



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, June 26, 2017 Meeting

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

City Support Staff Dan Whited (Director Service & Engineering) and Celia Thornton (Project Supervisor) were present. Also present was City Council member Rachael Dorothy.

Minutes from the May 22, 2017 meeting were approved. Mike Bates, who was absent from the May Meeting, abstained.

Huntley Road Repaving Project: Ms. Martin recognized that Mr. Whited, the City Engineer, was present to help answer questions as the board discussed the Huntley Road repaving project. Ms. Martin then gave some background provided by Mr. Hurley on the project.

1. The annual arterial improvement projects, as approved in the Capital Improvements Program, involve the repair of curbs, gutters, storm inlets and street base; the mill and overlay of pavement; and restriping of an arterial street in Worthington. The 2017 project is Huntley Road from Granville Road to Schrock Road. The arterial improvement program is funded by license taxes.
2. The 2017 CIP appropriated \$425,000 from that fund for the Huntley Road project. The current engineers estimate is \$438,000.
3. The bid documents are being prepared with an alternate that would add sharrows during repaving. The alternate will allow the City to see the cost for adding the sharrows and make a decision whether to add that to the project. City Council would like a recommendation from Bike and Ped on whether or not this is a good application for sharrows or not. If so, would this be a priority enough to pay the cost of adding them. The alternate provides two options for bidders, one is the more maintenance friendly and permanent thermoplastic sharrows that would be put on during repaving and would likely cost around \$35,000. The other option would be painted on sharrows, like we have on West Wilson Bridge Road, which would cost the city roughly \$8,000 per year to maintain once applied.
4. The City Engineer has reviewed the road and does not recommend any reduction to lane widths (current is 12 foot lanes north and south and a 12 foot center turn lane). Any speed limit recommendations would be separate from this project.

5. In summary, Council and staff are looking for the BPAB recommendation on whether this is a recommended location for sharrows in general. If yes, is it priority enough that Bike and Ped would want it to be done now in lieu of those dollars being utilized for other higher priority bike and pedestrian improvements elsewhere?

Mr. Whited informed the board that the sharrows may not need to be re-painted every year. It would depend on wear but it is possible that they could last several years before repainting became necessary. He also pointed out that some users find thermoplast treatments slippery which can be a hazard in the rain. Mr. Whited then reminded the board about the NE Gateway improvements which would occur in 2021 that may include some bike lanes on sections of Huntley Road. Ms. Martin observed that it is important to look at the overall plan for the area when considering these sharrows, what facilities are recommended on either end. Mr. Bates then drew everyone's attention to a document provided by Bike Worthington and handed out just prior to the board meeting. He was surprised and disappointed that the information provided in this packet wasn't discussed at the previous Council meeting and feels it needs to be addressed (for example, why didn't the police chief address the illegal use of the turn lane by trucks). Mr. Bates felt that the way the City Manager presented the information was business as usual and he feels that key points of information weren't addressed that bear directly on the board's ability to make a recommendation. Ms. Dorothy then referenced BZA minutes that stated in 2011 an agreement was reached between Quikrete and the City that Quikrete would stop center lane stacking by building out an extension lane along Huntley Bowl Park for trucks. Mr. Bates noted that it had been six years since then and wondered whether this was an issue of Quikrete not building or the City not enforcing, and his understanding was that BZA is a quasi-judicial organization. Mr. Bates then requested a follow up with the City Attorney and Police Chief. Mr. Rist then asked when this project was approved, where it came from, and where the money was coming from. Mr. Whited answered that it had been in the CIP since 2012, but not funded, and that money was coming from licensing tax funds provided by the county. Mr. Rist then asked if anyone from the board had gone on this past spring's street improvement ride with Service, because he wasn't asked (had gone in 2016). Mr. Whited replied that no one from the board went this year though Council Members Dorothy and Michael both went. Mr. Rist and Ms. Martin thought that the intent was that someone from the board would always be invited to attend. Mr. Bates brought the conversation back to the previous Council meeting where Council Member Myers had stated that Huntley was unsafe for bikes because of truck traffic and that matters were further complicated by truck stacking. Mr. Bates felt that the information was presented in such a manner as to discourage any bike route on Huntley Road, but now that he'd read the Bike Worthington document that says truck stacking isn't allowed it changes his view of how the road should be handled for bike and pedestrian traffic. It may have been that Mr. Myers didn't know about the code and agreement with BZA, or that he just doesn't want bike traffic on Huntley, or both. He wonders how the board can recommend anything without knowing the proper use of the road. Maybe there is room for bike lanes if lane widths were reduced. Mr. Whited pointed out that bike lanes could only be accomplished by removing the center turn lane. A discussion among board members followed regarding recommended bike lane widths and possibilities. Ms. Martin felt that this was an important discussion to have but reminded the group that the ask from Council right now is whether the board wants to approve funds for sharrows. Mr. Rist suggested putting a condition on it- pending a resolution to safety issues. Mr. Bates says his point is that the board was asked to recommend something without having all of the necessary data. He was especially upset that he'd sat through a Council Meeting where erroneous information was presented. He agrees that questions need answered before a recommendation can be made. Mr. Rist asked how critical the timing was- when was work being done. Mr. Whited said that the projects had gone out to bid. Ms. Martin said this goes to the point of why a master plan is needed and she doesn't like that the board is being asked to make a recommendation at this point rather than being included in the original design phase. Her

