

Canal Winchester

*Town Hall
10 North High Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

January 18, 2022

6:00 PM

Council Work Session

*Bob Clark - Chair
Laurie Amick
Jill Amos
Chuck Milliken
Patrick Shea
Mike Walker
Ashley Ward*

- A. Call To Order** *Clark called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.*
- B. Roll Call** *Present 7 – Amick, Amos, Clark, Milliken, Shea, Walker, Ward*
- C. Also In Attendance**

Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire, Amanda Jackson, Bill Sims

D. Reports of City Staff

Bill Sims – Things are relatively quite for the moment around town with the cold weather. But there is some work going on, primarily at the McGill Park. They are actually installing fencing and will be for the next couple weeks on that project. Work for the park in the spring when the weather breaks will resume with primarily we have the playground to be completed and a lot of incidental type things. But completion date for that project is May 15th and they should definitely be on track for that. With the municipal complex, there's a lot of work taking place right now. Flooring being installed, cabinets and counters, completing interior doors. Really working towards an end of February completion. There might be some factors that will come into play as to when we specifically move. A big part of that is going to hinge on the fiber installation. We're at the mercy of our fiber provider. We're hoping to see them shortly to at least start getting the cables installed. On that track, we're probably looking at Community Center demolition in late winter, possibly the early part of March, with the new parking lot being completed in April. We also have the Gender Rd Ph V project still currently under way even though there's no activity there. We expecting delivery of the traffic signal poles the last week of January. My expectation is to see the electrical contractor back on the project early to mid-February to start wrapping that project up. Also, at McGill, we have the utility extension project. You may remember we ran a water and sewer out to that site. We had been waiting for quite a while for the power to be installed by South Central Electric. That did occur here before the holidays. We're going to be testing the new lift station at the end of January. Make sure everything's functioning properly so we can close that out. And we're getting ready for the 2022 Street Program. EMH&T is wrapping up the detailed design. We're going to be looking at using an electronic bidding process through a company called Bid Express this year with that project. We've talking about it for a while, but COVID pushed a lot of communities to get on board with using that method. Some of the folks we talk with regularly have done that successfully so we're going to give that a shot as well. So, looking forward to that for the street program. The work for street program is primarily in Ashbrook Village - the Streams End Dr, Edgewater, Creekside Crossing Dr area. Also, Dietz Dr in Westchester, in the golf course section, from east of Thrush Dr to Connor Dr. We do have an alternate for Trine St, from East Waterloo to the railroad tracks, depending on what the prices look like, whether we can squeeze that in this year. We're not sure what the asphalt bids are coming back at at this point. Also, the sidewalk program will be occurring. That's in the early phases of Ashbrook, sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Ashbrook. We will be concentrating our efforts there, as well as work the bike path on West Waterloo St and significant number of restriping improvements around town. Looking forward to that getting started. On the private side, things are very quiet. Greengate subdivision is currently down. They have punch list work to finish. But the Friendship Kitchen is underway, as well as the Chipotle off of Diley. TG Mechanical in Canal Pointe, they have just started getting started on their site work as well. We have a lot of right-of-way activity occurring right now. AT&T has been submitting a number of permits for the last couple of months. I think they are gearing up for a lot of spring work as they extend fiber into a number of the subdivisions. We're also working with Everstream who is extending some services as well. We're currently working on an easement for them on a parcel that we have at the Groveport and Gender Rd intersection. And Spectrum is staying busy as they usually are. I also want to welcome Jamie James who you may know as working in the building department. She is actually going to be joining my team as the Right-of-Way Technician to help out with all this permitting activity.

Shea – Are you adding any boulevards? You know how on Dietz, you have a couple of boulevards down there in the middle that really help slow down and break up the flow of traffic there. Speed is a constant complaint coming out of that neighborhood and several neighborhoods. Are you looking at adding any additional boulevards on that when you're doing the improvements?

Sims – We will not be. We did add two additional ones by the park area a few years ago. That gives us essentially four in the golf course area. You get any more than that you start impacting intersections and driveway access in some of the locations. We'll be saving those exactly the way they are. We won't be removing them, but we will be working on the pavement.

E. Request for Council Action

RES-22-003

Development

A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR THE ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER OF CERTAIN TERRITORY IN MADISON

TOWNSHIP CONTAINING 70.625+/- ACRES AND BEING LOCATED SOUTH OF
BIXBY ROAD AND WEST OF RAGER ROAD

- Request to move to full Council

Haire – We’ve discussed this property at length. This would be the resolution necessary to accept the annexation of the Schacht property which contains 70.625 acres. The Board of County Commissioners heard that application, which was filed on October 26th, they heard it on November 8th. The Ohio Revised Code requires that 60 days past – I’m sorry, the Board of Commissioners heard that on October 26th. We received it on November 8th. Sixty days must pass from the date of receipt of the transcription of that. The 60 days has passed, so we are asking for acceptance of that annexation. With this annexation, the City would be taking the responsibility for the adjacent right-of-way for Rager Rd.

