



## **Meeting Minutes**

Monday, February 2, 2015 ~ 7:30 P.M.

Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building  
John P. Coleman Council Chamber  
6550 North High Street  
Worthington, Ohio 43085

## **City Council**

*Bonnie D. Michael, President*  
*Robert F. Chosy, President Pro-Tempore*  
*Rachael Dorothy*  
*Scott Myers*  
*David M. Norstrom*  
*Douglas Smith*  
*Michael C. Troper*

*D. Kay Thress, Clerk of Council*

**CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call, Pledge of Allegiance**

Worthington City Council met in Regular Session on Monday, January 20, 2015, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Pro-Tem Chosy called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 P.M.

**Members Present:** Robert F. Chosy, Rachael R. Dorothy, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper

**Member(s) Absent:** Bonnie D. Michael

**Also present:** Clerk of Council Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistance City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Molly Roberts, City Engineer William Watterson, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Chief of Police James Mosaic, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There was one (1) visitor present.

*President Pro-Tem Chosy invited those in attendance to stand and join in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.*

**VISITOR COMMENTS** – There were no Visitor Comments

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **January 5, 2015 – Regular Meeting**

**MOTION** Mr. Myers made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

**There being no comments, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote to approve the minutes as presented.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION**

*President Pro-Tem Chosy declared public hearings and voting on legislation previously introduced to be in order.*

**Ordinance No. 04-2015**

Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay for Renovations to the James Kilbourne Memorial Library Building; Making a Contribution of Funds to the Worthington Community Improvement Corporation; and Authorizing the Worthington Community

Improvement Corporation to Administer the Funds for the Kilbourne Building Renovations.

**The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.**

*Mr. Greeson shared that staff briefly touched on this topic when council recently approved a resolution that authorized us to enter into a \$300,000 state grant. It was articulated at the time that staff would be seeking council's approval of an appropriation of \$500,000, which is the estimated cost of work for a variety of improvements in the common areas of the Kilbourne Building. Common areas typically include a foyer, bathroom, walls, and ADA accessibility. In this case, we also want to pursue things for public benefit throughout the entire building such as the HVAC system, evaluating the necessity for sprinkler systems, and possibly the removal of the mezzanine.*

*Mr. Greeson commented that the state grant works on a reimbursement basis. Therefore we have to appropriate the funds and then seek reimbursement. In addition to the \$300,000 that the city will be reimbursed, staff is asking for an additional \$200,000 to perform the prescribed work. Council has also authorized permission to have the CIC act as the city's agent to contract for and oversee the performance of the work.*

*When asked by Ms. Dorothy for a timeline for the work, Mr. Greeson replied that we have to accomplish the grant spending by June 30<sup>th</sup>. There is a provision in the state grant that allows us to request a 60 days extension. That request has to be made 60 before the June 30<sup>th</sup> deadline. The reason for requesting the CIC oversee this project on behalf of the city is so that we can move quickly and also use the construction manager provisions under state law. Jack Hedge with the Design Group has already been engaged to help update the plan documents.*

*Mr. Norstrom concluded that we should not have any problems meeting the deadline. Mr. Greeson replied that staff is working as if that is what we have to do. He doesn't anticipate a problem meeting the deadline but it is an old building.*

*Dr. Chosy asked if the entire \$500,000 needs to be expended by that time or can it just be the \$300,000 of the grant. Mr. Greeson replied just the \$300,000. Dr. Chosy stated that if we aren't quite done with the work but we have exceeded \$300,000 then we are okay. Mr. Greeson agreed. He added that staff believes it can do that.*

**There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 04-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes    6        Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Chosy**

**No       0**

**Ordinance No. 04-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.**

**Ordinance No. 06-2015**

Amending Ordinance No. 40-2014 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for Appropriations from the General Fund and Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balances.

