



# 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, May 11, 2026

7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER:**

*Gahanna City Council met for Committee of the Whole on Monday, May 11, 2026, in Council Chambers. Vice President of Council Jamille Jones, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. The agenda was published on May 8, 2026. All members were present for the meeting. There were no additions or corrections to the agenda.*

**B. ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:**

[ORD-0019-2026](#)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A PRE-ANNEXATION AGREEMENT WITH K C REAL PROPERTY INVESTMENTS, LLC AND TRIVIUM DEVELOPMENT LLC FOR PARCEL 170-000488-00 LOCATED AT 4710 EAST JOHNSTOWN ROAD

Director Gottke introduced the proposed annexation of an adjacent parcel to the previously annexed Toney parcels. He explained that the item involved a pre-annexation agreement for the neighboring property and deferred further discussion to David Fisher, counsel for the applicant.

David Fisher stated that the proposed pre-annexation agreement mirrored the agreement previously adopted for the Toney property annexation. He explained that the owners of the neighboring house on East Johnstown Road approached the applicant about selling their property for annexation as part of the overall project. He said the applicant entered into a contract approximately one month earlier to purchase the property and planned to incorporate it into the development

if Council approved the annexation. Mr. Fisher explained that the additional parcel would provide an opportunity to create increased buffering for adjacent properties, particularly for neighbors to the south along Pamela Drive. He stated that the planning process remained in the early stages, although a preliminary plan appeared in Council's packet. He noted that the parcel consisted of approximately one-half acre and that the proposal would combine the property into a single overall project. Mr. Fisher then offered to answer questions from Council.

Vice President Jones asked whether Council had any questions or discussion regarding the proposal. With no questions or further discussion, Vice President Jones stated that the item would return for first reading on May 18, with second reading and adoption scheduled for June 1. Council determined that the item would proceed on the regular agenda rather than the consent agenda.

**Recommendation: Introduction/First Reading on Regular Agenda on 5/18/2026;  
Second Reading/Vote on Regular Agenda on 6/1/2026.**

**C. ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**Returning for further discussion (First Reading held 5/4/2026)**

[ORD-0018-2026](#) AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CITY OF GAHANNA CODE, PART ELEVEN - ZONING, TO UPDATE AND CLARIFY CODE PROVISIONS, REINSTATE OMITTED STANDARDS, AND IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF ADOPTED PLANS

Michael Blackford, Director of Planning, stated that he provided a presentation on April 6 and believed Council introduced the proposed code changes for a First Reading the previous week. He stated that he was present to answer any questions regarding the proposed amendments.

Councilmember Renner stated that he had reviewed the proposal through the lens of sustainability and resiliency and expressed concerns regarding Section 1117.07 and the added language related to increased flexibility for the Planning Commission concerning master development plans. He stated that he understood the need for flexibility, particularly within the Creekside Mixed-Use District, but wanted language added to clarify that any deviation from strict zoning standards must include written findings and must not reduce environmental, stormwater, or ecological

performance standards. He stated that he believed the current language could allow the City to negate strict standards. He referenced item number eight in the section and stated that he wanted stronger language requiring written analysis and consideration of ecological performance, environmental impacts, stormwater runoff, and riparian access. He offered to provide suggested language. Director Blackford stated that additional language might be helpful, but he expressed some confusion because the proposed amendments did not change any existing requirements. He explained that most of the standards Councilmember Renner referenced related to engineering requirements and primarily fell under Chapter 9, with some under Chapter 11. He stated that those standards must still be adhered to. He further stated that any additional language might fit better within the major development plan approval criteria located in a separate section of code. Director Blackford stated that staff could review the suggestion. He added that the intent of the amendments was to increase standards and encourage developers to exceed minimum standards, particularly through green infrastructure language drawn directly from the land use plan. He emphasized that staff did not intend to encourage reductions in the standards. Councilmember Renner responded that the language appeared to allow the Planning Commission to waive standards if it identified an economic benefit. Director Blackford acknowledged the concern and stated that the issue depended on the specific standard involved and whether it fell under Chapter 9 or Chapter 11. He reiterated that Chapter 9 standards could not be varied and stated that staff could consider adding clarifying language in an appropriate section of code. Councilmember Renner asked to work with Director Blackford to ensure the code specifically addressed ecological performance, environmental impacts, and stormwater runoff measures. Director Blackford agreed to review and consider those items and stated that staff would need to determine the most appropriate language and placement within the code.

