Meeting Minutes - FINAL

August 6, 2018
5:45 PM

Council Work Session

Mike Walker – Chair  
Jill Amos  
Will Bennett  
Bob Clark  
Mike Coolman  
Bruce Jarvis  
Patrick Lynch
A. Call To Order  
Walker called the meeting to order at 5:47 p.m.

B. Roll Call  
Present 6 – Amos, Bennett, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker  
Absent 1 – Lynch

A motion was made by Walker, seconded by Clark to excuse Mr. Lynch. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 – Walker, Clark, Amos, Bennett, Coolman, Jarvis

C. Also In Attendance

Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire, Amanda Jackson

D. Request for Council Action

RES-18-011  
A Resolution In Support Of The Columbus And Franklin County Metro Parks Replacement Park Levy

- Request to move to full Council

Peoples: Thank you Mr. Walker, this is a resolution to support the Columbus Franklin Metro Parks levy; they’re coming up on the end of their 10-year levy that they had that started in 2009; they are – per their promotional material, there is going to be an increase; currently it’s at .75 million, and they are requesting to go with an additional .2 million, for a total of .95; they said it will amount in an increase of an additional $13 per one hundred thousand of home valuation; obviously, as you all know, we have 4 metro parks that are surrounding Canal Winchester; Pickerington Ponds, Walnut Woods is probably our closest one, Chestnut Ridge – the site we’re on; we have been working with them, we’d love to get a connection for our bike path that we’re putting on Groveport Road right now, over across to Walnut Woods; that would connect us up with the rest of the central Ohio trail parks network – go up through Three Creeks, and I believe it goes up to Sandusky; I’m not positive about that one, it is a north-south trail that goes through that; they requested just some support towards that, and bringing that resolution to our council; Clark: I’m going to oppose this resolution – I’m a supporter of the metro parks, but I feel that this increase – they’re doing a lot of expansion in other counties; there’s a park in Hocking County, Fairfield County, Pickaway County, Delaware County, Union County; none of those counties pay any tax towards the metro parks; I would like to see if the voters of those counties would be willing to support the parks in their areas, and help to defray that they need an increase at this time of revenues; that’s my reasoning, I support metro parks, I use them, but I feel that if there’s parks in other counties, I think they should have a fair share in paying for the maintenance and the upkeep of those parks that are in the other counties; Peoples: Mr. Clark, I can ask them about if they are reaching out into those counties; I’m not sure if it’s just the way that they were organized, and the way that their ? structures are; I guess similar to our CWJRD is just a very geographical location; I don’t know, but I’ll find out – I’ll send a follow-up email out; Clark: I think that they would have to form a park district in that county to put a levy on, but it can be done; they can put one on each of those parks in those counties.

Jarvis: Mr. Peoples, we normally take action on a resolution at the time that it’s proposed; given the fact that there’s additional information out there, would this be okay timetable-wise to table this resolution this evening, or not to take action on it this evening, and carry it over to the next
meeting? Peoples: I don’t see anything; obviously they’re just starting their campaign now; I don’t see anything in their communication that has a deadline on it, so I think that should be fine; give me an opportunity to get a few answers.

Jarvis: Can I make a motion to forward this to full council, but not for this evening’s meeting, but for 2 weeks from today – which would be August 20th? Peoples: I’ll defer to Ms. Jackson for the answer on that; Jackson: We can certainly do that, I just have to make a note; it is showing up on your council agenda this evening, so it may be cleaner if you just table it at council, and then take it off the table at the 20th meeting, if you wish to vote on it then.

A motion was made by Jarvis, seconded by Coolman to move this resolution to full council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 5 – Jarvis, Coolman, Amos, Bennett, Walker
No 1 – Clark

ORD-18-027
Finance
An Ordinance Authorizing The Mayor And Clerk To Accept And Execute The Plat For The Villages At Westchester Section 12, Part 2, Phase III
- Request to move to full Council

Ordinance Attachments: Planning and Zoning Recommendation

Haire: That’s the next section of the Villages of Westchester; this is on the west side of Gender Road, south of Harrison Lane, which connects back out to Gender Road; Dietz Drive is the first intersection with a traffic signal, the next intersection down Harrison Lane – this is south of that; this would be – is this 3 and 4, or is it just 3? Jackson: Just 3; Haire: I don’t recall how many lots that is; 28 lots available in that section, they’ve started construction on the streets now; by the time we get through the third reading, they’ll have all the streets constructed.

