognition and for their support. Mayor Amorose Grooms read a proclamation in recognition of their anniversary. It is important to register to be a donor.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

The Clerk and Ms. Burness noted that no Citizen Comments have been received for items not on the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

There was no request from Council to remove an item from the Consent Agenda. The Clerk and Ms. Burness noted that no comments have been received regarding the Consent Agenda.

Mayor Amorose Groomes moved approval of the three Consent Agenda items.

Mr. Keeler seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.

- Approval of Minutes of the September 28, 2020 Regular Council Meeting
- Approval of Minutes of the September 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting
- Notice to Legislative Authority of a new D5J Liquor Permit for Gardenia LLC, dba Gardenia Market, 16 N. High St., Dublin.

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCES

Ordinance 73-19 (Amended)

Adopting Chapter 122 Under Title XI of the City of Dublin Codified Ordinances to Regulate Short-Term Rental Facilities.

Ms. Readler noted that Council reviewed a prior draft of this legislation at its December 2, 2019 and January 6, 2020 Council meetings. After hearing testimony, the Ordinance was referred back to the Community Development Committee for additional consideration. The CDC meeting was initially planned for March, but due to COVID-19, it was postponed to September 16, 2020. A great discussion occurred at that CDC meeting with a significant number of public involved. The revised legislation reflects the changes discussed at that meeting. Mr. Boggs will share the presentation and review the revisions and the legislation itself.

Mr. Boggs provided a brief history of this issue, which was first reviewed by the Community Development Committee in August of 2019; recommendations were made to Council on September 23, 2019 and Council then referred this back to the CDC for further review. On November 6, 2019, the CDC discussed a draft ordinance that would require registration of short-term rentals and a limit of 14 nights per calendar year. The Committee then directed the draft legislation move forward for introduction at Council. On December 2, 2019, Ordinance 73-19 was introduced with a 14-night cap on short-term rentals per calendar year; required registration; and required information on number of guests and stay to be submitted by hosts, with 24-hour host contact information. At the second reading on January 6, 2020, more questions were raised and the ordinance was referred back to CDC. On September 16, 2020, the CDC reviewed seven different options presented by the Law Department, made recommendations, and forwarded those recommendations along with the draft legislation to Council for final review. The draft legislation reflects the changes recommended by the CDC on September 16, 2020.

Mr. Boggs noted that the following options were presented to the Committee:

1. Adopt a policy outlining the City's expectations for short-term rental operators and communicating that to the rental operators.
2. Require registration of all short-term rentals.
3. Differentiate between hosted and unhosted rentals.
4. Place a cap on the number of nights in a given year that a short-term rental can be offered.
5. Prohibit short-term rentals in certain zoning districts while permitting it in others.
6. Prohibit all short-term rentals.
7. Maintain the status quo with no short-term rental regulation.

The CDC reviewed the options and ultimately supported a blend of options 2 and 4.

He provided an overview of the proposed legislation:

- It creates Chapter 122 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances as a business regulation of short-term rentals.

- It defines “short-term rentals” as any room or dwelling rented for less than 30 consecutive days.
- Prohibits renting a property as a short-term rental for sleeping accommodations for more than 2 weeks in a calendar year, to be rented in full week increments. This contemplates that a short-term rental owner in the City of Dublin would have to commit to the two weeks they plan to rent, and that would use their allotment for the calendar year. This recognizes the number of events that might attract short-term rental tenants to the City versus having a constant demand throughout the year and potentially a constant effect on neighboring properties.
- Requires a \$225 yearly registration fee and a registration form. The fee covers the staff and City resources needed for administering the program.
- Ultimately, distinguishing between hosted and unhosted rentals was found by the CDC not to be an attractive option. If there were negative impacts of having short-term rentals – whether traffic or people on other properties or noise – they did not see that hosted versus unhosted would be a distinguishing factor.
- This legislation creates a more stringent regulation for people who violate any potential conduct regulations of the short-term rental registration – ranging from six-month suspension to one year, and finally no longer being able to register a short-term rental operator who has repeated violations.
- It also includes more questions for the operator in terms of how many occupants the property accommodates and how many will be staying on a particular stay. It caps the number of parking spaces that can be accommodated in the garage and driveway, including two on street parking spaces.
- Finally, rather than proceeding in a criminal prosecution from an unclassified offense to a third degree misdemeanor, as contemplated in previous versions of the ordinance, this would make it an unclassified misdemeanor. Upon repeat offense, no jail time is available, but the fine could be up to \$1,000. The potential for the Mayor’s Court magistrate or municipal judge exists to impose a more attention-getting fine for repeat violators.

He shared a chart comparing the changes of a short-term rental ordinance on long-term rentals, hotels and motels, traditional B&B, sharing economy (Airbnb, VRBO, etc.) and corporate housing. This short-term rental ordinance would apply only to the sharing economy type of rental – Airbnb, VRBO, etc.

Mayor Amorose Groomes noted that Mr. Reiner, Chair of CDC is having technical issues with connection to the meeting. She noted that Mr. Boggs has correctly summarized the CDC meeting discussion.

Mr. Keeler added that he serves on the Committee as well, and he has some issues to discuss when Council deliberates on the legislation.

Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested that Council hear public testimony at this time, prior to the Council deliberation.

Peter O’Neill, 8568 Turnberry Court, Dublin stated he is in full agreement with what has been presented. The only comment to add is he has been in the Dublin area for over 25 years. For the first 8-9 years, he lived in the Riverside Green/Riverside Hills area where 1/4 to 1/3 of the houses were rental homes. These families were part of the community. Where he lives now on a cul-de-sac in Muirfield, his experience has been completely different – with two short-term rentals on the street. What they primarily see are large gatherings, parties – not families staying in a home for a visit to the zoo or other attraction in the area. They do see businesses using the Airbnb medium as a means to secure a large home with bedrooms and large living areas for gatherings. There have been other users that bring a lot of vehicular traffic to the street. Most importantly, these uses are completely out of character with the residential nature of their neighborhood. He appreciates Council’s time on this matter.