President Weaver thanked Director Blackford for his work on the zoning code overhaul and the subsequent round of edits. He then asked questions regarding Section 1109.01 and the proposed changes related to electric vehicle parking and variance requests. President Weaver stated that the issue appeared to involve policy considerations and asked for clarification regarding the difference between an EV-ready parking space and an EVSE (electric vehicle supply equipment) space. Director Blackford explained that EV-ready spaces generally included

underground conduit infrastructure, while EVSE spaces included the actual charging equipment necessary for vehicle charging from day one. He stated that EV-ready spaces allowed future tenants or users to install the charging apparatus later as part of their build-out. President Weaver stated that the report and redlined draft indicated the City had received several variance requests seeking relief from EVSE requirements in favor of EV-ready spaces. Director Blackford clarified that applicants had frequently requested variances to avoid installing EV infrastructure entirely, rather than requesting EV-ready accommodation. He stated that staff had likely granted more of those requests than they ideally would have preferred. President Weaver stated that the matter appeared to involve broader policy considerations regarding how the City should encourage sustainability efforts. He expressed a preference for requiring applicants to seek variances rather than granting broader flexibility in the code itself. He stated that he preferred to encourage sustainability goals by maintaining stronger requirements. Director Blackford responded that the proposed amendments would likely move the City closer to its sustainability goals because applicants would have more opportunities to comply without seeking variances. He explained that applicants often requested the maximum possible deviation from the code during the variance process and stated that recent experience showed many applicants received approval for eliminating EV requirements altogether. He noted that the City had received feedback from experienced professionals across the country indicating that Gahanna's requirements exceeded those in many other jurisdictions, including some areas of California. Director Blackford stated that staff aimed to scale back the requirements slightly while still encouraging compliance with sustainability goals. He further stated that staff hoped the proposed amendments would result in some level of EV infrastructure rather than none. President Weaver asked whether applicants generally justified variance requests by claiming the requirements created an undue burden. Director Blackford stated that applicants frequently cited budget concerns and acknowledged that such concerns often resulted in granted variances. President Weaver asked whether staff knew the average cost difference between EV-ready and EVSE spaces. Director Blackford stated that he did not have that information. President Weaver then asked Mayor Jadwin whether MORPC or the sustainability committee could provide guidance or model language related to EV infrastructure requirements. He stated that he wanted the City to remain aspirational without imposing overly burdensome requirements and wanted to strike

an appropriate balance. Mayor Jadwin stated that the MORPC roundtable had not discussed template ordinance language specifically, but she believed resources might exist. She offered to investigate the matter and stated that MORPC had a meeting scheduled in approximately three weeks. She also stated that she could contact a roundtable member with expertise in the field to determine whether additional guidance existed. President Weaver acknowledged Director Blackford's point that allowing EV-ready spaces might better achieve the City's goals based on the types of variance requests staff had received, although he reiterated his preference for applicants to fully meet the sustainability goals whenever possible. Director Blackford stated that the matter ultimately represented a policy decision for Council and that staff would implement whatever direction Council chose.

Councilmember McGregor asked about Creekside and Section 1103.17(c), stating that the proposal appeared to allow businesses to avoid following the code if the City considered the business desirable for the area. She expressed concern that the approach did not seem fair to businesses that had previously complied with the code requirements. Director Blackford acknowledged her concerns and explained that variances already served a similar purpose, although variances operated under strict legal standards intended for abnormally shaped lots or irregular topography. He noted that the City routinely requested and granted variances for issues such as EV charging stations. He also pointed out that the Creekside area contained significant additional guidance within the land use plan and strategic plan regarding the district's vision. Based on his 12 years of experience in Gahanna, he believed advancing that vision and meeting those goals carried greater importance than strict adherence to the zoning code. He noted that every new construction project he had worked on had requested and received variances. He added that residents frequently argued the City allowed requests in the present that it had denied in the past, particularly in residential cases, but his research showed the City had routinely granted such variances over time. Director Blackford explained that the proposed process supported goals in the land use plan and strategic plan related to streamlining permitting. He stated that the process removed traditional variance criteria and instead evaluated developments based on how effectively they advanced the goals of those plans. While a specific business could factor into the evaluation, he emphasized that staff would consider multiple factors. He also noted that the City had received no

