



# City of Gahanna

## Meeting Minutes

### Committee of the Whole

200 South Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

*Jamille Jones, Chair*  
*Merisa K. Bowers*  
*Nancy R. McGregor*  
*Kaylee Padova*  
*Stephen A. Renner*  
*Michael Schnetzer*  
*Trenton I. Weaver*

*Jeremy A. VanMeter, Clerk of Council*

---

Monday, March 23, 2026

7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER:**

*Gahanna City Council met for Committee of the Whole on Monday, March 23, 2026, in Council Chambers. Vice President of Council Jamille Jones, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The agenda was published on Friday, March 20, 2026. All members were present at the meeting.*

*Vice President Jones announced two changes to the evening's agenda. She stated that Council would remove Item D from the Department of Administrative Services section of the agenda and would add a discussion at the end of the meeting regarding a resident's request for recognition.*

**B. ITEMS FROM THE SENIOR DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS:**

[2026-0064](#)

Gahanna Civic Center (825 Tech Center Drive) Construction Update 3.23.2026

Kevin Schultz, Senior Director of Operations, introduced the first agenda item as an update on the 825 Municipal Complex project and reported a slight delay from the previously discussed timeline. He explained that electrical work caused the delay, noting that numerous small outstanding items prevented the team from completing the commissioning process. He stated that commissioning involved testing the building to ensure full functionality, particularly for the Police Department, which required flawless operation. Director Schultz explained that the executive team considered moving City Hall and the Senior Center into the building

before the Police Department. He stated that internal discussions led them to reject that option due to concerns about public confusion regarding police services. He reported that the team focused on verifying the entire electrical scope across all floors and the building expansion, including circuits, generator connections, and uninterruptible power supply systems. Director Schultz stated that he stopped providing firm dates due to repeated delays. He indicated that commissioning would likely begin on or around April 17, 2026, and noted that the process would not take long but would delay occupancy. He added that the team expected to provide a clearer schedule within the next 10 to 14 days.

Director Schultz reported that the building's appearance represented a positive development. He described the facility as visually impressive, warm, and aligned with project goals. He reviewed photographs showing the exterior, including the main entrance, signage, landscaping, and aerial views that highlighted the park-like setting. He also described features such as the Police Department entryway, secured parking areas, and Senior Center access points. Director Schultz also reviewed interior images, including the main corridor, Council Chambers entrance, and office areas. He highlighted design elements such as graphics, study enclaves, and locally produced maps integrated into the building. He described additional interior features, including conference rooms, departmental spaces, and standardized furniture layouts. He contrasted the new facility with the existing building, noting a significant improvement in environment and functionality. Director Schultz concluded by expressing appreciation for the Council's patience. He stated that the building would serve as a valuable resource for both staff and the community and anticipated occupancy within the next 30 to 45 days. He then invited questions.

#### *Questions from Council*

Councilmember Padova thanked Director Schultz for the update and stated that the building looked very nice. She expressed excitement about seeing it in person and asked how the delay would impact the revised April 2026 meeting schedule. Director Schultz responded that the Council could choose to reinstate the normal April 2026 schedule by reversing the previously adopted adjustment to Council's rules. He noted that leadership discussed the schedule and stated that the decision

remained with Council.

President Weaver thanked Director Schultz for the presentation and agreed that the building would serve as a tremendous community asset. He deferred to the administration regarding scheduling and noted that combining meetings could create long evenings. Mayor Jadwin asked for clarification on the April 2026 schedule discussed at the leadership meeting. President Weaver confirmed that the City Council planned a Regular meeting on April 6, 2026, and both a Regular meeting and Committee of the Whole on April 27, 2026. Mayor Jadwin stated that maintaining the existing calendar would likely ease staff workload as they completed preparations for the building. She indicated that the administration would defer to the Council's preference. Councilmember McGregor confirmed that the Council would not hold a Committee of the Whole meeting until the end of April 2026, and President Weaver affirmed that understanding. Councilmember Padova asked whether the two meetings on April 27, 2026, would still occur in the current facility. Mayor Jadwin advised that the Council should plan to meet at 200 S. Hamilton. President Weaver stated that he had no objections to maintaining the existing schedule. Councilmember Bowers asked how the schedule would affect May 2026 meetings. Mayor Jadwin responded that the administration did not anticipate changes to the May 2026 schedule and expected to move into the new building by the end of April 2026, although she noted uncertainty. She added that the location of meetings in May 2026 would depend on the readiness of the new facility.

