



City of Gahanna

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Meeting Minutes Committee of the Whole

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

Jeremy A. VanMeter, Clerk of Council

Monday, July 17, 2023

7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

A. CALL TO ORDER:

Vice President of Council Trenton I. Weaver, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The agenda was published on July 14, 2023. All members were present for the meeting. There were no additions or corrections to the agenda.

Introduction of Shannon Hamons, Director of Economic Development

Vice President Weaver recognized Mayor Jadwin for a moment to speak. Mayor Jadwin introduced the new Director of Economic Development, Shannon Hamons, and invited him to share a few words with Council. Mr. Hamons expressed his thanks to those members of Council whom he had already met for their words of encouragement. He is looking forward to making a difference in the community. He has about 30 years of experience in economic development, which is a balance of private and public sectors. Mr. Weaver thanked Mr. Hamons and shared that he looks forward to working together. The Mayor added that many people from the state level, local communities, and development sector have expressed their excitement for Mr. Hamons to join Gahanna's team.

B. ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE:

[MT-0014-2023](#)

A MOTION AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT AND WAIVE COMPETITIVE BIDDING PURSUANT TO CODE SECTION 133.02(c)(4)(A)(2) FOR EMERGENCY REPLACEMENT OF THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL CABINET AT GRANVILLE STREET AND FLINT RIDGE DRIVE

Kevin Shultz, Senior Director of Operations, presented information on the Department of Public Service items. The traffic signal cabinet at Granville

Street and Flint Ridge Drive was run over just before the opening of the new library. This motion would allow the administration to enter into an agreement with Jess Howard for replacement of the traffic signal cabinet.

Recommendation: Adoption on Consent Agenda on 7/24/2023.

[ORD-0056-2023](#)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION - General Fund and Streets Fund for Traffic Signal Cabinet Repairs

Director Schultz noted that the second item, ORD-0056-2023, is for funding the traffic signal cabinet repair at the cost of \$75,549.47 with a 10% contingency on the project. Some of this work has already been completed in the emergency repair, as well as the reconstruction of the fiber when it was pulled out of the ground during the accident. The work that Jess Howard has left totals about \$69,897.30.

Councilmember Padova asked if the repair would allow for the green arrow signal going into the library. Director Schultz said that his understanding of the green arrow is that the loop indicator in the pavement is bad. There is no traffic camera detection at that intersection; it is actually the loop detector in the road. That situation is under investigation and there is still uncertainty as to what it will take to fix that issue. Director Schultz said there has been discussion of putting detection in that intersection to bypass the loop, which is somewhat outdated technology. Padova clarified that these requests will not fix that issue; Director Schultz confirmed.

Councilmember Renner asked about the project timeline. Assuming it passes, how fast will everything be done? Is there a completion date? Director Schultz stated that it depends on the supply chain. A previous project took months for the cabinet to arrive. It is hard to tell how long this one would take.

Councilmember McGregor asked if an emergency is needed for the appropriation. Director Schultz stated that the second action needs two readings and there will be no 30-day hold, so emergency action is not needed. A waiver was not requested because waiting an extra two weeks is not an issue. McGregor asked if there is a way to recoup some of the cost from the individual who hit the cabinet. Director Schultz confirmed that they do go back with the liability insurance provider of the person who caused the damage. The city has a new insurance provider and they will handle the claim just as if two individuals had been in an accident. In the future, this supplemental will not be needed because the insurance provider will be able to recoup the cost. The agreement with the new insurance provider commenced in April, while the accident took place in February or March.

Vice President Weaver shared that his version has the waiver in the title and asked for clarification. Mayor Jadwin stated that it had been removed. Director Schultz stated that the waiver of second reading should be stricken from the title.