new construction projects in the Creekside District during his 12 years with the City, so no recent developments had faced standards different from those proposed for future projects. Councilmember McGregor referenced developer Ben Hale, who had completed significant development projects in the past. She recalled that Mr. Hale had supported stricter standards as long as future developers had to follow the same requirements. She expressed concern that when one developer invested additional money to meet stricter requirements and later developers did not have to meet those same obligations, the earlier development could lose value. She stated that she believed all developers should follow the same standards. Director Blackford stated that he understood both Mr. Hale's position and Councilmember McGregor's concerns. However, he argued that the proposal would better accomplish the consistency Mr. Hale described. He explained that although variances should remain independent and should not influence future requests, approved variances often created precedents. He gave the example that if one property owner received approval for an eight-foot fence, subsequent applicants became more likely to receive the same approval. Over time, the original justification weakened, and the variance effectively became the standard. He observed that the City frequently requested and granted variances, which often reduced the strength of the justifications and shifted arguments toward comparisons with neighboring properties. In his view, that process allowed more applicants to circumvent the code and prevented consistent standards. Director Blackford stated that the proposed process would allow the City to evaluate the overall quality of a project and determine how effectively it advanced the goals of the land use plan and strategic plan. While he agreed that Councilmember McGregor had raised a valid concern, he believed the proposal would help the City achieve higher-quality projects throughout the district. He added that the process would allow the City to deny requests for the same deviations when another project had provided desired features such as structured parking, public art, or rain gardens and the new project had not. He concluded that the proposed tool provided a more appropriate method for ensuring quality projects.

Councilmember Bowers thanked Director Blackford for his comments and asked follow-up questions from a practical perspective. She asked whether a significant economic development project currently under consideration involved a development team or applicant working on a

major development plan in collaboration with the Planning Department. Director Blackford confirmed that applicants had to come through his office and said projects typically were submitted directly to staff, although collaboration occurred about half the time. Councilmember Bowers asked whether staff evaluated projects by identifying deviations from code and determining whether those deviations aligned with broader land use and strategic goals. Director Blackford agreed and clarified that staff separated economic development considerations from land use decisions. He said the process focused on accomplishing land use and strategic plan goals rather than property values or economic considerations. Councilmember Bowers asked whether staff could decline to recommend approval of a major development plan if the requested deviations did not holistically meet land use goals. Director Blackford confirmed that staff could withhold approval of deviations if a project failed to meet those goals. He explained that the proposed process allowed planners and the Planning Commission to evaluate projects based on how they advanced the goals and outcomes identified in the land use plan and strategic plan, rather than relying on the more legal and technical variance criteria related to irregular property conditions. Councilmember Bowers asked whether staff currently worked with applicants on requested variances before bringing recommendations to Council. Director Blackford said staff routinely identified variances during the review process and informed applicants about modifications needed for compliance. He stated that applicants often requested variances because they did not budget for certain requirements or did not want to comply with them. He added that staff generally preferred compliance with the code but noted that the Planning Commission often found it difficult to deny variances after approving similar requests on previous projects. Councilmember Bowers asked whether staff envisioned submitting a deviation matrix or deviation list to the Planning Commission as part of future applications. Director Blackford confirmed that applicants would still need to provide a list of requested deviations and justifications. He explained that the justifications would focus on how the project furthered the goals of the strategic plan and land use plan. Councilmember Bowers asked how Director Blackford would measure the success of the proposed process if Council adopted it. Director Blackford said the City would need projects to move through the process before making future amendments, but he believed the process would succeed immediately for several reasons. He said the strategic plan emphasized streamlining permitting

and noted that consolidating multiple applications into a single application would provide added value for applicants and customers. He also stated that the process would make the strategic plan and land use plan more relevant during project review and would help the City achieve larger community benefits identified in the land use plan. He contrasted that approach with variances, which he said generally benefited individual projects rather than the community as a whole. He gave examples such as allowing additional height in exchange for structured parking, public art, or rain gardens that aligned with land use plan recommendations.

