

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

October 3, 2022

6:00 PM

Council Work Session

*Bob Clark - Chair
Laurie Amick
Jill Amos
Steve Buskirk
Chuck Milliken
Patrick Shea
Mike Walker*

- A. **Call To Order** *Clark called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.*
- B. **Roll Call** *Present 7 – Amick, Amos, Buskirk, Clark, Milliken, Shea, Walker*

C. **Also In Attendance**

Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire, Amanda Jackson

D. **Reports of City Staff**

Bill Sims

E. **Request for Council Action**

ORD-22-037

Council

AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THE CANAL
WINCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

- Request to move to full Council

A motion was made by Amick, seconded by Buskirk to move ORD-22-037 to full Council. The motion carried with the following vote:

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

Abstain 1 - Walker

Discussion started at 5:46 on YouTube Chanel

Amick – I think there might be some confusion because the request at the last Council meeting was to bring forward the Chamber’s proposal so that it could go through the three readings and ultimately to a Council vote. The legislation that is in your packet this evening is for a \$10,000 annual stipend for three years. If you revert back to your August 15th Work Session minutes the proposal documented in the minutes is for \$64,160.00 in year one, \$66,845.00 in year two, and \$68,580.00 in year three. I did reach out to Ms. Mathias who is traveling and is not going to be here tonight. I believe Ms. Ankrom is going to be here at the Council meeting to see if perhaps she had made that change and she had not. The proposal that is in your packet for this evening’s discussion is not correct unless I’m missing something, and I would refer you back to the August 15th Work Session minutes to review their proposal. Do I have a misunderstanding or is that also everyone else’s understanding?

Milliken – That’s my understanding.

Amos – That was my understanding. Nothing has changed in my opinion from the original ask to now. We still haven’t established what fundraising and they haven’t raised prices. There’s still a lot of questions for me so somewhere between now and the final reading I’m hoping Ms. Mathias can come in and shed some more light. I feel like right now we still don’t have the full picture of why the city needs to be responsible.

Amick – Like I said, I don’t know if Ms. Ankrom will be given an opportunity during Old/New Business during the Council meeting later tonight. Ms. Mathias told me that Ms. Ankrom would be here for that so otherwise we’ll just defer this to the next meeting. Mr. Boggs, maybe you can help me clarify for me what actions need to be taken on Ordinance #22-037 to change that from the \$10,000.00 per year for three years to align to the proposal that they presented on August 15th.

Boggs – If the will of the Council is to refer it on to the full Council meeting, it could be revised between first reading and second reading without formal action to amend it or it could just be changed now and move forward at the next meeting. I’ll have to take blame for that, I must have had the wrong note as to what the ask was when I went back and consulted it. That difference from their proposal to what’s in front of you is my mistake.

Amick – No worries whatsoever. There’s been a lot of discussion about bed tax and a lot of topics are kind of blurring together.

Clark – I’ve got real concerns about this. I’m not convinced that this amount of money or even more money is the answer for this organization at this point. I think with the things we have coming down the pike of a possible police study that might request additional officers. We’ve got a whole host of other things like McGill Park down to street signs were wanting, and everything else. I’m getting a little concerned about the money. I just think this can open something I don’t know if we want to go down with other organizations that will be coming in here shortly if this goes forward. That’s my two cents worth as one member.

Milliken – Going back to the discussion previously when I was suggesting maybe we go the route of the bed tax and I guess that wasn’t good enough for them. Here we’re left with this option of \$63,000.00 and going up to \$68,000.00 or whatever it is. Would there be an appetite for some sort of negotiation on that figure? Would that make you feel better about that? Maybe we don’t go \$60,000.00, maybe we go \$40,000.00 and make them meet us in the middle.

Clark – I’d want to see on their end some productivity. I mean something that shows they’re able to go out and raise the rest. She said that she needed the full \$60,000.00 to really make an impact to get the person in place that would really make the changes necessary for this organization. If we give them \$40,000.00 or \$45,000.00 or \$50,000.00, how are we certain they can raise for that position? Why don’t they go and raise \$15,000.00 or \$20,000.00 then come to us and say we’ve got the \$20,000.00 now or \$15,000.00 now we’re here for the rest?