**Recommendation: Introduction/First Reading on Regular Agenda on 7/24/2023;
Second Reading/Adoption on Consent Agenda on 8/7/2023.**

C. DISCUSSIONS:

1. Tobacco Retail License - Franklin County Public Health

[2023-0029](#)

FCPH Draft Template - Tobacco Licensing

Councilmember Padova introduced the presentation by sharing a graph showing that electronic cigarettes and vapes have become more popular now than standard cigarettes were in the 1990s. She shared that both of her parents and other relatives smoked and recalled begging them to stop, even before fully understanding the health risks. Today, the smell has been removed and flavors have been added, which makes smoking more enticing. Essentially, twenty years of progress have been wiped away by these advances in tobacco. Councilmember Padova and Clerk VanMeter have been comparing Tobacco Retail Licensing (TRL) legislation in comparable areas, and Whitehall recently passed a TRL ordinance. It includes caps on how many licenses will be issued and includes proximities to youth-oriented facilities. It grandfatheres in existing retailers while establishing guidelines for new retailers. Whitehall has roughly the same number of retailers as Gahanna. Padova wants to ensure Council is moving forward correctly. The Columbus flavor ban will go into effect next year. Like Whitehall, Gahanna shares borders with Columbus. Padova introduced Lola Ajibola and Eric West, representatives of Franklin County Public Health (FCPH). Ms. Ajibola introduced herself as the Behavioral Health and Addiction Services Supervisor at FCPH, overseeing the TRL program and harm reduction efforts. Ms. Ajibola said her presentation will go over how the TRL policies can impact the community and outline operational policies as more communities are onboarded. It will define timelines and procedures for compliance checks and underage buys.

Eric West thanked Council for allowing FCPH to present. The first point is to outline why a policy should be adopted in the first place. It is to

reduce youth access from the source. Youth have access to tobacco in a variety of ways but stopping it at the source is one objective. In 2021-2022 there were 108 GJPS students who were disciplined for tobacco-related reasons. Right now, they want to hold retailers accountable but there aren't guidelines to do that. There are state restrictions and a state license for cigarette retailers. However, this does not encompass all forms of tobacco, and the FCPH license covers all forms including vape products. It is rooted in health equity. The flavor ban Columbus is enacting is something that one other Franklin County city has done - Bexley. In Gahanna, 34.9% of adult smokers were using menthol cigarettes in the last year. Statistically, nationwide, menthol is catered toward the Black and African American community. So, this issue is largely about health equity. Tobacco impacts everywhere and Gahanna is no different. In Gahanna, 16.1% of adults use tobacco. There are 28 tobacco retailers in Gahanna, which is 3.5 for every 1,000 students. All schools within the school district are located within two miles of a tobacco retailer. FCPH encourages the distance from schools to be put into an ordinance if one is passed by Council. Policy items to consider include tobacco retailers' distance from schools. Existing retailers would be grandfathered into those boundaries; however, if the business changes ownership it would be considered a new retailer and they could be held accountable for not selling tobacco in the future. Mr. West said there is typically a fine or penalty structure with such a policy. He said that Reynoldsburg, Whitehall, Bexley, and Hilliard have passed ordinances so far. They have all used the structure of \$500 for a first offence, then \$750, and \$1,000 with a possibility of license suspension or revocation/non-renewal if the penalties reach that level. Signage is provided to the retailers and there are placement requirements.

Ms. Ajibola shared that once an ordinance is passed, FCPH works with the city's legal department to establish a contract. It details the scope of services and what would be expected from the city. The epidemiology team would work to confirm the number of tobacco retailers in the area, then establish a launch date. Ajibola outlined the timeline for communications with retailers once policies are in place. Mr. West commented that the FCPH will go to each retailer, post the signage, and provide handouts to each retailer. Each retailer goes through a checklist with FCPH staff to ensure they are aware of compliance requirements. There are two components of a compliance check. They go to the retailer

and check that they are in compliance with the local ordinance, as well as making sure the required signage is posted. The other component is attempted underage purchases. Ideally, no purchases will actually be made through these attempts. FCPH has a team of trained 18-20-year-olds who will do the purchase attempts. West outlined the process for attempted underage purchases. He also shared examples of the compliance checklist and the tobacco retail license. The Mayor clarified that FCPH issues the license; West confirmed.

Vice President Weaver thanked Ms. Ajibola and Mr. West for their presentation.

Councilmember Schnetzer directed a question to his Council colleagues, asking what precisely Council wants to do. He wondered if the issue is flavoring - selling tobacco to anyone under 21 is already illegal, so would an ordinance be redundant? Padova said that Whitehall's ordinance does not have a ban on flavoring, and one would be up to Council. West shared that Bexley is the only city in the area with a flavor ban. Padova said that regardless of the flavor ban, this ordinance ensures that all retailers receive the compliance checks, the license, and it puts the pressure on the owner rather than an employee to comply. Hopefully, with these new policies in place, underage buys will not occur as often. Schnetzer said it seems like a method of enforcement.

