Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 19, 2016 ~ 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
Scott Myers, President Pro-Tempore
Rachael Dorothy
Douglas C. Foust
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 Tuesday, January 19, 2016, in the John P. Coleman Council Chambers of the Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio. President Michael called the meeting to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

Members Present: Rachael R. Dorothy, Douglas Foust, Scott Myers, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent:

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Building and Planning Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were eleven visitors present.

President Michael invited all those in attendance to stand and join in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

VISITOR COMMENTS

President Michael acknowledged two Boy Scouts who were present and working on their Citizenship in the Community merit badge that is required for their Eagle Scout designation. She encouraged them to asked questions.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- December 21, 2015 – Regular Meeting
- January 4, 2016 – Organizational Meeting

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

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

Change in Order to Agenda

Resolution No. 05-2016

Clarifying the Conditions of the Economic Development Venture Grant for MedVet Associates, LLC.

Introduced by Mr. Myers.
MOTION
Mr. Smith made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Mr. Greeson welcomed Dr. Eric Schertel, who is the President of MedVet. He shared that MedVet is one of our largest businesses and an anchor tenant on one of our most important corridors, the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor. We appreciate him being here tonight.

Mrs. Stewart commented that in December the City Council acted upon a venture grant agreement associated with the expansion of MedVet’s headquarter operations here in Worthington. That grant provided for four installments. The first was to be distributed at the time of their certificate of occupancy for the expansion building, which is right next door to their current facility. There is to be three subsequent annual installments after that time. Since the venture grant was approved and through discussions with MedVet staff realized that they are adding the jobs sooner than there expanded premises will be available to be occupied. The request before council this evening actually modifies the first distribution and will make it payable either upon the issuance of the certificate of occupancy or when the new jobs associated with the expansion and with the venture grant begin to occur. That would allow the payment of the grant to be made sooner since they are already beginning to add those jobs. Since staff felt the intent of the grant was to be timed with when the jobs were to be added, we thought it was an appropriate clarification to be made and seek council’s approval that would allow for that.

Ms. Dorothy stated that she is confused as to why we are doing the certificate of occupancy however she totally agrees that the distribution should be at the time the jobs are created. Mrs. Stewart shared that language was left in place since it was part of the original grant agreement and action taken by council. This resolution just adds in the other option for an earlier payment.

Mr. Myers asked what the number of jobs were that would trigger payment. Mrs. Stewart recalls it being about one hundred jobs with about six million in payroll by the end of their ramp up for expansion, which is occurring in the next five to seven years.

Mr. Norstrom commented that members are very glad that MedVet is staying in the community. Ms. Michael agreed.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 05-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION
President Michael declared public hearings and voting on legislation previously introduced to be in order.

Ordinance No. 01-2016 Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an
Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund
Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of
Engineering and Related Services for Preliminary
Design and Related Services for the Intersection
Improvements at Huntley/ Wilson Bridge/
Worthington-Galena Roads and Determining to
Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 602-14)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that a number of years ago the city applied for federal attributable
funds to improve the Huntley/Wilson Bridge/Worthington-Galena Road intersection.
This intersection has long been identified as an area of congestion in the city of
Worthington and something that at some point we would strive to improve. Staff will
share a little bit of the timeline but he wanted to touch on the two actions that staff wants
council to consider this evening. Then he will turn it over to our consultants, Neil
Schwartz and Mike Brehm with EMH&T to overview the process that we have
undertaken to evaluate this intersection, the public engagement that has occurred as well
as the preferred alternative that has been arrived at. Afterwards Council will have the
opportunity, if you so desire, to approve a motion that will approve a preferred
alternative. That is an important step because that allows staff to move forward to
finalize the design contract that will then be brought back to council in the future to move
forward with the design. The ordinance for public hearing tonight was previously
introduced and will fund the design. The drafts of scopes of services from EMH&T are
still be reviewed by staff and our partners, ODOT and MORPC. Staff would like for
council to table the funding ordinance until the alternative is selected and the actual
design contract is complete. It will be fine should Council not be ready to select a
preferred alternative tonight. Staff is prepared to have further discussions if that is
necessary but we will approach that question at the end of the presentation. He invited
Mr. Brehm to share his presentation and reported that staff will be prepared to answer
any of council’s questions.

Mr. Brehm thanked Council members on behalf of EMH&T for the opportunity to assist
the city with this project and to present an overview of their work product this evening.

Mr. Brehm shared the following PowerPoint presentation:
BACKGROUND | PROJECT TO DATE

History

- In 2012, the City of Worthington successfully applied for MORPC Attributable Funds for right-of-way and construction phases.
- In 2014, the City of Worthington engaged EMH&T to advance traffic studies and identify feasible alternatives for improving the intersection.
- The Huntley Road / Wilson Bridge Road / Worthington-Galena Road Intersection Improvements FEASIBILITY STUDY was submitted to the City of Worthington in August of 2015.
- The study identified 4 feasible alternatives and a preferred alternative.
- Public involvement occurred November-December of 2015.
- Due to the use of federal money in the financing of this project, it must proceed through the Ohio Department of Transportation’s Project Development Process (PDP).
- The project has been assigned a project name (FRA-CR084-1.36) and number (PID 95516).

