



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Wednesday, June 22, 2016 Meeting

Members Present: The members present were Michael Bates, Ann Horton, Emma Lindholm, Douglas Knight, John Rist, Kelly Whalen and Jeannie Martin (Chair).

City Support Staff present were Darren Hurley (Director) and Celia Thornton (Project Supervisor).

With a small change to the 3rd sentence of page 4 requested by Mr. Rist, the minutes from the May 23 meeting were approved by all present.

Swearing In of Reappointed Member: Mr. Knight was sworn in as a reappointed member of the Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Board by Ms. Martin.

CIP: Mr. Hurley gave an overview of the City's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) process, covering the following:

- A. What is the Capital Improvement Program (CIP)?
- B. Overview of City's CIP Process Council/Staff – between \$4 - \$5 million annually.
- C. Bike and Ped and the CIP - \$100,000 allocation, has been set aside at this point. It is there as a placeholder, some projects have been funded outside of that allocation.
- D. Bike and Ped's Role with the CIP – make recommendations of projects/prioritize so Council can determine allocation in balance with other City needs.
- E. 2017 process – Staff typically submit recommendations in August to City Hall, with Council discussing the staff requests in the early fall.

After Mr. Hurley's presentation, Mr. Bates expressed that the advisory board needs to get integrated into this City process. For example, 161 is going to get repaved from I-71 to Olentangy River Road. Mr. Rist jumped in and said, if we knew in a timely manner, the board could piggyback onto existing projects and at least make some timely suggestions for improvements. Mr. Hurley acknowledged that a theme of our discussions has been how to get the board positioned to get ahead of City projects. He also wanted the board to be aware how far out some of these plans are and that we're not on an island. Members of Council have bike and pedestrian improvements on their priority list and are also trying to get the board positioned

to give timely input. We're playing catch up on some projects that were already in the works but for future projects the timing of advisory board involvement will be better orchestrated.

Mr. Bates asked if the board should be looking to promote their own special projects, or just focusing on what is on the 5 year CIP and try to tag on, adding \$20,000 to a project here, some on another project, and accomplish improvements that way. Ms. Martin said she thinks that is exactly what should happen. Mr. Hurley promised to email a copy of the CIP to all board members so they could review it themselves. He noted there are some problems in just looking at the CIP to understand all of the projects going on in the future. For example, \$400,000 is allocated for street improvements, but specific projects are not listed, so we don't know what streets are being improved. Mrs. Horton asked how staff finds out what is going on. She also wondered whose budget bike and pedestrian projects fall under. Ms. Martin reiterated that by looking at the existing CIP, the board can look for alignments and make the most use of their own CIP funds. Mr. Rist asked if they were getting the first year of five, or all 5 years of CIP projects. Mr. Hurley said that all 5 years would be included.

Review of Steering Committee Recommendations & Progress Made To Date: Mr. Hurley referred to a handout in member's packets and gave an overview of bike and pedestrian projects completed and underway, and mentioned projects being undertaken by sub-committees. Mr. Rist liked the idea of having a list of projects already accomplished so that Council and the public can see that there is a demonstrated list of completed projects. This would provide evidence to voters, here is what we've accomplished so far, imagine what we could do with more money.

Discussion of Process for Selecting Recommended Projects: Mr. Hurley explained that the original steering committee recommendations need to be kept current and updated periodically. He believes it is too soon to completely revise all of those, however, there is a need to determine priority projects for Council consideration during the upcoming Capital Budget Process. What process would members like to use to do this? Staff suggest either a subjective discussion that could take into account the original ranking, the low hanging fruit of certain projects due to budget constraints, and member debate/dialogue, or some type of more objective ranking system such as the rubric or a version thereof used by the original steering committee which started with the determination of standard measures and compared projects relative to those criteria to establish priority rankings. A combination of the two could be considered also. Staff would like feedback tonight on which process to use and then we will prepare for that process in our next meeting. Ms. Martin thinks we ought to send a memo to Council letting them know that regardless of what street projects come up, we want input. Mr. Bates made sure to mention that it isn't just streets, but also sidewalks. Mr. Rist stated that the board needs to be aggressive and get as many projects listed as possible and have a debate about how to list them for funding purposes. Mr. Hurley said not to focus so much on the board's allocation of \$100,000 per year, that project price is not as relevant as getting upcoming projects listed and prioritized. Mr. Whalen thinks it should be a yearly priority to update the project list (part of an annual strategy). He wondered whether the board needs to shift our strategic planning meeting to align better with the CIP. Mr. Rist suggested we add an additional strategic planning meeting just to discuss CIP. Mr. Whalen believes the group should always have a list of our top 5 projects. Mr. Hurley said the challenge will be ranking them by just the top 5. He thinks that the projects don't all need price tags, but should be relatable to the CIP. Ms. Martin doesn't want to commit to a list of the top 5, it could be 10, and not necessarily in any order. Mr. Bates asked how we measure what we've accomplished. The start of a project tracker was included in the packet for this meeting. Ms. Thornton can review it and if additions need to be

