

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Held _____

_____ 20 _____

Mayor Lecklider called the Monday, May 24, 2010 Regular Meeting of Dublin City Council to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Dublin Municipal Building.

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mayor Lecklider moved to adjourn to executive session at 6:00 p.m. for discussion of personnel matters (to consider the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion, or compensation of public employee or official).

Vice Mayor Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

The meeting was reconvened at 7:05 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mrs. Boring led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Lecklider, Mrs. Boring, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, Mr. Gerber, Mr. Keenan and Mr. Reiner. (Vice Mayor Salay returned to the meeting at 7:45 p.m.)

Staff members present were Mr. Foegler, Ms. Grigsby, Ms. Readler, Mr. McDaniel, Chief Epperson, Mr. Hahn, Mr. Langworthy, Ms. Crandall, Mr. Harding, Mr. Hammersmith, Ms. Puskarcik, Mr. Burns, Ms. Ott, Ms. Cox, Mr. Sweder, Ms. Adkins, and Ms. Gilger.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gerber moved to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2010 Council meeting.

Mr. Keenan seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATIONS

• Outgoing Board and Commission Member Recognition

Council recognized members of boards and commissions who completed service in March of 2010. Present to receive a service award were Robin Campbell, Community Services Advisory Commission; Mindy Carr, Community Services Advisory Commission; and Bridget Dritz, Parks & Recreation Advisory Commission. The board and commission members who could not be present for recognition include: Flite Freimann, Planning & Zoning Commission; Lois Reese, Ken Frazer and Michelle Baker, Parks & Recreation Advisory Commission; Sean Cotter, Board of Zoning Appeals; Pat Costello, Community Services Advisory Commission; and Alice Robinson-Bond, Personnel Board of Review. On behalf of City Council, Mayor Lecklider thanked the outgoing board and commission members for their commitment to the community in volunteering for public service.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence requiring Council action

LEGISLATION

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 19-10

Adopting the Proposed Tax Budget for Fiscal Year 2011.

Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Grigsby stated that the adoption of the municipality's tax budget is required by the Ohio Revised Code. It is then filed with the Delaware and Franklin County Auditors' offices as part of the City's obligations in order to receive local government funds. As part of this process, the City revisits the allocation of its inside millage, currently at 1.75 mills. In the past, 100 percent of the funds were allocated to the Parkland Acquisition Fund. More recently, a portion of the inside millage has been allocated to the Capital Improvements Tax Fund. Last year, as part of the CIP process, the amount allocated to the CIP Tax Fund was increased, and the amount allocated to the Parkland Acquisition Fund was decreased. She reported that an update on income tax revenue collections through April 2010 was also included in the Council packets. This additional information was provided

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 2

Held

20

because of the fact that income tax revenues decreased in 2009. In 2010, the income tax revenues through April have increased over that period in 2009. As a result, the income tax projections for 2010 have been revised to show them as flat -- the same as in 2009 -- rather than the anticipated reduction that was originally programmed in the 2010 Operating Budget.

Mr. Keenan asked if the inside millage rate of 1.75 mills is the actual millage rate or the effective rate.

Ms. Grigsby responded that it is the actual rate. Inside millage is not adjusted.

Mr. Keenan asked if any outside millage is received by the City.

Ms. Grigsby responded that the only outside millage the City receives is from a 1976 Police Operating levy. When originally approved, it was 1.2 mills. Currently, for the residential side, it is slightly less than two-tenths of a mill; the commercial component is three-tenths of a mill.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the June 14 Council meeting.

Ordinance 20-10

Amending Chapter 95 (Nuisances) of the Dublin Codified Ordinances to Address the Storage of Residential Waste and Recycling Containers.

Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Readler stated that the Law Director has prepared this ordinance with the assistance of Mr. Langworthy and Mr. Burns. This ordinance attempts to regulate the location of waste receptacles. A section of the City's existing Code already regulates the duration of time that the containers may be left out; there is also a penalty section. The proposed addition to the Code is in the "Nuisance" chapter. It would require that any trash and recycling containers be stored either indoors or in the rear or side yard and screened by landscaping. Legal staff recommends a delayed effective date, which will allow time for staff to educate the public on the new requirements.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that some citizens have raised concerns about the use of the term "shielded," as it might result in their view of their neighbors' yards becoming that of trash receptacles. Descriptive, clear directions are necessary to clarify the expectations to the residents.

Ms. Readler responded that appropriate opaque examples of landscape screening can be provided during the 90-day education process.

Mr. Reiner stated that requiring a minimum opacity of 95 percent would provide clarification.

Ms. Readler responded that the language would be revised accordingly.

Mayor Lecklider asked if the term "adjoining property" was sufficiently clear, and whether it should be plural. It seems it could include either property to the side or to the rear.

Ms. Readler agreed. Staff will make this revision prior to second reading.

Mrs. Boring asked if the language sufficiently addresses a property where the rear yard faces the street.

Ms. Readler responded that the requirement is that the receptacles be screened from adjoining property owners and from any street.

Mr. Langworthy responded that it does not make any difference where the door is located; it is where the house sits on the lot. For example, a corner lot has two "fronts."

Mayor Lecklider stated that it was his understanding that Council requested a hybrid of the Reynoldsburg and Westerville ordinances. Is the draft ordinance a fair representation of those?

Ms. Readler responded that both ordinances were used as a framework for modeling this section. Those community ordinances also had specific pick up and storage times that were not included in this draft, as Dublin's Code already addresses those components. One of the other community ordinances also permitted screening by a constructed enclosure. However, it was Legal's opinion that it would complicate the process to add

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 3

Held

20

requirements regarding permitted materials and size and a review of the same. A landscape barrier alone seemed more efficient.

Mayor Lecklider invited public testimony.

Bruce Miller, 6189 Dublin Road stated that Council surely must have more important issues to address than a citizen's trash cans. It seems that Dublin is attacking a problem that does not exist. Accordingly to the news article, Dublin has received only six complaints. The unattractive, blue recycling containers were Council's decision. He does not have room in his garage for the huge recycling container and two trash cans. It also is not safe to store a trash can in the garage if there are combustible materials in it, and he occasionally discards cloths with oil or gasoline on them in his trash can. He prefers to leave the trash cans outside. He does not object to screening them outside, but he is not able to screen adequately with shrubbery. He could screen with a wood fence, but Dublin has strict fencing requirements, including a height restriction of 42 inches. The height of the blue recycling containers exceeds 42 inches. A local newspaper article stated that Vice Mayor Salay expressed the opinion that all trash receptacles should be stored in garages, as storage outside doesn't complement Dublin. In that case, there are other more critical situations to address – such as in Waterford Village, where there is a sidewalk in complete disrepair. In summary, his request would be that Council revise the proposed ordinance to permit screening with a fence and that Dublin modify its fencing restrictions to permit fencing tall enough to screen the recycling containers.