Amos – The one we’re looking at tonight is the obvious reason why a lot of our residents are here tonight because they are not happy about what’s going on and how it’s going. We’ve had several meetings with the developers over the past couple weeks for this property, and a lot of the concerns that Planning and Zoning – I’ve followed up with a lot of the Planning and Zoning members as well. Over the last couple of months I’ve had lots of conversations with them – why did you turn it down? Why did you feel this way? Why was it unanimous? The majority of them have said that it all stemmed back to the infrastructure of the roads. Can you please explain for our public what the developer, and I realize that we’ll touch on this a little bit later in the ordinance, but can you explain some of the modifications that the developer has come forward with?

Haire – Sure, so we can do that now or the developer and their traffic engineer are here this evening. They would like to give a presentation and it would outline specifically those transportation improvements. We can do that now or we can do that in the Old Business section.

Amos – I’m fine with Old Business but I do think we just need to touch on and it to make sure we all understand. I have a few questions that pertain to it.

Shea – When we were in discussion, I thought Rager Rd was going to get closed down and kept inside the Township and us not assume responsibility for that? That road is pretty rough right now.

Haire – With the annexation, it would be Canal Winchester’s responsibility for the roadway from Bixby Rd south to the location to the church, the portion adjacent to the church. The church is not being annexed. We’ve had had discussions with both ODOT and with the Franklin County Engineer’s Office which represents Madison Township about closing a portion of Rager Rd there and cul-de-sacing it at the end and removing the connection to 33. But there will be no access, with the exception of the church, from Rager Rd. There’s nothing being proposed for any other access besides the church. If it’s closed at 33, it essentially turns into a driveway for the church.

Shea – It turns into a driveway but it is in abysmal shape. I’ve seen better roads in West Virginia.

Haire – You are correct. It is not in good shape.

Amick – It’s my understanding that conversations have been had with the church leadership. Is that correct?

Haire – The only conversations I’ve personally had with anyone from the church was a representative that came to our Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. I believe that the developer has spoken with the church.

Amos – And that’s something we can ask for clarification on later?

Haire – Yes.

A motion was made by Shea, seconded by Milliken to move RES-22-003 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 – Shea, Milliken, Amick, Amos, Clark, Walker, Ward

RES-22-004

Development

A RESOLUTION INDICATING WHAT SERVICES THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER WILL PROVIDE TO 87.4± ACRES OF LAND, MORE OR LESS, FOR THE ANNEXATION KNOWN AS THE LEVIN ANNEXATION BY DAVID J. ROBINSON, AGENT FOR THE PETITIONERS

- Request to move to full Council

Haire – This is the first step from the city's perspective in annexation proceedings. The applicant has filed to annex 87.4 acres of land on the north side of Bixby Rd and south of Winchester Pike. They filed that petition with the Franklin County Commissioners on January 5th, which was delivered to us on January 11th. We have 20 days to pass this services resolution according to the Ohio annexation laws. This resolution essentially will provide the following services upon annexation. That's water, sanitary sewer, refuse, police, and road maintenance upon the acceptance of the annexation. I mentioned this is something that Ohio annexation law requires and Ohio Revised Code essentially stating the services that will be provided. It's not committing us to anything beyond saying that we have the capacity to serve this property with services. It will return to Council again after conducting hearings at the Franklin County Commissioners Office. It will return to us again in the future for acceptance of the annexation.

Milliken – To be clear, this is not tied to any specific development for the moment. This is just for services, utility services.

Haire – This is stating the services that will be provided. But Council did previously approve a pre-annexation agreement and an economic development agreement for this parcel.

Milliken – You said the one that we already passed, that was a pre-annexation or a development?

Haire – Correct. There is a development agreement and a pre-annexation agreement that Council approved last fall. With the Levins who own this property and with Stotan Industrial who's proposing to develop this property?

Amos – Is the annexation tied to anything else? At this point in time, you're just considering the annexation? Not applying for a variance on zoning? Are those two tied?

Haire – Correct. This is the annexation only at this time. They have a pending application before Planning and Zoning Commission to consider the rezoning of that parcel. It was scheduled to be on last Monday evening but we had to cancel the meeting for lack of quorum.

Amos – So to provide services to this property, there is no additional cost to the city at this time for installation or any such?

Haire – Correct.

Ward – Is the annexation tied to the zoning? So if the zoning doesn't go through, the annexation wouldn't happen?

Haire – They would have that right in their pre-annexation agreement for detachment.

Shea – Can we get a basketball court?

Haire – Inside one of the buildings?

Shea – Absolutely.

Amos – Yes.

Haire – I'm not sure how that would work.

Shea – I'm sure how it would work. I did the math today. You only need about 9,000 sq feet to pull it off. That call was the guy I called earlier. We'll see what happens. I think it would help our community. I think it would be a nice blessing. I think it would be a sign of good faith on the part of these folks that you're working with to develop.