[Image of Huntley Road / Wilson Bridge Road / Worthington-Galena Road Intersection Improvements]

**ODOT’s Project Development Process**

1. Planning (PL)
2. Preliminary Engineering (PE)
3. Environmental Engineering (EE)
4. Final Engineering / ROW (FE)
5. Construction (CO)
Project Goals
1. Improve Capacity (Level of Service)
2. Improve Geometric Deficiencies (Roadway Alignment)
3. Improve Access Management Issues
4. Provide Pedestrian & Bicycle Connectivity

Feasible Alternatives Development
- Traffic Counts
- Traffic Projections

Mr. Brehm shared that traffic was projected to 2035.

Ms. Dorothy asked Mr. Brehm if he knew how much additional traffic was added. Mr. Brehm replied that on the busiest leg of the intersection, which is the portion of Worthington-Galena Road that goes under I-270, the existing traffic is about 29,000 vehicles per day. By 2035, that number is expected to grow through 36,000 vehicles.

Mr. Foust wondered at the key variables that were used to determine that projection. Mr. Brehm reported one of the variables was counting traffic on certain days. They work to choose the days carefully so that they are representative of the actual traffic. Friday
afternoons are not good because some leave work early or don’t work on Fridays. They usually try not to count intersections in the summer months because there is no school traffic. There are certainly a number of variables that they use.

Mr. Foust commented that he was interested in learning what key assumptions were used such as growth on that strip. Mr. Brehm explained that to project the traffic twenty years into the future they coordinate with ODOT (Ohio Department of Transportation) and MORPC (Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission) who both have groups of engineers and traffic modelers that maintain some pretty elaborate and involved overall traffic models of central Ohio. Those models are developed based upon anticipated changes in demographics, population, as well as land use. The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study was something that they provided to that modeling team to make sure that the information was captured in the traffic projections.

- Environmental Studies
- Intersection Concepts
- Refinement
- Cost Estimates

Mr. Brehm stated that he would like to present the Preferred Alternative and then he will step back and explain how they reached that alternative.

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT | FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES**

**Signalized Realignment #2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Mr. Brehm explained that the Preferred Alternative is what is known as Signalized Realignment #2. It consists of realigning Worthington-Galena Road and Huntley Road into a continuous north-south movement. North on this map is in the top right hand corner. The proposal will also realign the southwest leg of the existing intersection to provide some spacing between those two intersections. They are kind of splitting the existing intersection up into two intersections. The existing southwest leg of
Worthington-Galena would be maintained with a cul-de-sac at the north end to provide access to businesses and residents along that existing corridor today.

Mr. Myers noted that some frontages for those businesses would be eliminated and would be put on a service road. Mr. Brehm agreed. Mr. Myers asked if they reached out to any of those businesses or landlords. Mr. Brehm shared that as part of the public involvement process they did reach out to all of the business owners. Not only the property owners but the tenants as well. They mailed 59 letters out to property owners who were affected by this project, in terms of having proposed improvements adjacent to their frontages. They also hand delivered 114 – 140 letters to all of the tenants of the buildings. They worked to engage everyone involved.

Ms. Michael asked if any negative feedback was received. Mr. Brehm reported that he doesn’t recall any negative feedback being received, particularly related to the subject of moving that road and potentially changing the visibility of their business.

Mr. Brehm went on to explain that the change would include two traffic signals. There was talk about pedestrian facilities as they are very important to the community as well as to the funding agencies. What they have proposed is a ten foot wide shared use path along the west side of Huntley Road and continuing north under I-270 to the Lakeview Plaza intersection. They have also proposed a shared use path on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road from Huntley Road to McCord Park and a five foot concrete walk on the north side of Wilson Bridge Road from Huntley to west of the railroad tracks. They propose to add pedestrian and bicycle facilities across the railroad, which is not something they take lightly. As a result they have included in project cost estimates as well as their feasibility study some pedestrian and bicycle gates, similar to the existing vehicular gates at that railroad crossing. When a train is detected the gates come down and block the road. These gates would be similar in that they would block the path and the sidewalk. This location involves two separate railroad, Norfolk Southern and CSX so this creates a challenge with the detail design work.

Ms. Dorothy thinks that during detail design it was mentioned in the comments that all pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be going through the new Bike and Ped Committee. Mr. Brehm acknowledged that as something staff had recommended. This design is their recommendation and has been developed pretty carefully and with consideration for future CIP projects that the city may have south on Huntley, future CIP improvements west on Wilson Bridge as well as the city of Columbus bicycle thoroughfare plan as we get to the northern part of the project improvements. They would encourage dialog with the Bike and Pedestrian task force and be very interested in their recommendations. Ms. Dorothy added that she wants to make sure that they have design input. Mr. Brehm agreed. He added that the key as he sees it and as Mr. Greeson said is to come to consensus on the signalized realignment as the preferred alternative. There is certainly of scope elements, like the Bike and Pedestrian facilities that we will be working through in the very early stages of detail design.
Mr. Brehm went on to say that there are right-of-way implications associated with realigning the roadways. He pointed out that the preferred alternative impacts two existing structures. The first is located at the realigned Huntley Road intersection; 7200 Huntley Road is a commercial property. The second is located at the realigned Worthington-Galena leg, which impacts 431 Wilson Bridge Rd.