inclination at this point is to say no to sharrows and that she'd rather have a study done, because ultimately she would rather see bike lanes, especially if Quikrete can be made to comply, though also has concerns about where this new stacking lane would go in regards to Huntley Bowl Park. Even though Huntley Road is an industrial corridor that doesn't mean people don't need to walk or bike to work on it, and there is a triathlon store located in one of the businesses that sells bikes and there is nowhere for people to test bikes out. Ms. Martin is also upset because she didn't know about the Quikrete agreement either. Mr. Rist asked whether we could go back later and add sharrows later, or other treatments, after the board gets more information. Mr. Whited said possibly and added that this project had been in the CIP for some time. Ms. Dorothy said yes, it had been in there, but had not been funded by Council. Ms. Martin said she and the board had asked for information on bike and ped projects in the CIP from staff and had never received it. Ms. Thornton believed staff had received that information and said she'd resend it out to everyone. Ms. Thornton also said that Ms. Martin had made a good point earlier that this is a good example of why a master plan is needed, so that the board has definite priorities to inform these types of decisions. Is Huntley the best way to route people and where the board wants to spend money? Mr. Bates said in this case the board hadn't been provided enough information to make a decision and referred back to suggestions on the Bike Worthington document. Ms. Martin said we need a study, the board doesn't know what the correct treatment for the road is without such a document. She then asked Mr. Whited about the condition of the road and if the center lane was in bad shape due to truck stacking. Mr. Whited replied that it is actually the edges of the road that are in the worst shape- the curbs and catch basins. Overall the road is in a Level D condition and near the end of its lifecycle. He said this is a balancing act of maintaining failing infrastructure and adding bike and pedestrian facilities. In his opinion a good option is redoing the road, adding sharrows and working on a Bike & Ped Master Plan. He is very reluctant to advise removing the middle lane as that could adversely affect businesses in the corridor. There is a lot of traffic entering and exiting all of those businesses. Mr. Whalen also voiced concerns about removing the center lane and said he thought it would be useful for cyclists who needed to turn. Mrs. Horton asked if there was an option to wait. Ms. Dorothy said she is voting against funding the project at the next Council Meeting, though the project still may go ahead. Mr. Whalen brought up that this might be when a standard set of recommendation guidelines, or standard design guidelines, might be helpful (thermal vs. painted) and Ms. Martin said she wants a master plan first, then standard recommendation. Mrs. Lindholm expressed her opinion that, while she hates not recommending adding a bike facility to a road, at this time she doesn't feel good recommending sharrows because she isn't sure that it would be a safe option for this road. Mr. Rist said there are just too many outstanding questions. He thinks we should put forth a motion to not approve the request at this time and revisit it later when we have more information. Mr. Bates agreed with Mr. Rist and seconded the motion. Then Ms. Dorothy asked permission to speak, and was granted it by Ms. Martin. She noted that a bike and ped group (first the steering committee and now this board) has been around since 2012 and is upset that the board didn't have input earlier in the process and is now on the spot. She's also upset that a policy hasn't been implemented yet of getting all plans in front of the Bike & Ped board, preferably prior to this point in the project when they could have an impact. There is the capability of providing options for all users, but only if everyone has the option of providing input. There is a lot on this road. We have a park, businesses, the food pantry and a significant amount of money is being spent on right of way infrastructure for the city to not include others in these discussions early enough to have an impact. She thinks everyone's comments are very valid and understands why the board doesn't feel it can make a decision at this point. But, we need to ensure that everyone has a place at the table and ensure that we look at all users. Ms. Dorothy is quite distressed at how this has come about and thinks exclusively building this out for trucks is not the right thing to do but now is the option on the table. Mr. Bates says the other option is to make a recommendation for everything (lower speed limits, protected bike lanes, sidewalks, etc.)- a Complete Streets recommendation so we go from making no recommendation

