



Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 3, 2017 ~ 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 Monday, July 3, 2017, 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, David Norstrom, Douglas K. Smith, Michael C. Troper and Bonnie D. Michael

Member(s) Absent: Scott Myers

Also present: Clerk of Council D. Kay Thress, City Manager Matthew Greeson, Director of Law Pamela Fox, Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart, Director of Finance Scott Bartter, Director of Service and Engineering Dan Whited, Director of Planning and Building Lee Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation Darren Hurley, Chief of Police Jerry Strait and Chief of Fire Scott Highley

There were eight 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 reported there being several individuals who wish to address City Council regarding items that are not on the agenda. She informed them that Council policy allows speakers five minutes or less to comment.

Bill Pearson, 1950 West Dublin-Granville Rd.

Mr. Pearson read the following statement and shared several slides:

My name is Bill Pearson and the reason I'm here is over a widening issue on Worthington's West Corridor pertaining to West Dublin Granville Rd.

The issue is in extending the merge lane that currently begins at Olentangy River Rd and continues west for a distance of 430 feet. The proposal is to extend it to 1130 feet.

I am here tonight to ask that you help me persuade ODOT to abandon this extension proposal for the following reasons:

We were informed by Randy Kill, the traffic study coordinator with Burgess and Niple that the primary reason for this extension was due to all of the side swipe and side related accidents that this merge lane was responsible for.

After I thoroughly researched this through the Ohio Department of Public Safety (including all accidents from the first of 2012 to the present), I learned that there was a total of 54 accidents. This included the Olentangy/161 intersection and everything to and including the Alrojo/161 intersection. Only three accidents in this 5 ½ year span were due to side related issues.

Mr. Pearson shared that he has copies of all of the accident reports if anyone wished to review them.

Furthermore, traffic leaving the Shaker Heights neighborhood turning west onto 161 from Alrojo would now have two merging lanes of oncoming traffic closing in upon them to deal with in addition to possible proposed bike lanes if we are to have those. Even if drivers proceed into the turn lane, they will have two oncoming lanes attempting to merge.

Mr. Pearson added that it seems like this is just adding traffic issues that could cause more accident related issues.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom for clarification regarding the three accidents, Mr. Pearson shared that the fifty four accidents that occurred between 2012 to present were between the intersections of Olentangy up to and included the intersection at Alrojo. Only three of those accidents were side related on SR-161.

When asked by Ms. Michael if there were others, not side related, but within that 430 feet, Mr. Pearson replied yes. There were fifty four total accidents, most of which were bumper to bumper type accidents or broadside accidents at the intersections.

When asked by Mr. Foust if the accidents centered down in the intersection itself and had nothing to do with that merge, Mr. Pearson replied yes. He wanted to make sure he got everything so he included everything in the intersections and the stretch in between.

Mr. Norstrom clarified that the question they were asking is, of those fifty four how many happened in the 430 feet. Mr. Pearson replied that he doesn't have that information at his fingertips but could sit and compile it after he finishes his comments.

With an extended merge lane, traffic is now traveling at a higher rate of speed when attempting to merge. This now can place pedestrians at risk if sidewalks are installed as they are in every plan presented.

Lane encroachment is considerable and could cause the home at 1940 Dublin Granville Rd. to be taken out or at the very least severely compromised.

Some septic system leech beds of adjoining properties will be compromised.

Mr. Pearson showed a picture of Lisa and Doug Brown's home at 1940 Dublin Granville Rd. with the merge lane in front of their place. They feel their home will be literally taken out if the merge lane goes through.

The existing merge lane functions well as designed and will be greatly improved by having the proposed center turn lane allowing westbound traffic to turn left onto Alrojo instead of backing up traffic as it currently can and sometimes does at peak traffic times of the day.

Mr. Pearson commented that with the turn lane that they have going in, it will greatly alleviate any type of back up traffic. They were almost implying that much of the traffic was due to not having a long enough merge lane but residents feel that the turn lane will take care of that because if someone is in the turn lane at rush hour they can block traffic way back.

The proposed 700-foot extension of this merge lane is not only not necessary, but more critically however; the incursion of this extension will create alternate safety hazards. Additionally, this will cause unneeded financial losses of property values to solve a problem that does not exist.

