



WORTHINGTON BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Monday, Oct. 23, 2017 Meeting

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

City Support Staff Darren Hurley (Parks & Recreation Director) and Celia Thornton were also present along with residents Paul Dorothy (179 Kenbrook) and Tony Konecny (196 E. Dublin Granville Rd.). Susan Banbury (114 Glen Dr., Columbus) was also present.

Minutes from the September 21, 2017 meeting were approved with one change, that Grand Rapids (on page 1) be changed to Rapid City.

Mission/Vision (Kelly Whalen): Mr. Bates noted that current Mission/Vision language had been included in the evening's packet. Mr. Whalen had asked that this be included on the agenda prior to realizing he wouldn't be able to attend the meeting. Mr. Whalen believes it is important to finish this process prior to the Master Plan process, for its inclusion in the plan. Since he wasn't able to attend, and there were several other board members missing, the issue was tabled.

Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan – RFP Draft: Ms. Thornton explained that the current draft used the Rapid City format, but that Mr. Creed's verbiage fit nicely into those categories with a few additions from the Rapid City plan and the boards brainstorming list of desired deliverables from the previous meeting. However, Mr. Schmidt had sent an email stating that both Mr. Creed's plan, as well as the Rapid City plan, were too heavy on the evaluation of existing conditions, which have already been done in great detail, especially for the downtown. The plan needs to focus more on creating and selling a vision of the future. Mr. Hurley believed that what Mr. Schmidt was trying to say is that he much prefers getting away from a lot of data collection by the consultants and prefers getting the community involved and engaged through walking audits and other means. He wanted to make sure to give his feedback that he thought this draft was still a little too technical and would prefer a push the other direction. Mr. Bates shared that he also thinks what Mr. Schmidt is saying is that there is also a big money link between how much data we ask for and what the plan will cost. Mrs. Lindholm asked for clarification on whether he was saying we/the community should collect the data or that he already thinks the data exists. Mr. Hurley clarified that he already thinks the data and resources necessary exist, even looking at the list created in the RFP. Mr. Rist doesn't get the sense that we're heavy on data, or asking for that. He believes you need data to back-up your recommendations. Mrs. Lindholm

agreed and believes the data is necessary for credibility. Mrs. Horton said she thinks the document is stating we already have some great data but that the consultant would be responsible for collecting anything that can't be provided. Mr. Creed commented that he is biased towards data, but agrees with what Mr. Schmidt is saying that you can wrap a lot of dollars up in collecting data. He believes in finding a happy medium between what we can afford and in having a solid underpinning for the plan. He does like how Ms. Thornton worded the document by stating that the City was interested in a cost effective approach. This opens it up to a responder doing a technical approach and giving them the freedom to be innovative and make suggestions, especially about what is more important versus less important. Perhaps we could end up with a cafeteria approach where we get some pricing and see what we can afford to do. However, he does think that using existing data you might get good overview plans, but they may not necessarily drill down as deep as we'd like. An example that comes to mind is the last presentation on the downtown Mobility Study and some of the recommendations we saw that didn't make sense and couldn't give data driven reasons why they were made. Ms. Thornton shared points that Mr. Whalen thought needed to be addressed and included with the board. Most of his were that Worthington is landlocked and small, so we're mostly looking to maintain, enhance and replace infrastructure and won't be dealing with building new infrastructure due to expansion. His big point was the Worthington has physical barriers that need to be addressed, such as north/south and east/west freeways, the river, etc. and that consultants should be able to identify best practices for overcoming these boundaries based on other cities experiences. Mr. Hurley also pointed out that he'd mentioned that there should be a very evident end vision, due to our landlocked position. Mr. Rist had a different view of that. Even though Worthington is landlocked you don't know what will change and disagrees that there is an endpoint- he sees short and long term objectives. Mr. Bates agrees with Mr. Rist and sees it as tactical versus strategic. They just wouldn't put it in those terms or use that exact language. Mr. Bates said redevelopment also needs to be addressed- it will change things even though we are landlocked.