**The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.**

*Mr. Greeson reported that the supplemental appropriation relates to a couple of things. As the Fresh Thyme grocery store project has moved forward, city staff and the developer have identified an opportunity to relocate the AT&T telecommunications lines that are located in front of the building underground. This includes poles that run just south of Worthington-Galena in front of the Groves office building and end near the Sprint Lube on the south end of the Fresh Thyme property (the west side of High St). They are not power poles but rather carry telecommunications (mostly fiber optic cable) and it was an opportunity to partner with a private developer and work together to create a better aesthetic, not only in front of their property but the other properties along that section. As you traverse south on High St. you will notice that through most of the corporate limits there are no poles on that side of the street. This is an opportunity to bury those lines and create a more aesthetically pleasing section of our community.*

*Mr. Greeson shared that the estimated cost of that total project was around \$60,000. Staff negotiated with the developer who will pay all but \$15,000 of that total. Staff is seeking council's approval of an appropriation that would allow us to pay them for that portion of the work.*

*Mr. Greeson commented that the second piece of this appropriation is administrative in nature. He reported that very year we budget for employee health care expenses based on the number of employees in the plan. This year we had several employees that had to be added to the plan because of their spouse's employment situation and health insurance availability. These were employees who had previously opted out of the plan. This was an unanticipated cost that the city is incurring for health insurance that we are obligated to provide and that we didn't know about at the time the budget was adopted.*

*Mr. Myers recalls from the CM Memo and related to the CIP expenditure, that the city hopes to recoup this expense when TIF revenues are realized. Mr. Greeson agreed that we could reimburse ourselves with those revenues.*

*Mr. Myers asked the timeframe before those revenues would be generated. Mr. Greeson and Mrs. Roberts replied at least two to three years. Mr. Greeson added that at that time members could reimburse this expense. We are obligated to reimburse the sewer expense. Staff estimated originally that there will be more funds available than the sewer expense from the TIF. The TIF ordinance was written to allow us to do things in the North St. intersection area so council will have to make some judgments about how to use those dollars when they become available.*

*When Dr. Chosy commented that this request is for additional spending, Mrs. Roberts agreed that it was. He asked for an explanation regarding contingency in the CIP fund. Mrs. Roberts clarified that each year there is a budget line item in the operating portion of the CIP budget for contingency funds. Those funds are typically utilized for unanticipated overages or engineering costs that we didn't project during the budget process. Dr. Chosy understands that there is not enough money in that fund. Mrs. Roberts agreed.*

**There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 06-2015. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes    6        Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Troper, Chosy**

**No     0**

**Ordinance No. 06-2015 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.**

#### **NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED**

##### **Resolution No. 04-2015**

Approving an Agreement and Permit for and between US Signal Company, LLC, a Michigan Limited Liability Company, to Operate and Maintain a Telecommunications System Within the City of Worthington Pursuant to and Subject to the Provisions of Chapter 949 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington.

**Introduced by Ms. Dorothy.**

##### **MOTION**

Mr. Myers made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 04-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

*Mr. Greeson commented that this is a standard renewal of a right-of-way agreement pursuant to our Codified Ordinances. Staff stands ready to answer any questions.*

**There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 04-2015 carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

#### **REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

##### Discussion Item(s)

- Request For Proposals – Old Worthington Mobility Study

*Mr. Greeson commented that he would like to discuss what staff is calling the Old Worthington Mobility Study. Members may recall that in the Capital Improvements Plan we included \$50,000 for the Downtown Mobility Study. In this case staff changed the name to Old Worthington Mobility Study because we want it to look at the areas between North to South, Evening and Morning. Council's specific instruction to staff was to evaluate the Stafford and High intersection first and get a recommendation so that whatever we plan to do in that intersection can be added to the 2016 CIP for capital investment. But in addition to that we wanted to look at the pedestrian crossing at Short St. and the one at Village Green Dr. From a bigger picture standpoint we were to look at opportunities to improve pedestrian access and improve bicycle accommodations throughout Old Worthington to include things like ADA, filling sidewalk gaps as well as things that we might not have thought of historically.*

The **Request for Proposal** includes the Scope of Services as follows:

### SCOPE OF SERVICES

#### A. Phase One

1. Perform a detailed traffic study of the High Street - Stafford Avenue intersection including vehicle and pedestrian traffic counts.
2. Evaluate options for improved pedestrian crossings including but not limited to pavement striping, traffic islands, flashing beacons, mast arm supported beacons/message boards, HAWK signals, and full signalization.
3. Perform a traffic study of the High Street corridor traffic operation to evaluate improvement or degradation of operations as a result of potential pedestrian improvements.
4. Provide a detailed report detailing each improvement option including improvement to pedestrian safety, aesthetic features, estimated cost, and impact to traffic operation. Present the report to Worthington City Council.