Mayor Lecklider clarified that all Council Members – not only Vice Mayor Salay -- were supportive of some measure being enacted.

Mayor Lecklider asked Mr. Burns to comment regarding the combustible materials issue raised.

Mr. Burns responded that Mr. Miller is correct in that oily rags discarded in a trash can do create a fire hazard.

Mayor Lecklider asked what the City advises regarding disposal of combustible items within a trash container and asked him to comment about the color of the recycling containers.

Mr. Burns responded that the City discourages discarding oily rags in trash containers. The City obtained the recycling containers at no cost through a grant program. Blue was the only color available, and at the time, blue was the national standard color for recycling containers.

Mayor Lecklider stated that some residents have commented that the recycling containers do not fit in their garages. What sizes of containers are available?

Mr. Burns responded that the containers are available in 32-gallon, 64-gallon, and 96-gallon sizes; 64-gallon is the standard size.

Mr. Keenan noted that the recycling program has been very successful. The program reduces the amount of trash and therefore reduces the related tipping fees that the City must pay. The residents of Dublin enjoy free trash pick-up, unlike most of the other area municipalities, and the reduced tipping fees help the City maintain that practice.

Mrs. Boring stated that other communities are pursuing similar legislation, and sample legislation from other communities was provided to Council. She does, however, concur with Mr. Miller regarding permitting fencing to screen the trash cans. She would like staff to determine if some type of fencing might be acceptable.

Mr. Gerber responded that this question has been raised in the past regarding other areas. He would recommend that the legislation contemplate all types of housing and all types of neighborhoods.

Mr. Reiner stated that he concurs with staff's current position on this issue. Permitting constructed fencing of a 42" enclosure would require City staff review and oversight. He does not believe adding that option would be a good use of taxpayers' funds.

Mayor Lecklider noted that the reference he made to the Community Survey was that 66 percent of the respondents indicated that residents should be required to store their trash

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 4

Held _____

20 _____

receptacles in a closed structure, such as a garage, when the receptacles are not being set out for collection.

Mrs. Boring asked if there is consensus of Council to have staff look into the use of fencing as a type of screening.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that the proposed legislation does require screening. Ms. Readler noted that the legislation would require "an opaque landscape screening." Presently, there is no provision for any type of constructed enclosure. Mrs. Boring asked if Council is unwilling to consider any type of screening other than landscaping.

Mr. Reiner responded that he does not object, assuming the City is willing to bear the expense of the inspections and ensures that the fencing matches the home. However, this would open up an area of architectural issues that he is not certain the City wants to oversee.

Mrs. Boring responded that some guidelines, such as color, can be provided in the Code. It may be of value to have staff review what other communities have done, and then advise Council if some type of fencing enclosure would work in Dublin. As Mr. Gerber indicated, there may be some cases in which other options are needed.

Mr. Gerber stated that his interpretation of the proposed language is that its intent is to accommodate the various types of neighborhoods and homes.

Ms. Readler responded that is the intent. It is difficult to regulate constructed enclosures and account for the different types of neighborhoods and houses, specifying acceptable materials, size and appearance. The level of detail would make enforcement difficult.

Mr. Gerber stated that if a resident does not want to store the trash receptacles inside the garage, they can be stored outside and screened with landscaping. That would be in compliance with this ordinance.

Ms. Readler added that it must be opaque screening. Clarification of "opaque screening" can be made by providing examples during the public education period. The wording will be revised to indicate 95 percent opacity, as Mr. Reiner has suggested.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that the proposed ordinance will permit residents with garages too small to store their trash containers inside to store them outside, in the rear or side yard, and screen them with natural elements versus wood or brick.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the June 14th Council meeting.

Ordinance 21-10

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Quality Supply Chain Co-Op, Inc., to Induce It to Locate Its Main Office and Associated Operations and Workforce within the City, and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement.

Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Gilger stated that Quality Supply Chain Co-op (QSCC) is a spin-out company of Wendy's. They are housed temporarily at Wendy's headquarters until a decision regarding their location is made. The State of Ohio has approved a job creation tax credit for this company. The proposed incentive is contingent upon their execution of a five-year lease with Wendy's. They must also retain the current 20 employees hired from Wendy's and create 24 additional jobs. The proposal includes a four-year, 20 percent performance incentive that is capped, as well as a \$5,000 location grant to assist with setting up their offices. Physical separation from Wendy's is necessary, so some construction will be required.

There were no questions.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the June 14 Council meeting.

Ordinance 22-10

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Inventrio, LLC to Induce It to Locate Its Main Office and Associated Operations and Workforce within the City, and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 5

Held

20

Mr. Reiner introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Gilger stated that Inventrio is considering office space in Metro Center, as well as other locations along I-270. They have been acquired by a California company, Venture Capital, and they will spin off from the University Medical Center. Inventrio is a software development company. One of their largest clients is the National Cancer Institute. They conduct software development that makes medical information secure and makes it possible to cross multiple platforms at different types of hospitals, reading each other's computer systems. In consideration for executing a five-year lease in Dublin and creating 20 jobs, the agreement will provide a three-year, 10 percent performance incentive, capped at \$22,500 for the term of the agreement. The company would have to reach predetermined annual withholdings targets to qualify for performance incentives. The City estimates it will pay Inventrio approximately \$12,000 in incentives and net approximately \$108,000 in withholdings.

There were no questions.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the June 14 Council meeting.

OTHER

• Recommendation re. Dublin Road Water Tower Site

Mr. Hammersmith stated that this is a continuation of the discussion regarding a site for the Dublin Road water tower, a half-million gallon, single pedestal spheroid, identified in the 2007 Dublin Community Plan. At their May 10th meeting, Council provided direction not to fly the location balloon, but instead to post electronic photo renderings of the recommended site at the City's web site. The photos posted are of Site 5, Location B, which is on the Muirfield Village Golf Club property, south of the Bogey Inn, near an existing cell tower. Council also directed staff to reach out to the Village of Shawnee Hills officials and discuss with them their concerns with the proposed site. He and Ms. Cox met with Mayor Monahan and Shawnee Hills Village Administrator Ed Swanson on May 14 and toured the site. Shawnee Hills' request was that Dublin consider a site approximately 1,000 feet to the south, based on the visual impact to Shawnee Hills and the view looking west from the Riverside Drive/Glick Road intersection. Staff subsequently identified an alternate site -- Site 5, Location D on the Muirfield Village Golf Club parking lot. However, this site appears to be a fill site and therefore staff continues to recommend Site 5, Location B, due to three factors: (1) fewer houses within a 50-foot radius would be impacted; (2) the property owner has indicated an unwillingness to sell Site B and is willing to sell Site D; (3) the geotechnical conditions, as Site D was essentially a sink hole that has been filled in over the years. If Site D should be considered further, additional exploration at that location would be necessary.