The Mayor wondered about the 28 retailers, and if there was a list. She counted 19. She wondered if the count included the schools in Jefferson Township, or only within the City of Gahanna. Padova added that attached to the agenda there is a map. She believes that all retailers are on the map, which includes 25 retailers. FCPH had identified 28, which may have been pulled from the Auditor's office. Padova asked West how the list of retailers is determined. West said that FCPH's list will be checked against Council's list and they will make the determination together.

Councilmember McGregor posed questions relating to the Whitehall ordinance. It refers to Franklin County Board of Health (FCBH), but she wanted to clarify that FCPH and FCBH are the same entity. Ajibola stated that while they are Franklin County Public Health, Franklin County Board of Health is their governing body. McGregor pointed out there is a

typo in Whitehall's ordinance, at 741.10(C). In another section, the ordinance says the Mayor can appoint more licenses if they are of value to the city. McGregor wondered how this is determined. West said he is not sure how Whitehall made the determination. McGregor noted how many licenses are set by the ordinance. Whitehall allows for one license per 685 residents, which would be 51 licenses in Gahanna. She feels this is too many licenses allowed. The Mayor remarked that would allow double the amount currently in the city. West added that his understanding was that Whitehall based the number off of the current number of licenses within their city. McGregor asked what happens if a new childcare facility locates itself within the boundary of an already-existing tobacco retailer. West replied that while this would be covered in the agreement or ordinance that Council creates, it would probably be covered under the grandfather rule that applies to already-existing establishments. West said new tobacco retailers would not be allowed to locate themselves within the set boundary of the school. McGregor asked how the number of smokers in Gahanna are determined. West replied that the epidemiology team works on that, and there are also area surveys to collect that information. McGregor wondered if the 108 reported tobacco incidents in the schools were all unique incidents, or if they were from repeat offenders. She noted that it only amounts to 1% of Gahanna's students. West said that he believes these are unique incidents, but also noted that this number only includes those who are caught and disciplined. He added that kids are finding ingenious ways of hiding such things, and that enforcement can be difficult. Some schools resorted to vape detectors. Mayor Jadwin asked if the Whitehall ordinance had been adopted; West confirmed.

Councilmember Bowers expressed her gratitude for the presentation. She noted that the lack of enforcement of this issue has been concerning and there are currently not resources at the state level for enforcement. It is clear that local governments have the right to regulate tobacco. She said it is a non-partisan issue and there is bi-partisan support for the issue. Bowers asked if there has been any kind of periodic review or comprehensive tracking for the existing programs. West said that so far, the program has been launched in Hilliard, and FCPH will be providing Hilliard with a report of compliance checks so they can see retailers' adherence to the license requirements. Hilliard can then reevaluate their program. Ajibola added that these are still conversations they are having

and they are still determining how to work through the data to share it with Hilliard. The process is still being ironed out. Bowers said she would want, at the most expansive, to see a review every three years. She is interested in fine-tuning the research tools to collect a more accurate percentage of smokers, including teens. There is not one piece of legislation that will fully solve the issue, but if there is some impact from this initiative, that would be fantastic. Bowers asked what an appropriate number of retail licenses is for a community of 36,000.

Councilmember Padova added that one of the first things she is glad to hear is two colleagues questioning the limit. She would like to remove the part of how many retailers per residents and make it a set number. She would like feedback from Council on how many retailers they want to see. She does not want to see an onslaught of vape shops opening up in Gahanna as the flavor ban in Columbus takes place. West acknowledged that the flavor ban takes place in February 2024, and Columbus did not want to see retailers going to other communities. He said that if multiple jurisdictions are on board with creating policies, that will help prevent that problem.

Mr. West inquired about the map that Padova referenced. Padova said that she and VanMeter had put the map together on their own. West asked if FCPH could have the map as well so they can include it in their resources when determining the current number of licenses.

Councilmember McGregor asked if all the cities enact a ban or licensing, unincorporated areas of Franklin County would still have no restrictions, and wondered if Franklin County has any way to enact a ban. Ajibola said that unfortunately Franklin County does not have a way to enact a ban yet. Padova clarified that right now Gahanna would not be enacting a flavor ban. The City would only be requiring the licensing.