Ms. Michael asked Mr. Greeson if there was anything that he wanted to add regarding this topic. Mr. Greeson thanked Mr. Pearson for sharing his thoughts. He thinks it would be important to inform Council of where we are in the process and we will pledge to make sure that we get these comments into that process if they are not already a part of it. Ms. Stewart has been the City's liaison to the project. He asked her to comment.

Ms. Stewart shared that the project team consists of the City of Worthington, the City of Columbus, Perry Township, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Franklin County Engineers Office, and ODOT. That group has been engaged with this for a number of months as have an advisory committee that has representatives from the various neighborhoods in the area and other organizations that were interested in this corridor. That Adversary committee has had a series of meetings and they narrowed down to some alternatives that were presented at a public meeting that was held at the high school on June 6th. The topic that you have been talking about is one of the items that was shown at that meeting as well as a number of proposals for the whole stretch from Olentangy River Road to Sawmill Rd. We are currently in a thirty day public comment period, which ends on July 7th. ODOT will then summarize all of the public comments that they receive and will then bring those back to the Adversary Committee for reaction and responses. They will then go to the project team for next steps. These comments can be provided as part of that public comment period. She informed Mr. Pearson that he can submit those directly to ODOT or staff can forward those on.

Ms. Stewart added that one of the other reasons she has heard besides accident history as to why the lengthening of that merge lane is because traffic currently backs up from the Olentangy River Rd. intersection back to the east. The westbound traffic is now fully utilizing both thru lanes because of the quick merge past the Olentangy River Rd.

intersections. A longer merge lane may more fully utilize the thru lanes at Olentangy River Rd. and clear some of the traffic backups that are occurring there.

Mr. Pearson contends that the lack of a left turn at Alrojo St. is the cause of the backups over Olentangy and StRt 315. He shared that he has also attended all of the committee meetings. He was kind of surprised that nobody had been asked to represent the west corridor of Worthington specifically. Other neighborhoods like Shaker Heights and Plesenton were represented. Ms. Michael added that Strathaven was also represented. Mr. Pearson agreed. He shared that he did a petition up and down the street and zero people received the public notice in the mail with the exception of the two houses between Alrojo and Olentangy River Rd. on the south side.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom if he has shared his comments with ODOT yet, Mr. Pearson replied that he just did that today so hopefully they will be there by this Friday's cutoff. He thanked Council for their time.

Kay Hoffman, 5555 Indianola Ave.

Ms. Hoffman shared that she is here to talk about the sidewalks that are being marked in her neighborhood for replacement. She talked to Mr. Whited earlier in the week and had sent Ms. Michael an e-mail on the 29th of June with her concerns.

Ms. Hoffman reported being interested in understanding the criteria that is used to mark sidewalks for repair and replacement. She walks her dog twice a day in her neighborhood. Not all of the area has sidewalks yet only selected streets or blocks are being marked for repair. She received a letter from the City of Worthington (second time in fourteen years that her sidewalks have been marked) that said for close to \$1,100 the City will repair her sidewalks. Mr. Whited presented it to her as an opportunity to take advantage of the contracting rates that the City has with its vendors. She knows that it is a city ordinance but it appears to her to be selectively used. Initially she was told that it was tied to street improvements. Then she was told that that wasn't necessarily true because she knows that there were repairs done in her neighborhood last year where sidewalks were not marked for repair or replacement.

Ms. Hoffman shared that she has a couple of questions that she posed in the e-mail that she sent to Ms. Michael. The questions are as follows:

- 1) Criteria
- 2) It seems to her that if this is in relationship to street repairs that are being done that people are concerned with the aesthetics of what things look like rather than the safety of the citizens in the community, which is a concern.
- 3) Would also like to understand how the City awards certain contractors for this business and the amount of revenue being generated because the City is clearly generating revenue for these vendors. How often is that happening?

Ms. Hoffman asked what kind of revenue is being generated for these contractors in Colonial Hills where she lives this year as opposed to 2016. If there is a difference, then why is there.

Ms. Michael remarked that she wouldn't say that revenue is generated but rather we are paying for work that the contractors do. Ms. Hoffman replied that she would think they are making a profit.