made will do so and email it out prior to the next meeting. Mrs. Horton stated that as a citizen she wants to see net gain proposed and met year by year in bike and pedestrian improvements within the city. It is this board's job to measure and track these improvements and share them with residents. It goes to accountability. Mrs. Lindholm asked whether board members should come to the next meeting each prepared with their own list of top 5 projects. Ms. Martin said that was a good idea and we could take all individual recommendations and put them together. Mrs. Lindholm asked whether project lists should be sorted by year or just have a list? Mr. Hurley likes the concept but would like the board to focus specifically on projects for 2017. Mr. Whalen likes the idea of general recommendations. That way every time there is construction the board is ready to give recommendations (for new development, street improvements, and sidewalks).

Updates:

1. PHB's – Currently in plan review, no change to timeline as previously communicated. Sub-committee reviewing educational materials.
2. SRTS – Staff level communications with school officials, planning a joint meeting to feature Kate Moening – SRTS coordinator.
3. Mobility Study – No change, has been tabled by staff in lieu of NE Gateway project and other summer projects for city engineering office. Will pick back up soon. City Engineer has received drafts for phases 3 and 4 – in process of ensuring scope was met, working on format, etc.
4. Citizen Feedback Status - Staff working on background information for three resident issues, will bring back on agendas as time/space allow. Mr. Bates asked for clarification- does Worthington have a leash law? Ms. Thornton answered no. Mr. Hurley said that dogs must be under reasonable control.

Other:

NE Gateway Project – Feedback has been given, EMHT working to provide options and framing. Likely to come back in July at either our regular meeting or in a specially scheduled depending on submission deadline requirements with MORPC. Likely to come back in a best, better, okay format. Ms. Martin would prefer we schedule an extra meeting in July for Safe Routes to School if possible.

Bike Rides/Audits – reports from Darren and Ann Horton on riding the NE Gateway area. Mr. Hurley took an audit ride with City Manager Greeson and Council Member Dorothy in the areas of the NE Gateway Project. He stated that it was not a comfortable ride and that there were lots of points where he didn't feel comfortable riding his bike. The experience did provide him with a good general feel for the area but it is hard to recommend treatments because the new construction will change the roads and until it happens it's hard to tell what the impact will be.

Mrs. Horton also rode her bike from Proprietors to Schrock to the Schrock/Huntley intersection. There were at least 10 to 14 trucks moving through the roads and it was very hectic. She was headed north on Huntley past Tilton's to the food pantry. Mrs. Horton doesn't think bikes and trucks sharing the road on Huntley and Proprietors can be done safely. She would rather we concentrate bike and pedestrian facilities in Old Worthington and push the traffic to the edges of the city. She also thinks narrowing the lanes would seriously jam up and slow down traffic through the NE Gateway area and she'd prefer vehicular traffic be the priority in that area. Mrs. Horton also asked if the COTA turn-around on 161 is dead. Ms. Martin replied no, but that it

wasn't well thought out and citizens weren't happy with the suggestions, so changes would need to be made for it to come back and pass.

Mrs. Lindholm asked for everyone's input on the surveys created by her sub-committee. There was some discussion around what to do with it next. Mr. Hurley discussed simple distribution solutions. There were some comments about adding residency questions and whether or not email addresses should be requested.

Mr. Whalen remarked that the renovation of the Olentangy Trailhead is looking good.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be held on Monday, July 25, 2016 at 6pm.