Councilmember Bowers asked about the status of technology installation in the new Council Chambers. Director Schultz explained that staff could not finalize installation until completing the electrical inspections on the first floor of the new civic center. He assured Council that staff would fully test systems and train personnel before holding meetings in the new chambers. He added that the technology would resemble current systems and would not require a steep learning curve. Councilmember Bowers asked whether the city would maintain overlap with the current facility, and Director Schultz confirmed that plan.

President Weaver asked whether the City Council should consider scheduling a Committee of the Whole meeting on April 6, 2026. Mayor Jadwin stated that she believed that was part of the earlier discussion. President Weaver suggested scheduling it and canceling it if unnecessary

to avoid missing agenda items. Director Schultz agreed.

Vice President Jones clarified that the Council would not change the May 2026 meeting schedule but might continue meeting in the current facility during the transition. Director Schultz confirmed that understanding. Vice President Jones asked for any additional questions and thanked Director Schultz for the update. She expressed excitement about moving into the building. Director Schultz stated that staff would schedule a tour for Councilmembers once the building reached an appropriate stage for walkthroughs.

[2026-0065](#)

Creekside Flood Mitigation and Plaza Improvements Project Presentation 3.23.2026

Director Schultz provided an update on the Creekside Plaza project recalling that he last presented the project to Council approximately in August 2025. He reported that Fishbeck and POD provided updated cost estimates in December 2025, and stated that recent focus on the 825 Municipal Complex project delayed further progress on Creekside. He explained that staff had re-engaged on the project and sought the Council's direction on next steps. He stated that the project reached approximately 60% design status and that staff aimed to determine how much of the overall project the Council supported. Director Schultz reviewed how the project aligned with the City of Gahanna's strategic plan, Our Gahanna. He stated that the project supported goals related to elevating unique places, connecting the community, and celebrating community identity. He emphasized that Creekside represented one of the city's most unique assets and that the proposed improvements would enhance both local and regional engagement.

Director Schultz reviewed the project components, including flood mitigation for the creek bank and parking garage, trail improvements with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access, reconstruction of retaining walls, enhanced visual access to waterways, replacement of brick pavers, streetscape improvements, and redesign of the lower plaza and lagoon area. He explained that the redesign would create a more functional and accessible gathering space. Director Schultz presented updated cost estimates and stated that the full project ranged from approximately \$22.8 million to \$24.3 million. He noted that the estimate included both construction and soft costs and that the project remained listed in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with flood mitigation

identified as a top priority.

Director Schultz then outlined a reduced scope option that addressed safety, maintenance, and required flood mitigation. He detailed components labeled A through H, which included ADA ramp improvements, guardrail repairs, brick paver removal and replacement, stair and curb reconstruction, pedestrian bridge repairs, restroom improvements, fountain and pump system repairs, and miscellaneous structural repairs. He explained that many existing elements did not meet current standards or had deteriorated due to age and water infiltration. Director Schultz stated that the estimated cost for these safety and maintenance improvements totaled approximately \$6.2 million, and when combined with flood mitigation, resulted in a total project cost of approximately \$12 million. He explained that this reduced option would restore existing conditions but would not include enhancements such as trail improvements or plaza reconfiguration.

Director Schultz stated that staff needed to provide direction to Fishbeck and POD regarding whether to advance the full project or focus on the reduced scope. He noted that funding would likely involve bonds and acknowledged uncertainty regarding market appetite for financing. He concluded by requesting the Council's feedback to guide the next phase of design and project development.

Vice President Jones stated that she had one quick clarification before turning the discussion over. She asked whether section 6.2 included items A through H and what the next line referenced. Director Schultz explained that the next line referred to flood mitigation of the garage and the creek bank itself.