to recommending it all. Ms. Martin thinks the recommendation should be that we're recommending nothing because we weren't involved early enough and we might want to see a more Complete Streets approach to this project but she wants to be careful because while she thinks reduced speed limits are great, she doesn't think we can make the entire City 25 mph, we still need to have some realities and there is a fine balance between the two. It is a corridor for volume transportation and she doesn't want to discount trying to get cars and trucks through that area. But that doesn't exclude it from adding Complete Street components which includes bikes, pedestrians, buses, and would go so far as to add green infrastructure. Mr. Rist asked if there was a designation in the City for freight corridors, which would get different treatments or designations for bike and ped? Mr. Whited said not in his understanding, though we do have some designated not for freight. Mr. Rist does think that if a road is exclusively for moving cars and specifically trucks, especially big ones, through then that's a whole different level of treatment and safety consideration. Ms. Martin interjected that is why protected bike lanes would be necessary, for safety reasons. She then went on to say that we're saying we can't make a recommendation for two reasons, first, we're being asked at the 11th hour and two, we don't know how the street has been studied and what the correct treatment is or if Complete Streets has been considered. Mrs. Horton expressed her concern about sharrows on this road. It is not Longfellow and who are we inviting to ride with sharrows and she is just not sure it's safe enough. She isn't saying no because it's the 11th hour, but because she's not sure it's the right thing to do on this road. There was then again discussion on how fast this project was moving forward with Mr. Whited reiterating that it was going before Council in one week for funding. There was more discussion and the group decided to write a memo basically stating that they are not recommending sharrows at this time because they feel the road needs further study and they have questions that need answered regarding truck stacking, safety and other plans for the corridor north and south. Ms. Dorothy and Ms. Martin agree that the memo needs to note that one reason the board can't recommend this going forward is timing- the board wasn't involved early enough. Ms. Martin promised a memo capturing these thoughts would be emailed to everyone to make sure everyone agreed before it went to Council. This was made into a motion and seconded. Mr. Whalen was curious how this item came to be on their agenda tonight. Ms. Dorothy said because she insisted that it come to bike and ped. Council just had a presentation by the board, the city is looking at Complete Streets, yet they weren't included in the design phase of this project nor had there been any bike and ped input and it was going to Council for approval. Ms. Dorothy said this is why the City needs a process in place that routes applicable projects to bike and ped. Ms. Martin said she needed a minute to pick on staff. This was a known project to City staff, yet no one said anything to the board? She said she's looking at Ms. Thornton and Mr. Hurley. Mr. Whited said she could also look at him. Ms. Martin said that maybe this goes to the point that the board needs more staff help, because obviously Mr. Hurley and Ms. Thornton need help- they have job one, and this is job two. There should be someone solely responsible for bike and ped information and communication in the city, even if it's just 20 hours per week part time. Ms. Dorothy said if the City had a Complete Streets policy and a process in place to get these things before the board, then you wouldn't need additional staff help. Ms. Martin thinks you need both, processes and someone whose only job is to work on bike and ped- whether that's full time, part time, she has no idea but that's all they should be focused on. Mr. Rist requested that in future the agenda have an area where items that need to be decided on are kept and that the information be sent out in advance- so the board knows it's coming. Ms. Thornton said that she does try to do that when possible. If you look at the bottom of the current agenda in the "updates" section it alludes to several items (mobility study and EEDS Ohio report) that we'll be discussing at the next meeting and you were given the packets tonight to read prior to the July meeting so you will be able to come back ready to make decisions. This was just a bit last minute for us as well. Ms. Martin asked if the board could go back and finalize and vote on our motion. She asked if all were agreed that the board would write a memo to Council, pass it around to everyone, but that we are all in agreement that we're not recommending anything right now. Mr.

