Dublin City Council Work Session
Monday, June 15, 2015

Minutes of Meeting

Mayor Keenan called the Monday, June 15, 2015 Study Session of Dublin City Council to order at 6:30 p.m. at the Dublin Municipal Building.

Members present were: Mayor Keenan, Vice Mayor Gerber, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, Mr. Lecklider, Mr. Peterson and Mr. Reiner. Ms. Salay was absent (excused).

Staff members present were: Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Mumma, Ms. O'Callaghan, Ms. Cox, Mr. Garwick, Mr. Langworthy, Mr. Earman, Mr. Ashrawi and Ms. Wawszkwiecz.

Also present were:
Charlie Broschart, Division Manager, Franklin County Public Health Water Quality Division
Josh Garver, Franklin County Soil and Water Conservation District
Joelle Angel-Chumbley, Kolar Design

- **Water and Sewer Extension Policy**

Staff Presentation
Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the City receives requests from citizens who are interested in receiving City sanitary sewer and/or water service. Staff has also heard the reverse from citizens – that they are not interested in receiving those services. This is a very important topic for many reasons.

1. It could be a public health and safety issue should residents not maintain their systems.
2. It is an environmental issue and could, potentially, affect property values.
3. It is also a complicated issue due to the number of areas involved; costs to the City and property owners; potential equity issue; and prioritization challenges.

These are the topics for tonight's discussion. Detailed information was provided in Council's packets in preparation for this discussion.

Several years ago, there was an effort to identify all of the areas within the City that currently do not have connection to or access to public water and sanitary sewer services. A comprehensive data set was developed and an analysis of 22 areas (depicted on the map) was done of the properties currently not connected. These areas are located throughout the City with a higher concentration around the river. Most of the areas are comprised of existing single-family homes and some commercial businesses, as well. The costs of potential extensions of the main line were then calculated after creating preliminary designs of water and sewer extensions to the affected areas. Because the total cost is significant, it is important to ensure there is a real benefit to the City from the expenditure. Prioritization of the work will be necessary, as it is impossible to complete over $18 million of work at one time, should the City decide to fund the main line extensions.

Information has been assembled regarding the current capacity charges for a single-family home. Those charges are associated with tapping into water and sanitary sewer. Total capacity charges for extending 3/4-inch water lines and 6-inch sanitary sewer lines are approximately $9,000 per home. This includes the actual capacity charges, as well as the meter. There are also additional charges to construct the lateral service from the main line to the home and for any plumbing necessary to the house. For lateral extension of a typical 6-inch gravity sewer service, the costs would range from an additional $3,000 - $5,000, depending on the length of that extension. If it

involves a grinder pump or lift station force main, it could be between $7,000 - $12,000, depending on the length of the line and elevation of the home.

Dublin City Code regulates the provision of sewer (Chapter 51) and water services (Chapter 52). The Code sets forth the requirements for building sewer and water main lines, as well as connection, usage restrictions, fees/charges, administration and enforcement. The Code requires that once the City extends either sewer or water services to within 100 feet of the property line, property owners are required to connect at their own expense within 90 days after receipt of notice. The Code also provides for a hardship waiver process.

Sewage treatment is regulated by the State, and Ohio Revised Code Chapter 3718 requires the Director of Health to adopt rules that require Boards of Health to approve installation and operation of sewage treatment systems, conduct site evaluations, and prescribe standards and specifications related to sewage treatment systems. The State provisions requiring connection are similar to the City's provisions. To develop a policy, the City recognizes that it is necessary to understand the location of all the privately maintained systems throughout the City, as well as the condition of those systems. To do this, the City has partnered with two County agencies, representatives from whom are present tonight -- Charlie Broschart, Franklin County Public Health Department, and Josh Garver, Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District.

Charlie Broschart, Division Manager, Franklin County Public Health, Water Quality Division, stated that this division oversees household sewage septic systems, as well as water quality of wells and private water systems. They conduct annual inspections of two types of systems within the City of Dublin and the County:

- aeration treatment units, which treat onsite all the waste produced, after which the effluent is discharged off site.
- evapo transpiration systems, a soil-based treatment system.

