

Planning Commission
1 22 10

the original provision for chickens and bees had a one year sunset provision which comes up in Feb. in last 12 months only 14 applications mainly for chickens and bees. At first admin hurdles since then smoothly . very few complaints from neighbors. Confident the ordinance is working well. Some concern about ordinance id a chance – in current ord every submittal has to go to building and housing – we determined not necessary unless there is a significant structure that’s going to be built (a big hen house) if it’s a small coop (?) it won’t need to go for building and housing.

So far, how much activity (Coyne)?

Health Department director (Carroll?) had one complaint about siting. We’re comfortable with the change.

One application for a pig that didn’t meet the ordinance (not enough land area and set back) so it was turned down

Cimperman – think this year should see fewer concerns

Approved.

The Commission also heard from CSU about the North Union Farmer’s Market space at 19th Street and Euclid, located where the university knocked down the Corlett Building. The plan is to improve the plaza, an interim use, with trees and planting beds (no mention if CSU was adopting stormwater best practices such as bioswales) and a 1970s throwback (Kuri called them ‘fussy’) kiosks designed to screen a special events restroom and mechanical boxes. CSU was asked if a composting toilet would be considered, and the university is still looking into “whether it’s technically feasible. The university is not opposed to the idea,” said Geoff Varga of Ralph Tyler Co. The long-term plan is to build a performing arts building on the site. Director Bob Brown asked about the original plan to replace the concrete with a more permeable surface – a grass eco-grid was considered. “We can certainly replace that with permeable pavement, but it has to survive service vehicle use.” The Commission will leave it to CSU’s discretion, Brown said.

Approved (not unanimous)

Across the street from the CSU farmer’s market site – the commission considered the demolition of the former Morse Graphic building to create a plaza for a building renovation that is part of the Collegetown retail/housing development (some of the brick of the building will be exposed -- what is the quality of the brick?)

Medical Center Company Chiller Plant – The utility provider for university circle area electricity and steam heat for CIA, UH and Case.

This is for a chiller plant addition. This plant is on Mayfield Road just east of Little Italy. Expansion away from Mayfield will accommodate pump rooms to increase capacity of the plant. Exterior is precast white concrete panels. Since this is a design issue, no

Originally slated to be on corner of Mayfield and circle drive but bc of desire for redevelopment for UCI to develop Lot 45 decided to expand toward the university. The chiller takes electricity from the coal fired power plant.

Bike pedestrian issue on bridge

Brown – I know Lillian wasn't here last meeting I met yesterday with ODOT not directly about this but about the project I think you know planning commission asked to change policy to allow three members on the review team officially yesterday we had intro meeting a prebriefing myself Rob Mavic and Andrew Watterson . The docs from consultants will be kept under lock and key at ODOT. This binder with 200 pages of text is the bid document – it's on the web site – for the Innerbelt project. And 1500 pages of appendices also on web site. The RFQ will go out Feb. 2 respnses due March 2. And between march 2 and August proposals will be winnowed. Recommendation that the 30% submissions done to highest level of detail. Proposals evaluated in the summer and ODOT approve in August. The issue before us is the issue of bike ped access on the bridge. In 2006 planning commission was told it was formally rejected at the time the 20 mil was justified bc of the proximity of other roads and the fed approval went through nevertheless it continues to be an issue and planning commission hasn't changed its position of support for bike ped . we have asked ODOT about alternative technical concepts bidders and permitted to submit alt tech concepts that go beyond what's in bid's tech specs and ODOT would consider. Some minor i.e. material and depths obviously the addition of sidewalks is not minor. Kuri – we're not talking about bike lanes on a highway it's one multipurpose path separated by a barrier.

Brown ODOT has 85 mil in Stimulus funds in this project (ARRA) their timeline for getting bid awarded is barely on schedule for getting those dollars . they talk us if a bid came in with bike ped on bridge they would have to go back into the environmental review process and told us they would lose that money. It is what it is...there are two 12 foot breakdown lanes on either side of the bridge (12? Not 17?) Not every bridge has that. We asked about could we have one breakdown lane. When five lanes standard is to have two break down lanes. The commission in light of 2006 support could choose to modify that statement in assumption this can be done without losing the \$85 mil. It's an issue not only the project would lose it but the state would lose the money – at least that's what's been explained to us.

The commission has been on record for bike ped lane from the start. (Krumholz) but also concern don't lose money for lengthy review process. I ask we support bike ped

path with proviso that is doesn't involve substantial danger of losing the money now available and would be lost to state of ohio that it required review.

Kuri – that timeline is correct, but when decision made by commission back in 2006 that option was not available to us (was before the design build) I agree we shouldn't put the 85 mil at risk think no harm exploring this asking ODOT to place in alternate bid section option for price for full bridge proposal with multi use path. So get two prices one without and one with. And I think with type of teams going to get creative solutions going to get some that are higher without and some same cost with it. I guarantee will be parts of process a whole host of things that will come up and require environmental review. I don't see time as the factor here not need Army Corp it's about a positive benefit so don't see time as an issue. When the bike lane came up on Euclid Corridor the environmental assessment was done but somehow it got done. I would like to see the commission ask the question if this can get done in the timeline esp if bids come in and its below the price.

I would like to see a motion that asks this gets put in as an alternate – if they come over I may be wrong but I think we'll get a variety of bids at that point let's say let's go.