*Mr. Greeson commented that Phase One speaks to the High St. and Stafford intersection. He added that council already appropriated the funds for this study so what he is seeking tonight is input. He thinks staff has the authority to issue the RFP and the procurement regulations allow us to select a consultant and award the contract because it is under \$50,000 but staff doesn't want to issue an RFP that doesn't really aim at what council wants to achieve. The goal tonight is to collect input and then redraft the RFP and issue it based on some of the consensus input that we receive this evening.*

*Ms. Dorothy asked if A.3. covers the entire area of North to South on High St. Mr. Watterson replied that this area includes Southington through Worthington-Galena because the signals are interconnected. He added that those signals are interconnected and operate with a progression both northbound and southbound. So if you travel at the*

*posted speed and you have a green light, you can continue getting the green lights in both directions. Those signals are operated from the master controller at Granville Road and High St. If we add a signal into that progression it can affect how that progression operates and may degrade traffic flow. That needs to be evaluated to determine if it will degrade traffic and if so, then how much. Ms. Dorothy clarified that the study is for vehicular traffic. Mr. Watterson agreed.*

*Mr. Norstrom recognized that we are asking the consultant to give us the best work they can for \$50,000. With regard to A.2., he asked if we are asking the consultant to give us their best recommendation for the crossing. He gave the example of the HAWK signal, which might not be the right device for the High/Stafford intersection in terms of how he normally sees the HAWK signals used.*

*When asked by Dr. Chosy about the HAWK signal, Mr. Greeson explained that they are a pedestrian actuated signal. Mr. Watterson added the signals at Village Green Dr. South and Short St. currently are flashing beacons and do not require a stop. The HAWK signal would require a full stop so it has the potential to affect north and southbound traffic on High St. the same as a full traffic signal.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that if he is a consultant doing this study he might look at the HAWK signal but not make the decision that the HAWK signal is appropriate for that intersection or he could make the decision that it is appropriate for that intersection.*

*Mr. Greeson asked Mr. Norstrom if he is suggesting that A.2. we change it to, Provide recommendations for improved. . . Mr. Norstrom agreed. Mr. Greeson thinks that is what staff meant. The challenge with this crossing is that there is not the typical data that you might have such as crash history and things like that so there is likely going to be multiple options to choose from.*

*Mr. Norstrom stated that gets to his second question, the detailed traffic study of High St./Stafford. He asked if we are going to have people out there counting pedestrians crossing that for a period of time as he is not familiar with pedestrian counts. Mr. Watterson thinks they will need to count pedestrians on site and very likely the turning movement.*

*Dr. Chosy asked if pavement lighting across the road is one of the choices. Mr. Watterson replied that it is not listed in the RFP. Dr. Chosy replied that while he understands that the language says "including but not limited to" he would like stronger wording to consider that.*

*Mr. Norstrom stated that he doesn't want to see the consultant wasting a great deal of time on improvement options that they don't consider are appropriate. Mr. Greeson commented that there may be some that they rule out fairly quickly. Mr. Norstrom pointed out that that is not the way this is written. It looks like there could be a great deal of time spent on evaluating options that they don't think are the right ones for a full evaluation. Ms. Dorothy agreed.*

*Mr. Watterson commented that that would mean that they may not evaluate something that members might think highly of. Mr. Norstrom replied that members are asking them to provide professional opinions.*

