



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, April 24, 2017 Meeting

Members Present: The members present were Michael Bates, Larry Creed, Ann Horton, Emma Lindholm, Jeannie Martin, John Rist and Kelly Whalen.

City Support Staff Darren Hurley (Parks & Recreation Director) and Celia Thornton (Project Supervisor). Also present was resident Paul Dorothy and John Gallagher from Carpenter Marty Transportation.

Minutes from the March 27, 2017 meeting were approved. John Rist, who was absent, abstained.

161 Corridor Planning Update: Ms. Martin gave a quick review of the information provided from the March and April meetings (see attached packet). The 161 Committee's comments regarding the plans are in the second packet (also included). What Ms. Martin is asking the board to do is to go through the presentation and email her any comments that are different from those the committee made prior to Monday, May 15, 2017 so that they can be addressed as this progresses.

Mr. Dorothy shared that this is an ODOT process but that what will happen at the end is that all agency partners must agree and sign for this project to move forward. Mr. Dorothy also reviewed his comments to the committee for the board (which are captured in a document and included in the packet).

Mr. Rist asked what the timeline was. Ms. Martin replied that it has been pushed back a month or two with public meetings in June and July. The 161 Committee will then review the comments in July and Ms. Martin will keep the board updated.

Review Engineering Project Scoping: Mr. Hurley reviewed the four categories that had been scoped by Engineering. It was decided that N2 (trail connection- Wilson Bridge Road to northeast corridor), which seems to be moving forward on its own, should be kept on the list so it can continue to be shown as a priority by the board. Mr. Hurley then stated that the next order of business was how to firm up what the board wants to present to Council. He thought that Mr. Bates comment at the last meeting deserved discussion. Is there a small subset of projects that could be packaged together and presented showing what could be accomplished with varying amounts of

funding? Mr. Bates clarified, money for projects scoped, money for consultants, add rough timelines, etc. Mr. Hurley said that City Council would like a written update on the board's accomplishments, prioritizations and scoping, for their review, prior to a board presentation. City Council is also receiving recommendations from the Parks and Recreation Commission and Swim Inc. and is trying to get a feel for the types of projects and amounts of money each group is requesting. He shared that the Parks and Recreation Commission is going to present their Master Plan to Council on May 8, 2017. This board may not get to present until June. Mr. Bates thought it would be worthwhile to point out to Council that some of these projects are part of a larger rehabilitation of existing infrastructure and would be accomplished along with engineering projects, so even though it looks very expensive, the cost listed is not just the bike and ped component, but includes the entire project cost. Mr. Rist said that he thought there was some initial desire to have the Parks Commission and Bike & Pedestrian Board present their plans together, with a combined dollar amount. It would be a two-step presentation, and now it sounds like that is not going to happen. Mr. Hurley was not aware that this was the plan but rather that we wanted to get them both to them as quickly as we could. The Parks presentation had been bumped back a month because of other Council business taking priority. Mr. Dorothy is concerned that with the focus on funding, some low hanging fruit is being lost, that the board is missing out on the opportunity to accomplish projects that don't cost anything now. A good example is reducing speed limits. Ms. Martin said that this is a great observation, but there were comments made that the engineering recommendation as a whole was to look at everything holistically. What is the bigger plan in place? Yes, there are some things they could do but its all part of a comprehensive plan and shouldn't be done piecemeal. Mr. Bates thinks there is room for both. It's good to have pricing and specifications for projects, but that the board can still do some of the things which don't require money, such as speed limit changes. Mr. Hurley said his impression was that the board is not precluded from making some specific road requests. Mr. Creed interjected that what we started out doing some months ago was to try to get some sort of short and long term plan together, put some dollars to it, and set the projects in the context of all the projects listed for Council. Mr. Rist wants to know specifically what is the recommendation we're making to Council. In his opinion we should make a recommendation that strongly states that this board needs well beyond the \$100,000 allocated by Council to accomplish anything, so that they can reallocate a substantial amount of money from the CIP or existing operating programs. Or the other option is they could issue debt themselves, or they could go to the voters. But the board needs to be proactive in what we're recommending to them so they can put something on the ballot this November. Mr. Rist indicated he knows for a fact they need to have something to the county elections board by August 9, which means they need to start having public hearings and discussion on this and if we don't go to them till June, Mr. Rist doesn't see how this will happen. Mr. Hurley has received no indication from Council that they are in a big hurry and is following the direction they gave at their retreat as he indicated in his update to the board after the retreat. They asked for a written update that they could digest prior to our presentation. Then, they wanted to board to come before them and present and answer questions. Mr. Hurley asked if there was urgency and Council made it clear they wanted to methodically receive and analyze all the community needs. Council also stated they did not want to be put in an adversarial position, in reference to first give them the projects and the scoping before making specific time restrictive recommendations that they might have to reject. They want a dialogue and an opportunity to come to agreement on how to move projects forward. On top of all this, the schools are getting ready to go for a levy, so as a community we need to spend some time processing all of this information. Mr. Hurley concluded that he is just sharing his observations of Council and as an advisory board if the consensus is something different that is the board's decision. Mr. Rist's opinion is that if we aren't pushing this now, then

