



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Finance Committee

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Michael Schnetzer, Chair
Karen J. Angelou
Merisa K. Bowers
Nancy R. McGregor
Kaylee Padova
Stephen A. Renner
Trenton I. Weaver

Jeremy A. VanMeter, Clerk of Council

Monday, August 14, 2023

City Hall, Council Chambers

Immediately following the regular Committee of the Whole meeting on August 14, 2023

A. CALL TO ORDER:

Councilmember Michael Schnetzer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m. The agenda was published on August 11, 2023. President Renner was absent from the meeting. All other members were present. There were no additions or corrections to the agenda.

B. DISCUSSIONS:

1. Capital Improvement Plan

Chairman Schnetzer opened the meeting with a housekeeping note related to recent Finance Committee meetings. He highlighted that during the discussions on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), specific projects that Council had received feedback from residents or raised concerns over the years were addressed in an Excel spreadsheet containing these projects. This Excel spreadsheet had been attached to the current agenda ordinance item for reference ("Council-Committee-Proj-List-2023-08-09"). Chairman Schnetzer turned the meeting over to staff for any formal presentation planned for the meeting before turning to Council colleagues for comment.

[ORD-0060-2023](#)

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE CITY OF GAHANNA 2023-2027 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Kevin Schultz, Senior Director of Operations, opened the discussion by introducing a document that had been provided to the attendees outlining the proposed changes. Schultz explained the first proposed addition, which was to include a third council member appointed by the president on the CIP Advisory Committee. This council member would join the mayor, council president, finance chair, senior director of operations, senior director of administrative services, and finance director on the committee.

Chairman Schnetzer sought clarification on the rationale behind adding a

third council member to the committee. He had no objections but wondered if there was a specific reason for this addition.

Director Schultz responded that a third council member would create an odd number of members on the committee. This would ensure that in case of a tie vote, there would be an opportunity for a decisive vote. He stressed that the proposal stemmed from the previous Finance Committee meeting's discussions about the advisory committee's operation.

Chairman Schnetzer opened the floor to members for their thoughts.

Director Schultz presented changing the CIP advisory committee meeting frequency from a quarterly basis to a monthly basis. He explained that meeting monthly would provide a better cadence for discussions and updates related to the CIP. He further elaborated that the proposed meeting time would be before regular council meetings at 6 p.m. on Monday evenings. Schultz informed members that meeting minutes would be generated for each monthly CIP advisory committee meeting. These minutes would be attached to the subsequent council meeting agenda for review and comments if necessary.

Chairman Schnetzer asked a question regarding the administration's perspective on the need for monthly meetings. He sought clarification on whether the volume of work justified the proposed monthly meeting frequency.

Director Schultz explained that the rationale behind proposing monthly meetings was to ensure a continuous conversation and ongoing updates with Council in a manner that had been conveyed by Council a couple weeks ago.

Chairman Schnetzer proposed that it could be trialed.

Director Schultz expressed openness to adjusting the proposed monthly meeting frequency based on the committee's preferences. He highlighted that the administration was receptive to alternative meeting cadences, including every other month or quarterly. Schultz conveyed that the Committee's feedback indicated that a quarterly meeting might be too infrequent, prompting the exploration of other options. He emphasized that the nature of the CIP Advisory Committee, not being a formally recognized body by Charter or Council, provided some flexibility in structuring the meeting schedule. Schultz proposed the idea of incorporating email communication for comments and feedback. He suggested that if the committee members agreed with the contents of the report and there were no significant comments, the meeting could potentially be canceled. In such cases, the committee could file the report with the Council Office and consider this as their meeting for the respective month.

Councilmember Bowers asked who would decide when meetings would be called or canceled. Director Schultz said it would be the seven-member

committee's discretion. Bowers clarified whether this meant just a consensus of the committee. Schultz said that was correct.

Chairman Schnetzer reiterated trialing the monthly meeting idea but thought it might be too frequent and that every-other month seemed to be a better frequency.