Ms. Burness reported that testimony was received today from Victoria Bork, 8612 Dunblane Court, Dublin, Ohio:

RE: Airbnb Guidelines

Great start from the prior meeting regarding guidelines for the Air B&B for general rentals.

However, I would encourage you to make a strong statement of Zero toleration for parties and event rental.

I suggest not a "3 strike and you're out" but, a "1 strike and you're out." This would acknowledge the homeowner or rental company has a responsibility to "vet" their client.

What are the rights of the neighbor and neighborhood to defend themselves from the inconvenience and distribution? Who pays for the property damage and garbage in the lawns and street to pick up?

What role will the Dublin City Police provide? Does the Neighbor have to wait until 11pm for the Noise Ordinance?

If there are cars in the lawn, driveway and street preventing emergency vehicles from entering the neighborhood is there an ordinance?

If there is a smell of drugs or people arguing in the street, what are the guidelines for the neighbor who has to endure this lack of self-control?

Upper Arlington has said "No" to Any Air B&B

Why are their citizens and neighborhoods of more value than Dublin?

Finally, Now that we know a plot of terrorism toward an elected official occurred in an Air B&B in Dublin, don't you believe there is enough to say "NO"!

Council Discussion

Mr. Keeler stated he agrees with Mr. O'Neill and Ms. Bork. It is clear the desire is to preserve residential neighborhoods as such, which is the intent of this legislation. He would like clarification about the two-week limitation. The legislation Section 122.02A states that a host cannot rent the property for less than one week. He understands that the City does not want seven different occupants within those seven days of that week. However, it reads that you cannot rent the property for three days, as written. Is there a way to modify that verbiage?

Mr. Boggs responded that could be done. It can be amended on the floor. His interpretation of the Committee discussion was they wanted it to be such that it could not be rented for three days versus a minimum of seven. Perhaps his interpretation is not correct.

Mr. Keeler stated that a three-day rental by a tenant would take up one week of the allowed two weeks per calendar year. The neighbors would likely prefer a short-term rental occupant be there for three days versus seven. Also, Section 122.04F1 and 2, number of cars and occupants, the way he reads this it does not state we were limiting the number of cars or occupants – but simply asking the host to state how many would be there. There needs to be a limit in place. It could be limited based upon the number of bedrooms, etc. as other areas in the country have done. He agrees that the application should state the number of occupants and vehicles; the legislation should go one step further to limit that. The last item relates to the violations. He believes there needs to be "teeth" and violators need to lose the privilege of having the ability to rent the property. His only concern would be a litigious neighbor who calls the Police for minor violations, and whether that would count as a "strike" against that homeowner. It seems the consensus is that people do not want short-term rentals in their neighborhood. Therefore, some could be very sensitive if there is a hosted Airbnb next to them. How are the complaints validated, etc.?

Mr. Boggs stated that in terms of maximum occupancy and parking, Division B of Section 122.04 – the initial registration – is where (in B5 and B6) it states the maximum number of occupants the site would accommodate. That is up to two per bedroom and six would be the maximum number of motor vehicles. Division F below relates to each individual rental and how many of that number of registered people will be present.

Mr. Peterson stated that he assumes that when it comes to progressive suspensions, when it references result of an offense – that means a conviction, correct? They must be charged with violating the statute and be found guilty in Mayor's Court for that to be an offense that would trigger criminal consequences. Or is an offense simply a neighbor calling in a complaint?

Mr. Boggs responded that to be an offense that is subject to the penalty in 122.13, it would be a Mayor's Court conviction. For the revocation of registration in 122.07, that

is when the issues of noise, exceeding the number of occupants, etc. is considered and it would be an administrative revocation, based upon report and evidence gathered by the Planning Director through Code Enforcement. That is totally a civil administrative penalty subject to appeal by the property owner if they felt the decision was incorrect. Mr. Peterson stated that the due process provided in that situation is not in Mayor's Court – but administratively. What is the burden of proof? He shares Mr. Keeler's concern about a neighbor who calls frequently to make the noise complaints. While he supports this legislation, there needs to be a balance of people's rights. By saying the rental is for a week at a time, the desire is to prevent the one-night party or 14 Fridays or single nights where a house is rented for a party. The desire is for an extended weeklong stay as opposed to one night. There is a balance between the property owner's right to lease out his home and the next-door neighbor's right to complain about it. What is the due process if a person feels they are wrongly accused? What is their recourse?

Mr. Boggs responded that with revocation of registration – a civil administered process – they are losing the privilege granted by the short-term rental registration. They do have a right to due process before that is taken away, and so it is incumbent upon the City to have proof by preponderance of the evidence. On appeal, if it were the short-term rental operator appealing, then that burden switches to show that the City's decision to revoke was unreasonable and not supported by a preponderance of the evidence. A criminal conviction is very meaningful to people and so there is a greater amount of due process involved. With the simple revocation of the registration, there is not that weight of additional protections. It is similar in kind to someone who is having a contractor's registration revoked or any other type of permitting.