Ms. Cox recapped the project information. Sites A, B, and C on the map are sites on the Muirfield Village Golf Club parking lot, which were previously considered. Site B is staff's recommendation. Site D is the location suggested by the Village of Shawnee Hills in a recent meeting. Shawnee Hills has asked the City of Dublin to (1) move the water tank site to the south 1,000 feet, and (2) provide information about what would visually be on the water tower.

Accordingly, staff has evaluated the site, looking at a 1,000-foot radius of the site. Site D is further south, so approximately 23 additional homes were included. The red pin dots on the map are the vantage points from which the photos of the sites were taken. The trees on Site D are not thriving, potentially due to fill material. There is a great deal of loose rock and voids in the ground surface, which can indicate a sink hole in the area. Both Sites B and D would alleviate the system deficiencies. The costs would be nearly equal, although a formal cost estimate for Site D was not conducted. The estimated project cost is \$2,676,000. Staff's recommendation continues to be Site B. She noted that, typically, three shamrocks are painted on water towers, but the visual details have not yet been determined.

Mayor Lecklider invited public testimony.

Patrick C. Monahan, Mayor, Village of Shawnee Hills, 40 W. Reindeer, stated that the Village Council suspended their meeting tonight in order to attend Dublin's Council meeting. Accompanying him tonight is Council president Yvonne Clippinger; Council

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 6

Held

20

Members Jim Gauldin, Charles Callender, and Kris Garren; Village Administrator Ed Swanson; and Village patriarch, Warren Miller. They are here as the concerned neighbor to the north to discuss Dublin's proposed water tower. The Village of Shawnee Hills works with the City of Dublin annually during the Memorial Tournament, relaxing its noise ordinances, and accommodating the Tournament traffic flow. Although Dublin may not be aware, the Tournament impacts Shawnee Hills businesses, as few people travel north during the Tournament. The two communities also celebrate history, as Shawnee Hills officials helped break ground for the Veterans Park and participated in the dedication. However, Shawnee Hills was not notified of Dublin's consideration of this site for an additional water tower. After learning of the proposed site, they invited themselves to the public hearing. On May 14th, they met with Mr. Hammersmith and Ms. Cox. They toured the site and discovered it was much worse than anticipated. It is next to the Oxford School, which is located in Shawnee Hills. Site B is just 100 feet from their border, which they consider an affront to Shawnee Hills. Why should Shawnee Hills have a water tower in this location that does not serve them? In addition, the approach traveling west to the O'Shaughnessy Dam is one of the most attractive sites in all of central Ohio. Concord Township should never have permitted the albatross of a cell tower to be constructed in this location. This water tower would rate as a second albatross to the area, spoiling its appearance. Mr. Hammersmith has indicated to them that it does not matter where the water tower is sited within the Muirfield Golf Club parking lot, and that it is Council's decision where to locate it.

As they have already communicated to Dublin, Shawnee Hills does not want this water tower on their border, nor further destroying the view across the dam. They do understand the need Dublin has for a water system improvement. The Village of Shawnee Hills respectfully requests that Dublin City Council move the water tower 500 feet south on the Tournament parking lot site, against the eastern tree line. They would also prefer the name "Dublin" not be affixed to the tower. At their last meeting, their Village Council unanimously approved a motion to make a formal request to Dublin City Council not to approve Site B, and to instead approve Site D. If Council wants to move Site D off the sinkhole, they should do so.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked staff if the response from Muirfield Village Golf Club was that they are not interested in selling Site D to the City. She understands that, as it would break up their property more significantly. However, did the Golf Club suggest an alternative site that would meet Dublin and Shawnee Hills' needs?

Mr. Hammersmith stated that Mr. Kennebeck, General Manager for Muirfield Village Golf Club, responded to the email request sent by Ms. Cox that the Golf Club has no interest in considering Site D; Site B was the only site they would consider at this time. However, staff did not meet with them personally to discuss possible alternatives. They could do so, if Council would like. The Golf Club's interests are in minimizing the impact on their current parking needs and potential future development.

Ms. Cox added that staff did have an earlier discussion with the Golf Club about Sites A, B and C. They selected Site B because it is in an area in which no parking occurs.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that the Golf Club's interest would be in protecting the total property for potential future use.

Mr. Keenan asked if the City's acquisition of their property could cause potential damage to the residual parcel.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that is correct. One of the challenges with Site D is that it is anticipated the City would desire to own the property on which the water tower would be constructed; it would not a matter of securing only an easement. This would include ownership of access to Dublin Road or another public roadway. City acquisition of Site D would segment the Golf Club property into two parcels. There is a possibility the City could acquire a cross access easement, but staff did not investigate that possibility as they anticipated ownership of a complete parcel.

Mr. Keenan stated that he appreciates Mayor Monahan and the Shawnee Hills Council attending this meeting to provide their input. He acknowledged that Dublin's communication with Shawnee Hills should have been more thorough. He noted that during his 20 year service as a Washington Township trustee, the township placed four fire stations within the Dublin area. Each placement involved a contentious process with some property owners. After the stations were constructed and the controversy subsided,

May 24, 2010

Page 7

Held

20

the locations were not an issue. These are not easy decisions, but Council must make them for the good of the entire community.

Vice Mayor Salay concurred with Mr. Keenan's comments. Council considered other sites as well as a site on Memorial Drive, and the selection has narrowed to this general area. Site D gives her more concern. Council did consider the southern corner of the parking lot site, but it would be in the back yard of the adjacent homeowners.

Mr. Reiner stated that Council directed the City Engineering staff to identify the best site in order to make a non-political recommendation. He has observed the public process through several meetings. He applauds the Muirfield residents who will have this tower close to their backyards, yet have accepted this as being in the best interest of the community. In looking at the view shed from S.R. 745, aesthetically, it makes the most sense to place the tower on Site B. The City has invested a good deal of money to investigate many other potential sites, and the choice has finally narrowed to this site.

Mr. Reiner moved to accept staff's recommendation of Site 5, location B for the water tower placement.