Mr. Norstrom asked for clarification on her second point as he didn't quite understand it. He thinks it was something about aesthetics. Ms. Hoffman explained that initially when she actually saw somebody in the neighborhood marking certain blocks, she approached them and asked if they could help her understand why her sidewalk is being marked again in a fourteen year period and what the criteria is. She was told that it was connected to the street repair because her block was slated for repair, which she thought was odd because she didn't see the connection between the two. She voiced that thought and was given Mr. Whited's contact information. She called Mr. Whited and had a conversation. He actually suggested that she come and talk with Council. She first sent an e-mail to Ms. Michael but since she has not heard back from her yet she thought she would come and voice her concerns. She would like to understand what we are trying to accomplish. The bottom line for her is that if it is tied to the street repair then she is concerned that there are uneven sidewalks throughout her neighborhood that are not being tapped.

After receiving confirmation that her e-mail was sent to the correct address, Ms. Michael found the e-mail caught in the City spam filter.

Ms. Hoffman again voiced her concerns.

After considerable discussion, Ms. Michael asked staff to conduct research in an effort to answer some of the questions that Ms. Hoffman is asking.

Mr. Norstrom asked Mr. Whited what the standards are for identifying sidewalks that need repaired/replaced. Mr. Whited replied that a tripping hazard is defined as 3/4" upheaval or differential in any portion of the sidewalk but it particularly happens at the joints. We do not have an inspection program where we go out and walk all of the sidewalks but as sidewalks with those differentials are noted by staff or by notifications from citizens or others we will send letters to the homeowners and have them repair them at their cost. When it comes to the street improvement program, when we know that we are repairing the street, we do inspect the sidewalks that are contiguous to those streets and take the opportunity to allow the homeowner in that area to repair those sidewalks through the street improvement program although they do not have to. The sidewalk needs to be repaired but we allow the contractor to include that in his contract and it gives a better price. Mr. Norstrom commented that we provide them that opportunity because we have a discount with the contractor. Mr. Whited agreed that we have a better price that is selected through a select bid process every year and it is done with those sidewalks that are contiguous to the streets that are being paved.

Ms. Hoffman replied that she understands that but she doesn't think that is uniformly applied because she knows that last year a repair was done on N. Selby and Andover and she can assure them that there are uneven sidewalks on N. Selby.

Ms. Dorothy thinks that staff relies on citizens calling in different addresses that need to be repaired. She thinks it is correct that the city does not do a complete audit every year of all the tripping hazards because they are numerous. She added that members recently received a walkability study for the downtown that indicated a significant number of sidewalks in Old Worthington that need to be repaired.

Mr. Troper encouraged her to let Mr. Whited know if she experiences any sidewalks that are offset. He does that regularly and it has probably resulted in twenty sidewalks being replaced. It is not something that we survey like Mr. Whited said but if you see it and let them know notices of repair will go out to the property owners.

Ms. Dorothy noted that council has been discussing how much of public money should be used to help fund sidewalk repairs because it is a significant mode of transportation for the community, especially mothers and people who walk or run to have a safe alternative path to the street.

Ms. Michael added that the whole sidewalk issue is a big issue that the City just doesn't have enough money to totally tackle citywide so members are always trying to determine which ones have to be done and which ones can be done. There is such a need. She recalls a sidewalk study that was done about ten years ago and the cost was over \$12,000,000 in needed funds.

Ms. Hoffman remarked that she can appreciate that but as a resident who is already paying, recognizing that she lives in a lovely community that she enjoys and where she feels safe but her point is that in fourteen years she has had to do this twice. She would venture to say that there are other people in her neighborhood that have uneven sidewalks who have not been asked to replace or repair their sidewalks.

Ms. Michael confirmed that staff will look into the issue and get a report back to Council and to Ms. Hoffman. She thinks members have a good feel for where the problem is but she wants to give staff a chance to address the issue.

Ms. Hoffman added that she negotiated contracts in her former life. She would love to know what kind of bids took place with these cement vendors. Her cost is \$1,100 to replace four parts of the sidewalk.

Mr. Whited shared that the street improvement program goes out for bid yearly to all of the general contractors in the area that do paving and concrete work. They do the curb repair, drainage and resurfacing. It is a competitive bid. When asked by Ms. Hoffman if it is for the sidewalks themselves, Mr. Whited replied that sidewalks are a part of numerous line items.

Mr. Smith asked if it is possible that people in her neighborhood who have had street improvements in previous years may have been informed to repair their sidewalks but actually didn't. Mr. Whited replied not having been here he supposes it's possible but they tend to follow up on them pretty well.