Rist asked if Council would have the memo by next week's Council meeting. Ms. Dorothy said that would be most helpful. Ms. Thornton expressed concern since Mr. Hurley was on vacation until the next meeting and she is not comfortable writing a memo to Council without Mr. Hurley seeing or agreeing to it. Mr. Bates said he wasn't sure of protocol but couldn't the board write a memo to Council without staff being involved? Ms. Thornton said she thought so and she could help Ms. Martin with verbiage. Ms. Martin then called for a vote of those in favor of the memo and recommendation and all agreed. Mr. Whited then said he'd send some road information to Ms. Thornton the next day to distribute to the board. Mrs. Horton asked if he would please keep the board informed on his progress with Complete Streets and he said he would. Mr. Whited then left the meeting.

City Council Presentation Follow-up (Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan): Ms. Martin thanked those that attended the Council meeting for coming. The general tone and receptivity of Council to the recommendations and efforts of the board were very positive. Council has asked staff to schedule a work session (likely July 10 at their committee of the whole meeting) to discuss various initiatives needing funding and how they might be incorporated into the CIP and operating budgets. Mr. Rist asked if this meant a work session for the board with Council? Ms. Thornton thought it meant a work session with City staff, not the board. Mr. Hurley would talk to Council about what this board has asked for, more money to complete a certain amount of projects, or packaged projects, as scoped by Mr. Whited, that could have an impact in the City. Ms. Martin wanted to clarify this was then a staff work session. Ms. Thornton said she was not positive, but that was her understanding. Mr. Rist said he felt he had a different take from what he heard at the Council meeting. He was disappointed and felt like Council has just kicked the can down the road and there is no serious discussion about how to pay for these things in the long term, especially when Mr. Myers said as projects come up we'll find funding. To him that is not accepting the reality that these projects need serious money if we actually plan to build any of them. We're not talking about \$50,000 or \$100,000, we're talking about millions. And Parks has the same issues. So to him it was disappointing that they didn't work harder and faster so they could have had something on the ballot this fall, but that is just his personal opinion and take on it. There was then some discussion as to what staff would bring forward to Council at this work session. Ms. Thornton thought it would be looking at ways to package scoped projects to see how much money it would take over a 5 or 7 year timeline to have significant impact in the City. Ms. Martin preferred that if staff was packaging things they bring it back to the board first. She made the point that the board intentionally didn't prioritize projects as they were trying to make the point that here is a whole list of projects and costs that would take 120 years to accomplish with current funding, so needing more money was the number one priority. If the board doesn't get more money, then they figure out how to proceed and prioritize with what they have. If we do get more money, then we also prioritize. Ms. Dorothy did say it was clear to her at Council that there were no priorities, which was a little confusing. She wanted to make sure everyone understood that just because something is in the CIP, that doesn't necessarily mean it will be funded. Often projects are parked there, sometimes to show as a priority so grant money can be applied for, but if that money doesn't come then the project won't necessarily be completed. This will be the case for many bike and pedestrian projects. It's in the CIP but won't be a high priority unless we can get grant money for it. She thought it was a little disingenuous for Mr. Whited to say a multiuse trail is in the CIP at a future date on Huntley Road, because that doesn't mean the City will build it. Ms. Martin still thinks it's important to know what's in the CIP so we can push those forward, but understands now that there could be confusion and that the main points the board was trying to make could have gotten lost. She's frustrated too because she doesn't know the best way to get things accomplished, is it