*Mr. Greeson concluded that we will just put “provide a report”. He added that the consultants will not only be evaluated on their qualifications but we will also ask to look at some of their work product. We will work with them to ensure that we get enough information in the report.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that they could be prejudiced against a certain type of signal and just not do it. Mr. Norstrom commented that we are asking professionals. He used the example of in-pavement lighting. Some members have seen it and it is very impressive but it is also very expensive. He doesn’t know the effectiveness of that product in this situation versus a HAWK or versus something else. While the consultant doesn’t know the statistics, they already know that answer because of their knowledge. He doesn’t think members want them to spend a great deal of time or energy to write up a report that has detailed information on the recommendations that they won’t make.*

*Mr. Myers asked if he think some of the economics will drive some of this. Mr. Norstrom replied partially. Mr. Myers added that they are going to have to make calls because they are not going to have an unlimited pool of money to spend. Mr. Norstrom agreed. Mr. Myers commented that in the world of this sort of a study he doesn’t know if \$50,000 is a lot or a little. Mr. Norstrom replied that he thinks it is a little. Mr. Watterson agreed that it isn’t an excessive amount. Mr. Myers hopes the economics will drive some of that. Mr. Norstrom agreed.*

*Mr. Greeson thanked members for that feedback.*

## B. Phase Two

1. Perform a detailed traffic study of the High Street – Short Street and High Street Village Green Drive South Intersections including vehicle and pedestrian traffic counts.
2. Evaluate options for improved pedestrian crossings in consideration of the improvement option selected for implementation at the High / Stafford intersection.
3. Provide a report including features and a cost estimate for the proposed Improvements.

*Mr. Greeson commented that we want the consultants to tell us what we should be doing at these locations and whether there are opportunities for technological improvements to what we already have. Mr. Norstrom agreed.*

*Ms. Dorothy stated that she is confused about how Phase One 3. would be affected by any options for improving pedestrian crossings. She asked if that would be taken into any consideration from Phase Two. Mr. Watterson commented that for instance, if members determine in Phase One that they want to use a flashing beacon at Stafford then Short and Village Green Dr. South flashing beacons should probably have the same configuration. Likewise, if members determine that a HAWK was the preferable option then members may want to consider adding a HAWK at those other locations.*

*When asked by Dr. Chosy if there are any State rules that would prevent us from installing red lights that close to StRt 161, Mr. Watterson replied no.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that the lights we currently have at the post office do not require a full stop. Mr. Watterson replied by stating that as with any crosswalk in Ohio, they require that the motorist yield to the pedestrian when the pedestrian is in the half of the crosswalk that the vehicle is in.*

*Mr. Norstrom stated that the HAWK acts like a red light. Mr. Watterson agreed.*

*Ms. Dorothy going back to Phase One stated that we want all phases to be done so they are probably going to be doing Phase One and Phase Two simultaneously. Mr. Watterson replied that the schedule has them bringing the results of Phase One to members in July and hopefully at the work meeting in July have a determination as to how members wish to proceed. Then they could begin the design work on Phase One and make their evaluation for Phase Two based on what members decided in Phase One.*

*Mr. Smith asked where Worthington-Galena comes into to this. Mr. Watterson explained that Worthington-Galena is the northern most signal in the interconnected core.*

*Mr. Smith asked if there is any thought into this Scope of Service about any potential development within that corridor and how that might impact traffic especially for budgeting for projects in the next five years. Mr. Watterson replied no.*

*Mr. Smith asked how we account for that. Mr. Norstrom replied we don't. Mr. Smith concluded that we just let it happen. Mr. Norstrom added that we would do another traffic study at that point in time.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that he had a request. He stated that if we get rid of the flags at the two places that we have them now, he would like to have one for a souvenir. Mr. Norstrom shared that the flags were Dr. Chosy's idea. Dr. Chosy reported that the idea came from someplace where the Olympics were going to be held.*

### C. Phase Three

1. Identify locations in the study area lacking pedestrian access including infill sidewalk opportunities within city blocks and city block sections with no existing walks.