Ms. Michael asked what is located at 431 Wilson Bridge Rd. Mr. Brehm replied that it is residential in appearance. When asked by Ms. Michael if it is being used as a business Mr. Brehm replied that it may be. They have mailed and hand delivered information to that residence but are not aware of the individual attending the public meeting. They also reached out with a certified letter in December that included the preferred alternative map in hopes of generating some dialog between the city and the property owner and they did not hear back on that. Mr. Greeson shared that it is commercially zoned but he doesn’t think it is currently signed for a business.

Mr. Brehm acknowledged that this is a big change that is being proposed. He shared that he now wanted to take a step back and explain more about how they got to this point. He mentioned level of service earlier. From a traffic engineering perspective that is how they compare alternatives. It is a measure of congestion. It is similar to grades in school with an “A” being great and “F” is terrible.

Ms. Dorothy commented that the grade pertains only to vehicles. Mr. Brehm replied that in the context of this presentation, yes.

Mr. Brehm shared that the aim in grading is for a “C” in the worst hour of the day. So in 2035 our hope is to come up with an intersection improvement that maintains at least the level of service “C” in the worst hour of the day.
Mr. Brehm shared that the first alternative they looked at involved widening the existing intersection with additional turn lanes and through lanes. With that improvement they were able to get the intersection to a level of service “D”. While this would be an improvement it does not reach our goal of level of service “C”. This alternative also falls short in that it doesn’t correct the geometric deficiencies at the existing intersection. The existing intersection has three lanes on each leg. This alternative would widen the existing intersection anywhere from five to seven lanes so it is a pretty significant widening.
They also looked at a roundabout. He is a big fan of roundabouts and has designed seven of them in central Ohio. A roundabout at this location did not turn out to be a good solution either. This actually got the intersection to a level of service “C” so that was a good thing however it had an “F” on the eastbound Wilson Bridge Road leg. It is feasible but in their opinion really not prudent because it would unofficially be the largest roundabout in Ohio.
Mr. Brehm shared that since they were unable to reach the goals that were set at the beginning with these first two options, they started looking at outside the box options. During their traffic analysis they noticed the southbound Worthington-Galena Road and turning left onto Huntley movement was very, very heavy as was the reciprocating movement of westbound Huntley to northbound Worthington-Galena Rd. That heavy movement suggested that they should look at a realignment option that made that a through movement instead of a turn movement. They developed the option titled, Signalized Realignment #1, which is very similar to the preferred alternative but the exception being the alignment of realigned Worthington-Galena Road. That alignment would have impacted three structures on its own. So they looked at another alignment, realignment #2, which is the preferred alternative.
Mr. Brehm shared that this alternative is less impactful on existing structures. Signalized Realignment #1 and #2 are the same from a traffic perspective. One nice feature about this concept is that the existing Rush Creek Commerce Center would be tied into a signal, which would make access into and out of the center better.

Mr. Brehm shared that this signalized realignment concept got them to the overall service level “C” at both signalized intersections.

Mr. Brehm commented that their report recommended Signalized Realignment #2 as the preferred alternatives, which was based on a couple of factors, which he will talk about on a subsequent slide. Realignment #2 is a slightly cheaper option based on our cost estimates. It is virtually the same from a traffic perspective and it impacts fewer structures than Signalized Realignment option #1.

Mr. Brehm shared the comparison information of the four options in the charts below.
Mr. Brehm noted that the size worked against the widening and roundabout option as it would be difficult to implement quality pedestrian/bicycle navigation.
Mr. Brehm noted the signalized realignment options as being the more expensive options, with signalized option #2 being the cheaper of the two.

Ms. Dorothy asked if the cost estimates were all in today’s dollars. Mr. Brehm replied that the estimates are all inflated. The costs include design, right-of-way, and construction. The construction dollars are inflated with contingencies to construction year 2019.

Ms. Michael questioned the construction not beginning until 2019. Mr. Brehm explained that this follows an ODOT process. There is a very prescribed process that needs to be followed for the project, particularly from a right-of-way acquisition standpoint and federal dollars being used for that purpose. This signalized realignment alternative, really any of the alternatives, would have resulted in potential total takes of parcels and there are certain prescribed timelines and durations for those relocations to take place. It will be here before members know it. Ms. Michael shared that she has been watching this intersection for twelve years. So four more kind of makes it feel really long.

