



Veterans Parkway Advisory Committee

Meeting #1

MEETING SUMMARY¹

This is a summary of the first Veterans Parkway Advisory Committee meeting, held Oct. 14, 2008 at the Delaware County Hayes Building, 104 N. Sandusky St., Delaware, OH 43015, from 3 to 5 p.m.

Participants

Veterans Advisory Committee Members

Don Damron, Ohio Rail Development Commission
Carl Johnson, PPG
Frances Jo Hamilton, Main Street Delaware
Don Lee, Olentangy Watershed Alliance
Gus Comstock, City of Delaware Economic Development
Tim Browning, City of Delaware Public Works
Brad Stanton, City of Delaware Public Utilities
Dave Effland, City of Delaware Planning
Erik Mackling, Delaware County Engineer's Office
Scott Sanders, Delaware County Regional Planning
Berlin Township Trustee Philip Panzarella
Delaware Township Trustee John Main
Delaware City Councilman Andrew Brush
Senator Bill Harris
Mayor Windell Wheeler
Bill Buhner, Riverby Estates
Denny Schooley, Delaware Area Transit Authority
Bob Lawler, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission
Larry Davis, Delaware City Schools Facilities and Transportation
Russ Martin, City of Delaware Police Department

Project Steering Committee

Project Manager Jessica Ormeroid, City of Delaware Department of Engineering Services- Lead Agency
Project Manager Dave Mengerink, Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) - Advising Agency
Project Manager Bryan Parsell, DLZ – Consultant Team

¹ This Summary is intended to provide a paraphrased overview of presentations made, materials discussed, questions asked and comments made. It is not intended to be a word-for-word representation of the meeting.



Bill Ferrigno, City of Delaware Department of Engineering Services
Thomas Homan, City of Delaware City Manager
Tammy Boring, ODOT
Kevin Davis, ODOT
Janice Gartner, ODOT
Manoj Sethi, DLZ
Steve Metzger, DLZ
Marie Keister, Engage Communications

Observers

Charles Ash, City of Delaware
Lee Yoakum, City of Delaware
Brenda DeSalvo, Riverby Estates
Nick Gill, MORPC
Ray Armstrong, Berlin Township Zoning

Meeting Handouts

- Agenda
- Advisory Committee roster
- Regional and study area maps
- Comment sheet
- PowerPoint presentation

Meeting Summary

Welcome

Delaware City Manager Thomas Homan thanked everyone for joining the meeting and agreeing to participate in the Veterans Parkway Study. He explained that the City had funding through the planning, environmental analysis and design of a proposed roadway should the need be verified through this effort, but that so far funding for construction is not available. Mr. Homan said the City was committed to working closely with the public and key stakeholders on this effort, and appreciated everyone's willingness to commit their time to participating on the newly formed Veterans Parkway Advisory Committee.

Bill Ferrigno, P.E., Director, City of Delaware Department of Engineering Services, explained that the City of Delaware, with assistance from the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), is initiating the "Veterans Parkway Study," which is an outgrowth of earlier efforts known as the US 23/US 36 Connector and the Delaware Southeast Bypass.

Mr. Ferrigno explained that the current roadway system causes trucks to use William St. for access to US 36/SR 37, which in turn connects vehicles traveling between I-71 and US 42 and US 23. This brings trucks through a residential area, creating congestion, inefficient movement of goods and people, and raising safety concerns. The Veterans Parkway project was identified in



the 2001 City of Delaware Thoroughfare Plan to provide an additional east-west route southeast of the City connecting US 23 and US 42 to US 36/SR 37.

The purpose of this multi-year effort is to use technical expertise and public input to determine whether there is a need, and if so to develop possible concepts, for the proposed Veterans Parkway corridor and route. The City of Delaware hired the DLZ Team to conduct the necessary planning and environmental analyses, as well as preliminary engineering, for this effort.

A Project Steering Committee has been formed that includes City officials, ODOT staff and representatives of the Federal Highway Administration. The City is asking the Veterans Parkway Advisory Committee to provide community input and expertise as the study moves forward.

Mr. Ferrigno introduced DLZ team member Marie Keister from Engage Communications, who will facilitate the Veterans Parkway Advisory Committee and lead the public involvement effort.

Meeting Purpose, Introductions and Advisory Committee Role

Ms. Keister reviewed the meeting purpose, which was to introduce the Veterans Parkway project, project team and Advisory Committee members; outline the decision-making framework for the project and outline the roles of various participants; seek input on key issues and project goals; and review next steps.

Ms. Keister asked everyone in the room to introduce themselves and their organization.

Ms. Keister explained that her role as facilitator is to make sure technical issues are clearly communicated, clarify any potentially confusing issues, ensure that participants have an opportunity to share their ideas, and to conclude meetings on time. She explained that the role of the Advisory Committee is to:

- Advise the decision-makers on:
 - ✓ Community values
 - ✓ Concerns and opportunities
 - ✓ Priorities
- Represent each member's constituency and/or interest
- Share information and expertise
- Learn from each other
- Be respectful of each other

She showed a graphic illustrating how the Advisory Committee fits within the context of the technical analysis, public involvement and information dissemination and decision-making process (*see PowerPoint presentation*).



Study Background and Process

Manoj Sethi, the DLZ team's senior project principal, provided an overview of the organizational structure of the project team. He showed maps that indicated the study area boundaries, and provided a more detailed history of how Veterans Parkway emerged as a transportation priority. Mr. Sethi summarized ODOT's Project Development Process, which the study will follow and which ensures that this effort meets all state and federal environmental and technical guidelines.