*Dr. Chosy asked for a definition of an “infill sidewalk”. Mr. Greeson replied that a good example is there is a section on Hartford St. south of New England where the sidewalk ends in the middle of the block. There are a variety of those types of places around town and some of those may create more critical problems for kids walking to school or for people trying to get to the farmer’s market while others may be less critical.*

*Mr. Norstrom thinks it should be looked at from the perspective of one side or the other. For example, on Hartford, you can go down the west side of the street all the way but the east side does have problems. From the perspective of a bike and pedestrian committee the question is what do we have in Worthington where there are no potential pathways? Then we can talk about shoveling snow and all of the other stuff.*

2. Evaluate options for improved pedestrian connections between major destinations in the study area.

*Mr. Greeson sees #2. as the more open-ended, tell us how in your professional judgment we can better make Old Worthington walkable, particularly amongst all of the destinations that people are trying to go to and from. He thinks that is where there is more opportunity to be creative about applying pedestrian improvement techniques that we may not find in our community today.*

*Ms. Dorothy asked for a definition of “major destinations”. Mr. Watterson replied that they include the library, schools, and restaurants. Mr. Greeson added commercial business area and public parking lots.*

*Ms. Dorothy noted that the corridor goes all the way from Southington to Worthington-Galena which does include some 35 mph speed limits. Mr. Watterson clarified that that area is the interconnected traffic signals.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that the map doesn’t mark the intersections that we are talking about pedestrians or anything. Mr. Greeson shared that the consultant will receive links to all of the GIS information that is available about all of this.*

*Mr. Norstrom shared that from his perspective the general concept of this is kind of like preliminary engineering. We don’t want them to get into too much detail in anything because \$50,000 isn’t going to allow for much detail. So the idea is to get an overview. Mr. Greeson agreed that this is not design.*

*Dr. Chosy asked if the \$50,000 includes all of these phases or is that just for the first phase. Mr. Watterson replied that it is for all four phases of the study. Mr. Greeson added that we want a deliverable on the first one because that is the one that members said was the highest priority. We want that soon.*

3. Develop recommendations for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements in the study area including sidewalk width, slope and detectable warning considerations
4. Provide a report including locations and cost estimates for the identified deficiencies.

#### D. Phase Four

1. Evaluate the study area for bicycle transportation accommodation including the Granville Road and High Street corridors through the study areas.
2. Develop options for improved bicycle accommodation in the study area including but not limited to the use of sharrows, bike lanes and multi-use paths.
3. Provide a report including descriptions, locations and cost estimates for the identified options.

*Mr. Greeson commented that in Phase Three we talk about pedestrian connections and in Phase Four we talk about bicycle transportation accommodations and trying to improve access for those on bicycles and all types of users in that area. We wanted to call that out separately as a desired outcome of this study.*

*Mr. Greeson clarified for Dr. Chosy that the area is from North to South and Evening to Morning because that was originally a recommendation of the Bike and Pedestrian Committee. It actually encompasses two other recommendations, Stafford and High and the Downtown Mobility Study. Staff interpreted Downtown Mobility Study as Old Worthington, not just our commercial area of downtown but also the residential area.*

*Mr. Troper commented that he is no expert on traffic and pedestrian traffic but what happens if we get to Phase One and you pick something great but then it doesn't work so well with the other phases. He is trying to understand why you wouldn't look at C.2. in terms of the big picture before you look at each piece. Mr. Norstrom replied because council told them that we wanted to look at that one first.*

*Mr. Greeson added that members know that there is a problem there that they want to address. He thinks that is usually the way you would approach it. While we want to look at everything, if there is an area of focus that members want to solve he thinks it is okay to specify it up front. We don't go into this not knowing much about our community. We go into it knowing a great deal about our community and all of that information will be provided to the consultant. Ultimately it is outlined like this because council members said it was a priority.*

*Mr. Myers thinks the policy behind starting this is really in Phases Three and Four and he agrees with Mr. Troper in that. He wants to make certain that we don't get too*

*bogged down in making this about a pedestrian crossing. While he thinks he has lost this argument already, he isn't certain that he has come full circle on saying yes he wants a crosswalk at Stafford. He wants to make certain that members feel free to reject a crossing there at the very end if it is going to have a greater impact on the rest of the downtown. That being said, he wants to make certain that we stay true to the policy that got all of this started, which was that we want to be able to move people by ways other than cars through areas of Worthington. Those areas could be as far as Selby Blvd and church or the mall or the bike path at the river.*