Attorney Mularski and Mayor Jadwin commented that they were not able to find the Whitehall ordinance. West stated that January 17th should have been the date it was passed but noted that he had to find the ordinance through previous meeting minutes rather than directly on the site. Jadwin said she appreciated the presentation and applauds the efforts. She also noted her personal experience of having parents that smoked, and that it seemed “cool” because of Hollywood. She believes

there are some contradictions in the draft that was given to Council. Mr. VanMeter and Padova noted that the Whitehall clerk had sent a Word version so that redlines could be made.

Councilmember Bowers asked about possible video training sessions, and whether those were a part of the program. Mr. West said FCPH is looking into a recording training session that retailers will have access to. Bowers asked if the local municipal ordinance would be referenced on the certificate. West confirmed it would be reference. Bowers said it seems like the purpose of this ordinance is to shift enforcement to the entity that wants to enforce it, which is Franklin County Public Health, and to take it off of Gahanna's law enforcement. She expressed gratitude to FCPH for taking on the program.

Vice President Weaver thanked Councilmember Padova and Clerk VanMeter for their work. He brought the conversation back to Council's earlier questions of *What is the goal?* He noted there are still questions and still plenty of time for questions. He said that perhaps right now is not the time for the flavor ban, given what other communities are doing. He asked if the City Attorney could review the situation and also reach out to Attorney Bivens in Whitehall to discuss how it is working for them. In the meantime, Council can send questions to Councilmember Padova to convey to FCPH.

Councilmember Angelou asked why there wouldn't be a flavor ban. West said there is hesitancy in other communities to do everything at once. He felt there has been some push from Columbus for other communities to do the flavor ban at the same time, but there has been some overall hesitancy with doing so. Angelou commented that she feels Gahanna should include the flavor ban and do it all at once. West said he thinks the hesitancy comes from not wanting to upset community members. Flavors include those found in cigarettes, cigars, and chewing tobacco, though West noted that vaping is the fastest growing of all forms of tobacco. It is appealing to youth because of the flavors and research is still being done to determine if vaping is a safer alternative. Research shows youth are starting with vaping and not using more traditional forms of tobacco. Padova added to this point, that if a flavor ban is the will of Council, she will look into it. This feedback is what she is seeking. She believes flavored tobacco is what is targeted in youth. Children don't necessarily

know what it is and may not understand the dangers.

President Renner shared that he is for the licensing component, however said he is opposed to a flavor ban. He feels that an adult who wants to smoke can make the choice for themselves. The dangers can be explained to them, but as long as the adult is over 21, they have the freedom to choose if they want to smoke those particular products. A flavor ban would take away the rights of citizens who chose to do that. He does, however, want to protect children, and acknowledged that the ban on smoking in public places was the right move. Since February 2024 is when the ban goes into effect and we can project out a bit as to when retailers may be looking to expand, he wants to target a timeframe to put everything together. Padova said that depending on the feedback received tonight and shortly after the meeting, she and VanMeter will get together next week to continue the conversation. She believes they can bring it back to Council on the 31st or August 14th to have a draft for first reading to Council. McGregor said she is OK with the licensing at this point and would like to move forward with that portion and not move forward with a complete flavor ban. Weaver agreed and suggested that Council target August 14th to bring the issue back to Council.

Councilmember Angelou shared that she was previously a smoker, and she feels the bans are important because of how difficult it is to stop. West said that is one of the reasons some cities were hesitant of the ban.

Mayor Jadwin said she will send Padova the questions that the administration has. Vice President Weaver thanked Mr. West and Ms. Ajibola for their presentation and time.

Recommendation: Scheduled for further discussion on 8/14/2023.

D. ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING:

[ORD-0054-2023](#) AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL AND REPLACE CODE SECTION 521.06 - CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND REPLACEMENT OF SIDEWALKS, INTEGRAL APPROACHES/APRONS AND RELATED AREAS; AND TO REPEAL AND REPLACE CHAPTER 903 - SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Director of Engineering Tom Komlanc and Transportation & Mobility Engineer Paige Wright presented sidewalk program updates. There are approximately 200 miles of sidewalk within the city. Of that, about 90% is

in residential areas. Ten percent are in commercial or non-residential areas. There are just over 2,000 ADA curb ramps. A third-party service provider has been capturing data about the city's sidewalks. There is about \$17.5 million worth of maintenance activity across the City. If approximately 180 miles of the 200 total are in residential areas, the overall maintenance cost is about \$15.7 million. This is an average of about \$87,000 per mile. In 2023, there is about \$541,625 in maintenance related activity. In 2022, this was \$857,105 and in 2021 it was \$1,219,740. There were more defects in the sidewalks targeted in the 2022 program, showing that the level of defects varies. In the past 3 years, about 15% or \$2.6 million of the overall sidewalk maintenance has been carried out.