Councilmember Bowers thanked Director Schultz for bringing the item forward for further discussion. She asked whether he conducted a similar exercise to identify true or expected costs for the full Creekside Reimagined project, noting that the first line item appeared more solidified than in the previous year. Director Schultz replied that the estimating worksheet presented those figures, including categories such as flood improvement mitigation, garage mitigation, trail improvements, lower and upper plazas, and streetscape elements. He stated that the Fishbeck estimate appeared very solid. Councilmember Bowers referenced the cumulative project budget shown at the bottom of the

worksheet as \$24,229,000 and asked for confirmation. Director Schultz confirmed the figure and explained that he provided a range on a previous slide by adjusting escalation and design contingency from 15% to 7.5%. Councilmember Bowers then asked whether the administration organized or quantified feedback received from the public during prior community engagements regarding the Creekside Reimagined conceptual renderings. Director Schultz clarified that the previously presented estimate around August 2025 was approximately \$22 million. He stated that goal statements one, three, and four in the strategic plan reflected community sentiment and indicated a desire for change at the plaza. He noted that staff conducted both public and private engagement efforts and that he held numerous one-on-one conversations with residents. He identified the most common questions as how the project would differ from the 2008 effort and how it would be funded. He reported that the public had not expressed negative feedback regarding the renderings, though some individuals opposed the splash pad due to concerns about pets. He concluded that overall feedback was very positive and that engagement occurred at multiple events.

Councilmember Bowers stated that her experience aligned with his summary, noting that feedback on the public improvement project was consistently positive, while feedback on private development was more varied. She emphasized concerns regarding funding, differentiation from prior efforts, engineering continuity, and project oversight. She asked how Director Schultz responded to questions about how the project would differ from past efforts. Director Schultz responded that the project began before his tenure as Senior Director of Operations and emphasized that the city approached the project differently from its early 2000s efforts. He stated that staff took significant time to develop a solid project scope and estimate and analyzed the project in detail. He described a deliberate process in which staff refused to advance without resolving key questions. He explained that identifying items A through H and associated challenges reflected the recognition of extensive work required to support capital funding. He stated that planning and public engagement for the project differed from past efforts and emphasized the administration's commitment to ongoing transparency, similar to updates provided on other projects. He added that even a smaller \$12 million project would warrant consistent discussion due to Creekside's importance as a foundational city asset.

Councilmember Bowers stated that she remained concerned about how

the City of Gahanna spent public dollars and ensured a return on investment for the community. She asked about the potential impact of increasing the project from approximately \$12 million to \$24 million on other capital improvement plan projects and whether trade-offs existed. She also emphasized the need to address funding questions and confirmed that the city would not pursue a tax increase or additional public contributions. Director Schultz stated that the Capital Plan included some uncertainties but remained solid overall. He cited West Johnstown Road and the Westside Utility Project as examples of projects fully supported within the plan. He explained that staff pursued additional funding opportunities, including an application for a \$12 million Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) discretionary grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation. This was unrelated to the Creekside work but would increase available city resources. He also referenced applications to the Franklin County Transportation Improvement District and other funding sources. He emphasized efforts to expand funding pools to accomplish more without increasing taxes. He reiterated that the city would not pursue a new tax levy and instead sought to address deferred maintenance and community priorities through strategic funding. He described the Creekside project as both a deferred maintenance effort and a re-envisioning initiative. He acknowledged the increased project cost and stated that the city aimed to leverage external funding sources, including a previously secured \$250,000 federal earmark and ongoing requests for additional federal support. He concluded that expanding funding sources remained critical to meeting community needs and advancing city projects.

Mayor Jadwin added that Councilmembers might recall that when they adopted the Capital Improvement Plan, they intended it to forecast and identify projects appropriately. She explained that the plan allowed the city to project costs, prioritize projects, and fund them in phases over time so that the City Council could clearly see how projects aligned with one another. She stated that the capital improvement plan marked a significant step forward in forecasting project impacts. She acknowledged the comment regarding no new taxes and emphasized the importance of understanding and utilizing all available revenue sources, including Tax Increment Financing funds (TIF), to reinvest in infrastructure. She noted that she and Director Bury discussed potential funding mechanisms but explained that staff could not provide more concrete answers until they determined the project's final cost. She

stated that funding sources would vary depending on whether the project cost \$5 million, \$11 million, or \$20 million. She reiterated that the administration actively pursued outside funding sources, had already secured some funds, and continued to seek additional funding for multiple projects. She explained that securing funds for one project could free up resources for others. She concluded that the Capital Improvement Plan served as the guiding framework to ensure that projects did not fall behind. Director Schultz added that the project would also require private investment from the building owner, estimated between \$2 million and \$3 million depending on final project details.