A motion was made by Bennett, seconded by Clark to move this ordinance to full council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 – Bennett, Clark, Amos, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker

ORD-18-028
Finance
An Ordinance Authorizing The Mayor And Finance Director To Enter Into An Agreement With The Regional Income Tax Agency For The Administration Of The Income Tax Laws Of The City Of Canal Winchester And For The Collection Of Said Income Taxes, And Declaring An Emergency (Agreement)
- Request to move to full Council

Jackson: Thank you Mr. Walker; right around the time of our last council meeting, I received notification from the city of Columbus stating that they would no longer be collecting and administering income taxes for other municipalities, so they’re ending their third party services effective at the end of 2018; this was not something that I think we were expecting; once we got that letter, I reached out to the Regional Income Tax Agency, also known as RITA, as well as the CCA (Centralized Collection Agency) with the city of Cleveland; those are the only 2 other organizations within the state of Ohio who do third party administration services; this is not
something that financially I think would benefit the city to bring in house; we don’t have the space, we don’t have the manpower, it’s just an undertaking; we would like to continue to have a third party administer our taxes; we met with RITA, and with CCA – I met with them twice, the mayor met with each of them once; we discussed the uniqueness that is Canal Winchester, what we would expect of them, what they would expect of us; ultimately, we felt RITA was the best fit for Canal Winchester; because we are looking at a very short timeframe, and the thought of converting basically 3 years’ worth of income tax data from the city of Columbus’ software to RITA’s software, it is very imperative that we move on this piece of legislation this evening; RITA will not do anything until we approve this ordinance and sing the agreement; they will need every bit of the next 5 months to get this done; this would be effective in January of 2019; we’ve also already started talking about the PR campaign that will need to take place to inform everyone of this change; from a cost perspective, it will be very similar, if not a little less costly than what city of Columbus was; we don’t really have to worry about a huge impact to our budget in that respect; we’ll probably see some other services from them that we weren’t originally getting from the city of Columbus; with that, I’d be happy to answer any questions; Jarvis: In addition to the service itself, what I’m hearing is that there’s going to be some conversion costs; Jackson: No, none of that will cost us anything; they just need the time to do the actual conversion; Jarvis: Our agreement with the city of Columbus, did it have a timeframe for when one party or the other would announce that they would end the contract? Jackson: It was 6 months, yes; Jarvis: Wow, so they hit it; Jackson: Pretty much almost to the day.

Walker: Any other questions or discussion? Amos: Will be taking care of the mailing and the marketing portion that you’re talking about, or will RITA be helping? Jackson: It’s going to be kind of a joint effort; there will be information coming directly from RITA; with the data that they’re getting from the city of Columbus, they will have better addresses for tax filers than maybe we will; we’re going to work together to do that.

A motion was made by Amos, seconded by Bennett to move this ordinance to full council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 – Amos, Bennett, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker

E. Reports

Matt Peoples – Nothing to add to my written report.
Lucas Haire – I don’t have anything to add, we have a lot to cover tonight.
Amanda Jackson – I can just echo that, if you would like; honestly, the biggest thing going on in my department is this change-over from the city of Columbus to RITA; things are quiet, and I like it that way.