Mr. Gerber seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

Dublin Road South Bikepath Preliminary Alignment

Mr. Hammersmith stated that this segment of the Dublin Road South bikepath between Tuttle Road and Historic Dublin is programmed in the Five Year Capital Improvements Program – for design in 2009, construction in 2012 and final landscaping in 2013. The preliminary engineering for both this bikepath and the Brand Road bikepath was initiated last year to identify an alignment in order to determine some of the initial impacts to adjoining properties. The process calls for staff to then discuss the proposed alignment with the public to solicit public input and provide a report to Council before proceeding to the final design stage. Regarding the Dublin Road South bikepath, a public meeting was held on November 19, 2009 at Thomas Elementary, attended by 35 residents. Those in attendance were provided with a map of their property and the location of the bikepath in relationship to it. Subsequent to the meeting, a direct mailing with exhibits was sent to the property owners who had not attended, requesting their feedback. Over the last few months, the City has received some feedback, and a revised report has been prepared. On May 12th, the Bicycle Advisory Task Force reviewed the alignment and viewed it as a favorable facility.

Mr. Sweder, Civil Engineer stated that subsequent to the public meeting, public comments have been received. Staff anticipates finishing final design in 2010, which will permit the City to begin easement acquisition in 2011, followed by utility location, construction in 2012, and final landscaping. The project will begin at Tuttle Road and proceed north. He reviewed the map of the various segments of this bikeway. In the preliminary alignment, the bikepath was pushed further away from Dublin Road and closer to the homes. The intent was to avoid conflicts with some of the landscaping and trees. This was the area of most concern to the residents. They did not necessarily object to the bikepath, but to its proposed location and asked that the bikepath be pushed closer to the road and further from their homes. Moving north, the alignment encounters difficulty in locations where there are water courses, and decisions have not yet been made regarding the resolution of those issues. It will be possible to keep most of the bikepath within existing right-of-way. Other constraints include the Historic Dublin walls and existing utility poles. In this area, the bikepath path would run in the public right-of-way, but it is inside the walls, on the residents' side, to avoid impact to the utility poles and the historic walls. The bikepath ends at the existing brick sidewalk at the southern end of Historic Dublin.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the challenge is to weave this project in with all the existing items – trees, sanitary sewers, waterlines, utility poles, stone walls, other landscaping and existing driveways. Therefore, there will be some adjustments in the final design. In the area adjacent to Llewellyn Farms, the residents asked that the bikepath be placed on the east side of the road, but the existing trees do not allow for that placement. The only alternative would be to temporarily remove the existing trees, install the path in their place, and then replant the trees on the west side of the path.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 8

Held

20

Mr. Sweder then displayed a map with an overlay of the preliminary alignment on an aerial view, and reviewed some of the challenges at different locations. He summarized that most of the 46 responses received from residents have been positive, and the Bicycle Advisory Task Force endorses this alignment along the west side of Dublin Road.

Mr. Hammersmith noted that as the final design stage proceeds, staff will continue to seek public input and address residents' concerns, where physically possible.

Mayor Lecklider invited Council Members to comment.

Mr. Reiner stated that he appreciates the intent to preserve the stone walls. He believes the aesthetic impact of this alignment would be minimal and most of the trees would be preserved. He asked if an estimate of the project cost has been developed.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that there is an amount programmed in the CIP, but no updated estimate on the current alignment has been developed. That will occur during the final design stage.

Mr. Reiner inquired if this would be an asphalt path.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that it will be an 8-foot wide asphalt path.

Mr. Keenan asked what funding is programmed in the CIP for this project.

Ms. Grigsby responded that the estimated project cost is \$1.1 million in 2012-2013.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that this will provide the citizens who live in the area the opportunity to walk or ride their bikes. She has observed many pedestrians walking in the street along Dublin Road, which is a safety concern. The stone walls are a significant element in the Historic District, and their preservation is critical.

Mr. Keenan stated that this bikepath will serve many citizens in the Llewellyn – Tuttle area, allowing them easy access to the Historic District.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that she attended the public meeting. In the southern portion where there is a conflict with the ditches, trees and path – are those ash trees?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that he will work with Forestry to find out.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that regarding the stone fences, many homeowners have asked that the bikepath be located on the street side of the fence. There was discussion about relocating portions of the fence to make that possible in certain areas. What was the result of staff's research? As that was not part of staff's recommendation, was it determined not to be feasible?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that it is not necessarily a bad concept. It is something that staff prefers to address in the detailed design stage. However, if the path were to run on the outside of the wall on one property, it would have to be the same on the next. It would also depend upon the grade. He is not overly optimistic that it is feasible, but staff will review this. It would be more realistic to replicate the walls than to move and reuse the same stone. But the walls would lose some of their character in this process.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that there are large setbacks for most of the homes along Dublin Road, but between Hertford and Rings Roads, there is a historic home and another home that are very close to the road. Those homeowners are very upset, as a path would essentially be right next to their homes. Will staff consider all other options within reason?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff will determine if there is the opportunity to place landscape material between the path and their home to provide screening and protect their view.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that another issue is with bikepath crossings where there are waterways.

Mr. Gerber stated that the report was well done. There are many residents who are looking forward to the bikepath, but some others have concerns. He is pleased that staff will make an effort to work with them.

Mayor Lecklider invited public testimony.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 9

Held

20

Joan Wernz, 5707 Dublin Road stated that she lives in the 1840 historic Llewellyn farmhouse. She inquired if any Council members have a bikepath in front of their homes. Mr. Keenan indicated that there is a path in front of his home.

Ms. Wernz inquired how long it has existed and the width of the path.

Mr. Keenan responded that it has been in place since 1993. It is the traditional width of path.

Mr. Hammersmith stated it is likely eight feet wide.

Ms. Wernz stated that her neighbor measured a bikepath in a northern area of Dublin, and it was four feet wide.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the Dublin Road South bikepath would be the standard width of eight feet. That information was shared with those who attended the public meeting.

Ms. Wernz responded that she was aware that it had, but the question was also asked if the bikepath could be modified to four feet, consistent with some areas of the City. Their house sits very close to the road, and this bikepath will take up all the available space.

They have lived in their home for 28 years and never anticipated this occurring. They would greatly prefer the more narrow bikepath, as exists in northern Dublin. An eight-foot bikepath seems unnecessarily wide. She thanked Council for their consideration.

Nan Newcomb, 5617 Dublin Road stated that their concern is with the safety of the path.

In the past, the speed limit in this area was 25 mph, but a few years ago, it was increased to 35 mph. In their opinion, if a bikepath will be installed in this area, the speed limit should be lowered to 25 mph. They observe many speeders on the road, all traveling well over 35 mph.

Linda Stephens, 6015 Dublin Road stated that the grade on Dublin Road rises and the road curves at their property. Traveling south on Dublin Road, they have limited time to make the turn into their driveway. With the grade change, the curve and the stone fence, they have limited visibility. Now, they will also have to worry about a biker being hidden behind the stone fence. All this presents a serious safety issue. They have lived in their home for 28 years, and one of the reasons they purchased the property is because of its historical stone fence. They have repaired the fence throughout the years; Dublin does not do so. On the property to the south, the fence has deteriorated, and the City does nothing about it. The stone fences are very fragile. As the construction workers move their equipment around them, the stone fences may collapse.