Councilmember McGregor asked about the \$11 million project, removing and reinstalling bricks. She expressed concern that many of the existing bricks had disintegrated and questioned whether reinstalling them would lead to continued deterioration. She asked whether the materials or installation methods contributed to the issue. Director Schultz responded by reframing her question and explained that the city could replace the existing bricks with different pavers for approximately \$6 million. He stated that consultants from POD and Fishbeck indicated that 15 to 25% of the existing bricks would likely not be reusable, and he acknowledged that the loss could be greater. He stated that the original material likely did not suit a high-traffic area and that the construction method also contributed to the problem. He referenced issues observed at the 825 Municipal Complex project, including voids and unstable sand beneath structures, which required reinforcement to maintain functionality. He stated that multiple issues affected the pavers and agreed that even if the city completed the \$6 million portion of the project, the area would continue to require ongoing maintenance, which would create additional costs that remained difficult to estimate. Councilmember McGregor asked whether ADA ramp standards changed since the plaza's construction in 2008 or whether the ramps had not met standards initially. Director Schultz stated that his understanding indicated that the standards had not changed. Councilmember McGregor then asked where water entered the pump room. Director Schultz responded that water seeped in from the roof, which also functioned as the floor, and noted that water entered the garage in the same manner.

Councilmember Schnetzer thanked Director Schultz and stated that he appreciated the information presented, noting its complexity. He explained that he understood the proposal as consisting of approximately

\$12 million in flood and safety essentials and a \$24 million version that reflected what was shared publicly. He recalled that earlier discussions included potential funding sources such as city funds, private contributions, grant funding, and possible sponsorships. He stated that affordability remained the central concern. He asked whether completing individual components, such as the pavers estimated at approximately \$2.5 million, would preclude elements of the larger reimagined project. He further questioned whether the proposal functioned as an either-or decision between completing essential improvements or pursuing the full project. Director Schultz stated that he and the administration viewed the situation as an either-or decision. Councilmember Schnetzer confirmed that this meant a choice between a \$12 million project and a \$24 million project. Director Schultz affirmed that understanding. Councilmember Schnetzer asked whether any funding sources depended on selecting one option over the other, noting that grants often favored new projects over maintenance. He asked whether the city could reduce the \$12 million gap through sponsorships, private contributions, or grants. Director Schultz stated that staff received mixed feedback regarding grant funding. He explained that some advisors encouraged focusing on more visible or appealing project elements, while others recommended prioritizing practical improvements such as flood mitigation. He stated that staff attempted to balance those approaches in grant applications. He added that the city had not encountered restrictions related to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood mitigation funding. He explained that grant outcomes often depended on reviewer perspectives. He noted that earlier in his career, grants often funded a large portion of projects, but current trends required municipalities to contribute a larger share. He stated that the city pursued smaller grant opportunities rather than large requests, noting that a recent state capital request sought approximately \$4 million. He concluded that pursuing multiple smaller funding opportunities did not disadvantage the project.

Councilmember Schnetzer stated that the purpose of the discussion involved gauging the City Council's perspective. He noted that the Council previously prioritized the Creekside plaza project among major initiatives. He stated that while the Council reached consensus on prioritization, questions remained regarding how to fund the project and bridge the financial gap. He expressed interest in receiving more detailed information about funding strategies and stated that, although there was interest in moving forward, practical affordability constraints

remained unclear. Director Schultz stated that he agreed and suggested continuing to work with Fishbeck and POD to advance the design while ensuring consideration of the larger project. Councilmember Schnetzer reiterated that the City Council needed additional information regarding affordability, efficiencies, and functionality improvements for the plaza.

Councilmember Padova thanked staff for bringing the item forward and stated that her views aligned with those expressed by Councilmember Bowers and Councilmember Schnetzer. She stated that she strongly supported Creekside and acknowledged that maintenance needs existed. She indicated that the estimated cost for maintenance did not surprise her. She asked whether completing the full \$24 million project would improve future maintenance conditions and reduce long-term care needs. She referenced concerns about deteriorating bricks and asked whether the full project would provide greater longevity and reduce future expenses. Mayor Jadwin asked for clarification regarding Councilmember Padova's statement about the level of care at the plaza and stated that she disagreed with any suggestion that the city had not maintained it properly. Councilmember Padova clarified that she did not intend to suggest that the city had failed in its responsibilities but instead referred to the need for a significant reinvestment in infrastructure. Mayor Jadwin acknowledged the clarification. Councilmember Padova reiterated her concern that the city should avoid replacing materials with similar materials that would deteriorate again and asked whether the project would result in more durable outcomes. Director Schultz stated that feedback from POD and Fishbeck indicated that some original construction methods may not have met current standards. He cited examples such as railings and guardrails that were not fully affixed to structures as required today. He explained that material selection and updated construction practices would reduce maintenance needs and increase longevity. He stated that the project would not replace old materials with identical materials if those materials proved unsuitable. He acknowledged that maintenance would always remain necessary but stated that improved foundational elements would reduce overall maintenance demands and extend the lifespan of the improvements. He added that future councils would likely address smaller maintenance items rather than undertake another full-scale overhaul within a similar timeframe.

