

Committee Members:

- Jeff Wobser, at-large – Committee Chair
- Randy Greeno, at-large
- Dennis Hellmann, ward 2
- Grant Russel, at-large
- Beth Warnecke, ward 3
- Mayor Christina Muryn
- Jim Staschiak, Auditor

Staff:

- Jaclyn Hohman*
-
-
-

Guests:

Randy O

Meeting Start Time: 4:03 PM

Meeting End Time: 5:35 PM

Agenda:

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

New Items

Continue the Strategic Planning process.

Adjournment



Jeff Wobser, Strategic Planning Committee Chair

COMMITTEE REPORT
THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FINDLAY, OHIO

The **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE** met on April 18, 2023 to continue the Strategic Planning process.

We recommend: *To continue building the strategic plan document and process.*

Aye Nay *J. Wob*
Jeff Wobser, Chairman

Aye Nay *Randy Greeno*
Randy Greeno

Aye Nay *Dennis Hellmann*
Dennis Hellmann

Aye Nay *Grant Russel*
Grant Russel

Aye Nay *Beth Warnecke*
Beth Warnecke

Aye Nay *Christina M. Muryn*
Mayor Muryn

Aye Nay *J. Staschiak*
Auditor Staschiak

LEGISLATION: _____

DATE: April 18, 2023

COMMITTEE: STRATEGIC PLANNING

FINDLAY CITY STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
April 18, 2023
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

MEMBERS PRESENT: Greeno, Russel, Warnecke, Wobser, Muryn, Staschiak, Hellmann

ABSENT: none

Guests: Randy Otermat

Staff: Jaclynn Hohman

OLD BUSINESS

Wobser suggests getting the high-level goals decided with the group and then passing the document off to PlanningNEXT. This would be presented to council with details of how to proceed in the process to finish the document. This way PlanningNEXT would be able to finish their commitment by July. Muryn would like to establish a timeline to also present action items, goals could be presented to other Council committees for feedback. Wobser states that this would ensure we have enough time to thoroughly vet the action items. Muryn believes that a process has been a goal the entire time and hopes that the committee can get through the remaining goals today and then she will reach out to PlanningNEXT. Staschiak said that if the goal is July completion then there are only 4 meetings remaining to get through the whole document, there is a lot of complexity.

NEW BUSINESS

Goal 5

Muryn proposed changing language to “An attractive place to live, learn, work, play, invest, and raise a family.” Staschiak questioned if PlanningNEXT had provided feedback on this goal as discussed. Muryn and Wobser said that they had not and said it should be left to the group. Staschiak questioned if “attractive” was not a broad enough word. Muryn said she agreed but is not sure of the correct word. Some of these items may be re-arranged. She believes this goal is more so speaking about the physical environment created in the community. Staschiak questioned if we speak anywhere else about neighborhoods in the City, this is the most appropriate place. Each neighborhood is a community and areas of the community feel neglected, this may be the spot to point to on the document to let them know they are not neglected. Muryn agreed and said that objective 5.5 should highlight investment in neighborhoods. It also goes back to prior statements about not getting too specific. Staschiak suggests changing language to reflect that we are governing in a way that shows we care about the community.

Russel motion to keep Muryn language “An attractive place to live, learn, work, play, invest, and raise a family.” Greeno second.
6-0-1 (Abstain Staschiak)

