



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, January 23, 2017 Meeting

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

City Support Staff Darren Hurley (Parks and Recreation Director) and Celia Thornton (Project Supervisor) were present. Also present was Council Representative Rachael Dorothy, resident Paul Dorothy, and two representatives from Carpenter Marty Transportation- Kristin Studabaker and John Gallagher.

Minutes from the November 28, 2016 meeting were approved by all with the exception of Jeannie Martin who was absent from that meeting and abstained.

Organizational Meeting – Appointment of Chairs: Mr. Hurley shared that it is customary at the first meeting of the year to appoint a chair and vice-chair for the advisory board. It has been the practice of some boards such as the Parks and Recreation Commission to rotate chair responsibilities while some have stuck with the same chair for two or more years at a time. Our procedure is to take nominations, have any discussion, then someone make a motion with a subsequent board vote for the chair and then the vice-chair. He added that during this first year he worked in more of a co-chair role in terms of leading and facilitating meetings. It is now Mr. Hurley's desire to move more into a typical staff support role where he works to prepare materials and agenda items for the chair/vice chair and they serve more as the facilitators of the meetings. This allows for the board to function more as a citizen led group and less as a staff led/facilitated group. Mr. Hurley would like any chair and even vice-chair nominees to accept with that understanding as to expectation. Mr. Knight asked if Ms. Martin was willing to continue serving as chair. She responded that she was happy to stay as chair or leave and empower someone else. Mr. Bates said that he felt the same about the vice-chair position as Ms. Martin. Mr. Knight asked if anyone else had the desire to serve. Mr. Creed proposed that we have more time for a deliberation process, to give people time to think about throwing their hats in the ring or think about nominating another board member. Mr. Hurley suggested that the group could table the matter until February to achieve deliberation time. Mr. Bates and Mr. Creed

made a motion to table the discussion until February and this was passed. In future Mr. Bates would like staff to remind the board about upcoming appointment of chairs at the October or November meeting, prior to January, so the board has time to consider options.

Project Priority Distribution and Project Scoping Update: Ms. Martin shared that Ms. Thornton had updated the Project Priority list and asked for any edits or further thoughts. Mr Rist asked if there were other City schools that had projects that should be added to the list (for SRTS reasons). Ms. Thornton said that we don't have a list or know of specific projects related to schools and that it would take a lot of work to come up with one (sidewalk gaps, etc.). Ms. Martin stated that these would be captured if the board did a formal master plan, that most projects pertaining to Bike & Ped would be included and the plan would inform the board's progress forward and what would ultimately be recommended to Council. At Ms. Thornton's urging Mr. Dorothy interjected that the reason the Steering Committee hadn't captured specific projects related to schools, according to his memory, was that data on sidewalk gaps wasn't given to the Steering Committee until later in the process (too late to really be utilized) and that this is work that still needs to be done. Mr. Rist said his concern is that if this board is bringing forward a list of projects to Council for the purpose of asking for a levy, that he wants to be certain there is equity in coverage and that certain areas of the city aren't ignored. Mr. Bates thought maybe we should identify schools on a map with a half mile radius around them and see what projects fell inside those circles. Then it's another conversation whether the board wants to consider changing scoring/prioritizing based on what they find. Ms. Thornton agreed to get take the existing Bike & Ped project map and to add City elementary and middle schools with a half mile radius around each. Mr. Hurley said that there are challenges in mapping projects, some are broad, some difficult to map to specific locations, and saying we have projects that cover the entire city can be misleading. Mrs. Horton asked a clarifying question regarding how staff defined what was a study versus a project. Mr. Hurley said it was a judgement call. If he thought we knew what to do from an infrastructure standpoint, then it was a project. If we weren't sure exactly what to do or weren't even sure if the idea had merit, then he classified it as a study. Mr. Rist said he was confused. His understanding was that what City Council and Mr. Greeson want is a specific list of buildable projects, not studies, in order to convince voters to approve raising taxes. Ms. Martin said it can be a combination because it all has to be paid for somehow and we need feasibility studies and cost estimates for projects, or for additional staff, if that is the case. Mr. Rist thinks these should be two separate lists, one for studies and one for brick and mortar projects. Ms. Martin said in her experience you have to do studies to get brick and mortar projects shovel ready. Mr. Rist understands, but says there are too many, in his opinion, that say evaluate. Mr. Hurley said in many cases you could substitute "design" for "evaluate," which is part of a project. At this point Mr. Hurley transitioned into work that a sub-committee, under the guidance of Mr. Dorothy, had done. Mr. Hurley indicated this work touches on what Mr. Rist was talking about, we're trying to scope projects and there are a couple of ways we can do that, but we need cost estimates so we can tell Council that we can get so many projects completed with a certain amount of money. The sub-committee helped him understand what amount of this we can do in a certain timeframe. His initial feedback from Mr. Whited (City Engineer) is that without more scoping, his ability to provide accurate cost estimates is limited, the projects are too vague and under developed. Using the projects as written, the cost estimates Mr. Whited provides will either be wild guesses or based on making a lot of assumptions. But what he wanted to bring to the entire boards attention was the

