

**Village of Whitehouse
Village Council Meeting As A
Committee of the Whole
Village Hall, Whitehouse, OH
6:30pm September 10th, 2024**

CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Meeting was called to order by President of Council Louann Artiaga.

Council Members Present: Dave Riggenschach, Carrie Tuohy, Steve Connelly, Larry Yunker, and President of Council Louann Artiaga.

Staff Present: Administrator Jordan Daugherty, Deputy Administrator Joshua Hartbarger, Mayor Rich Bingham, Fire Chief Jason Francis, and Public Works Director Steve Pilcher.

Connelly made a motion to approve the July 9th Committee of the whole meeting. Seconded by Tuohy.

No citizens comments on agenda items.

GENERAL

Request to apply for OPWC funding

Director Pilcher informed that it is now time to apply for OPWC Funds. Packet includes a cost estimate to resurface a portion of Cemetery Road. The road is showing its age and is in need of repair and has had a lot of construction traffic. His recommendation would be Cemetery Road from Weckerly Road to the Wabash trail. A question was asked on the remainder of Cemetery Road. Director Pilcher answered that section was paved 15 years ago and not needed yet.

Tuohy asked to add to the September 17th Council meeting, seconded by Fine. Motion passed all ayes.

Kleinfelder Waterville Street Contract

Director Pilcher discussed the Waterville Street contract with Kleinfelder. He identified that this was only the section in the scope of services. The extra is not included in the contract at this time. The \$35,500 (not to exceed) is just for design and bid. Tuohy asked a question of making sure we are not bid splitting with a limit of \$50,000. Director Pilcher answered that if we cannot fulfill these with internal employees, we can solicit bids from other contractors. A question was asked on the water tower. Director Pilcher stated we did solicit bids for construction and design engineering and Kleinfelder was the only answering contractor.

Riggenschach made a motion to place Waterville Street contract on the September 17th Council meeting, seconded by Fine. Motion passed all ayes.

Administrator Spending Limits

Tuohy discussed Solicitor Heban was going to write a resolution on Administrator spending limits. Discussion was started in January, but still not complete yet. Artiaga asked what we're asking to write. Tuohy stated that's what we need to decide, either a Yes or No. Riggenschach stated there should be a limit. Administrator Daugherty spoke of ORC stating the maximum amount of what Administration can spend on a project without Council approval was \$50,000

and changed to \$75,000 in January. Past practice has been nothing unbudgeted or above \$25,000. There has never been an approval above \$25,000. That practice will continue unless directed.

More Discussion:

- Mayor Bingham stated that about 9 months ago we agreed to be a team. This is about trust. Discussion was held on why this is needed. Mayor Bingham indicated that he feels there hasn't been an issue. More discussion was had.
- Fine noticed he sees both points. He agreed there has been no problem, but it is Council's right to set guardrails on spending. He indicated its about asking questions to set the guardrails.
- Connelly recognized similar points. He indicated that these parameters and reports are meant to dot the I's and cross the T's on financial matters to identify gaps. He again identified he hasn't seen issues, but if it's something we need it's worth the conversation. Not for disparaging anyone.
- Yunker indicated he looked at other communities. His research indicated an ordinance for their Administrator. This shouldn't be looked at as a limit to the Administration but a confirmation of what can be done. This limits the interpretation of what it is to avoid future conflict.
- Artiaga asked clarification if the spending limit is in legislation. Daugherty stated no. Daugherty agreed that limits should be in place, and he wanted to be clear, our practice has been less than ORC.
- Artiaga referred to the budget process again and what we want spent in the year. Artiaga asked how Council wants to proceed.
- Riggensbach stated the fact of how this conversation went is why we need it in place. He stated the protection for Administrator and clarity for the Village is why it's needed. He pointed out that escalators could be included as well.
- Pilcher identified that emergency spending provisions are often requested in EPA and other plans.
- Mayor Bingham discussed caution of restrictions, again stating there hasn't been an issue that he has seen. More discussion was held. Riggensbach suggested that this is formalizing and not restricting.
- Connelly mentioned he supported the approach. Tuohy thought that Solicitor Heban was going to be present with research and a recommendation. Riggensbach suggested to do research. More discussion was held.
- Fine added to have Solicitor Heban research, what are municipalities limits, and exclusion for emergencies.
- Connelly pointed out a Blade article stated local communities have from \$25,000 to \$50,000.
- Artiaga mentioned another thought that this protects Administration because the Administration traditionally takes blame in most issues. Artiaga asked that if this is in place, would this aid in people's perception of fiscal responsibility while protecting the process and Administration. Connelly agreed and this is clarity and fiscal responsibility. Tuohy agreed this sets the rule.
- Yunker added that if we set it and it's determined too low we can always bring this back up.
- Riggensbach added that we have enough input on a limit, \$30,000 adds an escalator in.
- Artiaga asked Council's decision, Riggensbach suggest \$30,000 with escalators and more discussion on emergency measures. Fine suggested that we can move forward but ask the Solicitor for information. Fine volunteered to write the Solicitor.

It will also be added to the next Committee of the Whole as the consensus was to hear from the Solicitor.

State route 64 plan

Administrator Daugherty gave a background history on the concepts of the SR64 corridor. He stated that about 5 years ago we switched to form based code zoning. Daugherty pointed out that Dublin did this when they were smaller. While this design isn't perfect, it gives you an idea. This video gives you an idea. He gave description of the power point and starting location and more discussion. He gave further information on the experience rather than just driving through. And reminded these are just concepts.

