



City of Gahanna

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Meeting Minutes Committee of the Whole

Nancy R. McGregor, Chair, Vice President

Jamie Leeseberg, President

Karen J. Angelou

Merisa Bowers

Brian D. Larick

Stephen A. Renner

Michael Schnetzer

April Beggerow, MPA, CMC, Clerk of Council

Tuesday, September 8, 2020

Virtual Meeting

Immediately following the Regular Council meeting

Call in details: 513-306-4583

Conference ID: 269 350 748#

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Nancy McGregor called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

B. DISCUSSIONS

Discussion: Virtual Meetings

Mrs. McGregor asked about staying virtual vs. in person meetings.

Mr. Renner replied that a lot of other bodies are still virtual. If we could logistically be 6 feet apart he would support but he doesn't know that it's possible.

Ms. Bowers added that some are meeting in person and some are virtual but her concern is getting the tech issues worked out. Streaming isn't consistent. She said if we continue to stream consistently then virtual would be fine but constituents need to be able to see and hear what is going on in local government.

Mr. Leeseberg said that one other concern with opening Council meetings are that attendance is much more popular. City Hall is still a controlled environment.

Mayor Jadwin said that with Mayors Court, we only allow one person at a time. We would have to increase the deep cleaning. She has heard from other municipalities that they are staying virtual because it is difficult

to limit how many people can come in. Assuming we can get technical issues resolved and until COVID numbers in the area go down virtual seems the better way to go.

Mrs. Angelou asked if all the employees have returned.

Mayor Jadwin replied that they came back in June, and some are teleworking. Some have expressed concern with family issues and some positions allow for telework easier than others, but 99% are in the building.

Mrs. Angelou asked if we come back in, we would have to have additional cleaning.

Mr. Crawford said the entire facility is about \$1,000 but we've reduced to just the core areas so his guess it would be \$500.

Mrs. Angelou asked if it is covered with CARES money? And that maybe if it's just a half an hour, that's a lot of money.

Mr. Crawford said it is.

Mrs. McGregor said that it seems like everyone wants to remain virtual and we will revisit this the end of October.

1. ITEM FROM THE CLERK OF COUNCIL

[2020-137](#)

LIQUOR PERMIT REQUEST: 1335 Stoneridge; applicant Pier 11 Boiling Seafood

Mrs. Beggerow shared the Liquor permit request. It was filed in December of 2019 and not forwarded to the City in a timely manner. Council took no action.

2. ITEM REFERRED FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

[ORD-073-2020](#)

ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF GAHANNA, OHIO: Amending Chapter 1181 PERSONAL WIRELESS SERVICE FACILITIES

Mr. Mularski presented the legislative file. He stated that he helped put this together and it's for the 5G towers that have different requirements and have State constraints. This gives us the ability to regulate as much as possible the 5G towers.

Public hearing is scheduled for October 5th.

Mrs. McGregor said that not that we can do anything about this, but we might have one of these every block because the 5G waves are much shorter, that might put a lot more towers in our right of ways.

Mr. Leeseberg asked why are we not co-locating these to limit the number of poles. We have a ton of poles out there already.

Mr. Mularski replied that this will give us the ability to require that. We can require it in some instances.

Mr. Leeseberg said that he thought that we weren't requiring co-locating.

Mr. Mularski replied that we don't require it, but it is encouraged, we can't require it.

Mrs. Angelou asked if there is any monetary reimbursement to the City?

Mr. Crawford replied that he isn't aware of any reimbursement, there is an application fee, and utilities pay an annual fee, but there is nothing else we can get from this.

Mr. Leeseberg said that there is some revenue generation from them being on our pole.

Mr. Crawford replied that this code will allow us to require them to co-locate on a city owned pole, but that will be challenging due to the requirements of upgrading that pole to be able to sustain the added load. We want to avoid ugly poles in areas, but we'll use this code to hide these things as best as we can. Using a city owned pole isn't really what we want to do, it adds more liability when they are adding to a city owned asset. We incur additional cost to maintain the larger city-owned asset.

Mr. Schnetzer asked about the option to have cell towers that look like a street light and them going though the neighborhoods. In a situation where there is already a street light, is it possible to steer them towards replacing the pole that exists with a cell tower/light pole.

Mr. Crawford replied that it is the same issue as above, we could require them to upgrade the city asset, but then we own an asset that isn't standard. If a car knocks down a streetlight, we have to replace a pole that is bigger and not standard- and how fast would we need to replace it to satisfy the cell company, we don't keep poles in stock.

Mr. Leeseberg said that as far as the cost goes, poles get hit, it happens,

he just doesn't want more poles than we have to, and we have a ton.