Mr. Peterson stated that with the criminal portion, it indicates *up to* a \$250 fine, so the magistrate has some discretion. He noted that in terms of moving that from an M3 to an unclassified misdemeanor, in Mayor's Court one has an automatic right to transfer to the downtown court if there is risk of jail. This is a homegrown problem and one that Dublin wants to deal with itself. Keeping it in Dublin is a good idea, which results from the unclassified misdemeanor category. He supports the fine being *up to* an amount as it provides some discretion for the magistrate. When it comes to the suspensions, there is no discretion, correct? If there is an offense, it is automatically a six-month suspension, and continuing penalties with repeat offenses, correct?

Mr. Boggs responded that is correct, provided that the violations are supported by a preponderance of evidence.

Mr. Peterson stated that the legislation references the Planning Department has the right to enter the property to search to ensure the representations made in the application for short-term rental are accurate. A comment was received with a question about what would happen if the presence of drugs is detected in this entry. What will happen if the Planning staff empowered to enforce this by entering a residence finds drugs? If the property owner refuses to allow entry by the Planning staff who has the administrative authority to do so, is the legal recourse to call the Police? Will the Police indicate the Planning staff is doing an administrative search and should be allowed entry? He asked if this has come up in any litigation of these kind of statutes.

Mr. Boggs responded that, to his knowledge, there is not a Fourth Amendment decision on the administrative search with respect to entering premises. An administrative search in this instance would be very limited in scope. He would not advise anything but this limited scope and would not advise anyone – Planning staff or Police – to enter a home without the owner's consent to search, either for evidence of a crime or for evidence of a violation of the registration.

Mr. Peterson stated that the litigation comes up when such a search finds something that was not intended to be found. Therefore, it is important to have the authority to be in the home.

Mr. Boggs stated that Code Enforcement staff is versed in all of this, based on their current duties. If there was an odor of burnt marijuana from a Code Enforcement officer doing a spot check on a registration or from a call by the neighbor, his expectation is the Police would be involved at that point.

Ms. Fox stated that in Section 122.04B7, corporate housing is exempted, which is understandable and appropriate. However, it indicates that an affidavit attesting that the short-term rental operation is in compliance with all applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations concerning the provisions of sleeping accommodations to transient guests is required. What is this affidavit required to state? This seems a little vague and could be used by someone who simply says they are a corporate entity.

Mr. Boggs responded that the affidavit referenced in this section is for a registrant of an actual short-term rental. That is not the corporate housing affidavit, but is for someone who files their registration and is required to provide an affidavit to the City regarding smoke alarms, exits clear of obstruction, etc. – things regulated by other entities.

Ms. Fox asked how the City knows that the corporate housing business is legitimate and not someone who purchased several homes as B&Bs and decides to classify them as corporate housing. How do we sort out the true corporate housing?

Mr. Boggs responded that the legislation envisions that people will be taken at their word and is backed up by filing an affidavit. They are giving their word under oath under penalty of perjury or falsification. If an entity came in and indicated they were corporate housing, then began to receive complaints that would result in the City doubting that affidavit was true, it could be investigated using all of the trade associations that exist for this type of housing group.

Ms. Fox stated that if this legislation is approved, it can be evaluated at a certain point in time to determine if tweaks are needed.

Mr. Boggs agreed.

Mayor Amorose Groomes commented regarding the seven-day period for rental. She recalls the Committee discussion envisioned two seven-day periods in a calendar year in which a facility could be rented. An owner could rent it from one to seven of those days, but a one-day rental would take up seven of the available days. That is her recollection.

Mr. Keeler stated that was his understanding as well. However, the legislation indicates short-term rentals for a period of less than one week are not permitted. The desire was to limit the rentals to up to two tenants in a 14-day period. Up to seven days of rental is permitted per occupant, but it can be less than seven days.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the 14-day limit was related to the federal tax guidelines that permit an individual to lease their primary residence for up to 14 days per year with deferred taxes.

Vice Mayor De Rosa thanked the residents and the Committee members for all of their work on this over a long period of time. Council will review this in a year to assess its effectiveness. She is supportive of this legislation and thanks everyone for their diligence and dialogue in order to arrive at this point.

Mayor Amorose Groomes noted that having lived on a street with short-term rentals, she appreciates how disruptive that can be to the neighborhood. She asked Mr. Boggs what is needed to clarify the language about the two seven-day rental periods. Is it possible to vote on this or is the specific language needed prior to the vote?

Mr. Boggs responded that the language should be established prior to the vote. He asked for confirmation that the intention is that once an owner has rented their property for one night, the owner as the operator is committed to seven nights of their 14-day allotment.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the property owner can rent out their property up to two times per year, and each rental can be for up to seven days.

Mr. Reiner commented that Mr. Keeler and the Mayor have described the Committee discussion about this issue accurately. The legislation would allow two rentals and a limitation of two weeks per year.

Mayor Amorose Groomes asked Mr. Boggs to draft this language and report that to Council for the amendment that can be voted upon.

Ms. Fox asked for clarification. If a property owner has a one-week allotment for a rental, can the owner rent to more than one person in that week or only to one for a period of one day to seven – and that would comprise use of the entire week, correct? Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the legislation would allow two rentals per year and each would be for up to seven days for a total of 14 days.

Ms. Alutto stated that most of the owners will require payment prior to the rental and there is no refund, so there are protections for the property owner in place. Many require a minimum number of nights for the stay.

Mayor Amorose Groomes asked for any subsequent public comment on this topic via the online portal.

Ms. Burness reported that Frank Fraas, 7735 Kate Brown Drive has submitted the following comment:

What are the penalties if someone is found renting their property without registering or if they rent more than the allotted 14 days?

Mr. Boggs responded that someone who does not register is subject to the criminal penalty, as there is no registration to revoke. This would be a Mayor's Court prosecution as a violation of the Chapter. Likewise, if someone rents in a longer duration or greater occupancy than that for which they had registered, they would be subject to Mayor's Court prosecution as well as revocation or suspension of their ability to register.