Director Schultz proposed the idea of using the Council Office, Clerk VanMeter and staff, to provide support to the CIP advisory committee.

Chairman Schnetzer asked if there was any comment from members or Mr. VanMeter on this idea.

Clerk VanMeter asked, as far as the retention schedule, where records [of the CIP advisory committee] lived. He thought it sounded like the record for the meeting would probably be a Council Office document. Director Schultz said that the report itself would get attached to a Council agenda, which would become a permanent record as part of the correspondence with the body. Mr. VanMeter said that he thought the proposal was acceptable, as long as Council Office had advanced notice when meetings would be and when support would be needed. Chairman Schnetzer asked if there was any concern from the Council. Vice President Weaver said he was amenable to this as long as the Clerk and his staff can handle it.

Director Schultz provided an overview of a "proposed agenda/report" for the CIP Advisory Committee. He explained that the document is broken down into different sections, starting with "Project Updates and Amendments." Schultz clarified that every item listed as a "project" in the document refers to a published project within the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The report mirrors the order of projects in the CIP and includes project numbers, codes, and descriptors for easy reference. He mentioned that updates on specific projects and amendments would be discussed in this section. Schultz highlighted the example of the West Gahanna Sanitary Sewer Analysis, indicating that the updates provided match the contents of the CIP. He described the "Completed Projects" section, which lists projects that have been finished and will eventually be removed from the CIP. The discussion moved to "Projects Added to the CIP," which outlines projects suggested for inclusion based on committee conversations. Schultz pointed out the inclusion of two projects related to wayfinding and protective fencing on baseball fields, both currently without cost estimates. He explained the provision for "Projects Expired or Removed," highlighting that no projects were currently proposed for removal. Mr. Schultz discussed the final section, "Items Under Review," which serves as a placeholder for potential CIP projects, including those suggested by council members or residents. He mentioned that specific items included in this section, such as stormwater management, drainage improvements, park renovations, and utility line relocations, were discussed. Schultz acknowledged that other projects, like the roundabout study, could be added to this section in the future. He concluded by stating that the proposed report is subject to review and modification based on committee feedback. The intention is to provide the committee with the necessary information in a more frequent and amenable

manner.

Director Schultz delved into the structure and content of the proposed "agenda/report" for the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Advisory Committee. He emphasized that the term "project" used within the document refers to projects that are formally published in the Capital Improvement Plan, with the exception of the final section titled "Items Under Review." Schultz outlined the organization of the agenda/report, highlighting its various sections. He began with the first section, "Project Updates and Amendments," clarifying that this part would present updates and potential amendments to specific projects. He noted that the document was watermarked as "proposed," meaning it was subject to potential revisions based on input but stressed that the document contained real items currently existing in the CIP. Schultz elaborated that each item is identified by its project number or code and accompanied by a project descriptor. He used the example of the sidewalk program to illustrate how committee members could locate specific projects within the Capital Improvement Plan based on the information provided in the report. He referred to the recent update provided by Mr. Komlanc during the Committee of the Whole session regarding the sidewalk program. Schultz highlighted that the same update was reflected in the report, specifically mentioning the progress of new sidewalks along Heil Drive, Laura Drive, and Rocky Fork Drive. He noted that these sidewalks were currently in the design phase, with construction anticipated for 2025. This information aligned with the update presented earlier by Mr. Komlanc. Schultz then moved on to discuss another component of the report, which would include a list of supplemental appropriations for the year 2023. He recalled that during the development of the 2023 capital budget, a smaller amount of appropriations had been requested for evaluation purposes. The purpose was to determine which projects would receive funding for the latter half of 2023. Schultz explained that this list of supplemental appropriations would be presented at the next Committee meeting scheduled for the 28th, highlighting that he was only providing a glimpse of the projects, but the full list would be available for the committee's review. By providing specific examples of updates and upcoming items within the "Project Updates and Amendments" section, Schultz aimed to illustrate the kind of information that committee members could expect to find in this section of the proposed report. He highlighted that the report would include a section that updates the committee on projects that have been completed within a specific time period. For instance, he mentioned the completion of the Big Walnut Fiber Loop project. Schultz noted that such completed projects would be removed from the document in subsequent adoption cycles but would still be documented in historical records.