*Mr. Norstrom pointed out that those areas are outside of the study area. Mr. Myers agreed. Mr. Greeson shared that we know Fresh Thyme will be a major destination for walkers.*

*Mr. Myers commented that right now we have sidewalks that terminate in the middle of a block. He just wants to make certain when we talk to the consultants we let them know that while your study area is confined to this area, the town is bigger than this so don't give us a study that leads us to a spot that we can't get out of. That doesn't make any sense. We still have to look at this globally because our true mission here, he thinks, at least what was his policy in appropriating this money was that we look at this as a way to move people around town other than just by car and that has to be holistic in the approach. Mr. Norstrom added except for \$50,000 you can only really look at the study areas specified. Mr. Myers stated that he understands they are not going to study the path from North St. to the mall. He gets that but they can't do this in a vacuum. They can't ignore the fact that we have the Shops up there. For example, is High St. the best way to get there? Mr. Norstrom commented that is not what we are asking. Mr. Myers agreed but eventually that is the question we have to answer. Mr. Norstrom argued that \$50,000 is not a lot of money when it comes to consulting studies. He understands completely what Mr. Myers is saying but given the scope, the consultant only has to look at what we tell them to look at. Mr. Myers said he understands.*

*Mr. Norstrom and Mr. Myers continued to discuss the Scope of Services, what it includes versus what it doesn't, the \$50,000 appropriation and what that means, and the study area versus the global impact.*

*Mr. Myers stated that it is council's job to look at the big picture. He wants to make certain that council doesn't lose sight of why we are committed to this project. It isn't just for this intersection. Mr. Norstrom agreed.*

*Ms. Dorothy leads to her questions about Phase Four. She asked what targets we are giving them for #2. She thinks one of the problems that we had is that we have this transportation guideline that is specific for vehicles but not for pedestrians or bicycles. She asked if that is our guideline that is really meant for cars or are we giving them a different guideline, a different standard to get to. She asked if we are giving them a target for developing these options for \* ~~approved~~ improved bicycle accommodations in the study areas. Mr. Greeson thinks we are asking them to provide us with a range of options. It may be different approaches to addressing the same problem. There may be*

*different feasible options for addressing the same issues. Mr. Watterson added that it may be modifying parking, adding sharrows or dedicated bike lanes through the study area. Mr. Greeson added that it could be some combination of those.*

*Ms. Dorothy again asked what guidelines. All of these transportation engineers are looking at guideline standards and there are different options out there. Are we telling them to use the latest standards for bike and pedestrian guidelines? Mr. Norstrom replied that we are asking for their professional opinion at this point. He thinks that is the way the document is structured at the moment.*

*Dr. Chosy asked how soon Phase Four would kick in. Mr. Watterson replied that the reports for Phases Two, Three and Four would be presented to council on September 14<sup>th</sup>, which is the September work meeting.*

*Ms. Dorothy commented that she would like to ask their opinion on if there are different standards we should be adopting to improve our overall bike and pedestrian accommodation throughout Worthington for the future use.*

*When asked by Mr. Greeson if she wanted that as part of this study Ms. Dorothy replied that she would like it included as part of the Phase Four.*

*Mr. Greeson stated that from a wording standpoint he thinks we can accomplish that, at least in the study area by saying in Phase Four #2. "Develop options for improved bicycle accommodations and standards." Mr. Smith stated that the wording that Mr. Myers keeps using is pretty accurate. He thinks something like "getting people from point "A" to point "B" without using vehicles" and using that as an approach for future.*

*Mr. Norstrom stated that he has a real problem with where this discussion is going because we are talking about \$50,000. There are two ways you can approach a study. One is to get to something that is operational. The other is to get to conceptually what you want. This is in that first one, to get something happening. If we want to have a study, for example that looks at complete streets on High St. that is a different and lengthy study. He has no problem with that but that is not the direction that council has given staff.*