Milliken – The reason I bring that up is because I do share your concern to some degree, but I also would love to see a thriving chamber. So, however, we can play a part in making that work but also protecting the interests of the city.

Amick – I was not on Council at the time when CWJRD requested but as I understand it and for those of you who were there, please keep me honest. The CWJRD was struggling, and they needed to put a director in place to give focus to the CWJRD. They’ve made I think what appears on paper to be tremendous progress and so they were given if you will seed money to help get their organization moving in the right direction. I don’t see the chamber’s request much different than a three-year dose of seed money to help them move in the right direction. They run on volunteer power. I can’t speak for all the leaders of the chamber board, but I know that some of them have full-time jobs. Again, this is kind of like seed money to get the chamber moving in the right direction for a short period of time. You’re right, this could be setting a precedence but again this to me has a short window and if they don’t make progress that’s on them. I participated deeply in the community plan discussions, and I walked out feeling very optimistic about the future of business in this community. If we don’t have a strong Chamber of Commerce that could be a deterrent for people wanting to do business here. I know that the chamber’s role is to help with businesses once they are here but to attract business, I would think that you’d want to have a strong chamber.

Amos – Real quick I’ll address the CWJRD part. The CWJRD is a partnership between the city and the school. The city did not want to run a parks and rec department and did not want to run the sports. The school did not want to run the junior level sports that were below their school programs. It was beneficial to keep the CWJRD and CWJRD provides enough money to pay for the programs. It just wasn’t enough to grow this program and to put it back where it needed to be because of COVID. In the past we’ve always been able to provide our own income for the jobs.

Buskirk – In their proposal there was a comment in here that they would like to hire someone full time for 90 days and a dollar amount attached to that. I would be more likely to support that 90-days of salary and see what they do with those funds during those 90-days, to see if I wanted to continue to support that effort as opposed to signing up now for a three-year package.

Milliken – I think that’s reasonable as long as it’s feasible.

F. Old/New Business

OTH-22-020

Technology Enhancements

Discussion started at 32:56 on YouTube Channel

Amick – Do we have a clock ready to go for tonight?

Pearce – I could always look one up on Google.

Amick – I think where we left it is we were going to try some like zero-dollar options to put some clocks up on the screen and give people a visual clock who wish to address Council so that they know how much time that we have with the hopes that we don't interrupt their train of thought. I think that's what we're going to try tonight unless there are any objections.

Shea – I think that's awesome.

Amick – The other thing was the digital transcription service and what price tag that might come with. As I looked at the minutes, I did see the tags in there for where you can see it on the YouTube video. More importantly, the minutes are coming out earlier, so I appreciate that. I'm willing to, unless you've already done the research and there's a dollar amount for us to consider, withdraw that from the Old Business agenda.

Pearce – I don't know if Amanda has anything? No.

Amick – Do we keep it on there then until we have a price tag, or do we table it for now? What would you like to do Jordan? Again, I just want to say thank you because I feel like you heard Council, or you heard me about getting the minutes out sooner so thank you for your effort there. It's very much appreciated.

Pearce – No problem. I'm more than happy to keep doing what I'm doing. I've just been trying to type the main key points of what you all discuss and then if you wanted to go back you could see the time on where you talk about it in YouTube.

Amick – Let's go ahead and remove that for now and then we'll see how the clock works out tonight.

Amos – Laurie, we liked your suggestions by the way.

OTH-22-021

Pedestrian Safety

Discussion started at 35:43 on YouTube Channel

Shea – Any plans?

Peoples – One of the topics from last time was the downtown area and we're going to keep that on there until we get the plan. We just met with our engineer so it will be a little bit of time before we have anything in the downtown area as part of the 2023 Street Program.

Shea – What about Thrush and Groveport? Was that in the works too?

Peoples – It is still in the works. We're trying to figure out whether we can get it this year or if it's going to end up being next year.

Shea – Is that kid, okay? Does anybody know?

People – I do not know. I've not heard anything.

Shea – I haven't either. Let's hope he's okay.