Mr. Smith then commented that worst case scenario, if he has a couple inch gap in his sidewalk in front of his house, what is the City going to do and in what timeframe. Mr. Whited replied that he will receive a letter and have twenty one days to respond to complete the work. Mr. Greeson added that we will know about that either as a result of seeing it or as a complaint from a neighbor. It is possible that we could do repair or spot work in an area and have not inspected the sidewalk but generally if it is a part of the street improvement program where we are looking at resurfacing an entire street. Not every residential street has the same asphalt life but in general that ensures that residents experience about the same cycle of inspection unless we receive a complaint or pro-actively observe a trip hazard.

Mr. Norstrom stated that if a resident doesn't repair it, we contact them again and eventual we will make the repair and bill them. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Greeson agreed. He isn't aware of that being done often but that is the process. Residents often take advantage of piggybacking on our bid but sometimes residents will choose to use their own contractor and staff will work with them to accommodate that.

Going back to the bid process, Ms. Hoffman understands that it is tied to improvements on the curbs and pavement. When we do that bid process, which she assumes is being done every year, she asked if sidewalks are always included in the process. Mr. Whited replied yes but residents are not required to use our contractor.

Ms. Michael thanked Ms. Hoffman and stated that staff will be getting back with her. Ms. Hoffman thanked Council for their time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **June 12, 2017 – Committee of the Whole Meeting**
- **June 19, 2017 – Regular Meeting**

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to approve the aforementioned minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

Ms. Dorothy noted that she had several typographical errors that she submitted. She wanted to highlight that June 12th was the meeting that the Bike and Ped Committee presented.

The motion to approve the minutes as amended carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION

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

Ordinance No. 24-2017

Amending Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of Arterial Improvements – Huntley Road and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 653-17)

The foregoing Ordinance Title was read.

Mr. Greeson reported that the 2017 adopted Capital Improvement Program included an arterial road resurfacing project for Huntley Road. Motor vehicle licensing tax dollars are typically utilized to fund road projects like Huntley. At the last meeting Council authorized staff to bid that project and introduce the ordinance for consideration with blanks. That is done so that the amount of the successful bid and the name of the successful bidder can be incorporated during the public hearing. Members also had a discussion about sharrows and asked for input from the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board on whether to include them on this street. Afterwards staff included sharrows as an alternate aspect for bidders to propose on so that we could provide a better cost for those amenities. The lowest responsible bidder was Decker Construction at \$420,123.14. Bids for painted sharrows came in at \$10,500 and thermoplastic sharrows at \$21,840. Per our discussion, staff also discussed the issue with Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board. At that meeting Councilmember Dorothy also presented a Bike Worthington analysis that he thinks was handed out and e-mailed today. That analysis recommended a different stripping pattern than was bid and proposes the elimination of the center turn lane, reduced lane width, reducing the speed limit, and he believes adding buffered bike lanes. He thinks they will probably hear about those ideas tonight.

When asked by Mr. Norstrom what Bike Worthington is, Mr. Greeson replied that he understands it to be a bicycle advocacy organization that has been formed. Representatives of that organization may speak tonight and describe what it is.

Mr. Greeson acknowledged that the Advisory Board who is also represent this evening was frustrated with the process as they did not feel that there was enough discussion or involvement in the design phase regarding this project. As shared in a letter from their chairperson, they did not feel that they had enough information to adequately consider the issues of sharrows or no sharrows. Further discussions with them presumable would have surfaced some of the issues that were raised at that meeting earlier and provided more time for them and us to debate the merits of the various proposals. Our goal is to provide the Board and Council with the best information to make decisions. Regardless of the decision this evening, staff is committed to working with the advisory board and Council going forward from tonight to establish a clear process to accomplish what we think are shared goals. Those goals being that we adequately maintain our

infrastructure and advance projects in a timely manner. That we consider opportunities and make improvements to our bicycle and pedestrian facilities when we can and that we do both of these things in a professional and thoughtful way that builds trust amongst parties. With that said, he would respectfully suggest that there are really four options for members to consider this evening as follows:

- 1) Move forward with the project as bid, without sharrows
- 2) Move forward with the project as bid, with sharrows. Determine whether painted or thermoplastic or with the appropriation and authorization to add sharrows if the advisory board feels it appropriate
- 3) Table the project. Recommend for no more than two weeks and only if members want to obtain information necessary to make a decision. Tabling beyond July 17th may affect the bid and the ability to accomplish the project in the construction window.
- 4) Reject the bids

Mr. Greeson shared that if members want everyone to give serious consideration to the elimination of a turn lane, shrinkage of the lane width, and speed limit reductions, he would suggest that there needs to be a more robust process that engages the advisory board, technical expertise and the interests and plans of local businesses to arrive at what is best long term for all users in that area of our community. That cannot be accomplished in two weeks. It would require the postponement of the project until next year and possibly combining it with another project that is nearby. We believe that all four of those options are feasible and responsible and are prepared to discuss each of them in detail if members so desire.