He noted he now has prepared, with the assistance of Ms. Readler, the proposed amendment to the duration language in the Ordinance:

Section 122.02 to amend division A:

Short-term rental operators are prohibited from renting any room or dwelling to transient guests for more than two weeks total in a calendar year. The short-term rental may be rented up to two times per year in increments up to seven days.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated she believes this language is clear and reflects the intent. Procedurally, how would Council incorporate this change?

Mr. Boggs responded that a motion to amend Ordinance 73-19 would be needed – to Section 122.02, Division A to read: *Short-term rental operators are prohibited from renting any room or dwelling to transient guests for more than two weeks total in a calendar year. The short-term rental may be rented up to two times per year in increments up to seven days.*

If the motion to amend is passed, Ordinance 73-19 would then be voted upon as amended tonight.

Mayor Amorose Groomes moved to amend Ordinance 73-19, Section 122.02, Division A as read into the record by Legal staff.

Mr. Keeler seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

Vote on Ordinance 73-19 as amended: Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.

Ordinance 27-20

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documents to Acquire a 0.204 Acre, More or Less, Perpetual Easement from the Muirfield Association, Inc. from Reserve "RRRR" Located on the North Side of Glick Road for the Construction and Maintenance of the Glick Road, Section 3 Shared-use Path.

Mr. Hammersmith stated there is no additional information to report for this item. Staff expresses the City's appreciation to the Muirfield Association for the donation of this easement. Staff recommends adoption tonight.

The Clerk and Ms. Burness reported no public comment has been received for this item.

Mr. Reiner commented that if the land on the south side of Glick Road should become available in the future, the City should consider abandoning this project and go back to keeping the shared-use path as one continuous strip, east to west on Glick Road – that would not require a crossing of Glick Road. It is unfortunate that the easement could not be secured to do that.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 28-20

Adopting and Enacting a Supplement (S-48) to the Code of Ordinances for the City of Dublin, Ohio.

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. Readler stated that this Ordinance adopts the Code supplement prepared by American Legal Publishing, the City's codifier. The supplement is typically prepared twice per year to update our Code on the City's website. The supplement includes local legislation through June 30, 2020 and state legislation current through June 19, 2020. Staff recommends approval at the second reading on October 26.

The Clerk and Ms. Burness reported no public comment has been received for this item.

There will be a second reading/public hearing on October 26.

Ordinance 29-20

Adopting the Annual Operating Budget for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2021.

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Mr. McDaniel stated that per the Charter, he is presenting a proposed operating budget for fiscal year 2021. This proposed budget is based generally on the same revenue projections considered in the recent Five-Year CIP adopted by Council. Despite the economic situation, Dublin's economy continues to be resilient. However, the Hotel-Motel Tax Fund and the Recreation Fund have been impacted by COVID-19, presenting some challenges in the proposed budget. Staff is proposing a relatively status quo budget compared to the current 2020 budget in order to maintain the service levels expected by residents and businesses. Staff proposes continuing with organizational changes in order to remain competitive and to retain and attract workforce, moving our economy forward. Similar to past budgets, this budget shows expenditures outpacing revenues, but as in previous years, this is not anticipated to be the result at year-end. Staff will continue to monitor the City's revenues and expenditures on a daily basis to ensure we remain within budget. Most importantly, he believes this budget reflects the support necessary to execute on his what is his understanding of Council's priorities and goals.

The proposed budget will be reviewed in detail at the upcoming work sessions.

Mr. Stiffler then provided a broad overview of the 2021 operating budget, as submitted to Council in the packet:

1. He reviewed the proposed schedule for review that includes policy decisions to be made for the 2021 budget at the fund level versus the division level. For this reason, the work sessions will include the policy discussion. The work sessions are scheduled at 6 p.m. on October 19, and at 5 p.m., prior to the October 26 Council meeting. If a third workshop is needed, that is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, October 28. The second reading/public hearing of the Ordinance is tentatively scheduled for November 9 Council meeting.