Harold Jenkins, 5545 Dublin Road stated that their comments to the City were characterized in the summary provided by staff as "supportive" of the bikepath. He would like to correct that. What they had indicated was that in its proposed alignment, they are entirely opposed to this bikepath. However, if the bikepath were to be moved next to the road, they would be completely supportive of it. There is a ditch in their front yard that is difficult to mow and very difficult to maintain. It serves as a trash collector for those driving along the road, and he must then remove the trash. If the City were to fill in the ditch and install the bikepath by the road, the situation would be improved, and he would be supportive. The proposed alignment of the bikepath cuts right through their yard. They have five grandchildren who will no longer be able to use their yard to that point. Pedestrians and their dogs will also be crossing their yard on the bike path, leaving behind debris. He requests that the City fill in the ravine and run the path between the road and the tree line, versus through the middle of his yard.

Mr. Gerber stated that there is a long stretch of land where there is the road, then a ravine, then the tree line, then lawn and homes. Could the bikepath be moved closer to the road in those areas?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that during detailed design, that area will be evaluated to assess the feasibility of moving the bikepath toward the roadway.

Mr. Gerber stated that doing so would address two issues: (1) the City will have a bikepath; and (2) a steep ravine will be eliminated, which presents a safety issue for vehicles in that area.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the alternatives will be considered, which could mean that some trees will have to be removed.

Vice Mayor Salay asked how the stormwater system would be addressed in this location.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 10

Held

20

Mr. Hammersmith responded that an enclosed system could be installed, which would increase the cost of the project.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that would resolve a couple of problems for the residents.

Mr. Gerber asked if another public meeting for residents would be scheduled when the final design is ready, or would that public meeting take place at Council.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that staff would work with individual property owners during the detailed design stage. Another public involvement meeting will be held before the detailed design has been completed, in order to receive public input. Important information for the design comes from discussions with the public. At that point, the final design will be completed and scheduled for review at a Council meeting.

Bruce Miller, 6189 Dublin Road asked who would be responsible for snow removal from the bikepath.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that the City would do so.

Mr. Miller responded that one of the City engineers indicated that the four-foot paths in the northern portion of the City are owned by Muirfield and maintained by them, not by the City of Dublin.

Mrs. Boring responded that the ownership depends on which side of the fence the paths are located.

Mr. Miller noted that those paths are not eight feet wide. He added that along Dublin Road South there is a serious speeding problem, which they have been trying to address since 1995. He has clocked traffic at speeds from 45 to 60 mph. This will present a hazard to pedestrians and bikers.

Cindy Tawney, 20 Longview Drive stated that her home is at the corner of Dublin Road and Longview Drive. She has lived there for 23 years. She bought this home because of the uniqueness of the property and the environment of all of Dublin Road with large trees. What the City is proposing for this part of the community will destroy the very features for which the homeowners purchased their homes - the large trees, the privacy and the mature landscaping. Most of the property owners along Dublin Road spend a tremendous amount of time caring for their yards. City staff's perception of community support at the previous public meeting is not accurate. Most of the property owners along Dublin Road South do not want a bikepath through their front yards. She regrets that she did not take the time to send her input earlier to Council members. As a professional realtor for 21 years, she believes that this bikepath will impact the property value of all of these homes. Future buyers will not want to buy homes that have a bikepath through their front yards, particularly those homes where the bikepath is on private property. City Council will be depreciating the value of their homes, which means depreciating the property value of the City of Dublin for a bikepath that probably will likely not be used by many. She is privileged to have the historical stone fence on her property and treasures it. She has a privacy screen on both sides of the stone fence purely to buffer the noise and add privacy and safety from Dublin Road. She was told at the public meeting that all of her screening on the road side of the fence would be removed with this project. It is impossible to replace 15-foot screening. She has been through this type of situation with the City of Dublin before; the City removed all of her screening with the sewer project. There is also a safety issue. She does not want to have to see everyone who travels up and down the street, and she does not want to have to clean up after them. The speed of traffic on Dublin Road creates a safety hazard when cutting grass on her property. If the City wants to install a bikepath in this location, it will be essential to enforce the speed limit. She has considered selling her house before this project begins because she is so opposed to it. She knows that there are other property owners who feel the same.

Neil Owens, 5521 Dublin Road, stated that the report indicates "no response received" for his address. However, they did send their comments to the City, and they were favorable. They like to walk and bike, and believe this bikepath would create connectivity within the neighborhood that could be useful. However, they have now heard their neighbors' concerns about privacy and screening. He recommends that there be close interaction with the residents relative to issues of screening and other matters that impact the properties. In addition, the issue of speeding has been raised. This really is an issue of concern for Dublin Road, whether one is cutting grass along the ditch or walking along the road. He asks that Council reconsider the speed limits along Dublin Road in view of the

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 11

Held

20

safety concerns involving the speed of traffic, the access, and limited size and width of the road. What is the process by which the engineering design for the bikepath proceeds and the interaction with the neighbors occurs? If meetings are scheduled too far apart, many decisions are made before valuable public input is received. Many valuable suggestions were made tonight. He believes the City could benefit from the input of the neighbors, and vice versa.

Mayor Lecklider stated that his understanding is that the proposed alignment could still be modified. Is the proposed alignment entirely within the City's right-of-way?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that the majority of it is within the City's right-of-way. Some of the proposed bikepath is outside the City's corporation limit and within Washington Township. Therefore, it will be necessary to obtain a right-of-way permit from the Franklin County Engineer's office and to have Franklin County sign off on the plans. Within Dublin, bikepath easements will be necessary for the portions of the bikepath that are not within the City's right-of-way. For example, the southern portion of the bikepath near Llewellyn Farms is currently outside of the right-of-way. If it is possible to move it closer to the road, the path will be within the right-of-way. Regardless of whether the bikepath is within right-of-way or whether easements from the property owners must be obtained, the City will work with the residents in an interactive manner during the final design process. An effort will be made to address their concerns and minimize the impact to their properties.

Mayor Lecklider requested clarification of the width of the bikepath.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that there were two comments at the public meeting regarding the bikepath width along Dublin Road North. Just south of Glick Road, there is a four or five-foot wide bikepath, but it is part of Muirfield's private bikepath system, which Muirfield also maintains. In the vicinity of Bailey Elementary School there is a path on the east side of Dublin Road. It is a four-foot path, installed by the developer, which served the Donegal Cliffs and Amberleigh subdivisions prior to the construction of the remainder of the Dublin Road North bikepath system. All of the Dublin Road bikepath system installed by the City is eight feet wide – from the Historic District to Glick Road, with the exception of this one area. He believes the intent is that when that particular area needs repair or significant improvement, the City will consider the possibility of widening it to eight feet.