Councilmember Padova asked whether replacing the existing fountain with a splash pad would provide maintenance benefits or simplify operations compared to the current lagoon system. Director Schultz responded that simplifying the lagoon and pump room could provide some benefits, but noted that a splash pad would introduce different maintenance requirements, including water treatment for increased usage. He stated that the change might slightly increase complexity but only marginally. He added that routine maintenance activities, such as cleaning and repositioning furniture, would continue regardless of the design. He stated that the Parks and Recreation Department would continue to manage those responsibilities. Councilmember Padova asked whether staff engaged with the owners of the three private buildings affected by the project and whether they supported the proposal. Director Schultz stated that staff spoke with the management company and that it supported the project. He stated that staff also spoke with the property owner, who appeared reserved but indicated that he supported the direction of the conceptual designs. He added that the property owner recognized responsibility for certain flood improvements on private property, as the city could not use public funds for those repairs, and that the city would manage and oversee the project.

Councilmember Renner thanked staff for the information and stated that the presentation provided a rapid overview of the project, including emergency and flood-related needs estimated at approximately \$12 million. He stated that he understood staff reached a point where direction to the design team was necessary and asked why the issue returned at that time. He noted that the Creekside Reimagined project had previously been discussed in conjunction with private development and questioned the timing and process. He expressed concern that the Capital Improvement Plan advisory process had not met for several months and stated that he felt frustrated that the Council had not received sufficient time or information to address the issues. Director Schultz responded that the Capital Improvement Plan advisory committee last met around October or November 2025, before the budget process, and confirmed that the committee had not met in 2026. Councilmember Renner stated that he did not recall the October 2025 meeting and remembered only the budget discussions. Director Schultz reiterated that the meeting occurred just before the budget process and noted that prior discussions included both public and private aspects of the Creekside

project. He stated that he perceived some Councilmembers expressed hesitation about proceeding with the full \$24 million project. He explained that staff planned to return in the first quarter of 2026 after receiving updated cost estimates in December 2025. He added that work on the 825 Municipal Complex project required significant time and affected his ability to advance other responsibilities, including scheduling advisory committee meetings, and he apologized for that delay. He stated that staff sought to determine whether to proceed with the larger project or limit the scope to essential safety and maintenance improvements. He acknowledged that advisory committee discussions could have occurred, but stated that staff would likely have reached the same point of seeking City Council's input. Councilmember Renner stated that earlier engagement would have allowed the Council to provide feedback on key issues and better understand the project. He stated that he wanted to assist but lacked sufficient information to provide meaningful direction. Mayor Jadwin stated that the presentation largely repeated information shared in August 2025, with updated cost estimates. She explained that staff reached a point where they could not proceed with design direction or provide more detailed project information without understanding the City Council's level of interest in the full project. She clarified that staff did not seek a formal vote or commitment but instead sought general consensus to guide next steps. She stated that the design approach would differ significantly depending on whether the Council supported the full project. She added that businesses at Creekside requested construction timelines and expressed concerns about uncertainty, and she explained that staff could not provide schedules without defining the project scope. Councilmember Renner acknowledged the explanation and stated that he received communications from businesses. He stated that he viewed the issue as one of project phasing and requested clearer information on phases and timelines to better respond to stakeholders. He reiterated that he supported the project but lacked sufficient information to determine whether to support the \$12 million or \$24 million option. Director Schultz stated that the City Council's expression of support for the larger project would allow staff to work with finance staff to evaluate potential bond packages and funding strategies. He stated that it would also allow him to engage a construction manager to begin pre-construction services, including scheduling and timeline development. He explained that current estimates assumed a 30-month schedule, but that further analysis could refine that timeline. He stated that initiating those steps without the Council's input would be inappropriate.

He added that staff would continue refining the design, budget, funding strategy, phasing, and business impacts and would return to the Council with additional information, similar to the process used for the 825 Municipal Complex project. Councilmember Renner stated that he needed to understand trade-offs and potential impacts associated with each option before deciding and concluded his remarks.