Mrs. Angelou asked if there is vandalism potential when they're lower?

Mr. Crawford replied that he was not aware of increased vandalism. The actual antenna are actually 20 ft off the ground.

Ms. Bowers asked about other municipalities' attempts to be more restrictive that were circumvented by the General Assembly. Is there anything we can do to encourage changes at the state level?

Mr. Mularski replied just to contact the state legislators.

Recommendation: Introduction/First Reading and return to Committee. Public Hearing scheduled for October 5, 2020.

3. ITEM FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

Presentation: CARES Program and Use of Additional CARES funds.

Ms. Bury said that she actually needed to introduce a supplemental for CARES Act funding. She asked Council to return to weekly meetings because she is having difficulty getting information prepared every other week to try to make things timely. She requests weekly meetings even if virtual.

Mayor Jadwin asked Ms. Bury to explain the Budget process/timeline.

Ms. Bury outlined the budget time line and said she is having a hard time adjusting the budget timeline to the every other week meeting schedule. She added that the tax budget rates resolution has been received and needs to be submitted by October 1. She asks that during the budget season, that Council meet weekly.

Mrs. McGregor said that perhaps during budget season a meet every week would be prudent.

Mrs. Angelou agreed.

Mr. Schnetzer said that if it will be just a couple of incidents, we could have special meetings.

Ms. Bowers added, or Finance meetings.

Ms. Bury said it would be helpful and have the ability to have special meetings.

Mr. Schnetzer said that was the purpose of a special meeting, to adapt and be flexible to a constraint.

Mrs. McGregor asked if there is a reason to call one meeting (committee) over a special meeting.

Mr. Mularski said it could be either, it could be discussed at either one.

Mrs. McGregor asked when this needs to start.

Ms. Bury said she just got the tax budget with the rates so perhaps to call a special meeting on the 28th to adopt that in time for the 1st.

Mr. Leeseberg said we can intro and pass as an emergency.

Ms. Bury said her understanding is she would have to introduce it first which would be done at committee.

Mr. Leeseberg said we can introduce it and adopt it at the same meeting. This is a yearly item that is addressed every year.

Mr. Mularski clarified that Committee and Council is not interchangeable. It depends on what you want to do.

Mrs. Angelou said she would like to go back to weekly. We could just have regular meeting and the next week come in for finance and the 5th Monday would not be anything. This is an important time of year and now we have CARES Act money so it would be prudent to have Finance Committee the next Monday and helpful for us. It is something we would be doing if it weren't for COVID-19.

Mrs. McGregor said Joann needs a special meeting on the 28th, so could we have a special meeting and finance meeting on the 28th? So finance meeting on the 2nd and 4th Mondays in October.

Mr. Schnetzer asked what the ask is from Ms. Bury.

Ms. Bury replied that she needs to introduce legislation for the CARES act money.

Mr. Schnetzer said that ok, budget season is basically now through the end of the year. In years past, we haven't always had good discussion early on, so there isn't a reason Finance couldn't be stacked onto regular meeting nights, but if there is a time crunch a special meeting is

appropriate to address that.

Mayor Jadwin added to keep in mind there will be additional CARES act reporting at the end of the year. So there will be budget and the CARES act on top of that.

Mrs. Angelou said that CARES act deadline may be extended to the 31st.

Ms. Bury said that is the deadline for the county and state to do their reporting but we have to do ours first.

Mrs. Angelou asked has there been any report on the excess money, she heard it was going to be per capita vs that group? She hasn't heard if that has been passed by the Senate.

Ms. Bury said that as far as she knows they're going to use the local government formula, she hasn't heard of any changes.

Mrs. McGregor said so we don't need to do anything special next week, we can wait until the 21st to see what we need to do.

Ms. Bury asked if this is adequate as an introduction for legislation for the CARES act.

Mrs. Beggerow said that there is no ordinance or supporting material.

Ms. Bury said she needs to bring the information forward for the introduction.

Mrs. Beggerow said that we don't have mandatory referral so this can be brought forward for introduction and adoption same evening with a waiver of second reading.

4. ITEMS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE & ENGINEERING

[ORD-075-2020](#)

AN ORDINANCE ACCEPTING RIGHT OF WAY DEED FOR 0.33 +/- ACRES ALONG THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 350 WEST JOHNSTOWN ROAD.

Mr. Crawford presented his legislation. The report and supporting material is attached.

No questions were asked.

RECOMMENDATION: Consent Agenda.

[ORD-076-2020](#)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH INSITUFORM TECHNOLOGIES, LLC FOR THE 2020 SEWER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; WAIVING SECOND READING.

