



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Thursday, September 21, 2017 Meeting

(Note: Meeting was rescheduled from the normal fourth Monday date)

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

City Support Staff Darren Hurley (Parks & Recreation Director) and City Council Member Rachael Dorothy were present.

Minutes from the August 28, 2017 meeting were approved with one correction on the third page changing inhabitable to uninhabitable. John Rist, who was absent from the August Meeting, abstained.

Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan Scope: Mr. Hurley overviewed the materials that had been sent out by Ms. Thornton prior to the meeting. He indicated the goal of this discussion was to identify deliverables and key process components that would help staff to draft an RFP that could be reviewed by the Board at their next meeting. Members could choose whether to identify another plan they liked in terms of format and adapt it to Worthington or to utilize Mr. Creed's draft and we could shape into Worthington's format.

Mr. Rist likes Mr. Creed's outline. He would like to see representatives from the committee on any work team with schools involved. He also likes Portsmouth's document with the benefits as listed on page four from it. For deliverables he likes the example from Portsmouth that includes a project schedule and evaluation criteria. He also likes parts of the California example including the goal of the project, purpose and need which could be added to Mr. Creed's document.

Mr. Bates likes the Rapid City document. He likes how it is very definitive on goals and objectives and how it identifies high priority projects. He also likes the idea of utilizing stake holders to create a steering committee. Mr. Creed added he likes the idea of including interest groups and advocacy groups. Mr. Bates added that data collection was present in almost every report.

Ms. Horton liked the Rapid City plan, liked the appendices at the end which gave lots of data and references along with design references. She liked that it gave criteria they used to determine

priorities. She added how wide a sidewalk should be is an example of criteria that could be included in a plan.

Mr. Rist noted some had a technical advisory committee and would that be helpful in terms of guiding a process? Mr. Bates asked what is it we are trying to accomplish with this document. Are we trying to increase usage? Are we trying to increase walking, health, etc.? It isn't clear to him yet. Mr. Whalen and Ms. Horton indicated the recently adopted Mission/Vision should help with that. Some plans had that in their introduction.

Mr. Bates suggested we use the Rapid City plan as a guide and combine it with some of Mr. Creed's drafted components. Mr. Bates likes the format of the Rapid City plan and how it has objectives and clear benchmarks. We need to have a way to measure progress.

Mr. Rist suggested our list of wants should include project costs. Mr. Creed added it should include the part about City policy and planning document review. Mr. Bates wants to see it include a steering committee and/or public process. Ms. Lindholm asked how does the steering committee relate to this board's role? Mr. Hurley explained how the Parks and Recreation Commission served as the "steering committee" in their master planning process. Ms. Horton asked if it was like what was put together for the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) workshop? Mr. Bates suggested that the Board would manage the public input portion. Mr. Creed suggested the stakeholder groups would come and provide input at points during the process. Mr. Bates suggested a steering committee element, stakeholder element, and public element. Ms. Horton stated we all agree we need public involvement. The Board continued discussing this concept and it was suggested by Mr. Schmidt to just indicate in the RFP the desire to have public input and the consultants would have preferred and recommended approaches that we could consider.

Mr. Schmidt added he really liked the Rapid City document. Mr. Rist suggested adding mapping as deliverable of enhancements and improvements. Mr. Schmidt suggested we utilize the Old Worthington Mobility Study as a resource. Mr. Hurley added that was the goal of the study once completed to be a resource for this planning process. Mr. Rist added he would like to see an implementation plan and evaluation criteria as a deliverable. He would also like to see a full project schedule.

Mr. Creed asked what was the cost of the Rapid City plan? Mr. Hurley responded staff would find out and share with the board. It would give us an idea of how costly a detailed plan like that one would be. Mr. Creed suggested we utilize the Rapid City listing of minimum services of consultants that includes the number of public meetings. Mr. Whalen asked how much data do we include as it varies in the different plans.

Mr. Rist added funding options are important to include. Mr. Bates responded the California example had that in it. Mr. Rist added the California example also included way-finding.

Ms. Horton suggested referencing existing studies and Mr. Creed added the city's GIS mapping would be useful. Mr. Hurley indicated he would reach out to MORPC about resources they might be able to provide.

Mr. Creed asked if there are any non-project deliverables. Mr. Rist asked if demographics was a deliverable.

Mr. Schmidt stated the California plan would be way out of our budget range and that way-finding could be expensive as well. Mr. Creed said the deliverables list looks pretty good, including the four “E’s” project list, cost estimates, etc. He indicated our process list still needs work.

