



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, July 25, 2016 Meeting

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

City Council Member Ms. Rachael Dorothy was present along with City Support Staff Robyn Stewart (Assistant City Manager), Dan Whited (Director of Service & Engineering), Darren Hurley (Parks and Recreation Director) and Celia Thornton (Project Supervisor). Also present were EMH&T Senior Project Manager Mr. Michael Brehm and Mr. Neil Schwartz. Resident Mr. Paul Dorothy (179 Kenbrook Dr.) also attended the meeting.

Minutes from the June 25, 2016 meeting were approved by all present.

Northeast Gateway Bike & Pedestrian Accommodations Update with EMH&T:

Mr. Hurley introduced Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart and Director of Service and Engineering Dan Whited to the board. Mr. Hurley then reminded the board that at the May meeting EMH&T did a presentation on draft designs for the NE Gateway project and sought feedback on bike and pedestrian accommodations. Since that meeting they have reviewed feedback, met with staff to compare notes and have incorporated much of the feedback they received from the board. Tonight they are back to present the updates they have made and to obtain our feedback on their progress. Mr. Brehm reiterated Mr. Hurley's statement and added that on the new map (passed out to board members) white flags denote new additions to the project, yellow indicates sidewalks (new ones are dashed), red shows shared use path and blue indicates bike lanes. He then proceeded to summarize and review the suggestions made in the May meeting and highlight what has changed:

1. Suggest adding bike lanes on Huntley Road/Worthington-Galena Road corridor and provide pedestrian facilities on both sides of the road from the CSX Railroad spur to Sancus Boulevard.

Staff and the consultant agree with the suggestion to add bike lanes and pedestrian facilities to the Huntley Road / Worthington Galena Road corridor. Huntley Road will be designed to include bike lanes and concrete sidewalk on both sides of the road. Worthington Galena Road north of Wilson Bridge Road will be

designed to include bike lanes, a shared use path on the west side, and a concrete walk on the east side.

2. Consider the use of buffered and/or protected bike lanes along the Huntley Road/Worthington-Galena Road corridor.

Bike lanes will be designed to include a two-foot buffer between the bike lane and the vehicular lane.

Mr. Rist asked if there would be raised pavement, cones or some other type of physical barrier for added safety. Mr. Brehm said there had been some discussion on user type and they felt that buffering and striping was adequate. Section width is a factor (maximizing space without encroaching on private areas and running into space issues). Ms. Martin commented that it's similar to other places in the city and asked if there was also 2 feet on the other side? She said it seems pretty wide. Mr. Brehm said yes it's wider, partly to keep water out of travel lanes during rainfall, and as a buffer from the curb.

3. Consider reducing lane widths along the Huntley Road/Worthington-Galena Road corridor to offset additional pavement associated with bike lanes.

Given the percentage of larger vehicles (trucks) using the roadway and the curvature in alignment, staff and the consultant recommend that the 11-foot lane width be held for through lanes throughout the project in accordance with the ODOT Location & Design Manual. However, a reduction in turn lane width from 11 feet to 10 feet will be pursued during design.

4. Reconsider the increased number of vehicular travel lanes along the Huntley Road/Worthington-Galena Road corridor.

In 2012 the City was awarded federal funds to improve the intersection by reducing vehicular traffic congestion. A thorough traffic study and analysis was performed to determine the required number of lanes and arrangement that would effectively reduce congestion to an appropriate level. In the interest of improving vehicular traffic congestion and meeting the purpose and need for which the project was funded, staff and the consultant recommend that vehicular traffic lanes be implemented as shown in the 2014 Feasibility Study.

5. Consider removing the center two-way-left-turn lane (TWLTL) along Huntley Road to offset additional pavement associated with bike lanes.

The TWLTL helps to reduce congestion and allows a more continuous north/south traffic flow by reducing "friction" through the corridor. As the parcels along the corridor become fully utilized in the future, the TWLTL is anticipated to become even more beneficial. Staff and the consultant recommend that the TWLTL remain as part of the scope of improvements in order to help reduce congestion and meet the purpose and need of the project.

6. Consider reducing the speed limit through the Huntley Road/Worthington-Galena Road corridor.

Section 4511.21 of the Ohio Revised Code establishes speed limits and prescribes how a speed limit may be altered. Pursuing a speed limit reduction, would require an engineering speed study to demonstrate that the 85th percentile motor vehicle speed is less than the currently posted speed limit of 35 mph. The speed limit study would include a warrant analysis and speed check analysis and will require a review and approval process involving ODOT. At this stage of project development, staff and the consultant recommend that the speed limit remain at 35mph for design purposes as to advance the project and meeting schedule commitments that are tied to the current project funding.

