



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, Nov. 27, 2017 Meeting

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

City Support Staff Darren Hurley (Parks & Recreation Director) and Celia Thornton were also present along with Council Member Rachael Dorothy.

Minutes from the October 23, 2017 meeting were approved.

Mr. Bates began the meeting by recognizing Ms. Dorothy who just returned from attending the National League of Cities in Charlotte, North Carolina, where she participated in a bike ride along. One of the things she noticed were their intersection crossings. All of the traffic lights turn red for a period giving pedestrians a chance to use the road without vehicular interference. After this trip she is very excited about the City working with MORPC on our Complete Streets policy and can't wait to see what innovations the policy might include. She is also happy to make the board aware that a bike share program, which Darren will speak to later, has contacted the City and is interested in expanding their program in central Ohio, particularly Worthington. She then thanked the board for all of their work.

Mr. Hurley shared with the board that the bike share program interested in coming to Worthington is called LimeBike and that they will be meeting with City staff to discuss this possibility. The City has monitored CoGo in the City of Columbus, hoping the program would migrate out of the downtown area to a location closer to Worthington (such as Clintonville) so that Council could re-evaluate investing in the docking stations necessary for this program. The main difference between CoGo and LimeBike is that LimeBike doesn't require docking stations or any monetary investment by the City. There was some discussion about how LimeBike works. Mr. Hurley is coordinating to try and get LimeBike to present to the board and promised to send out a link for the LimeBike website.

Old Worthington Mobility Study Phase 3 & 4 Review: Mr. Hurley said that Engineering and Parks & Recreation staff had met and felt that all of the suggestions made by the board had been addressed in the final documents, but wanted a final board review to see if there were any additional comments. Mrs. Lindholm noted that the documents mislabeled the Worthington Historical Society (they marked the wrong building (see the map on page 8, letter T). Mr. Rist wanted to make sure that the suggestion for paid parking in the downtown area was captured in the funding section (it was- on page 27 under

“Local Funding”). Mrs. Horton was concerned that projects, rated as short term, medium term and long term, weren’t also rated by how close they were to a school. She also said that as the Safe Routes to School project went forward it may affect the project priorities. Mr. Creed pointed out that the comment regarding bus shelters had been changed in one section of text, but not in another section and a bus shelter on the Village Green is shown on the associated graphic. He would prefer the comment go away, but if it needs to stay then prefers it be put in the long term list and re-worded to say monitor or consider. Mrs. Horton suggested that the sidewalk in front of senior living on Hartford that leads to the library should be a priority and moved from the long term to the short term list (page 19, phase 3, zone 5). Other than these few items the board was satisfied with the changes made to the document.

Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan – RFP: Mr. Hurley reviewed the Request for Proposal (RFP) history and process as thus far accomplished by the board. He reminded them that there have been several drafts and urged the board to focus on the process and deliverables rather than everyone trying to write a draft which can quickly become burdensome and will delay the process. Ms. Martin apologized for missing the last two meetings but said that she and Mr. Schmidt had been working together to finalize an RFP. As people who respond to RFP’s on a regular basis, she and Mr. Schmidt agreed with Mr. Hurley and asked the board to focus not on the specific wording but on scope (process), deliverables, and timelines. She also said that way-finding is usually done as a separate entity, which requires its own RFP, and shouldn’t be a part of the Master Plan. There was then some discussion around the draft document handed out by Ms. Martin, including funding (\$50,000 has been set aside by City Council in their Capital Improvement Program) and making sure the RFP reaches competent consultants. Mr. Bates then commented that Mr. Creed had been very vocal at the last meeting regarding the RFP and wondered what his thoughts/concerns were. Mr. Creed shared that he wants to make sure the plan includes enough data collection and fears ending up with a list or plan that is not detailed enough if we aren’t careful in the RFP wording. Mr. Hurley’s suggestion and recommendation is to let Mr. Schmidt, Ms. Martin and Mr. Creed work on this together until the three of them are satisfied and then to let the City add whatever it needs to formalize the RFP. At that point he will send it out for one final review to the board via email, for process and deliverables only. Also realize that the consultant may bring other ideas to the proposal. After some final discussion, including consensus that the board wants the RFP out as early in the year as possible, board members agreed on that process and were ready to move on to the next agenda item.

Since Mr. Whalen had been unable to attend the last board meeting, and the board had skipped the Mission/Vision Statement item on October’s agenda, Mr. Hurley wanted to touch on it at this meeting. Mr. Whalen shared a document he had worked on outlining his ideas for the board vision statement. He’d begun working on this prior to the Master Planning process, but noticed that a Mission/Vision Statement appeared in other Master Plan documents so thought completing this would be timely. He also believes it will be helpful for the public and future board members. He then asked if the other board members agreed and saw a need for this process. Mr. Bates would like to see it posted on the City’s website and believes it helps the public know what the board is about. Consensus was reached among the board that this should be completed and placed on the City’s website. Mr. Whalen would also like to see it included in the Master Plan.

January Planning Session Discussion: Ms. Martin stated that in the past the board has held a planning meeting in early January to prioritize work for the upcoming year. She asked if this was something the board wished to continue this year. Mr. Hurley added that the regular January meeting was when we would be looking for chair nominations and appointments and he had a note from last year to remind everyone in November. Mr. Creed supports the idea of looking for low hanging fruit, since the board will be busy with the Master Plan in 2018, and asked what projects Service might be doing that the board could add to. Mr. Bates likes reviewing what has been accomplished in a

separate meeting that doesn't add to the length of a regular meeting. Mr. Rist also likes the review and asking- did the board accomplish what they had prioritized for the year? Mr. Whalen ideally would like to see the board identify one physical project as part of this year's meeting, something simple such as a trail connection or sidewalk, and he thinks the meeting is a good idea. Ms. Lindholm pushed for safety and programs to be a priority along with, or in addition to, a physical project and also is in favor of the meeting. Mr. Hurley reminded the board that they will be very involved in a big planning process this year, so asked them to carefully think about and assess what else they can reasonably handle and accomplish. The board then chose January 6, 2018 from 8:15 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. as their planning meeting date and time. The location will be emailed out by Ms. Thornton at a later date.

Updates:

1. EEDS Ohio State Student Report – The students have moved on and are no longer able to attend a board meeting. The board decided that the report was best suited to be included as a document for review by whatever consultant completes the Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.