conversation that the sub-committee had on how many of these projects it's feasible to scope, how many do we want to attempt to do and what is our ability to do that. At this point Mr. Dorothy passed out and explained several sheets of projects that the sub-committee had done some detailed scoping on, using a simple matrix. Mr. Dorothy believes it is reasonable to have thirteen of these done by the end of the year, maybe five by April if the board informs the sub-committee which five they want scoped. He said it took 8 hours to complete L-3 (the first one, but that included setting up the format, etc.) and that T-1 took 2 ½ to 3 hours. Mr. Creed interjected that they are also open to board feedback on the template. Mr. Rist asked who the audience was for this detailed scoping. Mr. Dorothy replied that it starts with this board and can also be given to City Council. It could also be a public document if posted on the website, it is written for the general public. Ms. Martin said that she thinks it is very detailed, which isn't bad, but has a hard time seeing this level of detail for all of the scored projects. She was thinking that maybe the board could just elaborate and add three or four more sentences of details to each of the projects. There was discussion about the pro's and con's of each style, the need for the depth and the pace at which projects could move. Mr. Dorothy and Mr. Creed both said that they think we're talking about 2 different things with two different objectives. Ultimately the group decided to divide up the scored projects, with each board member taking 5 or 6 projects, and try to add better general descriptions (about a paragraph in length). Ms. Martin used to do this for the City of Dublin and will provide an example to the group. Ms. Thornton will turn the project listing into a Google document that can be shared and edited by all. This will be enough to keep all projects moving forward. In the meantime the sub-committee could also keep moving forward on more in-depth scoping.

SRTS Next Steps: Mr. Hurley and Ms. Thornton provided an update on recent meetings with school staff. The schools response in general was very positive but the timing is not ideal because of the district wide Facility Planning process that they are currently in the middle of with the community. At this time they don't have the resources or ability to engage in Safe Routes to School with the City. Therefore, Mr. Hurley and Ms. Thornton met with Kate Moening to figure out how we could best move forward without direct school involvement. She recommended using the training grant already awarded on one of the three options below (and stressed the first):

- a. Safety in Active Transportation: School & Community Planning
- b. Conducting a School Walk Audit
- c. Non-Infrastructure Implementation

After an initial review, Ms. Martin and staff are recommended option A. The advisory board concurred. Mr. Knight asked that Ms. Thornton provide the group with several dates 60 or so days out at the next meeting. Mrs. Lindholm also asked that a list be put together of who to invite for the board's review.

Wayfinding Recommendations: Mr. Hurley shared that The Old Worthington Partnership and Sustainable Worthington initiated a project related to Smart Growth Principles for Old Worthington. This project was with a group of students. After some initial review, the students selected two areas of focus, one was electric vehicles/charging stations and the other was bike infrastructure and trail signage. City staff were engaged because of its on-going wayfinding process and a set of recommendations was made to the OWP. The City Manager asked Mr. Hurley to share the recommendations with the Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Board relative to the bike infrastructure and trail signage which is for the area from the Olentangy Trail at 161 and

315 along 161 up to Old Worthington. City Staff are looking for this groups thoughts on the recommendations and whether you would offer any different recommendations or thoughts. We can discuss this evening or give you more time to review and discuss it in detail at the February meeting. There is no time crunch because there currently aren't funds allocated to do the work. Ms. Dorothy clarified that this is separate from the City's wayfinding project. Mr. Rist suggested we table this issue till we get through with our own tasks since it isn't time sensitive. Mr. Dorothy suggested that this seems like a good candidate for a public/private partnership and could have a higher priority and be implemented because it would be good for the businesses who could also help to pay for it.

Updates:

1. Mission/Vision Statement (Kelly Whalen) – Tabled as Mr. Whalen was unable to attend the meeting.
2. Bike Rodeo (Emma Lindholm) – The City and AAA are working as partners on a Bike Rodeo this spring. Ms. Lindholm asked the group for volunteers to help at the rodeo. Ms. Martin, Mr. Erickson, Mr. Bates and Mr. Knight all volunteered. Others will check their calendars.
3. Bike & Ped Surveys – Ms. Thornton distributed results for the board's review. Mr. Hurley said the board could review this in relationship to our recently set priorities in case the survey results impact our placement of any priorities. Ms. Thornton agreed to send out links to the surveys so the board could better review the results online.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.