2. He noted this is a status quo budget, as Mr. McDaniel has indicated and continues to provide the same level of services in 2021 as in 2020.
3. Operating expenditures for 2021 are estimated at \$94,007,455, representing a decrease from the 2020 operating budget of 1.8 percent. Personnel costs decreased by \$1.178 million due to not having a 27th pay period as occurred in 2020 – this 27th pay occurs every 11 years with a biweekly pay system. Operating expenses increased 2.3 percent and capital expenditures decreased 66.1 percent over 2020.
4. He reviewed the General Fund Balance and noted that in 2020 and in 2021, it is estimated the fund balance would be 56.2 percent, which is \$5.3 million in excess of the 50 percent reserve policy. The decrease in General Fund balance is significantly impacted by the planned capital expenditures. The 2021 through 2025 CIP transferred \$6.15 million to the Capital Improvements Fund for the Shier-Rings Road realignment and sewer extensions. The realignment is part of the development agreement approved in April 2019 with OSU. Absent those CIP items and on a purely operating budget basis, the General Fund balance would be expected to be 68 percent.
5. In terms of operating revenues, it is estimated for 2021 as \$86.6 million, a decrease of 6.8 percent compared with 2020 operating budget.
6. Historically, expenditures are budgeted high and revenues low. He shared a graph of the budgeted and actuals from 2006 through 2020. Next, he shared a graph of projected versus actual variance between expenditures and revenues. He is projecting for 2020 a variance of around \$5 million. For 2021, the operating budget variance is budgeted to be -\$7.4 million, which is a result of revenue declines in the Recreation Fund and the Hotel-Motel Fund representing \$3.5 million. These declines are directly attributable to COVID-19. These Funds will be discussed in more detail on October 19. The proposed budget transfer of \$3.5 million from the General Fund in order to provide the standard level of services in these two Funds is proposed in 2021. Absent the impact of COVID-19 on these Funds, the budget transfer proposed this year would be much more in line with prior budgets.
7. Again, the 2021 operating budget expenditures as proposed are \$94 million, a 1.8 percent decrease from the 2020 operating budget.
8. Personnel costs make up the largest component of expenditures with salaries totaling \$38.3 million in 2021. This budget contemplates 415 full-time employees and provides funding for 413 of those positions. This is a decrease of one authorized position from the 416 approved in the 2020 operating budget. Including the 27th pay period savings over the 2020 budget, the allocation of \$250,000 for the reorganization was a placeholder and is not needed in 2021. The wage increases for 2021 are per union contract and 2 percent for non-union employees. The reorganization that began in 2020 operating budget will be completed, adding a new Data Manager position in a new Division of Performance Analytics. Two positions are eliminated – custodian and permit technician. The positions left unfunded and moved to contractual are: Chief Information Officer and Government and International Relations Manager. Evaluation will continue in the future. In addition, the Operations Department staffing and reorganization is included in the 2021 budget.
9. In terms of benefit expenditures, the 2021 budget is \$16.5 million or a 1.5 percent decrease from 2020. The cost of health insurance is increasing by 5.6 percent for single coverage to \$12,330 and by 6.5 percent for family coverage to \$29,203. These increases are driven by \$764,000 or a 16.9 percent in medical benefits and administrative costs. The budget as a whole was offset by a decrease of nearly \$400,000 or 21.1 percent in the Stop Loss Premiums. Also included are contributions to OPERS and the Ohio Police & Fire Pension Fund. There is a decrease of \$185,000 associated with 2021 having 26 pay periods versus the 27 in 2020. There is also a decrease of about \$440,000 associated with reducing the number of budgeted positions to reflect more closely the actual healthcare elections by employees. This process change may require

adjustments prior to the budget's adoption or through supplemental appropriations in 2021.

10. There are other personal services of travel and training. These were reduced by just under \$300,000 or nearly 40 percent from the 2020 operating budget. The largest component of this is a reduction in travel and training by 50 percent citywide. This will allow funding to be available for online and virtual training for City employees in 2021.
11. The operating expenditures total \$38 million, or a 2.3 percent over the 2020 operating budget.
12. Contractual services make up \$18.7 million of the operating expenditures and increased by \$60,000 over 2020.
13. Supplies comprise \$7.4 million of the operating expenditures and they are relatively unchanged from 2020. There was a citywide reduction in supplies and equipment maintenance but there was an increase in pool chemicals and sign shop supplies.
14. Other Charges and expenditures increased \$830,640 or 7.5 percent over 2020 operating budget. There was an increase in the refuse/recycling contract of \$550,000; an increase in economic development incentives of \$622,725; and the inclusion of the Dublin 2035 Framework at \$250,000. Offsetting was a decrease in the grants to the Dublin Arts Council. The City appropriates 25 percent of the actual revenue collected in the Hotel-Motel Tax Fund and distributes it to the DAC. Because a 60 percent decrease in Hotel-Motel tax revenue is projected, staff reduced the corresponding appropriation by 60 percent or \$442,500. Special Projects reduction related to the one-time expenditures associated with the ICMA conference.
15. In terms of capital expenditures, there is a decrease of \$1.4 million or 66 percent from the 2020 operating budget. The Rings Road farm payment of just under \$1.3 million was a four-year process and the last payment was made in 2020. There was some reduction in capital spending in the Recreation Fund and an increase in pool spending related to the second pool.
16. In regard to the reorganization, there are some significant differences between 2020 and the 2021 budget. The two positions eliminated are the custodial worker and permit technician, and the data manager position was added. The costs include salary, benefits and family health care for all of these positions.
17. He shared a list of the positions being reclassified across the City. Some of this work began during 2020 and will be completed in 2021. The operating budget will now reflect all of the changes in staffing.
18. He shared a list of the noteworthy changes for 2021, which have been highlighted earlier in this presentation.

He concluded by stating that the 2021 Operating Budget succeeds in the five focus areas of Fiscal Health, Economic Vitality, Community Engagement, Safe and Resilient Community and Smart, Customer-Focused Government. In terms of fiscal health, the budget complies with the City's General Fund policy and acknowledges that the Recreation Cost Recovery Policy will not be able to be met under current public health guidelines and directly addresses the COVID-19 related revenue declines. In regard to economic vitality, the budget proposes a 34.1 percent increase in funding for economic development incentives and demonstrates our commitment to continue to grow our economy.

Mayor Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Stiffler for all of his work on assembling this proposed budget.

The Clerk and Ms. Burness reported that no public comment has been submitted regarding this matter.

Mayor Amorose Groomes reminded Council that if there is something not included in the proposed budget that they would like considered, they should let Mr. Stiffler know that so that he can be prepared for the next work session.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the November 9 Council meeting; budget work sessions are scheduled at 6 p.m. on October 19 and 5 p.m. on October 26, with a third date reserved of October 28 if it is needed.

INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE – RESOLUTION

Resolution 62-20

Accepting the Lowest and Best Bid for the Glick Road Shared-Use Path – Section 3 Project.