Ohio Administrative Code now requires all health departments to begin to inspect all household sewage treatment systems (HSTS) within a certain period of time, so the department is in the process of developing a plan to expand that inspection process. They have to look at all types of HSTS, operational permit term, frequency of inspections, costs of the inspections and permit fees. At some point, they will be looking at all systems within the City of Dublin that are not connected to the City sanitary sewer. In 2013 and 2014, the annual operation maintenance program for aeration treatment units inspected 184 discharge systems within the City. A total of 190 inspections were conducted on the first round. Findings were that 84% of the systems required no corrective action; 12% required some corrective action; 4% were unable to be inspected; and the remainder were vacant properties. The 12% rate of corrective action needed was lower than the County average of 14-15% failure rate. The following year, 90% of the 184 systems were in compliance. At this point, no aeration treatment units are in need of correction.

Josh Garver, Franklin County Soil and Water Conservation District, stated that their agency deals with natural resource issues throughout Franklin County. In recent years, they have become involved in the NPDS (stormwater discharge) permits. With the new opportunity, they have been partnering closely with Franklin County Public Health. The process will involve two parts: a detailed field inspection with documentations, and a health-based risk assessment based on environmental variables found during the field inspections. He reviewed the results of the field inspections, conducted on a voluntary basis, which included:

- Types of systems;
- Documentation of where the systems discharged – into storm sewer systems, ditches, streams, or tiles;
- Assessment of where there was the greatest potential for problems.

Currently, all the systems are functioning well but need to be maintained on a consistent basis, and all are prone to failure.

Mr. Broschart stated that in the field inspections, they did find issues on 37 of the 378 parcels they inspected. Those were referred to Code Enforcement and resolved. Aeration treatments units are mechanically driven, and therefore can fail. There are a number of these units within the Scioto River corridor. Because of the limitations of the soil and the proximity of bedrock to the surface, they are the only kind of systems that can be installed in the corridor. They directly discharge into water courses, storm sewers, or directly into the Scioto River. This is a concern, because when these systems do fail, there are between 300 – 600 gallons of untreated sewage discharged per day into the waterways. That is the area of greatest health risk.
There are also areas of soil-based systems – Grandee Cliffs, Summit View Road, Glencree Place and Trails End Drive. In those areas, there is very poor soil, and there are limited ways in which to modify or correct systems that begin to fail. [Maps were shown depicting areas of less risk in green and areas of greater risk in red.]

Mr. Garver stated that they summarized the areas of risk by parcel. Closer to the river corridor, there is significant limestone and cracks in that limestone, which permit deeper penetration. Because there are also wells in this area, there is concern about contamination of those wells. Contamination can be either surface or subsurface, infiltrating into the water courses.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that this study provided information that is important in relation to prioritization discussion. In the areas denoted on the maps as areas of greater risk, there are no current problems, but they have the greatest potential for risk.

Policy Development
One factor to consider is the level of property owner demand that currently exists for the City to extend those services. In 2004 and 2006, Council requested that staff survey property owners in affected areas to assess interest in utility extensions.

Water service extension. Property owners completing the survey were aware that if service was extended, they would be required to connect and would be responsible for the costs associated with connecting. Across the 20 areas referenced, 25% of the homeowners expressed interest in having water service extended. There was only one area in which there was an 86% positive response rate. That is significant, because the draft policy proposes a requirement of at least 85% of the property owners in an area to petition the City for extension of the main line. In 2006, only one area met that threshold.

Sanitary sewer service extension. Across these areas, the overall interest in sanitary sewer extension was 25% with only one area meeting/exceeding the 85% threshold. The reason they are presenting the 2006 data is that the City has not received a significant increase in complaints or concerns expressed by residents in the affected areas since that survey, which would indicate there would not be much change in desire should the residents be surveyed again.

History
Research showed examples of special assessments that were levied in the late 1970 – 1980s. In early 2000, there are examples where the City funded and extended water and sewer main lines to a few areas. In those cases, the residents were required to connect at their own expense or to obtain a hardship waiver from Council. One example of that was for Indian Run.