7. Suggest providing a shared-use path on one side and sidewalk on the other along the south leg of Worthington-Galena Road.

Staff and the consultant agree with this suggestion and recommend that a shared-use path and sidewalk be designed for the south leg of Worthington-Galena Road within the limits of roadway realignment.

Ms. Martin inquired what treatment was going to be used under the bridge (hopefully not grass). Mr. Brehm said that it would not be grass but some type of aggregate material with bitumen, or decorative concrete. The design team hasn't yet tackled this concern.

8. Consider adding a pedestrian crossing at the south leg of Worthington-Galena Road and Railroad crossing. If the crossings is not feasible, suggest building pedestrian/bicycle facilities to the railroad.

There are three railroad crossings in/near the project area 1) Wilson Bridge Road crossing NS and CSX, 2) Huntley Road crossing CSX spur, and 3) Worthington-Galena Road crossing NS and CSX. The current project scope includes improved pedestrian crossings for Wilson Bridge Road and Huntley Road which are the two crossings closest to the proposed roadway improvements. These pedestrian crossing improvements also directly benefit future CIP projects to extend sidewalk/shared use path to the west along Wilson Bridge Road and to the south along Huntley Road. Geometrically, these two pedestrian crossings are located at nearly 90 degree angles to the tracks (no skew) and therefore, have a high probability of approval by the railroads.

Ideally, the third crossing on Worthington-Galena Road would be improved, as well. However, due to complicating factors, staff and the consultant do not recommend pursuing pedestrian crossing improvements at this location as part of the Northeast Gateway project. The most significant complication at this crossing is the 40 degree skew angle at which the road crosses the tracks. Per ADA Guidelines and railroad expectations, pedestrian facilities would need to cross the tracks perpendicularly, meaning that the sidewalk and/or shared use path would need to diverge from the roadway at the track crossing. Based upon past project experiences, this would be viewed by the railroads as a separate crossing (not part of the existing road crossing) and permission to construct this crossing would be denied. At that point, pursuing a pedestrian crossing at this location would become a legal matter.

In the interest of moving the Northeast Gateway project forward and meeting schedule commitments associated with project funding, staff and the consultant recommend that pedestrian crossings at the Worthington-Galena Road intersection with CSX and NS railroad tracks not be pursued as part of the project. However, the project improvements to Worthington-Galena Road will be designed with consideration for a future pedestrian railroad crossing at this location, which could be pursued as part of a separate project.

Ms. Horton inquired about the number of trains on CSX and Norfolk crossings. Also wondered how much adding it would cost to add pedestrian crossing improvements. Mr. Brehm said that the big crossing would cost around \$700,000 and the spur around \$200,000. Ms. Horton noted it wasn't an even exchange and wondered because of access to our community. Mr. Hurley stated that beyond the issue of money, the railroads weren't likely to agree.

9. Recommend adding sidewalks along the cul-de-sac street.

Staff and the consultant recommend that sidewalks not be added along the cul-de-sac street as part of the Northeast Gateway project. Sidewalk improvements will be considered in the future along with private redevelopment in this area.

10. Need to consider the level of service for bicyclist and pedestrians.

Level of Service calculations for bicyclists and pedestrians have been evaluated and are detailed on a separate document.

Ms. Martin asked for comments/questions from the board. Mr. Erickson asked what the cost implications were for adding the bike lanes. Mr. Brehm responded that along Huntley it was about \$600,000 in construction costs, and \$200,000 at the railroad crossing. Mr. Erickson referred to the original design and asked if that was in the scope of the CIP? Mr. Brehm said he can't answer questions regarding the CIP but that in 2012 when the City applied for MORPC funds, the previous City Engineer (Mr. Watterson) was initially thinking of putting in a round-about, but that design didn't work for the space. Neither did adding lanes. Splitting the road did, but added 80% higher project costs. The City pursued the project knowing the costs involved and put them into updated funding. MORPC may decide to approve more money for the project and in the meantime they are covering 80% of the current costs which only leaves the city paying for 20%. The terms of the MORPC funding is an 80/20 match, so any additional costs proposed and accepted by MORPC would cost the city 20% of those costs. Mr. Brehm added that changes in scope (bike lanes, sidewalks, RR crossings, retaining wall under the bridge) was a net change of 7%. Mr. Erickson wanted to make the point that that is still an increase of \$120,000 to the City if you take Huntley Road for example. Mr. Rist asked when the project goes to construction. Mr. Brehm said likely 2019. Right of way acquisition starts next summer (2017). Ms. Horton asked how bikes make turns. Mr. Brehm said riders should exit bike lanes and move into traffic turn lanes (common practice and plenty of examples around Columbus). Ms. Martin raised questions regarding the gutter pans, which led to a brief discussion about tree lawns. Mr. Brehm said some of these things hadn't been updated on the schematic but are being planned for. Mr. Rist also asked a question trying to understand the COTA routes in the area.

