



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, July 24, 2017 Meeting

Members Present: The members present were Mike Bates, Lawrence Creed, Ann Horton, Emma Lindholm, Jeannie Martin, John Rist, Gary Schmidt and John Stephan.

City Support Staff Dan Whited (Director Service & Engineering), Celia Thornton (Project Supervisor) and City Council Member Rachael Dorothy were present. Also present were Traffic & Planning Department Manager, Steve Jewell, of DLZ Corporation and Planning Section Manager, Kim Littleton, of Burton Planning Services. Resident and Bike Worthington representative Paul Dorothy (179 Kenbrook Dr.) and Kristin Studabaker of Carpenter Marty Transportation also attended the meeting.

Minutes from the June 26, 2017 meeting were approved. Lawrence Creed, who was absent from the June Meeting, abstained. Mr. Rist had a question as to whether the originally planned July 10 City Council/staff work session occurred or was rescheduled. It did not occur due to Huntley Road presentations and would only be rescheduled at the request of City Council.

Swearing in of New Members: Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Stephan were sworn in as City Council appointed members of the Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Board by Ms. Martin. Each took a moment to briefly introduce himself to the board.

Old Worthington Mobility Study Presentation – Phases 3 & 4: Mr. Whited introduced the two presenters of the Old Worthington Mobility Study, Mr. Jewell and Mr. Littleton. Mr. Rist asked why the study focused on Old Worthington. Ms. Dorothy said that the Stafford crossing issue was a root reason why this area needed studied. Mr. Jewell then began the presentation with a brief overview of Phases 1 & 2 and then proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation outlining Phase 3 (presentation of Phases 3 & 4 attached to minutes). The following comments were made regarding Phase 3:

- (Mr. Stephan) Asked if priority should be given to streets with no sidewalks before streets with existing sidewalks on one side; much discussion – good point but consider vehicular volumes and pedestrian traffic as part of prioritization process. Modify report page 13 Long Term (LT) recommendations.

- (Mr. Rist) Asked why hand rails were LT when that seems simple enough to be Short Term (ST). While work and cost for rails appears simple, there may be hidden issues that require considerably more affecting ADA items. Immediate action is not required, but when work occurs on ADA switchbacks, rails must be added. Committee can readjust priorities during future discussions and/or work with Master Plan.
- (Mrs. Horton) General question about sidewalk width for brick vs. concrete. Most sidewalks in study area are 4 feet wide. Jewell stated that many cities use 5 – 6 feet as minimum, but pedestrian volume, area usage (residential vs. business) should be considered. In old neighborhoods where ROW is restrictive (Not wide enough) street may need narrowed with removing parking or occasional sidewalk bump outs are provided for wheel chairs to pass each other). City is currently working on standards for sidewalks and widths to be established.
- (Mr. Dorothy) Suggested that report be modified indicating that Safe Routes to School be given high priority for infill of new sidewalks.
- (Mr. Creed) Suggested report recommend that City develop standards for where (what streets) brick sidewalks are required, and if used, what type, color, etc. be established for continuity and to minimize issues.
- (Ms. Martin) In Zone 2 of recommendations, the alley north of SR-161 shows sidewalks. This alley is narrow, and while pedestrians may use it vehicular traffic is low; remove sidewalks from consideration.
- (Mr. Rist) Questioned if contingency cost in Table 2 are included in Table 3; cost do not appear to include contingency costs and there is no note with table indicating if included or not.

Mr. Littleton then presented Phase 4 and the following comments were made:

- (Ms. Martin) City/committee is involved in study on SR-161 west of SR-315 which has pedestrian and bicycle elements. Leave recommendations for SR-161 in this study, but keep perspective for city master plan.
- (Mr. Rist) Asked if there was one or two Shared-Use Paths (SUP) on SR-161. Mr. Littleton explained that there were two recommended for long term.
- (Ms. Martin) Brought up issues with using Village Green as part of bicycle circulation: access to residents, churches, businesses, and removal of parking. (Littleton) pointed out that access remains to local traffic and thru traffic and parking is restricted. (Mr. Creed) parking is critical hot button for this whole are of downtown; asked what ‘value’ is to removing parking [advantages vs. disadvantages]. After considerable discussion, committee preferred removing this idea from plan.
- (Mr. Dorothy) Stated his issues with large focus on High Street and SR-161
 - Safety issues with sharrows on these streets
 - Parking on side streets with sharrows along parallel streets to High Street
 - SUP on north side of SR-161 should be priority because of pool and schools
 - Need update to city code to incorporate bicycle parking so bicyclists have place to park

Mr. Littleton pointed out that need for bicycle parking with some ideas is addressed in report, but we will review it for improving wording.

- (Mr. Creed) Then asked how much parking is removed by adding bicycle parking to existing parking lots? (Littleton) responded that lots may need remarked for more efficient use or that bike parking can be added in the grass. He will make sure this is more evident in report.
- (Mr. Bates) Asked for the definition of a “sharrow”? (Littleton) responded to question: warns driver of bicyclists using the roadway; gives bicyclists a path (wayfinding); generally provides a wider lane for both vehicle and bicycle.