The first four steps of this process, which will be the focus of study efforts through spring, 2009, will verify whether there is a need for Veterans Parkway, clarify the project purpose and, if justified, then seek public input on preliminary conceptual alternatives on where the route might be located. A "red flag summary" is being conducted now to determine if there are any environmental, engineering or right of way concerns that project engineers should avoid when considering route alignment concepts.

Mr. Sethi pointed out that each Advisory Committee member had been provided black and white and color copies of the study area, along with a comment form. He asked participants to review the maps and indicate on the black and white copies any areas the engineers should try to avoid.

Questions and Comments

Advisory Committee member Philip Panzarella noted that the team should be aware of subsurface tiles that assist with drainage of farm fields in the study area.

Member Bill Buhrer commented that Riverby Estates currently does not have any noise concerns, but building a new roadway nearby could change that. Also, he noted that Pollock Rd. is growing increasingly congested, and that a proposed residential development in the area will increase traffic.

(See additional written comments.)

Goals, Problems and Opportunities –All

Ms. Keister said there were a variety of interests represented on the Advisory Committee, and that it was important to seek input on project goals, issues and opportunities in more detail, and to get a sense of community priorities. Each member had Post-it notes in front of them. They were asked to write their thoughts on goals, problems and opportunities – one per sheet -- on the Post-it notes.

These ideas were then posted on flip charts titled "Goals," "Problems" and "Opportunities". After the results were discussed, similar ideas were grouped together. Participants were then provided nine dots. Each participant was invited to "spend" three dots – one per idea – in each category, to indicate which ideas should receive higher priority. Ms. Keister indicated that all ideas would be considered as the project progresses, regardless how many "votes" each idea received. However, the dots would give the team a sense of priority. She explained that the top ideas might emerge as



the project’s overall goals, which could serve as criteria for evaluating proposed alternatives that might be developed during the project.

The following is a summary of the input received during these two exercises:

GOALS

Rank	Goals	No. of Red Dots
1	Facilitate efficient traffic flow 23/42 to 36/37 → 71 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve connectivity between 42 SW & 36/37 E ▪ Improve industrial park access ▪ Expedite the movement of trucks from industrial areas to highways leading to interstates ▪ Traffic egress & ingress/commercial & public transportation mobility/ease public & commercial flow ▪ Make area more attractive for industrial growth (area south of airport) ▪ Direct commercial traffic out of residential areas 	12
2 (Tie)	Truck traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eliminate pass through traffic 	11
2 (Tie)	Coordinate land use and transportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roadway improvements should be coordinated with intercity passenger rail station location study - Improve regional access to intercity passenger rail station (possible sites in Delaware area) - Compatibility with future outerbelt plans 	11
4	Provide infrastructure for logical developments that advance economic development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure extensions – water/sewer 	10
5	Don’t remove all traffic through downtown <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove trucks, but not all traffic, which is bad. - Possible solution = good wayfinding. 	9
6	Maintain quality of life	8
7	Retain property values	3
8	Increase safety	0



PROBLEMS

Rank	Problem	No. of Red Points
1	Congestion at “Point” (intersection of US 36 and SR 37)	12
2 (Tie)	Bridge access across the Olentangy - OEPA Olentangy River permit required	10
2 (Tie)	\$ - Project cost – acquiring funding	10
4	Too many trucks in residential area - Re-routing truck traffic also reroutes business traffic - Manufacturers do not find area below airport attractive	8
5	Securing rights-of-way	7
6	Environmental concerns (drainage issues)	6
7	Loss of prime farm land	4
8	Traffic problems on E. Williams (school) ▪ Excess traffic on side roads during construction	4
9	Moving noise to other locations both residential & commercial ▪ Noise & congestion in neighborhoods	3
10	Unbridled growth ▪ Road width access/increased growth and population/disruption of tax base and growth	2
11	Railroad is obstacle to E-W traffic ▪ There are 5 State and Federal highways going thru the middle of Delaware	1



OPPORTUNITIES

Rank	Opportunity	No. of Red Points
1	Economic development with good transportation (combined results of two)	19
2	Create high-density station -area development plan around passenger rail station, with roadway access	10
3 (Tie)	Fiber-optic infrastructure extension	6
3 (Tie)	Opportunity to provide safe bike route to Alum Creek	6
3 (Tie)	Improve traffic flow	6
6 (Tie)	Stronger tax base <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitate community development and legality/movement of commerce into & out of area 	5
6 (Tie)	Reduces repair cost on local roads	5
9	Open up land for development on East side	4
10 (Tie)	Increase manufacturing base below airport	3
10 (Tie)	Railroad container yard location	3
12 (Tie)	Nice memorial for Veterans	1
12 (Tie)	Expand new railroad right-of-way	1
14	(Future) school access	0
15	Address regional & local growth concerns - improve	0
16	Environmental reclamation	0
17	Opportunity to increase number of east/west paths	0
18	Opportunity to reduce fuel consumption by providing more direct route	0
19	Limited access facility	0

(See additional written comments.)



Action Items/Next Steps

Ms. Keister said that next project steps would include:

- Developing the Red Flag Summary Report
- Developing the Existing and Future Conditions Report
- Drafting the Purpose and Need Document
- Identifying conceptual alternative solutions
- Reconvening the Advisory Committee sometime before next spring

Ms. Keister asked that participants return their comment forms, and to ensure their names and addresses were correct on the Advisory Committee roster.

Mr. Ferrigno thanked everyone for their participation and insightful comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.