Director Schultz then moved on to mention the projects that the committee would propose adding to the CIP based on discussions. He referred to projects listed on the spreadsheet that Chairman Schnetzer had attached to the agenda. One of the projects focused on wayfinding and aimed to re-establish the "Gateways, Entry Signs, and Wayfinding" project that was previously included in the Capital Needs Assessment (CNA). Additionally, he addressed the project related to protective fencing for the baseball fields, particularly along the first and third base lines of the fields closest to the

parking lot. He acknowledged that the cost for this project was uncertain, so it was marked with placeholders denoted by x's and yellow highlights. Regarding projects that may have expired or been removed from the plan, Schultz indicated that the plan itself contained provisions for such cases. He emphasized that currently, there were no proposals to remove any projects from the plan. The majority of the information that Chairman Schnetzer had attached in an Excel file, outlining potential projects, was located in the last section of the proposed report. This section, titled "Items Under Review," served as a placeholder for Capital Improvement type projects that had been requested by committee members or residents at various points in time. Schultz clarified that these projects were not limited to council requests; they could also include inquiries from residents or other stakeholders. Director Schultz provided additional information about ongoing projects and considerations related to infrastructure improvements. He mentioned that he had conversations with Vice President Weaver regarding certain projects that had been under consideration. Schultz indicated that some of the projects mentioned in Chairman Schnetzer's list focused on pedestrian-friendly infrastructure, particularly sidewalks and multi-use paths associated with specific roads. He proceeded to offer a quick update on the status of projects related to pedestrian infrastructure. For instance, he mentioned Morrison Road and noted that a sidewalk already existed on the northeast side from Hamilton Road to Tech Center Drive. He then provided details about proposed improvements, including efforts to work with the transit authority, COTA, to potentially enhance or relocate their bus stop facility near Taylor Road and Morrison. Schultz also addressed a few other projects that had been brought up in discussions. He mentioned updates related to James Road and Hines Road. Additionally, he highlighted the inclusion of certain items from the spreadsheet that Chairman Schnetzer had provided. One of these pertained to stormwater management policy and procedures. Schultz underscored that the committee was aware of the importance of drainage improvements for various development and redevelopment projects. He cited an example related to the 825 project, emphasizing the need to assess stormwater structures for potential relocation and enhancement to align with stormwater management standards. He mentioned the Park renovation project, particularly focusing on drainage improvements for Academy Park. He indicated that the project aimed to evaluate and potentially enhance drainage areas within the park as part of the Academy Park redesign project. This project was already included in the plan. He then brought up the Creekside utility line relocation, acknowledging that there was some uncertainty about its categorization and funding source within the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Despite the uncertainty, he noted that it was listed for discussion and consideration. Director Schultz acknowledged the potential for adding more projects to the "items under review" section of the proposed report. He mentioned that Mr. Weaver had a project in mind related to studying a roundabout at Hamilton Road and Clark State Road. Schultz expressed the intention to refine and expand the list of items under review, ultimately aiming to create a comprehensive and detailed overview of potential projects for the committee to consider. Schultz concluded by reiterating that the proposed report was a starting point and emphasized its flexibility for further adjustments. He invited input from committee members on aspects like formatting, content inclusion,

and level of detail. Schultz acknowledged the importance of crafting a report that provided necessary information to the committee while accommodating their preferences regarding frequency and content.