At Ms. Michael's request, Mr. Greeson repeated the previously reported bid information. He added that we would typically include contingency. The project with contingency but without sharrows would be \$462,135.45. Staff is prepared to answer questions about each of the four options that were outlined. Council may want to take public input before we fully discuss that but we welcome the opportunity to have further dialog about it.

Ms. Dorothy would like to have time to seriously consider other modes of transportation besides the truck traffic especially since it was discussed at a meeting that she did not attend. At the Quikrete, we know that trucks stop in the center turn lane which is a very unsafe environment and puts the City at risk. The City had a lease agreement with them since 2011 to be able to build out near Huntley Bowl so they could take those trucks off that center lane and that has never been done. She feels that is a serious safety consideration. She often drives down this way when going to work in Westerville and has noticed people who walk and bike in this corridor to the many other businesses besides the trucking industry. She thinks members need to have serious consideration of all interests and plans of all the local businesses and people who patronize the park. We have Huntley Bowl Park there that we have no other way to get to besides this Huntley Road and she thinks members need to have time to seriously consider all modes of transportation along it.

Ms. Michael noted that members received a report that was dropped off from the Advisory Board at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Greeson added that both the chair and vice-chair of the Advisory Board are present this evening.

Ms. Michael invited Mr. Dorothy to address Council.

Paul Dorothy, 179 Kenbrook Drive

Mr. Dorothy shared that he is present to represent Bike Worthington. Bike Worthington is a non-profit that represents the interest of bicycle and multi-modal considerations within the city of Worthington. It is clear from what has been discussed tonight that an organization such as that is desperately needed. We've been working at this for almost three years but nothing really seems to change. We have this "improvement" that has been brought forward without consideration for anything but vehicular traffic. This has been brought forward in almost a brinkmanship like manner. If we do not take it, we will lose the bids. If members seriously want to look at all the other modes, we will have to set these bids aside. That shouldn't have come to this point. This should have been brought through the process well before this. He handed a report to members and hopes they will look it over. It didn't take him much time to do. He shared that there are thirty two businesses in the Huntley Road corridor. Only two of them focus on trucking. The rest focus on something else. When we do this we pick the winners and the losers in these transportation corridors. If we follow this plan, we pick Quikrete as the winner and Tri-Tech Multisport as the loser. We pick a park that no one can safely bike or walk to as the loser. We pick the other businesses who may need employees who can walk or bike to their facility as losers. We pick the citizens of the community as losers. The Quikrete trucks park in that center left turn lane. That is in direct violation of the Ohio Vehicle code and Worthington has been letting that go on. Worthington is on notice that that is going on as it has worked out a deal with Quikrete for an alternate place for them to stage their trucks. When there is an incident the City opens itself up for liability. They are on notice that there is a safety problem here.

In his information he talks about the possibility of including buffered bike lanes here and reducing the speed limit to make it a friendly corridor. If we are worried about these truck movements, we ought to have them going a little slower because that center left turn lane doesn't help the trucks. They don't turn from that center left turn lane. They require the entire width of the roadway to make their turn. So center left turn lane or two lanes with buffered bike lanes makes no difference to that tractor trailer driver because he is making his turn using the entire width of the roadway.

We talk about the concern for heavy truck volumes but the only truck volumes he has seen are from the 1979 study. That '79 study didn't consider bike or pedestrians because there were no bikes or pedestrians observed in the corridor at the time the peak hour counts were taken. No sidewalks or bicycle facilities maybe there won't be that many bikers. That was forty years ago. If we repave this road, with the life span of a pavement being between fifteen to twenty years, we are going to kick the can down the road decades before we are willing to make improvements for all members of our community.

There has been talk about the fact that this is vehicle tax money. Everybody here that owns a bike and regularly rides a bike also owns a car and pays that same vehicle tax. Our children also use bikes and walks to get around. He thinks we want to provide a safe way for them to get to and from the park we have provided for them.