staff or money? Ms. Martin feels like we keep talking about this and are getting nothing done. The board decided a second memo was warranted to clarify for City Council that the board's current priorities are to make sure a Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan is created for the City of Worthington (within the next year) and to push for a board approved Complete Streets adoption by City Council. Ms. Martin believes also a push for dedicated additional staff just for Bike & Pedestrian should be added. Ms. Martin thinks a master plan should be done by a consultant and might cost between \$80,000 plus. Mr. Bates and Mr. Rist would like to see multi-modal added to the master plan. Ms. Martin thinks if you add multi-modal you'll be upwards of \$100,000. She does think the master plan would need to include all previously done work- we don't want it to reference other documents that then have to be found and consulted. Ms. Dorothy wants to make sure that the board doesn't just wait for the master plan to get completed and hopes they will still continue to take advantage of upcoming projects and push for improvements while the plan is being completed. Ms. Martin said sure, but without a plan the board has no direction and it makes meetings like this one very difficult. We are a pinball machine bouncing all over. The board is agreed that two memos will go to Council.

Tool Box Talks: The idea of doing a toolbox talk education session at the beginning of each meeting has been discussed and we wanted to get started on that at our July meeting. Brainstorm ideas for what people would like to see on the list of potential topics. The idea would be over the term of a member (3 years) to cover 30 or so topics that would provide education and updates to supplement the members overall knowledge of bike and ped. Ms. Martin would also like to propose that we record these so that they can be put on the website for others to view- the public, Council. She did meet with John Gallagher a week ago and he has a lot of ideas he'd like to present (bike boxes, sharrows vs other treatments, etc.). There are many ideas, we could have Julie Wolcroft come in to talk about SRTS from a different perspective. There could be an education session about runners in bike lanes, and we could have Paul come talk to us about speed limits, basically, there are many topics for discussion. If anyone on the board has ideas they should email them to Ms. Thornton. Ms. Martin pointed out again that this would be another good use of file sharing. Mr. Bates would like Council to have a better understanding of SRTS- that it's not just a sidewalk policy. The board would like to hear from other people who have done it, even if they had bad experiences or didn't complete it so we could learn from their mistakes. Mrs. Horton believes that SRTS started as a grassroots program among concerned parents and should be involving PTA's and doing lots of education and encouragement in the community to push it up as a priority to the school district and city level. Ms. Martin and Mrs. Horton would like Complete Streets to be prioritized, if possible for the July meeting, August if July isn't possible. Ms. Thornton will try to get someone from MORPC to come for the first Tool Box Talk to educate the board on Complete Streets.

Updates:

1. EEDS Ohio State Student Report – A group of students worked in cooperation with the Old Worthington Partnership and the City of Worthington to create some recommendations on being a more sustainable downtown environment. Their recommendations are in a document we are distributing tonight. This was also sent by Michael Bates in an email in March. We are working on having someone with the program come to present the recommendations at our July or August meeting so please review it and we'll add it to an agenda.
2. Mobility Study (Phase 3 & 4) – The Old Worthington Mobility Study included phases three and four which address walking and biking access in Old Worthington. The consultants

have finalized drafts of their recommendations and will be at our July meeting to present and obtain your feedback. Please review the information between now and then and come prepared to discuss. We'll also provide an electronic copy.

Ms. Thornton also shared with the board that Mr. Knight had resigned. He enjoyed serving but a job change at work, which includes a lot of travel, meant he won't be able to attend Monday board meetings in the future.

Ms. Martin let the board know that after the Active Transportation meeting she acquired SRTS Lesson Plans (3 packets encompassing lesson plans for grades K-2, 3-5, and 6-8). Ms. Thornton has scanned the packets and will email them out to the board. Ms. Martin recommended that a file sharing option, such as Dropbox, be made accessible to the board and these documents, along with others, can be stored there.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.