Haire – We do not permit recreational uses within limited manufacturing districts.

Shea – Well the good thing is we can do some variances.

Boggs – Well, there would be a number of zoning issues that would arise with that. I'd be happy to sit down with you and Lucas to discuss what you have in mind.

Haire – This is annexation. It has nothing to do with zoning at this time.

A motion was made by Milliken, seconded by Amick to move RES-22-004 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 – Milliken, Amick, Amos, Clark, Shea, Walker, Ward

ORD-22-004

Finance

AN ORDINANCE TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE REPRESENTATION IN THE FRANKLIN COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT WITH THE FRANKLIN COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER ON

BEHALF OF THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER MAYORS COURT FOR THE
CALENDAR YEAR 2022

- Request to move to full Council

Jackson – *This is an annual contract. If someone comes in to our Mayor’s Court and they would like a public defender, it’s not something we offer here. It has to go to the county level. They do have to meet certain income requirements in order to qualify for that public defender but we are also required to pay for that public defender. So, this contract is with the Franklin County Public Defender for the cost of those services. This contract, on average, we spend maybe \$3,000 a year.*

Clark – *This is a routine thing we do every year.*

Jackson – *Correct.*

Amos – *Out of curiosity, is Mayor’s Court still being done virtually?*

Jackson – *Mayor’s Court was never done virtually. The only thing we’ve doing virtually are the prisoners.*

Boggs – *Prisoner arraignment.*

Amick – *If I read correctly in the documentation that was provided, this was about a \$23 per case request. Is that correct?*

Jackson – *Correct. We are billed on a quarterly basis.*

A motion was made by Shea, seconded by Amos to move ORD-22-004 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 – Shea, Amos, Amick, Clark, Milliken, Walker, Ward

F. Old/New Business

Clark – *We have NorthPoint Development is here to present on the project on the Schacht farm.*

Brent Miles, NorthPoint Development – *I am one of the owners and founders of NorthPoint Development. I am based in Kansas City, which is where our headquarters is. As you heard, previously we know there has been concern, questions. We obviously are before you tonight with a revised plan and to specifically address the concerns that we heard at the Planning Commission about traffic and infrastructure improvements. I’ll go through this for the benefit of you and the audience as well. A little bit of history. We purchased and developed two buildings off of Bixby Rd. We purchased that ground from the City of Canal Winchester and built two industrial buildings. We are under contract, we have not closed, on the parcel that’s under question tonight where we could build two additional buildings. As you know, the items before you tonight, there are two – annexation and rezoning. Obviously, this is not annexed and with that comes the rezoning afterwards. It’s important to us obviously that we listened. What you will see tonight and hear tonight from me, and I’ve talked to many of you personally, is to hear your concerns to see that we could present a revised plan that could come before you. I know I don’t live here. I know you have residents. I know you’re elected. But I do truly think that with the development of our first two buildings, this is the appropriate land use, the highest and best use on this piece of property. I know you have a big debate in your city. What does your city become in the future? What is Canal? You have a great downtown. You have residential. You have BrewDog. I think you could all be proud of that. And I know that there’s lots of applications before you. I’m not saying that industrial development – I know there’s a sense of you don’t want to become Groveport or some of these other things. I’ve heard that from the community and I understand that. I don’t live here. I don’t vote here. But I do want to invest here. I want to invest my personal money. I want to invest my personal money. And I want to invest \$90 million into your community. I’m not saying all applications are appropriate. I can only talk about my two buildings and my application and my proposal and my plan. I want to be clear about that. I’m not tone death to what’s going on in this community and the choices that you all have to make. I’m not tone deaf to that at all. But at the same time, I think investing \$90 million developing two new state of the art buildings where we just developed two others, you’ll hear me later, I have a prospect in hand, depending on how tonight goes, to sign a lease on these buildings. Take both of them for their regional headquarters that would create 300 jobs and \$14 million in payroll, which of course has a direct benefit to the city because of your city income tax. Public may not be aware of all the plan changes so I’m going to encapsulate them all in this slide. As you can see, since we went through Planning Commission, the plan has changed. The plan has gotten smaller. We’ve reduced both buildings. While not required, we are prosing an 8-foot berm along 33 and Bixby Rd. We know this is the gateway into your city. It’s one of the first things that people see. We want this done in a manner – again, code doesn’t require it. Our first two buildings didn’t have it which I’ll talk about here in a bite, but I think that we’ve sized an appropriate berm. That’s what’s shrunk the development as well as screening and fencing along the top. We want the interchange to happen at 33 and*