Mayor Lecklider requested that staff comment on the City's intent regarding maintaining the integrity of the historic stone fence.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that as part of the final design process, the stone walls will be evaluated. The City successfully constructed around the stone walls on the northern section of the Dublin Road bikepath, and the walls were not negatively impacted. This project does not involve an enormous amount of construction. Typically, it requires grading, cutting the path, placing the stone, compacting it and topping with asphalt. Where there are significant grade changes, embankment material will be brought in to build up the area. However, the latter cannot occur adjacent to an existing wall, because the ground level would be changed.

Mayor Lecklider requested that he respond to the safety issue, specifically the conflicts with the bikepath, driveways and stone walls that provide separation.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that safety was also a concern expressed during the Dublin Road North bikepath project. The speed limit in that portion is 45 mph and the traffic volume is higher than on Dublin Road South. However, there have been no pedestrian or bicycle accidents. Much of this is due to the fact that the City tries to maintain high visibility on the path. Regarding the speed limit on Dublin Road South, several years ago, the City worked with Franklin County Engineers to achieve a consistent speed limit on this area, in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code. The 25 mph speed limit was not in conformance with the ORC. A speed study was conducted, and 35 mph was determined to be the appropriate speed for that segment of roadway. A report was provided to Council at that time, which can be updated at this point in time. He noted that in Stealth Stats surveys of the current speeds, they fall within the 85th percentile of the 35 mph speed limit. There were a few incidents of 45-50 mph, but not because of a road issue. It is a behavioral issue, and therefore an enforcement issue.

Mr. Gerber noted that he lives nearby and can attest that the average speed is closer to 50 mph. He would like this to be evaluated again. On the northern portion of Dublin Road, there are more neighborhood entranceways, but on Dublin Road South, the curb cuts are primarily driveways. From that standpoint, a lower speed limit is desired.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 12

Held

20

Mr. Hammersmith responded that there are three components in a speed study -- 85th percentile speed, the location of access points, and the geometrics of the roadway itself. All three components were evaluated on Dublin Road and staff will update the report for Council.

Vice Mayor Salay responded that it would be helpful to conduct Stealth Stats again along this section of roadway and determine whether the speeds are closer to 35 mph or 50 mph. Prior to the establishment of a uniform 35 mph speed limit on Dublin Road, there were varying speed limits along the road, which was problematic for the drivers and for the police enforcement of speeds.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the variances made the speeds essentially unenforceable. Vice Mayor Salay stated that near Karrer Place, however, the setbacks decrease and homes are much closer to the road. There is more of a residential feel as one is entering the area from the south. However, the speed limit continues to be 35 mph in this location. She would expect the 25 mph speed limit to begin further to the south.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that the beginning point for the 25 mph speed limit remains unchanged from where it was before the previous speed study. That area was not included in the evaluation. The Historic District begins north of that point.

Vice Mayor Salay pointed out that this is an area in which homes physically sit close to the road.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that an evaluation can be conducted of this section.

Vice Mayor Salay responded that would be useful, as well as the speed study to verify current average speeds. She added that she has biked often on the City bikepaths this spring and noticed markers on the bikepath that indicate "Stop" or "Caution" to notify the user of a blind spot or conflict point approaching. Perhaps similar signage could be added in this area.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that if a situation warrants, that type of warning device would be added.

Mrs. Boring stated that she also would like to have the Stealth Stats conducted again. The Police also maintain accident reports for the area, and this information would be helpful.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that Engineering maintains a three-year accident history. The information is obtained from Police. He would be glad to include that data.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented regarding the public testimony provide tonight. She appreciates the fact that 25-30 years ago, when people purchased property on Dublin Road, Dublin was a very rural community and a village. As a city, Dublin today has a bikepath system throughout the community. This is a feature that differentiates Dublin from other communities. As Dublin developed, bikepath and pedestrian paths were a priority for the community and are extensively used today. There have been many citizens in the southern portion of the community request similar paths for their portion of the community to enable them to walk to the Historic District. Dublin is a different community today than 28 years ago. Statistics indicate the trend for a focus on health, including public bikepaths and pedestrian paths. She does not believe this bikepath will negatively impact the community. Many people locating in Dublin indicate that safe, public outdoor access is an attractive feature. It will likely be a selling point in the future for this area, as the remainder of the community enjoys this amenity.

Vice Mayor Salay stated the community surveys consistently indicate the residents' desire for greater bikepath and pedestrian path connectivity.

Mayor Lecklider thanked the public for their comments. The City Engineer has indicated that the traffic speed on Dublin Road South will be re-evaluated. The Police Chief is also present tonight, and has noted the public's comments regarding speeding in this area.

Vice Mayor Salay moved to direct staff to proceed with the final design of a multi-use path along the west side of Dublin Road from Tuttle Road to Karrer Place, evaluating the option for placing the path on the street side of the stone fence, working with property owners to address landscape and view concerns, to conduct Stealth Stats and revisit the speed limit on Dublin Road South, and to provide a report to Council.

Mr. Gerber seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Foegler reported that:

1. Senate Bill 110 was passed in the Ohio Senate with protective language for communities such as Dublin. It will likely be voted on by the Ohio House this week. SB 110 provides updated rules for onsite household sewage treatment systems. The House Speaker's goal is to bring the bill for a vote before the session ends in June. The City of Dublin was successful in lobbying the Senate to add grandfathering language to the bill. The most recent communication Dublin received indicates the bill may come out of committee as early as Wednesday and move immediately to the House floor. The City is monitoring the issue closely and will keep Council informed.
2. Staff is working to schedule the next Bridge Street Corridor public meeting, with a tentative date of Monday, June 21. Staff will be contacting Council members and others to confirm the best date. More information on that event, including location and status, will be forthcoming before Council's next regular meeting.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS/COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE

Mr. Keenan:

1. Clarified that in regard to the earlier discussion regarding the speed limit on Dublin Road South, Council's intent is to have staff revisit the Stealth Stats on that portion and provide a report to Council on the Dublin Road South speed limit.
2. Noted a traffic issue on Coffman Park Drive, which is the access from Coffman Road/Emerald Parkway to the Community Recreation Center and then to Post Road. There is a large volume of traffic moving through this intersection, and the traffic light timing for one movement is approximately four seconds. In addition, the speed limit on Coffman Park Drive is 15 or 20 mph, but vehicle speeds are closer to 35 mph. The corporate community has found that connection to the west. He would like to see some Stealth Stats and perhaps a traffic count done for Coffman Park Drive.