*Ms. Dorothy doesn't think she is asking about looking into complete streets on High St. She is asking for their professional opinion of any nationally recognized standards that are currently out there that we have not adopted or looked at that other people throughout the country are currently using. Mr. Norstrom replied okay. He added, within the study area at this point in time and by implication could be adopted throughout the entire area. Ms. Dorothy replied yes and definitely as Mr. Myers said could or could not be adopted but just giving us the option.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks ultimately if we ask for that kind of guidance for the study area we will all learn about the merits of some of those standards and probably have a more informed dialog as we start to apply them to other parts of the community. He asked Ms.*

*Dorothy if that is how she is viewing it. Ms. Dorothy agreed that we may or may not apply them but yes. Mr. Greeson added that he can imagine different things in different parts of the city.*

*Mr. Myers asked if this is too much in one bite. Ms. Dorothy replied no. The standards are already out there. They are not creating new standards.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that he is not that familiar. He assumes that Ms. Dorothy and Mr. Smith being on the Bike and Ped Committee understand what the issues are.*

*Mr. Myers guesses that he is looking at this a little more globally. It seems to him that Phase One is something that is pretty standard for what a traffic engineer or somebody who is going to bid on this proposal does. They are going to study whether there ought to be a crosswalk here, the affect it is going to have on the rest of traffic, and what kind of crosswalk it ought to be and they are going to give us a recommendation. That is pretty cut and dry and members will take a look at that. Then they get into this kind of more amorphous, policy driven, bigger picture kind of thing. He asked if it is going to be too watered down for us to deal with when it comes into us. He asked if we want to carve out Phase One and then come back later for Phases Two, Three and Four. Mr. Greeson thinks we could have a series of projects come out of Phases Three and Four. So standards are one thing. They are helpful as we consider future road projects, as development may occur, and as we apply those standards to that. The downtown is probably more limited than if you were doing it in another part of town that might have more development and more road construction over time. But when you talk about in-fill sidewalk opportunities, improved pedestrian connections, bike access, there could be a series of physical changes and options. He listed a number of possible physical options for the area. He added that all of those options are kind of big picture conceptually but they turn into CIP projects that we would have to prioritize. So they could become practical once they are prioritized.*

*Mr. Myers asked Mr. Greeson if he thinks that those kinds of ideas are realistic outcome of this RFP. Mr. Greeson replied that he thinks they are in conceptually form and recognizing that we are not asking for detailed design. Mr. Watterson added that if you look at Phase Three, there are a number of situation in Old Worthington where there is not an opportunity to walk. Mr. Myers commented for them to come back and say you ought to put a sidewalk on Hartford St., we kind of already know that. He hopes it will provide a little bit more than that.*

*Mr. Watterson continued by saying that some would likely be used more than others. If the interest is in having sidewalks available all over Old Worthington there has to be some sort of strategy to begin that and prioritize that. Many of the sidewalks in Old Worthington do not meet ADA requirements. The lawsuit in 2000 only required that curb ramps meet ADA so long sections of walk are not ADA compliant. Then Phase Two opens up a lot of other ideas like shared streets that shares car, bicycles and pedestrians. They are being used in some parts of the country affectively. Whether they are applicable to Worthington or not is a question that would be very interesting to look at and*

*determine if there is a use somewhere. He thinks we have discussed Phase Four. There are many options for bicycles on busy streets and we have seen some in various areas around Columbus and there are opportunities to use that in Old Worthington. Like with everything, there are trade-offs.*

*Mr. Greeson thinks “trade-offs” is a good word because he thinks everything we are going to get into is a built environment. We are going to get into parking versus accommodations. We are going to get into traffic accommodations versus bike accommodations and all those kind of things that this will hopefully narrow the field and give us some sites specific recommendations or some options for areas that could be publically discussed in an informed way.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that it is a good start.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that another way to look at this potentially is this is our innovative area. We may come up with three or four different suggestions that we could try out in the study area and see how they work and then apply them appropriately across the city. Mr. Myers replied that he is all for that. He just wants to make certain we can get to that point with this RFP because to him that is why we are doing it. It is not to get a crosswalk. Other members agreed.*