Bixby. We're willing to donate just shy of 7 acres there to allow that interchange to happen in the future. In addition, I'll talk about it here in just a little bit, we're also throwing in, and we will do this via agreement, our money and our lobbying efforts to partner with that to get that interchange moved up in the time frame so that development of that interchange can happen not 10 or 15 years in the future but can happen sooner. We've invested over \$1 billion into the state of Ohio. We can bring our power and our lobbying ability to team with you, as well as fund some of those pre-studies that are required to get that interchange moved in the timeframe for implementation. Last but not least, we've committed to roadway improvements. Hearing just what you heard from the Planning Commissioners, hearing what we heard from staff, and you all, that we're committing to \$2.8 million in road improvements that weren't in the previous plan. We'll walk through those here briefly. I think it's easiest to go clockwise – A, B, C, D, E. For those of you that have interacted with me, we originally proposed four areas of improvement. Councilmember Shea, I will specifically address D when we get to your question about Rager R. Section A – this is the widening of Bixby Rd. Obviously this goes to the intersection. This is a cost of about \$1 million. We are cooperating with other developers and other proposed uses around us. Overall, you have a lot of applications. Not just development. You have gas stations, residential units. We took a holistic report at the direction of your staff and your team to say how do we look at all the traffic studies so there's a seamless integration. It's not just the traffic that's there today. It's the traffic of the future. The traffic of full build out. Everything you're seeing ahead of you, some of them weren't required by traffic study but we're throwing at it, in some places, to solve problems that exist today. Section B – this is the improvement of Bixby and Winchester Pike. This is a cost of \$500,000. This is an additional turn lane. We're working with the county on this now. We're looking at it's level of service. Right now, with no development, and I misspoke last week, I said it was a level service D, right now with no development is a level service C, and with our improvement, it remains a C. What we're doing is throwing money at this so that that pass through, that thoroughfare, remains at the same level of service that you have today. There's signalization. There's a turn lane. There's lot of little nuances that happen in that 160-page study. But in very short form, basically adding improvements so that we don't decrease the level of service that you have today. C – This is Winchester Pike and Gender Road. As all of you, this is an area that needs to be studied. This is under the control of Columbus. Lots of developments are feeding into this part of the infrastructure. There would be a pro-rata share that we'd be required. We're saying that we'll go above and beyond our pro-rata share and that we'll simply put \$500,000 into the pot to improve that intersection. We know other funds are going to be coming in. We're going to be working on grant funds. We're going to be working with City of Columbus, county. Lots of people here but let's go ahead and throw \$500,000 into the pool even though our pro-rata share isn't that. Let's go ahead and throw \$500,000 in the pool because we know that is of concern to everybody, is this intersection at Winchester Pike and Gender Road.

Shea – That particular detail. That's \$500,000 that goes into a pool. Where does that go? Does the city hold that in trust? Is there an escrow fund for promised improvements? How does that work?

Miles – I'll let somebody who has letters after their name probably answer that. But I think that this is a development agreement, that we would put this in our agreement with you and it's probably a pass-through from us into the pool with whoever you partner with. I don't know if that's a tri-party agreement with Columbus or Franklin County. I don't know what the government side of it is. But you could hold me into the development agreement or the incentives agreement to pass it to you so that you can use it.

Haire – We've got a number of studies that we're working on with the City of Columbus on this intersection currently. So we're having those discussions currently. We have another called scheduled for the 21st to discuss this. But Columbus, the developer that's developing just southwest portion of this intersection with 8 out parcels and 500,000 square feet of industrial space and 144 apartments, what they're looking at are the improvements that have been identified as part of their project, and they're putting a cost estimate to those. That's how we'll get to proportional share. So every, in our case, this development, the potential for Stotan development, the potential for Sheetz, all those would be contributing to those funds based on their proportional share of traffic.

Miles – And I'll be clear with if my proportionate share isn't \$500,000, I don't care. I'm putting \$500,000 in. If my proportional share is over, which I don't think that there's a possibility that that's the case, so be it. I'll pay my proportionate share. But at minimum, you get \$500,000.

Shea – That was more of a function of where does the money actually go. Does it sit in your accounts waiting on some sort of mechanism? Does it get disbursed to the city and therefore they have control of it and can use it for the purpose that was stated and hold it in escrow rather than have to come chase it down later? A half million dollars is a lot of money.

Miles – What I would suggest, however you want to legally do it, I will just pay that in addition to my building permit or however you want to trigger. We've accounted for that \$500,000 in my budget. It's spent. However you want to get it from me upon approval, upon signing of the agreements or permit issuance, it doesn't matter to me.

Clark – Mr. Haire, I want to clarify. The statement you made of the outparcels and the 500,000 square foot warehouse, that's not in the city of Canal Winchester, correct?

Haire – No, it's a city of Columbus rezoning application. The developer has submitted the traffic study as part of that application.

Shea – Where is that at exactly? Is that just north on Bixby?

Haire - It's the southwest portion of this intersection. Everything southwest of the C there. So everything north of Wyler Chevrolet, around the car wash that's there.