The improvements that we are talking about would change the costs of this project by less than 2%. That doesn't even come up to the level of contingency that the City has placed on this project. We have to do better for our community. We talk about the best information to make our decisions. We don't have that tonight. We just don't. It is time we did better. It is time we looked at all modes of transportation fairly and it is time we work for all of our citizens and not just a few special interests.

Mr. Foust thought the last conversation members had on this topic they differentiated between Huntley and Proprietors. He thinks in that conversation members were more accepting of the notion that Huntley is commercial to an extent and to try and make it something other than what it is was a challenge that members really couldn't take on because it didn't make sense.

Ms. Dorothy interjected that she doesn't agree with Mr. Foust's comments. She noted that she wasn't in attendance at that meeting but she has ridden both of those corridors. She agrees that Proprietors is easier to ride down.

Ms. Michael commented that Mr. Foust summarized what was said at the last meeting. If Ms. Dorothy has a different view that is fine but he did correctly summarize what the feelings were by the end of that meeting.

Ms. Dorothy understands that she has a different viewpoint. There are plenty of businesses along Huntley Rd. that people would like to walk or bike to but don't feel safe, even though she sees people do it because they have no other alternative. Yes Proprietors currently has a sidewalk where Huntley has none. It is wider along Proprietors while on Huntley you have trucks and people speeding. It is an unsafe place where you wouldn't want to walk or bike because you will get killed. Why wouldn't council want to provide safe adequate transportation lanes for people not in vehicles? She doesn't understand that.

Mr. Foust shared that unfortunately that same statement can be made about so many roads in the Columbus area. Many of the roads have a mix of retail and commercial or light commercial. He doesn't think you can take every thoroughfare and necessarily make it bike friendly, particularly in the case where there is two that run side by side, and a half mile apart. Ms. Dorothy acknowledged that they serve vastly different people.

Mr. Norstrom noted that one is much safer than the other under current circumstances. Ms. Dorothy replied that she doesn't know about that as she thinks they are both fairly unsafe but one does have a sidewalk.

Mr. Norstrom thinks members should move forward with this item.

After Mr. Greeson reiterated the four possible options at Mr. Smith's request, Ms. Dorothy stated that she wanted to make sure that everyone got through the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board memo. She didn't know if Ms. Martin or Mr. Bates were going to talk about their memo but at the end they mention that the Board unanimously agreed that bicycle and pedestrian facilities need to be provided on Huntley and they would like to revisit this subject at a future date once proper data addressing the above is provided.

Mr. Greeson shared that our arterial project for 2018 is the Huntley / Schrock intersection and west to the railroad tracks. Mr. Whited commented that depending on funding, the plan is to go from where the Northeast gateway terminates to Schrock Rd., include as much as Schrock Rd. as we can but he doesn't think there will be much. Mr. Greeson noted that we will be in that area with this contiguous project. If this legislation is delayed staff will incorporate it into that project as far as the money will go. The risk of that is with some deterioration and construction inflation but he doesn't know if that would be significant at this point.

Mr. Troper shared that he would be fine with delaying the vote until July 17th so that members could get more information. He would also like to hear the bike and pedestrian members since this is new information that members received today.

Mr. Smith commented that he doesn't think that sharrows on this road will make much of a difference. He keeps referring back to his recent trip to Baltimore and how deathly scary it was walking next to east coast traffic and main thoroughfares. He keeps thinking of those going to the resource pantry because he knows that some of those folks walk there and to other things listed on this document. Two weeks would help him make a decision, which may mean to postpone it even longer but he would need those two weeks.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Smith if he is suggesting reducing the center turn lane all together. Mr. Smith confirmed that as the question he needs two weeks to think about. He needs to think about the questions, then ask them and get the information.

Mr. Norstrom asked if there is a reason for two weeks versus one week. Mr. Smith replied that one week is fine but two weeks was brought up.

MOTION Mr. Norstrom made a motion to table Ordinance No. 24-2017 for one week. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foust.

The motion to table for one week carried by a voice vote of five "aye" (Foust, Troper, Norstrom, Smith, Michael) to one "nay" (Dorothy).

Ms. Michael reiterated that the motion to table was for one week. Should anyone have questions she encouraged them to make them known.