Staschiak said that we should be mindful about how the state is approaching the economics of cities, it has a direct impact on long term approaches to building a City. If the state eliminates income tax, if we end up in a sales tax based economy it would change what we want, etc. We want to make sure that we are mindful of sectors and the impact on their ability to provide services. Muryn agrees that we should pay attention to conversations happening at the state level. One of the concerns is taxation for individuals not living within your City, it is something that we need to be aware of. It is not addressed in this goal but was addressed previously on action items regarding long term fiscal health. Russel believes that 5.6 should be moved and does not fit, it sticks out from the others and may be better in section 4. Muryn asked if this is an appropriate objective to take to PlanningNEXT. Warnecke said that if you look at the action items under it is similar to 5.1. She does not mind if you add neighborhood but then commercial and industrial should be considered being added as well for zoning considerations. Warnecke thinks that the way it was written included commercial and industrial and if the new language is added then the action items underneath do not seem to fit. Russel asked if tall timbers is considered a neighborhood, they are generally defined geographic areas, he believes Warnecke makes a good point that the word neighborhood may not fit. Staschiak said that the use of the word attractive should be reconsidered and that the message is getting mixed. Our job is not to make every neighborhood attractive. Russel said the word is very broad and is in the eye of the beholder. Muryn agrees that it is much more broad than making it look pretty. Russel said it is also important to understand the origin of the goal which is because the community said a lot about wanting to be attractive. It is also just talking about taking care of our stuff. Staschiak suggested changing “enhance” to “care for.” Muryn said that the execution is the most important part.

Muryn motion to “Care for the physical environment in the City’s residential neighborhoods, commercial, and industrial districts consistent with the character of the community.” Russel second.

Staschiak proposes amendment to drop “consistent with the character of the community” from the sentence. Second from Russel.

Warnecke said if you take off the end language it may seem that the City is going to go out and change things.

Vote on amendment

3-4 (Muryn, Warnecke, Russel, Greeno)

Vote on Muryn Motion.
6-1 (Staschiak)

Hellman questioned to confirm that 5.6 has sub bullets.

Muryn motion to approve 5.1-5.6 objectives as written assuming that 5.6 will be moved. Hellmann second.
7-0

Goal 6

Staschiak questioned if it includes amenities for older population. Greeno said that all abilities are covered.

Muryn motion to approve as written. Russel second.
7-0

Muryn motion to approve all as written. Russel second.

Russel said that either the parenthesis should be removed or amenities should be used. Staschiak questioned if the word recreational should be removed from 6.2. He believes that programs and activities should be removed. Russel questioned how many times the words amenities is used. Muryn said that 6.1 and 6.3 could be combined. Wobser suggested replacing amenities and accessibility with accommodations in 6.3. Russel said that it is plan, communicate, physical, and provide for each goal in that order so how do we better say it. Staschiak questioned the use of the word recreation in 6.3. Hellman suggested removing the word about in 6.2.

Muryn motioned to approve the goals as now written. Second Greeno.

Russel suggested adding programming to 6.4. Muryn asked if recreational should be added to 6.4 or not because it is quite broad.

7-0

Goal 7

Staschiak questioned if this is a global goal or a local goal because the points under it are all local goals. We should be connected to the world. Russel said that once again that this is from community comment and they would like to be connected to their neighbors as well as internal physical transportation. Muryn said that if we continue to find things that will benefit the citizens of Findlay

Muryn motion to approve the goal 7 as written. Russel second.

Wobser said that the lower bullets are all about connected the City and it does not take on connecting us to the rest of the world. Somewhere else on here it talks about the fiber loop which connects us to the rest of the world. Muryn stated again that this goal is broad enough to be defined further with objectives in the future. Staschiak said that if it is a global goal then the airport should go here and would like to define. Muryn said it goes back to what Russel said previously about how many of these goals will cross over. Wobser said if you read 4.6 it fits best there and if we want to add something also to this point that ties to the airport we can. Staschiak said that if we are going to keep it narrower and food for thought in thinking about the sub bullets.

7-0

Russel would like to switch order of identify and evaluate in 7.2. Staschiak would like to see a bullet added for the cost feasibility for streets, they are very expensive and must be maintained. Russell stated that we should be able to evaluate the design and cost effectiveness. Muryn said that we are looking to have a maintenance plan for these designs.

Russel thought that there was community input on rideshare, or scooter rental possibility. Muryn said that transportation is a big thing but thinks that this is probably an item that from the legal standpoint of city government looking at it does not make sense. It makes more sense to support other organizations. Russel said that there was constant input on hats and how the younger generation does not use it, people are very interested in having scooters.

Muryn amended motion to approve 7.1 and 7.2 and leave 7.3 for further scrutiny. Russel second.
7-0

Wobser calls meeting to end.