Chairman Schnetzer expressed his gratitude to Director Schultz for the presentation. He summarized the key points covered in the presentation for the advisory committee's structure and the proposed report. He highlighted the initial focus of the presentation, which involved discussing the structure of the advisory committee itself. This included the proposed expansion of the committee to seven members, with the addition of a third member from the council. He also emphasized the discussion on the frequency of committee meetings, starting with a monthly cadence to assess its effectiveness. Chairman Schnetzer acknowledged that the matter of records retention would also involve consideration by the Council Office. He then transitioned to the second part of the presentation, characterizing it as addressing either process or content. He outlined the five general sections outlined in the proposed report: project updates and amendments, projects completed, project additions, projects removed or expired, and items under review. These sections would provide a reliable framework for the types of content that would be covered during each CIP advisory committee meeting. Chairman Schnetzer sought confirmation from Director Schultz if his understanding of the presentation was accurate. Director Schultz affirmed Schnetzer's understanding. Chairman Schnetzer opened the floor to questions and comments from Council.

Vice President Weaver expressed his thanks to Director Schultz for the presentation and the proposed format for the agenda/report. He conveyed his satisfaction with the structure and content of the report. He highlighted Director Schultz's mention that the items under review wouldn't solely consist of Council recommendations but could also include constituent requests. Vice President Weaver noted that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) process generally outlines how staff evaluates individual projects or proposals. Weaver acknowledged that the proposed report offers an appropriate means for staff recommendations and constituent requests that directly involve staff to be presented to the Council and the broader community. He recognized the extensive work conducted within City Hall that often remains unseen, and he emphasized that this report would bring these specific requests to the Council's attention. He concluded by stating that he sees this approach as a positive way for the Council to be informed about these matters.

Chairman Schnetzer opened the floor for discussion and comments regarding the format and structure of the advisory committee, any concerns about having seven members, and the frequency of meetings. He noted that the general consensus from the Council seemed to be in favor of the proposed changes and was ready to move forward. He mentioned that he did not believe anything formal was required, such as passing a resolution or memorandum, to proceed with these adjustments. Director Schultz responded by saying, "No, sir." Councilmember Bowers commented that there might be some amendments needed for section 2.1 in the Capital Improvement Plan that could be addressed. Director Schultz remarked that

in the actual CIP advisory committee section, the only necessary addition would be the seventh member. Chairman Schnetzer inquired about the need for amendments when the proposal comes back the following week with Council. Director Schultz responded, sharing his opinion that no amendments are needed. He mentioned that if there's a preference to amend it based on certain aspects like the monthly meetings, it could be considered. He noted that the document already includes the phrase "at least quarterly" for meeting frequency, and the main amendment would involve adding the seventh member, which he deemed a straightforward and simple change. Chairman Schnetzer concluded the CIP would go on the regular Council agenda for a vote next week.

Councilmember Bowers mentioned that a report was provided just prior to the meeting, which served as both a mock-up and addressed some substantive points from the CIP document. She raised a question about how this document would be included for the purpose of the minutes. Director Schultz responded, stating that he would send it to the Clerk. Mayor Jadwin commented that it could potentially be included as an attachment to the minutes. Clerk VanMeter confirmed that the document could be included for the agenda item in the minutes.

Councilmember Bowers expressed her interest in discussing the specific items mentioned in the document, particularly the topic of the website. She requested an update on the progress of the website redevelopment, which had been mentioned in the Parks Master Plan and asked previously during the Committee of the Whole. Director Schultz clarified that the website redevelopment is not categorized as a capital item but falls under the operating budget. He confirmed that the redevelopment of the website is currently underway.

Councilmember Bowers acknowledged the contents of the document and expressed her gratitude for the inclusion of existing sidewalks on the northern section of Morrison Road, extending from Tech Center Drive. She noted her concern, however, was regarding the southern section of Morrison Road, specifically the area south of Tech Center where there is a lack of sidewalks. She wanted to ensure that the discussion and consideration would encompass more than just the COTA stop and would include the Central Park Apartments and other soft industrial or flex spaces in the vicinity.