Vice President Jones thanked Director Blackford and asked whether Council preferred to place the legislation on the Consent Agenda or Regular Agenda for Second Reading and adoption on May 18, 2026. Councilmembers indicated a preference for the Regular Agenda. Vice President Jones confirmed that the legislation would appear on the Regular Agenda and thanked Director Blackford for his presentation.

**Recommendation: Second Reading/Vote on Regular Agenda on 5/18/2026.**

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

**Returning for further discussion (First Reading held 5/4/2026)**

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

Miranda Vollmer, Senior Director of Administrative Services, returned to Council to provide additional explanation regarding the request for funding. She explained that the request involved a supplemental appropriation of \$100,000 to establish a partnership with the Gahanna Area Arts Council (GAAC). She stated that the partnership would provide cultural and artistic opportunities for residents and visitors while promoting cultural vitality, civic engagement, and economic vibrancy. She added that the partnership would strengthen the community, expand existing offerings, and bring additional resources into Gahanna in a responsible and strategic manner. Senior Director Vollmer referenced the Our Gahanna Strategic Plan and stated that residents had expressed a desire for vibrant and inclusive public spaces, additional communitywide events, and stronger cultural and artistic experiences. She explained that the proposal directly responded to those priorities.

She noted that several arts programs supported by the City currently operated directly through the City, which made them ineligible for state or federal arts funding. Although the City already invested in those programs, she stated that the current structure did not maximize that investment. Senior Director Vollmer explained that partnerships between municipalities and arts councils were common nationally. She stated that more than 2,500 local arts agencies nationwide received tax revenue from municipalities and that more than 98% of those organizations operated as 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations similar to GAAC. She stated that partnering with GAAC would create the structure necessary to access funding opportunities currently unavailable to the City. She explained that the partnership would position GAAC as the official arts agency for Gahanna, allowing the organization to apply for and receive grants at the state and national levels that the City could not pursue directly. Senior Director Vollmer stated that the partnership would allow GAAC to leverage outside funding and return those dollars to the community instead of losing them to other cities. She described GAAC's mission as connecting and enriching the community through participation in and engagement with the arts. She noted that GAAC had already established itself as a trusted leader in arts programming, events, and outreach in Gahanna during the past eight years. She also stated that GAAC had built credibility at the state level by receiving taxpayer funding and remained the only organization in Gahanna eligible to receive Ohio Arts Council funding while holding the highest sustainability designation from the Ohio Arts Council.

Senior Director Vollmer explained that the proposed contract included opportunities for the City and GAAC to collaborate on identifying capital improvement projects that could leverage outside funding, expanded programming, and long-term initiatives such as a public art master plan. She stated that the proposed investment totaled \$100,000, although a substantial portion did not represent new spending. Instead, she explained that the proposal shifted the administration of existing programs. She used Creekside Live as an example and explained that transitioning the program through GAAC would make it eligible for grant funding. She also noted that the partnership would allow the Arts Council to convert in-kind services into trackable and accountable expenses that could count toward grant eligibility, improving transparency and financial efficiency. Senior Director Vollmer stated that the contract included strong oversight measures. She explained that the City would pay only

approved invoices submitted by GAAC. She also stated that GAAC would provide annual reports detailing expenditures and outcomes and that both the City and the State could audit financial records. Senior Director Vollmer emphasized that the timing for the funding request remained critical. She explained that GAAC operated on the State fiscal year because it received funding from the Ohio Arts Council, with that fiscal year beginning on July 1. She also noted that federal funding opportunities through the National Endowment for the Arts had recently opened and would close in early July. Senior Director Vollmer concluded by stating that the Administration recommended approval of the \$100,000 appropriation to enhance arts and cultural opportunities in the City, provide residents with the experiences identified in the strategic plan, and bring additional resources into Gahanna. She then offered to answer questions from Council.