Funding options
Staff researched other cities regarding funding options. The tool most often used was assessment of individual land owners for the entire cost of installing the main line. In all cases, cities required connection of the properties in the affected areas once lines were available; it was not an option.

Draft Policy
Staff has taken all of the following information into account:
- Inventory and health risk assessment information
- Results of resident surveys in 2004 and 2006
- Best practices from around the country and cost to extend to affected areas

It is important to have a written policy that provides parameters but also provides some flexibility, because there is a significant cost associated with extensions. Annual funding and prioritization discussions would be necessary. She noted that the policy would apply only to developed property.
There are two different processes for utility main line extension:
- Petition by affected property owners
- Funding through the City CIP process

Petition Process
- There must be a significant property owner commitment to justify the expenditure of extending the main lines. The extensions that occurred in the early 2000s required a range of 80-95% positive property owner response.
- Property owners would submit a utility extension application including a petition signed by no less than 85% of the property owners in the affected area.
- Affidavit indicating property owners' willingness to connect and donate easements.
- City evaluates and determines if application is complete.

This policy provides the City with flexibility in terms of prioritization and timing, taking into account the following factors:
- Health and safety
- Future development potential
- Potential to leverage a planned CIP project
- Cost effectiveness
- Cost estimate and reliable resources

Each year, as part of the CIP process, the City Manager would then provide a recommendation to Council. Should Council choose to fund a petitioned project in the 5-year CIP, correspondence would be sent to the property owners in the affected area.

Petition by Affected Property Owners:
- If petitioned project is funded, property owners in the affected area are notified.

- Property owners must pay connection charge prior to City advertising the construction contract for installation of the mainline. City may withdraw funding for project if property owners do not pay.
- For the connection, there is a fee that must be paid to Dublin and another fee that must be paid to Columbus. As an incentive, property owners would receive a waiver of 50% of the City of Dublin's connection charges if that payment is made prior to advertising.
- Property owners would be responsible to pay for all lateral service lines to the home and interior plumbing necessary to connect to main lines.
- City would fund 100% of the design and construction of the utility main extensions.

Mr. Lecklider asked for clarification. If that incentive of payment made prior to advertising is deducted from the estimated cost of $10,000 per property owner to connect, the average cost would be $5,000?
Ms. O'Callaghan responded that the $10,000 estimate amount includes both the Dublin and the Columbus capacity charges. The incentive would reduce only Dublin's capacity charges by 50%. For the sanitary sewer, Dublin's charge is $2,300; for water service, Dublin's charge is $1,890. Those charges would be reduced by 50% -- not the Columbus charges.

Mayor Keenan stated the cost could be affected by the property topography.
Ms. O'Callaghan responded that the topography would impact the lateral connection costs. The incentive applies only to the capacity charges.

<u>CIP Process</u>

- This process would be utilized in the event of health and safety concerns or opportunity to leverage a planned capital improvement project.
- Property owners would be required to connect within 90 days after official notices to do so.
- As an incentive, property owners would receive a 50% waiver of the City's connection charges if payment is made prior to advertising
- Property owners would be responsible to pay for all lateral service lines and interior plumbing necessary to connect to main lines.
- City would fund 100% of the design and construction of the municipal utility main extensions.

<u>Connections</u>

- Identify those properties that are currently within 100 feet of public water and sewer but not connected.
- Update maps.
- Research the status of waivers previously granted by Council.
- Determine follow-up action to be taken with any property owners who have not connected to the public system and do not have a current waiver.

Mr. Peterson stated that there are 22 areas identified in the City with no utility service. There are also properties that have services available but are not connected. Are those within the 22 areas identified or in other areas?
Ms. O'Callaghan responded that staff is not certain at this point. Staff believes there are some properties within the 100 feet of an available line, but that information is being verified.
Mr. Peterson inquired if it is possible these are outside of the 22 specified areas.
Ms. O'Callaghan responded that is correct.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if there are some properties that are within the 100 feet required connection area that have not connected for some reason.
Ms. O'Callaghan indicated that is correct.
Mr. Lecklider inquired if that number is unknown.
Ms. O'Callaghan confirmed it is unknown at this time.