Director Schultz explained that clear and descriptive communication from both Council and constituents is crucial in addressing their requests effectively. He highlighted that sometimes emails lack details like addresses or specifics, making it challenging to understand the exact ask. He noted that the update provided in the document was written in response to the information available at the time, and he believed there was a previous understanding that the sidewalk on Morrison Road stopped at Waterbury. This understanding influenced how the update was composed.

Councilmember Bowers expressed her appreciation for the value of open dialogue within the Committee. She highlighted the importance of

collaborative problem-solving and noted her gratitude for the Committee's ability to identify and address issues collectively. Councilmember Bowers said she just wanted to note the absence of sidewalks to the south of Tech Center and emphasized that the issue extended beyond the discussion solely about the COTA stop on Morrison Road. She also expressed her enthusiasm about the update on James Road, which had been a topic of resident discussions over the years. She mentioned her anticipation for the recommendation on Hines Road. Additionally, she mentioned that there were certain projects from the council spreadsheet that were not included in the report.

Director Schultz responded there was just one project not included on the proposed report. Councilmember Bowers asked which one had not been included. Director Schultz replied that it was the one about restrooms in the pocket parks. Councilmember Bowers confirmed that this is what she had also identified. Director Schultz said this was only a proposed agenda and that it would end up getting on the list. Councilmember Bowers acknowledged Schultz' remark and observed that this meeting seemed like it was used as the first advisory committee meeting. She wanted to understand where along in the process this item was. Director Schultz clarified that this body would not be the format of the CIP advisory committee, again indicating the purpose of the proposed report was mostly for illustration. Councilmember Bowers said she understood but Schultz did provide updates on actual projects during his presentation. Director Schultz reminded that the report had been watermarked with the word "proposed." Councilmember Bowers said she saw the watermark. She asked if the restrooms in the frequently used pocket parks would be hypothetically included in the section "Items Under Review." Director Schultz confirmed.

Vice President Weaver noted that hard copies of the plan were provided on June 12, 2023. He inquired about the most recent update or any edits made to the CIP document that was currently attached to the agenda. Director Schultz responded that he didn't recall providing hard copies, apologizing for any confusion. Vice President Weaver clarified that the Clerk printed out the document for them.

Director Schultz clarified that the final copy of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was attached to the current agenda item. He explained that the new copy did not have the yellow watermark that indicated it was a draft. While the narrative portion of the document remained largely unchanged, there were minor adjustments made to the summary sheets and some of the worksheets. He noted that the content had changed very little, but there were some detail-oriented revisions, such as correcting accelerators and percentages that were previously inaccurate.

Vice President Weaver expressed concern about the accuracy of project updates in the document. He emphasized the importance of incorporating any updates that might have occurred since the document was initially provided. He also pointed out that there were some blank boxes for the status of projects that were in progress, as well as some proofreading issues that needed to be addressed before the document could be voted on.

Director Schultz clarified the definition of the term "project" in the context of the document. He explained that if a project is listed under the "items in review" section of the proposed agenda, it has not yet been included in the document. He mentioned that the intention is to discuss adding these projects during the first meeting of the CIP advisory committee. He noted that there might be additional projects that are ready to be included in the capital budget planning process later in the year.

Councilmember Angelou expressed her support for the proposal. She suggested that the advisory committee should meet monthly, considering the dynamic nature of the topics discussed. She also mentioned that having another council member on the committee is acceptable as long as all council members are well-informed about the proceedings. She praised the overall concept of the committee, highlighting the importance of addressing crucial matters. She acknowledged that she would not be on Council for much longer but expressed her positive view of the ideas presented in the proposal and commended the mayor for collaborating on its development.

Recommendation: Second Public Hearing Scheduled 8/21/23; Second Reading/Adoption on Regular Agenda on 8/21/23.

C. ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business before the Finance Committee, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.

Jeremy A. VanMeter
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Finance Committee, this
day of 2023.*

Michael Schnetzer