Ms. Dorothy shared that she is available to converse with members. She believes that more data needs to be provided and a longer time to study. She would urge members to reject the bids and have it included in a project for next year.

Mr. Norstrom commented that if members are going to consider this issue again in one week, which we just voted to do, then members need to provide their questions to staff over the next couple of days. This has been in the five year capital plan. It is not a surprise to anyone if they pay attention. The question has already been asked and answered in terms of more coordination with our Bike and Ped Committee. He thinks the Bike and Ped Committee recommendations however is basically to move forward. Ms. Dorothy disagreed. Mr. Norstrom asked Ms. Martin to comment. Ms. Michael invited Ms. Martin to address Council.

Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St. (Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board)

Ms. Martin shared that the reason they did not have a recommendation wasn't only because of the fact that it was a short notice when brought to them but it was the fact that they did not feel that the corridor had been studied fully. Knowing that the northeast gateway will include bike lanes and knowing all the types of businesses that are through that corridor and that pedestrians and employees do travel by foot and by bike to get there, they feel that it needs to be a little bit more of a comprehensive view than just putting some paint on the ground. They weren't sure if that was the appropriate facility to be placed there, which is why they said that they would be amenable. They were asked to make a recommendation and they can't because they don't feel that enough information has been provided. They feel that it needs to be looked at in the future once the things listed in the memo are addressed.

Mr. Norstrom explained that he interprets that as a future date that means further away than August. He says proceed with the program we have in place. Let's get the road under repair. Then if we want to come back and put sharrows but he would like staff to address the question of how safe are sharrows. He noted that someone was killed in sharrows in Cincinnati so he doesn't think that sharrows is the right answer. Ms. Dorothy agreed.

Mr. Norstrom and Ms. Dorothy greatly disagreed on when the road should be repaved.

Ms. Michael stated that this legislation has been tabled. She would like to see a sketch of what it would look like with sharrows. Any other information that members want needs to be sent to Mr. Greeson.

In going back to Mr. Pearson, he clarified that the total westbound side related accidents, not including the Olentangy River Rd. or Alrojo intersections were three. There was an additional one car into the ditch in the corridor and three more that were bumper to bumper accidents for a total of seven accidents over 5.5 years. Mr. Norstrom went back to the original 54 accidents that were identified. Mr. Pearson stated that 33 were intersection accidents at Alrojo and Olentangy.

Mr. Pearson clarified for Mr. Smith that the information was gathered from the Ohio Department of Public Safety. Chief Strait confirmed that ODOT through the Ohio Department of Public Safety actually maintains all of the OHIs for the entire state of Ohio.

Ms. Michael thanked Mr. Pearson for his time. Mr. Pearson added that after petitioning each and every person on the entire corridor there is not one single person who is in support of that extended merge lane.

NEW LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

Resolution No. 39-2017 Adjusting the Annual Budget by Providing for a Transfer of Previously Appropriated Funds.

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 39-2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

Mr. Bartter reported that he is exploring the possibility of bringing on a consultant to assist in formalizing our financial strategy. This would transfer the funds that were previously appropriated for two salary lines into the consultant line.

There being no additional comments, the motion to adopt Resolution No. 39-2017 carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Ordinance No. 25-2017 Amending Ordinance No. 45-2016 (As Amended) to Adjust the Annual Budget by Providing for an Appropriation from the Capital Improvements Fund Unappropriated Balance to Pay the Cost of 2017 Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs and Determining to Proceed with said Project. (Project No. 654-17)

Introduced by Mr. Foust.

Ordinance No. 26-2017 Amending Applicable Sections of Chapter 943 of the Codified Ordinances of the City to Change the Name of the Flint Road Cemetery to Flint Cemetery.

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.

Ordinance No. 27-2017

To Amend the Official Zoning Map of the City of Worthington, Ohio, to Change Zoning of Certain Land from C-4, Highway and Automotive Services to WBC-3, Mixed Use (7007 North High Street), Parcel #100-001218.)

Introduced by Mr. Smith.

Staff noted that Ordinance No. 27-2017 needs to be referred to the Municipal Planning Commission for consideration/recommendation.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALSPolicy Item(s)

- TREX and New – Diamond Wolves LLC

Mr. Greeson reported that members previously approved a TREX for a D-2 liquor permit. The Department of Liquor Control has approved that. Council now has an opportunity to object to it. This is for the D-2 which allows for the sale and non-premise consumption of wine and mixed beverages until 1:00 a.m. Separately from the TREX, Liquor Control is also issuing a D-1, a D-3, and a D-6 permit. They are for the Tomatillos Authentic Mexican Restaurant / Diamond Ice Cream which is located at the western end of the Linworth Crossing development on W. Dublin-Granville Rd. Staff has no concerns with these two applications.