Mayor Keenan asked if temporary waivers were granted previously, but no follow-up occurred.
Ms. O'Callaghan responded that some waivers were for one year, five years, etc. Staff is checking on the status of those.

Ms. Cox stated that there are two separate issues involved. There are some areas where a sewer was constructed to serve a developing property, and the property owner was never notified that they needed to connect. There are also some properties on Indian Run, MacBeth and MacDuff where the owners requested waivers, and they are not connected. The focus on the 22 areas was with the intent of determining where the City needed to invest capital dollars for extensions, not looking at areas where the sewer already is extended but properties are not connected.
Ms. O'Callaghan added that staff needs to review those areas, as well, and determine what options exist for connecting those homes.

Mr. Lecklider stated that for any policy Council adopts to have integrity, property owners within 100 feet need to be required to connect.

Monitoring and Reporting
A report would be submitted to City Council annually as part of the CIP process, containing:

- Number and quantity of private HSTS in City
- Updated list of affected areas
- Updated preliminary cost estimates for design/construction of main line extensions
- Recommendation reports related to any petition for extension of services received prior to March 1 of that year

Discussion
Mr. McDaniel stated that the inspections and data provided tonight are very helpful. He believes there are also septic systems within the area that are not typically inspected, because there is no inspection requirement.
Mr. Boschart responded that is correct.

Mr. McDaniel stated that is possible to have crisis situations with those systems. As part of this neighbor-initiated policy, there could be a property owner who indicates that he/she has a crisis situation. It is incumbent on the homeowner to inform the City of what alternatives they have considered, if any, and then to submit a petition. Council always has the option to consider such cases outside of the process, but staff is attempting to have a predictable budget and curb crisis situations. Proactively inspecting the systems better formulates the decision process and helps to better understand what the crisis is, if any. It puts the onus on an area that wants to be served to demonstrate that they have an issue. A petition process with an affidavit, which is modeled off some other cities, seems to be a good way to include that within the budget process. In regard to the CIP process, in a couple of years, Council will begin to see some debt issues roll off, such as the West Bank sewer. There will be more capacity within the sewer budget/capital budget to

address some of these areas, such as in the river corridor. Staff will look at potentially proposing that in a five-year CIP. That would be a CIP-initiated process.
Mayor Keenan inquired if the resident approval percentage is needed in the affected areas.
Mr. McDaniel responded that is required. Council could also address it as a policy to gradually extend utility lines through the CIP process. Property owners within 100 feet would be required to connect.

Mr. Reiner stated that when this was previously reviewed, there were some residents aggressively pursuing extension of water and sewer main lines. That direction was anticipated until resident surveys indicated a greater number did not want the extensions due to the costs of connection. If the City pursues this again, it is important that the City ensure that the entire costs of connection are shared with the homeowners. Previously, a good amount of time was spent on the effort only to learn later that the property owners did not want the extensions due to costs of connection.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that, given the excellent statistics provided that indicate any needed remedies were taken care of, the next step would be to send a personal letter to each household sharing what the cost would be for the extension. A form would be included for the property owner to return indicating his desire. In reviewing the statistics, there isn't an overwhelming reason to move forward with a main line extension, unless the citizens are interested and willing to bear a reasonable cost for connection.

Mayor Keenan stated that he has also heard from some residents that they don't want a monthly water and sewer bill. When this was discussed five-six years ago, neighbors were pitted against neighbor. Although some passionately wanted these services, the majority did not. In regard to the suggestion that the lines be extended gradually over a number of years, would that be accomplished in a prioritized manner?
Mr. McDaniel responded that staff would look into that, perhaps using the river corridor as a starting point where there are a cluster of these systems. The City could begin with that corridor, with the goal of protecting the City's waterways. The City would extend the main line and require the property owners to connect.

Mayor Keenan stated that is a large amount of money, and for those nearing retirement age or senior citizens in those areas, it can be very difficult to pay the costs of $15,000-$20,000.

Mr. McDaniel stated that there would be a distinction between a Council-initiated effort versus resident petition. With the former, the City's cost is greater due to the cost of easement acquisition. If the residents petition for the extension, they would be asked to donate the easements as part of the process.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the City does have a few transportation projects in the proposed CIP where some utility extensions could be leveraged. Staff would anticipate having those discussions as part of this year's CIP process.