Mr. Myers commented that this timeline assumes that the city can take the two properties without strenuous objection. Mr. Brehm replied that the schedule is based on a worst case scenario in which those parcels need to be appropriated. Mr. Myers disagreed. He commented that worst case would be in the courts that long.

Mr. Brehm explained that the city would have quick take authority through imminent domain. The quick take authority would give the city access to that property within a certain period of time. The fact that there is a commercial relocation makes it not necessarily in the city’s best interest to acquire the parcel and take position of it within four to six week after filing. The schedule contemplates one year for right-of-way acquisition, which is something that is really pushing it out into 2019.

Mr. Myers asked if that particular building housed a fence company. Mr. Brehm believes that to be correct. Mr. Myers assumes the property owner and tenant were contacted.
Mr. Brehm replied that several of the family members who own the property attended the public meeting. There was a great deal of dialog with them and they were aware of the project even before the public meeting. They were very interested in the timeline and when potential offers may be made and that sort of thing. Mr. Myers was glad that they are aware and engaged in the process.

Ms. Michael asked if the acquisition of right-of-way takes less time will the construction move up. Mr. Brehm replied that when ODOT uses the term “right-of-way acquisition” they are referring to anything from right-of-way to highway and utility easements, to even temporary construction easements so we have anticipated a mix of all of those. Certainly with the scope of magnitude of some of the relocations where the road would be outside of existing right-of-way today we certainly recommend that the city attempt to acquire right-of-way for those situations.

Mr. Myers asked what other factors besides size and uniqueness persuaded them that the roundabout wasn’t the way to go. Mr. Brehm reported there being several factors. The size was a concern. To have three circulating lanes on two sides of the circle would be unprecedented in this part of the country.

Mr. Troper asked if any of the alternatives took into consideration the potential number of crashes that would occur. Mr. Brehm replied yes. Certain community have built what is known as a double-double roundabout, which is two circulating lanes on every side of the circle. Double-double roundabouts have sort of fallen out of favor in central Ohio. He shared that there were so many angle crashes as the result of the double-double nature of the roundabout at US 62 at Morse Rd. and constructed by the Franklin County Engineers Office. Within one to two years of the opening of that roundabout they actually went in and made some changes. There is a great deal of crisscrossing with the roundabout and it can be a point of confusion. We have seen numerous angle crashes in other similar roundabouts. They are generally not injury accidents but there is property damage which is an inconvenience because it affects the capacity which means congested traffic. So accidents were considered. We feel like there is a potential for those types of accidents if this were to be built.

Mr. Brehm went on to say that it was an overall level of service “C” however the eastbound traffic leg received an “F”. We think that is because this movement is so dominant. Roundabouts work best when all the legs are fairly equal because drivers rely on gaps in order to enter the roundabout. If one movement is dominating the roundabout then it is not letting people get in to the roundabout. They were particularly concerned because that leg gets very congested and backups across or towards the railroad tracks. It is particularly challenging for bike and pedestrian mobility, particularly for a blind individual. You would potentially be asking a service dog to digest everything that is going on and make a decision and lead that person out into traffic.

Mr. Myers asked if in a roundabout you move bicycles through the roundabout itself as opposed to around it. Mr. Brehm shared that it depends. One school of thought is to provide off ramps and suggest to bicyclist that they leave traffic and operate more like a
pedestrian as they navigate the roundabout. That is probably the leading school of thought. But certainly the confident bicyclists who are willing to ride on Huntley Rd. with the truck traffic and who are willing to take on Worthington-Galena Rd. where it narrows under the bridge could be confident enough to try to navigate the roundabout with the cars.

Mr. Foust noted that earlier he had asked a question about the projections of traffic from 29,000 to 36,000 vehicles. He commented that the city is currently involved in “a river to the rails”, Wilson Bridge Road Corridor discussion. The answer that he was hoping to hear was that we aligned what is being proposed here with our projections based on some assumptions about what may happen in the Wilson Bridge Road corridor. If growth in that corridor reaches 60 or 70% of what it could potentially be, is there some way that we can look at the impact of that assumption. It seems to him that there are two kinds of concurrent issues going on that really could be somewhat intertwined. Mr. Greeson believes the Corridor Study was factored into the modeling. He explained that MORPC, who serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, which is a federal designation for the region uses federal funding to model population growth, land use plans and they build that into computer models that project traffic growth as a result of land use change.

Mr. Foust concluded that MORPC projections that were used here actually have some awareness of what has been proposed. Mr. Greeson recalls hearing Mr. Brehm say that those plans were provided to the MORPC for inclusion in the model. Mr. Brehm agreed. He added that they made a submission to ODOT and MORPC, which is a request for certified traffic so when we do that we provide them with all of our data collection and any land use plans that we are aware of. The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Plan was certainly included as part of that package to make sure that information was factored into the projected traffic for all four legs of the intersection.

Mr. Foust commented that he is almost comfortable. He would still love to know at some point what the assumption was about the buildup based on the proposed zoning changes. If that comes to fruition is the assumption based on a 30% or 70% growth. We will probably not have that answer tonight but he would feel better having some understanding of the modeling that MORPC used. It seems to him that we have this concurrent thing going on here. He loves what is being done but he just wants to make sure we have thought it through with all the variables we have on hand.