F. Items for Discussion

18-082 Small Cell Technology in the Right-of-Way
Bill Sims: Thank you Mr. Walker, I just wanted to bring to council’s attention some information about some code changes that we’re going to need to make about small cell facilities in our right of way; should be bringing some legislation hopefully to our next meeting; basically, we need to make some code changes as a result of changes in state law; House Bill 478 basically allowed small cell facilities, antennas, within the public right of way; we were incumbent upon us to establish code to comply with the ORC, and to establish specific guidelines for ourselves, to reduce the impact of those facilities on the community in our right of way; just a tiny bit of background, I know you’re a little pressed for time – the facilities typically are in an antenna, a small antenna, 6 cubic feet or smaller, mounted on a pole, basically 40-feet or less; there’s usually a cabinet of some nature, sometimes it’s ground-mounted, sometimes pole-mounted; there’s some size requirements on that as well; those are the small cell facility; there’s also, separate from that, will be permitting things like power to that facility, as well as fiber – has to be run to each of those facilities; we are working on developing our code, using some other cities as a template here; most of the communities in central Ohio, probably the whole state are working diligently here in the last couple of months to start trying to bring this together; basically, our proposal is a 2-part type of scenario, where we’re going to update our code, as well as establish some design standards and guidelines for the facilities; the first part of that in the code will basically be defining an application process, timeframes, standard conditions for that kind of work, and those kind of facilities; establish requirements to comply, with a set of design standards and guidelines; we’ll establish safety requirements, as well as a recovery of costs; these facilities can be located 100% on their own, they can be co-located on other utilities, they can be co-located on city utilities; there’s also potentially cost impacts on relocations that might be necessary to – the work the city needs to do in the right of way for removal of those facilities, so all of the cost impacts are handled as well in the code; there’s the design portion of that; some of this can be handled through planning, and P&Z’s input as well, as far as establishing aesthetic standards, depending on the type of area it is in, each district in town; it won’t have the same standard in Olde Town historic neighborhood as it would in Industrial Park; I just wanted to let you know that’s coming, so it won’t be a surprise here next week; we will want to get that passed as an emergency; we will be receiving these applications – there’s at least one facility owner now that’s already beginning the process; we don’t have the application yet, but we will shortly; it looks like the future is that we will see a lot more of them; any questions right now? Bennett: Yes, Mr. Sims – I understand the urgency to get something on record; you foresee that coming our next council meeting? Sims: I do, again it’s kind of 2 parts – the code portion, the fundamentals of this – that will come to be passed as an emergency; the design standards, the guidelines; we are basically developing a basic set right now based on other communities; Luke has been working on that to make some adjustments for us now; the code will become a part of the codified ordinances; the design guidelines, based on the code’s direction, will be allowed to be updated regularly to accommodate what our current situation is; Bennett: Is the code very basic across municipality? Is there a basic template that we are picking out? Sims: It is, there’s a couple of firms that have been working on these; Frost Brown is one of them, so we’re basically piggybacking on some of their previous work at this point; Haire: I’d be happy to send out the draft we have right now of the design requirements, which are the aesthetic requirements, if you want to see those and what we’ve been working on; really it’s just setting the standard for what type of pole we want to use in each location; that’s what we’re down to, we’ve kind of defined the areas where we feel there is a different architectural character that we want to match;
we’ve done a lot on the spacing of where these can be located; making sure that they’re not impacting any pedestrian facilities; some of these have boxes that stick out 2-3 feet, we don’t want them sticking out towards the road, but if you stick them towards the sidewalk, you still need to maintain the ADA compliance; we’ve spent a lot of money on the street trees, so we don’t want them impacting the street trees when they go in; it’s all of those type of things that we’re putting in, and the guidelines to really facilitate where they can go; Bennett: How many of these do we imagine are going to be ground-mounted, versus pole-mounted – is there a way we can stipulate one over the other? Sims: All of the antennas are pole-mounted, so whether they’re on their own pole, or co-located on a utility, or they could be co-located on a city owned facility – typically it would be like a traffic signal, or a – for instance, our taller streetlight, like the Diley light – those could be a co-location; some of those may require structural improvement, in which case the cost would be more; we will not ever share – basically take on the costs associated with adding to one of our facilities; Haire: The idea is to keep everything internal to the posts, so you wouldn’t have any exposed wires; in most cases, if they co-locate on a wood post, say South Central, one of their wood poles – they may have some wires on the outside, but it would be in a conduit, and it would be one specified color; Bennett: I thought I had read something where there are ground cabinet options for those; Haire: There are underground cabinet options for the facilities; Sims: They’re still associated with something that’s aerial; the cabinet can either be mounted on the pole, or it can be ground-mounted separately – you can actually have a vault underground, potentially if there’s just no way to do it aboveground; Haire: It would kind of look like a traffic signal box; that’s what they would look like if they were on their own; Sims: The specifics of the design guidelines, they’re going to take some work to get all of the various details, we just don’t want to be blindsided where someone is going to slap up a wood pole, and a chrome box or something downtown; we want to have some kind of control immediately, and then finesse those final details; Amos: Did the House Bill provide any sort of timeframe as a protection to the city if someone were to apply before this was put in place? Sims: The end of July; Haire: August 1st was the first day; Sims: It all happened pretty quickly; this has been ongoing for a couple of years now; we were trying to speculate before Senate Bill 331, and that passed; it was not good for the city, we basically zero input on what went where; that, fortunately, was pulled back; this is the result, basically, of negotiation; Bennett: Mr. Haire, and Mr. Sims, if you both have an opportunity to send those draft documents, that would be fantastic; Sims: Absolutely, there’s a few photographs as well that are helpful.

G. Old/New Business

H. Adjournment at 6:10 p.m.

A motion was made by Clark, seconded by Bennett to adjourn. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Clark, Bennett, Amos, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker