

Canal Winchester

*City Hall
Council Chambers
45 East Waterloo Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

July 5, 2022

5:30 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 6 – Amick, Amos, Clark, Milliken, Shea, Walker

C. Also In Attendance

Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire, Amanda Jackson

D. Reports of City Staff**E. Request for Council Action****RES-22-023**

Mayor

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE LABOR DAY FESTIVAL COMMITTEE TO OPERATE THE ANNUAL "CANAL WINCHESTER LABOR DAY FESTIVAL" ON THE VARIOUS STREETS AND SIDEWALKS OF THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Amick, seconded by Shea to move RES-22-023 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 4 – Amick, Shea, Amos, Milliken

Abstain 2 – Clark, Walker

Ebert – This is a resolution very similar to the Blues & Ribfest a month or so ago. We do this every year. It just sets the boundaries for the Labor Day Festival, what they can use, what they can't use, and what the hours are going to be.

Amick – Are there any changes?

Ebert – Not really. It's all pretty much the same.

RES-22-024

Development

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TAX INCENTIVE REVIEW COUNCIL FOR THE FRANKLIN COUNTY TAX ABATEMENT AREAS WITHIN THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Shea, seconded by Amos to move RES-22-024 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Shea, Amos, Clark, Milliken, Walker, Amick

Haire – Annually the City is required to hold a tax incentive review Council that is chaired by the county auditor. We held that meeting on June 22nd. That's to review every property that's receiving any type of real estate tax incentive in the City and the agreements associated with those. There are 19 properties that are currently receiving a real estate tax incentive in Canal Winchester CRA #1. They're listed on your agenda there of those 19 properties. There's a report associated with that. There are 801 total jobs. The total abated value of property is \$30,666,500 and there are \$905,911.36 in forgone taxes. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have in regards to any of those properties.

Shea – Do we know what payroll revenue we've generated off of these abated properties?

Haire – On these specific they're what's called a pre-1994 CRA so there's no specific commitments for jobs

or payroll. The only requirement that they have is that they're current on their taxes and the properties are being maintained.

Shea – I understand but can we identify these locations by their address and know what payroll revenues were receiving from them?

Haire – Mrs. Jackson could likely do that, yes.

Shea – Is that something we track Mrs. Jackson?

Jackson – No, we do not.

Shea – I think as we continue to go forward with the contentiousness of development and abatements that would be nice to see some numbers in terms of payroll revenue tied to these abatements that we've given out over time. If that is something you guys could do that would be really helpful.

Clark – Before we proceed to vote, I just had a question for Mr. Boggs. I serve on the TIRC Committee and review these with the committee. Do I need to recuse myself?

Boggs – No you do not need to do that since you're serving in your capacity as a City official.

Haire – Prior to that I'd like to review the rest of the reports as well. That's just CRA #1. So, the second one is the Route 33 CRA. We currently have one agreement in the Route 33 CRA. The current is stag industrial. That's for two industrial buildings on Winchester Blvd. The total commitment there was a \$22 million investment to create 80 jobs with \$2.4 million in payroll by December 31st of 2023. As of the end of 2021 there was a total investment of \$36,281,000 in real estate there. There were 414 jobs created at that site with a payroll of \$9,935,945. Looking at that Mr. Shea that produced \$198,718 in income taxes. They also pay a \$40,000 PILOT payment to the Canal Winchester Schools which was paid and then the City shares 25% of the income taxes collected with the school district. Which would be just under \$50,000 in that case. The next agreement is with NorthPoint Development or MP Canal Winchester, this is for two industrial buildings on Bixby Road. This is in the Route 33 North CRA. It is the only agreement that we have in that CRA district. The agreement there was that they would invest \$30 million, create \$2.4 million in payroll and 80 new jobs by December 30th of 2021. They've invested \$36 million in real estate there. There were 152 jobs created with the payroll of \$6,205,551. I will note on both these agreement areas, those were for partial year occupancy so those weren't occupied. Any of these buildings weren't occupied for the entire year so we're projecting much higher revenue and job numbers on each of those as we move forward into future years. That agreement again, they pay a \$40,000 PILOT payment to the Canal Winchester School District which was paid. The total income taxes received on that parcel were \$124,111.00 which just over \$31,000 would be shared with the Canal Winchester Schools and 25% of that. We also review TIF districts. The first TIF that was reviewed, the Bixby Road TIF, that was a TIF that was created to address infrastructure needs along Bixby Road with development that's happening in that area. That TIF was established in 2020. There are no collections in that TIF yet because it has not been certified by the Ohio Department of Taxation yet. As of 2021 we have since received the certification so we'll start collecting revenue into that TIF fund. That's on the incremental value increase of the land as the land increases in values while these buildings are exempt from increased on the value of the building. There is no funds received and none expended out of that fund. The next is the Gender Road TIF. The Gender Road TIF was established in 2013. The first year of collections were 2015. This is probably our most active TIF fund. That fund balance at the end of 2021 was \$1,207,951. The funds received in 2021 was \$566,555. The total of

expenditures out of that fund were \$2,589,383. The balance owed is \$2,554,765. The reason you're seeing that is that there were some City infrastructure projects that were completed to extend utilities to Bixby Road and there was money advanced from the City into those funds. That's what you're seeing is those advances in and expenditures out and so as funds come into this TIF, the City will be reimbursing itself for those expenditures. There's a similar outstanding balance for Hanners Park. The City acquired Hanners Park and as funds are available we've been paying ourselves back for that acquisition.

Shea – I have a question on the NorthPoint TIF. When I'm looking at the abatement form, when it says date investment completed August 13th 2021, is that when the final occupancy was given? They started moving in maybe in September so we only got four months of revenue off of that property.

Haire – Correct.

Shea – So, we are looking about a third of revenue.

Haire – One tenant space wasn't occupied the entire year of 2021 which is occupied now. There's 80 plus people working in that facility that aren't reflecting these job numbers either. So, yes, you'll see exponential increase in both parcels.

RES-22-025

Development

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TAX INCENTIVE REVIEW COUNCIL FOR THE FAIRFIELD COUNTY TAX ABATEMENT AREAS WITHIN THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Amos, seconded by Amick to move RES-22-025 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 5 – Amos, Amick, Clark, Milliken, Walker

Abstain 1 – Shea

Haire – Again, this is the same type of review, the tax incentive review Council for Fairfield County. The meeting was held on June 22nd. The tax incentive review Council voted to accept all the reports and continue the agreements. There are 13 properties in CRA #2 which are mostly in the Canal Pointe Industrial Park. As you can see from the report there are a total of 845 jobs located at properties receiving the exemption. Total annual taxes paid is \$150,194.76 and estimated tax savings are \$576,953.89. The first TIF is the Diley Road Tax Increment Finance District. This was adopted and created in 2007. It's a 30-year non-school TIF. All the TIF's we have in Canal Winchester are non-school TIF's. What that means is that the school district is made whole, they're given all the revenue that they would have received without taxes being paid. The way TIF's work is TIF's they're still paying the same amount they would pay in real estate taxes. They're just being redirected into the TIF fund. The school districts are made whole, the remaining taxing entities will increase. It goes into the TIF fund which is then used to handle infrastructure improvements within the TIF area. In the Diley Road TIF there was \$217,197 deposited in 2021, cumulatively \$1,993,245 The only expenses out of that TIF fund were \$2,721. Those are the county auditor's fees for collection and that's all that's been spent out of that fund since it was created. There's \$27,848 total spent out of that fund. We first collected revenue in that in 2011. We do have an outstanding liability with the Diley Ridge Medical Center, their Greenfield Development that is \$1,372,207. The next TIF is for Greengate that was created in 2017 and is again in 30-year 100% TIF as non-school. There were \$90,497 deposited there in 2021, cumulatively \$171,537. There were \$1,000 of expenses which would be auditor's fees. The outstanding liabilities that we have there is a TIF agreement with

Shrimangeshi LLC which was also done when we created the TIF in 2017. The outstanding liability for that is for the construction of the future Greengate Blvd. The total amount is \$980,000. That TIF agreement requires that the City construct the road prior to 2025, if not constructed by that time.

RES-22-026

Council

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A 42-INCH FENCE AT 70 EAST COLUMBUS STREET, FRANKLIN COUNTY AUDITOR PARCEL NUMBER 184-000057

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Shea, seconded by Amick to move RES-22-026 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Shea, Amick, Amos, Clark, Milliken, Walker

Clark – This is a Council discussion, does anyone want to start?

Shea – I will but there is a fly in the ointment. Not sure how to proceed here because Landmarks does not like the style that they want to go with for safety and that was a surprise I got tonight. I thought we were going to be able to approve everything.

Demkowicz – The fly in the ointment is we went to Landmarks at the last meeting because of the safety issues that were questioned regarding the spears at the top of the fence. The original fence had a cross bar across the top, over the spears. Landmarks said that they did not want the cross bar, they just wanted the spears. I have a safety concern over it. I know some of you expressed concerns and I'd like to know if I'm appealing to Council to allow us to put the bar on top for safety purposes.

Milliken – In this resolution the language states in the location and architectural style as previously approved by Landmarks Commission. Just for clarity sake, which fence was the style that was previously approved?

Demkowicz – With the spears but we did not request that. Landmarks told us that's what they would approve. They would not approve the fence with the bar across the top. That's kind of where we are because it's a safety issue as far as I'm concerned and other people. The original request was for the fence with the bar across the top. Landmarks said no.

Milliken – Mr. Boggs, passing this resolution tonight would only approve the fence without the bar?

Boggs – That is correct.

Shea – Unless we amend it.

Boggs – Right.

Clark – If we pass it with allowing him with the bar across the top, what legal authority at that point does Landmarks have?

Boggs – The architectural review process through Landmarks is a Council creative process so you would have the ability to supersede them by this resolution. It would trump Landmarks as you put it.

Amos – I've been to several Landmarks meetings and the one Mr. Demkowicz is talking about with the spears is the one they are asked for repeatedly. From everyone that comes forth, they ask for the same

fence with the spears on top. I do know we have people who have circumvented the system and put in the one without the fence which I believe there's a picture. Mr. Demkowicz, do you have a picture of the one that's approved by Landmarks and the one that you're looking to put in?

Clark – The person that put this in, did they just put it in without Landmarks approval?

Amos – That would be my guess. The one with the spears is always the one Landmarks recommended. I will tell you it's been brought up by almost every single person that walks in the room that this seems dangerous for as low as it is but it has not changed their opinion on it.

Demkowicz – As I told Landmarks at the last meeting, my neighbor got a Great Dane and it hasn't gone over the fence yet but as I told Landmarks I really don't want to wake up one morning and see a Great Dane bleeding out.

Amick – Did you have any conversation with your personal insurance company?

Demkowicz – Yes.

Amick – What was their advice or guidance to you?

Demkowicz – From a safety standpoint, the bar. I worked for an insurance company for 41 years. I can tell you that the bar is the answer.

Shea – When I said we had a fly in the ointment, I may need some more time here because changing the style and over doing Landmarks Commission is not something that we just wanted to do lightly.

Demkowicz – I understand. Please also understand our point. This started in April of last year and materiel and labor costs are going up on that fence to \$6,000. I willingly to invest in my property but I don't want to see the price tag keep rising up. I'm not pushing it. I don't want it done tonight, just let us know when it can be done because we'd like to get this finished.

Clark – What's the process Lucas at this point? Dates of when Landmarks meets next and when he would need to have any kind of change. If Landmarks isn't going to budge on this, if they've already seen this.

Haire – They've seen it multiple times. Mr. Demkowicz came to their last meeting which was last Monday night.

Clark – We either make a decision now whether if we want the bar or we want Landmarks decision.

Shea – I want the bar.

Clark – I'm fine with the bar.

Amos – I'll openly admit I struggle with trumping Landmarks because we have them there for a reason. I don't want to discredit them. Is it possible for Mr. Milliken serving as our President to be able to reach out and just have a conversation with them? I see the point of the bar. I'm totally on board with the bar to be honest. Especially in a property that runs along a sidewalk but I also feel like we need to at least do our due diligence and have that conversation with them.

Haire – I wasn't at the meeting last Monday evening. I know the discussion centered around the

Landmarks guidelines. Landmarks guidelines say that fences should be historic style so that's what guides them towards the pointed fence. I know of multiple other properties they've denied the same style. You're more than welcome to have this conversation but that's where their guidance is coming from.

Amos – How are those guidelines defined or reviews them?

Haire – Those are adopted by City Council. They're guidelines, they're not very prescriptive but last time I believe they were done was like 2012.

Amos – That would be my request is just for the President to reach out. Like I said, I'm totally on board with the bar. I think we need to do our due diligence. Mr. Milliken, is that something you'd be willing to do?

Milliken – Absolutely. Just to be clear, you're wanting me to meet with them and what's my goal here?

Amos – I don't want to circumvent them. I just want to make sure that they're in the loop and also to just let them know we will probably be reviewing the guidelines since it hasn't been done since 2012. I just want to have that conversation with their President.

Demkowicz – Can you tell me how long the review will last?

Amos – We meet again the first week of August. We will have a decision for you. That gives us plenty of time to have that conversation with them.

Demkowicz – That delays us another month which may possibly run the fence into September or October.

Amos – We're getting closer. I appreciate your patience whole heartedly.

Shea – I'd like to move this forward to full Council and vote on it tonight. That way if he wants to get started on the spear fence because the bureaucratic wheels don't move as fast as I think we all want them to sometimes.

Demkowicz – That's not how the fence is built. It either comes with the bar or without the bar.

Shea – I understand. I'm just trying to give you a way to get it done. It may not have a bar but with the bureaucratic time it's going to take, trying to give you a solution. It's not what you're looking for.

Milliken – If I could circle back to the beginning of this conversation. You'd mentioned moving it forward with the amendment of the new style. Would that solve this?

Shea – I'm okay with that.

Milliken – Mr. Boggs, would that solve this for now and we would still have that review discussion of the Landmarks guidelines?

Boggs – Yes that would solve it for this case. If Mr. Demkowicz has a picture of what that bar submittal is, I would just want to revise this resolution to reference that. I don't know what level of detail the permit needs to build that. It's simply referencing that picture as an exhibit would be enough.

Amos – Would we expect to see all the ones that were declined in front of us would be my question?

Walker – I'm in agreeance right now too. I'd like to add that with Mrs. Amos on this that I'd like to visit with Landmarks just for the simple fact we have denied and moving forward we'll be changing that for everyone. That kind of takes away from what Landmarks is doing here trying to keep the history.

Milliken – I'm okay with that. My only concern is that and maybe I'm misunderstanding things but meeting with Landmarks, I don't think we can get resolution and the guidelines reviewed and do what we want to do in the amount of time Mr. Demkowicz is hoping that we get things done. Am I reading that right?

Amos – My only thoughts are we should be having the conversation with them on why we're going to supersede them and to let them know that we'll be reviewing it.

Haire – There is an appeal process for Landmarks. Mr. Demkowicz did not appeal his approval. There is certain time frames you need to meet to appeal approval similar to Planning and Zoning cases you've seen in front of you that was not appealed.

Shea – I know we got a letter that got mishandled and lost for about a month that was addressed to this Council and that was part of the reason I wanted to move forward with this and solve this problem because there was an error on part of this City. I don't know if that letter is related to the appeals process or not.

Amick – Mr. Demkowicz, did you attend the Landmarks Commission meeting? I presume that you were there last week.

Demkowicz – Yes.

Amick – What was the conversation? Was it just a hard no because that's not what the Landmarks guidelines are or was there discussion and could you enlighten us on what some of that conversation might have been?

Demkowicz – There was some discussion. Basically, it was no.

Amick – To Mr. Haire's point, you had an opportunity to file an appeal. Have you done that or do you intend to? Is the time frame up for that Mr. Haire?

Haire – Yes. I believe the original approval took place early this year.

Boggs – My understanding is Mr. Demkowicz appeared at last Monday's Landmarks Commission meeting and asked to be recognized during old business so he didn't have an active application. The approval for the pointed type fence was given in that appeal period has run and so his options would be twofold in this case. Either to reapply the Landmarks Commission for the bar fence and then if they turn it down appeal to you as an administrative appeal or the second option which you're discussing tonight is a legislative override of that decision by Landmarks Commission.

Amos – Right now there is still the approval to put in the fence.

Boggs – Is approved with the speared points.

Shea – When was the original Landmarks hearing?

Boggs – Mr. Demkowicz, do you recall when you first got your approval for the style?

Demkowicz – August 24th, 2021.

Shea – What is the appeal period?

Haire – 10 days from approval. So, what was approved, the conditions were approved fence design is the Regis model 3131, 3 rails spear top and the fence be a maximum of 42 inches tall.

Amick – So again, you had an opportunity to file an appeal where it was clear that they were approving the speared fence.

Demkowicz – They approved the fence but we also had to appeal to Council to get the fence to be placed in the right-of-way.

Amick – There has been three issues. There is the right-of-way issue, then there was the fence height issue which is what we have on our docket this evening and now we have a third issue with the spears. Correct?

Demkowicz – Yes.

Amick – When they approved the spear top only at the Landmarks Commission meeting on Monday, you did not file an appeal or challenge that decision at that meeting.