Miles – Section D, this is the new D. It got brought up on several, and it got brought up tonight by you Mr. Shea, which is Rager Road. We've had preliminary conversations with the church. I think the question was asked of Lucas if he had them. I'm not sure if he had, but we've had preliminary conversations with the church directly. We've also been working with the County as they own the right-of-way here about cul-de-sacing this. While it's not included tonight because I didn't think of it before tonight, if it's a worry about maintenance or something on Rager Road, I would just say our \$2.8 million goes up because we'll mill and overlay it. We can do that, if we get our project, we'll mill and overlay Rager Road if that works for city and add that into our agreement as well. I know you're annexing. From those of you that don't know, I came from the public side so I was also concerned in annexation what I was inheriting when I annexed. If that's a concern of yours, that's something that we can add into our agreement as well. I just hadn't thought of it before tonight. Again, cul-de-sacing here prevents that turn movement on 33, which I know, I've heard from a couple people, school buses and safety, and all kinds of things. I think getting this, helps overall. It doesn't really affect our project but if we're doing it with our, we can easily add that into our work as well. And then E is the improvements to Bixby and US 33. And again, this is \$600,000 of improvement plus the \$100,000 I talked about and again, I don't know how you want to do it and transact it, but \$100,000 for the city. I've done interchanges all over the county. I've done them at the state level, at the federal level, and I will just tell you that spending \$100,000 and getting the table set on studies, environmental studies, all the things that have to happen, if you can take those things out of ODOT's hands and you can do them yourselves, control your destiny, you control your fate. You control your fate better. Let us help you control your fate better at getting the 33 and Bixby interchange moved up. Getting it on the STP, getting it on the TRAC program, all those things. In summary, I think we've got a proven track record. We do what we say we're going to do. One comment I didn't address in the plan is improving landscaping on 1 and 2. We tried something new when we did that. I don't know if it aesthetically worked out like we thought from a landscaping perspective. So, you have our commitment. We'll go back in in that detention area south of 1 and 2, we'll go back and improve those. I think we have a great track record here in the city. I think the design of the buildings, these are built for the long term. They're 40-foot clear truck courts. We're building the building of the future, not the past here. We've revised the plan. We've decreased it. We've added the berm. We've added the landscaping. We've added the fencing. We've thought into how the interchange will interact in Bixby, getting that berm because that's what people will see when they come off 33. We've moved our driveways so we're not interacting with that interchange. We're following ODOT standards and moving our interchange away from the 33 corridor, right, so that we could push it down. We're preventing that left turn from a signage perspective, and improvements perspective. We've committed to \$2.8 million plus road improvements tonight. I think the plan is better. I think the infrastructure's better. I don't know, because I didn't go back through the Planning Commission and ask them, but from what I heard, these were the points of concern. I think we tried hit those five points of concern by not just engineering but throwing money at that and throwing improvements at that. Infrastructure is important. Not only are we going to help fund, besides the \$100,000, you have full access to our team, our lobbying team. I think we have a meeting set with ODOT in the next couple of weeks where this is a top priority for them. Making sure that the understand that a developer that's invested a billion dollars in their state wants to invest more and helping you get that interchange faster. Pending tonight's approval, we've secured a tenant. We don't get this, they don't come. I think knowing the jobs, knowing the payroll, knowing what they do. This is a regional headquarters for them. I think that's an important factor. I don't want to build this building in Columbus but I'm going to develop these two buildings. I want to do it in Canal Winchester. I want to be a good partner in doing that. With that, I'll answer any questions that you may have. Hopefully you can see that we've listened, presented a revised plan, a better plan. A plan with more infrastructure and with that, I'll close.

Amick – If I looked at the elevations from our previous discussion with the latest landscaping improvements, the elevation diagram would imply that I would not be able to see the dock doors of these facilities from route 33, is that correct?

Miles – That's right. I think we have an elevation. What we did there, obviously you can't hide a 40-foot building. As we know, in parts of the country like Ohio and Kansas and Missouri, it's flat terrain. What we look at specifically there is trying to get that berm height high enough that we block the truck, the docks. That's why we specifically, we shrunk the buildings down, that way we can get

that 8 foot berm and plantings on top. To answer your question succinctly, yes, that's correct.

Amos – Mr. Miles, I'm not gonna lie. I called Lucas this morning and I asked him to put this back through Planning and Zoning. They were the originally ones to deny this application and I felt their reasons were valid. Mr. Haire gave me the, reiterated the fact that your tenant has a timeframe as well that they're dealing with. So I made calls to our Planning and Zoning Commission today and I talked through your entire packet that we reviewed the other day with you. It did address the majority of their concerns and I was able to have some deep conversations with them. I will tell you that they wished you would have come back to them and had these conversations with them. They felt like there were no options at the time presented. I do appreciate the fact that you've at least looked. You did take my request seriously when I asked for a better traffic study and you did consider a lot of the things. And Planning and Zoning did, from my conversations with several of the members, did say that this would have addressed many of their concerns going into this. I would have liked for it to go back through Planning and Zoning just so that they could have the opportunity to dive into it like we were able to. Now I look at some of the changes you're requesting and that you're committing to. I do realize that these are not necessarily city roads. The deceleration lane onto the freeway. The working the roads that are in Madison Township. How feasible are these? I realize that you're committed to the money. But how feasible is it to get these through so that they're not just false promises that we can bring to fruition?