Mr. Bates was uncertain how best to approach reviewing the document and collecting comments, especially since so many board members were absent, especially the chair. Mr. Hurley suggested that rather than go through the document page by page, because ultimately it is staff's responsibility to make sure that the document works, that the biggest focus of the board should be to make sure that the process and deliverables that you want are included. What he does know about RFP's is that ultimately the consultant will come back with thoughts/suggestions/changes on how to approach the project, so he doesn't want the board to overdo the wordsmithing of the RFP because the exact semantics aren't as important. View this as a roadmap and make sure all the expectations are there in terms of process and deliverables. He'd prefer we don't get bogged down in every sentence. Mr. Rist stated that he had some comments he'd like to make, especially some clarity around the schedule, which he assumes is tentative. If we follow our pattern and don't meet in December, then when we meet in November we'd need to adopt this RFP, and to him this seemed like a very aggressive schedule. Mr. Hurley said yes, that was the original thought, that tonight the board would get a pretty good review and staff would probably come back with our last draft at the November meeting, but these dates are very tentative. Since the last meeting Mr. Hurley also thought this through from a City standpoint. The funds are likely to be approved at the first December Council meeting. The initial CIP placeholder was the \$50,000 (separate from the regular annual amount allotted) but the board may end up asking for more once it receives an opinion on the final RFP. Since budget is typically approved the at the first December Council meeting it wouldn't be appropriate for this to be out until after that because the money isn't technically there. This probably moves all of these dates, but the goal was to have it on the street by the end of the year. Mr. Rist stated that his opinion is that we should get everyone's input tonight and gather it by email from those who weren't at the meeting and have it all ready to be approved at the November meeting, since we don't typically meet in December. Mr. Hurley concurred that had been his thought process. Mr. Creed had a concern that we hadn't heard any input

from Ms. Martin and he suspects she'd have some valuable insights. Mr. Creed has reservations about hearing from Ms. Martin for the first time and approving it all in one meeting. To him that seems too aggressive. The group consensus was that email feedback prior to the next meeting from everyone would be the best way to proceed. From a policy and process perspective, Mr. Bates feels good about the new version of the draft. It seems to cover the items talked about in the last meeting: community outreach, public meetings, etc. and he's ok with what is written. He then encouraged Mr. Rist to share his comments.

Mr. Rist said on page 2 under "Coordination Meetings with City Staff" (made up of staff from several City departments) Mr. Rist would like to suggest that someone from the board to be at those meetings. Under "Public Engagement" he thinks we need to include someone from the business community in that section. Page 3 "Needs Analysis" he thinks Safe Routes to School needs to be included in that sentence. Page 4 "Vision, Principals, Strategies" Mr. Rist asked if there were some national standards for walkable communities that we should try to achieve. Ms. Thornton said yes, that there were Walk and Bike Friendly Community designations and likes his point that those standards should be considered in creating this Master Plan. She also pointed out that a Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan is necessary to receive those designations. Mr. Hurley said another way to achieve those designations is through adopting Complete Streets and other standards the board has heard Mr. Dorothy speak to. Mr. Rist said on the same page under "Future Locations and Types of Facilities" he thinks there ought to be some sort of reference to transit. Under "Implementation and Funding" he wrote short term versus long term since that's how he thinks about this. Under "Performance Measures" he wrote police enforcement. The only other thing he would add is that by creating this Master Plan the board will also be creating a sense of expectation in the community that these things will happen, and we need to be cautious about making sure it's achievable and giving the community a sense of the long term versus short term achievement. Ms. Thornton said that in talking to Rapid City, SD one of the things they had shared was some frustration from residents that the plan had come out in 2011 and why wasn't everything accomplished yet, though really six years in the life of a city is pretty short when you're looking at getting funding or redoing all of the streets, so she concurred with Mr. Rist's suggestion about managing resident expectations by separating long and short term goals.

Ms. Horton said that she liked that the appendix was bigger than the plan, and that it had some good specific information imbedded in it. She also had a question regarding endpoints (schools, community centers, etc.). Do we identify those or are they identified by the person doing the plan? The point is she wants standards such as every park is accessible by bike or no further than a quarter mile from a trail. Mr. Creed is not sure it should be included in the RFP at this point but should be addressed as they write the plan and would go into the vision and goals. Ms. Horton is not sure they should be deciding those. Mr. Hurley said he sees the board giving them priorities and working with the consultant on that when drafts or presentations come to them. Ms. Horton just wants to make sure it's part of the process. She also wants to make sure that they are paying attention to regional connections and what is occurring in neighboring communities.

Mr. Creed thinks we should call this an RFQ rather than an RFP. It also seems to him that we should have some selection criteria included in the document. Specifically, what are your qualifications and what is your plan for getting it done? He also thinks this should include a selection criteria. Ms. Thornton apologized. In removing some of the legal verbiage, she accidentally removed a sample selection criteria. She will make sure it is included in the next updated draft she emails to the group.

Mr. Creed had a comment regarding public engagement and he didn't see a mention of the schools but thinks that would be an important organization to include. Ms. Thornton agreed to add that along with local businesses in that section.