Demkowicz – This has been such a process, it is hard to know when you should appeal, when you shouldn't appeal, who to appeal to, who to ask, who to talk to because we have been bouncing around from Planning and Zoning, from Landmarks, now Council. It's a fence.

Amick – I totally understand. Just the short time that I have been involved on this particular topic there has been three separate issues with this particular fence. I am trying to piece together how things keep changing. That's what I'm confused about.

Walker – It is just a fence but, in this case, if it would typically be back a couple more feet and then the spear wouldn't be any issue at all. Is there any possibility that it can move back and go with the spears?

Demkowicz – If you move the white wall back, I'll move the fence back. They both encroach onto the right-of-way. The wall is more dangerous than the fence because it only has a 2-foot sidewalk. Have a kid fall off and get struck by a car. There are a million scenarios that I can think about. Basically, it is a metal fence which we asked to originally have and then the safety bar across the top, which we weren't allowed to have. We had to have the spears then we were sent to Planning and Zoning. Planning and Zoning declined it because of the right-of-way issue then had to come to Council. This has been going on since last year. Now, were at the point where the 42-inches is here, can we do it? Now, Landmarks told us no about the safety bar.

Walker – Since this other has been thrown into this evening, we're just aware of this now. My personal thoughts are to have that conversation if it's not too late to have the conversation. Or does it have to appeal to go back through?

Boggs – There was no appealable decision made by Landmarks Commission last Monday. The appealable

decision occurred in August of 2021 before Mr. Demkowicz had the permission from City Council to maintain this fence in the right-of-way. There's not anything that Mr. Demkowicz can appeal administratively at this point. It's a question whether Council legislatively wants to say "despite the prior decision of Landmarks Commission we're going to grant you the ability to build the fence with the bar."

Amick – This might be a difficult question to answer but do we have any feel for how many of these wrought irons or of these fences that we have and around our downtown area?

Haire – We track that information. I can get it for you but I don't have any this evening.

Amos – Is everyone required a fence permit when they put it in?

Haire – Yes.

Amos – Is it required they turn in the Landmarks approval if there in downtown with the fence permit?

Haire – Yes, they are required to get a certificate of appropriateness and approval by Landmarks Commission.

Amos – That is my request is we need to have a conversation with them and follow up. I feel strongly about it.

Clark – Back to the dates, it would be August. When is the next Landmarks meeting?

Haire – The next Landmarks meeting would be the fourth Monday of this month.

Clark – So, it would be before our meeting. We can give them one more chance to look at this to make a change or not.

Mrs. Demkowicz – Can we just go ahead with the resolution that we have tonight?

Amos – So, that it will be approved for the 42-inches with the spiked?

Mrs. Demkowicz – Correct.

Amos – Is your request that we still talk with Landmarks?

Mrs. Demkowicz – No. We're done.

ORD-22-026
Development

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER TO ENTER INTO A COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AREA AGREEMENT WITH NORTHPOINT DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C., PURSUANT TO SECTION 3735.671 OF THE OHIO REVISED CODE; AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER TO ENTER INTO A RELATED SCHOOL COMPENSATION AGREEMENT WITH THE CANAL WINCHESTER LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT AND NORTHPOINT DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Amos, seconded by Milliken to move ORD-22-026 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Amos, Milliken, Shea, Walker, Amick, Clark