Miles – So now you've asked the tough question so I'm going to find someone smarter than me. That's Marc on my team. Marc and our traffic engineers. Marc Gloyeske is here tonight for that reason. Marc, I'll maybe have you address this specifically because I know you've been interacting with those other agencies.

Marc Gloyeske, NorthPoint – Specifically addressing the turn lane on 33, that was a request of ODOT when we turned in our initial traffic study. We didn't meet the warrants there. We're about 17 turning movements per day short of meeting the warrants for that turn lane. They felt from a safety standpoint, just allowing people to get over and slow down and make a safe turn, it was warranted. When revised our traffic study, we committed to installing that turn lane. They want it. They know it's coming. It's a simple matter of permitting it and building it.

Miles – What might be helpful for you and the audience, and it would be helpful for me, if it's alright with you, let's go back to A. Can we go through them – A, B, C, D and say this requires so and so's approval. We've talked to them. We haven't talked to them. I just think that that might be clearer for the group. I might just keep it on this big slide here so you can see all five and we'll just go clockwise starting with A.

Gloyeske – So A, again that's the widening of Bixby Road. That road will become a city of Canal Winchester road for the most part. We will work with your staff to design that, permit it, and build it. Intersection B, that is going to be both county and city. We have met with the county on several occasions. We actually have another meeting with the county and the city of Columbus, as well as the city of Canal Winchester, on Friday of this week to talk about both B and C. Again, B is the turn lane for Bixby and Winchester Pike. We will address that, but we will permit it. One thing we actually found out today from the county is that they're considering larger improvements at that intersection, the B intersection. We may be contributing to that, rather than building the turn lane. They may go ahead and build the entire intersection themselves with our contribution of that \$500,000. That's intersection B. We're going to work through that on Friday when we have a conversation with them. C is the same thing. That's a city of Columbus intersection. We've been in constant communication with their engineering staff regarding improvements and the study and signal timing for that intersection. We have that meeting set up for this Friday the 21st to discuss how that's going to be implemented. We're going to contribute the money, as Brent said, minimum of \$500,000. The thing that we want to do is make sure that that gets built and our \$500,000 goes towards that intersection. We're going to work with them to understand the ground rules, understand the timing of those improvements, and make sure we follow through and get those improvements done. We want our money to go to something that's going to help both you guys as well as our tenant when it gets built. Intersection D, that's going to be the county. That's Madison Township. As Lucas mentioned, the county actually maintains the roads and handles the roadwork for the township. We've had this conversation about the cul-de-sac, intersection B, previously. They're in favor of it. They actually already own the right-of-way there for it. We actually don't have any right-of-way issues. There's no utility issues that are in the way. That's going to be a simple matter of permitting it and implementing the improvements at that intersection. That will require a permit with ODOT as well, just to cut off Rager Road at 33. They were in those initial conversations and they are in support of that as well. And intersection E, I've already addressed. That was a request of ODOT, so we'll just work through their permitting process to get that implemented. And those will all be built as part of our construction project on site. You'll see us, assuming approval, you'll see us on site moving dirt. When the weather cooperated and permitted, we'd go out and make these infrastructure improvements.

Miles – They would be done before we finished any building.

Amos – I know there's an ordinance in front of us that did lock in some of those changes. We'll have to review that more later as we start going further into this. I know we're talking about the two buildings that we have that are currently under, and the previous ones you're committing to adding maybe, potentially beautifying those up a little bit.

Miles – I made that commitment to Mr. Shea in a meeting, so we add that. WE didn't know how that would be done in this context because two other buildings, we can put it in writing. But we're doing those improvements. Those would be on, if you can see my mouse, it would be in this area.

Amos – The retention pond area. Is the, and this may be completely untrue, but building 1 and 2, is there something changing with how those buildings are running that is going to cause an increase in traffic coming in and out of them that we need to consider? Is there something changing with whether they become a major hub or a minor hub?

Miles – No ma'am, I don't know what that – not to my knowledge.

Haire – Ms. Amos, I believe you're discussing building 1. The tenant in that space has only built out half the space and so they'll be growing into the rest of the space.

Miles – Yes, they leased it all. They occupied half as they waited for another operation to relocate to that, but our study takes that into account.

Amos – Ok, thank you. I think the misconception is that's become a major hub with several – I just want to make sure I understood that one.