Ms. Martin then opened discussion to the public for comments/questions. Mr. Dorothy had two questions. He asked whether EMH&T was considering bike boxes to make it safer for bikes to turn. If they are putting in bike lanes, they should be including bike boxes. A lot of road pavement costs are going up. Intersections will continue to control thru traffic. Based on ODOT estimations only 100 extra vehicles/hour move in a 5 lane cross section. His concern is that after paving for large vehicular traffic needs, speeds go up, making it less safe and putting bikers and pedestrians at increased risk. Speed versus rate of injury is an exponential curve. By designing it differently you'd create self-enforcing roadways that calm and slow traffic, keeping vehicle speeds safe. He does not see the need for extra lanes at the intersections. Mr. Dorothy's second question was also on intersections and setting them up especially for pedestrians. Five lanes of traffic is basically highway capacity and has the project analyzed traffic flow after adding in pedestrian calls? If the intersection gets significant pedestrian calls, all capacity increases are eliminated and the additional number of lanes are useless for moving vehicles. A holistic view for all modes, modeling with pedestrian calls (pedestrians dominate), is needed. Narrow the intersections to avoid gridlock due to high volumes of pedestrians. Mr. Dorothy noted that he likes the additions he's seen, but still doesn't think there is a focus on balancing what's out there, vehicles versus pedestrians. Mr. Brehm responded that there was some discussion about the amount of lanes, but reminded everyone that the project was funded for vehicle congestion and mitigation. Staff advised EMH&T to move forward with the same lane arrangements and will do all it can to get people safely across the intersections. As for speed limits, this becomes an enforcement issue. The initial project focus was to try and move cars as safely and quickly as possible and he isn't prepared to speak to the other studies referencing traffic calming. Mr. Creed said he understood and agreed with Mr. Dorothy that what he is saying is valid, but it's also important to point out that Sancus and Huntley ought to be a capacity corridor for vehicular traffic. If it isn't, then traffic will go through the heart of the city. So the question becomes, where do you want cars to go, and then provide capacity for them in those places. Mr. Bates stated that he isn't a traffic engineer but aren't there standards provided as to how many bike and pedestrians can be expected? Or empirical data? Mr. Brehm noted the big changes being made to existing conditions could make that more difficult, but they could try and get projections. Mr. Dorothy said that it's not that complicated, keep it simple with projections for none, slight, or a lot. Pedestrian calls dominate cycles at rush hour in downtown Columbus. By ignoring this potential problem we'll end up with the same congestion if we don't plan for a moderate amount of pedestrians, and it will blow up all the results. He also noted that ODOT doesn't consider pedestrians, mostly because much of the roadway they work on (highways) doesn't expect pedestrians. He went back to his statement that it's all about balance. Mrs. Dorothy said she doesn't want this area to turn into Morse Road. She wants all community members to have access.

Mrs. Horton questioned the five lanes going into a residential area and asked whether we need all of those, or whether it can go down to two lanes? Mr. Brehm answered yes, that it's due to signals. Ms. Martin asked what uses are demanding dual lefts? Mr. Brehm cited queuing, they need two eight foot turn lanes. Mr. Creed said it accommodated through volume. Mrs. Horton asked whether the changes on Huntley will make it less likely that people will cut through from High and Worthington-Galena? She also commented that she wouldn't narrow Huntley, Sancus and Wilson Bridge, but would narrow Worthington Galena. Mrs. Dorothy asked about the two left turns west bound to south bound, what is going on there? Ms. Martin said it was designed to discourage the use of Worthington-Galena, and so they don't get into needing to widen it down the road. She then wondered if maybe the turn lanes weren't needed at Worthington-