Mr. Reiner:

1. Referred to the staff memo regarding a potential Code amendment concerning cisterns. In his review of the general proposals for future legislation, he believes that an above-ground cistern would not be a feasible option for Council due to the aesthetics. He is unsure of the City's position concerning underground cisterns, but he believes these are the trend for the future. What is staff's intent regarding proposed legislation?

Ms. Adkins responded that it is dependent upon Council's direction. Staff would prefer to clarify the existing language, which is not clearly defined. There seems to be a growing interest in community partnerships looking for funding. The Columbus program consisted of rain barrels donated by a company. Staff is interested in seeking similar corporate sponsorships.

Mr. Reiner stated that, in his opinion, there are some rain barrels that are aesthetically appealing, and others that are not. The language of the ordinance should be sensitive to the need for aesthetics. In regard to cisterns, above-ground cisterns would not be acceptable; however, underground cisterns would require appropriate regulation. The trend in this direction is rapid, so there is a need for legislation to be drafted as soon as possible.

2. Appreciated the staff update regarding bicycle racks. Some of the pre-made sculpturally-inventive bicycle racks were attractive.

Mayor Lecklider asked if staff is seeking more feedback from Council concerning cisterns, or whether the report was informational only.

Ms. Adkins responded that Council's direction that they are not supportive of above-ground cisterns would be helpful. Staff can then move forward on drafting legislation to regulate below-ground cisterns.

It was the consensus of Council to have staff move forward on drafting legislation to regulate below-ground cisterns.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 14

Held _____

20 _____

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher:

1. Stated that she found the report on bicycle racks and art very intriguing. She is definitely more supportive of \$2,500 bike racks versus \$42,000 bike racks! But her questions relate to the process. She believes this is a Parks and Recreation responsibility and that the Arts Council would not need to be involved. She recommends this project be housed within the City's decision-making process. A few years ago, Council supported a goal of ensuring that retail stores had the opportunity for bike racks. She views the goal as having bike racks, which secondarily can be physically interesting in appearance – not having artwork that serves as a bike rack.

Vice Mayor Salay concurred, and noted that she believes Dublin Arts Council would agree.

Mr. Reiner noted that this matter should be discussed by the Bicycle Advisory Task Force members. They have previously discussed two-point connectivity and the need to carefully review how the racks are constructed to ensure that bicycles are not later stolen. It has to first be a functional bike rack that has an artistic appearance.

2. Stated that she and Mr. Foegler attended the May 13th MORPC board meeting. She will place the materials from meeting in Council's conference room.
3. Congratulated Ms. DiSalvo and Ms. LeRoy on the great fundraising efforts to date to support the Dublin Irish Festival.
4. Asked if the Bridge Street Corridor public meeting will be the first opportunity for Council Members to hear the recommendations.

Mr. Foegler responded that this presentation is the conclusion of the phase 2 piece. Staff will need to poll Council members regarding availability for a June 21st meeting. This is not the formal plan recommendations. The effort at this time is to identify the principals that will guide the plan and illustrative examples of those. There will be a level of detail for both the public discussion and Council's discussion. Then the moving forward process between Council, the consultants and the other stakeholders must be identified. Materials related to the public presentation will be provided to Council a week in advance of the public meeting. Essentially, this is a "policy and principles" guidebook, including graphics, for the plan.

5. Asked when Council would receive the goal-setting report and recommendations.

Mr. Foegler responded that staff has been refining the final goals drafted at the conclusion of the retreat. There were also some economic development goals for which Council expressed a desire to have more opportunities for discussion before finalizing – such as the library. A work session to advance and refine that goal and begin to consider some preliminary implementation strategies would be helpful.

Vice Mayor Salay added that it would be helpful for Council Members to have a copy of the draft report, which contains the text regarding the goals as discussed late in the goal-setting session.

Mr. Foegler noted that staff will distribute the full consultant report to Council.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that she discussed with Ms. Ott some minor modifications to the draft report.

Mr. Foegler commented that the economic development goal did need some further work on language.

Vice Mayor Salay stated that this information would be helpful for Council to have prior to a study session. What is the timeframe staff is anticipating for this?

Mr. Foegler responded that staff will provide the consultant's report to Council tomorrow. Staff can work with the Clerk's office to identify potential dates for a study session for this topic as well as some others. At the study session, the goals could be refined and finalized and Council could start to advance the preliminary thinking on strategies to implement key goals. Council can direct staff in regard to this implementation phase. The hope is this session could be scheduled in the next three to four weeks.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher continued:

6. She was surprised to read about the Memorial Day plans. She had understood what would occur was the traditional parade to the cemetery and the Grounds of Remembrance, and that a BriHi event would not be combined with the traditional events for veterans.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 101148

May 24, 2010

Page 15

Held

20

Ms. Puskarcik responded that the public space at the BriHi Square would be open, but there is not a planned event in that location. At the end of the Memorial Day ceremonies and picnic, the public can visit the square if they desire, as it will be open.

7. She appreciates the follow-up memo regarding BriHi, as there have been many questions about the status. It has been a two-year building process, has negatively impacted the businesses in the District, and there are only two confirmed tenants in the development at this time. Is the Square in fact going to be completed, other than the internal tenant spaces?

Mr. Hahn responded that the BriHi Square public space will be substantially completed by this weekend. The fences will be removed, the fountains will be operational, and the landscaping will be installed.

Mrs. Boring asked about the open stairs on the site.

Mr. Hahn responded that he does not have information about that portion, but the public plaza will be open by Memorial Day.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that the existing restaurants in Historic Dublin are impacted by the dust and debris generated from the construction. What does he mean by "substantial completion"?

Mr. Hahn responded that there will be some open contractor issues, but they will not be visible to the general public. There will be benches in the plaza available for seating, and landscaping installed.

Mr. Gerber stated that the project has taken a very long time to complete. But with respect to valet parking, he understood that the original plan called for valet booths ready to operate, and these would help to ease the parking problems in the District. Will these be ready soon? Every day, he hears complaints about the parking in the District.

Mr. Hahn responded that he does not have information to share about this aspect.

Ms. Ott stated that the operation of the valet parking will be tied to the opening of the first restaurant in BriHi. The valet parking will be available for a minimum number of nights each week during a trial period to better understand the flow. In addition, Stonehenge has been reaching out to other area businesses to see if there is an interest in combining valet services in that quadrant of the District.

Mr. Gerber noted that the businesses he is in contact with have not heard from Stonehenge whatsoever.

Ms. Ott responded that the business he refers to was contacted today and a meeting is scheduled tomorrow.

Mr. Gerber had understood that the valet parking was to serve other businesses in the District as well, and was not dependent upon Stonehenge finding a tenant for their building.