I'm excited about the opportunity about bike/ped path on the bridge, but concerned about the who will define when \$85 mil is at risk of being lost. If that review puts the \$85 mil at risk of being lost?

Bob – anything we do is a recommendation to ODOT – if our recommendation states that caveat than ODOT has its guidance from us and wouldn't take any action to lose that \$85 mil.

Krumholz – seems like most prudent course of action.

Kuri sure but would like to see this in there as an alternate. **This isn't black and white. We need to have a dialogue on this. This is far and away the largest design build. The dialogue is having them understand why this can be done that this methodology can take this much further before we close the door. Through exploring it would like to see them come in and have a discussion on this.**

Bowen design builder should be able to put in a exception for design improvement. If a design builder says it's x dollars more or no more and we will do design exception why shouldn't that score higher? I'm hearing for a design exception and lost 85 mil they should be scored higher (what if it costs less and it's a design exception).

Kuri – this is not a design exception;

Brown – ODOT said their rules ruled this out

Kuri – their alt route is atrocious. What I'm arguing is that ODOT intends for this to be incorporated.

Brown – it's not a design exception it's a contradiction of fed EIS. This was an issue raised and adjudicated and have position to rearticulate that. This is a design exception.

Coyne – we're not going to fall on our sword and lost \$85 mil. My understanding of EIS is to look at the project that will release negative environmental impact on community that could include tearing through neigh and air pollution. Adding this isn't contradicting it if anything it supports (goals of reducing environmental impact). Columbus just did a bridge that has a separate cantilevered ped bike bridge and when we raised issue and asked to present the scoring – instead of coming in and explaining the scoring they didn't. I still think this is reasonable and we should go on the record for that. Someone should remind ODOT in 2006 gas was \$4 and it will probably be that again and if we're going to be a truly sustainable town we should advocate for that stuff.

Krum – we asked for it they rejected it we're asking for it again without jeopardizing

Kuri – I think we should rrequest that ODOT come her eand address how bike ped can work with a design build and a can be beneficial for environment.

Putting in as alternative this is really a value proposition going to make someone might put in something decorative and so I would value that. It's going to give the three of you a menu of what to look at without jeopardizing the 85 mil so it has to be in there for us to get an apples to apples comparison.

Coyne – how many on the committee are ODOT employees?

Brown – in final analysis after review notes they sit in room they come to a consensus.

Kuri – open to having those publicly reviewed – still open to tat?

Brown – yes.

Coyne – the public could have sway.

We would there in 2006 (bike advocates) you have to be in the trenches the Cox brothers were at every meeting opposing the Detroit Superior

Brown suggest member of commission maybe Lillian attempt to craft a resolution.

Kuri – Make a motion to recommend that ODOT include as alternative bid item a multi-purpose path atop the bridge and that the three city members on the Innerbelt Bridge RFQ work with ODOT to include an alt bid to include a multipurpose path and recommend that we collaborate with odot and they

participate in our next meeting in a dialogue about how we can work together to see if this positive benefit to the Environmental Impact Statement is in the dialogue.

Krumholz to amend to affect that nothing above shall jeopardize the fed contribution to the project.

Bowen – second motion.

Approved.

At next meeting hope to have ODOT rep here to discuss this. That they send the right ODOT rep here.

Eckerle – this is an odot manufactured problem. What ever you do today cannot jeopardize the 85 mil I think we need to hold feet to fire. One of side benefit to paying the top three firms ODOT owns the ideas so they (the firms) might come up with a creative solution. I think there is an iconic view that is important to the city.

Most of these engineers who work with ODOT would be too scared to go through the time to do this if it's not an alternative.

Coyne – if you were a bridge designer and had alternative by having in record all three will consider. If only one came back with alternate and it was in the budget you would have all of these people in public and city council advocating for it.

Sheehan – been participating in this for OCBC and comment on safety want to commend response of commission to the public outcry for this.

But want to ask for clarification, Brown you said RFQ will be issued Feb. 2

You want to include in that RFQ as an alternative technical bid spec.?

Is the cost for the alt tech bid also going to be included?

Coyne only RFQ

Brown it does lay out the Abbey Ave.

I don't think want price as proposed you want what's the total price as proposed and price with alternative.

Sheehan – subtract cost of doing Abbey Avenue from cost of doing it on bridge.

Coyne – the cost of alt if it's 1 mil that's subtracted.

Because part of documentation now commercial road is all included in bid package and will be itemized for comparison.

We want to make sure this gets in (Brown).

Eckerle –

Brown on Feb 9 meeting scheduled for prospective bidders. Things can be mentioned to the firms.

Kuri – is that a public meeting?

Brown – don't know.

But could be a pre-proposal.

Kuri – can we find out if this is open to the public.

Cader – I would ask that this resolution is send to ODOT.

Coyne won't be here for next meeting on Feb. 5.

Brown – ODOT has been working on the bike lanes on Lorain Avenue to extend them beyond and through Ontario

Lakefront plan update – we had recent meetings with stakeholders the consultant advised that 100 ft. pier is really too much open space and could be some milling on it. The E. 9th Street Pier – we have never seen a proposal to put a building on it. He wants to know how to get more activity. Coast Guard is committed to rebuilding on site but at minimum can we get them to invest in a great looking edge on E. 9th street. Kiosks sitting wall landscaping to create an attractive edge to their property. They need a fairly large fenced off area.

Following resolution recognizing Councilman Joe Cimperman's service to Planning Commission for ten years (no longer on commission). "I think you make this better