Councilmember McGregor stated that the project made her sad because the original construction should have been completed properly. She stated that the city should not have needed to address flood mitigation issues and should have obtained the appropriate Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain permits during the initial construction. She stated that the bricks should have been installed correctly and that the city now needed to spend significant funds to correct those deficiencies. She emphasized the need for proper oversight by credentialed professionals during the current project. She stated that removing and reinstalling the same bricks did not make sense and referenced her own experience with a similar issue. She stated that the floodplain work and brick replacement must occur because the bricks contributed to leaks in the garage. She stated that the remaining question involved whether the city should include additional enhancements that would improve functionality and overall quality.

President Weaver thanked Director Schultz for the presentation and stated that he appreciated the information. He stated that he shared many of the sentiments expressed by other councilmembers. He emphasized that safety and floodproofing work must occur but stated that those improvements alone would not create the type of community space residents expected. He stated that the Creekside Reimagined concept would achieve that goal and expressed his belief that the Council generally shared that view. He stated that, as a general indication of his position, he supported continued exploration of the full project. He stated that residents expressed a desire for a successful Creekside and that completing only minimal repairs would not meet that expectation. He described the limited \$12 million option as insufficient and stated that replacing the pavers without broader improvements would not provide value. He requested that staff schedule a Capital Improvement Plan advisory committee meeting and noted that Councilmember Renner made a similar request previously. Director Schultz stated that he would schedule a Capital Improvement Plan advisory committee meeting.

Vice President Jones stated that she agreed with the comments made by other Councilmembers. She stated that Council supported the more comprehensive version of the Creekside project but recognized that funding remained a key consideration. She stated that completing the full project appeared more fiscally responsible than completing only partial improvements and potentially incurring additional costs over time. She thanked staff for the presentation.

**C. ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING:**

[ORD-0010-2026](#) AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH CAP-STONE & ASSOCIATES, INC. FOR THE 2026 STREET REBUILD AND WATERLINE PROGRAM (ST-1120 / TR-CM-02)

Director Schultz stated that he appeared on behalf of the Engineering Department to present two awards. He introduced the first item as the 2026 Street Rebuild and Water Line Program contract award. He stated that bids opened on March 3, 2026, and that the city received five bids. He explained that staff deemed one bidder non-responsible and therefore recommended awarding the contract to the second-lowest bidder, Cap-Stone and Associates. He requested the Council's action to authorize Mayor Jadwin to sign a contract with Cap-Stone and Associates in the amount of \$585,845, which included a 10% contingency. He also noted that the project included a separate construction administration and inspection contract, generally estimated at 15% of the total, in the approximate amount of \$87,000. He stated that staff included additional reporting details in the materials to provide more comprehensive information about project delivery.

President Weaver stated that he had no comments on the project itself but expressed appreciation for the enhanced report format. He specifically thanked staff for including additional information and for explaining why staff did not select the non-responsible bidder.

Councilmember Bowers stated that recent discussions about the Capital Improvement Plan prompted her questions. She explained that she brought her Capital Improvement Plan materials to better understand how the project sheet aligned with the contract under consideration. She referenced project TR-CM-02, the street rebuild program, and noted that

the project sheet identified \$355,000 in construction management costs funded by the capital improvement fund and \$2.25 million funded by the Water Capital Fund. She also referenced \$500,000 encumbered from the prior year. She asked how the proposed \$585,845 contract aligned with those figures. Director Schultz explained that the Capital Improvement Plan and the Capital Budget did not represent the same information. He stated that staff developed the Capital Improvement Plan in August 2025, prior to finalizing the budget. He explained that staff later revisited the figures during the budget process and adjusted allocations between the maintenance program (CM-01) and the rebuild program (CM-02). He stated that the document Councilmember Bowers referenced no longer reflected current figures because staff had since realigned funding. He added that staff initially anticipated completing more waterline work during the season but adjusted the scope due to resource constraints, as the city executed both the 2025 and 2026 programs concurrently. He stated that staff would update the project sheets during the year to reflect actual conditions and noted that staff typically reported such adjustments at Capital Improvement Plan advisory committee meetings, though he did not recall the exact timing of those discussions. Councilmember Bowers acknowledged the explanation and referenced prior meeting dates, noting a July 7, 2025, meeting and uncertainty regarding an October 6, 2025, meeting. She stated that she expected the process to return to alignment.