Mr. Lecklider stated that surveys of like communities indicate that the majority of the cities assess the expense of the main line extensions to the residents, as well, but that is not staff's recommendation.
Mr. McDaniel that in the past, there has been much discussion about what the City would be willing to take responsibility for in this regard. The policy decision that was made is that the City

would take responsibility for extending the main line. Some cities handle it in that manner, but most use an assessment district and/or assess in some manner for the main line, as well. A previous Council determined that before the City would assume the responsibility for the cost of extending the main line, 85% resident commitment was needed.
Ms. O'Callaghan noted that all the communities that were benchmarked required connection.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if the systems are being maintained, can they avoid any "crisis" situations.
Mr. McDaniel responded that is true for the most part. Different systems can be used, however, and there may be some systems that reach a failure point and the resident has no options.

Mr. Broschart stated that maintenance is effective, but these systems all have limited life. The discharging systems -- the aeration treatment units -- now are required to have NPDS EPA permits to discharge. They are complicated mechanical devices that have to reach and meet certain discharge requirements. The average cost of installation of those units is about $17,000. The cost range is $12,000 to $27,000, depending on what is needed. They do not last forever. The concrete tanks degrade over time. The motor can be replaced, but not the concrete tank, baffles, etc. that are the "bones" of the system. Eventually, they will need to be replaced. The costs of soil-based systems are a little lower, but can be as high as $30,000, depending on whether they are complicated drip type systems. Installers require full payment.

Mayor Keenan noted that was an issue in the past. A number of the homeowners had recently replaced their systems requiring a significant financial investment.
Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the records indicate that was the basis for granting many of the previous waivers.
Mr. Reiner stated that was also the situation with some wells. The owners had recently replaced shallow wells, digging down to 200 feet for a new well.

Mr. Lecklider stated that the City has the responsibility of maintaining a certain level of water quality and that is a consideration, as well. How is that measured/analyzed? Is that an area overseen by the EPA, and would they report any such need to the City?
Ms. Cox responded that it is one of the minimum control measures in the NPDS permit process with the EPA. The City is required to have mapping, monitoring of the systems, and a plan to address any issues. The City's program contains a basic framework for that, but it is being updated. If Council adopts a policy that requires connection for water/sewer extensions, that will be part of the plan that is submitted to the EPA.

Mr. Lecklider asked if the EPA or the City is required to regularly submit samples of the Scioto River within City limits for testing.
Ms. Cox responded that practice is in the process of changing, but the City is working with Franklin County Soil and Water on that effort. Dry weather screening is performed. The creeks are walked to view what discharges are occurring, and then, identify if it is good or bad water. If there are illicit discharges, which is water that should not discharging in a location, these are indications of systems that have failed. Those are reported, and the City works with Franklin County Public Health to have that corrected.

Mr. Lecklider stated that he assumes that if the inspection indicated anything on the verge of a violation, the EPA would mandate that the City address it.

Ms. Cox responded that the effort to check the systems and work with homeowners to achieve corrections has been effective. Dry weather screening indicates that there are no issues of concern.

Mr. McDaniel stated that staff would recommend that this proposed policy be memorialized. If Council approves the policy in regard to the petitioning process and CIP process as presented, it could be treated as an administrative policy. He does not know if it should be a codified ordinance – legal guidance could be obtained. As an administrative policy, Council direction tonight would memorialize that.

Mayor Keenan stated that there do not appear to be any changes in the percentages or in the existing process.

Mr. Peterson inquired if it adopted as an administrative policy, when would public input be obtained.
Mr. McDaniel responded that the draft administrative policy could be scheduled for consideration at a Council meeting, where the public could testify.

Mayor Keenan inquired if an ordinance would be preferred versus an administrative policy.
Mr. McDaniel responded that some cities have codified the policy; some have not. Staff will look into that and provide a recommendation.