MOTION

Mr. Norstrom made a motion to not request a hearing for a TREX liquor permit application or a new liquor permit application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

- Request to Bid – Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs – East North Street

Mr. Whited reported this being a combination of three projects from our CIP to accomplish sewer improvements within the central district. This would be North St., Morning St. and Ridgedale. The work is consistent with our sanitary sewer evaluation reports as completed by DLZ. The improvements will increase capacity and limit the chances of water in the basements in the area. The contract estimate is \$645,000+. Staff would like permission to put that out to bid in the next week so we can solicit the actual costs to bring back to council with a selected contract.

Ms. Dorothy asked how close we were to being done with all of the sewer projects. Mr. Whited confirmed there to be several more to be completed.

MOTION Ms. Dorothy made a motion to authorize the advertisement for bids for the Central District Sanitary Sewer Repairs – East North St. The motion was seconded by Mr. Troper.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Other Items

Mr. Greeson shared the following items:

- 1) He distributed a letter to members from the Central Ohio Mayors and Managers Chairperson, Mayor Ben Kessler of Bexley who provided a letter to mayors, city managers and council members throughout central Ohio regarding a piece of language related to water services that was in the state budget and inserted by Representative Duffey. It has had a great deal of debate of late and he wanted to make sure that staff provided this letter to members. He will report that the governor line item vetoed that particular item. He will send out the information that was provided as part of that veto.
- 2) Memorandum from Economic Development Manager David McCorkle who reported that Taste of Vietnam restaurant has ceased operations effective immediately. Staff will work with the Old Worthington Partnership to fill that important vacancy that will occur in the downtown.
- 3) Robyn Stewart has served on the Ohio City County Managers Association board and has been elected vice-president. We are very proud of her.

REPORTS OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. Norstrom shared that the news from COTA is that the search process for a new director is beginning. A search firm has been hired and we expect to have that decision made and a person in place probably by the end of the year. It is a very important position.

Ms. Dorothy reported that she attended the Bike and Pedestrian Board meeting. She wants to make sure that everyone knows that the whole group was quite frustrated that they didn't get more input on the Huntley Rd. corridor in a timelier manner. She is sure they would appreciate some more time if at all possible.

She also wants to note that from her cemetery board work, she has had a couple of people from the Rush Creek Village contact her then Mr. Whited and Mr. Chandler about some erosion from Rush Creek. She is not sure exactly what is going on. We have yet to respond to the resident but there are some serious erosion issues and she doesn't know if we as a City need to address that but she would be happy if Mr. Whited would respond to the resident. Mr. Whited confirmed that he let him know that staff is looking into that.

Ms. Dorothy shared with Mr. Norstrom that rush creek and erosion throughout the whole rush run water shed is an issue that the city has.

Ms. Michael shared that from the legislative side, the City has lost with the Governor's conference committee bill and the legislation signed by the Governor. They changed it from charging us 1% to have the Department of Taxation account for our money to ½% but they will still have the Department of Taxation accounting for our funds. Local government fund money was transferred from cities to townships and small villages, plus another large sum of money was taken off the top so we will be receiving less local government funds.

Mr. Norstrom asked if RITA would still be involved. Ms. Michael replied yes. This is only one type of our income taxes. Mr. Bartter explained that the provision allows businesses to opt-in to file their net profit return. Year after year businesses will be allowed to either opt-in to file through the state through the Ohio Business Gateway or with the City or RITA or whoever is administering that tax.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION Mr. Foust made a motion to meet in Executive Session to discuss Board and Commission appointments and appointment of personnel. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes 6 Smith, Foust, Norstrom, Dorothy, Troper, and Michael

No 0

Council recessed at 8:51 p.m. from the Regular meeting session.

MOTION Mr. Smith made a motion to return to open session at 9:14 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dorothy.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION Mr. Troper made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Norstrom.

The motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

President Michael declared the meeting adjourned.

/s/ D. Kay Thress
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the City Council, this
17th day of July 2017.*

/s/ Bonnie D. Michael
Council President