Mr. Norstrom shared that the modeling is national models that are used and adopted by local communities. He asked if that is correct. Mr. Brehm replied that certainly the approach to modeling is something that is probably used nationwide in certain aspects. But there are local people here in the state of Ohio and particularly with MORPC that are talking to people like Mr. Greeson and other leaders of other communities in central Ohio to keep track of planned improvements. Mr. Norstrom commented that the underlying technology is the same here as it is in Cleveland, Houston, or anywhere else. He understands them to be federally approved models that Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) has certified because they are the ones putting up the money. Mr. Brehm agreed.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Brehm what his level of confidence is regarding the projection of dollars. Mr. Brehm replied that his confidence is that they are 100% reflective of the scope and the level of knowledge of when these projects are going to proceed at the point in time that they were prepared. They do this a great deal. Certainly there are some scope elements that aren’t fully determined such as the extent of pedestrian facilities but for the improvements that he has described today, he is quite confident in their construction cost numbers. One area that is a little bit tougher from an engineering standpoint is to predict the right-of-way costs. He is not a real estate appraiser so they use the auditor’s data that is available and add many contingencies and try to anticipate potential damages associated with access changes and those sort of things. They have put a great deal of effort into this and they are confident in the numbers that they have prepared.

Going back to Mr. Foust’s earlier question, Mr. Greeson added that with the modeling, they likely factored much more than just our Wilson Bridge Road Plan. They would look to Columbus’ plans to the north and other land use plans because Worthington residents aren’t the only ones going through this intersection.

Mr. Troper commented that if the projection in traffic is wrong and it is higher than the 36,000, he asked if this is still the best alternative. Mr. Brehm replied that in his opinion it is for a couple of reasons. In terms of long term transportation improvement he feels like there is a great deal of benefit in having a continuous north/south movement. The signalized realignment, whether the projections are high or low, the roundabout doesn’t perform as well as this and still doesn’t respond to the demand of traffic today for this continuous north/south movement. The roundabout also would not correct the geometric deficiencies of the existing intersection. These are projections. They are very complicated models. But these methods that have been used to estimate traffic are consistent with how this type of work has typically been approached. From a modeling perspective, these models are evaluated, and calibrated. They will not be perfect on every intersection but in his opinion, it will be very close to what we are going to see.
Mr. Myers commented that on the diagram of the preferred alternative, the right-of-way markings, he asked if that is current right-of-way or would that be additional and larger right-of-way when this is completed. Mr. Brehm replied that all of the right-of-way shown on this particular exhibit is existing right-of-way. What they have shown in terms of proposed improvement is the asphalt, the striping, and the green outline is representative of a footprint. The proposed right-of-way line has been shown on other exhibits that they have prepared internally for the purposes of calculating the proposed right-of-way so they can estimate. They have in the feasibility study some very detailed estimates that break down parcel by parcel what acreage and type of “take” or acquisition. Mr. Myers reported that being the crux of his question. We have the “take” at the corner of Huntley and Worthington-Galena Rd. but immediately to the south of that it looks like we may have encroachment on possibly two other properties. Mr. Brehm agreed. He explained that for the widening of Huntley they would anticipate “strip takes” or widening the existing right-of-way by ten feet pretty much throughout the corridor. There is a need for some type of right-of-way or easement acquisition from most every parcel that is adjacent to any of the alternatives in the project area.

Ms. Michael commented that there is an existing road that will be removed. She asked what would be done with the property after the road was removed. She assumes that would be owned by the city at that point. Mr. Brehm shared that if the right-of-way were to be vacated he would have to look at the Ohio Revised Code for clarification on what happens when a road is vacated. He believes that the city doesn’t necessarily retain ownership of that. There certainly are utilities in that existing corridor today. The project wouldn’t necessarily require some of those utilities to be removed.

Ms. Michael wondered what the space would look like. Mr. Greeson shared that the city may not want to vacate right-of-way at this location but in the event that we retain it one of the things we talked a little bit about in the detailed design is coming up with some conceptual alternatives for how we might do landscape gateway improvements. One of the opportunities here in addition to the goals outlined previously is to create what essentially is a northeast gateway of the community for both the Huntley corridor as well as the Wilson Bridge Rd. corridor. You can certainly imagine that the additional space would provide an opportunity for landscaping or other amenities where that space does not exist today in that corridor.

Mr. Myers said that when he asked about public comment from the business owners Mr. Brehm’s answer seemed to hedge just a bit like maybe there was some negative feedback that was received from somewhere. If there was, he asked if he would highlight that for him. Mr. Brehm replied that if there are no more technical questions then he has several slides on the project and public involvement that he would like to share. We can always return to address additional questions later if need be.