Mayor Keenan requested that an ordinance be drafted, based on tonight's discussion.
Mr. McDaniel responded that the draft policy could be revised to reflect tonight's discussion, and provided for discussion at a future Council meeting.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that scheduling either a policy for adoption or an ordinance on Council's agenda for consideration should be acceptable.
Mr. McDaniel responded that staff would draft the policy in keeping with tonight's discussion and provide it to Council.

For benefit of the audience, Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher summarized that Council is generally leaning toward retaining the existing policy. The public is encouraged to look for a future Council agenda on which this will be scheduled, and to attend that meeting to share their affirmation of the process or request any changes. That would be helpful to Council in its decision-making process.

Mr. McDaniel clarified that there is no adopted, existing policy in place -- neither an administrative policy nor an ordinance that addresses this process. There is an existing policy for extension of lines, with the City paying for the main line and the 85% resident interest in connection required. However, the process by which that action is arrived at -- either initiated by the neighborhood, an affidavit process or CIP process -- is not address in a policy or through legislation. To date, the process has been more crisis-driven. This action will formalize the process.

Mr. Reiner requested that he wants to ensure, through survey or otherwise, that sufficient citizen interest and willingness to financially participate exists. With the last three efforts, it was eventually determined that the residents did not want the water and sewer extensions because of the expense of connection.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the petitioning process would ensure that.

- Wayfinding

Mr. Langworthy stated that following a brief presentation, Council will be asked to consider four specific items:

- Street name signs and traffic control signs (mockups on display)
- Historic Dublin wayfinding and entry signs
- Standard wayfinding outside the District
- Overhead wayfinding and traffic control signs at Riverside Drive/SR 161 roundabout

Mr. Gerber inquired what the reference to federal standards indicates.
Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) is a federal document that standardizes the appearance of all traffic control signs. Those standards are adopted by the state, and therefore the state's standards are exactly the same as the federal standards. They govern the size, mixed case and color of the letters.

Mr. Gerber stated that cities have used different colors of letters. Will the letters now used on signs be the same color throughout the country?
Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that green, brown, blue and this version of black and white are allowed, but not Dublin's current reversed colors.

Joelle Angel-Chumbley, Kolar Design, stated that the purpose of using the black letters on white background is to provide better integration with the new streetscape language that is being introduced within the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Lecklider inquired what is required. What would be the consequences of not making this change?
Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that there is no timeframe mandated to replace existing signage. However, repairs of damaged signs must comply with the new federal and state standards.
Mr. Lecklider stated that he assumes this is a community-wide requirement. What will occur with Muirfield signage?
Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that the Muirfield Association maintains the street name signs in Muirfield. The City of Dublin does not have that responsibility.
Mayor Keenan inquired if they are subject to the same guidelines.
Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded affirmatively.
Mayor Keenan inquired how the City would know if Muirfield is complying with these new requirements when repairs are needed.
Mr. McDaniel responded that they are not complying. He is not advocating one way or another.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that the City should make the Muirfield Association aware of this requirement, however.
Mr. McDaniel stated that when he was the Service Director, the City responded to this as an unfunded mandate, and did not implement the new state standard. However, it is now a federal and state mandate. It is typical, however, to have a period of years allowed for implementation.
Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that a period of time was part of the initial standards, but it has since been rescinded. Currently, there is no time frame established.
Mr. McDaniel noted that therein lies the flexibility – no mandated timeframe for implementation.

Mr. Lecklider inquired if Dublin is developing a city-wide plan.
Mayor Keenan stated that many cities do not have the resources to implement new standards.
Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that is the reason the timeframe was removed. Dublin's current signage, which is brown with white lettering, meets the criteria for 25 mph roadways. What is being discussed is updating letter sizes on the higher speed roadways, in mixed case, over a period of time – when those signs lose their normal serviceable life.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that from a visual standpoint, she likes the City's current practice of using all capital letters. Driving at any speed, it is easier for the driver to view all capital letters. Do the federal standards prohibit that?
Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded affirmatively.
Mayor Keenan stated that these standards are required, so he is confused about what Council direction is being requested.

Street Name Signs and Traffic Control Signs (mockups on display)
Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that their recommendation includes a change to the City's standard pole system. Consistent with the Bridge Street District streetscape language, a new round pole system would be implemented in the Bridge Street District only. A black frame would be applied around the street identification signs to provide a more upscale quality to the signature streets. An additional frame panel would be added on the backside of the regulatory signs.