Councilmember Schnetzer thanked Senior Director Vollmer and referenced questions he had raised during the April 27, 2026, Committee of the Whole meeting regarding the structure of the proposed partnership. He acknowledged her earlier explanation that the arrangement would allow the Gahanna Area Arts Council (GAAC) to leverage funding through organizations such as the Ohio Arts Council and the National Endowment for the Arts. He then asked whether the City and GAAC had identified \$100,000 worth of programs and projects for the remaining seven months of the fiscal year. Senior Director Vollmer responded that the scope of work distributed to Council included five areas of focus, some of which did not lend themselves to precise dollar amounts. She referenced Bright Blocks as an example and explained that the Parks Department currently provided labor assistance for the Arts Council without charging for those services. She also discussed performing arts programming and explained that GAAC qualified for the Ohio Arts on Tour program through its status with the Ohio Arts Council. That program would cover one-third of the performance fees for Ohio-based performing arts groups. She noted that programs such as Creekside Live would soon begin and stated that, moving forward, GAAC could coordinate those performances and additional events. She explained that the \$100,000 appropriation would help GAAC build the infrastructure necessary to leverage outside funding and return tax dollars to the community. She added that without the funding, GAAC could not expand programming or additional initiatives within the City.

Councilmember Schnetzer asked for clarification regarding the Bright Blocks example and questioned whether the City currently provided labor for the program. Senior Director Vollmer confirmed that the City did provide labor support. When Councilmember Schnetzer referenced her statement about charging services back to the City, Senior Director Vollmer acknowledged that she had misspoken. She clarified that the City provided various in-kind services to the Arts Council and other organizations in Gahanna without reimbursement. Councilmember Schnetzer stated that he was trying to understand the flow of funds and asked how the existing arrangement would change under the proposed \$100,000 authorization. After requesting clarification of the question, Senior Director Vollmer explained that her earlier example had not accurately reflected the arrangement. She instead referenced Creekside Live, performances at the Farmers Market, and Fourth of July entertainment, all of which the City currently funded entirely. She explained that if GAAC administered those programs through the proposed partnership, the organization could apply for Ohio Arts on Tour funding, which would reimburse one-third of the associated costs. She stated that this approach would bring State tax dollars back to Gahanna rather than allowing those funds to go to communities such as Dublin or Columbus. Councilmember Schnetzer then asked about the draft agreement attached to the agenda and whether that document represented the contract discussed during the previous Committee of the Whole meeting. Senior Director Vollmer confirmed that the attached agreement constituted the contract, assuming the correct version had been attached. Mayor Jadwin added that the agreement remained subject to any revisions or adjustments based on Council feedback. Councilmember Schnetzer confirmed that the draft agreement served as the working document. Councilmember Schnetzer asked what benefits the average resident would receive from the arrangement, aside from the benefits provided to the Arts Council. He asked whether the partnership would produce cost savings, expanded programming, or other tangible results. Senior Director Vollmer responded that the benefits included all of those outcomes, as well as the opportunity to leverage tax dollars currently paid by residents that otherwise went to other cities, municipalities, and organizations throughout Ohio instead of returning to Gahanna. Councilmember Schnetzer clarified that residents paid those taxes to the State rather than directly to the City of Gahanna. Senior Director Vollmer confirmed that understanding and explained that the State distributed those tax dollars through the Ohio Arts Council, but

those funds currently did not return to Gahanna. Councilmember Schnetzer also asked whether the Administration had identified any risks associated with the partnership and what steps had been taken to mitigate those risks. Senior Director Vollmer acknowledged that any partnership carried risks and stated that one possible risk involved the arrangement not working as intended. She explained that the contract included provisions allowing either party to terminate the agreement with at least 90 days' written notice. She also noted that the agreement allowed termination within 30 days in the event of a material breach. She added that the City Attorney's Office, including Mr. Roth, had approved the contract language. Mayor Jadwin also addressed Councilmember Schnetzer's earlier question regarding the seven-month timeframe. She explained that GAAC operated on a fiscal year running from July 1 through June 30, unlike the City's calendar-year fiscal cycle. As a result, she stated that the proposed agreement would function as a 12-month contract beginning upon adoption and continuing through the following year. She added that once GAAC entered its new fiscal year, the organization would have greater flexibility to apply for State funding opportunities related to 2027 programming. Councilmember Schnetzer clarified that she referred to fiscal years 2026 and 2027 for the Arts Council, and Mayor Jadwin confirmed that understanding.