Mr. Brehm shared that after the feasibility study was completed and a preferred alternative was selected they began the public involvement process as follows:
Identified Stakeholders

- City of Worthington
- MORPC
- Ohio Department of Transportation
- All property owners within or immediately adjacent to the project area
- All businesses located within the project area (includes non-property owners)
- Franklin County Engineer’s Office
- Worthington School Board
- U.S. Representative Pat Tiberi
- City of Columbus

Meeting Notification

- Invitations sent 2+ weeks prior to meeting
  - 59 property owners
  - Emailed to the Franklin County Engineer’s Office, City of Columbus, and the Worthington School Board
  - Hand delivered to 149 locations
- Worthington This Week - October 22, 2015 and October 29, 2015

Mr. Brehm shared that Mr. Columbo Cautela was not able to attend the public meeting so they held a follow-up meeting with him and several members of his family. Mr. Cautela owns the property at 7059 Worthington-Galena Road, his parcel is outlined in
red below and as members will see, his property is very much affected by the selection of the preferred alternative.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT| PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Follow-Up Property Owner Meeting with Columbo Cautela Family & Friends

- December 8, 2015
- 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- Louis J.R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building, 6550 N. High Street
- Presentation/Questions and Answer Session
- 12 attendees

Mr. Brehm shared that the overwhelming response from that meeting was that they did not support any alternative that would cause Mr. Cautela to be relocated from his residence. He is an older gentleman who built that house in the 1950s and has lived there ever since.

Mr. Myers pointed out that this option would not require him to relocate. Mr. Brehm agreed. He added that Signalized Realignment #1 would so of the two that group was overwhelmingly in favor of Signalized Realignment #2, which again is the alternative that they have recommended as preferred.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT| PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public Comments

- Written and oral comments received as a result of Public Involvement indicated the following common concerns:
  - Concern about impact to the Cautela home;
Concern that the railroad is a cause of the congestion;

Mr. Myers asked if there are any stacking issues with the preferred alternative that would be impacted by the railroad. Mr. Brehm replied that they looked very closely at that. One of their key concerns with the preferred alternative was that they are moving the existing intersection closer to the railroad. They were very sensitive to that and analyzed it closely in their traffic modeling to be sure that the queue related to that signal would not back up across the railroad. They didn’t stop there. They are widening Wilson Bridge Road so they wanted to create an equal amount of space that there is today so even though they are shortening the distance between the railroad and the intersection signal they are providing an equal or better amount of lane storage.

Mr. Brehm added that they would also anticipate including some detection so this signal would be smart enough to detect when a queue of vehicles is backing up towards the railroad and be able to adjust its timing to be able to flush those vehicles out. They also have to keep in mind that today cars do backup across the railroad but this intersection is operating at level service “F” today. It would be an even worse “F” in the future if they didn’t do anything here so just by the fact that they are making these intersections work better and moving cars more efficiently, they felt like that was another measure that would ensure that the distance between the railroad and the signal was properly managed.

Mr. Myers commented that they are still leaving just one eastbound land on Wilson Bridge Road, other than turn lanes from the railroad track to the first signal. Mr. Brehm replied that an additional lane would be added that is a through right so there in this scenario there are actually two lanes for eastbound Wilson Bridge Road at the Worthington-Galena signal.

Prefer a Signalized Widening alternative on the same alignment;
Concern for pedestrian and bicycle facilities; and
Impacts to buildings and businesses.

Mr. Brehm shared that they did analyze an additional Signalized Realignment #3 alternative based on a property owner comment. Our Signalized Realignment #2 is shown as the dash blue line below. Members will notice that Worthington-Galena Road is being relocated to intersection Wilson Bridge Road west of the existing intersection. This gentleman suggested that they look at realigning Worthington-Galena Road to the east to tie into Huntley. They felt like to properly address his comment they would have to look at that from a traffic and cost perspective. They compared the findings of realignment #3 to realignment #2 (results are listed below).
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT | RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INPUT

Additional Alternative
Signalized Realignment #3 (Feasible, but not Preferred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Signalized Realignment #3</th>
<th>Signalized Realignment #2 (Preferred Alternative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity: Mean of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity: Mean of Service</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrects Geometric Deficiencies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Access Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Driver Expectation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Navigation</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT | RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INPUT

Additional Alternative
Signalized Realignment #3 (Feasible, but not Preferred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Signalized Realignment #3</th>
<th>Signalized Realignment #2 (Preferred Alternative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Right-of-Way (in acre)</td>
<td>Permanent = 3.1</td>
<td>Permanent = 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Cost</td>
<td>$13.8 Million</td>
<td>$11.8 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Brehm shared that Signalized Realignment #3 is projected to be about $2M more expensive than Signalized Realignment #2. That difference in cost is driven in large part by the right-of-way acquisition costs because that would impact some fairly large commercial/industrial buildings.

Mr. Smith commented that in the presentation the public was basically given four options. He read the public comments where a couple of people preferred one of the options. He wondered whether the option to do nothing was offered. Mr. Brehm replied yes. They compared all four of the feasible alternatives to what they call the “no build” scenario. So at the public meeting they had an evaluation matrix that looked at level of service, geometric deficiencies, and pedestrian access of the four feasible alternatives and then those were compared to a fifth column, which was the “no build” alternative.

Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Brehm is giving members the impression that everybody favored option #4. Mr. Brehm commented that walking into a public meeting and seeing this proposed alternative for the first time is a great deal to digest and some people were a little taken aback by it. He can’t think of one person that he talked to in the public meeting that didn’t recognize the need to do something at this intersection. Everybody who drives it gets that there is a problem here. Their study was not needed to know that. Their study certainly confirmed it and proposed some ways to handle it but from his perspective talking with folks and then also reviewing the written comments, the overwhelming majority of people supported doing something.

Mr. Myers asked where the public could find a diagram of the Preferred Alternative #2. Mr. Brehm replied that it is available on the city’s website, within the feasibility study. The entire feasibility study that includes the cost estimates and the detailed right-of-way acquisition estimates are all available on the city’s website. The public meeting materials are also on the city’s website which includes the exhibits for all four of the feasible alternatives, the comparison matrix, as well as any handouts that were available at the public meeting. It is also included as an appendix to the public comment response document. So it is available as least three different places. He also believes the Preferred Alternative #2 image is what is shown when you go to that project section of the city of Worthington website.

Ms. Stewart added that in advance of this council meeting staff included it on the News and Events section of the City’s Homepage of its website that this would be considered at tonight’s council meeting. If members click on the “read more” it jumps into a short description and the picture of the preferred alternative. From there you can link to the project site which has all of the detail behind it.

Mr. Myers asked what the advertisement for the public meeting looked like. Mr. Brehm replied that it included a description of the proposed improvement and the details of the meeting. Mr. Myers added that all of the alternatives were displayed at the meeting. Mr. Brehm agreed that they were on display.
Mr. Norstrom shared that what he has heard tonight is that the consultant has done a very thorough job. He not only responded to comments but as he just presented they did a fifth alternative which in his experience is exactly the right thing to do. We know whenever there is change we are going to have some public opinion objecting to it in some manner, shape or form. The consultant has been very accommodating based on the description members have seen tonight. The difference between one of the least preferred and the preferred option is $2M. He is not as concerned about that since the FHWA and the DOT will be evaluating this before they fund it as well. He thinks the consultant has done an excellent job and this deserves Council’s support.

Ms. Michael asked if Mr. Norstrom supported the Preferred Alternative of Signalized Realignment #2.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to support the consultant’s recommendation (Signalized Realignment #2). The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Ms. Michael asked if anyone in attendance wished to comment on this issue.

There being none, the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ms. Michael shared that Mr. Greeson has asked that members table this ordinance to provide staff with time to work on all of the financials.

MOTION

Mr. Smith made a motion to table Ordinance No. 01-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

President Michael asked for a roll call on the tabling of Ordinance No. 02-2016.

Yes 7  Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers and Michael

No 0

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance No. 02-2016

Amending Ordinance No. 44-2015 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the City Share of Costs for the SR-161 Pavement Surface Improvements, (ODOT Project FRA-161-8.67, PID 96305) and all Related Expenses. (Project No. 617-15)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.
Mr. Greeson shared that this item was included in the Capital Improvements Plan. This is our match for participating in ODOT’s urban paving program. The large majority of the paving project is being funded by ODOT but this is our share. If members have driven SR-161 lately, particularly east of High St. you will know that this is much needed. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Dorothy asked the timeline for this project. Mr. Greeson replied that it will be this summer during the paving season.

Mr. Greeson shared that this project is unrelated to the SR-161 study. He added that he would like to schedule some time during a committee of the whole meeting concerning the city’s participation in a multi-jurisdictional evaluation of SR-161. That is with ODOT, Columbus, MORPC and Perry Township and involves Olentangy River Road to Sawmill. This is merely a maintenance resurfacing project.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 02-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7 Troper, Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust and Michael

No 0

Ordinance No. 02-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 03-2016 Authorizing the City Manager to Execute A Contract Between the City of Columbus Board of Health and the City of Worthington for Health Services.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson shared that the city is required to provide public health services. For many decades we have done that through contract with the Columbus Department of Public Health. It has been a very good relationship and one that he thinks is very advantageous to the city. He thinks we are the only municipal client, other than the citizens of Columbus. Many of the other cities contract with Franklin County Public Health and do so at a higher rate than we are able to do with Columbus. They provide a variety of services for our citizens. This contract is one of the routine end of the year contracts but it spilled over this year. The contract provides some laboratory work, inspections of septic systems, and mosquito abatement. They also inspect public and non-public school buildings, provide communicable disease control and sexual health services among other things. There is no change in the overall scope of services. There is a minor fee increase in the amount of $2,700. Staff recommends approval of the contract for another year.