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that on September 23, bids were received for this project. This project will construct a shared-use path along the north side of Glick Road from Carnoustie Drive to Din Eidyn Drive, and along the south side of Glick Road from Din Eidyn Drive to Muirkirk Drive east. The length of the path to be constructed will be approximately 2,060 feet. Included with this project will be a pedestrian crossing warning system to be installed at a new crosswalk across Glick Road, just east of Din Eidyn Drive – similar to the pedestrian crossing and warning systems on Glick Road at Caithness and Carnoustie Drive. Additionally, there will be a 50-foot long pedestrian bridge constructed over Deer Run. The Engineer's estimate for this project is \$450,000. Strawser Paving Company, Inc. submitted the lowest and best bid of \$385,427.16. The majority of the shared-use path will be located within existing Glick Road right-of-way. The portion of the shared-use path located near Deer Run will require the perpetual easement approved tonight from the Muirfield Association. Staff anticipates construction of the path to commence in late October. Glick Road will remain open to traffic during the construction process, and final completion date is May 14, 2021. Staff has thoroughly reviewed the bid submitted by Strawser and previous experience with Strawser on past projects has been favorable. Staff recommends Council approval of Resolution 62-20.

The Clerk and Ms. Burness reported that no public comment has been submitted regarding this matter.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes.

Resolution 63-20

Accepting the Lowest and Best Bid for the 2020 Guardrail Replacement and Maintenance Program.

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that on September 23, bids were received for this program. This year, the program involves the replacement of existing steel guardrail with painted, galvanized steel guardrail on Dublin Road; replacement of existing wood guardrail with steel-back timber guardrail on Memorial Drive east of Holyrood Court; and removal of a short section of guardrail on Macbeth Drive. The Engineer's estimate for the project was \$140,000 and the budgeted funds for the program are \$155,000 in the CIP. Lake Erie Construction Company submitted the lowest and best bid of \$152,325. Staff anticipates construction of this program to commence in early spring of 2021 to allow time for the ordering and delivery of materials. Streets impacted by the guardrail construction will remain open to traffic for the duration of the construction. The completion date for the project is April 30, 2021. Staff has thoroughly reviewed the bids and has had previous favorable experience with Lake Erie Construction on past projects. Staff therefore recommends approval of Resolution 63-20.

The Clerk and Ms. Burness reported that no comments have been submitted regarding this matter.

Mr. Reiner asked about steel-back timber guardrail. Will this provide the same aesthetic as the current timber?

Mr. Hammersmith responded it is the same guardrail the City began using on Brand Road over 10 years ago. The description is just a bit different.

Mayor Amorose Groomes asked about the painted steel and if it will weather into appearing as the wood material.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that the plate itself is galvanized and ends up with stain on it when the wood is stained.

Ms. Fox stated that the steel-back timber guardrail is such a better aesthetic. When is a decision made for this product versus simply a metal guardrail?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that decision is made during the design process. The difficulty with the steel-back timber guardrail is the depth of the assembly itself. Along Riverside Drive, sufficient offset could not be achieved to place the posts away from the edge of the roadway to make that work. Much depends on the embankment. The first option is always to consider using the steel-back timber guardrail. Another consideration are the terminations or ends of the rail itself and there is not an attenuator or collapsible attenuator for the end of the timber as there is for the steel.

Ms. Fox asked if the steel-back timber is more expensive than the metal guardrail and by how much.

Mr. Hammersmith responded it is approximately \$25-30 per foot difference.

Ms. Fox asked about the guardrail to be installed along Dublin Road. Where is that located?

Mr. Hammersmith responded it is just north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway along the east side of Dublin Road. In terms of design, it was not possible to use the steel-back timber guardrail without extending the culvert at that location or making adjustments to the embankment.

Vote on the Resolution: Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

OTHER

- Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC) Recommendation for Maintenance and Funding of Residential Stormwater Management Basins

Mr. Dearth provided a brief overview of this topic. He noted that Council requested CSAC review the City's past and current practices regarding the maintenance of stormwater management basins in residential areas. At the September 10, 2019 CSAC meeting, staff presented an overview of the City's stormwater master plan and an inventory of stormwater management assets throughout the community. The City's GIS staff identified 305 residential stormwater basins within the City. Of the 305, 154 are located on property owned by the City of Dublin. Staff identified 46 stormwater basins on City property that are privately maintained by the homeowners associations within the neighborhood the basin serves. CSAC requested further information that was then presented at the November 12, 2019 CSAC meeting. In February of 2020, the Commission recommended to City Council that the City assume the maintenance of 46 stormwater basins located on City property, with the consideration that there would be a funding mechanism identified to account for the increase in stormwater maintenance. City Council discussed the recommendations and ultimately chose to refer the topic back to CSAC with the goal of identifying a funding mechanism. Staff returned in August of 2020 with several proven funding mechanisms and proven strategies to present to CSAC. Staff utilized the EPA Municipal Stormwater Guidelines to illustrate what best practices are used to fund stormwater programs. Staff also highlighted several examples of municipalities leveraging EPA best practices, and an example of an innovative programmatic model. He introduced CSAC Chair, Steve Dritz to present the recommendations to Council.

Steven Dritz, Chairperson, CSAC stated that the Commission was charged with advising Council on creative ways to fund stormwater management for those 46 stormwater basins residing on City-owned property and managed by the HOAs. Council requested funding solutions that were fair to both the City and the residents, and which ideally did not alter original HOA agreements. A detailed memo from staff outlines the funding options that were reviewed, along with meeting minutes.

Dublin staff provided them with pertinent information about how different communities in Central Ohio and in like communities across the country fund stormwater management. The sources of this information include the EPA Municipal Stormwater Management Guidelines, the Western Kentucky University Stormwater Utility Survey of 2019, along with several documents that were municipality specific. They reviewed the pros and cons of various funding options. Key findings of their discussion were:

1. In the state of Ohio, general revenue and capital appropriations are the most common way of funding stormwater management projects. This is the approach currently in place for the basins managed by the City of Dublin.
2. A Special Improvements District (SID) appropriates the costs to the properties that directly require or benefit from the provision of services. A major drawback is that SIDs would be an additional fee on top of the typical HOA fees.
3. They talked of stormwater utility fees covering the stormwater management service for the entire municipality. These are prevalent in Central Ohio.