- (Ms. Martin) Requested that report refer to city providing for bicycle parking in the city code as part of the master plan. Also, she does not like marked bike lanes because of parking removal and possibly widening streets. Her preference is for leaving parking on street as buffer for pedestrians and traffic calming.
- (Ms. Martin) Questioned the recommendation for traffic circles, especially since recommended intersections already had good traffic control. They also inhibit left turns for school buses. Requested they be removed from consideration.
- (Ms. Martin) Questioned the need for sharrows in all corridors; appears to be overkill and not fiscally responsible for amount of markings/funding needed to install/maintain. Remove from consideration. Instead, she favors signs saying "May Use Full Lane."
- (Mr. Creed) Questioned whether the bicycle circulation plan with widening in Group 1 is feasible or not. (Ms. Martin) also commented that widening was not feasible and not practical in the Old Worthington area to accommodate bicycle lanes.
- (Ms. Dorothy) Did not see any references to NACTO only AASHTO. Also, look at typical for High Street to make sure they properly represent the particular section of street.
- (Mr. Creed) Questioned what is meant by local roads. (Littleton) responded that is was all roads other than High Street and SR-161. Mr. Creed also questioned about the reference to bicycle detectors on page 21; appears confusing. (Jewell) Pointed out that it was meant to have city put the small bicycle symbol on all vehicle detectors showing the best place for bicyclists to stop to be detected; wording will be revised to clarify.
- (Ms. Dorothy) Recommended using parallel streets to High Street as bicycle circulator. (Ms. Martin) Concurred, with preference being Hartford and Evening since there are existing traffic signals at SR-161.
- (Ms. Horton) Asked about Complete Streets and (Littleton) responded with an explanation. She then requested that Complete Streets be incorporated into a policy recommendation for the City.
- (Ms. Horton) Requested reiterated that north crossing at High Street and Village Green is not a safe place to cross and that it be removed from consideration. Especially since using the Green as a circulator is being removed from consideration.
- (Mr. Creed) Requested that report expand on transit: are shelters justified? - research COTA thresholds for shelters and include in report. Also, aesthetics for the Green are important and must be considered when incorporating bus shelters in this area.
- (Ms. Martin) Need to indicate in report that wayfinding signs are now in place (include photographs).
- (Mr. Rist) Consider adding income received from any "paid parking" be specifically earmarked for Bike & Pedestrian Committee Projects.

Mr. Creed then asked what was involved in this process moving forward. He was assured that the board's suggestions would be incorporated into the final document which would be brought back to the Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Board for a final review so that they could make a recommendation to City Council. Mrs. Horton also asked what cities were used/compared in this process, asked if they had master plans? Ms. Thornton promised to work with Mr. Jewell and Mr. Littleton to obtain this information for the board.

Huntley Road Repaving Project Follow Up: Mr. Bates then reviewed what had occurred with the Huntley Road repaving project. City Council had initially delayed approving funding for the project so that staff could gather more information for Council after hearing from Bike Worthington and the Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Board. At the next Council meeting City staff presented the requested information at which time City Council decided to move forward with the project as presented, without sharrows. The option to add sharrows at a later date is a possibility. Mr.

Dorothy shared that his feeling was that what Council was saying is that there are places where bikes and pedestrians don't belong. His bigger concern is that several Council members who don't feel this is a concern aren't getting enough pushback or information from this board and he feels there is a disconnect. Ms. Martin took exception to the comment as she was present at the Council meeting and presented the board's views. Mr. Rist asked why he feels there is a lack of information. Mr. Dorothy said Council Members need to know that people in the community are behind these bike and ped efforts and that these issues can affect re-electability. At this point Ms. Martin noted that it was getting late and she would like to focus on the agenda.

Updates:

1. Tool Box Talks (Dropbox Overview) – Members agreed that they had received the invite and were able to access documents. Those with issues would work with Ms. Thornton directly.
2. Crandall Sidewalks (Resident Letter) – Mr. Stephan thought that we should acknowledge receipt of the letter and show it as an update in the July 24 meeting. However, Council should take the lead and the board should stand by as advisors, if asked.
3. MORPC Complete Streets Presentation – A MORPC representative will be scheduled to give a "Tool Box Talk" at the beginning of a future meeting.
4. 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 creating a more sustainable downtown environment. We are seeing if it is a possibility to have someone with the program come to present the recommendations at a future meeting so please review the material and we'll add it to an agenda.
5. 161 Corridor Study Update – Ms. Martin was in Seattle for the last meeting, so Mr. Bates attended in her stead. Mr. Bates said that the meeting mostly consisted of a re-capping of all the opinions expressed from the public meetings. The project is going to move ahead without additional lanes. There will be two traffic lanes and a center turn lane, with a multiuse path on the south side of the road and sidewalks on the north. There was also some discussion about low hanging fruit- a Linworth intersection realignment, etc. People were generally very positive about the process. Mr. Dorothy noted that in the latest version bike lanes had been eliminated and ODOT was recommending 12 foot freeway lanes. He says community push back is crucial to change this, as ODOT's default is always "no." There was some discussion about the many jurisdictions involved (Columbus, Sharon Township, Worthington, Dublin) and Worthington's ability to impact the addition of bike lanes. Ms. Martin promised to follow-up with Mr. Greeson (City Manager).
6. Bus Circulators – Mr. Rist gave an update that COTA is no longer considering bus circulator options but are looking at the first and last mile- how people get to the transit system from their homes or work places. Mr. Rist said he would like the board to be involved in this process.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.