Councilmember Bowers congratulated Engineer Wright on her PE designation. On the commercial piece, she asked Director Komlanc to walk her through that process again. Komlanc said that one example is the Crescent development going in off of Tech Center Drive. New ADA-compliant sidewalks will be going in with this development. Kroger and McDonald's and things on Hamilton Road would have an opportunity to review the sidewalks if there was a change in that frontage. Bowers asked if, when doing the evaluations to see if sidewalks need repaired, it could also apply to commercial properties. Komlanc replied that doing so would get into the question of cost sharing, and whether the cost share program would apply to commercial properties. Bowers asked if there could be a commercial sidewalk program similar to the residential sidewalk program. Director Komlanc said that could be applied as they are maintaining a particular street where existing sidewalks are. He said challenge then is making more funds available up front. Bowers and Mayor Jadwin suggested that it may simply be a form of code enforcement and not a new program. Bowers asked if there would be some proactivity with code enforcement. Komlanc stated he could check. He is aware of an applicant for a property located on Havens Corners that is doing some site improvements and as part of the process there were areas of sidewalk improvements that were identified. Bowers feels that as we think about attracting development to the region, she doesn't want to lose sight of commercial sidewalk maintenance. Bowers asked about being more intentional with fees in lieu from the last presentation. Director Komlanc said there are areas such as along Taylor Rd and Taylor Station Rd where there is not a cohesive sidewalk network in place, but as improvements are done there could be a requirement to put turn lanes or facilitate improvements. There are ways to capture those dollars to then use for a capital project. Bowers commented on apartments on the south end of Morrison Rd. There are apartment complexes and nearby bus stops, and frequently there are pedestrians walking where there are no sidewalks. Developers argued that they

should not put in sidewalks because they would be “sidewalks to nowhere,” which has led to pedestrians walking in grass strips. Komlanc said this issue spoke to the fees in lieu aspect, so that as dollars come in, they can be set aside for projects.

Councilmember Padova thanked the staff for their work on putting together the information. She asked if residents are still responsible for paying 50% of the project if the City decides they need sidewalk repairs done. Komlanc said that on residential streets with no sidewalk, residents abutting that area can petition for an assessment. If they have 60% more of the abutting property owners that wish to have sidewalk facility constructed, in concert with a street rebuild or street maintenance, 50% of the cost would be covered by the city, up to the amount that is authorized in the City’s annual budget. Padova said that about a year ago, there is an area of Rocky Fork that was supposed to have sidewalks put in but because of the slope there were issues. It was put on pause because of the study and residents are still wondering when the sidewalks will be put in. She is concerned that residents may be under the impression that they will have sidewalks put in at no cost. Komlanc stated that the residents would have to have a petition with 60% of the property owners and then would be responsible for 50% of the cost. He acknowledged this is something Council could discuss as well. The rationale is that when a subdivision went in previously, it wasn’t built with a sidewalk, so residents didn’t incur that cost overtime. He noted that there is a benefit to connectivity.

Mayor Jadwin asked if there is a street rebuild on a street without a sidewalk, would the City bear the cost of the sidewalk? Komlanc said the City would ask the residents if they want sidewalks installed in their neighborhood. Padova asked for clarification: currently, would residents or the city pay for a sidewalk? Komlanc said that on residential streets with existing, non-ADA compliant sidewalk, the City will pay for the sidewalk facility on both sides as part of a rebuild. But for areas that do not, that is not presently part of the program. Ms. Wright added that her understanding is that where Gahanna City Code is silent, it defaults to the Ohio Revised Code. The petition for assessment would default for these residential streets. The City is adding a caveat of covering 50% of these residential streets with the proposed changes.