Vice President Jones asked whether Council had additional questions or discussion. She echoed appreciation for the report format and asked whether Council would place the item on the Consent Agenda for April 27, 2026. Council raised no objections.

**Recommendation: Introduction/First Reading on Regular Agenda on 4/6/2026; Second Reading/Adoption on Consent Agenda on 4/27/2026.**

[ORD-0011-2026](#)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH VISU-SEWER OF OHIO, LLC FOR THE 2026 SANITARY AND STORM SEWER CLEANING PROJECT

Director Schultz presented the second item, the 2026 Sanitary and Storm Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) program. He stated that bids opened on March 10, 2026, and that the city received three bids. He reported that Visu-Sewer of Ohio LLC submitted the lowest, most responsive, and most responsible bid. He stated that the total contract amount equaled \$398,000 and included a 10% contingency for

unforeseen items. He explained that the project included sanitary line cleaning and therefore qualified as a construction project subject to applicable guidelines. He noted that staff would manage construction administration and inspection in-house and would not require a separate contract for those services. He requested that Council approve an ordinance authorizing Mayor Jadwinto enter into a contract with Visu-Sewer of Ohio LLC for the CCTV and sanitary sewer cleaning work.

Councilmember McGregor asked whether the city previously had a truck capable of televising sewer lines and whether the city still owned that equipment. Director Schultz confirmed that the city still had the equipment but explained that the scope of the current project covered the entire area south of U.S. Route 62 and required more time and manpower than staff could provide.

Vice President Jones asked whether any additional questions remained. Hearing none, she stated that Council would place the item on the consent agenda for April 27.

**Recommendation: Introduction/First Reading on Regular Agenda on 4/6/2026;  
Second Reading/Adoption on Consent Agenda on 4/27/2026.**

**D. ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:**

[ORD-0012-2026](#) AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION - General Fund for Contract Services to Support Cultural and Artistic Programming  
Removed from agenda.

**E. ITEMS FROM COUNCILMEMBERS:**

**1. Procurement Code Discussion**

[2026-0054](#) Procurement Code Research Materials

Vice President Jones introduced the next agenda item, a continued discussion of the procurement code. She reminded those present that the City Council focused on threshold amounts, visibility, reporting, and transparency. She invited the administration to provide a brief recap and review updated documents.

Corey Wybensing, Senior Deputy Director, stated that the

administration had discussed the item with City Council since early February and sought to understand the Council's perspectives on thresholds and reporting enhancements. He referenced the March 9, 2026, Committee of the Whole meeting, where the administration presented recommendations to adjust procurement thresholds. He stated that the administration recommended maintaining the Micropurchase threshold at \$10,000 and reducing the Small Purchase threshold for Non-Construction items to \$150,000, with Construction thresholds aligned at the same level to streamline processes. He explained that this change would increase the number of items brought before Council and noted that all purchases above \$150,000 would require the Council's review. He stated that staff already modified reporting based on the Council's feedback, including enhancements to project reporting and consideration of adding purchase order reports to quarterly reporting. He noted that staff could provide reports more frequently but that activity levels varied throughout the year. He added that staff would continue refining reporting through the strategic planning process and returned the discussion to the Council for feedback.

Vice President Jones asked whether the Council could receive purchase order reports on a regular basis and inquired about the feasibility of providing them in a less labor-intensive format. Senior Deputy Director Wybensinger stated that the initial report was a standardized, less labor-intensive report, while the more recent version required additional manual effort. He also noted that staff provided a revised internal procurement flowchart used for training. He explained that any ordinance changes would require a review of internal controls, coordination with Administrative Services, and staff training to ensure compliance. He stated that implementation would require sufficient time to complete these steps. Vice President Jones then directed discussion to the threshold amount and noted that Council also considered a \$100,000 threshold. She invited Council feedback on whether members aligned with that figure.

Councilmember Bowers thanked the administration for its work and stated that the discussion was productive. She noted that bringing additional items to the Council agendas provided value by increasing public access to information. She referenced data on public engagement with Legistar, the city's legislative portal, and stated that usage levels were significant. She supported maintaining the \$10,000 Micropurchase

threshold and cautioned against overcorrecting by placing too many items on the Council's agendas. She stated that her review of purchase orders suggested that a lower threshold would add approximately two additional items per month, which she considered manageable. She stated that items above approximately \$90,000 often related to larger capital or strategic initiatives and suggested establishing a \$100,000 threshold, with the option to reevaluate in the future.