Councilmember McGregor asked why the proposed increase extended over the next two years rather than remaining at \$100,000 each year to evaluate the program's effectiveness. Senior Director Vollmer responded that this remained a possibility. She explained that when the City entered contracts extending beyond one year, staff would request funding during the appropriations process in the annual budget cycle. She stated that staff would include the additional \$150,000 in the October budget proposal and noted that if Council chose not to fund the contract at that level, the City would need to amend the contract. She also explained that the proposed increase in 2027 reflected the possibility that the initiative could establish itself as a priority and support development of a master arts plan identified in the strategic plan. She added that the additional funding would also support collaboration on other City events.

Vice President Jones asked whether the agreement could free Parks and Recreation staff or other City staff to focus on other responsibilities by shifting certain duties to the Arts Council. Senior Director Vollmer

confirmed that the arrangement would free staff time when the Arts Council handled performer bookings or managed art programming. She also stated that the Arts Council would provide administrative support to the Public Arts Advisory Committee, which would reduce demands on her time and the time of a management analyst assigned to those duties. She explained that when the City pursued projects such as public art sculptures, the Arts Council would manage administrative tasks required under the public arts policy, including scoring matrices, requests for proposals, and related processes that otherwise consumed significant staff time. She further stated that the Arts Council would assist with any future master arts planning efforts by coordinating consultants, gathering public and stakeholder input, and preparing reports and presentations. Vice President Jones thanked her for the explanation.

President Weaver noted that the scope of work contemplated additional items beginning in 2027. Senior Director Vollmer confirmed that statement.

Councilmember Schnetzer asked whether the Arts Council would serve as the delivery mechanism through which the City carried out its goals and objectives while the City retained control over decisions. Senior Director Vollmer confirmed that understanding. Councilmember Schnetzer asked whether the City would still maintain authority over public art decisions, joking that the City would not suddenly install a “statue of David” in Creekside Plaza. Senior Director Vollmer responded that the public arts policy would continue to govern any art placed in public spaces. She explained that a master planning effort would first identify appropriate locations for public art before implementation.

Mayor Jadwin referenced language in the scope of work stating that additional projects would occur as agreed upon and directed by the City in coordination with the Arts Council. She explained that if the City wanted to establish a new music concert series or another project, City officials would direct the Arts Council accordingly. She added that if the Arts Council proposed an idea that the City approved, both parties would work together to align projects.

Councilmember Padova asked whether the Arts Council’s board of directors served on a volunteer or paid basis. Senior Director Vollmer stated that she believed the board operated on a volunteer basis. A

comment from an Arts Council member in the audience followed indicating that board members made donations to the Arts Council in order to serve on the board.

Councilmember McGregor asked whether the Arts Council would continue operating with volunteers or hire paid staff. Senior Director Vollmer stated that the Arts Council could choose to hire paid staff if its board of directors approved that decision. She emphasized that the City would not dictate staffing decisions. She explained that if the Arts Council entered into the contract, the City would hold the organization to the same contractual standards applied to other City vendors. Councilmember McGregor then asked whether the City would provide funding directly or reimburse the Arts Council through invoices. Senior Director Vollmer explained that the Arts Council would invoice the City in the same manner as other vendors. She stated that staff would review and approve invoices before forwarding them to the Finance Department for payment. Mayor Jadwin clarified that the agreement did not involve simply providing the Arts Council with a lump sum payment. She reiterated that payments would occur on an invoice basis.

Vice President Jones noted that the Arts Council could potentially spend less than the approved amount. Senior Director Vollmer confirmed that possibility. Vice President Jones stated that the legislation had already received its first reading and would appear on the next week's regular agenda for second reading and adoption.

Councilmember McGregor asked whether any staff hired by the Arts Council would qualify as City employees. Senior Director Vollmer responded that any such individuals would remain employees of the Gahanna Area Arts Council, not the City.

Vice President Jones concluded by confirming that the legislation would appear on the regular agenda the following week for second reading and adoption.

**Recommendation: Second Reading/Vote on Regular Agenda on 5/18/2026.**

**E. ADJOURNMENT:**

*With no further business before the Committee of the Whole, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:54 p.m.*

---

**Jeremy A. VanMeter**  
Clerk of Council

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

---

**Jamille Jones**