Mr. Crawford presented his legislation. The report and supporting material is attached.

Mr. Renner asked the timeline for the lining parts.

Mr. Moorehead replied that he doesn't have a final schedule from them. The expectation is that the duration is short and will be completed in 2020.

Mrs. Angelou asked if we need a waiver of second reading.

Mr. Crawford said we don't but it would certainly help.

Added waiver of second reading to legislation.

Mr. Moorehead added that the date for substantial completion is December 16th, 2020.

RECOMMENDATION: Consent Agenda.

[ORD-077-2020](#)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND ENGINEERING TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH BELFOR FOR REPAIRS OF THE OKLAHOMA AVENUE SERVICE COMPLEX STORAGE BINS; WAIVING SECOND READING; DECLARING IT AN EMERGENCY.

Mr. Crawford presented his legislation. The report and supporting material is attached.

Mrs. McGregor asked if the supplemental is included in this ordinance.

Mr. Crawford replied that it is.

Ms. Bowers asked about waiving competitive bidding. Do we have history with Belfor in Gahanna?

Mr. Crawford said that we do not, but city officials have been reaching out to contractors and were able to obtain 3 quotes and the third company dropped out so this was the lowest of the 2 quotes.

Ms. Bowers asked when the storm hit.

Mr. Crawford replied it was the May rain event.

Ms. Bowers asked the timeline for completion.

Mr. Crawford said it was as soon as possible, no estimate on the time provided.

RECOMMENDATION: Regular Agenda.

Update on Creekside Engineering Project

Mayor Jadwin said that this issue relates to a contract discussed on April 6. Because Creekside, which was built about 15 years ago, is in a flood plain area, a special flood plain use permit was required at the time of construction to comply with city and FEMA requirements. Staff has been searching for this certificate because FEMA had requested it and it has not been located. The plan was to expand the search and adopt a contingency if it were not able to be located.

Mr. Crawford stated that the contingency plan was to secure an engineering plan, which Council approved April 6, with DLZ Engineering. After months of surveying, the report was received on August 28th. We are still evaluating that draft report. Tim Hampshire is here from DLZ to present a summary overview of those draft findings.

Mr. Hampshire heads up the water resources group at DLZ. He said DLZ was contracted in April to look at a couple of issues with the facility- whether a no rise certificate could be issued for the structure since it was built in a flood plain- that building the building doesn't create any detrimental increases in flood plain elevations which could flood adjacent structures. Also, whether a flood proofing certificate could be issued for the underground facility which says the facility would remain waterproof during a high-water event in the adjacent creek - the inside would remain reasonably dry for insurance purposes. There are some good findings but it's a mixed bag. A no rise certificate can be issued for the project. The analysis indicated that there is an insignificant rise in Big Walnut Creek. The flood proofing certificate required them to consider the effect of a 100-year event on the structure. It is a number established by FEMA. What was found that the walls that circumvent the parking garage. In general, those would be OK structurally during a high-water event. There is a bit of stress, but he was comfortable saying the walls would be fine. The concrete floor of the parking garage is a thin lightly reinforced slab on grade. It's just a 6-inch concrete slab with very little reinforcing steel that lays on a bed of gravel. One concern is during a high water ground water event around the parking garage, whereas the walls would be able to withstand the loading, there is a possibility that a great deal of water could percolate around that garage floor or heave/lift

the floor slab up. There could be enough water pressure under the floor slab to lift it up and enter the garage. Water could enter the garage where the concrete floor meets the walls. The other concern is that there are a few rooms, one in particular, the pool equipment/pump room, was constructed after the main walls were built. They cut openings through the main walls, installed doors, and then built the walls of the pump room out of masonry block and mortar such that you would see in a residential basement. Those type of walls, the exterior mortar and block walls are under stress from soil loading and water loading. The big picture is that the main walls appear to be ok, but the concerns are with the floor slab and the walls that were installed after the fact. During the construction of the facility, there was a slurry wall constructed around the entire complex. This is a concrete wall that is underground, you can't see it and it goes all around the Creekside facility to keep the water out. Caveats with that, there are a lot of documentation or reports that part of that may have been damaged or collapsed or they may have hit some obstructions underground that may have prevented it from being successfully constructed all the way around the perimeter. In addition, a lot of surface features are required in order to make that system watertight. The 100-year flood event is basically 1ft below the first floor of those buildings. There is a lot of surface features that are also needed to keep this system watertight. That would include concrete walking surface, drives, there was also to be a 2 ft clay cap installed in certain areas and there are indications that that has been penetrated through for the usual installation of utilities and landscaping improvements. We have been monitoring the ground water level and it has consistently been a couple of feet below the floor slab. But we haven't had a 100-year flood. There are some things that need addressed moving forward with the facility.