Councilmember Padova thanked staff for the updated procurement decision tree and asked about a footnote referencing competitive solicitation types. She noted that the document did not include a dollar threshold and asked whether that information appeared elsewhere. Senior Deputy Director Wybensinger explained that the referenced footnote related to the competitive solicitation section and that the \$150,000 threshold in the ordinance governed that requirement. Councilmember Padova acknowledged the clarification and confirmed that the threshold remained defined elsewhere.

President Weaver asked whether the administration considered implementing an annual 3% increase to threshold amounts, similar to practices at the state and county levels, or whether the administration preferred periodic reevaluation. Mayor Jadwin stated that the administration discussed that approach internally but determined that it would create confusion for staff due to frequent changes. She explained that maintaining consistent thresholds would provide greater clarity. President Weaver stated that he agreed with that approach and noted that state-level changes occurred less frequently. He expressed appreciation for the administration's reporting improvements and stated that the additional information was helpful. He also referenced concerns about smaller vendors' ability to compete for projects. He stated that he supported reducing the threshold and reiterated his prior preference for a \$100,000 threshold but acknowledged that he represented one perspective among several.

Councilmember Renner stated that he supported a \$150,000 threshold based on current economic conditions and increasing costs. He emphasized the need to support the administration with practical and logical policies.

Councilmember Schnetzer stated that he agreed with Councilmember

Renner and noted that his experience in the field carried weight. He referenced the prior \$250,000 threshold and observed that adjustments over time could lead back to higher thresholds. He stated that he did not see a strong need for change but supported \$150,000 as a reasonable compromise.

Councilmember McGregor stated that she initially supported a \$100,000 threshold but agreed that rising costs justified adopting a \$150,000 threshold.

Councilmember Padova stated that she did not observe a significant difference between \$100,000 and \$150,000 based on her review of prior purchase orders and expressed support for the \$150,000 threshold. She also stated that the updated procurement chart appeared simpler and easier for staff to follow.

Vice President Jones stated that she appreciated the discussion, research, and collaboration and expressed support for the \$150,000 threshold along with enhanced reporting measures. She asked the administration to provide a timeline for next steps. Senior Deputy Director Wybensinger stated that the administration planned to return at the next Committee of the Whole meeting with a redlined version of the proposed changes. He stated that the process would allow time to finalize internal controls and develop a training plan for implementation.

Councilmember Bowers asked whether the administration could present a redlined version on April 6, 2026, and stated that she supported moving forward efficiently. She expressed appreciation for the outcome and described it as a balanced solution that simplified processes while increasing transparency.

Mayor Jadwin thanked the City Council and stated that the administration appreciated reaching a compromise. She noted that staff devoted significant time and effort to the discussion, including responding to the Council's requests and evaluating options. She acknowledged concerns raised about the pace of the Capital Improvement Plan process and reaffirmed the administration's commitment to continuing that work. She explained that staff managed multiple responsibilities, including major projects and staffing transitions, and emphasized that no items were intentionally delayed. She reiterated the administration's commitment to

providing necessary information and collaborating with Council. She stated that staff would return with a redlined version on April 6, 2026.

Vice President Jones thanked the administration and acknowledged the time and effort contributed by staff.

## 2. Resident Recognition Request

Councilmember Bowers stated that she sought to gauge the City Council's interest regarding recognition for a Gahanna family's high school-aged son who recently completed his Eagle Scout requirements. She asked whether her fellow Councilmembers preferred to prepare a certificate of recognition for presentation at the Eagle Scout ceremony in April 2026, or to include recognition within a resolution for National Volunteer Month. She noted that the Council previously combined national month recognitions with recognition of individuals in the community and suggested that National Volunteer Month would provide an appropriate opportunity to recognize the Eagle Scout's contributions.

Vice President Jones stated that she supported connecting the recognition to National Volunteer Month and noted that the Eagle Scout achievement involved significant volunteer work.

Councilmember Bowers acknowledged the feedback and stated that she would bring the item forward on the April 6, 2026, Regular Agenda and circulate a draft in advance.

### F. ADJOURNMENT:

*With no further business before the Committee of the Whole, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.*

---

Jeremy A. VanMeter  
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Committee of the Whole, this  
day of 2026.*

---

**Jamille Jones**

DRAFT