OTH-22-001

Roebing Development Co. Basil-Western Rd Development Presentation (ORD-22-002 and ORD-22-003)

Craig Moncrief, Plank Law Firm – I represent Roebing Development. I'm also here with Adam Hemmer, who is the Vice President of Real Estate Development with Hemmer Companies. I won't go through too much as I assume most discussion will flow through him. Want to just review things just one more time, as far as the property goes. Once again proposing to develop two industrial buildings, light manufacturing district at around 190,000 square feet and 390,000 square feet. Wanted to bring a couple of visuals for you here today. First of all, we have the zoning map of Canal Winchester. I apologize, it's a little difficult to see from a distance but right here in red is the property which shows Hemmer's relationship with the rest of the city, the heart of the city over here. Obviously, you've got 33 which makes an ideal corridor for this type of development and easy access to 33. Here is just a satellite view, obviously the area in the red is the property, to give you an idea as far as the frontage, kind of the shape of the property itself in relation to 33. I know at the last meeting, there was a request for architectural renderings. This came in actually yesterday. This is a rendering, I think there is an image too, I gave it to Lucas, but this is a rendering of what one of the buildings would look like. And with that in mind, Adam is there anything you'd like to add?

Adam Hemmer, Roebing Development – I don't have anything specific. Just very happy to be here. Very happy to be working in Canal Winchester. Look forward working with you guys. I'm available for any questions.

Shea – Who are you?

Hemmer – I'm the developer. Adam Hemmer with Roebing Development. We're based in Fort Mitchell, KY. I live in Cincinnati.

Shea – You have my sympathies. You're walking into a very big hornet's nest right now. There's not much – you have my sympathies.

Shea – Mr. Chairman, I would like permission for Nick Roberts, Treasurer of the Canal Winchester Local School District to speak. He also serves as the JRD Treasurer and also can comment on abatements. I'd like to invite him up with your permission, please. Mr. Roberts, thank you for taking time out to come join us this evening. We appreciate your dedication to the community and the school district.

Nick Roberts, Treasurer, Canal Winchester Local Schools – You're welcome. Hopefully I can help out a little bit. What do you want to talk about first, abatements or CWJRD?

Shea – Let's do JRD real quick. Everybody's got a copy of the financials. Wanted everybody to have a copy of that because it's important.

Roberts – Just to give you a run down, CWJRD was formed by the city and the school years ago. And the school actually just took over

the financial records October 1st of 2020. They had a private accountant that was handling that. We met, I think 3 years ago, and there was some hardships with CWJRD so we all brainstormed on what we could do to make sure CWJRD was going to survive long-term. The school, myself, said ok, we'll become the fiscal agent to help save \$30, \$35,000 from the accounting side of things. And the city has recently dedicated, I forget the exact dollar amount, but it was in the \$87 to \$90,000 range if I'm not mistaken, which allowed CWJRD to add a director position which was very well needed. They were operating with one full time employee which was very difficult. At the current time, with the donation of the city and the director aside, the CWJRD is looking to break even this year. They've slimmed their programs down to make it more of a youth type level. COVID really hurt CWJRD over the last twelve months, to say the least, with not being able to have any participation or any programs going for what, I think 8 months, Ms. Amos? 9 months, with no program revenue. Things came back in the spring of this year. I don't think anything happened last winter. And just from January to June, they collected almost \$100,000 in revenues. If you have any direct questions, I'd love to answer those. But the school, I spoke with the school, a couple of our board members, we're definitely open to continuing a partnership and forming a partnership. Whether that may lead the district to contributing funds to help CWJRD or just continue field access and those type of things. Any direct questions relating to CWJRD?

Amos – I don't have questions, I have plans. But it's fine.

Shea – I just wanted to get the financials on the record for everybody. But hopefully we can continue to see the growth and the revenue and enrollment and give the youth some programs that are fulfilling to them. Thanks for speaking about that and thanks for helping us save \$30 to \$40,000 a year in accounting fees by taking on the financial agent. It's much appreciated.

Roberts – Yeah, and the new fields over at the park, once those are completed, I think will really benefit not only the community, the CWJRD. I think we're looking to have something going on with our baseball and softball teams as well. I think overall, the park's going to be a big factor for the community and having field access. Because you can never have enough gym and field access for all the programming and participation that's having.

Shea – We could use a couple more gyms.

Roberts – We did add one.

Shea – You did, and we appreciate you sharing it with us. You and I had a conversation on the telephone about abatements. Because, in my opinion, there's a lot of misinformation about abatements out there. One of my concerns not only as a citizen and a council person, but as a father in this town who has children in the school district, is that we continue to safeguard the quality of our schools. Make sure that people are paying their fair share when it comes to commercial development. And the truth of the matter is you, you get more tax revenue from a commercial development. Let's take this Schacht deal here, for example. When they abate the building that's built, the land is still taxed at its value that it was sold at, correct?

Roberts – Yeah, it would go towards the TIF piece of the project, typically. Usually there's some sort of infrastructure that goes along with the project.

Shea – And does the school continue to receive – if this project goes through, will the school receive additional revenue, less revenue, no revenue, what will happen?