when do we do it? Ms. Martin sees it as we were asked to come with these cost estimates and she thinks it's obvious that we can only get a few of these done with the \$100,000/year allocated. It clearly shows we need more than that to accomplish anything. So we approach it that way first and try not to create an adversarial position with Council. Just try to point out that this is what's going on, we'd like to see more of these done, and at that point put it on them to decide. Mr. Rist doesn't understand why this would be adversarial. Mr. Hurley says Council doesn't want the board to ask them to do something they may not yet be prepared to do. They would prefer discussion and you have to remember, they don't have any idea of what the ask is or how much this all costs. Before this board goes to Council and recommends a levy this fall, Council would like a dialogue to understand what the board is recommending, what the price tag is, and be given time to compare that to other City needs. Then Council will come up with a strategy for moving forward. Mr. Hurley is not telling the board what to do, he is simply giving his interpretation of how Council would prefer this conversation happen based on his observations. Mr. Dorothy said there is a limited amount of money and if we go with a whole projects approach initially, we may get to do one to two projects a year. But if the board could combine big projects by year with the low hanging fruit then they'd get to do 15 to 20 things a year which would add up to big changes. And furthermore, if we get people out there walking and biking and they're visible, and using the infrastructure, the pot of money will naturally get bigger. Mr. Creed thinks the other aspect is we need some feedback for our planning, if there is some support for some of this, or the ability to seek grant funding. Is Council willing to go for a levy? We need this information from Council to help us proceed. Mr. Bates suggested the board prepare for the presentation and say we've been at this for 15 months with a list of 50 projects and tell Council the story of the processes we've gone through, and what we realize is that \$100,000 isn't enough to make a major impact on engineering projects. Then ask if there is additional funding that can be appropriated. And meanwhile start looking at those low cost projects. He thinks his experience with the Stafford PHB is a good example of what can happen- if you build it they will come. The Hartford crossing wasn't put in earlier because no one crossed there, but now he's frequently stopped in his vehicle as people use that crossing. This goes to Mr. Dorothy's point that if you use it, they will come and it becomes cyclical. Mr. Hurley agrees and reiterated that Council wants to work with us, but the board needs to figure out how to package all of this information and present it. Mr. Creed asked what the next step was- to write a memo, tell the story and give them the list? Is that what the Parks and Recreation Commission did? Mr. Hurley clarified that yes, a memo and the project list and scoping would be given to Council prior to the presentation. Another thing Mr. Bates would like to have the board ask for is a policy to have Bike & Ped consulted as City projects proceed. He knows it's informally being done now, but would like it more in line with what happens with Planning & Zoning- that Bike & Pedestrian review is a formal part of the City's planning processes. Mrs. Horton says that is why she keeps bringing up Complete Streets, because it would essentially do that. Mr. Creed wonders if we should be concerned about leaving sidewalk projects (top three projects on the list) on the list since he knows they have caused so much contention in the past. Ms. Martin thinks we should leave them there, we are a Bike and Pedestrian board and should be putting sidewalks forward. There was some consensus that we needed Mr. Wetmore to give us his presentation, or give it to Council for us. At this point everyone agreed that Mr. Hurley move forward composing a memo for Council with a note that \$100,000 is not enough to move the current engineering project list. Mr. Hurley will send out a draft to the board the following week for their approval and will get the board scheduled for a meeting with City Council as soon as possible.

Mission/Vision (Kelly Whalen): The board reviewed and discussed the changes made to the last draft of the mission statement. Consensus was reached on a version of the mission statement and

was adopted by the board. The board will continue to work on crafting a vision statement at a future meeting. Mr. Whalen requested input from the board on the vision statement in the form of emails.

Updates:

1. Bike Rodeo Event – This event will be held on Thursday, May 11 from 5-8 p.m. in the Community Center north parking area. The event will include bike agility stations (for beginner and intermediate levels), a Safety City themed preschool trike area, vendor booths (RideHome, Trek, AAA, Police, etc.), and food (Dairy Queen, Kona Ice, Dan’s Deli). Children will receive a passport at the registration table and by completing stations can return the card for a drawing to win a bike provided by AAA. Bike helmet fittings and giveaways will also occur (helmets provided by a grant). Mrs. Lindholm reviewed a list of volunteers and asked them to email her their availability to volunteer for the event by assisting with setup, tear down and managing bike agility stations.
2. SRTS Active Transportation Update – Ms. Thornton reminded the board of the meeting scheduled for May 15, asked all members to RSVP and shared which community partners had already agreed to attend. Mr. Hurley, Ms. Martin and Ms. Thornton had completed a conference call with Ms. Moening the previous week and the agenda for the meeting was set.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.