

users. We can be encouraging walking, biking, multimodal and still maintain effective and efficient means of accommodating vehicular traffic, but that needs to be balanced out. This document has more of a focus on bicycles and pedestrians and it provides guidance. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee has said they had trouble prioritizing things and this document helps them to do that. She expressed that she thinks it is a good document and we have had a number of opportunities to review and give input.

Mr. Foust respectfully asked for more time before we adopt this. He got this Thursday night and it is 192 pages with tables and 8-point font. It is a very comprehensive document. He noted the fact that our own Council President asked a question about bicycle boulevards and he is not sure it got answered. ~~He read the description of bicycle boulevards from the topic and explained how these are pretty big wholesale changes from what people have come to expect in the community.~~ He explained how his own street has been tagged as one of those that would be a likely choice for a bicycle boulevard. He read from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan document that bicycle boulevards are slow speed, low volume streets shared by people driving. A target speed of 20 mile per hour is achieved through the use of traffic calming tools such as mini circles, raised tables, short medians, and chicanes. A target speed of 20 miles per hours should be planned, designed, and enforced. These are some pretty big wholesale changes that alter what people have come to expect in the community and he would like to be able to answer when his neighbors ask exactly what it is that we are doing here. He cannot answer that question because he has not had enough time with this. (Amendments made per request by Council member Foust at the June 3, 2019 meeting) He has not had time to fully digest it and it was placed on our laps abruptly.

President Michael read Mr. Smith's submitted comments. She read that he likes the report, but he hopes that Council does not vote on anything because he would like to analyze it before finalizing the approval. He figured we would want to discuss the details first. If Council wanted to wait, he would support that decision.

Mr. Myers said maybe he was negligent when this was last presented, but he does not remember being presented with marquee projects. Mr. Hurley said that was requested in order to identify projects that could be moved upon early on. Mr. Myers asked about the tier classifications. Mr. Hull said they were previously described as mid-term and near term. Mr. Myers said in the last report that Huntley from Worthington-Galena to Dublin is ranked as the 11<sup>th</sup> project and Proprietors from Schrock to Dublin is ranked as the 8<sup>th</sup> project. He asked if the committee looked at the meeting minutes when Council discussed this. His point is that we had a pretty robust discussion and one of the things he was hoping for is that we discussed Proprietors and Huntley and where we should encourage bicycles. What he is reading in the report is in both places. Council had that discussion. Mr. Hull said that the ranking and prioritization was an objective exercise. Mr. Myers said that he is a little gun shy about guidelines because some people are taking them as a bible, and he does not want this to become the bible. He reads the resolution and it could be interpreted as such that this is to guide city staff with their planning. He does not view it as that type of document. It is aspirational and a guideline with examples. In the resolution as written, he is not sure that is what it says.

*Mr. Greeson said that there is language in this plan and the Complete Streets toolkit that expressly says this is not prescriptive. You do not find this is law. Mr. Myers said that the design guidelines and master plan are not law. Mr. Greeson said those documents are also guidance for committees and staff. Mr. Myers reminded that we have a legal appeal pending based upon a violation of the design guidelines, which he believes is not a legal appeal, but that is not a universally held belief. Mr. Greeson said that the fundamental difference with that as opposed to this is that there is a codified ordinance appeal process and while limited in nature speaks to the use of the design guidelines. In this case, there is a conversation about how some communities adopt these, whether that is by ordinance or resolution. With a resolution, it is more often guidance to inform decisions, but not to prescribe them. We have no objection if there is concern about this and we need to spend more time with it. There is not a project that is not going to move forward if this is not voted on tonight.*

*Mr. Myers said those are two distinct discussions about the plan itself and the resolution adopting the plan. For him the issue is the resolution adopting the plan and what it means. This should be just a guideline and tool, not prescriptive. He does not want to build up false hopes. He asked if it is just a guideline, then his objections to specific items are less important. He does not believe there should be any priority of anything going down Huntley Road, he thinks it should be moved to Proprietors. We have semis going down Huntley. If this is just guidance to look at, then those concerns are not as important. Mr. Greeson brought up an example from a couple years ago about a discussion regarding Huntley Road. We backed into Complete Streets discussion. Essentially, the Complete Streets does not prescribe that we apply a specific project, but we can at least explore it and evaluate whether or not it makes sense to include some other users. We are not saying definitely doing something but rather it is more about when faced with a project, we will evaluate whether or not other users need to be accommodated for and if tools in the tool kit need to be applied.*

*Mr. Myers said five years ago this resolution would have been fine, but today it needs a better resolution. These types of things along with sustainability and lifecycle issues should be front of mind thinking. To him that is what this does. He wants to make it abundantly clear that this is a statement of policy and not of directive. He is willing to help draft a resolution that he can get his head around better that specifically details that out. Mr. Greeson said we could do that.*

*Ms. Kowalczyk said that she believes the resolution does what it needs, but if it needs to be worked on more she is on board with that. It is another lens to look at development and street maintenance to make sure we are doing everything we can to accommodate people of all ages, abilities, and all modes of transportation. So yes, she supports taking the time to do so. It is a guide and lens that we can use to evaluate as things come up.*

*President Michael said she agrees with Mr. Myers and expressed how she has seen people looking at guidelines as being more than guidelines. She supports a rewrite of the resolution.*