OTH-22-022

Police Study

Discussion started at 37:45 on YouTube Channel

Jackson – Everything has been provided to the consultants that was required from myself. They did confirm receipt of all of that. I have reached out to Fairfield County to ensure that they are putting together their portion, I have not heard back. I also have not heard from the consultants, they said they were going to reach out to both Madison Township and Fairfield County. Until I hear from someone, I'm going to assume that everything is moving along. I stress to the consultants that if they have communication issues to please get with me. If I don't hear anything from them, I will continue to follow up but that's the only update I have at this point.

Clark – You don't know if they've gotten anything from the police?

Jackson – I have no idea.

Clark – So, you've gotten everything that they sent to you to get this going?

Jackson – Correct.

Clark – Was that city-wide?

Jackson – Yes.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Discussion started at 39:12 on YouTube Channel

Shea – I talked with a resident about Code Enforcement. It was a follow-up conversation from his appearance at City Council back in April. He said that the issue he discussed, Andrew has been great on working through it. It's actually going to Mayor's Court presently but what he said was he was concerned because there's been some neighborly blowback. He was wondering if a complaint-driven system could lead to the neighborly blowback and I guess my comment tonight to my fellow Council members is, what's the balance between that proactive enforcement that's not over the top versus the complaint-driven system? I just want to throw that out there because keeping properties up to code is a big part of keeping our town nice and I think we all want to keep our town nice. This particular property I'm talking about happens to be a rental and I know that rentals sometimes don't get the love that our own homes do. I just wanted to see what you all thought.

Amos – I talked to Andrew earlier in the year just about some of the other Code Enforcement issues that we had. He said most of our Code Enforcement complaints are all made by residents, neighbors, and that's the way most of them come in.

Milliken – I believe most of them are repeat offenders. There aren't any new ones that pop up usually. I guess to answer your question, my thought would be, your proactive approach would be on the more habitual offenders and any new complaints you would keep complaint driven.

Shea – I really like that. That's a good way to thread the needle. I don't know how everybody else feels.

Amos – It is public record when somebody files a complaint. That was the other thing Andrew pointed out.

Haire – I would just say, if we're going to proactively enforce codes, we're going to proactively enforce codes on everyone. It is not going to be people that have violated codes in the past to be fair to everyone. It would be enforced on everyone.

Shea – Thad, is there a parole status for repeat code offenders that we could use to put them into a separate category to manage them differently?

Boggs – It wouldn't be called parole but depending upon what their initial sentencing is if they are sentenced in Mayor's Court they could be placed under probation. That would be a different circumstance than just proactively going back to people who have done their penance for previous violations. Now, what I don't know is necessarily, when people get into Mayor's Court are they remedying them before getting a sentence and so then they're not sentenced to community control. If they are sentenced to community control, is that terminated upon remedy of the violation? My sense of it from years past when I was in there more frequently, is that if people get a community control sentence, it is remedying the violation and will terminate the community control probation.

Shea – What if we flip the problem on its head and we do a rental property inspector?

Boggs – Just for rental properties I take it. I mean, there again you're focusing on a subset of people but presumably applying the same code so why shouldn't an owner-occupied structure be subject to the same property maintenance code as a rental structure. There's a whole host of issues that come up when you start focusing on residential rental properties only because oftentimes, they are disproportionately inhabited by people who may have socioeconomic statuses or other that are protected by law.

Shea – It should be equal. I hear what you're saying but you take a guy who's on parole and he doesn't get treated the same way as somebody who's not on parole. I guess that was sort of my thought.

Boggs – Right. You are correct about that. Somebody who's on parole is not treated the same way. Somebody who's on probation, if it is an extended probation beyond the remedy of their initial violation then they would be subject at least to a different standard in terms of moving through the Mayor's Court process than somebody who just picks up a new charge.

Shea – The code says currently that the undeveloped lots must be mowed twice per year and there's a certain month that's listed. Are we allowed to add a third cutting or a fourth cutting to that? There's not much undeveloped stuff now but the stuff that is undeveloped happens to be sitting in some pretty locations.

Haire – Yes. I mean, we can amend that section of the code. We would just have to go through the process to do so. Our codes are essentially for occupied lots, it's eight inches, and then for undeveloped lots it's twice a year.

G. Adjournment @ 6:44 p.m.

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

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