*Mr. Norstrom commented that he has not submitted a paper proposal in over five years. He added that submitting proposals in quadruplets is also passé. He would like to see us move into the 2100st century. Mr. Myers agreed.*

*Mr. Norstrom noted that members still don’t have tablets. Mr. Myers commented that we also don’t have the sound system upgraded yet either.*

*Mr. Greeson thanked members for the input. He added that it is important for staff to hear what members are expecting. We will revise the RFP to reflect what we heard tonight and will send it out. He noted that the procurement regulation requires that it be sent out to a minimum of five companies. We will probably send it out to more than that who have qualifications to do this kind of work. We will probably send it out locally, as well as firms in the state and maybe even some nationally. Staff will evaluate those and get them on board as soon as we can.*

*Mr. Norstrom complimented staff because we are letting them know that we have \$50,000 and we are asking them for their best approach to that. That is exactly the way to go with this study. Mr. Greeson added that staff also didn’t want to make the document fifteen pages of RFP language. We wanted to try to make it short and sweet.*

*Dr. Chosy thinks he speaks for all council members that they appreciate staff having brought this forward and letting members see it and discuss it and provide staff with a little better idea of what we are doing.*

*Mrs. Fox reported that last Wednesday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, staff received an appeal of an ARB decision. ARB decisions can be appealed to Council. It was an appeal of the ARB decision of improvements to the lot at 130 W. Clearview. The Council has the right to either accept the appeal or not accept the appeal. If the appeal is accepted it has to be heard within 60 of the date that the ARB passed their decision. So 60 days from January 22<sup>nd</sup>, which was the ARB meeting is March 23<sup>rd</sup> but that is the fourth Monday in March. So the Council deadline would be March 16<sup>th</sup>. She is just letting members know that we received this appeal. Staff will provide Council with the appeal and the decision materials at next week's meeting. Council can either choose to act next Monday but there is a little bit of time if members want to take a look at the materials and come back and perhaps make that decision at the meeting of March 17<sup>th</sup>. She thinks that would be sufficient as there will be three more Council meetings before that 60 day deadline if Council chooses to accept the appeal.*

*Dr. Chosy commented that if Council chooses to deny the appeal, he asked if they have recourse. Mrs. Fox replied not under our code. Mr. Norstrom added that they could go the legal circuit if they wanted to. Mrs. Fox agreed that they could if they feel that they are somehow aggrieved by that decision then they have the right to go to court. Dr. Chosy stated that if council decided to accept the appeal then we would have an open session and discuss it. Mrs. Fox replied that the code refers to it as a hearing.*

*Mrs. Fox added that staff would like to request an Executive Session for the purposes of land acquisition and economic development when council is ready to make that decision.*

## **REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

*Mr. Myers shared that he will not be here for the meeting on February 17<sup>th</sup>. If at that meeting council decides whether to accept the appeal or not, having sat through and understanding the resident's position, he is always in favor of accepting the appeal and listening to the resident.*

*Mr. Norstrom shared that Joan Bird requested that he remind council members that on Saturday, February 21<sup>st</sup> Leadership Worthington will celebrate their 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary with a gala. All members are invited and she encouraged everyone to attend. Since his wife was in the second class he knows that he will be there.*

*When asked by Mr. Myers the time of the gala Mr. Troper replied 7:30 to 10:30 p.m..*

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**MOTION** Mr. Norstrom made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss land acquisition and economic development. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

**The motion carried by the following voice vote:**

**Yes 5** Smith, Myers, Troper, Dorothy, Chosy

**No 1** Norstrom

**The motion carried by a voice vote.**

Council recessed at 8:40 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Council came out of Executive Session at 8:55 p.m.

**MOTION** Mr. Troper made a motion to return to open session and adjourn.  
The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

**The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

President Pro-Tem Chosy declared the meeting adjourned.

/s/ D. Kay Thress  
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this  
2<sup>nd</sup> day of March, 2015.*

/s/ Robert F. Chosy  
Council President Pro-Tem