The board had some discussion around who is included in the stakeholder group and how that was different than a steering committee or City project management team. Mr. Rist voiced concern that the project management team would only contain city staff. Mrs. Lindholm had concerns that with all these different groups there were a lot of people involved, but is concerned that the board wouldn't be as involved or influential as it should be- where are they connected. Mr. Hurley said that to him focus groups and stakeholders are other people in the community that would have a say, whether it's downtown or partners like COTA, advocacy groups (YayBikes), MetroParks, schools, basically other groups that would want to have a say in this plan, not a specially appointed body. What Mr. Rist was suggesting, a group to actually guide and focus the process, would be entirely different. He sees these as two different groups. Mr. Creed thinks there ought to be a steering committee who is meeting fairly regularly with the consultants and is guiding the whole process, where focus groups are one time meetings with groups in the community that you want the consultant to get input from that is specific to their focus. They are valuable but might not be groups that might not come to a public meeting and share information- an example being COTA. Mr. Rist thinks the board could act as a steering committee and maybe just add a few more representatives from the community (schools, businesses, etc.). He thinks we could expand our board to become the steering committee. Mr. Rist doesn't want to get to the end of the plan and then receive criticism that enough people aren't involved or had the chance to give input because then the credibility of the document is lost. Mr. Bates agreed with Mr. Rist. Mrs. Lindholm thinks that the board should be the project management team with city staff. Mr. Hurley said a project management team deals with the logistics of getting the contracts in place, negotiates how they will be paid, when they start work, who is attending what meetings and what kind of presentation are you bringing, etc. Essentially this group facilitates the process. The project management team doesn't make the decisions about what is going to be in the Master Plan, it's simply the coordination of the process. Mr. Hurley then read through the list that the consultants would be on the hook to do (3 Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Board meetings, one Planning Commission work session, 2 City Council Meetings, 2 public meetings, focus group meetings, and additional outreach and engagement) and said the reason to list those is because that will help the consultant set the fee for the work. To Mr. Hurley this is quite a lot of outreach, but it's up to this group if they want to make changes to it and would like to see more meetings we can add them, but there will be a fee for each meeting. Mr. Creed sees a gap between what Mrs. Lindholm and Mr. Hurley are saying. His point is that if the Project Management team is just staff, which is who the consultant will look to for direction. He asked who would be involved and Mr. Hurley said at least himself, as well as staff from Engineering and Planning. Mr. Bates suggested that maybe a board member or two should also be included on the Management Team. Mrs. Lindholm is still feeling that the board is being left out of the process too much. Mr. Rist again suggested that the steering committee be the guiding body that deal with the consultants and that this board, with a few additions, be the steering committee. Mr. Hurley said he's hearing a discrepancy between Mr. Rist and Mr. Creed because Mr. Rist is saying use this body and add to it and Mr. Creed is saying take some representatives from the group and have them join City staff on the Management Team. Mr. Rist said he'd like both. Mr. Hurley pointed out that there are fees for a consultant each time they meet. Mr. Rist says he wants the board to have input into everything. Before the consultant goes out to meet with any stakeholders, for example, the board should give input into what they are presenting. Mrs. Lindholm suggested that at least two members of the board be at Project Management teams, but more could show up if they wanted to. Mr. Bates agreed with that, he also thinks we want the ability to be at project management meetings. Mrs. Horton disagreed. Paid staff has access and should be there, she's not sure advisory board members should be. Mr. Hurley said perhaps for certain meetings, about presentations or engagement with the public are discussed, a few board members could be invited. He's not sure it's appropriate they be at every project management meeting when discussing payments and contracts. Mr. Creed said he's not sure it comes through in the document that we want this to be a very interactive process with the public. What he thinks the board really wants is that after they consultants go meet with stakeholders or hold public

meetings that maybe they come back to this group to talk about what they see, what they're going to do with the information and get some comments from the board and possibly some City staff. Mr. Hurley understands, but in order for one of these plans to be written there are a lot of touchpoints and he isn't sure how feasible it is for this board to come to every meeting. The general approach is usually to get some work done, bring it back to the board for feedback and to get redirected, rather than having the board involved in every step, that can be a challenge and a big cost factor. On top of that, part of his job as staff is to understand what the board wants and to make sure it's clear throughout the process and that your voice is heard even when you aren't there. However, if you want a seat at all of those meetings we can facilitate that just know that there will be additional impact to the planning process. Mr. Bates said if the board was there would they get much chance to give input or vote. Mr. Hurley clarified that staff isn't voting or impacting the plan in these meetings, that is what the board would do when the plans were brought to them during their 3 meetings. Mr. Creed said another way to look at it is that we can outline some of our concerns and make sure the consultant knows we want to be involved and interactive as the plan progresses. Ask the consultant to outline some ways that we can do that at various cost levels.