Staff provided six options, together with pros and cons of each option. CSAC assessed these, based on fairness for the entire community. These options are provided in the information provided in the packet.

After careful deliberation, CSAC recommends the establishment of a pilot grant program for the maintenance of stormwater basins on City-owned property and managed by HOAs. The benefits include: the grant would provide up to a 50 percent shared cost between the City and the HOA with a maximum allotment established by Council. Grants have successfully been used in Dublin in the past. The most recent example is the Commercial Façade Improvement Program. By doing this as a pilot, the grant application process would help us to assess the stormwater management needs of the City. Once the pilot is executed, it could be evaluated to determine if it should be renewed or terminated. He highlighted that the City of Dublin would not be the first to try this approach to stormwater management activities. Bowling Green, Kentucky – a city of similar size to Dublin – has successfully used a grant program to fund stormwater management. For a longer-term approach, CSAC recommends that the City consider a stormwater management utility as a way to fund the stormwater needs of the City. As the effort and cost to establish a utility is rather extensive, this initiative could be a formal project undertaken by the City. In closing, he thanked Council for their time and staff for the time they dedicated to this important issue.

Mayor Amorose Groomes thanked him for providing this report and asked him to share Council's appreciation with the Committee for their work on these solutions.

The Clerk and Ms. Burness reported that no public comment has been received on this matter.

Vice Mayor De Rosa noted that under this approach, similar to the façade grant program, the Council would allocate an amount of funds for this; the HOA would bring forward an application with a cost estimate; and the HOA would have to spend funds in order to receive a matching grant. Is that the approach contemplated?

Mr. Dearth responded that is correct.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that her assumption is that the longer one waits to do maintenance, the more costly it is. Will there be a savings overall if the HOA does the required regular maintenance with the help of this grant program?

Mr. Hammersmith stated that is true, generally speaking. In terms of silt removal, vegetation management, etc., these tend to worsen over time if not addressed. The outlet control structures also deteriorate over time and need to be monitored.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if the hope is that with a matching grant approach, the maintenance responsibilities of this would remain with the HOA management, but they would apply to the City with a request for a grant.

Mr. Dearth responded that is correct.

Ms. Alutto asked for the time period recommended for the pilot. Typically, grant programs are an annual or semi-annual basis. Would this be twice per year for one year and then evaluation? What is the recommendation for duration of the pilot?

Mr. Dritz responded that the pilot should be for one year. They did not discuss this at CSAC.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated the City is in the midst of operating budget preparation and review. There would be a need to identify the funding source and then have estimates from staff of what amount of funds would be required to move the needle on this, if Council decided to proceed with such a pilot. Perhaps in budget discussions, this could be addressed further.

Mr. Reiner asked for the scope of expenses for this program. Were other programs done in areas as large as Dublin? He believes a better handle on the budgeting aspect is needed from Engineering. Based on the aging of these stormwater facilities and the right-of-way fill with weed growth, it could be substantial. Before getting too far into this, it would be important to understand the real costs.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that is her point as well – a need for understanding the costs. She appreciates CSAC's efforts toward establishing a process/program, but what is not available is the funding costs.

Ms. Fox stated that they identified 46 HOAs with stormwater basins on City property. In PZC, there is ongoing discussion with developers about the desire to have additional stormwater basins. She assumes this pilot would include even more basins in the future. Those could be substantial expenses. The other question relates to stormwater ponds on private property. They also require work and she wonders if the true stormwater needs of the City would be addressed by just dealing with the 46 HOAs or if there are additional areas in the City that need help, too.

Mr. Dritz stated that he has no information about the state of those basins. He does know that the City provides guidelines to property management companies on managing those basins.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the focus of this effort was the 46 basins located on City-owned property, yet maintained by the HOAs. Historically, the private basins have been fairly well maintained. The City is currently sending out compliance letters for basins, including private ones. They tend to be able to fund the maintenance as a private entity like an office building or apartment building. In terms of what the funds will be expended for, it is intended for the capital costs that they had not planned for.

Ms. Alutto stated that further discussion at a work session or committee will require carefully establishing criteria because it will not be possible to fund all of the applications. It is important to determine the criteria as well as the funding source.

Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested referring this to the Finance Committee to work with Engineering on budgetary numbers to see if it could be accommodated in the budget.

Mayor Amorose Groomes moved to refer CSAC's recommendations to the Finance Committee for further study.

Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

- Fee Waiver Request – City of Dublin/Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center Partnership "Exercise is Medicine" Program

Mr. Earman noted he is accompanied by staff member Mollie Steiner, as well as Jodie Kuri, Director of Ambulatory Services and Stefanie Morrow, Director, Wellness & Health Coaching of The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center.

Mr. Earman noted that staff and OSU Wexner Medical Center representatives have discussed partnerships, as OSU continues to expand its care network with the new outpatient care facility currently under construction in Dublin. The goal of the partnership opportunities is to collaborate and share ideas, with the objective of opening discussion on how OSU's entrance into the Dublin region can support or strengthen opportunities in health and wellness for both the business and residential communities. This initiative relates to OSU's current "Exercise is Medicine" program, a physician referral-based program that strives to make physical activity and exercise a standard part of disease prevention and treatment. He described the program that

involves an 11-week period. A pilot program for this requires a space inside the DCRC with the goal of having participants discover a healthy journey and ultimately become a paying member and consistent user of the DCRC when the program ends. This program would improve patients' health in the community and potentially result in a new market for additional memberships at the DCRC.