- Video was shown with concept ideas.
- Discussion was held and Daugherty asked if Council is supportive of the concept. Council indicated that they are supportive, and this may promote more beautification. Daugherty admitted that there may be negativity with these but the overwhelming response is positive including the flowers.
- After discussion it was agreed to proceed with timeline and estimates. Daugherty will assist in these.
- Discussion was held on the proposed roundabouts on State Route 64. It appears that we are slowing traffic. Administrator Daugherty stated its exactly what it is supposed to do. Yunker noted some other areas where this was an issue. More discussion was had. Tuohy noted that we should inform the public on the plan.
- Daugherty stated he wants Council to be a part of this and move forward with items we can do. Council will have all associated timeline, proposals, and contracts brought before them in normal process.
- Discussion on a public meeting was had as well as conversation of posting in Mirror.

2024 Whitehouse Ballot Issues Education Proposal

Administrator Daugherty Showed the proposed ballot issues webpage format. He also passed out handouts. He asked for Council to review these documents and submit feedback. Daugherty identified how the information was composed, and all the public education will point to this page. We are trying to make it easy to read in what and why. A video will be included which explains these as well. This is front and center. Those that want to read have the information or those that prefer can watch the video. Daugherty provided a timeline for review to allow us time to get updates back. The information given has been reviewed by legal with a neutral no persuasion perspective. Examples were shown and discussed. Fine mentioned placing this on the Council or Committee meeting for any unresolved perspectives. Tuohy asked about placing on the agenda for discussion. Deputy Administrator identified the limitation of the website and cautioned on major changes. Fine and Riggensbach offered input on the design. Hartbarger clarified the limitations. Consensus was to have an open discussion at the next Council meeting.

Discussion Term limits

Connelly mentioned that with Council and Council only, he asked thoughts on implementing term limits. He is supportive of new thoughts and ideas. He proposes that Council spend no more than 2 consecutive terms and then must wait 4 years to serve again. He asked for opinion and input. He stated that Solicitor Heban indicated that it could be done by legislation.

- Artiaga stated that she heard the argument no one runs anyway. She said that with an incumbent it may limit people who want to run
- Tuohy stated would it be our job to find new members. She supports it.

- Artiaga asked that with new faces, would residents be more willing to communicate
- Connelly mentioned that by the new process, it brings a fresh look at old ideas.
- Fine asked how often it has been in previous years that people serve more than two. More discussion was had.
- Riggerbach stated that this was the path for the future and fully supported it. More discussion was had.
- Mayor Bingham stated term limits are a good thing. He cautioned on the situation where no one runs. More discussion. He also stated this should be a Charter amendment.
- Connelly suggested we make the decision for this year and place it for a Charter amendment.
- Yunker shared a model from Stow Ohio. Discussion was had on the model. Wanted to show as an example, not a suggestion.

Connelly made a motion to have the Law Director provide language on term limits. Riggerbach seconded. Motion passed all ayes.

Kleinfelder Economic Development Contract

Administrator Daugherty spoke on the history of the economic development proposal. Councilman Fine had suggested some comments which were reflected in the new proposal. He indicated there was no concerns with the changes. Fine commented on the third phase clarifying that some steps from step 3 was moved to phase 2. Kleinfelder agreed at no additional cost. Comments were held on this.

Fine made a motion to recommend the Kleinfelder economic development to the next Council meeting. Seconded by Connelly. Motion passed all ayes.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

No citizen comments.

OTHER BUISNESS

Artiaga asked on executive session. None for tonight

Yunker pointed out there was public concern on the planning commission. The change would allow for more houses per acre. One point he asked for consideration is the runoff stormwater issues. He indicated the Mayor has filed the petition for the ditch petition, but the County has moved till next year. He also stated that more housing creates more runoff issues. He suggested that other communities have put developments in abeyance until infrastructure is caught up. Yunker stated he's not suggesting this as action but for consideration.

- Fine asked Director Pilcher if these developments have field tile and would this slow down the flow? Director Pilcher stated a retention pond would slow the water to the water shed. He further stated it's an opportunity to improve the system by controlling what's going in as farm fields promote faster runoff.
- Mayor Bingham stated at the meeting that until the issue was fixed, the plan may not be supported until these issues are addressed by the developer. He indicated the builder may have a solution reducing the flow of runoff. The developer also discussed cleaning out the ditch and do engineer wise to help. These plans are in the works, and he would be able to respond at the public meeting. The developer made a valid point that while the large problem isn't his fault, he may have solutions to help.

- Yunker noted that in the media it stated that Whitehouse is causing this, and we need a good response. Mayor Bingham indicated we can't stop or prohibit growth, but a response is needed showing how it will improve these issues.
- Riggerbach asked for a Village wide map showing the problem. Daugherty indicated we have a flood plain map. Daugherty indicated the flood plan map gives a good idea.
- Fine noted that we should be cautious on downstream and upstream cleaning and would want to hear the engineer's opinion. Pilcher indicated he understood but didn't think that it would add to problem. Mayor indicated drainage swales would be included every third lot with a larger pond and a slower release.
- Touhy indicated that some residents that approached her were concerned on the elevation and the effect on the existing houses. Mayor stated that that's what the swales were for, and the developer would need to explain how its mitigated. Residents can come to the meeting to address concerns.

Connelly thanked Hartbarger for taking minutes.

Nothing from Fine.

Touhy appreciated everyone for their work.

Nothing from Riggerbach

Artiaga asked to add in the Council agenda to add a TMACOG section for Fine to update

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Riggerbach, seconded by Connelly. Adjourned at 8:26pm.

Respectfully submitted by Joshua Hartbarger, Acting Clerk of Council