Mr. Norstrom commented that based on what Mr. Greeson said, it sounds like staff did check with Franklin County and determined that while most of the other cities are going
with them it would be more costly for us to do that. Mr. Greeson replied that he has not specifically checked with Franklin County although he has become familiar with what other municipalities pay for their health services and believes we have highly competitive and favorable rates. He would be glad to send that kind of information out if it would be helpful in the future but he is confident in saying that we are not going to get a better deal.

Mr. Norstrom stated that his only concern is given what we have found out about providing fire services to other communities and they have left us to go in other directions. He asked if we know why all of the other communities in Franklin County are going with Franklin County instead of the city of Columbus. Mr. Greeson replied that Columbus doesn’t offer it to anybody but us. It is his understanding that it is just a longstanding relationship that they developed with us years ago and they have decided not to expand that in competition with the Franklin County Board of Health.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 03-2016. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes  7    Norstrom, Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper and Michael

No  0

Ordinance No. 03-2016 was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

Ordinance No. 04-2016

Accepting a New Water Line Easement from Trivium Worthington LLC; Approving an Agreement to Install Utilities; and Vacating a Portion of the Original Water Line Easement upon the Completion of the New Water Line at 350 West Wilson Bridge Road.

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mrs. Fox commented that members heard a little bit about this water line easement when members voted on the Amendment to Development Plan for Trivium Worthington at 350 West Wilson Bridge Road. She would ask that Council consider an amendment to this ordinance. After this ordinance was amendment staff received word from Trivium Worthington that Columbus had requested that the water line easement be a width of 30’ long rather than 20’ so staff has amended the body of the ordinance and the exhibits to reflect that 10 foot increase.

MOTION

Mr. Foust made a motion to accept the amendment as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously.
Mrs. Fox shared that this new water line easement is necessary because of the changes that Trivium Worthington is making to the building itself. Right now the water line extends directly in front of the existing building and they are proposing to relocate that a little farther to the south. In conjunction with this staff has included an agreement to install utilities which is part of the process that we have when we have public utilities. Although these water lines are on private property they are platted easements and exists within public easements so we also need them to execute an agreement to install utilities.

There being no additional comments, the Clerk called the roll on the passage of Ordinance No. 04-2016 (As Amended). The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 7    Dorothy, Smith, Myers, Foust, Troper, Norstrom and Michael
No 0

Ordinance No. 04-2016 (As Amended) was thereupon declared duly passed and is recorded in full in the appropriate record book.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 04-2016

Approving an Agreement and Permit for between Columbus Fibernet, LLC, an Ohio 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 Mr. Troper.

MOTION

Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 04-2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Myers.

Mr. Greeson shared that this is a routine administration of our Codified Ordinances that requires the city issue a telecommunications system permit for anybody that is operating within the right-of-way. This permit is for Columbus Fibernet, who has been in the right-of-way for quite a while. The renewal is for three years.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 04-2016 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 05-2016

Approving the Subdivision of Property at 918 High Street and Authorizing Variances (Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc.)
Introduced by Mr. Smith.

Ordinance No. 06-2016
An Ordinance to Revise the Codified Ordinances by Adopting Current Replacement Pages.

Introduced by Mr. Norstrom.

The Clerk was instructed to give notice of a public hearing on said ordinance(s) in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter unless otherwise directed.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

Policy Item(s)

- Sale of Fire Safety House

Chief Highley commented that the current safety house is twenty three years old. It is an early design of fire safety houses. New ones are smaller and more versatile. Staff doesn’t feel that it is wise to invest more money in its upkeep. Staff has to have council’s permission to sell this item in the event that the sale price exceeds $5,000. While he doesn’t think it will sell for that amount he just wanted to cover all of the bases.

When asked by Ms. Michael if a new one would be purchased, Chief Highley replied not at this time. It is not something that for the amount of investment that staff utilizes that much. He is looking at other alternatives that are less costly and a little easier to transport possibly for the future but nothing at this time.

Mr. Norstrom commented that selling items on the internet achieves a much higher prices than doing it locally. Chief Highley acknowledged that being his plan but given what these types of units have sold for there is not much cash return.

MOTION

Mr. Foust made a motion authorizing the Fire Chief to sell the Fire Safety House. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS (Continues)

- A capital bill request for improvements for McCord Park was submitted to our Senator. The city was awarded $300,000 to support the project. Staff thinks the Wilson Bridge plan helped.

- Officer Kurt Allton was injured in a traffic stop today. He is listed in stable condition at OSU and seems to be doing well. He added that none of the drivers of the vehicles were injured.
REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Smith commented that a Safe Routes to School National Conference will be held in Columbus in April. He shared that he would like to attend. Mr. Norstrom suggested that the chair of the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board attend as well. Mr. Greeson shared that the city will have staff representation there as well as. He believes that MORPC will be serving as host. He thinks it would be great to have council representation as well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Board and Commission appointments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Yes 5 Myers, Foust, Troper, Dorothy, Michael

No 2 Norstrom, Smith

Council recessed at 9:05 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to return to open session at 9:40 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

Mr. Troper made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

APPROVED by the City Council, this 7th day of March, 2016.

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President