Mr. Renner asked if DLZ is still monitoring the water around it and will they be upcoming?

Mr. Hampshire said there is automated ground water monitoring sensors and is set up for continuing monitoring. It began in the March/April time frame and did capture a high-water event and there was water in the parking garage, but the ground water was still shown below that level. It has remained consistent.

Mrs. McGregor asked if that high-water event was when Hoover was released?

Mr. Hampshire said he didn't think this event was in relation to water released by Hoover.

Mr. Moorehead said it was a combination of runoff and some from

Hoover. Their gates were up, but water flowed over the top dropping water into the creek. So, there was some contribution.

Mrs. McGregor said she would be curious as to what the results would be when we have that big release from Hoover.

Mr. Leeseberg asked if the report was done.

Mr. Hampshire said it is complete but is stamped draft but is essentially done except for any additional monitoring.

Mayor Jadwin asked about some corrections that needed done.

Mr. Moorehead said there are, but the substance is complete.

Mayor Jadwin asked Mr. Hampshire to share next steps.

Mr. Hampshire said the first step is to continue monitoring. There are steps that can be done soon to help waterproof the facility. Examples are missing items, anchor bolts, stop logs, to keep the water out during a high-water event. It appears as though backflow preventors are missing- they are a low-cost item to install and that could be done quickly and inexpensively.

Mayor Jadwin asked what would be the next step for the garage itself.

Mr. Hampshire replied it would be to address the CMU- mortar and block walls. Those walls are overstressed, there are signs of water infiltration through those walls. Any pipes that went through the concrete walls, some of those show signs of not being sealed against water infiltration. The garage floor is the big issue on the list. We have not seen a 100 year event at the site and if it were to get to that and finds an opening though the surface or if it were to get to an elevation where there are defects in the slurry wall, it could begin to fill up quickly. Remediation is recommended- install a structural floor slab.

Mayor Jadwin asked if the report contain the recommendations.

Mr. Hampshire said it does. With the structure being built and trying to remediate deficiencies, a more comprehensive model of the facility would be needed in order to model how these loads are being shared from the floor slab up into the walls. One way to address it is to remediate the floor slab to carry those water loads over into the parking garage walls. Right now the floor slab is doing its own thing. A redesign would be needed to make the floor slab and the walls to act as a unit.

Mayor Jadwin asked if there is a required time frame?

Mr. Hampshire said he didn't know if there was, but there hasn't been a large water event. We are getting into the fall, the spring is when the high-water events occur, the bigger concern is that the floor has never been proof tested to a high-water event. You'll never know that until there is a high-water event.

Mrs. McGregor said that essentially, a flood proofing certificate cannot be issued.

Mr. Hampshire said correct. I no rise permit can, but flood proofing cannot.

Mr. Mularski asked if fixing the floor would allow for a flood proofing certificate.

Mr. Hampshire said fixing the floor, along with the other items: taking care of the masonry walls, addressing the stop logs, the closure gates that have to be put up during a high water event, sealing newer pipe penetrations through the walls, flat gates on the outlet pipes.. a flood proofing certificate could eventually be issued but the floor is just one part of the puzzle.

Mr. Schnetzer asked if the water monitoring devices were in place since April.

Mr. Hampshire said the latter part of April. He can get an exact date.

Mr. Schnetzer said it was more of curiosity, he was looking at USGS gage data at the Central College gage that was just below the Hoover spillway and it looks like the largest discharge event this year appears to be late May. But maybe we can take some comfort that your monitoring device picked up the largest event this year and maybe back into 2018 for whatever that is worth.

Mr. Hampshire said he knows we captured one of the larger water events shortly after implementation.

Mr. Moorehead said that event in May, they were able to get the holes drilled and in the ground 2-3 days before that event occurred. It is also important to state that that Central College gage is only reflects discharge from Hoover reservoir. It is located such that the river is 100 feet down street from the dam, so the rest of the runoff doesn't get

captured in that gage. The height of the flooding that we did record with that gage was consistent with that of a 5-year flood, so we did get tested to a significant event but not that of a 100 year flood which the structure needs to be secured to.

Mr. Leeseberg said we have had historically had flood waters up to the bottom of the 62 bridge, that's a far more significant event, we didn't have the monitors at the time, we haven't had a failure in 15 years.

Mrs. McGregor said that the big boulder has a plaque on it that marks the high flood mark from 1959.

No further questions, meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

April Beggerow, MPA, CMC
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the Committee of the Whole, this
day of 2020.

Jamie Leeseberg