The second initiative expands virtual wellness programming as part of the existing FitBiz corporate wellness initiative. These virtual programs include a variety of topics and educational content delivered by a certified health coach. FitBiz was originally designed to assist businesses with onsite wellness programming, but by partnering with OSU and their established model of operating virtual programming, we can best meet the needs of local businesses as more employees work remotely.

To support the Exercise is Medicine program, staff is requesting a fee waiver of \$855 for the needed rental space at the DCRC. Use of this space for this purpose is timely, as there has been a significant reduction in rented gathering spaces in the DCRC due to the pandemic. Throughout this pilot program, staff will assess how many conversions to membership result from the program and will evaluate the success of the program for consideration in the future.

Staff therefore recommends granting a fee waiver for use of the classroom space for the 11-week period, which would begin in January 2021.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked what is different in terms of health and fitness during the COVID experience – focusing on the positive. These programs are a great idea, and she asked if there is a takeaway of what is being learned during COVID.

Ms. Kuri responded that the takeaway now, particularly for the "Exercise is Medicine" program is the fact that despite all of this, the programs continue to grow. She believes people are more aware of the benefits of a healthy lifestyle. They have a fitness facility in New Albany, and despite the fact that members are slowly returning, the exercise programs have remained full and are growing more quickly now than prior to COVID.

There were no further questions from Council.

Mr. Reiner moved approval of the fee waiver request for the "Exercise is Medicine" program scheduled for 11 weeks at the DCRC.

Ms. Fox seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel reported:

1. For the record, he is in receipt of a letter from Crawford Hoying, dated September 28. This letter includes a response from Di Perna Advisors regarding the A Block bonds and projected debt service accounting for years 2020, 2021 and 2022. He forwarded this to Council on September 29 and it is submitted for the record tonight. The letter from Di Perna Advisors is responsive to his request for certain questions to be answered relative to why funding previously requested of Council is no longer needed. If there are further questions regarding this matter, he and Mr. Stiffler will try to address those as well.
2. He also mentioned to Council previously that he will have some recommendations for Council regarding increased communication updates to Council by Crawford Hoying and others, in particular those also related to the Bridge Park New Community Authority.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Planning & Zoning Commission: Ms. Fox reported that PZC had an administrative meeting last week with four topics: property maintenance and vacant buildings, temporary sign codes, residential development patterns and some of the unique medical facilities and changes needed in the Zoning Code. Regarding property maintenance and vacant building suggestions, she thanked staff for their thorough research on Code improvements. PZC and ARB have reviewed the proposed ordinance, which will be forwarded to Council in the near future for consideration. In regard to temporary sign codes, one area of concern was the nonresidential sale or leasing signs throughout the City. She provided details of the recommendations

coming forward to Council. Regarding residential development patterns and medical facilities, the Commission had a broad discussion and it is a work in progress. Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that these Code changes will be coming forward to Council, together with the meeting minutes of the discussion.

Administrative Committee: Vice Mayor De Rosa reported that the next Dublin 2035 meeting is scheduled on Monday, November 2. More details will follow.

Community Development Committee: He thanked Council for their support of the short-term rental legislation as proposed by the Committee. The solution is very well worked out and he believes the citizens will be very appreciative.

Finance Committee: Ms. Alutto stated that the Finance Committee hotel-motel tax grant application review meeting is proposed to be rescheduled from Monday, November 30 to 6 p.m. on Wednesday, December 2. The Committee members were in agreement with the change of date.

Public Services Committee: Ms. Fox stated that the Committee had a great discussion presented by J.M. Rayburn on mobility at their recent meeting. SHARE has experienced an interesting year, given the COVID impact. They talked of their strength and challenges. They have decided to rebrand SHARE to the Dublin Connector. The Committee supported the branding change, as it reflects what it does. They are now serving 13 senior facilities and their strengths over the past year have been their ability to pivot with the community. Instead of moving people, they were often moving items and goods. Their challenge currently is with the limited COTA service and funding due to restrictions of COVID. They will be reviewing grant options. They have been able to innovate with their apps and platforms, with the support of the City. Most importantly, they are collaborating with the City and regional partners. Hopefully, this will become a very successful connector. They believe that success looks like one percent of the local population in Dublin – 700 regular riders. In 2021, the City will see TRIP bikes - dockless e-bikes - as additional transportation modes. The Committee is looking forward to how they evolve in the next year.

MORPC: Mayor Amorose Groomes reported that she, Mr. McDaniel and Ms. O'Callaghan attended the Commission meeting this week and the minutes will be available for review.

US 33 Corridor: Vice Mayor De Rosa reported that the group met last Friday with a full contingent of the neighboring jurisdictions. Development up and down the 33 Corridor continues to be very robust. It continues to be a drawing area for researchers, transportation, etc. – even through the COVID situation. They received an update to infrastructure, the interchange and improvements on US 42 in the planning phase. They will ask Mr. McDaniel to assist them in bringing a full update to Council at some point after the budget work is completed.

COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE

Vice Mayor De Rosa commented that the new leaf collection machine being piloted came through her neighborhood, and it rocks! Thanks to all for the hard work underway in collecting the leaves!

Ms. Fox gave a big “shout-out” to the Planning Division who are working on so many items! Their workload is very heavy and they are handling all of it very well.

Mr. Reiner suggested that a speed limit be considered for scooter drivers crossing the pedestrian bridge. Their high speed weaving has resulted in a dangerous situation. He asked that staff review this situation.

Mayor Amorose Groomes, on behalf of Council wished the Clerk a Happy Birthday later this week!

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mayor – Presiding Officer

Clerk of Council