Haire - I'll talk about the next two ordinances kind of simultaneously they're both very similar in nature. The first ordinance would allow the Mayor to enter into the CRA agreement and a school compensation agreement with both the Canal Winchester and Groveport Madison School District. That would essentially entice the developer to build a 540,000 square foot building, \$25,650,000 on that construction. Committing to create 175 jobs with \$6,768,475 in the annual payroll. That is \$38,677 per year, per job. That is the average for production and logistics positions in central Ohio currently. That's how that number was derived. Each of these agreements would create that amount so one is for a 528,000 square foot building which would be \$24,937,500 of investment and again 175 jobs with \$6,768,475 in payroll. That would be committed to by year three so it allows these buildings to have a period where they get up to full occupancy to meet that commitment. That would be monitored annually through the tax incentive review council process so it's required reporting each year to report your amount of payroll and the number of positions in place at the end of the calendar year. Then, it's monitored when we have our annual tax incentive review council in the summer. What these agreements do there's a spreadsheet that's the last page there of these ordinances that kind of breaks down what the developer is committing to from a school's perspective. So, what they're proposing is a \$0.20 per square foot annual payment in lieu of taxes to the school districts. These properties are bisected by the school district boundary line. If you look there is a map that's been provided that shows the building in orange, the dark orange areas are the Groveport Madison School District and the lighter orange color is the Canal Winchester Local School District. What they're proposing is a \$0.20 per square foot payment to the school districts in lieu of taxes each year. If you look at that the portion in the Groveport Madison Schools would receive \$69,887.40 per year and a portion of the Canal Winchester Schools would receive \$143,712.60 in a PILOT payment. That's a payment that's made to the school district directly each year. The agreement would require that prior to June that payment be made by June 1st. We could then monitor that payment through the tax incentive review council process. This also proposes sharing 25% of the income taxes that come in are generated by these properties with the school districts. In this case what we have proposed to the schools for easier administration and what the schools are working on agreeing to with each other is that the share of those taxes. The West building, Canal Winchester would receive 100% of that income tax share for that building. Groveport Madison would receive 66% of the east building. When they're only 52% of that building in 12% of the other building so it's basically just taking that area from the West building and moving it to the East building for easier administration. We've had these agreements in front of the Canal Winchester Treasurer and the Groveport Attorney and Treasurer and they're working on those and hope to have those on their agenda for the school boards review this month. We are requesting that these agreements be an emergency but we're not asking for any waiver of readings so this would go a three-reading process and be consideration at your next meetings in August. I will note that there was an error on the formulas there on the land tax portion. The land taxes on your packet it has a \$74,000 to Groveport, \$91,000 to Canal Winchester. The actual estimate there would be \$38,000 to Groveport and \$72,000 to Canal Winchester. There's a total of \$110,000 in annual land taxes that are estimated. \$38,000 to Groveport and \$72,000 to Canal Winchester. The total annual minimum of that land tax, the PILOT payment in the share of income taxes would generate a minimum of \$261,524 to Canal Winchester Schools and \$130,289 to Groveport Schools. There's a lot of estimates that are in those you know that's estimating what the auditor will value those buildings at. It's also the minimum of the commitments for the jobs and the payroll of jobs and payroll are more than that then the schools will receive more revenue based on their income tax share. Also included in this as a Community Benefit Agreement and that Community Benefit Agreement would provide \$750,000 payment to the City of Canal Winchester for each building. \$375,000 would be paid at

the issuance of the building permit and then \$375,000 would be paid at occupancy of the building. That would be for each building so a total of \$1.5 million in a community benefit payment to the City of Canal Winchester and that's in Section 4 of that agreement. I'm happy to answer any questions you have about that's a lot of information.

ORD-22-027
Development

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER TO ENTER INTO A COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AREA AGREEMENT WITH NORTHPOINT DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C., PURSUANT TO SECTION 3735.671 OF THE OHIO REVISED CODE; AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER TO ENTER INTO A RELATED SCHOOL COMPENSATION AGREEMENT WITH THE CANAL WINCHESTER LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT AND NORTHPOINT DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Shea, seconded by Walker to move ORD-22-027 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Shea, Walker, Amick, Amos, Clark, Milliken

F. Old/New Business

OTH-22-012 Council Vacancy

Milliken – We have an applicant in the room this evening. I guess there was some mix up with applications and he would like to interview for the position. I'm opening up the room to see how you guys feel about it. I'm okay with it.

Clark – I'll turn it over to Thad. If somebody tried to fill out an application and failed or whatever. I don't know who else would be in line. Would there be any problem doing this?

Boggs – It's Council's process so there's not anything laid out hard and fast as to how you have to conduct this appointment process. If Council wants to accept this person you can. If you want to stick to the submission through the portal you can do that as well. It's not a matter of legal consequence.

Amos – We had several people reach out to us directly and said they applied. This particular person did reach out and said they applied. It was the very first day it was up.

Clark – Are the other two here or?

Amos – We went back into the numbers that we were questioning and they were not applications. The pertained to other City business.

Amick – Thank you, Mrs. Jackson for going and checking those for us.

Milliken – Also for everybody that is here this evening that did apply, quickly going to give you the expectations of what's going to happen this evening. During full Council we will adjourn to Executive Session and one by one individually you will come in and we'll interview. Everybody will get the same three questions that were all predetermined by Council. After those three questions we'll open up the room to everybody on Council and discuss.

G. Adjourn to Executive Session

H. Adjournment @ 6:53 p.m.

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

Yes 6 – Amos, Milliken, Shea, Walker, Amick, Clark