Roberts – I'm not sure with these new buildings, but I know with building 1 and building 2, we did a revenue sharing agreement with them and the city to hold the somewhat whole. Our largest abatement in our district, because we sit in Franklin County and Fairfield County, our largest abatement, we lose about \$230,000 per year. With the last two agreements we completed for these types of projects, we're looking at \$100-\$150,000 in revenue sharing agreements. When you take that into consideration, it's a lot better than not having anything as far as revenue. Our total abatement in our district is almost \$915,000 that we would have received on taxes. The revenue sharing agreements are definitely welcome by the school to make sure we are receiving some sort of revenue from those projects.

Haire – Mr. Shea, in the last agreement we did with Molto Canal Winchester, who is in the process of developing two industrial buildings adjacent to Canal Pointe, in that agreement the school district is basically given a payment in lieu of taxes where they'll receive \$100,000 annually as an offset for the real estate tax exemption. Then they'll receive 25% of the income taxes that are generated out of those buildings. And that's for the term of the abatement. So, for the fifteen years that those buildings are abated. They'd also receive the land value increase. That land sold for more than \$35,000 an acre. Previously that was in CAUV so it was paying about \$10,000 per year in real estate taxes. Their real estate taxes would likely go to somewhere around \$75,000 a year that they'd be paying on the land value increase. They would receive \$75 for that. They'd receive no less than \$100,000 in a PILOT, which is an offset for the exemption, and then they would receive 25% of the income taxes that come in there. So depending on the company that comes in, in the case that was shown earlier, 300 employees, \$14 million in payroll, they would receive an additional

\$70,000 in income taxes. That project probably around \$340,000, right., is that right? \$240,000.

Shea – I don't know the exact sale price of what the Schacht property is in contract for. I've heard rumors and speculation but if it's \$7 million, you and I did the math, just the millage for the district alone was what \$104,250, I think, on the new market value on the land.

Roberts – That's correct.

Shea – I just want to make sure that the public is clear that yes, there are abatements on the buildings that are built. But these are not total lose situations because they do increase the revenue coming not only into the city, but into the school district, into the parks, into the zoo, into the libraries, into every other multiple levy we pay in Franklin County.

Roberts – Correct. Mr. Haire's done a nice job of making sure the schools are taken care of. I know in the last two agreements we've done that and that was the first ones that's ever happened in Canal Winchester city, as far as having a revenue sharing agreement in place to help the schools. We've tried working with some of the other abated properties that don't give us anything and it's really hard to get any type of funding or donations out of those companies. So, it's nice that the ones that are coming in are trying to be a part and take of the schools and be a part of the community.

Haire – Any future agreements are negotiated with the school district and with city council and with the developer. That would be part of any agreement. You can always change the numbers in terms of the share, the term.

Shea – I'm just a rookie. I'm just trying to make sure I'm understanding the lay of the land.

Haire – To be clear, we do have an existing tax increment financing district on Bixby Road and we do intend to extend that to any properties that are adjacent to that district. What that does is that allows us to capture that incremental increase in value and we basically non-school TIFs which means the school district is made whole. They receive the exact amount of revenue they would have received but for that TIF being in place. We redirect the other taxing entity's revenue that they would have received and put that back into infrastructure. The idea there is that as Bixby Road has an interchange put in place that we would have funding available to assist with either constructing the interchange or upgrading the roads in the area that would need upgrading because an interchange is being constructed.

Shea – This is the most complicated process I think I've encountered. Is there like a flowchart that I can look at that would explain to me how this works? There's a lot of variables there. If you do A and then C and then D and then X. It's all over the place.

Haire – I'd be happy to put one together for you.

Clark – Mr. Roberts, if we turn this down tonight, the zoning, and let's say the city of Columbus annexes this in a month, which I'm sure they will, what revenue at that point would you get if Columbus annexes and Columbus builds the building? What revenue would the school district get from that at that point?

Roberts – That would get tricky because we are a part of a Columbus agreement to where they can't extend out so it would really depend on if it fell under that agreement or not and I'm not sure if it does at this point. I'd have to look at it and see.

Clark – I'm pretty sure it doesn't.

Roberts – Probably not so we'd lose and it would go to Columbus City Schools. But from a development standpoint, if you're going to ask the schools what you would rather development, we would say commercial and industrial over residential. Obviously with bringing more and more kinds into the district from a servicing standpoint.

Haire – Also, to be clear, the Schacht property is in both Groveport Schools and Canal Winchester schools. So, they'll need to be separate agreements with each district.

Shea – I thought we were taking all that land into Canal Winchester so we didn't have to share it with Groveport or Columbus.

Haire – With annexation, it doesn't change the school district boundaries unless it's with the city of Columbus as part of their WIN-WIN agreement.

G. Adjournment @ 7:02 p.m.

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

Yes 7 – Milliken, Shea, Amick, Amos, Clark, Walker, Ward