Galena and Wilson Bridge. Mrs. Stewart reminded the board of the need to stay inside the scope of the project as some of the discussion items are not a part of this project. Ms. Martin said she's not a fan of traffic calming and doesn't believe it would work. Mr. Brehm said these decisions were for the City to decide. Ms. Martin noted that Mr. Creed had made a good point in keeping the traffic here. Mr. Brehm stated that what drove the lane decisions was moving vehicular traffic. He also said that while he has interest in ways to redirect traffic, his concern is that we're already pretty far along in this project. Mr. Dorothy said at level of service B, there is a long way to go to meet MORPC's standards. Mrs. Stewart said they were trying to get to level C, citing this is a critical business corridor. Mr. Dorothy asked what it means to fail? Mr. Whited said that the City can work with the consultant to address pedestrian concerns at intersections and that EMH&T hadn't come prepared for this particular discussion. Ms. Martin talked about reducing pavement on Worthington-Galena. She's okay with Huntley and Wilson Bridge. Since the City is going to work on concerns regarding pedestrian crossings, she asked if there were any further comments, or could we get a motion? A motion was made that the board is pleased with bike additions but that City staff should continue to work with EMH&T on intersection crossing for pedestrians.

CIP Recommendations: Mr. Hurley shared that at our last meeting he overviewed the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the process the City goes through each year to complete a new CIP. Since then, he has shared the 2016-2020 CIP with members and asked them to come back with their top five recommended projects for CIP consideration this year. He would like to have each member share their priority projects so we can get them all listed, and then depending on available time we can begin to build consensus on an overall list for staff to present during the upcoming CIP process. He has spoken with a couple of members regarding available funding and the impact of the PHB's in regards to whether we can get anything funded in 2017. His opinion is that really isn't up to us, our task is to provide projects in priority order for consideration and the process as designed will determine whether any of those can be funded in competition with the other city-wide demands on available funding.

Mr. Hurley said that we'd also be capturing ancillary projects that the board has had an impact on and that Ms. Thornton would capture these in a project tracker.

The following list was compiled by board members:

- Sharrows on main corridors – 161 and High Street **(B-2)**
- High Street Corridor study for Bike and Pedestrian Improvements **(B-2) (F-2) (T-1)**
- Update Sidewalk policy **(F-1)**
- Safe Routes to School (+2) **(H-1) (E-4)**
- Trail Connections – overall assessment for connectors
- Trail Connections – add multi-use trail to connect through Harding property **(A-2)**
- Trail Connections – TWHS/Evening Street **(H-1) (M-2) (U-2)**
- Trail Connections – 161 and Olentangy River Road **(C-2) (U-2) (Q-3)**
- Sidewalk Gap - Hartford (+1) **(K-1)**
- Sidewalk Gap – Evening Street Elementary (+1) **(H-1)**
- Complete Streets Policy Adoption **(I-1)**
- Targeted Enforcement **(D-2)**
- High and Wilson Bridge Road Intersection Analysis **(F-2) (K-4)**
- Caren Avenue sidewalks on south side **(K-1)**
- Bike route parallel to High Street
- Bike and Pedestrian Master Planning **(J-1)**

- Bike Rack Implementation Plan **(K-3) (J-4)**
- Sunday Parkway Events – summer 2017 **(J-3)**
- Olentangy Trail with Metro parks – Partnerships **(Q-2)**
- Alternate bike routes – other than 161 and High
- Alternate connection from Olentangy Trail to High Street – bike routes, etc.
- Replacement or improvements to Olentangy Trail bridges **(Q-2)**
- Worthington Galena Bike and Pedestrian Improvements **(E-2) (A-3)**
- Sidewalk Gap Analysis **(K-1)**
- NE Gateway Connections **(E-2) (N-2) (A-3) (E-3)**
- Linworth Park Connection – park to neighborhood **(S-2) (A-4)**
- Bike and Pedestrian Digital Communication Tool
- Safety Analysis utilizing data collection and consultants (+1) **(K-1) (N-1) (P-1) (O-2)**
- Safety Audits (+1) **(N-1) (H-3)**
- Citizen Driven Requests (+1) **(O-1)**
- UMCH Bike/Ped Facilities

Mr. Hurley stated that he and Ms. Thornton would compile the list and send it out to the group, first for clarification, and then so that we could discuss it at a following meeting. Mr. Creed noted that in addition to the list there were several other existing projects on the CIP that the board should be giving input on. For example, the Community Center parking lot and the Granville Road project.

Updates:

1. PHB's – Engineering working on contracts and keeping things on track. Council approved funding at a recent meeting.
2. SRTS – School officials have agreed to have a representative present for our educational session to feature Kate Moening – SRTS coordinator. That meeting is being planned for August 22, our next regularly scheduled meeting time.
3. Mobility Study – No change from last meeting, 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.

Prior to the end of the meeting, Mr. Rist wanted to know if the group had any interest in transit. Due to the late time, Mr. Hurley said that he would put that as a topic for discussion on the next agenda.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.