Mr. Bates recognized Mr. Dorothy who pointed out that on the second to last page under "schedule for proposal" there were some incorrect dates (2017 rather than 2018). He also wanted to caution the group that the best people in the country who do this kind of planning are not here (in Columbus). They are in Chicago and Baltimore. The board needs to keep that in mind and think about alternatives for engagement. For example, rather than flying someone if from Chicago for every meeting, look for Skype conference room options. Also, Worthington isn't on a lot of national firms' radar so what are we doing to make sure that the firms that are the best in the country at doing this will see Worthington's proposal and bid? Otherwise we'll end up with locals and we haven't had great luck with them, we keep getting ODOT style designs. Mr. Creed isn't sure an Alta would be interested. Mr. Dorothy disagrees because they've done so many of these they can leverage past work and put this together more easily than someone starting from scratch. Ms. Thornton voiced her concern that might a consultant from Chicago who doesn't live here or know the area turn out a plan that is too boiler plate and doesn't address our specific concerns. Mr. Dorothy said that in his experience, as long as the committee is strong and advocates for their needs, they will listen because they want to be able to talk about your community as a "win" at a national committee meeting. Mr. Dorothy also expressed that Bike Worthington would like to be involved as an external group if possible.

Mr. Hurley said that we have captured your comments tonight and will go back and incorporate them, along with anything we hear from members not present. Ms. Thornton will send the updated version back out through email for comments. What may call for another meeting is if Ms. Martin or Mr. Schmidt want to take the document in a very different direction. Mr. Bates would like to reiterate that the target to get this approved at the next meeting and out as soon as possible. Mrs. Lindholm would like Mr. Bates to share what he heard at this meeting with Ms. Martin so we're not going in a completely different direction at the next meeting, but if we are, then let us know. Mr. Hurley clarified that within a week another draft with the evenings comments incorporated would go out to the group and, barring some huge discrepancy, a second draft, with Ms. Martin and Mr. Schmidt's input, will go out before our November meeting.

Ms. Horton pointed out that the Rapid City plan was created by Alta (out of Chicago). Ms. Thornton shared that in speaking with their Planning Director they did have to really push for a plan that wasn't cookie cutter but that actually fit their community. They were very unhappy with the initial draft and then Alta was unhappy because they did a lot more work than they felt they were being paid (\$72,000). Mr. Creed says that's exactly what we want, lots of work for less money. Mr. Bates asked for any more comments and then suggested we move on to the updates.

Updates:

1. Complete Streets Update – The City applied for a grant for technical assistance from MORPC on creating a Complete Streets policy. The City was awarded the grant and City Council approved the acceptance of that grant. Mr. Hurley had attended an initial meeting with MORPC and Engineering to outline expectations and his input was that the plan needs to come through this board in both the initial beginning phases and in an approval phase, so those checkpoints are on their radar, though Mr. Hurley doesn't yet have a timeline. He did want to let you know work was underway, especially since this was one of the board's priorities.
2. Old Worthington Mobility Study Follow-up – Staff have received drafts with revisions on the Old Worthington Mobility Study phases three and four. These revisions are based on the feedback provided by the board at their July meeting when DLZ and Burton Planning Services presented the studies. Mr. Hurley inquired whether the board would like to review those at the November meeting and the consensus was yes.
3. EEDS Ohio State Student Report - Mr. Bates indicated he had been in contact with Joanne Dole, with Sustainable Worthington, who he had been working with to try to set up a time for the Ohio State students involved in the way-finding recommendations to come and present their recommendations to the board. Unfortunately, it appears those students are no longer around. Mr. Hurley reminded members staff had distributed the recommendations to the board so they had a copy. He also suggested the recommendations be part of the data available to the consultants during the master planning process. Mr. Hurley shared that the city has way-finding being implemented around town but at this point bike and pedestrian way-finding is not funded.

Mr. Dorothy then shared that Bike Worthington has a plan to sign bike routes in Worthington but their proposal is not to do big, intrusive city signs (that cost a lot so you can't do too many) but rather they are going to add temporary 1¾ inch medallions with color coded arrows to city signposts. The medallions are very unobtrusive, can be added to any signpost and will help bikers follow good bike routes through the city. For example, as you approach an intersection you'd see the medallion on the stop sign signpost with an arrow showing bikers which way go. The medallions can easily be re-stickered for maintenance (medallions are metal covered with UV stickers) and you can possibly do an entire city for \$1,200. The plan is to have several different colored medallions showing different routes. For example the blue route would be for Old Worthington or businesses. Green medallions would lead to trails (Olentangy Trail). The medallions would help lead bikers through the low traffic, low stress neighborhood routes that are great and safe but need signage for riders who don't know the neighborhoods so they don't end up going down dead end roads. The idea came from some signage done in Europe. The next step for Bike Worthington is to finish getting their 501c3 so that they can collect tax deductible donations and then fund this project. Ms. Lindholm asked if this needed City approval. Mr. Dorothy said yes, he would go to the City before putting up the medallions.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.