Historic Dublin Wayfinding and Entry Signs
Mr. Langworthy stated that the second item relates to replacement of the Historic District obelisk markers. Kolar's recommendation is a simple, highly legible sign replacing only four of the eight markers; the other four are not in highly visible areas. Instead of two on each side of the street, four new markers would be placed on the inbound side of the road. Because they are not street signs, they do not need to conform to federal standards.

Mr. Langworthy stated that the wayfinding within the Historic District would have a similar type of print, but a finial also would be located at the top of the sign pole. Standard wayfinding in the City would not have the finial. The finial is distinctive, reflecting Celtic symbology. (Graphics shown)

Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that because the City in undergoing so many changes, they have designed the structures with flexibility. The sign panel can slide in and out, permitting replacement. The finial is an element that can be applied or not applied. It will provide distinction in the Historic District versus the Bridge Park area that will have a more contemporary aesthetic.

Standard Wayfinding outside the District
Mr. Langworthy noted that there are some sign panel limitations, including weight and number.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated there is a limit of four messages per panel.

Mayor Keenan inquired if the wind-load issue has been addressed.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley responded that is part of the next step – engineering. The signs will then be integrated into some of the existing streetscape projects.

Mr. Gerber inquired if the material is vinyl, because vinyl fades due to weather conditions.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley responded that the prototypes on display reflect two options. The one at the top has a painted background with the letters on top; the bottom portion is vinyl. In terms of life

expectancy, both are similar. Most sign systems will not show any change in the colors for ten years. As part of the CIP, the City will develop a maintenance scenario, which would include replacement costs that could occur within a 10-15 year period. As the City grows, the system will grow, as well.
Mayor Keenan stated that there was information shared that the City's sign shop could maintain the vinyl sign.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley responded that not only would the fabrication cost of the vinyl be lower, but the City would be able to maintain it. The recommendation is that the City order a certain amount of overage as part of the initial bid purchase, to provide some inventory to use for future replacements.

Overhead Wayfinding and Traffic Control Signs at Riverside Drive/SR 161 Roundabout
Mr. Langworthy showed the graphics for two panels: the top panel identifies the various highway navigation; the bottom panel shows lane assignment and wayfinding. These will be placed in four locations.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that with the implementation of these elements, many of the existing signs will be removed from that environment. This combined system will reduce the number of signs needed. Lane assignment, wayfinding and the ODOT sign are incorporated into one unit. This places much of the signage up in the air, keeping most of the signs off the ground. Aesthetically and for safety reasons, it will be a better solution.
Mr. Langworthy stated that this solution will reduce the clutter.

Mr. McDaniel requested confirmation that after viewing the prototype, Council's direction is to use the bottom panel.
Council consensus was to use the bottom panel.

Implementation and Phasing
Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that implementation would be phased in over two years, which would be programmed in the CIP.
Phase 1 - they are working with EMHT, Structure Point and MKSK to integrate this system into the existing Riverside Drive/SR 161 roundabout project that is currently under construction.
Phase 1A – Implementation by 2016 would include 20 wayfinding signs. A series of temporary signs would allow for street closures during construction and some multimodal kiosks with pedestrian material panels.
Phase 1B – Includes the remainder of the Bridge Street District, including Historic Dublin, and some surrounding areas on Riverside North and around City Hall/Coffman Park. If all of that area is not implemented, some of the sign messaging will be broken in its path.
Completion of Phases 1A and 1B will provide a full path system of 57 signs incorporating all of the Bridge Street District and some of the adjacent areas.

Phase 2
Implementation by the end of 2017 would provide a full, city-wide sign system.

Mr. Lecklider inquired the cost.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley responded that the total cost for all three phases will be $1.3 million. That includes all of the vehicular directional, multimodal kiosks, the Historic District banners, replacement of the traffic control signs and street identification signs.