Ms. Ott noted that staff has agreed to tying the valet opening to the restaurant opening, as that is when the increased parking demand would occur from the project. Once that valet is open, any vehicle can choose to use it – it is not limited solely to BriHi Square tenants. It will be done as a letter of agreement, which provides the City with the ability to exit the agreement quickly if the City is not satisfied with how it is progressing. Staff also wanted to move forward with the parking demand study, which will provide some parking management strategies, before making any long-term commitment about the operation of the valet in this location.

Mrs. Boring:

1. Asked what has been decided about bicycle racks, based on tonight's discussion.

Ms. Ott asked if Council desires additional research to be conducted, and if so, does Council want such a report reviewed by Council, the Community Development Committee or the Bicycle Advisory Task Force? There are many models for this program from an artistic aspect, but it would be helpful if Council would clarify its preferred process.

Mrs. Boring noted that Council has been requesting bike racks for some time. What is the staff recommendation for the process?

Ms. Ott responded that staff can work with whichever group Council prefers. She asked what level of participation Council would anticipate from the Dublin Arts Council.

Mrs. Boring responded that she does not envision their involvement in this matter.

Mrs. Ott stated that staff will provide a recommendation with either the annual operating budget or in the CIP budget process and provide information on the incremental cost increase over the typical bike rack purchase.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 16

Held _____

20_____

Mr. Reiner stated that Council needs a recommendation for bike rack locations in the Historic District. In addition, some of the schools also need bicycle racks. Perhaps the BATF would be helpful in suggesting locations.

Ms. Ott agreed.

Mrs. Boring added that the community pools are in need of bike racks. At the last Council meeting, someone reported that the City is conducting a study to determine where racks are needed.

Mr. Hahn responded that the City's GIS department has been mapping the existing bicycle rack locations. They have mapped the public locations and are now working on retail locations. He noted that it is difficult to identify locations for bike racks in the Historic District that do not conflict with City Code. The greenspace surrounding the parking lots have landscape screening. Identifying an area large enough to accommodate a bicycle parking pad is more difficult than would be expected. Delivery of the unique bike rack for BriHi Square is expected this Thursday, and installation should be completed by this weekend.

Mrs. Boring moved to direct staff to conduct the bicycle rack program research and forward a report to BATF for review and recommendation to Council.

Vice Mayor Salay seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes.

2. Reported that she attended the Dublin Seniors Recognition Luncheon last week, attended by 430 seniors. A variety of entities provided the food as samples of their menu options.
3. Attended the Leadership Dublin project presentation at OCLC on Wednesday, May 12th. One of the projects presented was the CARE program, a joint effort with Washington Township Fire Department to benefit seniors within the community who need contact on a regular basis to ensure their well being. Compliments to both Leadership Dublin and the Washington Township Fire Department for this worthwhile program.
4. Noted that a BriHi Square local business person suggested that during the July 4th festivities would be a good time for the formal dedication of BriHi Square, perhaps following the parade. She believes that is an idea worth pursuing.

Vice Mayor Salay suggested that Events or Community Relations reach out to this individual. She received a similar e-mail and forwarded it to City staff for consideration.

5. Asked if Tournament invitations were provided to the Boards and Commissions this year.

Mayor Lecklider responded affirmatively.

6. Noted that the BATF minutes mentioned a Brand Road corridor comparison matrix. She has previously had inquiries about the Brand Road bikepath being connected to the City's bikepath system. Did BATF address the completion of that connection?

Mr. Reiner responded that at their May meeting, BATF voted to designate Brand Road corridor as the top priority for implementation to improve connectivity in the system.

Mrs. Boring asked what is programmed and when for this in the CIP.

Ms. Grigsby responded that \$400,000 is programmed in 2010 and \$400,000 plus in 2011 for this project. Based on some of the BATF discussion, this funding may not be adequate to complete the connection. The discussion was directed toward the bike lane in this area.

Mr. Hammersmith added that the BATF has been looking at different corridors prioritized, and the matrix identifies different types of facilities that could work in the corridor. For Brand Road, they are evaluating the multi-use path versus a bike lane versus a shared-use lane. Part of their discussion at their recent meeting was that they would favor a bike lane along that corridor, recognizing that other paths are available in the City system to travel east and west, but that there is not an arterial for bikes and this bike lane would meet that need. Staff will bring this forward to Council for discussion at the CIP in August. Mr. Reiner noted that the BATF plans to present their recommendations to Council prior to the CIP. They have carefully considered the matrix of options provided by staff, which includes costs.

Mrs. Boring noted that striping the bike lanes will ensure that motor vehicles are conscious of and respect the cyclists sharing the roadway.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

May 24, 2010

Page 17

Held

20

7. Thanked staff for their outstanding efforts with the Dublin Road water tower study. They provided a very thorough analysis of each and every suggestion, including the impacts on the houses in the area. The property owners impacted by the Dublin Road South bikepath will expect the same level of dialogue with staff regarding that project, and she is confident that staff will provide it.
8. Complimented staff on the completion of the sidewalk between Sisters' Sweet Shoppe and the restaurant.

Mayor Lecklider:

1. Commented that he attended a breakfast recently at LifeCare Alliance. At one point in their program, they listed organizations that use the LifeCare Alliance catering service. One of those organizations was Embassy Suites in Dublin, and he recognized Embassy Suites for this.
2. Reported that he and Mr. McDaniel attended the Intelligent Community Forum's Top 7 Recognition in New York City last week. Mr. McDaniel was a speaker at the program. Two members of the Fishel Team, the City's partners in DubLink also attended as well as Greg Dunn of Schottenstein, Zox and Dunn. It was a significant accomplishment for the City and staff to be recognized as part of the Top 7 of ICF. He asked that Mr. McDaniel provide a copy to Council of the City's very impressive application submitted to ICF. The ICF Intelligent Community of the Year Award winner was Suwon, South Korea. He appreciated the opportunity to attend this very nice event.
3. While at the ICF conference, the New York City Council Member who spoke indicated it was their Bike to Work Week, which is a major event in NYC. He noted the bike lanes on the streets and how the motorists and cyclists are both accommodated.
4. Reported that training dates in July have been confirmed for two of the magistrates that Council has selected. During the interim period, the City's long-term magistrate recommended some individuals to serve, including Michael Miller, former county prosecutor. Mayor Lecklider indicated it is his recommendation that Mr. Miller's services be utilized as a back-up magistrate, if there is a need for a magistrate when current Dublin magistrate Kelly Roth is not available.

Mr. Keenan moved to approve the Mayor's recommendation of Michael Miller as the back-up magistrate and to authorize staff to enter into an agreement with Mr. Miller for magistrate services on the same terms and conditions as those of current magistrate Kelly Roth.

Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, no; Mrs. Boring, no; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Salay, yes.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Mayor – Presiding Officer

Acting Clerk of Council