Councilmember Bowers asked Councilmember Padova if some sidewalks were put in at the City’s cost. Councilmember McGregor agreed that they were. Bowers asked if the department could look back on recent sidewalk projects to see what has transpired. McGregor said on Rocky Fork Drive North, west of Flint Ridge, there was a problem with the slope when the sidewalks were redone. Jadwin confirmed that it

needed further engineering review. Padova said that those residents were told they would be getting sidewalks. It was postponed because of the slope, and now her concern is they will receive an unexpected bill if the sidewalks are put in. She expressed concern over what will happen to the existing sidewalk projects that have not been completed. McGregor brought up the Safe Routes to School program, which completely covered the cost of some sidewalks on Heil and Shull, because they were leading to Jefferson Elementary. Komlanc expressed his desire to be fair and equitable when rebuilding streets. He added that in CIP planning that cost will have to be considered. Mayor Jadwin stated that is the purpose of the conversation. Council needs to have input on the cost of these projects. Making the sidewalk repairs and replacement fair and equitable for all residences, regardless of income, lot size, and other factors is of utmost importance.

Director Komlanc stated that as the code currently exists, if sidewalk installation or repair is done, it is assessed to property owners. The question now is whether to rewrite the code so that if there is a street rebuild, the City covers the cost of that.

Councilmember Schnetzer expressed that in order for him to make an informed decision, he would need to see more numbers.

Councilmember McGregor asked if the two situations being discussed are a sidewalk installation within a street rebuild and a sidewalk installation outside of a street rebuild. If there was an area that wanted sidewalks, they would go the petition route for 50%. But if it is part of the rebuild, the City would cover it. Komlanc replied that eventually they would get around to the rebuild, but it's going to be a long time. He added that the way to find hard figures is to see the residential areas that don't have sidewalks and calculate them at \$400,000 per mile.

Ms. Wright asked if Council would like to look at commercial and residential sidewalks, or only residential. Bowers feels both types should be considered, perhaps with an exception for Route 62, which could become a multi-jurisdictional area. Vice President Weaver wondered how it would work with multi-jurisdictional areas where there is a county road. Could it be calculated in the same manner? Councilmember Bowers relayed that it was her understanding that this is not something that can be done independently.

Councilmember Schnetzer noted that there has been conversation as to whether a multi-jurisdictional trail should be constructed in that area. Director Komlanc confirmed. Mayor Jadwin reminded the group that the conversation is on the sidewalk maintenance program, so some of the

conversations being discussed are outside the purview of tonight's meeting. The goal is to discuss the sidewalk maintenance program.

Councilmember Schnetzer noted that he understood what was brought forward, which is whether a homeowner should bear the cost, or part of the cost, of a sidewalk installation program. He feels that in order to engage in the discussion, Council needs to have more information on the cost. Komlanc replied that the department can take an inventory of residential areas that do not have sidewalks and determine an estimate for sidewalk facilities. He added that as it relates to West Johnstown Road, Stygler Road, Agler Road, and Route 62, there may be opportunities within the CIP projects to have multi-use paths or sidewalk facilities installed as a part of the broader improvements within the context of a larger CIP project. The intent is to cover not only maintenance, but to get the areas ADA and PROWAG compliant.

Councilmember Padova asked if it is possible to get a count of how many projects there are in which residents are expecting the City to cover the cost of the sidewalks. Komlanc stated that would be difficult not knowing what conversations would have transpired with previous engineers. Padova clarified that she is referring to situations in which Council approved money to be spent to survey, design, or plan for sidewalks. She noted it has been done on Rocky Fork Drive, but it concerns her that there is not a status on the project.

Vice President Weaver circled back to the ask before Council. A proposed ordinance has had a first reading and is slated for a second reading but there are still many questions, some of which may not be directly related to the ordinance. He asked what the Council would like to do with this piece of legislation.

Councilmember Bowers said there are several pieces that are priorities, and wondered if there are portions that can be tabled so that others can be passed. The unpassed portions can continue to be discussed. She asked Mr. Mularski for legal guidance. Mr. Mularski commented that legally, any part of it can be tabled, but practicality is the important part here. Ms. Bowers directed her question to Komlanc, to narrow down what the essentials of the ordinance are to continue the program. Komlanc said the department will look at the provisions to determine if alternative language can be provided for residents to have options: A) the petitioning process through the Ohio Revised Code, or B) a sidewalk will be covered by the City if a rebuild is taking place. Vice President Weaver thanked Director Komlanc.

Recommendation: Scheduled for Adoption/Second Reading 7/24/2023.

E. 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 2023.*

Trenton I. Weaver
Chair