Mayor Keenan inquired where this project is budgeted.
Mr. McDaniel responded that it would be included for review in the CIP process.
Mayor Keenan inquired if any of it is currently budgeted in the road projects, such as the Riverside Drive signage.
Mr. McDaniel responded that signage for the roundabout was included in that project.
Mayor Keenan asked what the additional cost would be, beyond what is currently programmed? That information can be provided to Council at a later date.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that in Phase 1, all of the sign foundations would be installed as part of the roadway project, but the signage poles and sign panels would be a separate cost. The goal is to integrate these signs with any new roadway projects to avoid tearing up the new streetscape later.

Mr. Lecklider inquired the cost breakdown by phase.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that the breakdown is:

Phase 1A - $278,815; Phase 1B - $674,000; Phase 3 - $398,000.
Combined cost of the phases is $1.3 million.

Mr. McDaniel stated that this cost covers replacements and additions due to planned construction projects. There will be ongoing costs, as well, related to later construction projects. He inquired if the gateway entries are included.
Mr. Langworthy responded that they are not, as some details are continuing to be worked out. The gateway entries will be brought back to Council at a later date.

Ms. Angel-Chambley stated that a conceptual master plan phase was completed earlier. Tentative locations to demarcate the edges of the City have been identified – the primary entries off the I-270 interchange and the entry into Historic Dublin.

Mr. McDaniel stated that there may be additional costs with the gateway signs, the timing for which is uncertain. This item will be covered later with the CIP discussion.

Mr. Langworthy stated that there was a need to get the earlier phases underway due to the construction projects that are beginning.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher requested that copies of the cost sheet and PowerPoint be provided to Council.

Mr. Langworthy requested Council approval of the four wayfinding components.

Mayor Keenan moved approval of the Bridge Street District signs, street name signs and traffic control sign designs, as outlined in Item #1.
Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Lecklider, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Mayor Keenan moved approval of the Historic Dublin wayfinding entry sign design, as outlined in Item #2.
Vice Mayor Gerber seconded the motion.

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

Mayor Keenan moved approval of the standard wayfinding sign design, as outlined in Item #3.
Vice Mayor Gerber seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes.

Mr. Reiner commented that he finds the zoo sign on the right side of the post, with an arrow pointing north through town, to be distracting to the driver. Normally, a driver would look up on a freeway sign to see the direction they are headed. Perhaps the zoo directional arrow should be included at the top. Reading the center directional arrows at the top while traveling 45 mph, then diverting your eyes to the right to read the side sign board is distracting.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated that they have studied the options and worked through the design process with City Planning and Engineering staff. An earlier content consideration incorporated the information on the right into the top panel, but it was too much information. Studies indicated that some people are looking primarily for the route direction. From a further distance back, they will be able to read the information on the green panel, but they will not see the smaller text information until their approach is closer to the sign. There will be a hierarchy of experience at different distances. At 100 feet, the driver will read the content on the green sign and get lined up in the correct lane. As they move closer, they will delineate that content down to specific destinations within that direction. The idea is that by changing the hierarchy of the topography, the information will be understood at different times in the path.

Mr. Reiner stated that he understands that but was curious about not having that information on the center board above.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that when she is traveling, she looks up at the green sign only to determine the roads. She does not want to know what the ancillary activity possibilities are. For those who travel, that is universally consistent on the green signs. The question she has is why the Columbus Zoo is being advertised, when it is not within the City's jurisdiction.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley responded that there currently is a zoo sign inside the Historic District and at this intersection. It is a regional attraction. The messaging hierarchy they have developed for Dublin includes guidance to regional attractions on the edge of the City. Because zoo attendance brings value to the City, they believe it is an important destination to include.

Mr. McDaniel noted that some zoo visitors stay in Dublin hotels.
Mr. Langworthy noted that there are other zoo signs within the City jurisdiction.
The green overhead signs are illuminated.

Mayor Keenan moved approval of the overhead wayfinding traffic control sign design, as outlined in Item #4.
Vice Mayor Gerber seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mayor Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Lecklider, yes; Vice Mayor Gerber, yes.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher requested confirmation that what was presented tonight would be implemented by the end of 2017.
Ms. Angel-Chumbley responded that some of it will be sooner, but all would be completed by the end of 2017.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Clerk of Council