Mr. Bates would like us to talk about success criteria. What is the definition of success and how do we measure that? Mr. Hurley responded the Rapid City plan gives nice measurable to help track progress. Mr. Creed added the document should help us with a clearer vision on how we address each issue such as the Worthington-Galena corridor. Ms. Horton likes the clear criteria of how they prioritized the River City plan. It justified the priorities and the overall list. Mr. Rist added he could see us doing an annual survey to help measure impact.

Mr. Schmidt stated we have some information already, we could also utilize someone like Dan Burden who will do walking audits of communities. He referenced <http://www.walkable.org/>. He will come in and do a walking audit with communities like ours. They walk, do an audit in person, then he writes up a report based on what they experienced. Mr. Creed likes the idea of getting the community out on the streets instead of being in a room. Ms. Horton added she thinks the walking audit would be valuable and could see value in that being done in situations like the 161 study. Mr. Creed asked to put walking/biking audits on the process list.

Ms. Horton asked to put SRTS on the list since it is one of our stated priorities. Mr. Schmidt added SRTS fits under Education and Encouragement. Mr. Bates stated funding options important to include. Mr. Whalen asked it include something about the lifespan of the report. Mr. Schmidt added his experience has been a plan like this takes about 10 months to create. The group discussed timeline and how quickly it could be done. Mr. Hurley indicated he was working on getting an estimate so it could be included in CIP funding discussions with Council and then we could get it approved for 2018. If approved, staff could get the RFP out in late 2017 so the work could begin in early 2018. Mr. Rist suggested we have a draft RFP ready for the October meeting, final approval at the November meeting, and out on the street in December.

Ms. Horton asked how do we include bus stops and transit movement. Mr. Bates responded it appeared as what might be an above and beyond in the Rapid City document. It appeared but wasn't in the scope. Mr. Schmidt added we would want transit to be part of it.

Mr. Whalen asked if there were questions on the process. Mr. Schmidt reiterated his suggestion we let the consultants give us a recommendation on how they would like to lay out the process. They'll all have their own preferred methods. Mr. Creed added the process he is hearing could be well over \$100,000. Mr. Rist asked what is up with the CIP process. Mr. Hurley indicated so far the allocation is still at \$100,000 per year but Council has asked to discuss that during this fall's process. He knows they have indicated a desire to prioritize bike and pedestrian projects but will have to balance with other priorities. Mr. Hurley added staff are planning to recommend the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan be funded separately from the \$100,000 annual allocation.

Mr. Whalen asked if we would work the list of deliverables and process items into an RFP draft. Mr. Hurley responded yes we would merge the listings and the Rapid City report and Mr. Creed's draft into one draft for board review.

It was noted Rapid City has just under 70,000 residents. Mr. Schmidt added good consultants override the need for a perfect RFP. Mr. Whalen agreed but added we need it to be specific

enough to be sure we get what we need. Mr. Schmidt added if we go crazy with data collection the fee will go way up. He feels it is more important to get people involved and utilize more than public meetings. Mr. Creed asked us to utilize an on-line presence as well. Mr. Schmidt suggested we use what Mr. Creed put in his about data collection. Mr. Creed suggested we put our budgeted fee or a range in the RFP to help drive cost to what we can afford. Mr. Bates added the consultants won't have to start from nothing, we have some information and documents for them to draw from plus a board in place as a resource.

The brainstorm listing under process included:

- Public Meeting/Process Community Input
- Temporary Committee (Board/City Officials and Staff/Citizens)
- Using the existing Old Worthington Mobility Plan as a starting point and base to reduce time and cost.
- Minimum services of the consultant.
- Establish a "vision".
- Define success after the plan has been implemented over time. How to check/measure.
- Walk-ability audit, same for biking.
- Master Plan Lifecycle – when to review/revise after implementation.
- Creation phase – set clear schedule, milestones, deadlines for consultant and bike and pedestrian board.
- Data re-use – for example MORPC

The brainstorm listing under deliverables included:

- Project cost/Priorities
- Existing Conditions Review/City Wide Policies
- Inventory and mapping existing facilities – use/include existing studies.
- Public process – including web – citizens/stakeholders
- Draft/Final Master Plan Document and Maps
- Implementation Plan/Measurements
- Project Schedule/Timeline/Reviews
- Performance Measures
- Data – Demographics
- Funding Options – Specific to Worthington
- Way-finding
- 5 E's
- Tie into SRTS
- Include Transit

Updates:

1. EEDS Ohio State Student Report – Mr. Bates indicated he had been in touch with Joanne Dole regarding getting a report for the board at an upcoming meeting. Unfortunately the students have moved on but we should still be able to get an update on our agenda for October. Mr. Hurley added staff had the report and the Planning Department had information that we could share.

2. Agenda for Next Meeting – It was agreed our October agenda would include the RFP draft review, a report on the Old Worthington Mobility Study revisions, a Complete Streets policy update, and the EEDS OSU Student Report.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.